DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 543 CG 007 087

AUTHOR	Sklar, Bernard
TITLE	The School Sociologist: A New Role for the American Public School.
INSTITUTION	University of Southern California, Los Angeles.
PUB DATE	Apr 72
NOTE	25p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Community Influence; Educational Environment; *School Community Cooperation; *School Community Relationship; School Organization; *School Personnel; Social Behavior; Social Change; Social Factors; *Social Integration; Social Sciences; *Sociology; Urban Studies

ABSTRACT

The author sketches out an argument for the institutionalization of a new role within the public school system, namely, that of school sociologist. Such a person would address himself to the problems which schools face in regard to various groups or communities which they must deal with both within and without the school's walls. Three major areas are covered: (1) the ways in which social sociology is useful to schools and school personnel; (2) the nature of the school sociologist's role and its implementation; and (3) the kind of training such a person should have. The author concludes that the school sociologist would bring to the school a perspective which will help it to work more effectively in a time of great social unrest, rapid change, and increasing demands for more and better education. (TL)

THE SCHOOL SOCIOLOGIST: A NEW ROLE FOR THE AMERICAN PUBLIC SCHOOL[1]

By

BERNARD SKLAR

University of Southern California

PREPUBLICATION COPY: NOT TO BE QUOTE WITHOUT PERMISSION

Over the years, with the increasing emphasis on psychology and the interpretation of school problems in social-emotional terms, there has developed within the American school a well defined role known as that of the school psychologist. It is the function of the school psychologist to assist the school staff in testing, diagnosing and counseling young people and in that way contribute to a more stable and, it is presumed, teachable school population. In more recent times, however, it has become clear that in addition to the difficulties schools may have in regard to the personal adjustment of their students, there is an equal if not greater problem facing them in regard to the various groups or communities they must deal with both within as well as without the walls of the school itself. These problems are essentially sociological, and schoolmen as well as others have increasingly turned to sociology and related disciplines for their solution. What has not been done, and what I will propose in this paper is for schools to institutionalize the process by which sociological data and the insights that grow out of them are directly channeled into the school system. What this involves is the notion of a school sociologist--a person equipped with the techniques as well as the sensibilities of one who views the school in sociological terms and can help such institutions face their socially based difficulties in constructive and useful ways.

In order to support such an argument, it seems to me, three things need to be done. First we ought to outline the ways in which sociology has indeed been useful and continues to be useful to schools and school personnel; secondly, we must describe the exact nature of such a role and the way in which it would be carried out; and lastly, we ought to suggest the kind of training such an individual as the school sociologist would have, should such a position find acceptance.

THE PROBLEM

That the sociology of education has become of increasing concern there can be no doubt. The field, which for many years was incorporated within broad departments of Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education, has in recent years broken away to form a more research oriented and purely sociological base for the study of students, schools and their surrounding environments. The American Educational Research Association, in recognition of the growth of such a commitment among its own members, recently instituted a new division (Division G) to focus those interests and encourage their professional development. At this time there are over 800 members of that division. The American Sociological Association, which for many years has maintained an "interest" area for those concerned with educational sociology, has over 500 dues-paying members. But if one really wants to sense the impact of this concern on the world of ideas one has only to turn to the literature. Where just fifteen years ago there were only a handful of textbooks or readers on the sociology of education and fewer empirical studies, one can count such items today literally in the hundreds and hundreds. In a recent study, B.Y. Card and his associates

found that, in terms of textbooks alone, the rate of publication has almost quintupled in the past fifteen years.[2] In addition, specialized centers for the training of educational sociologists per se, within schools of education, have grown up over the past decade at such prestigious institutions as Stanford, UCLA, Harvard and Chicago and increasingly departments of sociology have found themselves looking for, or developing within their own ranks, someone whose primary focus is on education. Finally, throughout the country, teacher training institutions have realized the need to offer their students up-to-date and valid sociological knowledge regarding schools and their problems in order to prepare their graduates for teaching assignments that await them, particularly in urban and slum schools.

