

ED 032 639

24

EA 002 531

By-Dillingham, Harry C.

A Study of the Response of Cincinnati Voters to a Reduction in Elementary and Secondary Services.

Cincinnati Univ., Ohio.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.

Bureau No-BR-7-E-161

Pub Date Mar 69

Grant-OEG-O-8-070161-0011

Note-160p.

EDRS Price MF-\$0.75 HC-\$8.10

Descriptors-Community Attitudes, \*Community Surveys, Extramural Athletic Programs, Kindergarten, Negro Attitudes, Parent Attitudes, \*Public Opinion, Public Relations, \*School Budget Elections, School Community Relationship, \*School Support, School Taxes, Social Factors, Statistical Analysis, Summer Programs, Tax Support, \*Voting

Identifiers-\*Cincinnati

The failure of a property tax levy, submitted to Cincinnati voters in November and December of 1966, resulted in an announced reduction within the school district's summer school, kindergarten, and interscholastic athletic programs. To determine the effect of this reduction on voter support for the schools, a stratified sample of 520 registered voters was interviewed in the fall of 1967. The actual vote in the 1966 elections and the intended vote in an upcoming levy election were compared for groups of respondents that varied in age, marital status, homeownership, children in or out of school, interest in athletics, religion, attitudes toward racial integration, income, education, and race. In general, the reduction of school services appeared to effect greater support (vote) changes among those respondents who were placed in a conflict situation by factors of cost and interest in the school system (e.g., property taxpayers with children attending school) than among those respondents whose vote did not involve conflict. Specific findings are presented in the document's 84 cross-tabulations and in the appended straight tabulations of all of the interview responses. (JH)

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

BR 7E161  
PA 24

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

OE-BR

ED0 32639

A STUDY OF THE RESPONSE OF CINCINNATI VOTERS  
TO A REDUCTION IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SERVICES

Project No. 7-E-161  
Grant No. OEG-0-8-070161-0011

Harry C. Dillingham  
Associate Professor  
Department of Sociology and Anthropology

March 1969

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

University of Cincinnati

Cincinnati, Ohio

EA 002 531

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	Background . . . . .	1
II.	Problem . . . . .	3
III.	The Survey Method . . . . .	5
IV.	The Results . . . . .	7
	The Schools and Other City Services . . . . .	7
	Race and Age . . . . .	8
	Involvement in the School System . . . . .	12
	Satisfaction with the System . . . . .	21
V.	Innovations . . . . .	33
VI.	Attitudes Toward Integration . . . . .	36
	Children in School . . . . .	39
	Homeownership . . . . .	54
	Children in School and Homeownership . . . . .	68
VII.	A School Riot Affects Voters' Attitudes . . . . .	73
VIII.	The Vote Changers . . . . .	100
	Homeownership . . . . .	101
	Religion . . . . .	103
	Education . . . . .	103
	Income . . . . .	106
	Children in School and Homeownership . . . . .	108
	School Service Reductions . . . . .	114
IX.	Conclusions . . . . .	115
	Appendix A . . . . .	117
	Appendix B . . . . .	119

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Voting Patterns in 1966-67 by Race	9
2	Voting Patterns by Race and Age	11
3	Have any of your children left school before graduating?	13
4	Do you have any nieces, nephews, cousins, or grandchildren presently enrolled in the Cincinnati Public Schools?	14
5	Do any of the neighbors that you visit with very often (e.g., once a week or more) have children enrolled in the local public schools?	16
6	Do any of your close personal friends have children enrolled in the Cincinnati Public Schools?	17
7	Did you or your (husband, wife) ever play in interscholastic athletics when you (they) were in school?	18
8	Do you (or your husband or your wife) enjoy interscholastic athletics?	19
9	About how often?	20
10	Generally speaking, how would you say the local school funds are used?	22
11	Do you feel that people in Cincinnati were kept adequately informed about basic issues during the last school tax election?	23
12	It is important for a school board to make wise and reasonable decisions concerning the operation of the public schools. To what extent do you feel the present school board makes sound and reasonable decisions about school matters?	26
13	And how about the judgment exercised by the administrative staff. To what extent do you feel the administrators exercise sound and reasonable judgment about school matters?	27
14 A	Have you heard of the recent appointment of a new Assistant Superintendent of Schools?	28
14 B	How would you say you feel about this?	29
15	Generally speaking, do you feel that the public schools have spent too much, too little, or the right amount of money on special facilities such as libraries, gymnasiums, swimming pools, and so forth?	30

LIST OF TABLES  
(continued)

TABLE		PAGE
16	Would you review this list and make a judgment as to whether (name community) should spend much more, a little more, the same amount, a little less, or much less than it now spends on building, maintaining and operating public schools?	32
17	Some schools in the country have responded to greatly increased enrollments by dividing the students into two groups with one group going to school from about 7 a.m. until 1 p.m. and the other group going from 1 p.m. until 7 p.m. Would you favor such a plan for students here in Cincinnati?	34
18	In the past few years, school administrators have been proposing that children start school when they are 3 or 4 years old rather than waiting until kindergarten age. How do you feel about this?	35
19	And with respect to racial integration of the schools in the Cincinnati area, are things moving?	37
20	Some people feel that many American communities are moving too rapidly in their efforts to racially integrate housing and the schools. Other people feel that things are moving too slowly. Thinking about the Cincinnati area, would you say that the racial integration of <u>housing</u> is going:	38
21	Some schools in the country have responded to greatly increased enrollments by dividing the students into two groups with one group going to school from about 7 a.m. until 1 p.m. and the other group going from 1 p.m. until 7 p.m. Would you favor such a plan for students here in Cincinnati?	41
22	Do you think that the school administration in Cincinnati should spend more money, less money, or about the same amount of money being spent now on schools in the Avondale and West End areas of Cincinnati?	42
23	In some communities school officials become increasingly aware of the kinds of buildings the people want to have built, while in other communities the building program departs from the wishes of the people. During the past year or two, do you feel that the school building policies in the Cincinnati School District:	43

LIST OF TABLES  
(continued)

TABLE		PAGE
24	Generally speaking, how would you say the local school funds are used?	44
25	It is important for a school board to make wise and reasonable decisions concerning the operation of the public schools. To what extent do you feel the present school board makes sound and reasonable decisions about school matters?	45
26	And how about the judgment exercised by the administrative staff. To what extent do you feel the administrators exercise sound and reasonable judgment about school matters?	46
27	Have you heard of the recent appointment of a new assistant Superintendent of Schools?	47
28	Generally speaking, do you feel that the public schools have spent too much, too little, or the right amount of money on special facilities such as libraries, gymnasiums, swimming pools, and so forth?	48
29	On what facilities has too much, (too little) money been spent?	49
30	Do you feel that people in Cincinnati were kept adequately informed about basic issues during the last school tax elections?	50
31	Would you review this list and make a judgment as to whether (name community) should spend much more, a little more, the same amount, a little less, or much less than it now spends on building, maintaining and operating public schools?	51
32	For statistical purposes, we would like to ask if you recall <u>how</u> you voted in the school tax proposals last November.	52
33	In many elementary school districts people organized last winter to collect money for keeping kindergarten in operation. Do you know if such a group was organized in this school district?	53
34	Another organization was formed last winter to collect money to keep the interscholastic athletic program going in the public schools. Did you hear of this organization?	55

LIST OF TABLES  
(continued)

TABLE		PAGE
35	Do you think that the school administration in Cincinnati should spend more money, less money, or about the same amount of money being spent now on schools in the Avondale and West End areas of Cincinnati?	56
36	Generally speaking, do you feel that the public schools have spent too much, too little, or the right amount of money on special facilities such as libraries, gymnasiums, swimming pools, and so forth?	57
37	Generally speaking, how would you say the local school funds are used?	58
38	Do you feel that people in Cincinnati were kept adequately informed about basic issues during the last school tax elections?	59
39	On the first levy in November, did you vote	60
40	If you do go to the polls, how do you think you will vote? For the school tax levy or against it?	61
41	Would you review this list and make a judgment as to whether (name community) should spend much more, a little more, the same amount, a little less, or much less than it now spends on building, maintaining and operating public schools.	61
42	Thinking about taxation here in (name community) when more funds are needed to build and operate the schools, as a general principle would it be best to:	63
43	If you were to sum up your feelings about the services which are provided you and your family by the local government in relation to the local taxes you pay, would you say that you are getting:	64
44	Compared with other communities in this area, would you say that the local property taxes here in (name community) are:	64
45	Property taxes assessed against <u>private homes</u> in this community are already too high and should not be increased. Do you:	65
46	Property taxes assessed against business and industrial property in this community are already too high and should not be increased. Do you:	65

LIST OF TABLES  
(continued)

TABLE	PAGE
47	67
"...should 'your community' spend much more, a little more, the same...'in' building, maintaining and operating public schools?"	
48	69
"On the first levy in November did you vote...?"	
49	70
"If you do go to the polls, how will you vote? For the school tax levy or against it?"	
50	71
Percentage Changes in "Yes" and "No" Votes November, 1966 to November, 1967	
51	74
Several schools in the Cincinnati area have a high proportion of Negro pupils. Some people feel that when classrooms reach 30% Negro pupils the quality of the classes diminishes because Negro pupils tend to come from more deprived backgrounds. Other people feel this is not true. On the average, would you say that the educational quality of classes drops when the proportion of Negro pupils reaches 30% or more?	
52	75
And with respect to racial integration of the schools in the Cincinnati area, are things moving:	
53	77
Some people feel that many American communities are moving too rapidly in their efforts to racially integrate housing and the schools. Other people feel that things are moving too slowly. Thinking about the Cincinnati area, would you say that the racial integration of housing is going:	
54	79
How Important Are Public Schools	
55	80
How Important Is Police Protection	
56	81
How Important Is Fire Protection	
57	82
How Much Tax Money Should be Spent on Public Schools	
58	83
How Much Tax Money Should be Spent on Police Protection	
59	84
How Much Tax Money Should be Spent on Fire Protection	
60	86
Should More be Spent on West End and Avondale	
61	87
Would you think for a moment about children attending school in the Cincinnati School District and then think about children attending school in the various suburban school districts which surround the city. Generally speaking, if it were equally possible and equally easy to do, would you prefer to have your children attend school in the Cincinnati School District, in a suburban school district, or wouldn't it make any difference to you?	



LIST OF TABLES  
(continued)

TABLE		PAGE
62	Generally speaking, how would you say school funds are used?	88
63	To what extent do you feel the administrators exercise sound and reasonable judgment about school matters?	89
64	How Important Are Public Schools	91
65	How Important Is Police Protection	91
66	How Important Is Fire Protection	92
67	How Much Tax Money Should be Spent on Public Schools	92
68	How Much Tax Money Should be Spent on Police Protection	93
69	How Much Tax Money Should be Spent on Fire Protection	93
70	Should More be Spent on West End and Avondale	94
71	School Preference	94
72	And with respect to racial integration of the schools in the Cincinnati area, are things moving:	96
73	Some people feel that many American communities are moving too rapidly in their efforts to racially integrate housing and the schools. Other people feel that things are moving too slowly. Thinking about the Cincinnati area, would you say that the racial integration of housing is going:	96
74	Generally speaking, how would you say the local school funds are used?	97
75	It is important for a school board to make wise and reasonable decisions concerning the operation of the public schools. To what extent do you feel the present school board makes sound and reasonable decisions about school matters?	97
76	Voting Patterns by Race, Education and Date of Interview	98
77	Homeownership	102
78	Religion	104
79	Education	105
80	Income	107
81	Voting Patterns by Children in School and by Homeownership	109

LIST OF TABLES  
(continued)

TABLE		PAGE
82	Exposure to Kindergarten Fund Drive by Some Voting Patterns	112
83	Exposure to Athletic Fund Drive by Some Voting Patterns	113

## Background

In November of 1966 the Board of the Cincinnati Public School District submitted a property tax levy to the voters, and it failed. The vote was 42.3 percent favorable. Subsequently in December the school board resubmitted a portion of the levy that had been rejected in November --this smaller levy was also rejected. Thirty-three percent were favorable.

The November levy was designed to renew two small levies due to expire in about a year, as well as add an entirely new levy for additional funds. The levy presented in December was for the new levy, only.

Soon after the second levy failed the school administration and school board announced the necessity of reducing the services the schools provided in order to balance their budget. Subsequently they began to designate the probable areas of reduction; and, finally, they firmly announced the specific types of services to be eliminated entirely and/or to be reduced.

Three types of affected services are of most concern, because they appear to have affected the largest number of citizens, and two of them generated a great deal of citizen interest and protest. They were: 1) summer school would be restricted to children who had to make-up a failed course; 2) kindergarten would be eliminated; and 3) inter-scholastic athletic events would be eliminated.

Local newspapers and television stations apparently received little evidence of citizen concern with the limitation of summer school eligibility, but they did begin reporting citizen sponsored movements to restore kindergarten and inter-scholastic athletics. Committees were formed to collect funds, sufficient to restore both services.

The athletic committee announced an address to which donations might be sent. The kindergarten committee, originally organized to supply kinder-

garten services in one elementary school district, subsequently provided leadership for P.T.A.'s throughout the Cincinnati Public School District in collecting funds from citizens to restore the kindergarten system. Enough money was collected to operate the kindergarten system for the first half of the 1967-68 school year.

### Problem

The relatively drastic reduction in school services, only some of which have been described, suggested an experimental situation. This would have involved taking interviews at the beginning of the school year, when the impact of the service reductions had just been imposed, and again near the end of the school year, after the service reductions had been experienced for a lengthy time, in order to compare the magnitude of change in favorableness toward school levy votes.

This did not prove feasible, because of a lack of adequate funding. Funds were potentially available for one set of interviews, only.

Since the announced plans for service reductions had already generated major responses from the community, and since one major reduction was going into effect in the summer of 1967 (reduction of summer school enrollments), it seemed feasible to measure the consequences of these actual and predictable impacts.

The research was then designed to estimate the impact of a reduction which had occurred in the summer school enrollment, and estimate the impact caused by the fears of kindergarten and athletics curtailment. These latter fears were supplemented by the widespread realization that the voluntary contribution of funds for these programs was a "one-shot" affair. Such contributions could not be relied upon in the long run.

In addition to the fears of curtailment in kindergarten and athletics there had been community-wide drives to reinstate them which had had widespread contacts with citizens. These drives themselves were expected to have generated support for passage of a school levy.

Several other factors were felt to be important in determining the failure or passage of a school levy and questions were designed to measure

these. It was felt that race was such a factor. Several acquaintances reported that many Negroes, normally supportive of school levies, had abstained from voting for the levy in November 1966.

Income and education were expected to be positively related to favorable votes for school levys.

Because the school levy is a property tax it was anticipated that home ownership would be an important factor.

Whether or not a person had children enrolled in the public school system, or had no school aged children was expected to influence his vote. Related to this was a desire to determine the effect of religious affiliation, since the Catholic segment of the Cincinnati population is large; and it was widely believed here, that Catholics were predominantly opposed to supporting the public schools.

Following the levy failure in November 1966 the news media reports, and private sources, suggested that a sizable portion of voters were disaffected with the school board and/or the administration officials proper, to the degree that their disaffection had caused the previous levy failure and would be likely to cause one again. Several questions were designed to shed light on this disaffection and its consequences.

### The Survey Method

About 400 interviews were planned. The study was concerned with voters, and a list of registered voters was available from which a sample could be drawn. A two stage sample was used with stratification on several variables. This is more fully described in Appendix A.

Five-hundred and twenty completed interviews were taken between late August and early November 1967. Most of them were in the city limits proper; but the school district includes a (generally continuous) belt of adjacent suburban communities and a proportional number of interviews came from these communities (9%).

In order to be able to test the validity of the sample's representativeness, as well as other reasons, the respondents were asked to name the candidates for election to the school board, and those for city council, for whom they intended to vote. The results of these tests are discussed in detail in Appendix A; however, here it may be noted that the sample validity appears satisfactory.

The selected voters were notified by mail that an interview would be conducted within a few days, subsequently interviewers called at their homes to take the interview. Many persons had moved from the address shown in the voter registration files, and a considerable effort was made to locate these people. One such voter we traced to Africa.

The results of the interviewing effort are shown below.

## Results of Interviewing

	Number	Percent of Possibles
Completed interview	520	72
Not at home to repeated calls	14	2
Moved, cannot locate	87	12
Moved out of school district	51*	
Deceased	27*	
Not a registered voter	1*	
Non-compos mentis	4*	
Refused, sick	20*	
Refused	91	13
Other reasons	10	1
	<u>825</u>	<u>722</u>

\*Persons who should not have been included in the sample because they were not registered voters at the time of interview or who could not be interviewed because of circumstances over which the interviewer had no control. They total 103.

We found, expectably, that many people were incorrectly listed as registered voters. Since the files listed those persons who registered or voted within the two years preceeding December 31, 1966; and, since we were interviewing seven to ten months after that date, it was inevitable that errors would be found. Fifty-one persons in the sample had moved out of the district, 27 persons had died, four were too senile to be interviewed and presumed to be too senile to vote, either.

Our completed interview rate was 74 percent. Actually it should be revised upward to approach 86 percent, since there is good reason to believe that many of those persons our interviewers could never find at home (at least six attempts were made), and most of those who had moved to untraceable addresses, had in fact moved out of the school district or otherwise become ineligible voters.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. Moving to a new precinct without notifying the voter registration bureau makes a registration invalid.



## The Results

### The Schools and Other City Services

Appendix B contains the questions asked and the distribution of answers given by the sample respondents. One hundred and twenty-three items of information were obtained.

To place much of this study and analysis in context it is advisable to examine some of these straight tabulations of the respondents answers. This is particularly true when assessing how voters evaluate the public school system in comparison with their evaluation of other services provided by local governments.

In Tables 15 through 28, Appendix B, the voters show that they place the importance of education as very high, higher than most other city provided services. Of even greater importance is the fact that about half of them are also prepared to support the school system with additional tax money. This support is second only to the proportions prepared to pay additional taxes for police and fire protection (Tables 29 through 42, Appendix B).

It should be pointed out that Cincinnati had been struck by a sizable riot in the summer of 1967 with associated losses by fire. Our interviews, occurring only a few months later, are probably reflecting the increased feelings of dependency upon those services (fire and police protection) which are of paramount importance at such a time.

In any event we find that attitudes endorsing the public school system predominate. There are negligible numbers of voters who would reduce the amount of taxes allocated to support the system.

## Race and Age

Beginning with Table 1 the analysis shows how voters with different social characteristics are oriented towards the school system.

For instance Table 1 shows the "voting patterns" of Nov. '66 and '67 for whites and negroes, separately. These "patterns" are arranged so that those intending to vote "yes" in '67 (irrespective of their vote in '66) appear in the first four rows; the next three rows contain those intending to vote "no" in '67, and the final three rows contain those who were undecided concerning their voting intentions in '67. Each row is different in that they represent people with different combinations of votes in '66 and voting "intentions" in '67.

