DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 083 355   UD 013 892

AUTHOR   Mann, Dale
TITLE   Shared Control in Urban Neighborhood Schools: An
              Interpretative Essay and Bibliography. Draft.
INSTITUTION   Columbia Univ., New York, N.Y. Teachers College.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington,
              D.C.
PUB DATE   1 Sep 73
GRANT   OEG-0-72-4401
NOTE   157p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS   Administrative Problems; Administrator Attitudes;
              Bibliographies; City Problems; Community Attitudes;
              *Community Control; Community Involvement;
              Decentralization; *Decision Making; Educational
              Administration; *Neighborhood Schools; Principals;
              *School Community Relationship; *Urban Schools

ABSTRACT
              School community relations in big cities are marked
by apathy and distrust and, often, by hostility. Yet, many Federal
programs and many pressing urban problems require that administrators
and communities work together more closely than ever before. This
project analyzes evidence from recent empirical research and from
field evaluations to identify the most successful practices which
have put administrators and neighborhoods together in shared decision
making. The key finding from that analysis is that involvement is
successful when it is significant. The tested procedures for
involvement were collected as a "Principal's Handbook for Shared
Control in Urban Community Schools." The present document, which is a
companion report to the Principal's Handbook, presents the evidence
on which the Handbook recommendations are based and it is organized
parallel to the Handbook for easy cross reference. A bibliography of
over 300 citations is appended. [For the companion document, the
Principal's Handbook, see UD 013 893.] (Author/RJ)

"SHARED CONTROL IN URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS

AN INTERPRETIVE ESSAY AND BIBLIOGRAPHY"

Dale Mann
Teachers College
Columbia University

September 1, 1973

- DRAFT -

ABSTRACT

"Successful Mechanisms for Urban School/Community
Involvement"

Dale Mann
Teachers College, Columbia University

School/community relations in big cities are
marked by apathy, distrust, and often hostility. Yet
many Federal programs, and many pressing urban problems
(eg., race and finance) require that administrators and
communities work together more closely than ever before.
This project analyzed evidence from recent empirical
research and from field evaluations to identify the most
successful practices which have put administrators and
neighborhoods together in shared decision making.

The key finding from that analysis is that
involvement is successful when it is significant. Thus,
the tested procedures for involvement were collected as
a "Principal's Handbook for Shared Control in Urban
Community Schools." The Handbook is organized by action
areas that a school principal needs to consider in
creating, maintaining and utilizing successful involvement.
Each area discusses the range of options available to
the principal. Building principals are thus able to
select features to fit their particular communities. The
areas are: (1) why share control; (2) when to share
control and what to expect; (3) who should be involved?;
(4) what should they do; (5) how should the group be
organized; and (6) how to help. Sample budgets and
sample by-laws are included in an appendix.

A companion document ("Shared Control in Urban
Neighborhood Schools: An Interpretive Essay") presents
the evidence on which the Handbook recommendations are
based and its organized parallel to the Handbook for easy
cross reference. A bibliography of over 300 items is
included in that essay.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dale Mann
Teachers College
Columbia University

SHARED CONTROL IN URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS:
AN INTERPRETIVE ESSAY

Preface

This essay is to be used in conjunction with
A Principal's Handbook for Shared Control In Urban
Community Schools.* That Handbook is a compendium of
recommendations for use by school principals who may
want to, or have to create and maintain mechanisms of
shared control between themselves and the communities
they serve. The Handbook tells the building principal
what he or she needs to be concerned with, what options
are available, and what steps to take in order to make
shared control a success.

