This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received

70-4488

WALTMAN, Bill Wayne, 1929-

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ATTITUDES OF NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS IN SEGREGATED AND DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS IN A METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY.

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/11244/2715

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ATTITUDES OF NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS IN SEGREGATED AND DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS IN A METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

BILL WAYNE WALTMAN

Norman, Oklahoma

1969

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ATTITUDES OF NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS IN SEGREGATED AND DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS IN A METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY

APPROVED BY

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Glenn R. Snider for his advice and counsel as director of this study and the writer's entire doctoral program. Appreciation is also expressed to Dr. J. F. Parker, Dr. Robert Bibens, and Dr. John Pulliam for reading the manuscript and for their contributions as members of the advisory committee.

A special indebtedness is acknowledged to the staff of the Consultative Center for School Desegregation and particularly to Mr. Charles E. Butler and Mr. James Mosley for their assistance in gathering the data and their many helpful suggestions. Mrs. Helen Massey typed the manuscript and performed numerous acts of kindness during the study.

Last, and certainly not least, the writer is forever indebted to his wife LaWanda, son Michael, and daughter Michelle for their continuous support, encouragement, understanding, and patience during the entire study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF TABLES		vi
Chapter		
I.	THE PROBLEM: ITS BACKGROUND AND SCOPE	1
	Background and Need	1
	Purposes of the Study	8
	Statement of the Problem	9
	Hypotheses to Be Tested	9
	Assumptions	11
	Definition of Terms	12
	Delimitations	14
	Procedures	14
	Treatment of the Data	17
	Organization of the Study	17
II.	REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE	18
	The Effects of Desegregated Education upon Attitudes	18
	Desegregation and Negro Self Esteem	27
	Negro Community Attitudes toward Race	33
	Negro Attitudes toward Desegregation	38
III.	DESIGN AND PROCEDURE	42
	Design of the Study	42
	The Population and Sample	43
	The Instruments	47
	Procedure of the Study	51
	Statistical Procedures	51
IV.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	53
	Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Segregated and Desegregated High School Seniors	54
	Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Negro High School Seniors in School A and School D	55

Chapter Page

Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Negro Seniors in School B and School D . . 56
Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Negro Seniors in School C and School D . . 57
Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Negro Seniors in School A and School B . . 59
Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Negro Seniors in School A and School C . . 60
Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Negro Seniors in School B and School C . . 61
Comparison of Attitudes Which Indicate Militancy of Segregated and Desegregated Negro High School Seniors 63
Comparison of Attitudes Which Indicate Militancy of Negro High School Seniors in School A and School D 64
Comparison of Attitudes Which Indicate Militancy of Negro High School Seniors in School B and School D 65
Comparison of Attitudes Which Indicate Militancy of Negro High School Seniors in School C and School D 66
Comparison of Attitudes Which Indicate Militancy of Negro High School Seniors in School A and School B 67
Comparison of Attitudes Which Indicate Militancy of Negro High School Seniors in School A and School C 68
Comparison of Attitudes Which Indicate Militancy of Negro High School Seniors in School B and School C 70
The Relationship between Anti-White Attitudes and Attitudes Which Indicate Militancy of the Desegregated Subjects . . 72
The Relationship between Anti White Attitudes and Attitudes Which Indicate Militancy of the Segregated Subjects . . . 73
Conditions Affecting the Study 74

V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS 77

Summary 77
Findings 80
Conclusions 85
Recommendations 86

BIBLIOGRAPHY 87

APPENDIX 91

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Scores of Segregated and Desegregated Seniors on Anti-White Attitudes .	55
2.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Scores of Negro Seniors in School A and School D	56
3.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Scores of Negro Seniors in School B and School D	57
4.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Scores of Negro Seniors in School C and School D	58
5.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Scores of Negro Seniors in School A and School B	59
6.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Scores of Negro Seniors in School A and School C	60
7.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Scores of Negro Seniors in School B and School C	61
8.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Scores of Segregated and Desegregated Negro High School Seniors on Attitudes Which Indicate Militancy	63
9.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Scores of Negro High School Seniors at School A and School D	64
10.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Scores of Negro High School Seniors at School B and School D	66

Table		Page
11.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Scores of Negro High School Seniors at School C and School D	67
12.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Score of Negro High School Seniors in School A and School B	68
13.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Scores of Negro High School Seniors in School A and School C	69
14.	Results of the Test of Significance Applied to the Mean Scores of Negro High School Seniors at School B and School C	70
15.	Coefficient of Correlation between Anti-White Attitudes and Attitudes Which Indicate Militancy of the Desegregated Subjects . . .	72
16.	Coefficient of Correlation between Anti-White Attitudes and Attitudes Which Indicate Militancy of the Segregated Subjects	73

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ATTITUDES OF NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS IN SEGREGATED AND DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS IN A METROPOLITAN COMMUNITY

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM: ITS BACKGROUND AND SCOPE

Background and Need

Perhaps the greatest challenge facing American education today is that of providing equal educational opportunity for all students. A concomitant concern is that of providing appropriate social experiences which are vital to the educative process. The task of effectively achieving school desegregation is a necessary prerequisite to achieving equal educational opportunity.

Appropriate social experiences cannot be provided for youngsters in a democratic society which is also pluralistic in nature if they are not given the opportunity to interact as peers with people who are different. To refuse to provide these experiences is to take the position that the pluralism of the American democratic society is, in fact, undesirable. Further, it would seem to be a denial of many of our fundamental values, including

that which espouses the dignity and worth of the individual.

The Coleman Report pointed out that Negro youngsters who attend desegregated schools achieve better than those who attend segregated institutions. The report goes on to say that the achievement of Caucasian youngsters is, apparently, not affected by the presence of Negro students.[1]

The legal basis for school desegregation is the now famous Brown v. Topeka Board of Education court case. In 1954 the United States Supreme Court nullified the old Plessy v. Ferguson decision establishing separate but equal facilities when it ruled that separate facilities are inherently unequal. Further impetus toward desegregation of school enrollments was given in the second Brown case in 1955 when the court ordered the defendants to take prompt and reasonable action toward full compliance in school desegregation.

A break-through in the struggle to achieve equal educational opportunity for all students in the public schools was provided through the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Despite the fact that the courts had ruled, it was only with the passage of the Civil Rights Act that penalties could be invoked against school districts which chose not to comply with the law. Section 601

---

[1]James S. Coleman, et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 23.

of Title VI of the act states:

> 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.[1]

Following the Supreme Court decision in the Brown case and the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, education groups began making statements and adopting policies with regard to school desegregation and equality of opportunity. The Educational Policies Commission made this statement concerning equality of opportunity in education:

> From a 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]

The American Association of School Administrators adopted a statement of policy concerning school desegregation. That statement read in part:

> . . . 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 the community in

---

[1]Section 601 of Title VI, Public Law 352 of the 88th Congress, The Civil Rights Act of 1964.

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

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

Despite the Supreme Court decision of 1954, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the evidence that school desegregation is an educationally sound practice; despite the fact that many of our fundamental values seem to support the desegregation of school enrollments; and despite the adoption of policy statements by school administrators and other education groups supporting school desegregation, isolation of public school enrollments by race still persists. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, in its study, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, discovered that racial isolation had, in fact, increased rather than decreased since 1954. The Commission estimated that 75 percent of the Negro students and 83 percent of the white students in the sample attended racially isolated schools.[2]

If racial isolation has increased rather than decreased in recent years, and the weight of evidence tends in that direction, a fundamental concern should be the reasons for it. Some evidence exists that behaviors

---

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

[2]Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 2-3.

and attitudes on the part of both Negroes and whites act as deterrents to the solution of the problem of racial isolation. In pointing out the causes of the recent racial disorders, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders placed its finger on white racial attitudes when it stated:

> Race prejudice has shaped our history decisively in the past; and it now threatens to do so again. . . (with) the continuing exclusion of great numbers of Negroes from the benefits of economic progress through discrimination in employment and education, and their enforced confinement in segregated housing and schools.[1]

Undoubtedly, a major cause for the lack of progress in school desegregation has been the unwillingness on the part of many whites to desegregate the schools. However, aid and succor has been given them by many Negro educators, who for reasons of their own, have sought to keep intact the Negro schools. In the years following the Brown v. Board of Education case, the practice in most southern and border states was that when the schools were desegregated, Negro teachers and administrators were discharged. So prevalent was this practice that in 1969, fifteen years following the end of de jure segregation, there were fewer Negro educators in the state of Oklahoma than prior to the 1954 Supreme Court Decision. This condition existed

---

[1]Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 203.

despite the fact that there had been an increase in the population of the state.

In recent years and months there has been a movement toward self-determination for black people. This movement toward self-determination is taking root in the field of education. At the Harvard Conference on Educational Subsystems in January, 1968, black participants withdrew and formed a black caucus for the purpose of preparing a position statement. That statement read in part:

> Black participants have formed a black caucus to address the question: "How do we gain control of our schools; thus the destiny of our children. . . We demand the responsibility for what happens to our children. We consider it an insult to be asked to prove whether we can do a better job in order to be granted the necessary resources and support. We should not be forced into answering the question, "Can you do it better?" to those who have failed miserably in the past despite their control over substantial resources. Our vision for control by the community is not on a demonstration basis for one or two years, but indefinitely.[1]

Great hope for school desegregation was placed in the so-called "freedom of choice" plan. Under this plan students were permitted to select the school they wished to attend. The rationale for the adoption of the "freedom of choice" plan was that Negro students would recognize the obvious advantages in attending majority white institutions and would, therefore, elect to attend those

---

[1]Position statement of the Five-State Organizing Committee for Community Control, addressed to the Harvard Conference on Educational Subsystems, prepared by a caucus group at the Harvard Conference, January 25, 1968. Reported in Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. XLIX (April, 1968), pp. 450-51.

schools. This, however, has not been the case. Negro students, in great numbers, have elected not to enroll in majority white schools. The failure of "freedom of choice" to produce substantial desegregation has been a concern of both the U.S. Office of Civil Rights and the courts. In the final days of its 1967-68 term, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that "freedom of choice" plans are unacceptable if another method will bring integration more quickly. Stating that many "freedom of choice" plans have not produced integration, the court went on to say that school boards must devise realistic plans which will "work now."[1]

One may, of course, speculate with regard to the reasons for the failure of "freedom of choice" plans to produce significant desegregation. The fact remains, however, that the majority of Negro students, when given the opportunity to do so, did not elect to attend predominately white schools. The alternative, which they did elect, was to attend predominately black schools.

Of fundamental importance is the question of whether or not these behaviors on the part of Negro educators and students are accurate reflections of the views held by the Negro community. Have Negroes become so disenchanted with the unwillingness of white school boards

---

[1]Reported in Washington Monitor, a supplement to Education USA, June 28, 1968.

and educators to integrate Negro educators and students into the mainstream of school life that they are willing to go their separate way in all-black schools? Are the inconveniences, hostile attitudes, and behaviors in desegregated schools influential in discouraging the enrollment of black students in these schools? What are the attitudes which appear to govern the behavior of black students in these matters?

Numerous studies have been done which purport to measure the attitudes of Caucasians toward Negroes, but little has been done to assess the attitudes of Negroes toward Caucasians. The whole matter of the attitudes of Negroes toward Caucasians, Negro attitudes toward civil rights and desegregation needs explication and delineation.

Purposes of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of Negro high school seniors toward Caucasians and toward militancy. The study concerned itself with the differences (or commonalities) in the attitudes of those seniors who attended segregated schools and those who attended desegregated schools.

The belief was held that the study would provide valuable information to educators in planning appropriate educational experiences for students. It should be of special value to the school in discharging its responsibility

for teaching acceptable values and providing appropriate human relations experiences for students.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to determine whether or not there were significant differences in the attitudes of Negro high school seniors in segregated and desegregated schools toward the variables of race and militancy.