Thus, row one shows the percentage of persons who voted (or said they voted) "yes" in '66 and who intended to vote "yes" again in '67. The second row shows the percentage of persons voting "no" in '66 but changing to a "yes" vote in '67, etc.

If the reader is interested in organizing the data by the vote in '66 it will be necessary to rearrange the rows. The code at the bottom of Table 1 shows that the sum of rows 2, 5, and 8 contains the percentage of persons who voted "no" in '66.

It is suggested that the reader familiarize himself with this code, which is necessarily, albeit unfortunately, complex.

It should also be noted that nearly all of the tables will show percentages in the cells, while the marginal totals are reserved for the raw numbers. The raw numbers for the individual cells may be computed by those interested.

There is a departure from common practice in these tables which should also be noted. Usually data on voting behavior presents percentage figures showing the percent who voted "yes" and the percent voting "no" with these

Table 1

## Voting Patterns in 1966-67 by Race

Voting Patterns*	<u>White</u>		<u>Negro</u>		N
1	32		47		179
2	12	55	9	65	57
3	8		5		39
4	3		5		18
5	13	15	6	7	58
6	2		1		9
7	1				3
8	14		5		62
9	3		15		27
0	13		9		63
	<hr/>		<hr/>		<hr/>
	100%**		100%		
Total	412		103		515

$$\chi^2 = 40.478$$

$$d.f. = 9$$

$$2 \text{ tail } p = .00001$$

\* Code for voting patterns:

	Vote 1966	Voting intentions 1967
1	yes	yes
2	no	yes
3	did not vote	yes
4	can't recall	yes
5	no	no
6	can't recall, or didn't vote	no
7	yes	no
8	no	undecided
9	yes	undecided
0	can't recall, or didn't vote	undecided

\*\* Figures in this and subsequent tables may not total to exactly 100% because of rounding off decimals.

percents summing to 100%. This is not a satisfactory procedure for the present study, which is equally concerned with that substantial percentage of eligible voters (registered to vote) who do not vote (or cannot tell an interviewer whether they voted "yes" or "no") in a given election but who do (or may) in another election.

In Table 1, the left column, such persons are found in rows 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, and 0, which sum to 43.2% of the total sample of registered white voters. This is a large and important category which must be included in the analysis.

Table 1 reveals that in both years the negroes, registered to vote, reported a substantially larger proportion of "yes" voters than did the whites. For instance in '67 fifty-five percent of the registered whites intended to vote "yes" while 65% of the registered negroes intended to vote "yes." This table also shows that negroes constituted 103 out of 515 registered voters or one-fifth of the total.

Age, also, appears to be related, very negatively, to a positive vote on school levies (Table 2). However, there is reason to believe that other factors are more determinative or causal than age and that age is strongly, positively related to these other factors, which will be discussed below.

Table 2 shows the relationship between age and the school levy votes for whites and negroes. Within the white group age is negatively related to a positive vote; no trend is apparent among negroes. The importance of age as a predictor of school levy voting behavior is vitated, despite the trend among whites, by the fact that age is also related, complexly to other variables, such as, homeownership and having children in school. As will be shown later these variables seem to be more "causal" than the age variable.

It is noteworthy however, that, among registered voters of both races, such a small proportion are found in the age group that is younger than

Table 2.

## Voting Patterns by Race and Age

White

Voting Pattern	30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	N
1	39	37	37	16	32	130
2	11	15	13	7	12	48
3	11	8	6	11	7	34
4	2	6	2	3	3	13
5	9	6	8	22	15	52
6	4	3		3	2	8
7					2	3
8	2	15	17	17	13	57
9	2	1	4	6	2	12
0	20	10	12	15	12	53
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100	100	100	100	100	
Total	46	73	83	81	127	410

Negro

Voting Pattern	30	30-39	40-49	50-59	60+	N
1	67	41	55	44	40	46
2	17	7	9	8	10	9
3		4	5	8	5	5
4	17	4		8	5	5
5		4	9		10	5
6					5	1
7						
8		11		8		5
9		22	23	12	5	15
0		7		12	20	9
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100	100	100	100	100	
Total	6	27	22	25	20	100

Code for voting patterns: See Table 1.

30 years; and, among the whites, such a large proportion are 60 years and over. The small proportion of young voters means an under-representation among registered voters, of persons who rent and who have pre-school age children. The large proportion of older persons means a high representation of homeowners as well as of persons whose children have passed through school, already.

### Involvement in the School System

The type and degree of involvement in the school system can, be expected to bear upon a persons voting proclivities for tax levys. This is brought out in Tables 3 through 9.

Table 3 shows that 74 respondents, 51 whites and 23 negroes, report they have had a child drop-out of school without graduating. This amounts to 14 percent of the sample. The 51 whites represent 21 percent of the 247 whites who could have had a child drop out. The 23 negroes constitute 41 percent of those negroes who could have had a dropout.

One might expect that such persons would be less than enthusiastic about public education and its support ... an expectation confirmed by Table 3, showing fewer "yes" voters and more "undecided" voters in both races among those who have had a child withdraw before graduation.

Having close relatives with children enrolled in the public schools was expected to be positively related to school support, but this was only true for negroes. Negroes also showed a much larger proportion with kin-related (Table 4) children enrolled in the public school. This is probably a consequence of: (1) the fact that the negro community here is heavily composed of recent in-migrants from the South, who, disproportionately, tend to consist of young persons of school age and/or young persons in child-bearing years; and (2) the high birth-rates of Cincinnati negroes.<sup>1</sup>

---

1. While the negro population of Cincinnati appears to constitute about 25 percent of the total, it contributes about 40 percent to the public school enrollment.

Table 3

Have any of your children left school before graduating?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>					<u>Negro</u>				
	Yes	No	Not Apply	No Answer	N	Yes	No	Not Apply	No Answer	N
1	24	36	31		131	35	46	48	100	46
2	10	14	9		47	4	9	12		9
3	14	6	10		34	9	9			5
4	2	2	5		13	4		10		5
5	14	13	11	50	52	13	9			6
6		3	2		8		3			1
7	2	1	1		3					
8	14	14	14		56	9	6	2		5
9		3	5		12	17	18	12		15
0	22	10	13	50	52	9		17		9
	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	100%	
Total	51	196	157	4	408	23	33	42	3	101

\*Code for voting patterns:

	Vote 1966	Voting intentions 1967
1	yes	yes
2	no	yes
3	did not vote	yes
4	can't recall	yes
5	no	no
6	can't recall, or didn't vote	no
7	yes	no
8	no	undecided
9	yes	undecided
0	can't recall, or didn't vote	undecided

TABLE 4

Do you have any nieces, nephews, cousins, or grandchildren presently enrolled in the Cincinnati Public Schools?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>				<u>Negro</u>			
	Yes	No	No Answer	N	Yes	No	No Answer	N
1	29	36	6	131	52	33	25	48
2	11	12	17	48	7	8	50	9
3	9	8	6	34	5	4		5
4	2	4		13	5		25	5
5	13	13	11	52	4	13		6
6	3	1		8		4		1
7	1	1		3				
8	16	12	22	57	5	4		5
9	3	2	17	12	17	8		15
0	14	12	22	54	4	25		9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	181	213	18	412	75	24	4	103

## Code for Voting Patterns:

	Vote 1966	Voting intentions 1967
1	yes	yes
2	no	yes
3	did not vote	yes
4	can't recall	yes
5	no	no
6	can't recall, or didn't vote	no
7	yes	no
8	no	undecided
9	yes	undecided
0	can't recall, or didn't vote	undecided



Why the whites do not show a trend similar to that shown by the negroes is an enigma...that is, the trend for those with close relatives enrolled as students to show more support for the schools than those without such relatives in school.

The whites having neighbors or close friends whose children are in the public schools are considerably more supportive of the schools than those without such neighbors and friends (Tables 5 and 6). Negroes do not show this relationship.

Cincinnati, along with most major cities in the U. S., contains a sizable Catholic population, and maintains a large parochial school system. Those Catholics having children enrolled in parochial schools are forced to pay taxes for the public school system as well as tuition to the parochial schools. Tradition and logic both conduce to a prediction of lack of support for the public school system. Tables 46 and 47 show that after controlling for the important characteristics of homeownership, and having children in school, those with children in parochial school are markedly less prone to vote for school levys.<sup>2</sup>

A small proportion of the registered voters have no children in public schools but do have pre-school age children. Apparently anticipating their immanent status as parents of students, and desiring an excellent educational experience for their children, these parents are exceptionally supportive of the school system (Tables 46, 47, and 48).

Finally, the school system reaches a large number of citizens, including voters, through its inter-scholastic athletic program and associated spectator sports program. Tables 7, 8, and 9 show that persons (or their spouses) who have participated in interscholastics, themselves, who enjoy watching the events or who attend such events (even if rarely) are very substantially more likely to vote for school levys than those persons not involved in such school-supported activities.

---

2. Only 17 percent of the white respondents with children in parochial schools were not Catholic.

TABLE 5

Do any of the neighbors that you visit with very often (e.g., once a week or more) have children enrolled in the local public schools?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>				<u>Negro</u>			
	Yes	No	No Answer	N	Yes	No	No Answer	N
1	36	30	6	131	48	46		48
2	14	9	19	48	8	8	50	9
3	9	7	6	34	6			5
4	2	4		13	3	8	50	5
5	8	18	13	52	5	15		6
6	3	1		8	1			1
7	1	1		3				
8	14	14	19	57	6			5
9	4	1	13	12	15	15		15
0	9	16	25	53	9	8		9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	214	181	16	<u>411</u>	88	13	2	<u>103</u>

## Code for Voting Patterns:

	Vote 1966
1	yes
2	no
3	did not vote
4	can't recall
5	no
6	can't recall or didn't vote
7	yes
8	no
9	yes
0	can't recall, or didn't vote

## Voting intentions 1967

1	yes
2	yes
3	yes
4	yes
5	no
6	no
7	no
8	undecided
9	undecided
0	undecided

Table 6

Do any of your close personal friends have children enrolled in the Cincinnati Public Schools?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>				<u>Negro</u>			
	Yes	No	No Answer	N	Yes	No	No Answer	N
1	38	27	6	131	48	46		148
2	11	12	18	48	8	8	50	9
3	8	9	6	34	5	8		5
4	3	4		13	3	8	50	5
5	11	15	12	52	3	23		6
6	2	1	6	8	1			1
7	1	1		3				
8	14	14	18	57	6			5
9	4	1	12	12	17			15
0	9	17	24	53	9	8		9
	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	
Total	221	173	17	411	88	13	2	103

Code for voting patterns:

	Vote 1966	Voting intentions 1967
1	yes	yes
2	no	yes
3	did not vote	yes
4	can't recall	yes
5	no	no
6	can't recall, or didn't vote	no
7	yes	no
8	no	undecided
9	yes	undecided
0	can't recall, or didn't vote	undecided

Table 7

Did you or your (husband, wife) ever play in interscholastic athletics when you (they) were in school?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>			N	<u>Negro</u>		
	Yes	No	No answer		Yes	No	N
1	42	27		131	54	39	48
2	14	11		48	9	9	9
3	6	10		34	2	9	5
4	2	4		13	4	7	5
5	9	15		51	5	4	5
6	1	2		8		2	1
7		1	3				
8	10	15	33	56	4	7	5
9	4	2	17	12	16	13	15
0	12	13	50	54	7	11	9
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	
Total	147	257	6	410	56	46	102

## Code for voting patterns:

	Vote for 1966	Voting intentions 1967
1	yes	yes
2	no	yes
3	did not vote	yes
4	can't recall	yes
5	no	no
6	can't recall, or didn't vote	no
7	yes	no
8	no	undecided
9	yes	undecided
0	can't recall, or didn't vote	undecided

Table 8

Do you (or your husband or your wife) enjoy inter-scholastic athletics?

Voting Pattern								
	Yes	Some- That	No	N	Yes	Some- What	No	N
1	36	26	28	131	53	41	32	128
2	13	12	10	48	9	12	5	9
3	8	6	9	34	2	6	14	5
4	4	2	2	13	5	12		5
5	10	14	18	52	5		14	6
6	2	2	2	8			5	1
7	1			3				
8	13	16	16	57	5	6	5	5
9	2	6	3	12	14	18	14	15
0	12	16	12	51	8	6	14	9
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100%	100%	100%	<hr/>	100%	100%	100%	<hr/>
Total	231	50	128	409	64	17	22	103

No answer column omitted because of insufficient number.

Table 9

## About how often?

White

Voting Pattern	Weekly	Monthly	Rarely	Never Attend	No answer	N
1	47	35	37	27	13	131
2	27	16	11	9	13	48
3	3	14	4	10	13	34
4			7	2		13
5	13	9	10	15	13	52
6	3	5	2	1		8
7				1		3
8	7	7	13	16	13	56
9		2	4	3		12
0		12	12	15	38	54
	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%	
Total	30	43	123	207	8	411

Negro

1	46	54	65	40	*	48
2	9	8	15	7		9
3				9		5
4	9			7		5
5	9			7		5
6				2		1
7						
8		8	5	5		5
9	18	15	10	16		15
0	9	15	5	7		8
	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%		
Total	11	13	20	57		101

\* No answer column eliminated because of insufficient data.

### Satisfaction with the System

Some of the more frequent reasons advanced to explain the failure of Cincinnati's November and December school levys were that the citizens were dissatisfied with one or more aspects of the system, e.g., the school board, the superintendant, or the administration in general. It was rumored that federal poverty program workers had convinced many negroes to vote against the levies as a means of convincing the white establishment of their power.

The data from this study cannot firmly refute (nor confirm) such allegations; but, as the following tables reveal they tend more to support a refutation than a confirmation.

When questioned about the wisdom with which school funds were used the modal response (Table 10) was "quite wisely." Seventy percent of the whites and 64 percent of the negroes felt they were used "wisely one-half the time," or "quite wisely," or "very wisely." Very small percentages stated that the funds were used "unwisely" in any degree. Those who felt the funds more wisely used were more likely to plan a "yes" vote.

Another question was how adequately they were "informed about basic issues during the last school tax elections." Interpreting the distribution of answers to this question is not simple, at first sight (Table 11).

We may first note that the modal answer for whites was the "yes" they were adequately informed. Negroes' modal answer was "no." But in both racial categories those who said they were "adequately informed" also were much less likely to say they intended to vote "yes" in '67. The whites who felt "adequately informed" had also been much more likely to have voted "no" in '66; corresponding negroes had been slightly more disposed to vote "no" in '66.

There is no certain interpretation of the meaning of these responses. One plausible interpretation is that a homeowners organization, which was

TABLE 10

Generally speaking, how would you say the local school funds are used?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>						No Answer	N
	Very Wisely	Quite Wisely	Wisely ½ the time	Rather Unwisely	Very Unwisely	Don't Know		
1	53	35	29	18	26	27	20	131
2	11	15	11	9	11	8		48
3	8	12	5	3		10	20	34
4	3	3	6			3		13
5	5	8	13	42	26	10		52
6	3	1	3	3		1		8
7	5		1					3
8	8	10	23	15	11	14		57
9	3	4	3			4		12
0	3	13	7	9	26	23	60	54
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>    </u>
Total	38	143	101	33	19	73	5	412
	<u>Negro</u>							
1	55	33	68	63	20	30		48
2		14	4		40	13		9
3	10	10				4		5
4					40	9	100	5
5		10	12	13				6
6						4		1
7								
8	5	10	4			4		5
9	15	19	12	25		13		15
0	15	5				22		9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>    </u>
Total	20	21	25	8	5	23	1	103



Table 11

Do you feel that people in Cincinnati were kept adequately informed about basic issues during the last school tax election?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>				<u>Negro</u>			
	Yes	No	D.K. & No answ.	N	Yes	No	D.K. & No answ.	N
1	25	40	32	131	45	57	22	48
2	13	12	5	48	13	6	6	9
3	10	5	11	34	3	6	6	5
4	2	3	7	12	3	4	11	5
5	18	10	4	52	3	6	11	6
6	3	2		8			6	1
7	1	1	2	3				
8	16	13	11	57	5	4	6	5
9	4	3		12	21	13	6	15
0	10	11	29	54	8	2	28	9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	194	161	56	411	38	47	18	103

Code for voting Patterns:  
Vote for 1966

1	yes
2	no
3	did not vote
4	can't recall
5	no
6	can't recall, or didn't vote
7	yes
8	no
9	yes
0	can't recall, or didn't vote

Voting intentions 1967

1	yes
2	yes
3	yes
4	yes
5	no
6	no
7	no
8	undecided
9	undecided
0	undecided

quite active and quite opposed to the Nov. '66 school levy, persuaded many homeowners that the schools did not need these levys and/or if they did need the funds they should not be provided by real estate taxes.

This interpretation is made plausible by the response pattern shown in a later table (Table 38) showing that most homeowners felt they had been "kept adequately informed." Subsequent tables will also show homeowners were most opposed to the levys.

Prior to the Nov. '66 levy vote most citizens were unaware of the magnitude or specific nature of school service reductions that would ensue. These persons may have felt that they had not been "adequately informed;" but, being "informed" by the actual cutbacks that occurred they were, when interviewed, more disposed to vote "yes."

These explanations are presented, however, very tentatively; and a more certain explanation is invited. One might speculate that persons who have little personal investment in the successful operation of the school system and/or who feel they have borne all (or more) of the costs they can be expected to bear would feel that any announcement of a proposed school levy constituted very adequate information. That, would be all the information they would require to permit them to decide that they should vote "no."

It was the voter who felt inadequately informed about the '66 election who had, nevertheless tended to vote for it and who said he would vote for the renewal levys of '67. The general response of voters to the inadequate provision of any public service, which they regard as necessary, is to support that service with additional money. The voter has little alternative unless he is convinced that there has been chicanery or gross mismanagement. Adequate evidence is usually lacking. When he feels that the service is necessary he will vote for financial support.

How did this sample of voters feel about decisions made by the school board? A majority felt their decisions were "sound and reasonable." Only eight percent of the whites felt they showed more poor judgement than good. The comparable figure for negroes is 13 percent (Table 12). In both races those who felt the decisions more "sound" were more likely to vote "yes."

These voters felt very similarly towards the administrative personnel (Table 13). In comparison to their conception of the adequacy of the school board the whites were a little more supportive of the administrative staff; the negroes were slightly less supportive.

About a month before interviewing began a position was created for a new assistant superindendant and a negro was appointed to this post. When questioned as to whether they had heard of this appointment (Table 14,A), and how they felt about it (Table 14,B), somewhat less than one-half of the white voters said they had heard of the appointment. Of those who had heard of it only about one-half had an opinion, but a great majority with an opinion (80 percent) approved this appointment.

Only one-third of the negroes had heard of the appointment, but they approved by a much greater majority.

Another dimension is tapped with a question about the adequacy of expenditures for special school facilities (Table 15). A majority (55 percent) of whites were satisfied; almost one-fourth felt expenditures were too high; and about 12 percent felt they were too low. Only two percent of the negroes felt such expenditures were too high; and, consistently with their usual greater support for the school system, 34 percent of them felt such expenditures were too low.