The Handbook recognizes that sharing de facto
control of school policy decision-making is a distinct
departure from prevailing school/community relations.
Its recommendations have been derived from a study of
the most successful practices in this field and from
the most recent research bearing on the topics with
which building principals must be familiar if they
are to realize the goals of their school and community
through shared control. The purpose of this interpretive
essay is to provide the documentation which supports
the recommendations contained in the Handbook. It is
very unlikely that any principal will want to adopt
en toto the recommendations of the Handbook. Neither
particular community situations nor personal tastes are
likely to allow that. Instead, it is anticipated that
principals and communities will pick, choose, and
modify the various options within each aspect of the
mechanism of shared control described in the Handbook.
The result can therefore be tailored to individual and
field situations. In order to facilitate that process,
wherever appropriate, this Interpretive Essay presents

---

the pro's and con's of a particular feature, discusses whatever research and evaluation is available, and defends the recommendation made in the Handbook. The essay is thus intended as a supplement to the Handbook. Because of that, unless the essay is used in conjunction with the Handbook the essay itself will seem a little disjointed. (The two are designed to complement each other.)

A number of people helped with this project. The research into features of successful involvement was greatly assisted by Madeline Holzer. She was especially helpful during the comparative phase of the project in which the literatures of social welfare, urban planning, and health care were examined for their relevance to education. The rigor (and vigor) of her criticism is reflected in the results of this project. Marva Harrison typed mountains of note cards and deciphered miles of scribbling in producing clean and prompt draft materials. Maria C. Bardeguez served as secretary and project assistant with stunning efficiency and unfailing good humor.

Finally, I owe a lot to my wife Sandra, who in her work as director of a day care center, deals with shared control in the urban context. The project is indebted to her and to the scores of other urban school administrators who have helped with this work. Woodrow Wilson wrote of people like them and their work in broadening what he called "the great stream of freeedom": "The men who act stand nearer to the mass of men than the men who write; and it is in their hands that new thought gets its translation into the crude language of deeds." (Woodrow Wilson, Leaders of Men)

New York City
August 31, 1973

Dale Mann
Teachers College
Columbia University
July, 1973

"SHARED CONTROL IN URBAN NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS:
AN INTERPRETIVE ESSAY"

The "Principal's Handbook for Shared Control in Urban Community Schools" is a compendium of recommendations for use by urban school principals in involving their communities in the school's decision-making processes. The handbook is based on the best and most recent evidence, drawn from cities all over the United States, about the features of community involvement which have been the most successful. In order to keep the handbook short and useable, it does not discuss the evidence from the research and field sources on which it has been based. This interpretive essay presents that evidence, discusses its limitations, and relates it to the recommendations made in the handbook.

This essay is organized to parallel the handbook. Users of that handbook who would like more detail about a given feature can quickly refer to the appropriate section in this essay. The initial section defines shared control and distinguishes it from other more common school/ community practices. The goals of community involvement, that is, what can be achieved by increasing involvement, are detailed next. The following section deals with the question of when to share control. It shows how the principal can assess the need for involvement. It also discusses the apprehensions--especially with regard to conflict--which are common among school principals contemplating community involvement.

The next three sections (III, IV, and V) take up the business of creating a community involvement group. They answer questions of who should be involved, what they should do, and how they should be organized.

A final section summarizes the principal's role and responsibility in helping the shared control group to succeed.

- 1 -

The Prevailing Pattern of School/Community Interaction

Involvement and participation are widely held
values in American society and school principals are no
exception. Most endorse community involvement in some
form and try to assist it. For example, the headquarters
of the New York City Schools had issued "Guidelines for
Individual Schools to Achieve Community Involvement in the
Schools" even prior to decentralization. The guidelines
recommended the establishment of neighborhood-based school
committees and stated that "in general the committee should
be the 'board of education' for its school as a local
school board is for its district."[1] In involving commu-
nities, principals are responding to several needs: to
keep the community informed; to build support for the
school; to organize the school's friends and allies; and,
to do those things in a way that will minimize interference
with the professional's autonomy. As one source puts it:
". . . The sound administrator wants as much parent activity
as he can muster because he can thereafter channel it appro-
priately, knowing how to protect his staff, how to use the
parents in the community, how to use the interplay to
strengthen the school, and how to keep the reins of
responsibility untangled."[2]