But all of this, if helpful to the scholar and the student of education, has in a direct sense contributed little to the day-to-day functioning of the school. Schools, with their immediate concern for the demand that they integrate their staffs as well as their students, revise and update their curriculum at the same time that they maintain or lower their costs, have found little comfort in these developments. Certainly some school people, particularly if they are working on advanced degrees, will encounter this new information from sociology as they complete degree requirements for the EdD. or Ph.D. More often, however, their time will be devoted to less theoretical material and courses designed for the practicing administrator. For the busy school executive, who must rely on his supporting staff for information and ideas, the situation is no better.

While curriculum specialists may have some acquaintance with the more popular works in the area of educational sociology, very few have the time, or for that matter, the training to fully comprehend this literature or properly make use of it. One can only wonder, in fact, at what has kept the sociologist from functioning as part of the school system in the past.[3] To some extent the fault must lie with sociologists for a degree of indifference, if not snobbishness on their part. In any event, the time has come for a reexamination of these attitudes and the possibility that sociologists may indeed be useful members of the school community and make a contribution to the solution of many of the vexing problems facing us today.

WHAT IS IT THEY KNOW ?

If that is the case then the first question we must ask is: In what ways has sociology contributed to our understanding of schools, or learning,or the learner himself, and how may it continue to do so in the future ? For purposes of discussion I have selected five areas in which the sociologist has expert knowledge that is, and continues to be, important to the school. Others, no doubt, would extend or amend this list, but for our purposes it should be adequate. The first relates to the sociologist's expertise in family and community life; the second has to do with matters which are somewhat social-psychological but have to do with problems of delinquency, youth culture and adolescence in general; the third one could define as the general area of organization and bureaucracy; the fourth has to do with the study of teaching as a profession and socio-

logical insigts into work roles, teacher self images and the like; and the last has to do with the school as a social system and the way in which norms, values and roles help to make schools function in the way that they do. Let us examine each of these areas separately.

When we talk of the sociologist's knowledge of community and family life we are in fact talking about an area in which some of the most fundamental work in sociology has been done. One does not have to go as far back as the well-known Middletown studies[4] to realize the enormous contribution which work of this kind has made to our understanding of such things as social class, religious values and work roles, patterns of race relations and the like. For years educators have drawn on such knowledge to form school policy or to solve day-to-day problems. Looking at just one of these notions--the idea of social class--will demonstrate just how complex a question is involved in the study of how people are stratified in our society and what this implies for education. Recent studies, for example, on the effect of socio-economic status on school achievement demonstrate quite clearly that the relationship between these two factors is not as simple nor as direct as some of the early studies led us to believe.[5] In order to understand differences in achievement of various groups of students one needs not only to know the social status of their families but also a host of subtle home and environmental factors. What kinds of expectations, for example, do the parents have for the child's intellectual growth and to what extent do they assist him in his learning or offer him opportunities to enlarge his vocabulary ? And what are the ramifications of ethnic background; particularly in a changing society ? There was a time

when knowing that a child was of Jewish or Chinese extraction might suggest, although certainly not always, certain parental values in regard to learning and hence achievement motivation. Now these "old world" values are changing, as are expectations in regard to education within the black community. Sociological awareness of such changes in values and norms and how they affect learning readiness, pupil adjustment and achievement levels are of enormous importance and it is such information that sociologists can and should bring to the attention of teachers, administrators and school officials.

The second area mentioned was that of delinquency, youth culture and adolescence. Although the literature in each of these fields is enormous and continuously expanding, the contribution that such knowledge has made to the functioning of the school may not be so clear. If we take a look at the problem of delinquency, we can note an enormous change in attitude on the part of the school which, in one way or another, may be attributed to the work of sociologists and others. Where delinquency was once regarded in essentially moral terms (delinquents were "bad" children) we now have an awareness of the importance which cultural factors, like family attitudes toward impulse control, planning for the future and status achievement have on individual disposition toward delinquent acts.[6] Studies in youth culture have also brought home the fact that peer groups have a powerful impact on attitudes toward academic achievement as well as aspirations.[7] The fact that young people often see themselves as members of a separate and alien subsystem within our society, as a number of sociologists have pointed out, has demonstrated the impact that one generation can have on