In summary these data bearing on the voters satisfaction with the school system show them to be generally satisfied. There is no presumption that the voters were greatly satisfied with their school system. But it is important to note that there is no evidence here of massive or large scale alienation from the system.

TABLE 12

It is important for a school board to make wise and reasonable decisions concerning the operation of the public schools. To what extent do you feel the present school board makes sound and reasonable decisions about school matters?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>						N
	Almost Always	Most of the time	About ½ the time	Make more unwise decisions than wise	Almost always make unwise decisions	Don't know and No answer	
1	43	38	21	22		25	131
2	10	13	10	26	25	5	48
3	10	8	10	7		8	34
4	6	4	1			1	13
5	8	6	17	30	50	19	52
6	2	3				3	8
7	2	1					3
8	6	13	24	7	25	14	57
9	2	3	3			4	12
0	$\frac{10}{100\%}$	$\frac{11}{100\%}$	$\frac{15}{100\%}$	$\frac{7}{100\%}$	$\frac{4}{100\%}$	$\frac{21}{100\%}$	54
Total	49	183	72	27	4	77	412
	<u>Negro</u>						
1	63	51	55	13	40	4	48
2		11	7	25	20		9
3		8			20	8	5
4		3	3	13		8	4
5		8		25	20		6
6						8	1
7							
8		5	7			8	5
9	13	8	26	25		8	15
0	$\frac{25}{100\%}$	$\frac{5}{100\%}$	$\frac{3}{100\%}$	$\frac{8}{100\%}$	$\frac{5}{100\%}$	$\frac{31}{100\%}$	9
Total	8	37	31	8	5	13	102*

\* One "no answer" omitted.

Table 13

27

And how about the judgment exercised by the administrative staff. To what extent do you feel the administrators exercise sound and reasonable judgment about school matters?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>						N
	Almost Always	Usually	About ½ the time	Show more poor judgment	Almost always poor judgment	Don't know and No answer	
1	35	40	21	33		23	131
2	11	14	8	22	29	7	48
3	13	6	11		14	7	34
4	6	3	1			3	54
5	8	6	23	22	29	19	52
6	4	2				3	8
7	3	1					3
8	8	14	19		29	17	57
9	4	3	4			3	12
0	10	12	13	22		19	54
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	80	162	75	18	7	70	412
	<u>Negro</u>						
1	56	38	59	50	57	29	48 <sup>th</sup>
2		16	7	8	14		9
3		9		8		7	5
4			7		14	14	5
5		9		17	14		6
6						7	1
7							
8		6	7			7	5
9	11	19	17	17		7	15
0	33	3	3			29	9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	9	32	29	12	7	14	103

Table 11. A.

Have you heard of the recent appointment of a new Assistant Superintendent of Schools?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>				<u>Negro</u>			
	Yes	No	No ans.	N	Yes	No	No ans.	N
1	39	28		131	61	40	33	47
2	11	12		46	6	9		8
3	7	10		34		8		5
4	1	5		13	3	3	67	5
5	11	12		52	15	15		15
6	2	2		8		2		1
7	1	1		3				
8	16	12		56	3	6		5
9	2	3		12	15	15		15
0	8	15	100	54	6	11		9
	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	
Total	168	237	4	409	33	65	3	101

Code for voting patterns:  
Vote for 1966

1 yes  
2 no  
3 did not vote  
4 can't recall  
5 no  
6 can't recall, or didn't vote  
7 yes  
8 no  
9 yes  
0 can't recall, or didn't vote

Voting intentions 1967

yes  
yes  
yes  
yes  
no  
no  
no  
undecided  
undecided  
undecided

Table 14 , B.

How would you say you feel about this?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>					N
	Favor	D.K.	Oppose	Never Heard	No answer	
1	55	24	14	29	19	131
2	9	13	14	13	6	4
3	7	6	9	10	6	34
4	2	1		5		13
5	5	17	41	11	17	52
6		4		3		8
7		1		1		3
8	11	23	5	12	17	56
9	2	2		4	6	12
0	9	8	18	15	33	54
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	88	83	22	200	18	411
	<u>Negro</u>					
1	65	46		42	20	48
2	4			11	20	8
3	4			7		5
4	4	8		2	40	5
5	4	8	100	5		6
6		8				1
7						
8	4			7		5
9	8	23		18		15
0	8	8		9	20	9
	<u>26</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>5</u>	
Total	26	13	1	57	5	102

Table 15

Generally speaking, do you feel that the public schools have spent too much, too little, or the right amount of money on special facilities such as libraries, gymnasiums, swimming pools, and so forth?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>				N
	Too much	Right	Too little	Don't know and No answer	
1	14	36	54	23	131
2	11	11	13	13	48
3	9	9	8	3	34
4	3	4	2	3	13
5	26	8	8	10	52
6	4	1		3	8
7		1			3
8	17	14	4	18	57
9		4		5	12
0	15	10	10	23	52
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
<b>Total</b>	98	225	48	39	410

Voting Pattern	<u>Negro</u>				N
	Too much	Right	Too little	Don't know and No answer	
1	50	49	44	48	48
2	50	4	12	10	9
3		9		5	5
4		2	12		5
5		4	6	5	5
6		2			1
7					
8		4	9		5
9		18	12	14	15
0		7	6	19	9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
<b>Total</b>	2	45	34	21	102



In fact when we examine Table 16 we find that only 12 out of 411 white respondents and one out of 103 negro respondents feel the public schools should have less money. Nearly three-fourths of the negroes feel they should have more; 43 percent of the whites feel they should have more (46 percent favor keeping the same amount).

Bearing in mind that these persons were questioned just before voting on a renewal levy, i. e., to spend the "same amount," their responses are consistent with those shown in Tables 10 through 15. The policy making board and the operating or administering staff were seen as competent and effective. There was, however, no mandate for increasing expenditures, except among the 20 percent of the sample who were negroes.

TABLE 16

Would you review this list and make a judgment as to whether (name community) should spend much more, a little more, the same amount, a little less, or much less than it now spends on building, maintaining and operating public schools?

Voting Pattern	Much More	A		<u>White</u>			No Answer	N
		Little More	Same Amount	A Little Less	Much Less	Don't Know		
1	55	43	21		17	24	9	131
2	13	5	17			6		48
3	14	12	5			6		34
4	1	6	2	8			18	13
5	6	4	16	42	67	18		51
6	1	1	3					8
7		1	1					3
8	1	11	20	25		18	18	57
9	1	2	4			6		12
0	<u>6</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>55</u>	54
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Total	78	99	188	12	6	17	11	411
				<u>Negro</u>				
1	49	46	40			50	60	48
2	9	14	5					9
3		7	15					5
4	11							5
5	2	7	10	100				6
6		4						1
7								0
8	2		15				20	5
9	22	14	5					15
0	<u>4</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>10</u>			<u>50</u>	<u>20</u>	9
	100%	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	
Total	45	28	20	1	0	4	5	103

## Innovations

Tables 17 and 18 show how the various types of voters responded to possible innovations in the school system. The first of these is a response that many school systems have made when enrollments drastically exceeded plant capacity; they have run the schools from daylight to dark by splitting the students into two shifts, morning and afternoon.

The Cincinnati voters reject this plan by about 2 to 1. Since this is an economy measure, it is predictable that the persons most favorable to this plan would also be more likely to vote against school levys. Table 17 bears this out.

Another proposal that has been heard in educational circles for several years, and that has been implemented among the poor by the federally supported Head Start Program, is that the criterion age for entering kindergarten be reduced from five years to four or even three. Results of questioning our sample of voters on such a program are shown in Table 18.

This table shows that 75 percent of whites are "opposed" or "very opposed," compared to 43 percent of the negroes. Within each racial category the voters who were more favorable to placing younger aged children in kindergartens were consistent in that they were more likely to support school levys. The relationship between voting patterns and acceptance of reduced age for kindergarten is one of considerable strength.

Both of these tables (17 and 18) deal with issues which could involve more or less expense for the school system. Those who support the less expensive programs are more likely to reject school levys.

TABLE 17

Some schools in the country have responded to greatly increased enrollments by dividing the students into two groups with one group going to school from about 7 a.m. until 1 p.m. and the other group going from 1 p.m. until 7 p.m. Would you favor such a plan for students here in Cincinnati?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>				<u>Negro</u>			
	Yes	No	Don't Know	N	Yes	No	Don't Know	N
1	31	36	13	131	35	48	67	48
2	11	12	11	48	9	9	11	9
3	7	9	7	34	4	6		5
4	4	2	4	13		6	11	5
5	20	9	13	52	9	6		6
6	1	3		8		1		1
7	1		2	3				0
8	14	12	24	57	4	6		5
9	2	3	4	12	26	13		15
0	9	13	22	53	13	7	11	9
Total	118	247	46	411	23	71	9	103

## Code for voting patterns:

	Vote 1966	Voting intentions 1967
1	yes	yes
2	no	yes
3	did not vote	yes
4	can't recall	yes
5	no	no
6	can't recall, or didn't vote	no
7	yes	no
8	no	undecided
9	yes	undecided
0	can't recall, or didn't vote	undecided

TABLE 18

In the past few years, school administrators have been proposing that children start school when they are 3 or 4 years old rather than waiting until kindergarten age. How do you feel about this?

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>						N
	Very Favorable	Favorable	Don't Know	Opposed	Very Opposed	No Answer	
1	50	49	30	32	23		131
2	13	7	9	10	15	25	47
3	3	12		8	11		34
4		2	13	2	4		13
5	3	5	22	15	14		52
6				3	2		8
7				2			3
8	9	12	22	14	15		57
9	9	2		2	4		12
0	<u>13</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>75</u>	54
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Total	32	43	23	178	131	4	411
	<u>Negro</u>						
1	53	52	39	46	36		48
2	6	10	15	6	9		9
3	6		15		18		5
4	6	7	8		9		5
5		3		9	18		6
6				3			1
7							0
8	6	3		9			5
9	12	21	8	18			15
0	<u>12</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>9</u>		9
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%		
Total	17	29	13	33	11		103

### Attitudes Toward Integration

Because of the widespread controversy that had been attendant upon the Supreme Court's school desegregation decision of 1954, the subsequent difficulties in implementing that decision, and the local controversy attendant upon the location of a new elementary school (1967) in an almost totally negro neighborhood, it seemed wise to probe this sample of voters to determine if their attitudes towards the integration of schools might have a bearing on their attitudes toward the school system and its support.

Table 19 shows the distribution of responses to such a question and how these responses are related to voting patterns in turn. Predictably, the negro voters tended to feel that "integration of schools" was going too slowly. Their modal response (34 percent) said it was going "much too slowly".

Among the white voters the modal answer (57 percent) said this form of integration was moving "about right." Another 23 percent felt it moving too rapidly, but only 5 percent felt school integration was moving too slowly.

The satisfaction with school integration was quite strongly related to voting for school levys among the whites; among negroes no relationship is apparent.

Among the white voters, those who felt that the integration of the schools was proceeding too rapidly were very opposed to both the school levys. An almost identical relationship is observed in Table 20, showing how voting patterns relate to attitudes towards the rapidity of "integration of housing."

Apparently these two questions tapped respondents in almost identical fashion. A difference is seen in the somewhat larger proportion of voters

TABLE 19

And with respect to racial integration of the schools in the Cincinnati area, are things moving:

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>						N
	Much too rapidly	A little too rapidly	About right	A little too slowly	Much too slowly	Don't know and No answer	
1	10	40	35	50	63	23	131
2	10	7	13	8	13	11	48
3	14	7	7		13	10	34
4	8	7	2			3	13
5	18	11	12	25		11	52
6	2	2	2			3	8
7	2					2	3
8	18	16	15		13	10	57
9	4		2	17		5	12
0	<u>14</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>23</u>	<u>54</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Total	50	45	235	12	8	62	412

Voting Pattern	<u>Negro</u>						N
	Much too rapidly	A little too rapidly	About right	A little too slowly	Much too slowly	Don't know and No answer	
1			49	41	54	29	48
2			6	11	11		9
3			15				5
4				4	3	43	5
5		100	9	4	3		6
6			3				1
7							
8			3	4	9		5
9			12	22	14		15
0	<u>    </u>	<u>    </u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>9</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Total	-	1	33	27	35	7	103

TABLE 20

Some people feel that many American communities are moving too rapidly in their efforts to racially integrate housing and the schools. Other people feel that things are moving too slowly. Thinking about the Cincinnati area, would you say that the racial integration of housing is going:

Voting Pattern	<u>White</u>						N
	Much too rapidly	A little too rapidly	About right	A little too slowly	Much too slowly	Don't know and No answer	
1	13	27	39	40	50	22	131
2	10	11	12	13	11	15	48
3	11	7	7	13	6	10	34
4	3	3	3	3		7	13
5	21	12	9	7	22	17	52
6	3	1	2			2	8
7	2	1		3			3
8	19	16	15	7	6	5	57
9	5	7	1	10			12
0	<u>14</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>22</u>	54
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Total	63	73	184	30	18	41	412
	<u>Negro</u>						
1	100	40	50	58	39	17	48
2		20		12	14		9
3		20	11		3		5
4				4	6	33	5
5			14		6		6
6				4			1
7							
8			4		8	17	5
9		20	14	12	19		15
0			<u>7</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>33</u>	9
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Total	2	5	28	26	36	6	103



who were content with the rate of school integration as compared to the proportion who were content with the rate of integration of housing. The difference is small, however; and it seems safest to conclude that opposition to rates of integration in general (whether the rates are perceived as too rapid or too slow) is related to voting patterns on school levys.

This finding presents some difficulties, because, while a considerable body of literature shows opposition to integration to be strongest in lower class categories, the data from this sample show this trend to be very weak in respect to these two questions on integration.<sup>1</sup>

Additionally, two other variables, rather strongly related to voting patterns show scant relationship with attitudes towards school integration rates (homeownership and children enrolled in school). The conclusion is that this variable has some independant power in predicting voting patterns for school levys. Why this is so remains speculative; there is no obvious rationale to account for its relationship with voting patterns for school levys.

#### Children in School

In this section many of the same variables are shown as in the preceding section, but here these variables are shown as they relate to the respondents status as: 1) parent of a child enrolled in the public school system, 2) parent of a child enrolled in a parochial school, 3) parent of a child too young for public school, or 4) a registered voter who has never had children or the children are not eligible for public school because they are too old (graduated or dropped out).

As will be seen this is one of the more powerful predictor variables of voting patterns and associated attitudes towards the school system. In general the reader will find, expectably, that those with children enrolled in the public school system or with infants who will be enrolled, soon,

---

1. See Tables 49, 50, and 51. These show education having a weak relationship to these attitudes towards integration, among whites.

are the most supportive. Those with (at least one) child in a parochial school and those with no (eligible) children vie for the position of being least supportive.

Beginning with an examination of Table 21, the readers attention is directed to the last column on the right, headed "N". This column shows the distribution of registered voters among the different categories of what will be called "children in school."

Within both racial categories, particularly the white, there is a great preponderance of registered persons without a direct or personal investment in the school system through their children. Such persons compose 70 percent of white voters and 56 percent of the negroes.

Examining the relationships within the table reveals that the voters who are, or will be, affected by split shifts are overwhelmingly opposed to such a plan. About one-third of those with an opinion favor the plan.

When asked about changing the amount of support for schools in heavily negro areas of the city, those with children in (or eligible for) public schools were most likely to favor "more" support, among whites as well as negroes (Table 22).

Consulting Tables 23 through 32, this same pattern continues (with one or two minor exceptions).

Table 33 adds an additional dimension to that of "supporting" the school system. As noted above, when the board announced service cutbacks to take effect in September '67, the two most publicly opposed were the abolition of kindergarten and interscholastic athletics.

The drive to obtain funds for the kindergarten reached every school district; but, as shown in the table, it reached most heavily those voters who had children in public school. Over half of such white voters were

TABLE 21

Some schools in the country have responded to greatly increased enrollments by dividing the students into two groups with one group going to school from about 7 a.m. until 1 p.m. and the other group going from 1 p.m. until 7 p.m. Would you favor such a plan for students here in Cincinnati?

	White			N	
	Yes	No	Don't know or No answer		
Children in public schools	18	77	5	100%	111
Children in parochial schools	36	59	5	100%	44
Children under 5 years of age, only	18	77	6	100%	17
No children in school	33	52	16	100%	239
Totals	118	247	46		411

  

	Negro			N	
	Yes	No	Don't know or No answer		
Children in public schools	26	67	7	100%	42
No children in school	21	68	11	100%	56
Totals	23	66	9		98*

\* Omits two respondents with children in private schools and three with children under 5 years, only.

TABLE 22

Do you think that the school administration in Cincinnati should spend more money, less money, or about the same amount of money being spent now on schools in the Avondale and West End areas of Cincinnati?

	More	Same	Less	<u>White</u>		N
				Don't know or No answer	100%	
Children in public schools	35	42	11	12	100%	111
Children in parochial schools	27	43	11	18	100%	44
Children under 5 years, only	41	41	12	6	100%	17
No children and all other	<u>26</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>25</u>	100%	<u>239</u>
Total	121	170	39	81		411

	<u>Negro</u>					
Children in public schools	45	31	5	19	100%	42
No children in school	<u>36</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>32</u>	100%	<u>56</u>
Total	39	24	9	26		98 *

\* Omits two respondents with children in private schools and three with children under five years, only.

TABLE 23

In some communities school officials become increasingly aware of the kinds of buildings the people want to have built, while in other communities the building program departs from the wishes of the people. During the past year or two, do you feel that the school building policies in the Cincinnati School District:

	<u>White</u>				N
	Closer to what people want	About the same	Farther from what people want	Don't know or No answer	
Children in public schools	39	24	26	11	100% 111
Children in parochial schools	43	23	23	11	100% 44
Children under 5 years of age, only	41	29	6	24	100% 17
No children	<u>23</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>28</u>	100% <u>239</u>
Total	123	98	102	88	411
			<u>Negro</u>		
Children in public schools	31	24	36	10	100% 42
No children	<u>20</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>34</u>	<u>20</u>	100% <u>56</u>
Total	24	25	34	15	98*

\* Omits two respondents with children in private schools and three with children under five years, only.

TABLE 24

Generally speaking, how would you say the local school funds are used?

	<u>White</u>							N
	Very Wisely	Quite Wisely	Wisely ½ of time	Rather Unwisely	Very Unwisely	Don't Know or No answer	100%	
Children in Public School	12	40	32	7	5	5	100%	111
Children in Parochial School	2	32	32	9	7	18	100%	44
Children under 5 years, only	18	35	18	6		24	100%	17
No children in school	9	33	20	8	5	25	100%	240
<b>Total</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>78</b>		<b>412</b>
	<u>Negro</u>							
Children in Public School	19	33	24	7	2	14	100%	42
No children in school	21	13	27	5	5	29	100%	56
<b>Total</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>22</b>		<b>98*</b>

\* Omits two respondents with children in private schools and three with children under five years, only.