More specifically the study attempted to analyze the relationships between anti-white attitudes as measured by the Anti-White Scale developed by Steckler and attitudes which are indicative of militancy as measured by the Militancy Interview Form, which consists of questions developed by Marx.

Hypotheses to Be Tested

The following general hypotheses were formulated:

Ho 1: There are no statistically significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors in segregated and desegregated schools.

Ho 2: There are no statistically significant differences in attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro seniors in segregated and desegregated schools.

Ho 3: There is no significant relationship between anti-white attitudes and attitudes which are indicative of militancy.

In addition to the three general hypotheses, the

following subhypotheses were formulated:

Ho 1: There are no significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors at School A and School D.

Ho 2: There are no significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors at School B and School D.

Ho 3: There are no significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors at School C and School D.

Ho 4: There are no significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors at School A and School B.

Ho 5: There are no significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors at School A and School C.

Ho 6: There are no significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors at School B and School C.

Ho 7: There are no significant differences in attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro high school seniors at School A and School D.

Ho 8: There are no significant differences in attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro high school seniors at School B and School D.

Ho 9: There are no significant differences in

attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro high school seniors at School C and School D.

Ho 10: There are no significant differences in attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro high school seniors at School A and School B.

Ho 11: There are no significant differences in attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro high school seniors at School A and School C.

Ho 12: There are no significant differences in attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro high school seniors at School B and School C.

Assumptions

It was assumed that the school should provide students with the opportunity to develop understandings, attitudes, appreciations and behaviors in the areas which provoke tension and conflict in the society, and that these learnings may be as important as the more abstract cognitive learnings with which most schools are chiefly preoccupied.

It was assumed that these attitudes and behaviors should reflect the generally accepted values of society. These values include: the dignity and worth of the individual; equality of opportunity; the concepts of truth and moral responsibility; freedom to pursue goals which do not infringe upon the rights of others; and the

application of reason as the best means of resolving problems.

It was assumed that students' attitudes are influenced by the school which they attend.

Definition of Terms

The terms to be used in the study are in rather general use in the literature; however, for the sake of clarity, certain of the terms will be defined.

Attitude--An attitude is a relatively enduring system of affective evaluative reactions based upon and reflecting the evaluative concepts or beliefs which have been learned about the characteristics of a social object or class of social objects. As an affective reaction, it is a covert or implicit response. It is a drive-producing response which elicits motives and thus gives rise to overt behavior.[1]

Militancy--Webster defines militancy as the state of being aggressively active. For the purposes of this study, the definition was extended to mean a willingness to become aggressive in civil rights activities.

Desegregated School--The literature suggests several definitions for a desegregated school. Blake defines desegregation as a deliberate change in school

---

[1]Marvin E. Shaw and Jack M. Wright, Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), pp. 10-11.

policy which results in children who formerly attended racially homogeneous schools now attending racially heterogeneous schools.[1] The U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare states that Negro students are considered to be enrolled in a desegregated school only when the white population of that school is at least 50 percent.[2] Another commonly used definition is that a desegregated school is one which cannot be readily identified as either black or white.

It appears obvious that if the racial composition of the total community is a consideration, what is considered to be a desegregated school in one community might not be a desegregated school in another. Of greater importance in determining whether or not a school is desegregated should be the matter of whether or not there is sufficient racial heterogeneity to permit significant interaction between the races.

For the purposes of this study a desegregated school was one in which Negro students comprised at least 20 percent, but not more than 70 percent of the total

---

[1]Elias Blake, Jr., "A Re-Definition of Educational Problems Occasioned by Desegregation and Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964" in a paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Washington, D. C., November 16-18, 1967.

[2]Report by the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, January 16, 1969.

student population. Thus, a desegregated school must have at least the percentage of Negro students in the total individual school population as the Negro population of the school district.

Segregated School--A segregated school was one which did not meet the criteria established for the desegregated school.

Delimitations

The study was limited to include only students in grade twelve of the public schools of Metropolitan Community. Because of the nature of the study this limitation was considered to be an asset rather than a weakness.

Procedure

The population for the study included the Negro seniors in a segregated high school and three desegregated high schools. The desegregated schools were identified as School A, School B, and School C. The segregated school was identified as School D. School A had a student population of 900. Approximately 20 percent of these students were Negro. School B had a student population of 900. Approximately 54 percent of these students were Negro. School C had an enrollment of 1800 students of whom approximately 20 percent were Negro. School D had a student population of 1458 students, all of whom were Negro with the exception of one Caucasian student.

Those seniors in the segregated school who had not attended a segregated school for at least one year prior to the study were excluded. Those seniors in the desegregated schools who had not attended a desegregated school for at least one year prior to the study were excluded.

It was necessary to select an instrument which would measure anti-white attitudes and one which would measure attitudes which indicate militancy. The decision was made to utilize Steckler's Anti-White Scale as the measurement for anti-white attitudes. The Anti-White Scale was developed by Steckler for use in a study of authoritarianism among Negroes. It was an eighteen item instrument in which subjects responded to each item on a Likert-type continuum ranging from agree very much to disagree very much. For negative items, weights were assigned the response alternatives from 6 (agree very much) to 1 (disagree very much). Weights for positive items were reversed. The subject's score was the sum of the weighted alternatives endorsed by him. Higher scores indicated anti-white attitudes. Permission was requested and granted for the use of the scale.

The decision was made to utilize appropriate questions from Marx's doctoral dissertation and published in his book, Protest and Prejudice: A Study of Belief in the Black Community, as the means of obtaining the data relating to militancy. The Militancy Interview Form was

a composite of questions from the Marx study. Marx combined eight items from his study into an Index of Conventional Militancy. These items were used in this study. Four additional items, also from the Marx study, were included after being evaluated and determined appropriate by a group of persons competent in the areas of human relations and school desegregation. Respondents received one point for responding to each question in a militant way. Those who said they had no opinion, or who responded in a non-militant way, received no score on the item. Permission was requested and granted for use of the questions.

A sample of 230 students was selected as subjects for the study. Steckler's Anti-White Scale was administered to students in groups at each of the schools. The information gathered through The Militancy Interview Form, consisting of questions developed by Marx, was obtained by interviewing students in small groups of five to fifteen.

Since the investigator was Caucasian and it was believed that this factor might inject bias into the study should he gather the data, competent Negro educators were asked to administer the data gathering instrument and conduct the interviews after careful indoctrination into the purposes of the study and utilization of the test and interviews.

Treatment of the Data

The data was analyzed utilizing the "t" test.

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{x_1^2 + x_2^2}{N(N-1)}}}$$

An F test was run to check for homogeneity of variance between segregated and desegregated students on both the militancy and anti-white variables.

$$F = \frac{S_1^2}{S_2^2}$$

Other statistical treatment included analyzing the relationships between the anti-white attitudes and attitudes indicative of militancy utilizing coefficient of correlation (Pearson's r).

Organization of the Study

The problem of the study was presented in Chapter I. Chapter II was devoted to a review of the pertinent literature related to the study. A description of the procedure and collection of the data was presented in Chapter III. Chapter IV was devoted to the presentation and analysis of the data. Chapter V contained a summary of the study, the conclusions based on the findings of the study, recommendations, and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF SELECTED LITERATURE

This investigation was primarily concerned with determining whether or not there were significant differences in the attitudes of Negro high school seniors in segregated and desegregated schools toward the variables of race and militancy.

A review of the literature revealed relatively few studies which were related directly to the problem of this investigation. Since the review of the literature presented in this study was intended to deal with the attitudes of Negroes, the review was organized into categories which corresponded to the major aspects of the study.

The Effects of Desegregated Education upon Attitudes

McDowell[1] studied the interracial attitudes of Negro youth living in Washington, D. C. The sample included 582 male and female high school students and dropouts between the ages of 16 and 19. The study sought to understand how particular situations affect interracial

[1]Sophia McDowell, "How Anti-White Are Negro Youth," American Education, March, 1968, pp. 2-4.

perspectives, and to account for variations in attitudes on the basis of various background attributes such as schooling.

These points stood out in the study: (1) Negro willingness to associate with whites was high. (2) This willingness was not extended equally to all whites or in all situations, but varied according to the kinds of whites and the kind of situation. It also varied according to how much voluntary informal social contact the subjects had with white fellow students. Negroes who already had much voluntary association with white fellow students inside the school, and particularly outside the school, were the ones who reported greatest willingness to associate with whites in all kinds of situations.[1]

These findings may appear inconsistent with the sensational evidence of interracial dissent in the cities of the land. However, McDowell stated:

> . . . In our interpretation there is no real inconsistancy. Mostly, the young Negroes in the headlines --except for small numbers of the ideologically radical and the extremely alienated--are not rioting because they want 'out' from the white world, but because they want 'in.' They share the values of their white peers, and want the same privileges.[2]

Crain,[3] in 1966 studied 1,624 Negro men and women

---

[1] Ibid., p. 3.

[2] Ibid., p. 4.

[3] Robert L. Crain, et al., "The Effects of Defacto School Segregation: A Survey of Negro Adults in Northern Cities," unpublished study prepared for the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, November, 1966).

who lived in the North and West. The primary problem of the study was to measure the long-run effects of school integration on adult Negroes. The findings were summarized as follows:

> . . . The impact of integration is widespread. Negro graduates of integrated schools are more likely to have attended and graduated college. . . . The present study found that Negro students in integrated schools not only score higher on achievement tests while in school but that they continue to score higher as adults. They are more likely to have better jobs and higher incomes. In general, they have more contacts with whites as adults, less anti-white feeling, and in general, stronger feelings of optimism about the opportunities available to them and a greater sense of happiness.[1]

In general, Negroes who attended integrated schools as children were less antagonistic toward whites even if the Negroes lived in segregated housing. Crain commented:

> Past contact with whites is a substitute for present contact in breaking down Negro desires to avoid whites. This implies that even if segregation in other aspects of American society is unchanged, an increase in school integration will in itself increase the willingness of Negroes to associate with whites.[2]

Less social distance did not, however, mean greater illusions on the part of Negroes concerning the willingness of white people to accept Negroes. Nearly nine tenths of the once-desegregated Negroes agreed that "the trouble with white people is that they think they are better than other people."[3]

Attending an integrated school had a profound

---

[1] Ibid., p. 4.

[2] Ibid., p. 79.

[3] Ibid., p. 82.

influence on the Negro adult:

> . . . We find that having a high education, having attended an integrated school, or having a high number of contacts with whites each increases happiness, and surprisingly, school integration is the most important of the three factors.[1]

In 1965 the Dumbarton Research Council studied 1,429 white and Negro graduates of the six high schools of Oakland, California. All of the subjects had attended the Oakland Public Schools from first through twelfth grade.[2]

The purpose of the study was to determine how Negro and white students who were educated in the same school system in the city of Oakland, differed in terms of the consequences of their varied educational experiences. The variables studied were success in finding employment, continuation of education, and racial attitudes. The primary comparisons were between those Negro and white students having attended racially homogeneous as opposed to racially desegregated schools.[3]

The findings were summarized as follows:

1. Negro graduates who attended desegregated schools were more willing for their offsprings to have

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 89, 92.

[2] Report of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools II (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), pp. 207-210.

[3] Ibid., p. 208.

an interracial education than those who attended segregated schools.

2. Negro graduates who attended desegregated schools were more willing to live in biracial neighborhoods (irrespective of difficulty encountered) and were more likely to have white friends than Negroes who attended segregated schools.

3. Negro graduates who attended desegregated schools were on the average less suspicious of whites, and felt somewhat more at ease in a biracial setting than similar Negroes who attended segregated schools.[1]

Webster[2] studied the effects of interracial contact and its effect upon acceptance. His sample included 60 white students and 44 Negro students in a Richmond, California junior high school. Parents of the two groups of children varied widely in terms of occupations and educational attainment. Control groups of seventh grade pupils were selected in segregated schools where no interracial contact was possible. Parents of Negro students in the sample came predominately from the South. After six months of contact, the Negro students had become more

---

[1] Ibid., p. 208.