another in terms of self images, occupational goals and personal values.[8] Finally, the study of adolescence, particularly where it has been related to the fucntioning of the school, has shown the kind of problems, both for the school as well as the child, which accompany the transformation of young people within our highly organized society into functioning, wage earning adults.[9] A good deal of this insight, once fresh and exciting, has been so completely absorbed into our overall culture that their roots in pioneering explorations by sociologists are often forgotten. New concerns, however, await us and sociologists have an important contribution to make in guaging how the new freedoms won by young people, changes in their general notions about career, family, jobs or for that matter, schooling will affect their values, attitudes and behavior within the classroom. The whole question of how we evaluate and reward students generally, must be examined in light of these changing values and new modes of carrying out these tasks must be tested, measured and adopted.

The third area in which important contributions have been made to our understanding of schools is through work in the area that sociologists call formal organization or bureaucracy. Here we see that not only the study of schools but also that of large scale governmental and business enterprises has vastly enriched our understanding of such things as the role of the "informal" organization, the nature of authority systems and the contribution which "charismatic" qualities make to the leadership process. In their pursuit of the question of what, in fact, are the functions of large scale organizations, sociologists have made an important contribution to our understanding of schools by their elucidation of "manifest" as opposed

to "latent" functions.[10] Thus schools can be characterized as having such manifest functions as the socialization of the young in regard t their proper civic responsibility at the same time that they may have latent function, as one author has contended, of making poor democrat of them--that is people with poor democratic habits.[11] But much needs be done, and in particular sociologists have an important task before in helping school officials understand the changing nature of their social roles in an era of increasing militancy and rapid social chan Has the leadership role of the superintendent, for example, literall come one of "coordinator of factions" and "mediator of tensions" as would have us believe ? And if this is so, what are the dynamics of prise that must move from a high centralization of authority and con to one of diffused organizational decision-making at the same time t it is increasingly made responsible for system results and coordinat effort.?

The fourth area mentioned was that of teaching as a profes Here sociology has made us aware of the fact that teaching is a very kind of occupation;[12] that working with children not only affects th tus that teachers enjoy but may also influence their behavior, such their patterns of speech;[13] that the very nature of such careers, li as they are to two levels--that of apprentice teacher and tenured te create special problems in regard to mobility, so that men move int ministration while women travel from lower status to higher status and finally, that unlike other professionals, such as doctors and la teachers have little control over who may enter the profession or h

practice and thus very little sense of themselves as a professional body.[15] But teaching is not only the reflection of an organizational class; it is also a highly personal, intrinsically artful occupation. In this connection social psychologists have pointed out the consequences that working alone (the self-contained classroom) and working with a highly transitory phenomenon (the children themselves) may have on the individual. Teachers, for example, have very few ways in which to measure their success; they also suffer from the absence of a clearly defined work technology, so that learning the job and evaluating one's worth become special problems not only in self-evaluation but in terms of continuous development and personal growth.[16] How these processes work are far from clear but the sociological approach by stressing the nature of the social role that is involved, its functional requirements, and its relationship to the school as a special kind of "social order" should bring us much closer to an understanding of how the teacher works and what the nature of such work means for schools, for children, and for those who must minister to the lives of both.

Finally there is the area of the school as a social system. Here, perhaps, sociologists have made their most important contribution. What they have demonstrated, over and over again, is that in many ways schools are "little villages," where special rules apply and where those who attend act in ways that are defined by customs, values and beliefs that are unique to that setting.[17] To be sure, the outside world provides many of the conditioning and enabling factors, such as financial support and certain sanctions about what the school should or should not do. But