This approach closely resembles public relations
when it is practiced for manipulative purposes rather than
for the assistance it can provide to more authentic commu-
nity participation. Because this public relations approach
is the most common pattern for urban school/community
interaction, it should be described in detail. It has four
characteristics: (1) one-way communications; (2) a
concentration on support for existing arrangements; (3) a
definition of the citizen as dependent consumer; and (4) a
definition of the educator as autonomous professional.
Public relations, like any other tool, can be put to good
and bad uses. Schools have an undeniably legitimate need
to communicate, to build support, and to preserve aspects
of professional autonomy. There are many practicing
professionals (in, for example, the National School Public
Relations Association) who take this wider view of the
purposes of public relations; however, in urban situations
the dominant practice is, as we shall describe, a narrower
one concentrated on manipulative public relations.

Most administrators interpret their main responsi-
bility in school/community relations as keeping the public
informed. Information is generally dispensed through PTA
bulletings, school newsletters, occasional flyers, and in

- 2 -

a few cases an annual report. For less active school
principals, a yearly report to the school board suffices.
The emphasis is on communication from the school out to
the community and is aptly expressed in the textbooks of
educational administration which counsel administrators
"how to tell the school story," "selling the school
mission," "letting the people know."[3] Luvern Cunningham
believes that this emphasis discloses,

> a basic fallacy in school system approaches to
> school public relations. The preparation prog-
> rams developed by colleges and universities for
> administrators have emphasized an "information
> giving" philosphy. School administrators in
> training have been urged to: tell people about
> the schools, bring parents into the schools,
> sell the schools to the people. Very few
> efforts of a continuing type have been mounted
> which allow parents and students opportunities
> to share their feelings about the schools with
> school officials. Information flow has been
> primarily one way. Legitimate outlets have not
> been provided for protest or discontent. PTA's
> and similar organizations have often ruled dis-
> cussions of local school weaknesses out of bounds
> in order to perpetuate a peaceful, tranquil, and
> all-is-well atmosphere.[4]

        In general, when textbooks discuss the need for
"closer" school/community relations, they refer to a
closer understanding by the community of the schools, and
not vice versa. Lay advisory groups serve mostly as
conduits for the school's position or as forums for the
principal's views and not for soliciting the community's
opinions. The literature of educational administration
goes on at length detailing how to use the media and
information campaigns for various purposes, but with one
recent exception,[5] there is very little attention to
systematic procedures for tapping community opinion.
When asked how they find out what their communities might
want or expect, the stock answer of administrators is to
refer to an "open-door policy" which means that anyone who
is willing to come to the administrator can get a hearing.

        Within the framework of the public relations model,
communications has a very particular purpose: to motivate
greater support for the schools. One author describes
this purpose as follows: "Public relations are necessary
(1) to secure continued and stronger support, (2) to
render an accounting, (3) to advance the educational

program, and (4) to promote the concept of community partnership in educational affairs."[6] The most extensive study of school/community communication ever undertaken set for its task ". . . to discover those factors which influence school-community relations, and, by implication, support of public education."[7]

All organizations require support and creating it is a central responsibility of the professional staff. Whether or not one agrees that it should occupy as much of the focus of school-to-community communications as it does depends in large part on how good a job the schools are thought to be doing. If the schools deserve support in their present configuration, then the public relations emphasis may be justified. However, if the schools need to change and to be changed, then running school/community interaction through the public relations screen is not useful. Extolling something's virtues is an inevitable method through which support is built; but where candid and critical assessment is more appropriate than un- blinking supportiveness for a flawed product, the public relations approach is no help. Mario Fantini points out that:

> The chief motivation of most professionals in [the current prevalent] concept of community relations is to make their system work more smoothly. From the parents' point of view their concept has a basic flaw: when a school system is dysfunctional, the community is acting against its own interests and those of its children in maintaining the system, in failing to criticize it. In short, the existing concept of parent and community participation in education is basically misdirected toward supporting the school's status quo.[8]

Thus in the long run, focusing on support alone and build- ing it through the selective presentation of only the best features of the schools, robs the schools of their ability to respond to new demands.