[2] Staten W. Webster, "Intergroup Contact in a Newly Integrated School and Its Effects upon the Levels of Acceptance and Friendship Choices of a Selected Group of Seventh Grade Pupils," unpublished doctoral dissertation in Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1960.

socially accepting of white students than whites were of Negroes. He also found that after six months, white students who had experienced interracial contact had become less accepting than were the white control students who had not experienced any interracial contact.

He concluded that (1) contact of itself was insufficient without adult guidance; (2) the initial conflict between Negro and white was never overcome and was allowed to stand in the way of improvement; (3) without a broad community program of positive acceptance, interracial classroom behavior cannot be changed in fundamental ways; and (4) six months may be too short a time in which to develop constructive interracial attitudes.

Gordon[1] studied the educational consequences of joining together students of extraordinarily varying social circumstances. In September, 1961, the predominately Negro Carver, Michigan school district was merged into the adjacent Oak Park district, an upper-middle class white suburb of Detroit. The occupations of the Negro and white parents varied widely. Only about 3 percent of the Negro parents belonged to the professional or proprietor class, while 46 percent of the white parents did so.

---

[1]Leonard Gordon, "An Acculturation Analysis of Negro and White High School Students: The Effects on Social and Academic Behavior of Initial Close Interracial Association at the Secondary Level," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, Wayne State University, 1966.

Almost the reverse was true of the unskilled class. Only 3 percent of the white parents were in this group, while 66 percent of the Negro parents were in the unskilled classification.[1]

Gordon found that Negro students participated less than whites in extracurricular activities and held office less frequently. Athletic activities were the great exception. Negroes joined non-academic school clubs at a ratio of about eight to one, while whites did so at about one to one.[2] More incidents occurred between Negro and white girls than between boys. Apparently, a basic reason for these tensions was economic and psychological; white girls were able to afford more expensive and contemporary clothing and this aroused resentment.

Gordon found that Negro students did not tend significantly to defer to whites in selecting companions and leaders; a good deal of self-selection occurred. Yet, there was a certain amount of white snobbery that also occurred:

> . . . 16 percent of the Negro students indicated that the fellow student they would like most to know falls into the white student category, while among white students, only 1 percent indicated a desire to know most a fellow student who is in the Negro category.[3]

Gordon found that white students would adapt to "those student activities in which Negroes engage and

---

[1] Ibid., p. 98.

[2] Ibid., p. 119.

[3] Ibid., p. 129.

which tend to enhance the self perception and status of white students."[1] More white students went out for athletics after Negro students came to Oak Park. The formation of a Human Relations Club in 1964-65 was another example of adaptive behavior by white students. Another adaptation was in a cooperative training program instituted in 1963-64 as a work-study device especially for Negro seniors. When Gordon made his study, he found that whites in the program outnumbered Negroes.

The expressed self-confidence scores of Negro students dropped. In 1961, 96 fourth through eighth graders at Carver Elementary were asked whether they were confident of being able to succeed at Oak Park. Ninety-five percent replied yes. In 1965, Negro students at Oak Park were asked the same question and seventy-two percent replied yes. Two observations should be made. First, as Gordon stressed, nearly three-quarters of the Negro children actually at Oak Park were still confident of succeeding. This was perhaps a more significant figure than the earlier 95 percent. Second, considering the objective achievement and social status gulf between the two groups of children, a modest drop from 95 to 72 percent might reflect a necessary and realistic adjustment by the Negro children. Gordon concluded that "lower-class Negro students from Carver performed more adequately than is

---

[1] Ibid., p. 165.

generally true of lower-class Negro students. The high achieving student culture of Oak Park was clearly a factor in this change."[1]

Chesler and Segal[2] made a comprehensive study of desegregation in Alabama. Their interviewers, all Negro college students, talked, during June through August, 1966, with a total of 217 Negro students who had attended a white junior high or high school in Alabama during the 1965-1966 school year. This number was "over 40 percent of the entire population of Negro junior and senior high students attending desegregated public schools in Alabama in 1965-66."[3] A control group of 75 Negro students was established. These were persons who lived near a desegregator, but who for one reason or another had not transferred to a white school.

The desegregators were extremely apprehensive about what reception they would meet at the white school:

> . . . over one-fourth of the Negro students went to school expecting to be beaten or harmed physically . . . another 52 percent felt "uneasy" or "worried," but not actually scared.[4]

Chesler and Segal summarized the students' actual

---

[1] Ibid., p. 233.

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

[3] Ibid., p. 15.

[4] Ibid., p. 28.

experience: "Quite clearly, Negro students experienced considerable indifference and rejection, and often physical and emotional brutality, when they entered white schools."[1] Yet, fifteen percent of the desegregators reported "positive" reactions and seventy-four percent said some whites had acted in a friendly way.[2]

In comparing the desegregators with the control group the researchers stated that "desegregators seem to be less negatively prejudiced against whites, and more actively concerned about change and their efforts in change roles."[3]

Desegregation and Negro Self-Esteem

Haggstrom[4] studied self-esteem as related to desegregation in Detroit and Ypsilanti. His sample consisted of a total of 120 Negro households in both cities. By self-esteem, he meant "self perception of the degree to which the basic values and aspirations are realized."[5] His central finding was that desegregated Negroes had higher self-esteem than did segregated Negroes. Haggstrom

---

[1] Ibid., p. 36.

[2] Ibid., p. 35.

[3] Ibid., p. 60.

[4] Warren C. Haggstrom, "Self-Esteem and Other Characteristics of Residentially Desegregated Negroes," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Social Psychology, University of Michigan, 1962.

[5] Ibid., p. 84.

stated that this was so "because the Negro community as a symbol of inferiority depresses the self-esteem of its members."[1]

Desegregated Negroes were more rejecting of the color line and more accepting of both white and Negro people. Segregated Negroes, on the other hand, tended to live within the color line and were less accepting of whites. Haggstrom found that "desegregated families more often and to a greater extent help children consciously work through problems of their feelings about racial differences."[2]

Haggstrom concluded:

> My guess is that Negroes of high achievement in adult life tend disproportionately either to have had desegregated childhoods or to have been children in households the adult members of which have been desegregated during childhood.[3]

Stinson[4] studied the effects of desegregation upon basic intergroup attitudes. A sample of 833 Negro and white students in 13 schools located in a large southern city was tested in September, 1962, and February, 1963. He found that

> positive perceptions of others' self-acceptance increased for the desegregated group while perceptions

---

[1] Ibid., p. 160.

[2] Ibid., p. 157.

[3] Ibid., p. 172.

[4] Harold N. Stinson, "The Effect of Desegregation on the Adjustment and Values of Negro and White Students," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1963.

> of the segregated group on the same variable decreased. There was greater similarity in the perceptions of Negro and white students than in the perceptions of segregated and desegregated students.[1]

Stinson did not indicate what specific experiences might have produced these results.

Singer[2] compared the effect of segregation and desegregation on the interracial attitudes of white and Negro fifth graders. Three schools were used in the test: (1) A High Exposure School (HES), whose fifth-grade student body was 60 percent white and in which extensive interracial contact was evident; (2) two Low Exposure Schools (LES), one whose fifth-grade enrollment was all white and the other whose fifth-grade enrollment was 15 percent white.

One aspect of the study included administering certain drawing tests which, in turn, included a self-portrait. Twenty-four of the Negro children colored the face of the self portrait. Of great importance was the fact that 18 of the 24 students were in HES. Singer observed, ". . . The Negro children who had greater contact with white children showed a tendency to differentiate themselves and assert their identity more clearly."[3]

---

[1] Ibid., p. 79.

[2] Dorothy G. Singer, "Interracial Attitudes of Negro and White Fifth-Grade Children in Segregated and Unsegregated Schools," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1960.

[3] Ibid., pp. 99-101.

Negro children in HES generally had less regard for whites as academic achievers than Negro children in LES. Singer explained: "The segregated Negro may see the white world as one of success and his own world as one of failure. . . ."[1] The bright Negro girl in HES "can conceive of herself as achieving more than a white child and turns to her own group rather than to whites for socialization."[2] Under integration, then, the Negro child was able "to differentiate himself without anxiety."[3] Singer commented that Negro children in LES "were less accepting of their skin color, saw themselves as poor achievers, and developed negative attitudes toward various non-white groups."[4]

Powell[5] studied the aspirations of academically talented Negro juniors and seniors in the segregated high schools of Alabama. The sample consisted of one hundred students who had scored above the 85th percentile on the national norm for the California Test of Mental Maturity.[6] Almost 40 percent of the sample did not plan to attend college. In explaining this low percentage, Powell quoted

---

[1] Ibid., p. 105.

[2] Ibid., p. 108.

[3] Ibid., p. 109.

[4] Ibid., pp. 113-114.

[5] Christus N. Powell, "Factors Affecting the Educational and Vocational Plans of High Ability Negro Students in the High Schools of Alabama," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1963.

[6] Ibid., p. 9.

several student responses: "I don't have the money to attend college, and if I did attend all I could do would be to teach school or carry the mail."[1]

It is important to remember that these students were identified as academically talented. In fact only 15 percent of all the students in the nation exhibited greater mental ability as measured by the California Test of Mental Maturity than did the students in Powell's sample. The indication is that the students did not perceive that they had a good chance to succeed even with a college education. How many of the sixty who planned to attend college who did attend is not known.

Meketon[2] in 1966 studied the effects of desegregation upon the self-esteem of Negro children. Her subjects were 89 Negro fifth and sixth grade students in three schools. Two of the schools were desegregated and one was a segregated Negro school. The segregated school was designated as School A. One of the desegregated schools was designated as School B, and the other as School C.

Schools B and C became desegregated under very different circumstances. School C desegregated amid a

---

[1] Ibid., p. 44.

[2] Betty F. Meketon, "The Effects of Integration upon the Negro Child's Responses to Various Tasks and upon His Level of Self-Esteem," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1966.

good deal of conflict and controversy, including demonstrations by the Negro community. School B, on the other hand, became desegregated through administrative action and no demonstration and debate were apparent.

In comparing the subjects in the three schools it was found that the subjects at School A scored higher on the Self Subtest, a partial test of self-esteem than the subjects at School B, the peacefully desegregated school. Subjects at School C, however, had significantly higher self-esteem scores than did the subjects at School A, the segregated school. According to the judgment of teachers, subjects at School C possessed higher levels of self-esteem than did the subjects in either of the other two schools. Teachers at Schools A and B found more evidence of defensive behavior than did teachers at School C.[1]

In explaining the differences between the subjects at the three schools Meketon suggested that family support, the support of a close-knit Negro community, national support including legal assistance from the N.A.A.C.P., and Supreme Court decisions were factors in the higher self-esteem scores of the children at School C.[2] Several Negro teachers worked at School C, and they, apparently, gave added support to the students. No Negro teachers were employed at School B.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 67-68.

[2] Ibid., p. 79.

Meketon had hypothesized that anxiety would overwhelm the desegregated subjects. This apparently did not occur. She commented: "The child is remarkably adaptable and flexible, and given the right circumstances can overcome many of the detrimental aspects of integration."[1]

Negro Community Attitudes Toward Race

Cothran,[2] in an effort to determine the uniformity, direction, universality and intensity of Negro conceptions of white people in the South, used thirty stereotyped conceptions in interviews with 174 Negro subjects who represented three social class groups. The thirty conceptions had been those found by Cothran to be most frequently mentioned by 341 Negroes questioned using an open-ended interviewing technique on stereotypes of whites.

Cothran found that the lower class was more uniformly unfavorable in its stereotyped conceptions of white people than either the upper or middle class.[3] There was little difference in the extent to which upper and middle-class Negroes held unfavorable conceptions of white people. A most interesting fact was that higher proportions of upper and lower-class Negroes were strongly unfavorable in

---

[1] Ibid., p. 90.