beyond that one finds that schools function in an independent fashion that in many respects confounds those, who, like school principals and administrators, feel they know more than anyone else how this particular institution is supposed to work and what its inhabitants, teachers and students alike, are supposed to do. How does one explain, for example, the variables of morale that one finds in different schools, and what is it that seems to make one educational program work in one place and given what seem to be identical conditions of money, manpower and expertise, fail in another ? These are questions that revolve around the nature of the school as a specialized place, with uniquely defined tasks carried out by specially trained personnel in conjunction with their, in most cases, immature charges. In this connection, one of the myths of school life and school success that sociologists have continued to question is the notion that a superior school plant makes, necessarily, for superior students. One of the more important findings of the Coleman Report, an impressive sociological investigation in itself, was the fact that the modernity of the school has little to do with the educational achievement of young people.[18] Another area that is being explored by sociologists is that of leader behavior. At one time there was a common belief that the morale of the classroom teacher was closely linked to the style of leadership provided by the principal. A recent study seems to point up the possibility that this is not the case; that teacher morale is not linked in any systematic way to the different modes of administrative behavior on the part of the principal.[19] All of which seems to suggest the changing nature of the school as a social system, where students as well as teachers are demanding certain

kinds of autonomy, where militancy has eroded much of the authority of school managers and where new techniques are required to mediate, to innovate, and most importantly, anticipate the changing nature of internal as well as external pressure on the school and its personnel. Obviously, sociologists can have much to say about these developments in the years ahead.

WHAT HE WOULD DO AND HOW HE WOULD DO IT

From this very limited survey one can see the impact that sociological knowledge has had, and, in the future, will continue to have on the functioning of the public school system in America. But the thought must arise as to how such knowledge of a highly theoretical sort can have practical usefulness to the schoolman or the school system. In a sense that is the principal burden of this paper--to define the function of the school sociologist and demonstrate the way in which he would make his knowledge and training useful in a school setting. In doing so we must first differentiate what the school sociologist would do from what his colleagues in the university and elsewhere attempt to do. Such sociologists, particularly those in the academic world, it seems to me, would engage in much, although certainly not all of the exploratory work, theory building and testing that we generally associate with the work of the sociologist today. Just as the school psychologist must rely upon his parent discipline for continued insights, information and technical support in his work, so the school sociologist would have to keep in touch with the major developments in his discipline as he went about his mission of aiding the school

in its day-to-day affairs. But what would such a task involve; what in particular would the school sociologist do and how would he do it ? Since there never has been such a thing as a school sociologist we can only speculate about what such duties would actually entail. Nevertheless, given what are the overall objectives of this role and the contingencies facing schools today, it seems to me that there are three major tasks, broadly defined, that the school sociologists could perform.[20] Others no doubt will develop with the actual institutionalization of this post, but these are the ones which seem to support the overall objective of making sociological knowledge useful in the operation of the public school and helping the school administrator and the school teacher do his job.

The first of these tasks, I would propose, would be to provide a school system or individual school with valid, up to date, and relevant information about the community it serves. Using published data from local, state and federal sources and supplementing these with surveys of his own, the school sociologist would help his administrator and the school staff remain appraised of such matters as: (1) the ethnic and racial characteristics of the community, (2) changing levels of income for that community and its various subgroups, (3) statistics regarding birthrates and projected school enrollments and (4) indices of parental background, including level of education, occupation and the like. Demographic data of this kind is crucial to planning but more importantly, knowledge about the nature of one's community and in particular, one's constituency (parents as well as students) is vital to the functioning of the modern school. Nowhere is this more evident that when a school district must face a school bond elec-

tion or referendum. It is at this point, usually, that the superintendent and his staff ask themselves such questions as: "Who are the electorate ?" "What are their characteristics?" and "Are they likely to support higher taxes or fight against them ?" The presence of the school sociologistwould not only guarantee the continuous infusion of such information into the school system but their interpretation and testing in a number of situations as well. For if anything has become evident in recent years it is the need for school staffs and in particular school administrators to remain alert to the changing patterns of community life; to understand the character of those who make up the community and their needs, interests and expectations of the school.