TABLE 25

It is important for a school board to make wise and reasonable decisions concerning the operation of the public schools. To what extent do you feel the present school board makes sound and reasonable decisions about school matters?

	<u>White</u>					N
	Almost Always	Most of the time	About half of the time	Make more unwise decisions than wise	Almost always make unwise decisions	
					Don't know or No Answer	
Children in Public School	12	50	23	6	1	9
Children in Parochial School	9	46	16	7	5	18
Children under 5 years, only	29	41	12	0	0	18
No children in school	11	42	16	7	0	23
Total	49	183	72	27	4	77
						100%
Children in Public School	12	48	31	2	0	7
No children in school	5	30	30	9	7	18
Total	8	37	30	6	4	13
						100%
						98*

\* Omits two respondents with children in private schools and three with children under 5 years, only.

TABLE 26

And how about the judgment exercised by the administrative staff. To what extent do you feel the administrators exercise sound and reasonable judgment about school matters?

	<u>White</u>					N
	Almost Always	Usually	About half of the time	Show more poor judgment than good	Almost always show poor judgment	
					Don't Know or No Answer	
Children in Public School	23	48	17	5	6	111
Children in Parochial School	18	39	14	7	21	44
Children under 5 years, only	35	41	6	0	18	17
No children in school	17	35	20	4	21	240
<u>Total</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>162</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>412</u>
	<u>Negro</u>					N
	Almost Always	Usually	About half of the time	Show more poor judgment than good	Almost always show poor judgment	
Children in Public School	10	33	38	10	7	42
No children in school	7	30	23	13	18	56
<u>Total</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>98*</u>

\* Omits two respondents with children in private schools and three with children under 5 years, only.



TABLE 27

Have you heard of the recent appointment of a new assistant Superintendent of Schools?

	Yes	No	<u>White</u>	N
Children in Public School	46	54	100%	111
Children in Parochial School	43	57	100%	44
Children under 5 years old, only	41	59	100%	17
No children in school	39	61	100%	233
Total	168	237		405*

\* 4 cases were not included that gave no answer.

	Yes	No	<u>Negro</u>	N
Children in Public School	42	59	100%	41
Children in Parochial School	50	50	100%	2
Children under 5 years old, only	50	50	100%	2
No children in school	26	74	100%	53
Total	33	65		98*

\* 3 cases were not included that gave no answer.

TABLE 28

Generally speaking, do you feel that the public schools have spent too much, too little, or the right amount of money on special facilities such as libraries, gymnasiums, swimming pools, and so forth?

	<u>White</u>				100%	N
	Too Much	Right Amount	Too Little	Don't know or No answer		
Children in Public School	19	56	18	7	100%	111
Children in Parochial School	30	61	7	2	100%	44
Children under 5 years, Only	24	65	6	6	100%	17
No children in school	25	53	10	12	100%	238
<b>Total</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>39</b>		<b>410</b>
	<u>Negro</u>					
Children in Public School	2	50	29	19	100%	42
No children in school	2	42	35	22	100%	55
<b>Total</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>20</b>		<b>97*</b>

\* Omits two respondents with children in private schools and three with children under five years, only.

TABLE 29

On what facilities has too much, (too little) money been spent?

	<u>White</u>						N
	Too Much Sports	Too Little Sports	Too Little Libraries	Any Other Answer	No Answer		
Children in Public School	14	5	6	15	60	100%	111
Children in Parochial School	18		2	20	61	100%	44
Children under 5 years, only	24		6		71	100%	17
No children in school	<u>15</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>60</u>	100%	<u>236</u>
Total	63	10	12	76	247		408
 <u>Negro</u> 							
Children in Public School		10	5	21	64	100%	42
No children in school	<u>6</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>62</u>	100%	<u>55</u>
Total	3	9	4	20	61		97*

\* Omits two respondents with children in private schools and three with children under five years, only.

TABLE 30

Do you feel that people in Cincinnati were kept adequately informed about basic issues during the last school tax elections?

	Yes	No	<u>White</u>		N
			Don't know or No answer		
Children in public school	44	45	12	100%	110
Children in parochial school	46	48	7	100%	44
Children under 5 years only	53	29	18	100%	17
No children in school	<u>49</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>15</u>	100%	<u>240</u>
Total	194	161	56		411
			<u>Negro</u>		
Children in public school	45	45	10	100%	42
No children in school	<u>32</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>23</u>	100%	<u>56</u>
Total	37	44	17		98*

\* Omits two respondents with children in private schools and three with children under five years, only.

TABLE 31

Would you review this list and make a judgment as to whether (name community) should spend much more, a little more, the same amount, a little less, or much less than it now spends on building, maintaining and operating public schools?

	<u>White</u>						N
	Much More	A Little More	Same Amount	A Little Less	Much Less	Don't know or No answer	
Children in public school	28	24	44	1		3	100% 111
Children in parochial school	21	18	55	5	2		100% 44
Children under 5 years, only	35	29	35				100% 17
No children	<u>13</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>11</u>	100% <u>239</u>
Totals	78	99	188	12	6	28	411
	<u>Negro</u>						
Children in public school	43	31	26				100% 42
No children	<u>41</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>16</u>			<u>16</u>	100% <u>56</u>
Totals	41	28	20			9	98*

\* Omits two respondents with children in private schools and three with children under 5 years, only.

TABLE 32

For statistical purposes, we would like to ask if you recall how you voted in the school tax proposals last November.

	<u>White</u>					
	For	Against	Can't Recall	Didn't vote or No answer		N
Children in Public School	40	37	7	16	100%	110
Children in Parochial School	32	43	11	14	100%	44
Children under 5 years, only	18	24	6	53	100%	17
No children in school	35	39	9	17	100%	240
<b>Total</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>73</b>		<b>411</b>

	<u>Negro</u>					
Children in Public School	71	19	2	7	100%	42
No children in school	54	20	14	13	100%	56
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>10</b>		<b>98</b>

TABLE 33

In many elementary school districts people organized last winter to collect money for keeping kindergarten in operation Do you know if such a group was organized in this school district?

Children in School	White				N	
	Contacted Gave	Did not Give	Heard of Drive Would Have Given	Would Not Have Given		
			Would Have Given	Would Not Have Given	No Answer	
Public School	46	6	10	9	3	110
Parochial School	32	7	5	27	5	44
Pre-School	24		29	18	6	17
All Others	11	6	10	29	1	238
Total	95	25	41	93	9	409
	Negro					
Public School	26	19	5	2	7	42
Others	6	2	9	20		55
Total	14	9	7	12	3	97*

\* Omits two respondents with children in private schools and three with children under 5 years only.

contacted, and 46 percent gave money. Nearly half of such negro voters were contacted.

The high percent of parents of parochial school children contacted, and giving money, is explicable on the grounds that the Catholic schools in Cincinnati do not operate kindergartens.

Similar relationships are found in Table 34 (interscholastic athletic fund drive). This drive did not include an organized effort to have personal solicitations made. Nevertheless parents with children in public school were more sensitive, apparently; as well as more disposed to contribute.

#### Homeownership

Another variable having great predictive power is the voters status of homeownership. There are three major variations of this status: 1) a person owns his home, outright, 2) a person is in the process of purchasing a home (mortgage or land contract), or 3) the person is a renter.

The following tables (35 through 39) will introduce the reader to the effects these separate conditions, or statuses, have on the voters orientation to the public school system. Generally the outright owner is least supportive; the renter is most supportive; and the buyer is intermediate.

It is of some interest to note the fashion in which white renters responded to feeling they were deprived of information on the 1966 tax levy (Table 38) but voted for it so heavily (Table 39), while the white owners were doing the reverse.

The next few tables show results for the sample as a whole without separate tabulations by race. Table 40 shows the voting intentions for 1967 by homeownership. As in Table 39, the renters lead the way in approving a school levy.



TABLE 34

Another organization was formed last winter to collect money to keep the interscholastic athletic program going in the public schools. Did you hear of this organization?

Children in School	White				Negro				N
	Contacted		Heard of Drive		Did Not Hear		No Answer		
	Gave	Did not Give	Would Have Given	Would Not Have Given	Would Have Given	Would Not Have Given			
Public School	6	6	30	31	16	10	2	100%	110
Parochial School	2	9	25	30	21	14		100%	44
Pre-School	12	6	18	24	12	29		100%	17
All Others	1	2	18	29	13	34	4	100%	238
Total	12	16	90	120	58	102	11		409
Public School	5	17	12	31	19	17		100%	42
All Others	2		16	36	24	18	4	100%	55
Total	3	7	14	33	21	17	2		97

TABLE 35

Do you think that the school administration in Cincinnati should spend more money, less money, or about the same amount of money being spent now on schools in the Avondale and West End areas of Cincinnati?

	<u>White</u>			All Other	N
	Home Ownership				
	Owms	Buying	Rents		
More	21	40	34	27	121
The same	50	35	33	36	171
Less	10	10	9		39
Undecided and no answer	19	14	24	36	81
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>      </u>
Total	186	99	115	11	411
		<u>Negro</u>			
More	35	49	35	*	41
The same	17	30	23		25
Less	22	3	12		11
Undecided and no answer	26	19	30		26
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		<u>      </u>
Total	23	37	43		103

\* No Negroes in "Other" category.

TABLE 36

Generally speaking, do you feel that the public schools have spent too much, too little, or the right amount of money on special facilities such as libraries, gymnasiums, swimming pools, and so forth?

	<u>White</u>				N
	Home Ownership				
	Owns	Buying	Rents	All Other	
Too much	30	18	22		98
Right Amount	53	58	55	55	225
Too Little	9	16	11	18	48
Don't know or No answer	8	8	11	27	39
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	186	99	114	11	410
		<u>Negro</u>			
Too much	4		2	*	2
Right Amount	44	53	37		45
Too Little	35	25	40		34
Don't know or No Answer	17	22	21		21
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		
Total	23	36	43		102

\* No Negroes in the "All Other" category.

TABLE 37

Generally speaking, how would you say the local school funds are used?

	<u>White</u>				N
	Home Ownership				
	Owns	Buying	Rents	All Other	
Very Wisely	10	6	11		38
Quite Wisely	36	42	28	9	143
Wisely half of time	24	26	25	9	101
Rather Unwisely	10	9	3	9	33
Very Unwisely	6	5	3		19
Don't know and No answer	13	11	29	73	78
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	186	99	116	11	412
	<u>Negro</u>				
Very Wisely	22	14	23		20
Quite Wisely	9	30	19		21
Wisely half of time	35	24	19		25
Rather Unwisely	9	5	9		8
Very Unwisely	9		7		5
Don't know and No answer	17	27	23		24
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		
Total	23	37	43		103

TABLE 38

Do you feel that people in Cincinnati were kept adequately informed about basic issues during the last school tax elections?

	<u>White</u>				
	Home Ownership				
	Owns	Buying	Rents	All Other	N
Yes	56	47	34	45	194
No	35	46	43	18	161
Don't know and No answer	9	8	23	36	56
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	185	99	116	11	411
	<u>Negro</u>				
Yes	30	35	42		38
No	57	46	40		47
Don't know and No answer	13	19	19		18
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		
Total	23	37	43		103

TABLE 39

On the first levy in November, did you vote:

	<u>White</u>				N
	Home Ownership				
	Owms	Buying	Rents	All Other	
For	28	35	46	55	146
Against	51	42	17	9	157
Can't Recall	8	5	14		35
Didn't Vote	12	16	22	18	67
No Answer	1	1	1	18	6
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>411</b>
		<u>Negro</u>			
For	70	43	72		63
Against	13	43	2		20
Can't Recall	4	5	14		9
Didn't Vote	13	8	9		10
No Answer			2		1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		
<b>Total</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>43</b>		<b>103</b>

TABLE 40

If you do go to the polls, how do you think you will vote? For the school tax levy or against it?

Vote on School Levy	Home Ownership				N
	Owns	Buying	Rents	All Other	
For	48	58	67	73	293
Undecided	25	24	18	9	114
Against	24	10	4		70
No Answer	3	8	12	18	39
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	210	136	159	11	516

TABLE 41

Would you review this list and make a judgment as to whether (name community) should spend much more, a little more, the same amount, a little less, or much less than it now spends on building, maintaining and operating public schools.

	Home Ownership				N
	Owns	Buying	Rents	All Other	
Much More	16	23	36	9	123
A little more	19	29	28	36	127
Same amount	50	43	26	27	208
A little less	3	3	2		13
Much less	3				6
Don't know or No answer	9	2	8	27	38
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	209	136	159	11	515

In Table 41 the renters lead the way in approving increased expenditures for the public schools.

When it comes to proposing new sources of taxation, evaluating property taxes, and evaluating the quality of local governmental services obtained for their tax money, the various categories of homeowner status do not differ from one another very much.

In Table 42 all categories are similarly divided in favoring a city income tax (about one-fourth), more money from the state (one-fifth) and more money from the Federal Government (one-fifth).

In Table 43 all three categories are similar in the percentages saying how much of their "money's worth" they obtain from their local tax dollar. Most voters said they do get their money's worth.

Table 44, 45, and 46 show the renters tend to be slightly less disturbed than owners and buyers by the current levels of property taxes.

In summary the renters respond to general questions about taxes and city provided services quite similarly to owners and buyers of homes, but on questions that call for increased commitments of property taxes for the public school system they behave as if they did not expect to pay, themselves, for these increased or improved services.

There is a reasonable explanation for the general trend in these tables showing that owners are most opposed, buyers next, and renters least opposed to increases in property taxes. The renter never sees a bill (or receipt) for property taxes. He pays such taxes in the form of higher charges for rent, as well as most other commodities he buys; but the symbolic connection between these increased charges and increased tax rates is invisible to the renter.



TABLE 42

Thinking about taxation here in (name community) when more funds are needed to build and operate the schools, as a general principle would it be best to:

	Home Ownership				N
	Owns	Buying	Rents	All Other	
Increase local property tax	2	8	4		23
Raise city income tax	23	26	20	9	116
More State money	21	21	25	36	117
More Federal money	19	23	23	27	109
Other	28	21	21	9	121
Don't know or no answer	7	2	6	18	30
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	210	136	159	11	516

TABLE 43

If you were to sum up your feelings about the services which are provided you and your family by the local government in relation to the local taxes you pay, would you say that you are getting:

Services	Home Ownership				N
	Owns	Buying	Rents	All Other	
More than your money's worth	6	4	7	9	30
Your money's worth	56	57	53	36	283
Less than your money's worth	35	37	25	18	165
Don't know or no answer	3	2	15	36	38
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	210	136	159	11	516

TABLE 44

Compared with other communities in this area, would you say that the local property taxes here in (name community) are:

Taxes	Home Ownership				N
	Owns	Buying	Rents	All Other	
Much higher than average	13	13	6	9	56
A little higher than average	21	22	16	18	103
Average	42	41	26	18	189
A little lower than average	11	12	6	9	50
Much lower than average	1	2	3		9
Don't know or no answer	<u>11</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>42</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>109</u>
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Total	210	136	159	11	516

TABLE 45

Property taxes assessed against private homes in this community are already too high and should not be increased. Do you:

	Home Ownership				N
	Owens	Buying	Rents	All Other	
Agree	86	77	66	45	395
Disagree	12	18	15	9	75
Don't know	1	4	19	36	43
No answer		2		9	3
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Total	210	136	159	11	516

TABLE 46

Property taxes assessed against business and industrial property in this community are already too high and should not be increased. Do you:

	Home Ownership				N
	Owens	Buying	Rents	All Other	
Agree	46	31	35	9	194
Disagree	15	29	29	18	118
Don't know	40	38	37	55	199
No answer		2		18	5
	100%	100%	100%	100%	
Total	210	136	159	11	516

The buyer is not as insulated from making this connection as the renter, but the impact of property tax increases is usually diffused by being paid on an installment plan and imbedded in bills that list "interest on debt," "capital", "insurance", etc. The buyer usually pays for his housing very much as a renter does and increased taxes are paid in individually small, monthly increments.

The owner pays for his housing in the form of taxes, only. Twice a year he receives a bill from the local government for a property tax. This bill must be paid in a lump sum amounting to hundreds, and in some cases thousands, of dollars. There is no diffusion over several months of payments, and the bill for taxes is not embedded in a category called "escrow". Thus the outright owner of property is more acutely conscious of this cost than the home-buyer, who is more conscious of it than the renter.

From the viewpoint of those governments and governmental agencies who are dependent upon property taxes for revenue the picture is made bleak by the fact that the "renter" is a definite minority of the registered voter population--among whites as well as negroes. In addition the renter is less likely to vote at all (Table 39).

TABLE 47

"...should 'your community' spend much more, a little more, the same... 'in' building, maintaining and operating public schools?"

by  
Children's School Attendance Status  
and by  
Home Ownership

	Child in Public School				Pre-School Children			
	Owens	Buying	Renting	N	Owens	Buying	Renting	N
Much More	33	26	45	49		17	73	9
A Little More	24	27	28	40	33	33	18	5
Same	37	45	28	60	67	50	9	6
A Little Less		1		1				
Don't know and no answer	6			3				
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	51	73	29	153	3	6	11	20

  

	No Children in School*				Child in Parochial School			
	Owens	Buying	Renting	N	Owens	Buying	Renting	N
Much More	12	15	29	54	5	31	44	10
A Little More	17	37	29	70	19	13	22	8
Same	52	39	27	115	67	44	33	24
A Little Less	4	2	3	9	5	13		3
Much Less	4			5	5			1
Don't know and no answer	12	7	12	32				
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	134	41	110	285	21	16	9	46

\* Eleven cases whose homeowner status is "other" are omitted.

### Children in School and Homeownership

In Tables 48 and 49 both of the variables studied in the last tables are combined to show their joint influence on voting in November 1966 and the voting intentions for November 1967. In both elections each of these variables is seen to be strongly related to support (or opposition) to taxes for public schools, and their combined effect is even greater.

In November 1966, 79.3 percent of those persons who rented their homes and had children enrolled in the public schools voted in favor of the school levys; but, only 19 percent of those eligible voters who owned their homes and had children in parochial schools voted in favor. Similar differences are found for these two categories in their voting "intentions" for November 1967. The other categories of eligible voters fall in between these extreme categories in both elections.

Table 50 summarizes the data from Tables 48 and 49 by showing the percentages of eligible voters in both elections who voted for and against these levys and the differences (within categories) in favorable votes and in negative votes. Finally, the bottom row of this table shows an index of total favorable change.

This index consists of the percentage difference in favorable votes from 1966 to 1967 added to the percentage difference in unfavorable votes. The maximum index figure that is possible here is 200. This would mean that all eligibles voted, and that they all voted unfavorable the first year but all voted the opposite the next year.