[2] Tilman C. Cothran, "Negro Conceptions of White People," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. VI, March, 1951, pp. 459-67.

[3] Ibid., p. 460.

their conceptions of white people. Middle-class Negroes were less inclined to be strongly unfavorable in their conceptions.[1]

Cothran concluded that the selected Negro stereotypes of white people were widely recognized in the Negro society; that there was a high degree of uniformity in responses; in most instances Negro conceptions were in the direction of unfavorableness; and the lower class was more intensely unfavorable than either the upper or middle class.[2]

McDaniel and Babchuk[3] duplicated Cothran's study in the North in an attempt to discover the degree to which northern Negroes differed from those in the South in the favorableness or unfavorableness of their conceptions of white people. McDaniel and Babchuk sampled 100 Negroes representing different social classes as designated by educational achievement and occupation. The sample was evenly divided between men and women and represented a wide age range.[4]

In this study the three social class groups were less neutral in responding to the stereotyped conceptions

---

[1] Ibid., p. 460. [2] Ibid., p. 467.

[3] Paul A. McDaniel and Nicholas Babchuk, "Negro Conceptions of White People in a Northeastern City," Phylon, Vol. XXI, No. 1, Spring, 1960, pp. 7-19.

[4] Ibid., p. 8.

than the people in the South. Consequently there were more favorable and unfavorable responses to the conceptions in the North. A similar relationship prevailed when the samples were compared along class lines. The northern middle-class sample was especially more unfavorable in its view of the whites when compared to the southern middle-class group.[1]

The findings of the McDaniel-Babchuk study were summarized as follows:

1. The stereotyped conceptions of white people were found to be equally as well known in the North as in the South.

2. Negroes in the North were less likely to respond neutrally to the stereotyped conceptions of white people.

3. There was considerable consensus between the samples with regard to the degree of uniformity in the responses; in most instances the direction of the responses was unfavorable.

4. The lower-class groups in both samples were more intensely unfavorable than either the middle or upper-class groups.

5. Essentially, the same pattern of responses was manifest in the two samples. This would seem to suggest

---

[1] Ibid., p. 16.

that there is considerable universality and agreement in the stereotyped conceptions of white people held by Negroes.[1]

In October, 1964, Marx[2] studied 1,119 Negro adults drawn from several different samples across the nation. The study concerned itself with two major problems: the reaction of Negro Americans to their oppression and quest for justice; and with the hostility of Negro Americans toward whites and the extent to which protest was linked to this hostility.[3]

Despite the fact that the civil rights movement had quickened its pace by 1964, and Negro protest had made itself manifest in violence, Negroes, in general, were not found to be hostile. Marx commented: "The data in this study suggest that in late 1964 the collective mood of the Negro community was still a fairly moderate one. . . ."[4]

Following are the major findings of the Marx study:

1. Only a third of the Negro community was consistently militant in outlook.

2. In spite of what many would consider strong provocation, even fewer were antiwhite.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 18.

[2] Gary T. Marx, Protest and Prejudice: A Study of Belief in the Black Community (New York: Harper and Row, 1967).

[3] Ibid., p. xxiv.

[4] Ibid., p. 205.

3. To the degree Negroes distinguish between Jewish and non-Jewish whites, they prefer Jews.

4. Civil rights militancy was negatively related to antiwhite and anti-Jewish feelings.

5. In spite of its importance to protest in some respects, religiosity is an important factor inhibiting militancy.

6. Conventional civil rights groups and leaders enjoyed overwhelming popularity.

7. Very few Negroes were strong supporters of the Muslims.

8. The least privileged Negroes, who are most likely to profit from social change, were the least likely to be militant.[1]

The common thread which ran through the three studies cited above was that it is the lower class Negro who is most likely to be hostile toward others. This is not surprising, since this is the group which has enjoyed the least success; consequently, they have little reason to "feel good" about themselves. Pettigrew stated the case when he quoted Trent: ". . . one investigator noted that those children who harbored the most negative attitudes toward both Negroes and whites tended to be

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 205-206.

among the least self-accepting."[1] Pettigrew continued: "Since the playing of the role of 'Negro' is likely to lead to low self-esteem, many Negroes also have a low regard for others. In addition, there are intimate relationships between hate and love and between frustration and aggression."[2]

Negro Attitudes Toward Desegregation

The notion is held by many that desegregation has a distinct appeal to the Negro middle class as opposed to the lower class. However, there is some evidence which would indicate that this is not the case.

Blumenfeld[3] studied the elite Negro families in the city of Baltimore. The Negro elite to which Blumenfeld referred were, as is the case in many communities across the nation, school teachers. It was found that the elite families were not in agreement regarding the desirability of desegregation. Blumenfeld asserted:

> In 1962, while some of the elite families were sending their children to schools which were an hour's drive away in order that the children might attend an integrated school, a sizable number of elite families would have their children travel a comparable distance

---

[1]Thomas F. Pettigrew, A Profile of the Negro American (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1964), p. 36.

[2]Ibid., pp. 36-37.

[3]Ruth Blumenfeld, "Children of Integration," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, 1965. University Microfilms Number 66-251.

> in order to avoid having the child sit in an integrated classroom.[1]

Rivera, McWorter, and Lillienstein were interested in the social class factors in two separate school boycotts in Chicago.[2] The investigators identified those Negro parents who had supported the first boycott in October, 1963, but had failed to support the second boycott in February, 1964. They explained:

> Those who shifted from a pro to an anti-boycott stand . . . were disproportionately persons of higher educational attainment. These figures imply a challenge to at least one widely held assumption concerning the values of middle-class Negroes: that such persons attach overriding importance to the principle of desegregated public school facilities. . . . (Defectors) tend to stress the quality of their children's education over the number of whites who happen to be enrolled in neighborhood schools.[3]

The October boycott had attracted 224,000 Negro students, while the February boycott drew 172,000.[4] The largest differences in participation were found to be in middle-class Negro areas.

It might be interesting to speculate further with regard to the reasons for the withdrawal of support for the second boycott. It appears obvious that the first boycott in October did not accomplish its objectives or

---

[1] Ibid., p. 112.

[2] Ramon J. Rivera, Gerald A. McWorter, and Ernest Lillienstein, "Freedom Day II in Chicago," Integrated Education, August-September, 1964.

[3] Ibid., pp. 37, 40.

[4] Ibid., p. 37.

there would have been no need for a second boycott in February. The investigators did not report whether or not there was a reasonable expectation that the second boycott would accomplish its objectives. Since the children were absent from classes for a period of time during October, it is possible that their parents were unwilling for them to interrupt their education for a second time in the same school year. In other words, it is possible that the failure of middle-class Negro parents to support the second boycott in February was completely unrelated to their positions with regard to desegregated school facilities.

Noel[1] studied the relationship of race consciousness and attitude toward persons of another race. His sample was composed of 515 adult Negroes. With reference to ethnic identification, the subjects were divided into two classifications: (1) Identifiers, or those who had a positive identification with Negroes as a group, and (2) Disparagers, or those who had a negative identification. Noel found that "Negroes who were militantly identified with the minority group were consistently more favorably inclined toward integration, both in attitude and action, than were those who disparaged the in-group."[2]

---

[1]Donald L. Noel, "Minority Group Identification and Societal Integration," unpublished paper presented at the 1966 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association.

[2]Ibid., p. 5.

In other words those who felt most Negro were likely to be least anti-white.

Noel explored the relationship of ethnic identification to "defensive insulation." Respondents who accepted the following proposition were classed as believers in defensive insulation: "It is best to stay away from white people; then you will avoid all embarrassing situations." Only sixteen percent of the persons classified as identifiers agreed with the statement, while 84 percent said no. Of the disparagers 56 percent agreed, and 44 percent disagreed. Put in other terms those who felt most Negro were much more willing to associate with whites than the disparagers.

In analyzing the results of the literature reviewed, it can be concluded that interracial interaction is a factor in the formulation of beliefs and attitudes of Negroes toward Caucasians. It can be generalized that contact with whites contributes to more favorable attitudes, but not under all conditions. The degree to which social class functions as a determinant in racial attitudes is not clear.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

Design of the Study

This study was designed to investigate the attitudes of segregated and desegregated Negro high school seniors toward Caucasians and militancy. It was believed that a study of this nature would contribute, at least in a small way, to the ability of the public school to discharge its responsibility for providing appropriate social and human relations experiences for students.

A major consideration regarding the design of the study involved a decision affecting the delimitation of the study and the selection of a group of students whose attitudes would be examined. It appeared obvious that some limitation must be placed on the population to be included in the study.

The decision was made to include only high school seniors in the study. This decision was made for two basic reasons: (1) from the standpoint of chronological age the seniors were the most mature group of students in the school, and (2) the seniors had been exposed to the educational system for a longer period of time than any

other group of students. These considerations were deemed to be important since it was believed that age and maturity are factors in the formulation of attitudes and that students' attitudes are affected by the school which they attend.

The study was further limited to include only the Negro seniors in the public schools of Metropolitan Community. This limitation was believed to be desirable because: (1) the intent of the study was to investigate the attitudes of Negro high school seniors in a metropolitan area, and (2) it was believed that expansion of the study would not add significantly to it.

There were two Negro segregated schools and three desegregated schools in Metropolitan Community which met the criteria established in Chapter I for segregated and desegregated schools. The segregated schools were identified as School D and School X. The desegregated schools were identified as School A, School B, and School C.

School X was a very small school when compared to the other schools in Metropolitan Community. Further, it was located in a rural area and, hence, had a largely rural orientation. For these reasons it was decided to exclude School X from the population of the study.

The Population and Sample

School A was one of the older high schools in the Metropolitan Community School System. Located in a once

affluent neighborhood on the city's near northside, the school operated until the fall of 1968 as an all-white junior-senior high school serving, largely, a middle-class clientele. School A became a desegregated school as a result of a court order which affected three other junior-senior high schools.

The court order was the culmination of a civil suit which was filed in October, 1961. The suit sought to enjoin the board of education from maintaining a dual school structure and other relief. The suit was in litigation until July 27, 1967, when a federal judge issued a final order for the implementation of a plan for the desegregation of the public schools of Metropolitan Community.

Included in the plan for desegregation was the combination of four secondary attendance zones. School A was paired with another junior-senior high school, with School A becoming a senior high school and the other school becoming a junior high school. School B was paired with another junior-senior high school, with School B becoming a senior high school and the other school becoming a junior high school. The board of education elected to effect the pairings a year earlier than the court had decreed. Permission was requested and granted to combine the schools at the beginning of the 1968-69 school year.

School A began the 1968-69 school year with a

student population of 900. Approximately 20 percent of these students were Negro. This was the first year in which Negroes had attended the school.

While it is true that Negro students had not attended School A prior to September, 1968, the seniors at School A had previously attended a desegregated junior-senior high school. Many of the seniors at School A had attended a desegregated school since the seventh grade.

School B had an interesting and unique history. Built in 1937 in the northeast area of Metropolitan Community, the school functioned for many years as a junior-senior high school serving an all white and relatively affluent student clientele. School B became a desegregated school in 1960. Desegregation came about because a growing Negro population in the city began moving north into the attendance area served by School B where better housing was available. School B was able to function as a desegregated school for a number of years; however, as more Negroes began moving into the area, more and more whites began to leave. Thus, a seemingly irreversible and all too familiar pattern was established. By the beginning of the school year 1967-68, the student population at School B was 95 percent Negro.

As a result of the court order which paired School B with another junior-senior high school, School B began the 1968-69 school year with 900 students and a

racial composition of 51 percent white and 49 percent Negro. At the end of the first semester the racial composition had changed to 54 percent Negro and 46 percent white.