All of this suggests the second task which the school sociologist can perform and that is as a consultant to his administrator and other members of the school system on such matters as community action, racial integration and general trends in the development of the social, political and cultural life of the community. It is only by understanding the character of a community that schools can truly serve them properly. If, for example, as a result of certain changes in the ethnic or racial makeup of the community it becomes apparent that tensions are building up between the school and organized groups of parents, civil rights organizations and the like, then it would be the responsibility of the school sociologist to aid the staff, especially the lower staff levels, in becoming sensitive to these demands, to interpret them honestly and correctly and deal with them in an appropriate and helpful manner. On every level of such an undertaking the school sociologist has a distinct contribution to make. In the earliest

stages of such development to act as a general interpreter or "translator" of what such groups, in fact, want and later on to act as a consultant to those making various responses to these needs and finally, and perhaps on a continuing basis, to serve as a source of feedback in terms of how well the school is functioning in response to these developments. It is particularly in terms of this latter role of "process" specialist that one can see a link between the older role of intergroup or human relations specialist in the schools and that of the school sociologist. In the past such intergroup relations experts have been called upon to serve as consultants or change agents when schools have been in trouble or were thought to be close to trouble. Often this was either too late or, because of the limited training of those involved, less than effective.[21] With the establishment of a professionally trained and institutionally recognized school sociologist much could be done not only to anticipate such developments before they reach crisis proportions, but to deal with them in the most effective way possible.

The third major task of the school sociologist would be that of "interpreter of organizational life." All school systems, regardless of how large or how small, are essentially complex organizations. Often, within such institutions, problems arise in regard to any one of a number of issues that have to do with the effective operation of large scale organizations. Breakdowns in communication occur, staff morale suffers, or problems arise in terms of the recruitment, training or assignment of new staff members. In all this the school sociologist has a special role to play as a specialist in organizational life. It would be his task to help staff mem-

bers interpret the various signs of organizational malaise, to see the relationship of their own roles to those of others and to help in the overall assessment of how well the organization is functioning to meet its own needs as well as those of its client population. There are in fact two distinct functions--that of assessment in regard to school success (usually, and often too narrowly, only in terms of pupil achievement) and assessment of the school system as an effective organization. School staffs, traditionally, are quite expert or at least have always had trained specialists at hand to help them with the former, the assessment of how well students are doing. It is the latter task that is most often neglected or not performed at all. The tendency, recently, for school systems to call upon management consultants to help them with their problems bears ample testimony to just this phenomenon. And just as large business firms have organizational experts on their staff, perhaps some day school systems will also employ specialists to help them with their organizational difficulties. At this point in time it seems sufficient to combine that task with those we have mentioned within the framework of one new, full-time institutional role or office--that of the school sociologist. His training in formal organization theory together with his insights into school systems should make him especially useful in helping school systems solve their problems with maximum sensitivity to both the needs of students and the needs of efficiency.

FINDING A PLACE

Thus in a very general way we have outlined three distinct functions or tasks that the school sociologist would perform. One was that of

the social statistician and expert on local community trends. The second was that of process consultant to the school in regard to social action and the system's response to demands for change, both internal as well as external. The last was as specialist in organizational development. In all this we have only spoken indirectly about "how" the school sociologist would fit in to the overall structure of the contemporary school organization. It is to that question which we must now turn, for it is a crucial one and one that could very well determine whether or not there is any viability to the role of the school sociologist at all.

How indeed would the school sociologist fit into this organization and what would his relationship be to its members ? Here again we can only be suggestive. Different school systems with different organizational features no doubt would solve this problem in different ways. Nevertheless, several aspects of this role seem clear. To begin with the position must be a high level one. Not only must the holder possess a doctorate but his status in the organization must be such that he can have direct access to the chief administrator--on the school level, the principal, on the system level, the superintendent. Although at this point in time it may seem more logical to some for the school sociologist to work on the higher, that is system, level, there is no reason why he could not be equally useful in a particular school, the functions of his office being adjusted accordingly. Regardless of the level, however, the job is one that demands a great deal of professional autonomy. By this I mean that, notwithstanding the commitment that the school sociologist has toward helping the school function more effectively, he cannot be seen by anyone as acting as an arm

of the administration. Knowledge about communities and sensitivity to the emerging needs as well as problems of subgroups within communities demands a kind of freedom and integrity that line officers simply do not have. The same could be said in regard to internal problems. There is no way for the school sociologist to be useful in intra-organizational difficulties if his job is seen as that of manipulating the staff for the ends of the administration.