The figures show that there were some massive changes from one election to the next, and they show the greatest changes occurring among homeowners and homebuyers who had children enrolled in public schools or about to be enrolled in public schools. The renters changed very little in any category, partly because their favorable vote percentage was high to begin with. The categories with children in parochial school or no children eligible for school show the least amount of favorable changes from the first to the second election.\*

---

\*Those with no eligible children who are homebuyers have a high change index score. This is not expectable.

TABLE 48

"On the first levy in November did you vote...?"

by  
Children's School Attendance Status  
and by  
Home Ownership

	Child in Public School				Pre-School Children			
	Owms	Buying	Renting	N	Owms	Buying	Renting	N
For	44	43	72	74			46	5
Against	40	37	7	49	67	17	9	4
Can't Recall and no answer	6	4	10	9	33		9	2
Didn't vote	10	16	10	20		83	36	9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	50	73	29	152	3	6	11	120

  

	No Children in School*				Child in Parochial School			
	Owms	Buying	Renting	N	Owms	Buying	Renting	N
For	31	32	49	109	19	44	44	15
Against	47	59	16	104	62	38	11	20
Can't Recall and no answer	9	7	16	33	5	13	22	5
Didn't Vote	13	2	19	40	14	6	22	6
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	135	41	110	286	21	16	9	46

\* Eleven cases whose homeowner status is "other" are omitted.

TABLE 4g

"If you do go to the polls, how will you vote? For the school tax levy or against it?"

by  
Children's School Attendance Status  
and by  
Home Ownership

	Child in Public School				Pre-School Children			
	Owns	Buying	Renting	N	Owns	Buying	Renting	N
For	69	64	79	105	67	67	46	11
Undecided	18	18	10	25	33	17	9	3
Against	10	10		12		17		1
No Answer	4	8	10	11			46	5
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	51	73	29	153	3	6	11	20

  

	No Children in School*				Child in Parochial School			
	Owns	Buying	Renting	N	Owns	Buying	Renting	N
For	41	51	66	148	38	44	67	21
Undecided	30	27	19	72	14	44	33	13
Against	28	12	6	47	43	6		10
No Answer	3	10	10	19	5	6		2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	135	41	110	286	21	16	9	46

\* Eleven cases whose homeowner status is "other" are omitted.



TABLE 50

Percentage Changes in "Yes" and "No" Votes  
November, 1966 to November, 1967

by  
Children's School Attendance Status  
and by  
Homeownership

	Child in Public School				Pre-School Children			
	Owns	Buying	Renting	N	Owns	Buying	Renting	N
<u>Increase in "Yes" Votes</u>								
"Yes" '67	68.6	64.4	79.3		66.7	66.7	45.5	
"Yes" '66	44.0	42.5	72.4		-	-	45.5	
Increase	24.6	21.9	6.9		66.7	66.7	0.0	
<u>Decline in "No" Votes</u>								
"No" '66	40.0	37.0	6.9		66.7	16.7	9.1	
"No" '67	9.8	9.6	-		-	16.7	-	
Decline	30.2	27.4	6.9		66.7	0.0	9.1	
<u>Index of Positive Change</u>								
	54.8	49.3	13.8		133.4	66.7	9.1	
Total	50	73	29	152	3	6	11	20

TABLE 50  
(Continued)

Percentage Changes in "Yes" and "No" Votes  
November, 1966 to November, 1967

by  
Children's School Attendance Status  
and by  
Homeownership

	No Children in School				Child in Parochial School			
	Owns	Buying	Renting	N	Owns	Buying	Renting	N
	<u>Increase in "Yes" Votes</u>							
"Yes" '67	40.7	51.2	65.5		38.1	43.8	66.7	
"Yes" '66	31.1	31.7	49.1		19.0	43.8	44.4	
Increase	9.6	19.5	16.4		19.1	0.0	22.3	
	<u>Decline in "No" Votes</u>							
"No" '66	46.7	58.5	15.5		61.9	37.5	11.1	
"No" '67	26.7	12.2	5.5		42.9	6.3	-	
Decline	20.0	46.3	10.0		19.0	31.2	11.1	
	<u>Index of Positive Change</u>							
	29.6	65.8	26.4		38.1	31.2	33.3	
Total	135	41	110	286	21	16	9	46

### A School Riot Affects Voters' Attitudes

On October 11, 1967, less than a month before the date of voting for school levy renewals, three (out of seven) school board vacancies, and all nine city council seats, one of the city's high schools was the scene of a riot. The disorders continued more or less intense for two or three days.

There has been no public report by a prestigious committee (Warren Committee) to explain to the public what happened. This author cannot recall hearing any statement affirming any event occurring in this riot that he has not also heard described in a different manner from some other source, or heard that the original description was a complete fabrication designed by "them" to deceive "us."

It does seem undeniable, however, by almost everyone that: 1) students vacated classrooms, 2) some students were physically assaulted by other students, and 3) to some extent, at least, the antagonists' lines were drawn by the criterion of race.

The community was stunned. There was no anticipation of such a development, and this is supported by the evidence in Tables 51 and 52. In Table 51 we see how white, registered voters with different degrees of education felt about schools with more or less than 30 percent of the pupils being Negro.

Such white voters as were interviewed before the school riot tended to feel that the quality of education was not influenced by having more than 30 percent Negro pupils. Those white voters who were interviewed after this riot were of a different persuasion. After the riot the majority of these voters felt the quality of education decreases when Negro enrollment exceeds 30 percent.

The voters were also asked how they felt about the speed with which the Cincinnati schools were being integrated (Table 52). Again, a majority of those interviewed before October 12 felt the speed was "about right."

TABLE 51

Several schools in the Cincinnati area have a high proportion of Negro pupils. Some people feel that when classrooms reach 30% Negro pupils the quality of the classes diminishes because Negro pupils tend to come from more deprived backgrounds. Other people feel this is not true. On the average, would you say that the educational quality of classes drops when the proportion of Negro pupils reaches 30% or more.

## Whites by Education

## Interviewed Before October 12

	Less than 8 years	8-11 years	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	N
Quality decreases	29	28	45	43	38	89
Quality not influenced	60	68	43	51	46	129
Quality is higher						
Don't know or No answer	11	4	13	6	16	23
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	45	47	47	65	37	241

## Interviewed After October 11

Quality decreases	55	46	45	45	52	66
Quality not influenced	20	33	35	42	40	49
Quality is higher	5	4	6			4
Don't know or No answer	20	17	13	13	8	19
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	20	24	31	38	25	138

TABLE 52

And with respect to racial integration of the schools in the Cincinnati area, are things moving:

## Whites by Education

## Interviewed Before October 12

	Less than 8 years	8-11 years	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	N
Much too rapidly	9	20	6	7	4	25
A little too rapidly	6	12	19	10	4	27
About right	57	58	62	66	67	165
A little too slowly	4	2	4	2	2	7
Much too slowly					9	4
Don't know or No answer	24	8	9	15	13	37
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	54	50	47	68	46	265

## Interviewed After October 11

Much too rapidly	31	29	3	16	11	25
A little too rapidly		21	21	18		19
About right	50	33	36	50	67	70
A little too slowly			12		4	5
Much too slowly		4	3		7	4
Don't know or No answer	19	13	24	16	11	23
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	26	24	33	38	27	148

Among those interviewed on or after that date less than a majority of the white voters felt the speed of this integration was "about right." The percentage who thought the speed was too fast ("much" or "a little" too rapidly) had increased from 20 to 30 percent.

The two questions impacted on the voters of different educational levels in different ways, but the effect of the school riot appears to have had similar consequences (though not the same degree of consequences). Before the riot the white voters with more education tended to feel that the higher ratio of Negro-to-white pupils was more deleterious than the low income voters thought it was. After the riot, the lower education voters were more likely to feel that the consequences were deleterious. Both types of voters had moved toward this position, but the lower education voters had moved much farther.

In answering the question concerning the speed of integration in the school it is the voters with higher education who are seen to have been initially most satisfied; and, after the riot, they were still fairly satisfied. But the voters with less education had shifted their opinions much farther. They were much less satisfied after the riots.

It would seem that the white voters with most education were the most pessimistic regarding the effects of integration in the schools (Table 52), but they were also the most satisfied with the rate at which integration of the schools was proceeding. Perhaps they felt that some lower quality of education was a necessary cost in order to achieve a more important long-range goal, racial integration. While the riot affected, and reduced, their optimism, their original positions were affected much less than those of lesser education who show radical shifts ...especially in Table 52.

Other changes in attitudes seemingly affected by the riots, are reflected in Tables 53 through 76. Table 53 shows how white voters of different educational levels felt about the speed with which the integration of housing was proceeding in Cincinnati. While the largest number of those voters who were interviewed before the riot felt the speed was "about right," almost as many felt it was too rapid.

TABLE 53

Some people feel that many American communities are moving too rapidly in their efforts to racially integrate housing and the schools. Other people feel that things are moving too slowly. Thinking about the Cincinnati area, would you say that the racial integration of housing is going:

## Whites by Education

## Interviewed Before October 12

	Less than 8 years	8-11 years	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	N
Much too rapidly	20	20	13	15	7	40
A little too rapidly	13	22	21	15	7	41
About right	26	44	49	56	59	124
A little too slowly	19	6	9	4	7	23
Much too slowly	4		2	3	13	11
Don't know or No answer	19	8	6	7	9	26
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	54	50	47	68	46	265

## Interviewed After October 11

Much too rapidly	23	25	6	18	7	23
A little too rapidly	8	29	36	16	19	32
About right	35	38	36	55	48	64
A little too slowly			6	3	15	7
Much too slowly	4		12		7	7
Don't know or No answer	31	8	3	8	4	15
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	26	24	33	38	27	148

Among those interviewed before the riot, the answers were strongly related to education; the higher the educational level the greater the percentage who respond "about right." Among those interviewed after the riot, the same trend seems to exist but it is not so regular as before.

Comparing Table 53 with Table 52, we see that the integration of housing was the more controversial issue. More white voters were concerned that such integration was occurring too rapidly (and too slowly, also) than felt this way about the integration of schools. This difference held among those interviewed before and after the riot.

Before the riot 31 percent of the white voters felt housing integration was too rapid; after the riot 37 percent expressed this opinion. Thus, while many of these voters were apparently affected by the riot, the effects seem to have been greater when they thought of school integration, where the comparable percentages were 20 and 30.

The importance of the public schools seemed greater to those interviewed after the school riot, particularly among those with less education (Table 54).

The felt importance of police and fire protection rose, also (Tables 55 and 56); and, while these general attitudinal questions are only crude predictors of behavior, we see in Tables 57, 58 and 59 that greater percentages of these voters say that more tax money should be devoted to the public schools, the police, and the firemen after the school riot than before. The increases in support were largest among the less educated voters; the voters with college degrees seem to have dropped their level of support for these services after the riot; but, the average level of support in the entire after-riot sample was higher. In fact after the riot the modal response called for spending "much more" tax money on police protection; where before the riot, the modal response was to spend the "same amount."

But the riot apparently did more than elicit increased support for the troubled public schools and the protective services; it also tended to polarize racial attitudes of whites (and Negroes as well, which will be treated in a following section). This polarization was



TABLE 54\*

## How Important Are Public Schools

## Whites by Education

## Interviewed Before October 12

	Less than 8 years	8-11 years	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	N
Very important	67	64	81	91	85	206
Fairly important	25	28	17	6	15	46
Not important	2	4		3		5
Don't know or No answer	6	4	2			6
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	52	50	47	68	46	263

## Interviewed After October 11

Very important	89	96	91	84	89	132
Fairly important	8	4	6	11	11	12
Not important			3	3		2
Don't know or No answer	4			3		2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	26	24	33	38	27	148

\*See Appendix B, Table 20

TABLE 55 \*

## How Important Is Police Protection

## Whites by Education

## Interviewed Before October 12

	Less than 8 years	8-11 years	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	N
Very important	92	92	92	96	98	247
Fairly important	6	6	9	4	2	14
Not important						
Don't know or No answer	2	2				2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>        </u>
Total	52	50	47	68	46	263

## Interviewed After October 11

Very important	89	100	100	100	93	143
Fairly important	4				4	2
Not important	4					1
Don't know or No answer	4				4	2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>        </u>
Total	26	24	33	38	27	148

\*See Appendix B, Table 24

TABLE 56 \*

## How Important Is Fire Protection

## Whites by Education

## Interviewed Before October 12

	Less than 8 years	8-11 years	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	N
Very important	90	94	92	96	96	246
Fairly important	8	4	9	3	4	14
Not important				2		1
Don't know or No answer	2	2				2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	52	50	47	68	46	263

## Interviewed After October 11

Very important	85	100	100	100	93	142
Fairly important	12				7	5
Not important						
Don't know or No answer	4					1
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	26	24	33	38	27	148

\*See Appendix B, Table 25

TABLE 57 \*

## How Much Tax Money Should be Spent on Public Schools

## Whites by Education

## Interviewed Before October 12

	Less than 8 years	8-11 years	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	N
Much more	13	4	23	15	37	47
A little more	15	18	23	27	24	57
Same amount	57	60	47	49	33	131
Less	2	14	2	4	2	13
Don't know or No answer	13	4	4	6	4	17
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	54	50	47	68	46	265

## Interviewed After October 11

Much more	23	21	30	16	15	31
A little more	23	42	21	26	33	42
Same amount	42	33	33	42	41	57
Less	4		6	8		6
Don't know or No answer	8	4	9	8	11	12
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	26	24	33	38	27	148

\*See Appendix B, Table 34

TABLE 58 \*

## How Much Tax Money Should be Spent on Police Protection

## Whites by Education

## Interviewed Before October 12

	Less than 8 years	8-11 years	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	N
Much more	30	14	32	31	24	70
A little more	19	32	36	43	37	89
Same amount	39	50	30	21	35	90
Less	2	2				2
Don't know or No answer	11	2	2	6	4	14
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	54	50	47	68	46	265

## Interviewed After October 11

Much more	39	38	46	34	11	50
A little more	15	46	30	26	52	49
Same amount	35	17	24	34	30	42
Less	4					1
Don't know or No answer	8			5	7	6
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	26	24	33	38	27	148

\*See Appendix B, Table 38

TABLE 59 \*

## How Much Tax Money Should be Spent on Fire Protection

## Whites by Education

## Interviewed Before October 12

	Less than 8 years	8-11 years	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	N
Much more	24	8	19	18	15	45
A little more	15	22	23	31	22	61
Same amount	52	66	55	46	57	144
Less	2	2				2
Don't know or No answer	8	2	2	6	7	13
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	54	50	47	68	46	265

## Interviewed After October 11

Much more	42	29	30	16	4	35
A little more	19	33	21	18	30	35
Same amount	31	38	49	61	59	72
Less						
Don't know or No answer	8			5	7	6
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	26	24	33	38	27	148

\*See Appendix B, Table 39

reflected in Tables 51, 52 and 53, and it is shown again in Table 60. There, most educational-level categories are seen to increase the percentages who would give extra support to schools in two predominantly Negro areas after the school riot; but there is also seen a similar tendency for the percentages who would withdraw support to increase after the riot, although this latter increase is smaller.

In Table 61 the higher educational categories show substantial declines in the percentages who preferred Cincinnati's own schools to the schools in the suburbs. There are also commensurate increases in the percentages favoring the suburban schools over Cincinnati's own.

When the voters were asked their "reasons" for preferring one school location over another, most persons choosing the suburban schools gave reasons that suggested they felt these schools would provide more "congenial" atmospheres for children, e.g., more discipline and less violence. The most frequent reason given for preferring Cincinnati schools was that they were superior in providing pupils an education.

The overall percentage favoring Cincinnati schools dropped seven percentage points. The increase among those preferring suburban schools was eight points.

In their overall evaluation of the manner in which the school system was being operated the white voters did not change after the school riot (Tables 62 and 63).

In Table 62, where their evaluations of the use of school funds is shown, there were no major changes by educational category nor in the overall or total distribution. In Table 63, where the voters' evaluations of the school administrators are shown, the same lack of change is found.

Earlier tables showed considerable changes in how the white voters evaluated the presence of a large proportion of Negro pupils, the speed of racial integration, and their preference for suburban over inner-city schools. They also showed the general shifts, upward, in dispositions to support the system with additional financial help.

TABLE 60 \*

## Should More be Spent on West End and Avondale

## Whites by Education

## Interviewed Before October 12

	Less than 8 years	8-11 years	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	N
More	15	16	38	29	44	74
Same	39	54	43	46	39	117
Less	15	14	4	7	2	23
Undecided	26	14	15	18	13	46
No answer	6	2			2	5
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	54	50	47	68	46	265

## Interviewed After October 11

More	19	29	52	13	52	48
Same	35	38	24	53	26	53
Less	19	17	3	11	7	16
Undecided	19	17	18	24	15	28
No answer	8					2
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	26	24	33	38	27	147

\*See Appendix B, Table 49



TABLE 61

Would you think for a moment about children attending school in the Cincinnati School District and then think about children attending school in the various suburban school districts which surround the city. Generally speaking, if it were equally possible and equally easy to do, would you prefer to have your children attend school in the Cincinnati School District, in a suburban school district, or wouldn't it make any difference to you?

## Whites by Education

## Interviewed Before October 12

	Less than 8 years	8-11 years	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	N
Prefer Cincinnati	26	24	40	25	46	83
Prefer Suburban	19	16	19	18	22	49
No preference or No answer	55	60	38	56	32	131
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	54	50	46	67	46	263

## Interviewed After October 11

Prefer Cincinnati	35	25	18	18	30	36
Prefer Suburban	8	25	33	29	33	39
No preference or No answer	54	50	45	50	37	70
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
Total	25	24	32	37	27	145

TABLE 62 \*

## Generally Speaking How Would You Say School Funds Are Used?

## Whites by Education

## Interviewed Before October 12

	Less than 8 years	8-11 years	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	N
Very wisely	9	8	11	3	15	23
Quite wisely	31	46	36	31	39	96
Wisely ½ the time	15	20	26	35	20	63
Rather unwisely	11	10	12	12	7	28
Very unwisely	6	4	2	3	7	11
Don't know and No answer	28	12	12	16	13	44
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	54	50	47	68	46	265

## Interviewed After October 11

Very wisely	15	17	9	8	4	15
Quite wisely	31	25	34	24	48	47
Wisely ½ the time	19	29	25	29	26	38
Rather unwisely		4	3	3	7	5
Very unwisely	8		6	8	4	8
Don't know and No answer	27	25	22	29	11	34
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	26	24	32	38	27	147

\*See Appendix B, Table 57

TABLE 63 \*

To what extent do you feel the administrators exercise sound and reasonable judgment about school matters?