School B met the criteria established in Chapter I for the desegregated school. Despite the fact that during the 1967-68 school year the student population was 95 percent Negro, it was believed that a significant number of Negro seniors could be identified who had been in attendance at the school in prior years. The decision was made to include the seniors at School B on that basis.

School C was located at the far northeastern edge of the school district. The school operated for many years as an independent school district. In 1960 School C was annexed to the Metropolitan Community School System and had operated as a junior-senior high school since that time. At the beginning of the 1968-69 school year School C had an enrollment of 1800 students of which approximately 20 percent were Negro.

School D was located on the east side of Metropolitan Community. The present building was completed in 1954 and served a predominately Negro attendance area. At the beginning of the 1968-69 school year, School D had a student population of 1458. There was only one white student in attendance.

The decision was made to utilize all of the Negro

seniors at School A, School B, and School C who met the criteria established in Chapter I. It was further decided to draw a random sample of comparable size from the senior class at School D.

A total of 106 seniors from the desegregated schools were utilized in the study. A number of seniors in the desegregated schools were not utilized, the chief reasons being: (1) they did not have sufficient desegregated school experience to meet the criteria established in Chapter I, and (2) absence from school at the time the data were gathered.

A random sample of 140 students was selected from the senior class at School D utilizing a method of random sampling described by Van Dalen.[1] A table of random digits developed by Fisher and Yates[2] was utilized in the sample selection. Of the 140 students, sixteen were absent when the data were gathered. This left a total of 124 subjects who were utilized in the study.

The Instruments

The Anti-White Scale (Appendix A) is an eighteen item Likert-type instrument developed by Gerald Steckler.[3]

---

[1]Deobold Van Dalen, Understanding Educational Research (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), pp. 298-99.

[2]Ronald A. Fisher and Frank Yates, Statistical Tables for Biological, Agricultural and Medical Research (New York: Hafner Publishing Company, Inc., 1953), pp. 114-19.

[3]Shaw and Wright, op. cit., p. 394.

It was used concurrently with his anti-Negro scale to measure the attitudes of Negroes in a study of authoritarianism in Negroes. Steckler's original sample consisted of 299 college students and members of church groups, all of whom were Negro. The sample represented both northern and southern Negroes.

The items are such that they lend themselves more to the testing of nonwhite than of white samples, and would be better used with Negro samples. Subjects responded to each item on a Likert-type continuum: agree very much, agree pretty much, agree a little, disagree a little, disagree pretty much, disagree very much. For negative items, weights were assigned the response alternatives from 6 (agree very much) to 1 (disagree very much). Weights for positive items were reversed. The subject's score was the sum of the weighted alternatives endorsed by him. Higher scores indicated antiwhite attitudes.

The split-half reliability of the scale was reported as .88. Shaw and Wright stated that the scale seemed to have very good content validity. In addition the scale correlated at .60 and .55, with the California E and F scales respectively.[1] These correlations were taken as evidence of construct validity.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 394-95.

The Militancy Interview Form (Appendix B) is a composite of questions from Gary T. Marx's doctoral dissertation which he did at the University of California in 1964.[1] His original sample consisted of 1,119 Negro adults selected randomly from several population centers.

Marx combined eight items from his study into an Index of Conventional Militancy. Respondents received one point for responding to each question in a militant way. Those who said they had no opinion, or who responded in a non-militant way, received no score on the item.[2]

Since it was the intent of this study to deal with militancy in the broader sense, it seemed advisable to include four additional items from the Marx study. The eight items used in the index did not include questions dealing with riots and violence. In view of the riots and other indications of Negro militancy which have occurred across the nation since 1964, it seemed both appropriate and necessary to include those questions if the study was to deal with major aspects of Negro militancy. Neither did the index include questions dealing with black nationalism. Since this was a concern which had grown since 1964, it seemed necessary to deal with the question in the interview.

---

[1] Marx, op. cit., p. 41.

[2] Ibid.

Marx stated that the index seemed to satisfy three main criteria of validity. First, the items making up the index had face validity. With one or two exceptions, every statement bore directly on the current civil rights struggle.

Second, the items were internally consistent; the items were highly intercorrelated. In addition, response to each was related to score on the index. At any given point on the index the proportion who agreed with any item was higher than at any lower point on the index. In other words, each item made an independent and systematic contribution to the respondents' scores. These patterns were the same in all samples.

Thirdly, external validation was provided. An index is said to be externally valid when it predicts responses to items that are not a part of the index but are related to the phenomenon the index purports to measure. Where scores on the index were considered in relation to a number of items related to militancy, it was clear that the index was in fact externally valid.[1] In addition the four supplemental questions from the Marx study were evaluated and determined appropriate by a group of eight persons who were competent in the areas of human relations and school desegregation. This evaluation gave additional support for the inclusion of the four items in this study.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 45.

Procedure of the Study

Students at each of the schools were brought together in order to complete the Anti-White Scale. They were asked to read the instructions carefully and to complete the scale. The interview, which was the method used in gathering the data needed relating to militancy, was rather highly structured. Students were gathered in small groups of five to fifteen where rapport was established, the purposes of the interview were explained, and students were asked to react to the questions on the interview form. This was followed by a conversation with each student in order to clarify any points not clear, and to gather additional reactions when possible.

Statistical Procedures

In order to test the hypotheses stated in Chapter I, it was necessary to measure the differences in the means of the scores on the anti-white attitudes and attitudes which indicate militancy of seniors in each of the groups. The mean and standard deviation for each group were computed on each of the two variables. The "t" test was used to test the significance of the difference between each of the groups on both anti-white attitudes and attitudes which indicated militancy. The significance of the difference in each case was tested at the .05 level of confidence. An F test was run to check for homogeneity of variance between each of the groups on both the militancy

and anti-white variables. Since the raw scores were available, the coefficient of correlation (Pearson's r) was utilized in analyzing the relationships between anti-white attitudes and attitudes which indicate militancy.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

This study was concerned with analyzing the relationships between attitudes toward whites and attitudes which indicated militancy of Negro high school seniors in segregated and desegregated schools. The significance of the difference between mean scores on anti-white attitudes was tested for the following: (1) the total segregated and desegregated samples, (2) School A and School D, (3) School B and School D, (4) School C and School D, (5) School A and School B, (6) School A and School C, and (7) School B and School C.

In addition the significance of the difference between mean scores on attitudes which indicated militancy was tested for the following: (1) the total segregated and desegregated samples, (2) School A and School D, (3) School B and School D, (4) School C and School D, (5) School A and School B, (6) School A and School C, and (7) School B and School C.

The primary statistical problem in each case was that of evaluating the difference in the mean scores between each of the groups. The statistical treatment

used to determine the significance of the difference was the "t" test.

An F test was run for each of the groups treated with the "t" test in order to check for homogeneity of variance. Since none of the F's was significant, it was concluded that all of the variances were, indeed, homogeneous, and that no unusual treatment of the data was necessary.

Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Segregated and Desegregated High School Seniors

Appendix C of this study presents the anti-white and militancy raw scores, and the difference between the mean scores of the segregated and desegregated sample was computed. Table 1 contains the calculated results from Appendix C that were necessary in testing the significance of the difference between the segregated and desegregated seniors using the "t" test.

From Table III of Fisher and Yates,[1] the critical ratio at 228 degrees of freedom was found to be 1.984 at the .05 level. The critical ratio of 1.40 of Table 1 was less than 1.984. While there was a difference in the anti-white attitudes of Negro seniors in segregated and desegregated schools, the difference was considered not significant.

---

[1]Fisher and Yates, op. cit., p. 40.

TABLE 1

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF SEGREGATED AND DESEGREGATED SENIORS ON ANTI-WHITE ATTITUDES

	Segregated	Desegregated	
Sample Size	124	106	
Mean	65.15	61.26	
Variance	401.60	359.48	
Standard Deviation	20.04	18.96	
Standard Error			2.78
Critical Ratio			1.40
Level of Significance			N.S.

Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Negro High School Seniors in School A and School D

Data concerning the anti-white attitudes of the Negro seniors in School A and School D were selected from Appendix C of this study to form Table 2. The table presents calculated results that were necessary in testing the significance of the difference between the two groups using the "t" test.

From Table III of Fisher and Yates[1] the critical ratio at 153 degrees of freedom was found to be 3.291 at the .001 level. The critical ratio of 6.20 in Table 2 far exceeds the .001 level; therefore, it was reasonable

[1] Ibid., p. 40.

TABLE 2

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF NEGRO STUDENTS IN SCHOOL A AND SCHOOL D

	School A	School D	
Sample Size	31	124	
Mean	71.35	65.15	
Variance	388.88	401.60	
Standard Deviation	19.72	20.04	
Standard Error			2.78
Critical Ratio			6.20
Level of Significance			.001

to assume that the difference in mean scores between the two groups was highly significant. It was interesting to note that School A, which was a desegregated school, exhibited the higher anti-white attitudes.

Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Negro High School Seniors in School B and School D

Data were selected from Appendix D of this study to form Table 3. The table contains the data that were necessary in testing the significance of the difference in mean scores of the Negro seniors in School B and School D.

From Table III of Fisher and Yates[1] the critical

[1] Ibid., p. 40.

ratio at 159 degrees of freedom was found to be 2.567 at the .01 level. Therefore, it was assumed that the

TABLE 3

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF NEGRO SENIORS IN SCHOOL B AND SCHOOL D

	School B	School D	
Sample Size	37	124	
Mean	54.11	65.15	
Variance	281.90	401.42	
Standard Deviation	16.79	20.04	
Standard Error			3.89
Critical Ratio			2.84
Level of Significance			.01

difference between mean scores of the two groups was highly significant. It was concluded from these results that the Negro seniors in School D, which was a segregated school, exhibited higher anti-white attitudes than did Negro seniors in School B, which was a desegregated school.

Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Negro High School Seniors in School C and School D

Data concerning the anti-white attitudes of the Negro seniors in School C and School D were selected from Appendix C of this study to form Table 4. Table 4 presents the calculated results that were necessary in

testing the significance of the difference between mean scores of the two groups using the "t" test.

TABLE 4

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF NEGRO SENIORS IN SCHOOL C AND SCHOOL D

	School C	School D	
Sample Size	38	124	
Mean	60.0	65.15	
Variance	276.22	401.60	
Standard Deviation	16.62	20.04	
Standard Error			3.87
Critical Ratio			1.33
Level of Significance			N.S.

From Table III of Fisher and Yates[1] the critical ratio at 160 degrees of freedom was found to be 1.960 at the .05 level. The critical ratio of 1.33 in Table 4 was less than 1.960 at the .05 level. While there was a difference in the mean scores of the two groups; and the mean score of seniors in School D, which was a segregated school, was higher than the mean score of seniors in School C, which was a desegregated school, it was concluded from these results that the difference was not significant.

[1] Ibid.

Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Negro High School Seniors in School A and School B

Data were selected from Appendix C to form Table 5 of this study. The table contains the data that were necessary in testing the significance of the difference in mean scores of the Negro seniors in School A and School B using the "t" test.

TABLE 5

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF NEGRO SENIORS IN SCHOOL A AND SCHOOL B

	School A	School B	
Sample Size	31	37	
Mean	71.35	54.11	
Variance	388.88	281.90	
Standard Deviation	19.72	16.79	
Standard Error			4.43
Critical Ratio			3.89
Level of Significance			.001

From Table III of Fisher and Yates[1] the critical ratio at 66 degrees of freedom was found to be 3.460 at the .001 level. The critical ratio at 3.89 exceeded this; therefore, it was assumed that the difference in mean scores of the two groups was highly significant.

[1] Ibid.

It was concluded from these results that the Negro seniors at School A, which was a desegregated school exhibited much higher anti-white attitudes than did Negro seniors at School B, which was, also, a desegregated school.

Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Negro High School Seniors in School A and School C

Data concerning the anti-white attitudes of the Negro seniors in School A and School C were selected from Appendix C to form Table 6. Table 6 shows the calculated results that were necessary in testing the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups using the "t" test.