The realities of school life, however, make it clear that if the school sociologist is to have any real autonomy he must somehow be independent of institutional control. How to accomplish that, at the same time that we guarantee a measure of institutional responsibility is probably the more worrisome feature of this entire proposal. Nevertheless, a solution, albeit a novel one is possible. What I would propose is that the school sociologist be funded by the state. For years state and federal funds have been made available to local school districts for specialized purposes, and even specialized roles. The only difference that I would propose in this case would be that rather than incorporating those funds within the budgets of the local school, that they be contained and administered by the state department of education itself. Under such an arrangement school districts would need to apply for a school sociologist (or perhaps even several) to work in their distict. Within guidelines provided by the state they should also be permitted to select the one they prefer and under specified circumstances have him removed. The result, it seems to me, would be far more salutory than having the school sociologist work directly under the school superintendent or principal as a district employee.[22]

TRAINING HIM FOR THE JOB

Now a final word needs to be said about how such a person would be trained. It should be evident from all I have said that the role envisioned here is in many respects a hybrid one; that it conbines a deep understanding of the discipline of sociology with something like an action orientation towards the problems of schools themselves. For this reason it would appear most appropriate to house such an individual from training purposes in a professional school of education, where the commitments to service are well established. At the same time we must see to it that he draws his relevant intellectual skills from appropriate places on the campus. A good deal of his early studies in sociology would necessarily have to take place within the department of sociology, but somewhere along the line it will be important for the school sociologist-in-training to take courses in community action from faculty members in the school of social work a course in city politics and city government from the department of political science and the like. How this would be done, with what proportion devoted to education, sociology, social work, urban studies or what have you, will depend on the school where it is being done, the resources available and the interests of the trainee. Some schools may require strong emphasis on group development while others may want their trainees to spend a good deal of time in developing social survey techniques. Correspondingly, students will vary in their interests or "strengths;" and some will favor the more "scholarly" aspects of the role while others will see social action as their domain.[23] In all this, however, it should be clear that there is an important task to be performed by the department that sponsors this educational program, and that is

to maintain an appropriate balance among the various elements that the student combines in his career package and see to it that some kind of integration takes place.

Obviously a certain amount of felxibility will be required, given the fact that we are talking about a multifaceted development on the part of the individual. Nevertheless, it should be recalled that our original injunction concerning the school sociologist was that he serve the school system or school unit as a facilitating agent. This means, first and foremost, that students within such programs must maintain a perspective of active concern for the success of the school as a learning environment. Students who have aspirations for basic research on school problems or who see their career lines as essentially within the framework of university teaching and research should be discouraged from entering, or once in, from remaining in such a program. In conjunction with this dedication to the success of the school as a place to learn must be an equally diligent pursuit of the particular tools that will help serve that purpose. For reasons we have explored earlier these are by and large sociological; both applied as well as theoretical. Students in this program must see themselves as heavily engaged in the study of that discipline. That is where they will receive the basic tools for their task; not only the essential concepts of sociology but the principal research and action skills as well. The basic difference between students committed to a career as a school sociologist and the more traditional student of sociology is that the former is a specially trained and skilled intervener in the social process of men while the latter is, typically, the passive observer and more formal student of that process. In this

connection it seems apparent that the dissertation assignment taken on by the school sociologist should be cast in an "action" framework; that is, seeing how, or initiating and evaluating how, certain changes in the natu of the school environment or student/teacher roles take place or affect th performance of some program, school, client population or the like.

In summary, then, let me say that what I have tried to do is sketch out an argument for the institutionalization of a new role within American public school today. I have called this role the school sociolo a person disciplined by the study of sociology, both basic and applied, a dedicated to the application of such knowledge for the improvement of the learning environment of the American school system. Such a person, or in the case of a larger office, persons would perform three essential tasks: (1) they would provide the school system with relevant information about its community, its clientele, and their parents for planning, information and action purposes, (2) they would act as specialists in helping school anticipate various demands for social action within the community and wi the school and helping them deal with them as openly, as honestly and as fectively as possible, and (3) they would serve the total school organiz as consultants in regard to the functioning of that organization itself. has also been suggested that such a role requires high status, that only holders of the doctors degree be enlisted to fill it and that they be tr within professional schools of education with heavy emphasis on the stud sociology, political science, urban studies and the like. Finally, some has been said about the autonomy of such a post and that for the sake of

own effectiveness it must be free from institutional control at the same time that it is responsive to legitimate institutional demands; in sum, to see the school enterprise and all its commitments as related to the various groups that make up its constituency--students, parents, teachers and public alike. Bringing such a perspective to the school I feel will do much to help the school work more effectively in a time of great social unrest, rapid change and increasing demands for more and better education for American youth.