## Whites by Education

## Interviewed Before October 12

	Less than 8 years	8-11 years	High school graduate	Some college	College graduate	N
Almost always	17	22	26	18	13	50
Usually	24	50	38	44	50	109
About ½ the time	24	12	26	15	13	47
Show more poor judgment	6	2		3	4	8
Almost always exercise poor judgment	2	4		1	4	6
Don't know and No answer	28	10	11	19	15	45
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	54	50	47	68	46	265

## Interviewed After October 11

Almost always	38	25	9	13	22	30
Usually	15	33	44	42	41	53
About ½ the time	31	21	12	13	22	28
Show more poor judgment		4	16	8	4	10
Almost always exercise poor judgment				3		1
Don't know and No answer	15	17	19	21	11	25
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	26	24	32	38	27	147

\*See Appendix B, Table 63

If the Cincinnati school system was regarded as less than ideal, particularly after the school riot, inadequacy was not attributed to the managers of the system by the white voters. The management of the school system was seen as being just as "wise" after the riot as before. The conclusion that is most consistent with these results is that the white voters saw the school system as being in trouble because of racial integration. The school administrators were not seen as a locus of this difficulty; the voters' solution was to increase the funding for the school system. As seen in Table 57, this solution was most appealing to those white voters with less education and least appealing to the college educated.

The response of the Negro voters to the school riot seems to have been quite different from that of the white voters, unless we see the responses of each as polarizing attitudes towards the other race. Table 64 shows Negro registered voters declining in the percentage feeling that the public schools are "very important." They also declined in the percentages viewing police and fire protection as "very important" (Tables 65 and 66).

But, while the percentages saying these services were "very important" declined; the percentages calling for increased expenditures of tax monies on schools, police and fire protection all increased (Tables 67, 68 and 69). In this respect the Negroes and whites were in agreement (corresponding tables for whites are 57, 58 and 59).

The white voters were prepared to allocate more money to predominantly Negro schools after the riot, but the Negro voters became markedly less favorable to this proposal. In fact their modal response shifted to a "don't know" or "no answer" category (Table 70).

Similarly, the Negro respondents greatly increased their "no preference" and "no answer" categories when questioned about preferences for Cincinnati versus suburban school systems. The percentages favoring each system declined after the riot -- perhaps they were saying "a pox on both your houses" (Table 71).

TABLE 64

## How Important Are Public Schools \*

	Negroes	
	Interviewed Before October 12	Interviewed After October 11
Very important	85	74
Fairly important	13	9
Not important	2	6
Don't know or No answer		11
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100%	100%
N	48	54

\*See Appendix B, Table 20

TABLE 65

## How Important Is Police Protection \*

	Negroes	
	Interviewed Before October 12	Interviewed After October 11
Very important	94	74
Fairly important	4	11
Not important	2	6
Don't know or No answer	-	9
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100%	100%
N	49	54

\*See Appendix B, Table 24

TABLE 66

## How Important Is Fire Protection \*

	Negroes	
	Interviewed Before October 12	Interviewed After October 11
Very important	96	76
Fairly important	2	9
Not important	2	6
Don't know or No answer	-	9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
N	48	54

\*See Appendix B, Table 25

TABLE 67

## How Much Tax Money Should be Spent on Public Schools \*

	Negroes	
	Interviewed Before October 12	Interviewed After October 11
Much more	33	54
A little more	39	17
Same amount	24	15
Less	2	-
Don't know or No answer	2	15
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
N	49	54

\*See Appendix B, Table 34

TABLE 68

## How Much Tax Money Should be Spent on Police Protection \*

## Negroes

	Interviewed Before October 12	Interviewed After October 11
Much more	49	56
A little more	29	15
Same amount	22	15
Less	-	2
Don't know or No answer	-	13
	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%
N	49	54

\*See Appendix B, Table 38

TABLE 69

## How Much Tax Money Should be Spent on Fire Protection \*

## Negroes

	Interviewed Before October 12	Interviewed After October 11
Much more	33	54
A little more	33	13
Same amount	34	19
Less	-	2
Don't know or No answer	-	13
	<hr/> 100%	<hr/> 100%
N	49	54

\*See Appendix B, Table 39

TABLE 70

## Should More be Spent on West End and Avondale \*

## Negroes

	Interviewed Before October 12	Interviewed After October 11
More	57	24
Same	31	19
Less	-	20
Don't know or No answer	12	37
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
N	49	54

\*See Appendix B, Table 49

TABLE 71

## School Preference \*

## Negroes

	Interviewed Before October 12	Interviewed After October 11
Cincinnati Public School	35	28
Suburban School	29	15
No preference	37	50
No answer	-	7
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
N	49	54

\*See Table 61



How Negroes felt about the speed of school integration, as a result of the school riot, is very apparent in Table 72. The modal response shifted from "about right" to "much too slowly." An identical pattern of shifts is shown in Table 73 concerning the speed of integration of housing in Cincinnati.

Before the school riot, 49 percent of the Negroes felt housing integration was too slow ("much" or "a little"); after the riot 71 percent felt it was too slow.

The direction of these shifts is opposite to that shown for whites (Tables 52 and 53).

While the white voters did not, apparently, change their attitudes toward the manner in which the school system was being operated (Tables 62 and 63), the Negro voters showed a marked decline in their satisfaction, particularly concerning the use of school funds (Tables 74 and 75).

Table 76 shows that whites in all educational categories increased the percentages of those intending to vote favorably for the tax levy in November 1967, after the riot, as compared with prior to the riot; while Negroes were decreasing their percentages of favorable votes. Both races showed declines in the percentages voting negatively (particularly among whites); and both races showed increases in the percentages of voters who were undecided as to how they planned to vote; but the increase in the undecided voters was massive among the Negroes.

Among the white voters, those with least education showed the largest percentage increases of favorable votes and largest declines in negative votes. Those with high school degrees showed the least change in both types of votes; those with education beyond high school were intermediate.

Our previous measures of changes in attitudes towards the schools after the school riot had indicated that the greatest changes occurred among the less educated voters and the least changes among the voters with most education, e.g., Tables 51, 52, 54, 57 and 61. But the changes in voting intentions was not least among the more educated; it was intermediate. The less educated voters did show the greatest changes in the earlier tables as well as in voting intentions.

TABLE 72

And with respect to racial integration of the schools in the Cincinnati area, are things moving:

	Negroes	
	Interviewed Before October 12	Interviewed After October 11
Much too rapidly	-	-
A little too rapidly	2	-
About right	41	24
A little too slowly	22	30
Much too slowly	29	39
Don't know or No answer	6	7
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100%	100%
N	49	54

TABLE 73

Some people feel that many American communities are moving too rapidly in their efforts to racially integrate housing and the schools. Other people feel that things are moving too slowly. Thinking about the Cincinnati area, would you say that the racial integration of housing is going:

	Negroes	
	Interviewed Before October 12	Interviewed After October 11
Much too rapidly	2	2
A little too rapidly	4	6
About right	39	17
A little too slowly	20	30
Much too slowly	29	41
Don't know or No answer	6	6
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	100%	100%
N	49	54

TABLE 74

Generally speaking, how would you say the local school funds are used?

	Negroes	
	Interviewed Before October 12	Interviewed After October 11
Very wisely	24	15
Quite wisely	22	19
Wisely ½ of time	31	19
Rather unwisely	8	7
Very unwisely	-	9
Don't know or No answer	14	32
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
N	49	54

TABLE 75

It is important for a school board to make wise and reasonable decisions concerning the operation of the public schools. To what extent do you feel the present school board makes sound and reasonable decisions about school matters?

	Negroes	
	Interviewed Before October 12	Interviewed After October 11
Almost always	8	9
Most of the time	37	26
About half of the time	22	33
Make more unwise decisions than wise	14	9
Almost always make unwise decisions	6	7
Don't know or No answer	12	15
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>
N	49	54

TABLE 76

VOTING PATTERNS BY RACE, EDUCATION  
AND DATE OF INTERVIEW

Voting Patterns	Interviewed Before October 12					Interviewed After October 11				
	Less than H.S.	H.S. Grad.	H.S. Plus	<u>Whites</u>		Less than H.S.	H.S. Grad.	H.S. Plus	N	%
				N	%					
1	18	28	38	75	28	28	50	40	56	38
2	7	17	10	26	10	14	6	20	22	15
3	13	4	9	25	9	10	3	5	9	6
4	5	2	3	9	3	2	-	5	4	3
	<u>42</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>59</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>91</u>	<u>62</u>
5	17	17	15	43	16	8	9	3	9	6
6	5	-	3	8	3	-	-	-	-	-
7	2	-	-	2	1	-	-	2	1	-
	<u>24</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>7</u>
8	15	21	17	45	17	10	6	8	12	8
9	4	4	1	7	3	2	6	3	5	3
0	14	6	6	25	9	26	19	15	29	20
	<u>34</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>77</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>46</u>	<u>31</u>
	100%	100%	100%		100%	100%	100%	100%		100%
<b>Total</b>	104	47	114	265		50	32	65	147	

	<u>Negroes</u>							
	Less than H.S.	H.S. and more	N	%	Less than H.S.	H.S. and more	N	%
1, 2, 3 & 4	70	73	35	71	62	55	32	59
5, 6 and 7	17	8	6	12	-	5	1	2
8, 9 and 0	13	19	8	16	38	40	21	39
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>
<b>Total</b>	23	26	49		34	20	54	

The Negro voters showed greater changes in the earlier tables than the whites. No breakdown by education was shown for them because of the small size of the Negro sample, and comparisons are most unreliable when such a small sample is divided by date of interview and further divided by levels of education. The original tabulations, however, from which these tables were constructed, showed the higher educated Negroes to have been more affected by the school riot than the less educated; and this is reflected in Table 76 where the Negroes with a high school education or more, are seen as reducing their positive vote for the school levy much more than the less educated, after the school riot.

### The Vote Changers

The analysis of the factors, or types of persons, who were disposed to change their votes is especially difficult. There are several causes of this difficulty.

One cause is that there are several types of voting changes possible, and some of them contain only a small number of people.

A second reason is that two different factors apparently influenced changes, and probably influenced different people in different ways, e.g., Negro voters responded to the actual and threatened school service reductions by planning to increase their positive vote over their November 1966 vote but they responded to the school riot by planning to reduce their positive vote. White voters responded to both events by increasing their intended positive votes; but those interviewed after the riot also increased the percentage of voters in voting pattern 9...those who had not voted in November 1966 and were still undecided about their decision for 1967 (Table 76).

Apart from differential impact of the riot upon white and Negro voters, however, no firm conclusions can be drawn as to how this riot impacted upon voters with different social characteristics. As noted before, Table 50 showed that homeowners and buyers with children in (or about to be in) public school were most likely to increase their percentages of favorable votes and decrease their percentages of negative votes from November 1966 to November 1967.

When other tables are examined showing the sample divided into those interviewed before and after the date of the school riot (October 11, 1967), the same patterns prevail. Homeowners and buyers with children in school, interviewed after that date, were even more likely to change to a favorable vote, and to change from a negative vote.

For instance, among white voters who were homeowners, who had a child in public school, and who were interviewed before the riot, we find that 27.6 percent more intended to vote "yes" in 1967 than reported voting "yes" in 1966. Exactly the same percent fewer intended to vote

"no" in 1967 compared with 1966. Their index of favorable change is the sum of these figures, or 55.2.

Among this same category of white voters interviewed after the riot the index of change is 66.7. The difference between these two index figures is only 11.5 that could be attributed to the riot.

From Table 76 we see that among those interviewed before the riot 22 percent reported changing to a "yes" vote for November 1967; and 5 percent reported changing to a "no" vote. Among those interviewed after the riot the respective figures are 24 percent changing to "yes" and 1 percent changing to "no." Obviously, the bulk of the vote "changes" had occurred before the riot.

Recognizing some dangers in the process, it seems best, however, to analyze as vote changers those who changed their vote (reported and intended) from November 1966 to November 1967, ignoring such changes as might be attributable solely to the school riot.\*

### Homeownership

We had found in earlier tables (39 and 40) that white "renters" were most disposed to vote "yes" on both levies. How do they compare with "owners" and "buyers" as vote "changes"?

They change to a "yes" vote more often than "owners-buyers" (Table 77)...22 percent net increase compared to 16 percent. They do not change from a "no" vote as often...13 percent net decline compared to 27 percent; and less often change to an "undecided" vote...11 percent net decline among renters and an 11 percent increase among owner-buyers.

It is worth noting, however, that the largest percentage of change to a "yes" vote among the renters comes from those who did not vote in November 1966 (patterns 3 and 4).

The owner-buyers change more often away from "no" votes to "undecided" and to "yes" votes (patterns 8 and 2).

---

\*The tendency for a larger percentage of voters to intend to vote "yes" after the riot was statistically significant.

TABLE 77

Voting Pattern	White			Negro		
	Owns and Buying	Renting	N	Owns and Buying	Renting	N
1	26	43	131	45	49	48
2	14	7	48	13	2	9
3	6	12	34	7	2	5
4	2	6	13	2	9	5
5	17	4	52	10	-	6
6	3	-	8	-	2	1
7	1	-	3	-	-	-
8	17	6	57	8	-	5
9	3	3	12	8	23	15
0	11	19	54	7	12	9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	285	116	401 *	60	43	103

\* 11 in institutional or parental residences, not tabulated



The net effect of the changes among owner-buyers and among renters was that the owner-buyers changed from a distribution of 30 percent "yes" and 48 percent "no" votes in November 1966 to a 48 percent "yes" and 21 percent "no" vote in November 1967. The renters went from 46 percent "yes" and 17 percent "no" to a 68 percent "yes" and 4 percent "no."

In terms of the index figures for voting changes, introduced with Table 50, the owner-buyers have a score of 43 for positive change -- the renters have a score of 35.

### Religion

The primary concern is with "Catholics" versus all "others" as shown in Table 78. The "other" category increased its "yes" vote percentage (net) by 17, the Catholics by 23 percent. The "others" decreased their "no" votes by 16 percent, Catholics by 33 percent. The index of change score for "others" is 33; for Catholics it is 56.

Despite the much greater increase among Catholics the result is that the non-Catholics were planning to vote 62 percent "yes" to 12 percent "no," while 45 percent of the Catholics planned to vote "yes" and 21 percent "no" in November 1967. The greater "change" among Catholics did not produce a greater ratio of favorable to unfavorable votes.

### Education

There is no clear trend of relationship between education and index of change scores. Table 79, nevertheless, shows that the higher educated were most likely to reduce their "no" votes by changing to "yes" votes; and the least educated were more likely to obtain higher percentages of their new "yes" votes (patterns 2, 3, and 4) from among those who had not voted in November 1966 (or could not recall how they had voted), patterns 3, 4, 6 and 0.

TABLE 78

## Religion

## White

Voting Pattern	Catholic	Other	N
1	19	41	131
2	16	9	48
3	6	10	34
4	4	2	13
5	16	10	52
6	4	1	8
7	1	1	3
8	22	9	57
9	2	3	12
0	10	15	54
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>412</b>

TABLE 79

## Education

## White

Voting Pattern	Up to eighth grade	Eighth & eleventh grade	Completed high school	Some college	College graduate	N
1	23	20	37	32	48	131
2	6	12	13	11	16	48
3	13	11	4	8	7	34
4	3	5	1	5	1	13
5	14	15	14	12	8	52
6	5	1	-	3	-	8
7	1	1	-	1	-	3
8	14	14	15	17	8	57
9	1	5	5	1	3	12
0	21	15	11	10	8	54
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	80	74	79	106	73	412

## Negro

1	47	52	50	35	80	48
2	7	4	25	10	-	9
3	7	7	8	-	-	5
4	3	4	-	10	-	5
5	7	4	17	3	-	6
6	3	-	-	-	-	1
7	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	3	4	-	10	-	5
9	10	19	-	21	20	15
0	13	7	-	10	-	9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	30	27	12	29	5	103

Income

Income is similar to education in that (1) the change index scores show no pattern of linear relationships to income; (2) the highest income category increases its "yes" votes at the expense of those who had voted "no" in November 1966, and (3) the lower income categories increased their "yes" votes at the expense of those who had not voted (patterns 3, 4, 6 and 0) in November 1966 (Table 80).

TABLE 80

## Income

## White

Voting Pattern	\$4,000 or Less	\$5-7,000 Income	\$7-10,000 Income	Greater than \$10,000	No Answer	N
1	23	30	30	44	27	131
2	9	11	11	20	2	48
3	11	11	6	5	9	33
4	5	4	3	1	6	13
5	16	12	18	7	13	52
6	-	2	4	2	-	8
7	-	-	1	-	2	3
8	16	14	18	8	15	56
9	4	4	1	5	-	12
0	14	12	9	8	27	52
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	81	83	80	109	55	408

## Negro

1	67	50	40	47	37	48
2	-	13	15	-	11	9
3	-	4	5	7	7	5
4	7	4	5	7	-	4
5	-	13	5	7	4	6
6	7	-	-	-	-	1
7	-	-	-	-	-	-
8	-	4	10	7	4	5
9	13	4	15	20	19	14
0	7	8	-	7	19	9
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	15	24	20	15	27	101

### Children in School and Homeownership

In Table 81 we can see how vote changes are distributed among the four categories of "children in school" and among the three categories of homeownership.

Those with children in...or about to be in...public schools changed the greatest amounts. And in these categories it is those who are homeowners or buyers who changed most often.

Those with no eligible children or with children in parochial school changed least, although in those categories it is the renters who changed more often than the owners or buyers.

Owners with children in parochial schools or without "eligible" children remained, consistently, as "no" voters much more often than any of the other categories.

So far in this analysis of white vote-changers there are two factors which seem to account for the changes to positive votes and away from negative votes: (1) involvement in the system and (2) cost. For instance, homeowners feel the greatest burden of cost and they tended strongly to vote "no" in November 1966. But homeowners with children in the public school (highly involved) tended to reduce their negative votes and increase their positive votes most of all when confronted with the school service reductions. They were placed in a conflict situation (cross-pressures) which they could resolve by shifting heavily towards support of the November 1967 levy.

Homeowners with low involvement were never placed in such a position of conflict and, hence, scarcely felt the force of any factors to reduce their negative stance. In November 1966 they were heavily opposed and they changed the least, as reflected in their voting intentions for 1967.

Renters with children in school had low "costs" and high "involvement." These two vectors operated to produce an initial favorable disposition; and, when their children were threatened with school service reductions, they responded by changing to an even more favorable position. But they could not change much because they were so favorable to begin with.

TABLE 81

Voting Patterns  
by  
Children in School  
and by  
Homeownership

White

Voting Pattern	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	%	N
1	34	20	9	2	9	2		14	2	7	100	44
	34	18	10	2	10	4		12	2	8	100	50
	52	11	11	6						17	100	17
	<u>36</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>2</u>		<u>10</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>9</u>		<u>111</u>
2	19	19			33			9	9	9	100	21
	35	7				14		21		21	100	14
	37	13	13	13						25	100	8
	<u>27</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>4</u>		<u>11</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>16</u>		<u>43</u>
3		33		33				33			100	3
			67					17	17		100	6
	37							13		50	100	8
	<u>17</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>5</u>				<u>17</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>23</u>		<u>17</u>
4	22	8	4	1	25	3	1	16	2	13	100	118
	28	17		3	3		3	34		6	100	28
	42	6	13	6	6	3		7		15	100	83
	<u>30</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>13</u>		<u>229</u>

Renters without children in school (no eligibles or children already in parochial school) were not faced with high costs but had low involvement. They had been initially favorable rather than opposed, but they also had high proportions of nonvoters (lack of involvement). The threatened loss of school services could, thus, result in changes for them; but their greatest changes came in shifts to positive votes out of former non-voting positions (3, 4, 6 and 0).