TABLE 6

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF NEGRO SENIORS IN SCHOOL A AND SCHOOL C

	School A	School C	
Sample Size	31	38	
Mean	71.35	60.00	
Variance	388.88	276.22	
Standard Deviation	19.72	16.62	
Standard Error			4.37
Critical Ratio			2.60
Level of Significance			.05

From Table III of Fisher and Yates[1] the critical ratio at 67 degrees of freedom was found to be 2.000 at the .05 level. The critical ratio of 2.60 exceeded the .05 level; therefore, it was assumed that the difference between the mean scores of the two groups was significant. It was concluded from these results that the Negro seniors at School A exhibited significantly higher anti-white attitudes than did the Negro seniors at School C.

Comparison of Anti-White Attitudes of Negro High School Seniors in School B and School C

Data were selected to form Table 7 from Appendix C of this study. Table 7 presents the calculated results

TABLE 7

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF NEGRO SENIORS IN SCHOOL B AND SCHOOL C

	School B	School C	
Sample Size	37	38	
Mean	54.11	60.00	
Variance	281.90	276.22	
Standard Deviation	16.79	16.62	
Standard Error			4.12
Critical Ratio			1.43
Level of Significance			N.S.

[1] Ibid.

that were necessary in testing the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups using the "t" test.

From Table III of Fisher and Yates[1] the critical ratio at 73 degrees of freedom was found to be 2.000 at the .05 level. The critical ratio of 1.43 was less than the .05 level. Therefore, it was concluded that the difference in mean scores between the two groups was not significant.

The subjects at School A, a desegregated school, obtained a higher mean score on anti-white attitudes than did the subjects in any of the other three sample groups. Despite this fact, the mean score of the total desegregated sample on anti-white attitudes was lower than that of the segregated sample, though not significantly so. When the desegregated schools were considered separately and compared with the segregated sample, significant differences were found. In testing the significance of the differences in mean scores between School A and each of the other sample groups, the higher mean score on anti-white attitudes of the subjects in School A was found to be significant in every case.

---

[1] Ibid.

Comparison of Attitudes which Indicate Militancy of Segregated and Desegregated Negro High School Seniors

Data concerning attitudes which indicate militancy of Negro high school seniors in segregated and desegregated schools were selected from Appendix C of this study. Table 8 presents the results of testing the significance of the difference between the two groups using the "t" test.

TABLE 8

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF SEGREGATED AND DESEGREGATED NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS ON ATTITUDES WHICH INDICATE MILITANCY

	Segregated	Desegregated	
Sample Size	124	106	
Mean	7.59	6.89	
Variance	7.90	7.67	
Standard Deviation	2.81	2.77	
Standard Error			.40
Critical Ratio			1.75
Level of Significance			N.S.

From Table III of Fisher and Yates[1] the critical ratio at 228 degrees of freedom was found to be 1.960 at the .05 level. The critical ratio of 1.75 was less

[1] Ibid.

than the .05 level. While there was a difference in attitudes which indicated militancy of Negro high school seniors in segregated and desegregated schools, it was concluded that the difference was not significant.

Comparison of Attitudes which Indicate Militancy of Negro High School Seniors in School A and School D

Data concerning attitudes which indicate militancy were selected from Appendix C of this study to form Table 9. Table 9 presents the calculated results that were necessary in testing the significance of the difference in attitudes which indicate militancy of Negro high school seniors at School A and School D.

TABLE 9

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS AT SCHOOL A AND SCHOOL D

	School A	School D	
Sample Size	31	124	
Mean	8.81	7.59	
Variance	5.02	7.90	
Standard Deviation	2.24	2.81	
Standard Error			.54
Critical Ratio			2.26
Level of Significance			.05

From Table III of Fisher and Yates[1] the critical ratio at 153 degrees of freedom was found to be 1.960 at the .05 level. The critical ratio of 2.26 exceeded the .05 level. It was, therefore, concluded from these data that the difference in mean scores between the two groups was significant. It was interesting to note that the Negro seniors at School A, which was a desegregated school, scored higher on attitudes which indicated militancy than did Negro seniors at School D, which was a segregated school.

Comparison of Attitudes which Indicate Militancy of Negro High School Seniors in School B and School D

Data concerning attitudes which indicate militancy were selected from Appendix C of this study to form Table 10. The table presents the calculated results that were necessary in testing the significance of the difference in attitudes which indicated militancy of Negro high school seniors at School B and School D.

From Table III of Fisher and Yates[2] the critical ratio at 159 degrees of freedom was found to be 1.960 at the .05 level. It was, therefore, concluded from these results that the difference in mean scores of the two groups on attitudes which indicated militancy was significant, and that the subjects in School D, the segregated

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid.

school, obtained the higher mean score.

TABLE 10

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS AT SCHOOL B AND SCHOOL D

	School B	School D	
Sample Size	37	124	
Mean	6.32	7.59	
Variance	6.86	7.90	
Standard Deviation	2.62	2.81	
Standard Error			.56
Critical Ratio			2.27
Level of Significance			.05

Comparison of Attitudes which Indicate Militancy of Negro High School Seniors in School C and School D

Data concerning attitudes which indicate militancy of Negro high school seniors in School C and School D were selected from Appendix C of this study to form Table 11. The table presents the calculated data that were necessary in testing the significance of the difference between the two groups on attitudes which indicated militancy.

From Table III of Fisher and Yates[1] the critical

[1] Ibid.

TABLE 11

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS AT SCHOOL C AND SCHOOL D

	School C	School D	
Sample Size	38	124	
Mean	5.87	7.59	
Variance	6.25	7.90	
Standard Deviation	2.50	2.81	
Standard Error			.55
Critical Ratio			3.13
Level of Significance			.01

ratio at 160 degrees of freedom was found to be 2.576 at the .01 level. Since the critical ratio of 3.13 exceeds that, it was concluded that the subjects in School D obtained a significantly higher mean score than did the subjects at School C.

Comparison of Attitudes which Indicate Militancy of Negro High School Seniors in School A and School B

Data concerning attitudes which indicated militancy of Negro high school seniors in School A and School B were selected from Appendix C of this study to form Table 12. The table presents the calculated results that were necessary in testing the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups.

TABLE 12

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS IN SCHOOL A AND SCHOOL B

	School A	School B	
Sample Size	31	37	
Mean	8.81	6.32	
Variance	5.02	6.86	
Standard Deviation	2.24	2.62	
Standard Error			.61
Critical Ratio			4.08
Level of Significance			.001

From Table III of Fisher and Yates[1] the critical ratio at 66 degrees of freedom was found to be 3.460 at the .001 level. It was, therefore, concluded from these results that the difference in mean scores between School A and School B was highly significant, and that the subjects at School A obtained the significantly higher mean score.

Comparison of Attitudes which Indicate Militancy of Negro High School Seniors in School A and School C

Data concerning attitudes which indicated militancy of Negro high school seniors in School A and

[1] Ibid.

School C were selected from Appendix C of this study to form Table 13. The table presents the calculated results that were necessary in testing the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups.

TABLE 13

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS IN SCHOOL A AND SCHOOL C

	School A	School C	
Sample Size	31	38	
Mean	8.81	5.87	
Variance	5.02	6.25	
Standard Deviation	2.24	2.50	
Standard Error			.59
Critical Ratio			4.98
Level of Significance			.001

From Table III of Fisher and Yates[1] the critical ratio at 67 degrees of freedom was found to be 3.460 at the .001 level. Since the critical ratio of 4.98 far exceeds that, it was concluded that the subjects at School A exhibited significantly higher attitudes indicative of militancy than did the subjects at School C.

[1] Ibid.

Comparison of Attitudes which Indicate Militancy of Negro High School Seniors in School B and School C

Data concerning attitudes which indicated militancy of Negro high school seniors in School B and School C were selected from Appendix C of this study to form Table 14. The table presents the calculated results that were necessary in testing the significance of the difference between the mean scores of the two groups.

TABLE 14

RESULTS OF THE TEST OF SIGNIFICANCE APPLIED TO THE MEAN SCORES OF NEGRO HIGH SCHOOL SENIORS AT SCHOOL B AND SCHOOL C

	School B	School C	
Sample Size	37	38	
Mean	6.32	5.87	
Variance	6.86	6.25	
Standard Deviation	2.62	2.50	
Standard Error			.64
Critical Ratio			.70
Level of Significance			N.S.

From Table III of Fisher and Yates[1] the critical ratio at 73 degrees of freedom was found to be 2.000 at the .05 level. Since the critical ratio of .70 was less

[1] Ibid.

than the .05 level, it was concluded that the difference between the mean scores of the two groups was not significant.

The subjects at School A, a desegregated school, obtained a higher mean score on attitudes which indicated militancy than did subjects in any of the other three sample groups. Despite this fact, the mean score of the total desegregated sample on attitudes which indicated militancy was lower than that of the segregated sample, though not significantly so. When the desegregated schools were considered separately and compared with the segregated sample, significant differences were found. The lower mean scores of both School B and School C were significant when each was compared with the segregated sample. The difference between the mean scores of School B and School C was not significant. In testing the significance of the difference in mean scores between School A and each of the other sample groups, the higher mean score on attitudes which indicate militancy of the subjects in School A was found to be significant in every case. It was, therefore, concluded that the higher mean score obtained by the subjects at School A affected the results of the study to a great degree.

The Relationship between Anti-White Attitudes and Attitudes which Indicate Militancy of the Desegregated Subjects

Coefficient of Correlation (Pearson's r) was calculated in order to determine the relationship between anti-white attitudes and attitudes which indicated militancy of the desegregated subjects. A summary of the results is presented in Table 15.

TABLE 15

COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN ANTI-WHITE ATTITUDES AND ATTITUDES WHICH INDICATE MILITANCY OF THE DESEGREGATED SUBJECTS

N	Anti-White Mean	Militancy Mean	Calculated r	Level of Significance
106	61.26	6.89	.42	.001

From Table VI of Fisher and Yates[1] it was found that coefficient of correlation of .42 at 104 degrees of freedom was significant at the .001 level. It was concluded from these results that there was a highly significant positive relationship between anti-white attitudes and attitudes which indicated militancy. In other words those subjects who tended to score high on anti-white attitudes also tended to score high on attitudes which indicated militancy.

[1] Ibid., p. 54.

The Relationship between Anti-White Attitudes and Attitudes which Indicate Militancy of the Segregated Subjects

Coefficient of Correlation (Pearson's r) was calculated in order to determine the relationship between anti-white attitudes and attitudes which indicate militancy of the segregated subjects. A summary of the results is presented in Table 16.

TABLE 16

COEFFICIENT OF CORRELATION BETWEEN ANTI-WHITE ATTITUDES AND ATTITUDES WHICH INDICATE MILITANCY OF THE SEGREGATED SUBJECTS

N	Anti-White Mean	Militancy Mean	Calculated r	Level of Significance
124	65.15	7.59	.32	.01

From Table VI of Fisher and Yates[1] it was found that coefficient of correlation of .32 at 122 degrees of freedom was significant at the .01 level. It was concluded from these results that there was a highly significant positive relationship between anti-white attitudes and attitudes which indicate militancy. In other words those subjects who tended to score high on anti-white attitudes also tended to score high on attitudes which indicate militancy.

[1] Ibid., p. 54.

Conditions Affecting the Study

It appeared obvious from an examination of the results presented above that the outcomes were influenced to a considerable degree by the relatively high anti-white scores and attitudes which indicated militancy of the subjects at School A, which was a desegregated school. In view of the results of this study it would appear both necessary and appropriate to examine some of the conditions which might have contributed to those results.

School A became a desegregated school for the first time at the beginning of the 1968-1969 school year as a result of a court order. A great deal of conflict and tension accompanied the desegregation of the school. The immediate community was generally opposed tothe change. The white patrons of School A had the usual fears which accompany initial desegregation: (1) the fear of falling academic standards, (2) the loss of tradition, (3) the fear that moral standards would be lowered, and (4) the fear that physical violence would accompany desegregation.