F O O T N O T E S

1. The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance of two colleagues, William G. Spady of the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education and Norman L. Friedman, California State College, Los Angeles. Their criticism of the first draft of this article were extremely useful in the preparation of the final version presented here.

2. B.Y Card, J.G.T. Kelsey and Julia Wong, "The Development of Educational Sociology as Reflected in its English-Language Textbooks Published from 1912 to 1970." Unpublished paper delivered at the 1971 Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in New York City, p. 14.

3. Testimony of such interest is provided by the Sixty-Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, entitled Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

4. Robert S. Lynd and Mary M. Lynd, Middletown: A Study in Contemporary American Culture. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1929, and Middletown in Transition: A Study in Cultural Conflicts. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1937.

5. One of the early attempts to critically examine this question was made by Richard M. Wolf,"The Identification and Measurement of Environmental Process Variables Related to Intelligence," unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964.

6. Solomin Kobrin, "The Impact of Cultural Factors on Selected Problems of Adolescent Development in the Middle and Lower Classes, The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, April, 1962, pp. 387-92.

7. Perhaps the best known work in this area is James S. Coleman's Adolescent Society. New York: Free Press, 1961. For more recent contributions to this area see D. Kandel and G. Lesser, "Parental and Peer Influence on Adolescent Educational Plans," American Sociological Review, 34, pp. 387-92.

8. Here the data is often impressionistic but nonetheless compelling. For a good example see: "The Education of Kate Haracz: Journal of an Undergraduate," in Change, May-June, 1970, pp. 12-26.

9. Arthur Stinchcomb, Rebellion in a High School. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964.

10. The best discussion of these terms is found in the original statement of Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959, pp. 19-84.

11. Elizabeth L. Simpson, Democracy's Stepchildren. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1970.

12. The best recent work in this area is Robert Dreeben, The Nature of Teaching. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Forsman and Co., 1970.

13. Emil Haller, "Pupil Influence in Teacher Socialization: A Socio-Linguistic Study," Sociology of Education, 40, pp. 316-33.

14. Howard S. Becker, "The Career of the Chicago Public School Teacher," American Journal of Sociology, 57, pp. 470-77.

15. Dan C. Lortie, "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching," in Amitai Etzioni, ed., The Semi Professions and Their Organization. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

16. Ibid.

17. The most congent statements in this regard are still found in Willard Waller's Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley, 1932.

18. James S. Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

19. Richard F. Wales, "The Elementary Principal's Leader Behavior and Teacher Morale," unpublished Ed.D. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1971.

20. In outlining these tasks it must not be assumed that one person would do them "equally well" or "all the time," anymore than describing the ideal functions of the school superintendent suggests that an encumbent does all the things contained in a job description of that post as well. Contingencies of time, place and personality will determine which tasks or combination of tasks will be preformed with what emphases, priorities, etc.

21. This is not to suggest that there is not a legitimate role to be played by what has been called "The Intergroup Relations Expert," (cf. Eleanor Blumenberg, "The School Intergroup Relations Specialist: A Profession in Process," Sociology of Education, Spring, 1968, pp. 221-26.) Unfortunately the role has too often been filled by mobile school teachers within large cyctems who have been assigned to downtown bureaus of human relations. In most cases these people have little specialized sociological training or receive it on the job.

22. The author is aware that a number of questions remain unanswered in regard to how, specifically, such a role would be established, what mechanisms would be used to recruit and channel personnel and so on. In this preliminary statement, however, it was felt that such a discussion would be premature if not pointless.

23. It should also be clear that larger school systems may employ more than one such person and in that way permit some to specialize in one aspect of the job while others take on the other or even newer dimensions.