The fact that neither measure of social class (education or income) shows any correlation with vote changes, despite the hypothesis that "cost" would be a factor, is probably explicable by analogy with the trends found with "homeownership" and "religion." In both cases we found that those most likely to have voted "yes" in November 1966 (renters and non-Catholics) had changed their votes least in terms of their voting intentions for November 1967.

We might have expected that a category of voters, who on average were disposed to vote yes, would change their votes, under appropriate stimulation, even more to the favorable side than a category of voters who were not, initially, as disposed to vote favorably. However, this reasoning ignores the fact that there always tends to be a proportion of voters in any category who are not prepared to go along with the majority of others in that same category. For instance while most persons who "rent" are favorably disposed towards school levys, there are some who did not vote yes in either 1966 or 1967.

It seems reasonable to suppose that this happened in the case of high income voters. High income voters were disposed to vote "yes" in November 1966. Under the stimulus of school service reductions they were even more disposed to vote "yes," but as the stimulus operates to induce some of them to change from "no" to "yes" it encounters a small, but hard core, element of resistance.

To put it in other words, both high and low income voters were induced to change their votes towards "yes" votes in 1967, but the ability of the high income category to increase its percentage of "yes" votes very much was inhibited by a proportion of high income voters who



would not change and by the fact that so many were already voting "yes."

This small number in our sample probably results from the generally higher class composition of registered voters when contrasted with the citizenry at large. The higher classes are less concerned to enroll their children in summer schools, because they place them in summer camps oftener and wish to take them on summer vacations that include the entire family.

The relationship between vote changing and the threatened abolition of kindergarten is more complex. It is reasonable to assume that this threat impacted heavily on parents with children of pre-school ages.

This is strongly indicated in Table 50 showing that parents who only had pre-school age children were very disposed to favorable change.

The other facet of analysis, however, was an attempt to measure the impact of the drive to collect funds to keep the kindergarten open. The relationship between this effort and voting change is seen in Table 82.

Here we see that the drive may have had some effect on those who had voted "no" in November 1966, since among such "no" voters those who had been personally contacted by fund solicitors were most likely to have shifted to a "yes" vote-intention for November 1967.

On the other hand no such intention to favorable change is found among those who had "not voted" in November 1966.

The case of the curtailment of interscholastic athletics is rather different. Tables 8 and 9 show that those who "enjoy" and/or "attend" such events are far more likely to vote "yes" originally and somewhat more likely to have changed to a "yes" voting intention for 1967.

Consistent with this trend are the results shown in Table 83. Among former "non-voters" as well as "no" voters, those who were "contacted" or who "heard of" the fund drive are seen to be most likely to change towards a favorable voting intention. This is particularly evident among the former "no" voters.

TABLE 82

EXPOSURE TO KINDERGARTEN FUND DRIVE  
BY SOME VOTING PATTERNS

White

Persons "Not Voting" in November 1966

Voting Pattern	Contacted	Heard About	Did Not Hear About	N
6	14		6	
0	43	64	48	
3 & 4	43	36	45	
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	21	22	62	105

Persons Voting "No" in November 1966

5	27	30	37	
8	38	42	33	
2	36	27	29	
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	45	33	75	153

TABLE 83

EXPOSURE TO ATHLETIC FUND DRIVE  
BY SOME VOTING PATTERNS

White

Persons "Not Voting" in November 1966

Voting Pattern	Contacted	Heard About	Did Not Hear About	N
6		4	12	
0	29	56	48	
3 & 4	71	40	40	
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	7	45	52	104

Persons Voting "No" in November 1966

5		30	41	
8	17	35	37	
2	83	35	22	
	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	<u>100%</u>	
Total	6	80	68	154

The reduction in the summer school program, then, had no ascertainable effect on the registered voters; but the curtailment of kindergarten had some probable effect; and the curtailment of the athletic program seems to have had an even more widespread effect.

In the case of the highest income category (Table 80) their maximum possible index of positive change score was 86. They achieved a score of 47 or 55% of the maximum possible for them to achieve.

The lowest income category could have achieved a score of 114; they achieved a score of 46, which is only 40% of their possible. Thus, while the highest income voters did not change absolutely, more than the low income voters; they did change more relative to what was possible for them. This again supports the hypothesis that "cost" is an important variable in voting for school levies. The higher income categories do not perceive levy increases as costing as much as the lower income categories do.

#### School Service Reductions

As noted at the beginning of this report, there were three school service reductions to be investigated (1) summer school, (2) kindergarten, and (3) interscholastic athletics. It was expected that each of these would show a measurable impact by inducing persons exposed to these reductions to change their voting pattern to a more favorable one towards the school levy.

In the cast of summer school curtailment there was no reliably measurable impact on voting changes. The impact could not be measured reliably because only about eighteen persons in the sample had children whom they said would or might be kept from summer school attendance by the planned curtailment. This number is too small to analyze. Among this eighteen, however, there was a stronger tendency to vote "yes" than among the remaining parents with children in school.

### Conclusions

The support of taxes for a school system is a complex affair when it is seen that support or opposition varies with each of many diverse social characteristics; e.g., age, marital status, homeownership, children in or out of school, interest in athletics, religion, attitudes toward racial integration, income, education, race, etc.

When, however, this support is seen from the viewpoint of the relative "costs" to different categories of "voters" and the relative amounts of "interest" or "investment" they have in the success of a public school system, it is possible to bring a great deal of order and prediction out of this complexity.

Utilizing 1960 data for census tracts in the Cincinnati Public School District, and information on votes in November 1966 tabulated by Mr. Guy Buddemeyer, research director of that system, two colleagues and myself obtained a .90 multiple correlation among the variables of: (1) percent Negro, (2) percent homeowners, (3) percent with incomes greater than \$10,000 per annum, and (4) percent favorable ("yes") vote on the November 1966 school levy.\* While such a high figure may not be found for other school levy elections, or in other cities, it is generally supported and buttressed by the trends in this data from a sample survey of registered voters.

While "cost" and "interest" help explain positive (or negative) votes in a straightforward fashion, we may think of an equilibrium model to explain changes in positive and negative votes. The reduction in school services introduced a new factor into the voters' assessments of the public school system. For many of them it apparently was taken as a threat to some kind of interest or investment they had; and this put them in a state of disequilibrium.

Where the vectors of "cost" and "interest" reinforced one another

---

\*Dr. Robert Carroll, Professor of Sociology and Assistant Vice-President for Research, and Mrs. Dona Lansky, graduate student in Sociology and City Planning at the University of Cincinnati collaborated with me on this analysis.

there was less vote changes. If the vectors reinforced one another positively there was less change because most of these persons (such as "renters" with "children in school") were already voting positively. Where the vectors reinforced one another negatively there was less change; because such persons (such as "homeowners" with "no children in school") were not affected by the service reduction; and, therefore, were not in disequilibrium. Changing a negative to a positive vote would mean paying a cost but receiving no additional benefit to one of their "interests."

The large changes came among those categories of voters who had had opposed vectors, and for whom the service reductions meant that their interest vector was reinforced. Equilibrium could be achieved by agreeing to pay the cost to restore the school services.

It is regrettable that the school riot could not be assessed in more detail. There is no question that it induced positive changes among the whites, and even more, negative ones among Negroes.

When placed in a context of a Negro movement for separatism and a movement of whites, who are in childbearing years and disposed to purchase homes, to suburbs, there is cause to be very pessimistic that central cities will maintain public schools at the level of services now obtaining. As any substantial reduction of those services occurs, and/or when racial violence erupts, one can very confidently predict rising rates of suburban migration among those categories of persons who can pay for school services and who have an interest in maintaining them.

## APPENDIX A

## Methodology

Because of fixed budget and some uncertainty as to interviewing costs, the sample was planned to permit its division into two parts, corresponding to two stages of interviewing.

A map was constructed showing the boundaries of 1960 census tracts, as well as the ward and precinct boundaries as of December 31, 1966. Each precinct was assigned a code number and allocated to that census tract within whose boundaries it fell (completely or mostly).

Each census tract was assigned numbers, each corresponding to its rank on the following characteristics: (1) percent of family incomes less than \$4,000/year, (2) percent of family incomes greater than \$10,000/year, (3) percent of families owning their homes, (4) percent Negro, (5) percent of population between 5 and 17 years, and (6) median school years completed.

Each precinct allocated to a census tract was given the same rank order numbers on these six characteristics as the census tract. These numbers were punched on I.B.M. cards, one card for each precinct.

The cards were sorted and ordered on each of the fields in turn. This results in the cards, finally, being ordered so that when a systematic sample is drawn, taking every "n"th card, the sample is also stratified by the six characteristics.

Before selecting the sample precincts, however, they were ordered on a field containing the number of registered voters in the precincts. Three equal-sized categories of precincts were separated from each other.

Sampling from the category with the largest sized precincts was heaviest; sampling from the smallest size was proportionally lightest. The application of a uniform number of interviews to each sampled precinct (11) counterbalanced the disproportionate sampling of large vs. small precincts and gave each registered voter an equal chance to fall in the sample.

As a check on the sample's representativeness the respondents were asked how they intended to vote for the candidates in a school board election and a city councilmanic election. If the sample were representative we would expect a close correspondence between the sample respondents stated voting intentions and the actual vote counts for the candidates. There should also be a close correspondence between those intending to vote for the November 1967 school levy and the actual vote.

The presentation of the data necessary to demonstrate the sample's representativeness would be very complex. The interested reader may write me at the University of Cincinnati for illustrative tables, but they will not be included here.

The complexity is a result of the changes in voting intentions following the school riot. After this riot the Democratic candidates tended to lose some votes from white voters and lost massively from Negro voters.

Republican candidates maintained their proportion of white votes and lost nearly all of the votes from Negroes, but the percentage of Negroes who had intended, before the riot, to vote for Republicans was so small, initially, that their loss scarcely affected the overall vote for Republican candidates.

Two Negro candidates for city council tended to maintain their percentages of votes from whites and increase, massively, their votes from Negroes.

When the data was broken down by wards, before and after the school riot, these same trends were found.



APPENDIX B

STRAIGHT TABULATIONS OF  
THE ANSWERS TO THE INTERVIEW

3

TABLE 1

QUESTION: Date of interview.

August	161
September	238
October	316
November	104
Unknown	6

TABLE 2

QUESTION: Age.

Under 25	17
25-29	39
30-34	43
35-39	59
40-44	51
45-49	56
50-54	56
55-59	54
60-64	38
Over 64	117
No answer	2

TABLE 3

QUESTION: Results of interview.

Completed interview	520
Not at home to repeated calls	14
Moved, cannot locate	87
Moved out of district	51
Deceased	27
Not a registered voter	1
Non compos mentis	4
Refused, sick	20
Refused	91
Other	10

TABLE 4

QUESTION: Sex of respondent.

Male	363
Female	454
Unknown	8

TABLE 5

QUESTION: Race of respondent.

White	418
Negro	105
Other	2

TABLE 6

QUESTION: Marital status of respondent.

Single	63
Married	373
Widowed	62
Separated	9
Divorced	18

TABLE 7

QUESTION: How many children do you have?

0 children	142
1 child	78
2 children	112
3 children	84
4 children	44
5 children	26
6 children	11
More than 6	24
No answer	2

TABLE 8

QUESTION: Have any or your children left school before graduating?

Yes	76
No	229
Not applicable	203
No answer	13

TABLE 9

QUESTION: Have any or your children ever played in interscholastic athletics?

Yes	115
No	167
Never had children or children in jr. of sr. high	216
No answer	23

TABLE 10

QUESTION: Do you have any nieces, nephews, cousins, or grandchildren presently enrolled in the Cincinnati Public Schools?

No answer	22
Yes	260
No	239

TABLE 11

QUESTION: Do any of the neighbors that you visit with very often (e.g., once a week or more) have children enrolled in the local public schools?

No answer	18
Yes	306
No	196

TABLE 12

QUESTION: Do any of your close personal friends have children enrolled in the Cincinnati Public Schools?

No answer	19
Yes	313
No	188

TABLE 13

QUESTION: Suppose your family had to move and only two satisfactory residences could be found. One of these is convenient to work, but the school is a rather poor one in your estimation. The other location is quite inconvenient to work (i.e., quite far from work) but you like the school there. Which of these two dwellings would your family probably choose?

No answer	45
Nearer work	54
Farther from work	421

TABLE 14

QUESTION: Some schools in the country have responded to greatly increased enrollments by dividing the students into two groups with one group going to school from about 7 a.m. until 1 p.m. and the other group going from 1 p.m. until 7 p.m. Would you favor such a plan for students here in Cincinnati? Why do you feel that way?

Yes - no reason given or uncodeable	8
Yes - with a positive reason	82
Yes - with any other reason, e.g., if there is no other way	53
D.K. - or undecided with or without a reason	47
No - no reason given or uncodeable	26
No - reason refers to hardship or detriment to child (too early, too dark, etc.)	143
No - reason refers to hardship or detriment to family	106
No - any other reason than 6 or 7	45
No answer	10

We are now going to talk about the different kinds of taxes which people pay and the kinds of services which our tax dollars provide. Here is a list of some of the services which local governments often provide. Thinking of your needs and those of your family, would you say that each of the following services is very important, fairly important, not very important, or not important at all? (Question 8 including Tables 15-28)

TABLE 15

QUESTION: The building and upkeep of local streets and roads...

Very important	371
Fairly important	125
Not very important	6
Not important at all	1
Don't know	4
No answer	9

TABLE 16

QUESTION: The building and upkeep of sidewalks...

Very important	309
Fairly important	155
Not very important	31
Not important at all	6
Don't know	5
No answer	12

TABLE 17

QUESTION: Providing parks and playgrounds facilities...

Very important	322
Fairly important	138
Not very important	29
Not important at all	8
Don't know	10
No answer	11

TABLE 18

QUESTION: Collecting trash and garbage...

Very important	449
Fairly important	40
Not very important	13
Not important at all	2
Don't know	4
No answer	10

TABLE 19

QUESTION: Providing welfare aid...

Very important	190
Fairly important	185
Not very important	59
Not important at all	43
Don't know	26
No answer	15

TABLE 20

QUESTION: Building, maintaining, operating public schools...

Very important	421
Fairly important	69
No very important	9
Not important at all	2
Don't know	4
No answer	13

TABLE 21

QUESTION: Providing library facilities...

Very important	350
Fairly important	129
Not very important	17
Not important at all	3
Don't know	8
No answer	11

TABLE 22

QUESTION: Providing city planning, (zoning, slum clearance, etc.)...

Very important	274
Fairly important	168
Not very important	34
Not important at all	10
Don't know	20
No answer	12

TABLE 23

QUESTION: Providing bus and transit services...

Very important	295
Fairly important	134
Not very important	47
Not important at all	22
Don't know	9
No answer	11

TABLE 24

QUESTION: Providing police protection...

Very important	477
Fairly important	24
Not very important	4
Not important at all	1
No answer	12

TABLE 25

QUESTION: Providing fire protection...	
Very important	477
Fairly important	25
Not very important	4
Not important at all	1
No answer	11

TABLE 26

QUESTION: Providing parking facilities...	
Very important	215
Fairly important	162
Not very important	81
Not important at all	30
Don't know	16
No answer	13

TABLE 27

QUESTION: Providing a sewage system...	
Very important	427
Fairly important	55
Not very important	10
Not important at all	4
Don't know	10
No answer	12

TABLE 28

QUESTION: Providing a water system...	
Very important	436
Fairly important	48
Not very important	9
Not important at all	4
Don't know	10
No answer	11



Would you review this list and make a judgment as to whether (name community) should spend much more, a little more, the same amount, a little less, or much less than it now spends on each of the following services? (Question 9 including Tables 29-43)

TABLE 29

QUESTION: The building and upkeep of local streets and roads...

Much more	56
A little more	89
Same amount	307
A little less	15
Much less	3
Don't know	30
No answer	20

TABLE 30

QUESTION: The building and upkeep of sidewalks...

Much more	61
A little more	83
Same amount	307
A little less	17
Much less	5
Don't know	26
No answer	21

TABLE 31

QUESTION: Providing parks and playgrounds facilities...

Much more	105
A little more	141
Same amount	197
A little less	19
Much less	11
Don't know	24
No answer	23

TABLE 32

QUESTION: Collecting trash and garbage...

Much more	61
A little more	88
Same amount	329
A little less	7
Much less	3
Don't know	15
No answer	17

TABLE 33

QUESTION: Providing welfare aid...

Much more	60
A little more	67
Same amount	175
A little less	89
Much less	56
Don't know	49
No answer	24

TABLE 34

QUESTION: Building, maintaining, operating public schools...

Much more	124
A little more	127
Same amount	209
A little less	13
Much less	6
Don't know	22
No answer	19

TABLE 35

QUESTION: Providing library facilities...

Much more	67
A little more	80
Same amount	311
A little less	18
Much less	5
Don't know	20
No answer	19

TABLE 36

QUESTION: Providing city planning, (zoning, slum clearance, etc.)...

Much more	67
A little more	87
Same amount	257
A little less	39
Much less	16
Don't know	35
No answer	19

TABLE 37

QUESTION: Providing bus and transit services...

Much more	90
A little more	110
Same amount	230
A little less	25
Much less	14
Don't know	25
No answer	26

TABLE 38

QUESTION: Providing police protection...

Much more	176
A little more	161
Same amount	150
A little less	2
Much less	2
Don't know	11
No answer	18

TABLE 39

QUESTION: Providing fire protection...

Much more	126
A little more	119
Same amount	244
A little less	2
Much less	1
Don't know	11
No answer	17

TABLE 40

QUESTION: Providing parking facilities...

Much more	38
A little more	84
Same amount	268
A little less	57
Much less	28
Don't know	25
No answer	20

TABLE 41

QUESTION: Providing a sewage system...

Much more	64
A little more	90
Same amount	301
A little less	15
Much less	4
Don't know	27
No answer	19

TABLE 42

QUESTION: Providing a water system...

Much more	57
A little more	72
Same amount	336
A little less	10
Much less	2
Don't know	27
No answer	16

TABLE 43

QUESTION: And are there other services which local governments may provide funds for that we have not listed here and which are important? (List and indicate how much more or less should be spent.)