The faculty of the school was, apparently, divided in its support for the desegregation effort. At one point, early in the year, the principal talked with a group of teachers, who, in his judgement were not supporting the desegregation effort. He suggested that they should either become supportive, transfer, or resign. This action possibly contributed to an already deteriorating

situation. Some of these teachers reacted by calling on the superintendent and protesting the behavior of the principal.

Later in the year a group of patrons circulated a petition which demanded that the principal and his assistant be fired. The chief complaint of those who circulated and signed the petition was that discipline had deteriorated at the school.

A mural had hung for many years in the hall of School A before it became desegregated. It depicted persons belonging to various ethnic groups engaged in various kinds of work. Negroes were shown working in a cotton field. Early in the school year a group of Negro students went to the administration and protested the mural on the grounds that it was offensive to Negro students. The school administration brought the protest to the attention of the central office and it became general knowledge in the community. The white patrons wanted the mural left hanging because it had been there for many years and was regarded both as a tradition and as a work of art. In an effort to placate both groups the decision was made to redecorate the hall which housed the mural. It was stated that the redecoration would be done during the summer and that the mural would be given to a museum. Before the redecoration could be accomplished, a Negro student tore the painting.

A Negro girl had been elected cheerleader for the following year. After her election and installation, a rumor was circulated that she had borne a child out of wedlock. When confronted with the charge, the girl admitted it was true. She was forced to resign as cheerleader.

These are examples of incidents which indicate the climate in which students and faculty operated during the first year of desegregation in School A. They cannot describe adequately the day to day tensions and conflicts, but they do indicate the general climate of human relationships which existed in the school.

In contrast, Schools B and C had been desegregated for several years prior to the 1968-69 school year. The faculties of the two schools were, apparently, more adequately prepared to deal with the problem of desegregation than was the faculty of School A. This is not to suggest that School B and School C did not have problems that were directly attributable to desegregation. It merely suggests that the climate of human relationships was, apparently, more effective than was the case at School A.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of Negro high school seniors toward Caucasians and toward militancy. The study concerned itself with the differences in the attitudes of those seniors who attended segregated schools and those who attended desegregated schools.

Four schools were identified for inclusion in the study. Three of the schools were desegregated and one was a segregated Negro school. The desegregated schools were identified as School A, School B, and School C. The segregated Negro school was identified as School D.

The study attempted to determine whether or not there were significant differences between the attitudes of the following subject groups: (1) between the two sample groups, (2) between the Negro seniors at School A and School D, (3) between the Negro seniors at School B and School D, (4) between the Negro seniors at School C

and School D, (5) between the Negro seniors at School A and School B, (6) between the Negro seniors at School A and School C, and (7) between the Negro seniors at School B and School C.

The design of the study required the testing of three general hypotheses:

Ho 1: There are no statistically significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors in segregated and desegregated schools.

Ho 2: There are no statistically significant differences in attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro seniors in segregated and desegregated schools.

Ho 3: There is no significant relationship between anti-white attitudes and attitudes which are indicative of militancy.

In addition to the three general hypotheses, the following subhypotheses were tested:

Ho 1: There are no significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors at School A and School D.

Ho 2: There are no significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors at School B and School D.

Ho 3: There are no significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors at School C and School D.

Ho 4: There are no significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors at School A and School B.

Ho 5: There are no significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors at School A and School C.

Ho 6: There are no significant differences between the anti-white attitudes of Negro high school seniors at School B and School C.

Ho 7: There are no significant differences in attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro high school seniors at School A and School D.

Ho 8: There are no significant differences in attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro high school seniors at School B and School D.

Ho 9: There are no significant differences in attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro high school seniors at School C and School D.

Ho 10: There are no significant differences in attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro high school seniors at School A and School B.

Ho 11: There are no significant differences in attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro high school seniors at School A and School C.

Ho 12: There are no significant differences in attitudes indicative of militancy of Negro high school

seniors at School B and School C.

Each of the hypotheses was tested at the .05 level of confidence.

The subjects were 230 Negro high school seniors enrolled in the public schools of Metropolitan Community. All of the Negro seniors enrolled at School A, School B, and School C who met the criteria established in Chapter I were utilized in the study. A random sample was drawn from School D and utilized in the study. There were 31 subjects at School A, 37 subjects at School B, and 38 subjects at School C whose attitudes were examined. The sample at School D consisted of 124 subjects.

Subjects at each of the four schools were brought together, asked to read the instructions carefully, and to complete The Anti-White Scale, which is shown in Appendix A of this study. Subjects were interviewed in small groups where rapport was established, the purposes of the interview explained, and the subjects were asked to react to the questions on The Militancy Interview Form, which is shown in Appendix B of this study. A conversation was held with each student in order to clarify any points not clear and to gather additional reactions when possible.

Findings

After the data were gathered the significance of the difference in mean scores was tested between each

of the groups identified above. The "t" test for the difference in mean scores was used to test each of the hypotheses at the .05 level of confidence. The results obtained from testing the hypotheses were as follows:

(1) The difference between the anti-white attitudes of the two total sample groups was found to be not statistically significant at the .05 level, though the mean score of the desegregated sample was lower than that of the segregated sample. The null hypothesis was, therefore, accepted.

(2) The difference in attitudes indicative of militancy of the two total sample groups was found to be not significant at the .05 level of confidence, though the mean score of the desegregated sample was lower than that of the segregated sample, and the null hypothesis was, therefore, accepted.

(3) The coefficient of correlation (Pearson's r) was calculated in order to determine the relationship between anti-white attitudes and attitudes indicative of militancy for both the segregated and desegregated samples. The coefficient of correlation was found to be .42 for the desegregated sample and was significant at the .001 level. The coefficient of correlation was found to be .32 for the segregated sample. This was significant at the .01 level. These findings indicated a highly significant positive relationship

between anti-white attitudes and attitudes which indicated militancy; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

(4) The difference between the mean scores on anti-white attitudes of subjects at School A and School D was significant at the .001 level. It was interesting to note that the higher mean score was obtained by the subjects at School A, a desegregated school. On the basis of these results, the null hypothesis was rejected.

(5) The difference between the mean scores on anti-white attitudes of subjects at School B, a desegregated school, and School D, a segregated school, was significant at the .01 level. The subjects at School B scored significantly lower than did subjects at School D; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

(6) The difference between the mean scores on anti-white attitudes of subjects at School C, a desegregated school, and School D, a segregated school, was not significant at the .05 level. The mean score at School C was lower, but not significantly so, and the null hypothesis was accepted.

(7) The difference between the mean scores on anti-white attitudes of subjects at School A and School B was significant at the .001 level. Subjects at

School B scored significantly lower than did subjects at School A; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

(8) The difference between the mean scores on anti-white attitudes of subjects at School A and School C was significant at the .05 level. The subjects at School C scored significantly lower, and the null hypothesis was rejected.

(9) The difference between the mean scores on anti-white attitudes of subjects at School B and School C was not significant at the .05 level. Subjects at School B scored lower, but not significantly so, and the null hypothesis was accepted.

(10) The difference between the mean scores on attitudes indicative of militancy of subjects at School A and School D was significant at the .05 level. Again, it was interesting to note that the subjects at School A, a desegregated school, scored higher on attitudes indicative of militancy than did subjects at School D, a segregated school. The null hypothesis was rejected.

(11) The difference between the mean scores on attitudes indicative of militancy of subjects at School B and School D was significant at the .05 level. Subjects at School B scored significantly lower than did subjects at School D, and the null hypothesis

was rejected.

(12) The difference between the mean scores on attitudes indicative of militancy of subjects at School C and School D was significant at the .01 level. Subjects at School C scored significantly lower than did subjects at School D; therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

(13) The difference between the mean scores on attitudes indicative of militancy of subjects at School A and School B was significant at the .001 level. Subjects at School B scored significantly lower than did subjects at School A, and the null hypothesis was rejected.

(14) The difference between the mean scores on attitudes indicative of militancy of subjects at School A and School C was significant at the .001 level. Subjects at School C scored significantly lower than did subjects at School A, and the null hypothesis was rejected.

(15) The difference between the mean scores on attitudes indicative of militancy of subjects at School B and School C was not significant at the .05 level. Subjects at School C scored lower, but not significantly so, and the null hypothesis was accepted.

Conclusions

When the total segregated and desegregated samples were considered, it was concluded that the lower mean scores on both anti-white attitudes and attitudes which indicate militancy of subjects in the desegregated sample were not significant. However, when the desegregated schools were considered separately and compared with the segregated sample, it became apparent that the differences were significant.

In all but one school the subjects in the desegregated schools obtained lower mean scores on both anti-white attitudes and attitudes which indicated militancy than did subjects in the segregated sample. Subjects at School A, a desegregated school, obtained higher mean scores on both variables than subjects at the other two desegregated schools and the segregated sample. It was concluded from these results that the subjects at School A were more anti-white and more militant than the subjects in any of the other groups.

A discussion of some of the conditions under which School A was desegregated was presented in Chapter III of this study. A knowledge of the climate of human relationships in the schools and the results of this study led to the conclusion that the mere placing of black and white students in a school is not enough to build a climate of mutual respect and understanding.

It is incumbent upon the community and educators to create a set of conditions in the school in which students will have the opportunity to develop understandings, attitudes, appreciations and behaviors in the areas which normally provoke tension and conflict in our society.

Recommendations

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

1. It is recommended that further research be conducted to determine the degree to which community unrest affects the climate of human relationships in the desegregated school.

2. It is recommended that further research be undertaken to determine the relationship of minority group participation in activities and other programs of the school to militancy and anti-white attitudes.

3. It is recommended that positive efforts be inaugurated through the curriculum, assembly programming and the activities program to develop positive programs in human relationships which extend to every faculty member and student in the school.

4. It is recommended that further research be conducted to determine the degree to which the attitudes and behaviors of teachers and other educators affect the attitudes and behaviors of students in the school.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Bennett, Lerone, Jr. The Negro Mood. Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, Inc., 1964.

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

Coles, Robert. Children of Crisis: A Study of Courage and Fear. Boston: Little and Brown, 1967.

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

Fisher, Ronald A., and Yates, Frank. Statistical Tables for Biological, Agricultural and Medical Research. New York: Hafner Publishing Company, Inc., 1953.

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

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

Lomax, Louis E. The Negro Revolt. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.

Marx, Gary T. Protest and Prejudice: A Study of Belief in the Black Community. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

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

Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968.

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

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

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

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

United States Commission on Civil Rights. Report of the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunities in America's Cities. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, November 1967.

Van Dalen, Deobold. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

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

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

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

Periodicals

Cothran, Tilman C. "Negro Conceptions of White People," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. VI, March, 1951, pp. 459-67.

Davidson, Helen H., and Lang, George. "Children's Perceptions of Their Teachers' Feelings Toward Them Related to Self Perception, School Achievement and Behaviour," The Journal of Experimental Education, XXIX, Summer, 1960, pp. 107-18.

McDaniel, Paul A., and Babchuk, Nicholas. "Negro Conceptions of White People in a Northeastern City," Phylon, Vol. XXI, No. 1, Spring, 1960, pp. 7-19.

McDowell, Sophia. "How Anti-White Are Negro Youth," American Education, March, 1968, pp. 2-4.

"Position Paper," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. XLIX, No. 8, April 1968, pp. 450-51.

Rivera, Ramon J., McWorter, Gerald A., and Lillienstein, Ernest. "Freedom Day II in Chicago," Integrated Education, August-September, 1964.

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: American Association of School Administrators, 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.

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

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

Unpublished Materials

Blumenfeld, Ruth. "Children of Integration." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Anthropology, University of Pennsylvania, 1965.

Crain, Robert L., et al. "The Effects of Defacto School Segregation: A Survey of Negro Adults in Northern Cities." Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1966.

Gordon, Leonard. "An Acculturation Analysis of Negro and White High School Students: The Effects on Social and Academic Behaviour of Initial Close Interracial Association at the Secondary Level." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology, Wayne State University, 1966.

Haggstrom, Warren C. "Self-Esteem and Other Characteristics of Residentially Desegregated Negroes." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Social Psychology, University of Michigan, 1962.

Meketon, Betty F. "The Effects of Integration Upon the Negro Child's Responses to Various Tasks and Upon His Level of Self-Esteem." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kentucky, 1966.

Noel, Donald L. "Minority Groups Identification and Societal Integration." Unpublished paper presented at the 1966 annual meeting of the American Sociological Association.

Powell, Christus N. "Factors Affecting the Educational and Vocational Plans of High Ability Negro Students in the High Schools of Alabama." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1963.

Singer, Dorothy G. "Interracial Attitudes of Negro and White Fifth-Grade Children in Segregated and Unsegregated Schools." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1960.

Stinson, Harold N. "The Effect of Desegregation on the Adjustment and Values of Negro and White Students." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation in Education, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1963.

Webster, Staten W. "Intergroup Contact in a Newly Integrated School and Its Effects Upon the Levels of Acceptance and Friendship Choices of a Selected Group of Seventh Grade Pupils." Unpublished doctoral dissertation in Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1960.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

THE ANTI-WHITE SCALE

This is a study of what people think about a number of social questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different points of view. You may agree strongly with some statements, disagree just as strongly with others, and perhaps be uncertain about others. Whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same way that you do.

Please 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	Disagree A Little	Disagree Pretty Much	Disagree Very Much
1. There is nothing lower than white trash.	____	____	____	____	____	____
2. White people may be all right, but they carry it too far when they try to butt into Negroes' affairs and go around with Negro women.	____	____	____	____	____	____
3. The whites have shown by their actions that they are naturally immoral, vicious, and untrustworthy.	____	____	____	____	____	____
4. No matter how nicely they treat a colored person, white people don't really mean it.	____	____	____	____	____	____
5. It is usually a mistake to trust a white person.	____	____	____	____	____	____
6. Any Negro who marries a white is a traitor to his people.	____	____	____	____	____	____
7. There may be a few exceptions, but white musicians and athletes are definitely inferior to Negro musicians and athletes.	____	____	____	____	____	____

	Agree Very Much	Agree Pretty Much	Agree A Little	Disagree A Little	Disagree Pretty Much	Disagree Very Much
8. White people are only friendly to Negroes when they want something out of them.	____	____	____	____	____	____
9. Negroes can expect no real help from white people in the fight against racial discrimination.	____	____	____	____	____	____
10. Most white people are always looking for ways to cheat and steal from colored people.	____	____	____	____	____	____
11. The colored race has been pushed around long enough; it's about time that the whites were made to get out of the Negro communities.	____	____	____	____	____	____
12. If there is a Heaven, it is hard to imagine that there are many white people up there.	____	____	____	____	____	____
13. Although the white man now rules the world, it will be a happy day when the tables are turned and the colored people become the rulers.	____	____	____	____	____	____

	Agree Very Much	Agree Pretty Much	Agree A Little	Disagree A Little	Disagree Pretty Much	Disagree Very Much
14. The world might be a better place if there were fewer white people.	____	____	____	____	____	____
15. When the Bible says, "The bottom shall rise to the top," it gives hope that the Negro people will someday give the orders in this country instead of whites.	____	____	____	____	____	____
16. It may be wrong to damn all whites, but it's plain that whites have all the money and power, and that they look down on any one who is colored.	____	____	____	____	____	____
17. There are many white people who are not prejudiced and who sincerely believe that Negroes are equals.	____	____	____	____	____	____
18. When it comes to such things as sports, dancing, music, and making love, the white man is not as talented as the Negro.	____	____	____	____	____	____

APPENDIX B

MILITANCY INTERVIEW FORM

We would like to get your reactions to a number of social questions. We will ask you to react to the questions on the form which you have in front of you. As you read the questions, if you have questions, I will discuss them with you. When you have reacted to the questions, I would like to talk briefly with each of you before you leave.

In your opinion, is the government in Washington pushing integration
too slow _____ too fast_____ about right_____

Negroes who want to work hard can get ahead just as easily as anyone else.
Agree_____ Disagree_____ Don't know_____

Negroes should spend more time praying and less time demonstrating.
Agree_____ Disagree_____ Don't know_____

To tell the truth I would be afraid to take part in civil rights demonstrations.
Agree_____ Disagree_____ Don't know_____

Would you like to see more demonstrations or less demonstrations?
More_____ Less_____ Don't know_____

A restaurant owner should not have to serve Negroes if he doesn't want to.
Agree_____ Disagree_____ Don't know_____

Before Negroes are given equal rights, they have to show that they deserve them.
Agree_____ Disagree_____ Don't know_____

An owner of property should not have to sell to Negroes if he doesn't want to.
Agree_____ Disagree_____ Don't know_____

What would you say about the civil rights demonstrations over the last few years--that they have helped Negroes, hurt Negroes?
Helped_____ Hurt_____ Don't know_____

Some people say that no good can ever come from riots like those that happened this past summer. Other people say that such riots do some good because they make whites pay attention to the problems of Negroes. Which comes closest to what you feel?
They do some good_____ No good can come from them_____ Don't know_____

If the United States got into a war today, would you personally feel this country is worth fighting for or not?
Yes_____ No_____ Don't know_____

APPENDIX C

SCORES ON THE INSTRUMENTS USED

APPENDIX C

SCORES ON THE INSTRUMENTS USED

School A

Subject	Anti-White Attitudes	Attitudes Indicative of Militancy
1	70	12
2	77	11
3	77	12
4	45	8
5	98	12
6	82	12
7	48	8
8	75	10
9	84	10
10	65	10
11	106	8
12	87	5
13	68	7
14	61	8
15	54	8
16	95	10
17	71	9
18	25	7
19	47	9
20	70	10
21	62	10
22	69	11
23	96	8
24	78	8
25	98	8
26	70	7
27	74	8
28	100	11
29	68	5
30	24	2
31	68	9

School B

Subject	Anti-White Attitudes	Attitudes Indicative of Militancy
1	29	6
2	72	5
3	60	8
4	69	7
5	77	8
6	42	10
7	53	10
8	63	5
9	45	2
10	41	10
11	76	6
12	75	9
13	52	6
14	53	2
15	24	10
16	84	3
17	59	6
18	30	9
19	58	8
20	54	8
21	55	8
22	20	2
23	36	6
24	45	6
25	34	2
26	82	7
27	54	4
28	63	10
29	32	2
30	47	10
31	59	8
32	63	5
33	64	5
34	41	5
35	69	8
36	40	2
37	80	6

School C

Subject	Anti-White Attitudes	Attitudes Indicative of Militancy
1	60	3
2	39	6
3	52	6
4	50	5
5	36	6
6	44	5
7	43	6
8	49	5
9	54	3
10	48	2
11	63	4
12	58	7
13	73	10
14	84	11
15	81	7
16	53	6
17	84	7
18	71	11
19	87	8
20	51	6
21	80	6
22	46	5
23	59	5
24	61	2
25	27	3
26	33	6
27	53	5
28	57	9
29	57	4
30	64	8
31	63	4
32	82	7
33	69	3
34	45	2
35	45	6
36	93	10
37	78	11
38	88	3

School D

Subject	Anti-White Attitudes	Attitudes Indicative of Militancy	Subject	Anti-White Attitudes	Attitudes Indicative of Militancy
1	104	10	46	64	6
2	104	10	47	86	8
3	60	10	48	67	6
4	74	10	49	32	3
5	61	10	50	61	9
6	66	10	51	24	8
7	76	10	52	46	4
8	96	12	53	52	8
9	90	12	54	54	9
10	73	12	55	70	10
11	69	7	56	48	11
12	71	4	57	45	4
13	97	10	58	44	2
14	72	0	59	58	6
15	45	12	60	49	5
16	65	12	61	60	6
17	37	6	62	42	7
18	68	9	63	32	8
19	51	9	64	70	9
20	61	10	65	29	8
21	80	4	66	42	10
22	55	2	67	70	5
23	46	3	68	79	10
24	26	4	69	80	10
25	61	8	70	76	9
26	55	6	71	60	7
27	59	6	72	88	7
28	79	10	73	33	8
29	89	9	74	93	10
30	75	5	75	69	7
31	106	11	76	46	7
32	54	9	77	82	9
33	44	8	78	86	6
34	106	12	79	65	12
35	47	6	80	51	7
36	64	8	81	89	8
37	29	5	82	103	12
38	48	5	83	64	7
39	66	4	84	100	3
40	32	6	85	55	7
41	89	5	86	92	10
42	31	7	87	100	7
43	36	5	88	93	5
44	45	5	89	94	11
45	43	6	90	68	7

School D (cont.)

Subject	Anti-White Attitudes	Attitudes Indicative of Militancy	Subject	Anti-White Attitudes	Attitudes Indicative of Militancy
91	93	10	108	60	10
92	47	6	109	76	3
93	65	9	110	56	4
94	56	12	111	64	12
95	76	8	112	55	10
96	55	9	113	48	9
97	64	5	114	50	6
98	70	8	115	65	4
99	59	10	116	56	11
100	80	6	117	89	5
101	49	0	118	63	5
102	66	2	119	84	8
103	69	8	120	53	5
104	60	11	121	84	5
105	51	10	122	99	11
106	53	10	123	104	12
107	47	5	124	97	10

APPENDIX D

CORRESPONDENCE RELATED TO THE STUDY

March 17, 1969

Mr. Bill Waltman
8504 Victoria Drive
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

Dear Mr. Waltman:

The Research Committee has approved your request to conduct research in the Oklahoma City Public Schools according to the application you recently submitted.

We request that you coordinate the activities in connection with the study with Mr. Bill Coffia, Research Associate.

We would appreciate receiving a copy of the completed study for our files.

Sincerely yours,

William L. Shell
Director
Research and Statistics

WLS/js

cc: Mr. Bill Coffia

October 16, 1968

Dr. George A. Steckler, Ph.D.
Doctor's Center Building
14077 Cedar Road
Cleveland, Ohio 44118

Dear Dr. Steckler:

I am presently engaged in developing a doctoral study under the direction of Dr. Glenn R. Snider, Professor of Education at the University of Oklahoma. The study will address itself to an examination of the attitudes of Negro high school seniors in segregated and desegregated schools.

I am interested in using an instrument which you developed entitled, "The Anti White Scale", which is published in Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes.

I would appreciate your approval for the use of the scale. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Bill Waltman

BW/jw

November 1, 1969

Mr. Bill Waltman
University of Oklahoma
555 Constitution Avenue
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Dear Mr. Waltman:

I hereby grant you permission to use my Anti-White Scale in your contemplated study.

Sincerely,

George A. Steckler, Ph.D.

March 3, 1969

Dr. Gary T. Marx
Department of Social Relations
William James Hall
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

Dear Dr. Marx:

I am presently engaged in developing a doctoral study under the direction of Dr. Glenn R. Snider, Professor of Education at the University of Oklahoma. The study will address itself to an examination of the attitudes of Negro high school seniors in segregated and desegregated schools.

I am interested in using several questions which were developed for use in your dissertation and published in Protest and Prejudice: A Study of Belief in the Black Community.

I would appreciate your approval for the use of the questions. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Bill Waltman

BW/jw

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Department of Social Relations

William James Hall
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
March 18, 1969

Mr. Bill W. Waltman
Consultative Center
555 Constitution Avenue
Norman, Oklahoma 73069

Dear Mr. Waltman:

You have my permission to use any questions from Protest and Prejudice that you may desire.

Good luck with your study.

Yours truly,

Gary T. Marx

GTM/lmb