Criticism of welfare services because they are too generous, not selective of the "really" needy, should require the recipients to work	6
Criticism of welfare because it is <u>not</u> generous enough	4
Lack of some public service, such as: hospitals, parochial bus service, etc.	30
Lack of cultural facilities such as: zoo, educational TV, museums	3
Any other reason	20
No answer	457

TABLE 44

QUESTION: If you were to sum up your feelings about the services which are provided you and your family by the local government in relation to the local taxes you pay, would you say that you are getting:

More than your money's worth	30
Your money's worth	283
Less than your money's worth	167
Don't know	33
No answer	7

TABLE 45

QUESTION: Compared with other communities in this area, would you say that the local property taxes here in (name community) are:

Much higher than average	57
A little higher than average	105
Average	189
A little lower than average	50
Much lower than average	9
Don't know	103
No answer	7

TABLE 46

QUESTION: As cities continue to grow and the number of children to be educated continues to increase, local communities will have to raise more money to build and operate their schools. There are three major ways in which this problem might be approached. 1) Increase the general property tax 2) Provide some form of city income tax, or 3) Request the state or federal government to divert more tax moneys to local governments. Thinking about taxation here in (name the community), when more funds are needed to build and operate the schools, as a general principle would it be best to:

Increase local property taxes	23
Raise the city income tax	117
Get more money from the state	117
Get more money from the federal government	109
Other (go to col. 41, below to give specific codes for "other" responses)	123
Don't know	23
No answer	8

TABLE 47

QUESTION: Other for Question 12 in Table 46.

Combination of 1 and 2 from above.	6
Combination of 3 and 4 from above.	41
Combination of 1 and 4 from above.	3
Combination of 2 and 3 from above.	22
Combination of 2 and 4 from above.	8
Any other reason or combination from above.	48
No answer	392

TABLE 48

QUESTION: In some communities school officials become increasingly aware of the kinds of buildings the people want to have built, while in other communities the building program departs from the wishes of the people. During the past year or two, do you feel that the school building policies in the Cincinnati School District:

Are closer to what people want	149
Are about the same	124
Are farther from what people want	139
Don't know	101
No answer	7

TABLE 49

QUESTION: Do you think that the school administration in Cincinnati should spend more money, less money, or about the same amount of money being spent now on schools in the Avondale and West End areas of Cincinnati?

More	163
The same	196
Less	51
Undecided	96
No answer	14

TABLE 50

QUESTION: Why do you feel this way?

(More) The schools are in bad shape compared to others	64
(More) Because the children are handicapped (race) they need extra educational help	42
(More) 1 and 2	11
(Same) The schools are OK	39
(Same) The American way is to give everyone equal opportunity	71
(Less) These areas break things and/or waste opportunities	28
(Less) These schools are already better than many others (e.g., new Burton school)	4
Any other reason that does not fit above or is uncodeable	168
No answer to 14a	93

TABLE 51

QUESTION: Last summer many people in Avondale protested the location of the Burton School in that area. After it was built, many people expressed strong desires to have the school operate as an integrated school by using school busses to bring white children to the Burton School and take Negro children to all-white schools. Do you remember reading or talking about this last year? Did you favor or oppose the bussing of students when you heard about it last year.

Favor	37
Don't remember	26
Opposed	337
"No" to question 15a	104
Other (No matter what)	4
No answer	12

TABLE 52

QUESTION: In the past few years, school administrators have been proposing that children start school when they are 3 or 4 years old rather than waiting until kindergarden age. How do you feel about this?

Very favorable	50
Favorable	73
Don't know or undecided	36
Opposed	211
Very opposed	143
No answer	7

TABLE 53

QUESTION: Also, for several years, school administrators have been proposing that schools remain open through summer. Would you favor or oppose such a plan.

Favor	175
Don't know	35
Oppose	278
No answer	32

TABLE 54

QUESTION: No matter how you feel about it, can you think of any reasons for supporting such a plan?

Keep children off street, they are idle in summer, riots	77
Children can use more education (of any kind)	51
Uses buildings more efficiently	78
Any other answer	130
No answer (incl. don't know and no)	184

TABLE 55

QUESTION: No matter how you feel about it, can you think of any reasons for opposing such a plan?

Need fun, relaxation	196
Some students need to earn money	9
Family cannot plan a vacation	52
Cost more money (taxes)	18
Combination of 1 and 3	14
Any other answer	110
No answer (incl. don't know and no)	121



TABLE 56

QUESTION: Suppose that the federal government assumed the responsibility for paying the cost of summer school for all students as a means of keeping any more riots from occurring. What would you think of this plan?

Favor	124
Don't know	55
Opose	259
Not codeable above	52
No answer	30

TABLE 57

QUESTION: Generally speaking, how would you say the local school funds are used?

Very wisely	58
Quite wisely	166
Wisely half of the time	127
Rather unwisely	41
Very unwisely	24
Don't know	96
No answer	8

TABLE 58

QUESTION: Do you feel that people in Cincinnati were kept adequately informed about basic issues during the last school tax elections?

Yes	232
No	211
Don't know	70
No answer	7

TABLE 59

QUESTION: A good many people were unable to vote in the last School tax election, the one held last November. Were you unable to vote, or did you make it to the polls?

Voted in Nov. and Dec.	414
Didn't vote	81
Voted in Nov. but not in Dec.	18
Don't know	1
No answer or refused to answer	6

TABLE 60

QUESTION: For statistical purposes, we would like to ask if you recall how you voted on the school tax proposals last November and December. On the first levy in November, did you vote:

For	209
Against	179
Can't recall	44
If "didn't vote" in Q. 21	78
No answer	10

TABLE 61

QUESTION: And on the second levy in December, did you vote:

For	181
Against	148
Can't recall	64
If "didn't vote" in Q. 21	82
No answer	45

TABLE 62

QUESTION: It is important for a school board to make wise and reasonable decisions concerning the operation of the public schools. To what extent do you feel the present school board makes sound and reasonable decisions (about school matters)?

Almost always	57
Most of the time	222
About half of the time	103
Show more poor judgment	36
Almost always show poor judgment	9
Don't know	85
No answer	8

TABLE 63

QUESTION: And how about the judgment exercised by the administrative staff? To what extent do you feel the administrators exercise sound and reasonable judgment about school matters?

Almost always	90
Usually	195
About half of the time	105
Show more poor judgment	30
Almost always show poor judgment	14
Don't know	78
No answer	8

TABLE 64

QUESTION: Have you heard of the recent appointment of a new Assistant Superintendent of Schools?

Yes	202
No	304
No answer	14

TABLE 65

QUESTION: How would you say you feel about this?

Favor	114
Don't know	95
Oppose	25
No answer	286

TABLE 66

QUESTION: Generally speaking, do you feel that the public schools have spent too much, too little, or the right amount of money on special facilities such as libraries, gymnasiums, swimming pools, and so forth?

Too much	101
Too little	82
Right amount	272
Don't know	57
No answer	42

TABLE 67

QUESTION: On what facilities has too much (too little) money been spent?

(Too much) sports	66
(Too much) bussing parochial students	2
(Too much) driver educated	3
(Too little) sports	19
(Too little) not enough spent on any (all) of these	17
(Too little) libraries	16
Any other answer or uncodeable	77
No answer	320

TABLE 68

QUESTION: In many elementary school districts people organized last winter to collect money for keeping kindergarten in operation. Do you know if such a group was organized in this school district? Did they call on you? If such an organization had asked you for support would you have contributed? Did you make a contribution? Would you have made a contribution if they had asked you for one?

1 Yes	1
2 No	4
3 Yes	5
4 No	2
5 Yes	123
6 No	106
7 Yes	109
8 No	36
9 Yes	48
10 No	4

TABLE 69

QUESTION: Another organization was formed last winter to collect money to keep the interscholastic athletic program going in the public schools. Did you hear of this organization? Did they contact you? Would you have made a contribution if you had been asked? Did you make a contribution? Would you have made a contribution if you had been asked?

1 Yes	0
2 No	6
3 Yes	0
4 No	7
5 Yes	30
6 No	122
7 Yes	15
8 No	23
9 Yes	104
10 No	4

TABLE 70

QUESTION: Did you or your (husband, wife) ever play in interscholastic athletics when you were in school?

Yes	204
No	305
No answer	11

TABLE 71

QUESTION: Do you (or your husband or your wife) enjoy interscholastic athletics?

Yes	297
Somewhat	67
No	151
No answer	5

TABLE 72

QUESTION: Do you (or your husband or your wife) ever attend interscholastic athletic events when they are in season?

Yes	236
No	156
If "No" to Q. 30	121
No answer	7

TABLE 73

QUESTION: About how often? (Refers to Table 72)

Weekly	41
Monthly	57
Rarely	144
If "No" to Q. 30	265
No answer	13

TABLE 74

QUESTION: Some people feel that the local property tax is already too high and future school needs cannot continue to be met by further increases in local property taxes. Other people feel this is not true. Thinking about the property taxes here in (name community) would you agree or disagree with these two statements? (Tables 74 and 75)

Property taxes assessed against private homes in this community are already too high and should not be increased. Do you:

Agree	397
Disagree	75
Don't know	43
No answer	3

TABLE 75

QUESTION: Property taxes assessed against business and industrial property in this community are already too high and should not be increased. Do you:

Agree	195
Disagree	118
Don't know	200
No answer	5

TABLE 76

QUESTION: If the local public schools in Ohio should receive increasingly larger sums of money from the state rather than from local tax moneys, what would be the best way for the state to get added tax money for education? Would it be best to get money through:

Increasing sales tax	98
A state income tax	44
Increasing corporation taxes	55
An increase in nuisance taxes	200
Don't know	9
No answer	112

TABLE 77

QUESTION: Other concerning Table 76.

Combination of 1 and 2	6
Combination of 3 and 4	7
Combination of 1 and 3	2
Combination of 1 and 4	20
Combination of 2 and 3	1
Combination of 2 and 4	4
Any other answer or combination	55
No answer	423

TABLE 78

QUESTION: Do you think that you will go to the polls to vote in the November elections?

Yes	481
Undecided	12
No	18
No answer	7

TABLE 79

QUESTION: If you do go to the polls, how do you think you will vote? For the school tax levy or against it?

For	295
Undecided	114
Against	70
No answer	39

Now look at this list of candidates for the school board. Do you recognize any that you plan to vote for? (Tables 80 - 86)

TABLE 80

CANDIDATE: Calvin H. Conliffe

Yes	78
Blank	440

TABLE 81

CANDIDATE: Gordon F. DeFosset

Yes	30
Blank	488

TABLE 82

CANDIDATE: Virginia K. Griffin

Yes	38
Blank	480

TABLE 83

CANDIDATE: Daniel H. McKinney

Yes	23
Blank	495

TABLE 84

CANDIDATE: John M. Sanning

Yes	17
Blank	501

TABLE 85

CANDIDATE: James E. Wolfe

Yes	28
Blank	490

TABLE 86

CANDIDATE: Wayne F. Wilke

Yes	48
Blank	470

Now look at this list of candidates for the Cincinnati City Council. From what you know now, how do you plan to vote? (Tables 87 - 106)

TABLE 87

CANDIDATE: Howard Crush

Yes	26
Out of city limits	48
Blank	444

TABLE 88

CANDIDATE: Ralph B. Kohnen Jr.

Yes	57
Out of city limits	47
Blank	414

TABLE 89

CANDIDATE: Willis D. Gradison Jr.

Yes	123
Out of city limits	47
Blank	348

TABLE 90

CANDIDATE: John E. Held

Yes	124
Out of city limits	47
Blank	347

TABLE 91

CANDIDATE: William J. Keating

Yes	121
Out of city limits	47
Blank	350

TABLE 92

CANDIDATE: Frank Mayfield Jr.

Yes	54
Out of city limits	47
Blank	417



## TABLE 93

CANDIDATE: Eugene Reuhlman

Yes	156
Out of city limits	47
Blank	315

## TABLE 94

CANDIDATE: Gordon Rich

Yes	129
Out of city limits	47
Blank	342

## TABLE 95

CANDIDATE: Myron B. Bush

Yes	145
Out of city limits	47
Blank	326

## TABLE 96

CANDIDATE: Robert R. Fitzpatrick Jr.

Yes	19
Out of city limits	47
Blank	452

## TABLE 97

CANDIDATE: Charles P. Taft

Yes	151
Out of city limits	47
Blank	320

## TABLE 98

CANDIDATE: Vincent H. Beckmann

Yes	136
Out of city limits	47
Blank	335

## TABLE 99

CANDIDATE: James O. Bradley

Yes	35
Out of city limits	47
Blank	436

## TABLE 100

CANDIDATE: William J. Chenault	
Yes	44
Out of city limits	47
Blank	427

## TABLE 101

CANDIDATE: James R. Clancy	
Yes	100
Out of city limits	47
Blank	371

## TABLE 102

CANDIDATE: Phil Collins	
Yes	125
Out of city limits	47
Blank	346

## TABLE 103

CANDIDATE: John J. Gilligan	
Yes	160
Out of city limits	47
Blank	311

## TABLE 104

CANDIDATE: Thomas A. Luken	
Yes	113
Out of city limits	47
Blank	358

## TABLE 105

CANDIDATE: Harry McIlwain	
Yes	71
Out of city limits	47
Blank	400

## TABLE 106

CANDIDATE: Paul H. Tobias	
Yes	22
Out of city limits	48
Not on questionnaire	168
Blank	280

Suppose the residence next to you is vacant and six different families have applied to move in. In terms of their probable desirability as neighbors, which of these families would you rank first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and sixth? (Tables 107 - 112)

TABLE 107

QUESTION: Negro medical doctor and his family.

First	40
Second	69
Third	107
Fourth	57
Fifth	12
Sixth	8
Respondent is a Negro	103
Respondent white; Interviewer Negro	32
Don't know	1
No answer	89

TABLE 108

QUESTION: White lawyer and his family.

First	194
Second	91
Third	25
Fourth	6
Fifth	2
Sixth	3
Respondent is a Negro	103
Respondent white; Interviewer Negro	32
Don't know	1
No answer	61

TABLE 109

QUESTION: Negro bank clerk and his family.

First	3
Second	20
Third	55
Fourth	155
Fifth	47
Sixth	3
Respondent is a Negro	103
Respondent white; Interviewer Negro	32
Don't know	1
No answer	99

TABLE 110

QUESTION: White postal clerk and his family.

First	98
Second	137
Third	57
Fourth	33
Fifth	1
Sixth	1
Respondent is a Negro	103
Respondent white; Interviewer Negro	32
Don't know	1
No answer	55

TABLE 111

QUESTION: Negro family on relief looking for work.

First	1
Second	0
Third	2
Fourth	9
Fifth	92
Sixth	175
Respondent is a Negro	103
Respondent white; Interviewer Negro	32
Don't know	1
No answer	103

TABLE 112

QUESTION: White sharecroppers looking for work.

First	2
Second	7
Third	61
Fourth	13
Fifth	101
Sixth	108
Respondent is a Negro	103
Respondent white; Interviewer Negro	32
Don't know	1
No answer	90

TABLE 113

QUESTION: Several schools in the Cincinnati area have a high proportion of Negro pupils. Some people feel that when classrooms reach 30% Negro pupils the quality of the classes diminishes because Negro pupils tend to come from more deprived backgrounds. Other people feel this is not true. On the average, would you say that the educational quality of classes drops when the proportion of Negro pupils reaches 30% or more.

Quality decreases	158
Quality is not influenced	178
Quality is higher	4
Don't know	21
Respondent is Negro	103
Respondent white; Interviewer negro	32
No answer	22

TABLE 114

QUESTION: How do you feel about adding flouride to the public water system as a means of reducing tooth decay among children?

Strongly favor	133
Favor	141
Neutral or don't know	119
Oppose	68
Strongly oppose	52
No answer	5

TABLE 115

QUESTION: Some people feel that many American communities are moving too rapidly in their efforts to racially integrate housing and the schools. Other people feel that things are moving too slowly. Thinking about the Cincinnati area, would you say that the racial integration of housing is going:

Much too rapidly	66
A little too rapidly	79
About right	215
A little too slowly	57
Much too slowly	54
Don't know	38
No answer	9

TABLE 116

QUESTION: And with respect to racial integration of the schools in the Cincinnati area, are things moving:

Much too rapidly	52
A little too rapidly	46
About right	269
A little too slowly	39
Much too slowly	43
Don't know	57
No answer	12

TABLE 117

QUESTION: Based on what you yourself know about teachers salaries in the Cincinnati Public School District, do you feel that these salaries are:

Too high	16
About right	255
Too low	202
Don't know	27
No answer	18

TABLE 118

QUESTION: Thinking now about the two different kinds of courses taught in the higher grades, -- one kind is called "academic", and is aimed at giving the student broad, general knowledge; the other is called "vocational" and is aimed at giving the student more specialized job skills. Do you think that either of these kinds of courses should be strengthened, that they both should be strengthened, or that they should both be kept about the way they are?

Strengthen vocational	132
Strengthen academic	17
Strengthen both	195
Keep both as they are	140
Other	5
Don't know	17
No answer	12

TABLE 119

QUESTION: How long have you lived at this address?

Less than 1 year	44
1-4 years	140
5-10 years	115
More than 10 years	212
No answer	6

TABLE 120

QUESTION: How long have you lived in the Cincinnati area?

0-4 years	13
5-9 years	19
10-14 years	25
15-19 years	37
Over 20 years but not all of life	163
All of life	254
No answer	6

TABLE 121

QUESTION: In what state were you born?

Lived in Cincinnati all of life	253
<u>New England</u>	
Connecticut	
Maine	
Massachusetts	
New Hampshire	
Rhode Island	
Vermont	6
<u>Middle Atlantic</u>	
New Jersey	
New York	
Pennsylvania	12
<u>West North Central</u>	
Iowa	
Kansas	
Minnesota	
Nebraska	
North Dakota	
South Dakota	7
<u>East North Central</u>	
Illinois	
Indiana	
Michigan	
Ohio	
Wisconsin	86
<u>South Atlantic</u>	
Maryland	
Delaware	
Washington D.C.	
Florida	
South Carolina	
North Carolina	
Virginia	
W. Virginia	
Georgia	31
<u>East South Central</u>	
Alabama	
Kentucky	
Mississippi	
Tennessee	96
(con't)	

(Table 121 con't)

<u>West South Central</u>	
Arkansas	
Louisiana	
Oklahoma	
Texas	8
<u>Mountain</u>	
Arizona	
Colorado	
Idaho	
Montana	
Nevada	
New Mexico	
Utah	
Wyoming	1
<u>Pacific</u>	
Alaska	
California	
Hawaii	
Oregon	
Washington	3
Foreign born	13
No answer	1

TABLE 122

QUESTION: What would you say was the size of the town or city where you were born, or was it a farm?

Farm	53
2,500	49
2,500-10,000	38
10,000-50,000	36
50,000-250,000	30
250,000	46
Lived in Cincinnati all of life	253
No answer	12



TABLE 123

QUESTION: What is your occupation? - Population Decile Scale.

One	5
Two	19
Three	2
Four	23
Five	17
Six	19
Seven	36
Eight	21
Nine	57
Ten	84
Unemployed, disabled, student, single, widowed, separated, divorced, retired	97
Housewife	136