The efforts of the public relations model resemble marketing practices and relegate the citizen to the role of a dependent and passive consumer of education services. Sherry Arnstein writes: "In the name of citizen participation, people are placed on rubber-stamp advisory committees or advisory boards for the express purpose of 'educating' them or engineering their support. Instead of genuine citizen participation,

- 4 -

the bottom rung of the ladder [of involvement] signifies
the distortion of participation into a public relations
vehicle by power-holders."9

    In the economic marketplace, the consumer must
be "sold" or motivated about the virtues of the product:
the analogy to education is painfully apparent. How-
ever, while the competition among various suppliers
provides a slight degree of protection to consumers in
the marketplace, the same is not the case in education.
There, selection is not preceded by comparison; one brand
may not be replaced by another; there is only support or
non-support. Moreover while the market consumer is
playing a somewhat voluntary role, in education that
role is portrayed as a duty.

    The dependence and passivity of the consumer
has been reinforced by building barriers between the
consumers and the producers; citizen involvement is
carefully guided and controlled. One author says, "the
administration assumes an initiating and guiding role in
any public relations program."10 Another author is even
more pointed: "An advisory committee must be oriented
from the beginning to recognize that its advice does not
constitute interference with the workings of the legal
organization: on the contrary it insures a greater
amount of invulnerability in the functioning of the entire
school organization."11

    As consumers, citizens are assumed to all have
the same interest. Viewing citizens as consumers and
school/community involvement as public relations leads to
an intolerance for legitimately differing interests and
opinions which characterize any urban community. Leslie
Kindred sets out some rules to be used by administrators
in controlling citizens committees: " . . . (2) The
committee should work only as a whole on the assigned
task . . . . (3) Any dissension should not be made public
and dissenting members should withdraw and then act as
individuals."12 Another author counsels that "the
advisory group may pervert its true function by exerting
pressure upon the board of education or upon the commu-
nity . . . . Objectivity and disinterestedness are
essential to the effective functioning of the advisory
committee."13

    There is in these recommendations an assumption
that closely resembles what Robert Salisbury criticized
as the "myth of the unitary community." The basic tenets

of the myth are that the best community will be "con-
sensual, integrated, (and) organic" and that therefore
there is no need to endure the kind of conflict over
educational issues that affects other, crass "political"
areas.[14] As Salisbury points, this attitude decreases
the chances that the special needs of particular groups
of children will be met appropriately.

It hardly needs to be stressed that in the
public relations-as-manipulation model, the professional
occupies a central, defining, and autonomous position.
That role is clear in the foregoing quotations where the
professionals are safeguarding their own authority by
limiting that of the consumers. Two agendas for school-
community relations typify this approach. The first
appears in Stephen J. Knezevich, <u>Administration of Public
Education</u>:

> "1. Inform the public about the schools.
> "2. Establish confidence in the schools.
> "3. Rally support for proper maintenance of the
>   educational program.
> "4. Develop an awareness for the importance of
>   education in a democracy.
> "5. Improve the partnership concept by uniting
>   parents and teachers in meeting the educa-
>   tional needs of children.
> "6. Integrate the home, schools, and community
>   in improving the educational opportunities
>   for all children.
> "7. Evaluate the offerings of the schools and
>   the needs of the children of the community.
> "8. Correct misunderstandings as to the aims
>   and objectives of the school."[15]

And in New York City the Board of Examiners has defined the
"Principal's Role in Building Good School-Community
Relations"

> "4.1 To encourage the use of school services
>   and facilities by responsible, interested
>   people and agencies of the community.

> "4.2 To utilize community resources in implement-
>   ing, enriching, and improving the school
>   program, and to train teachers in doing so.

> "4.3 To provide democratic and competent direc-
>   tion in assisting the people of the commu-
>   nity to cooperate with the school in its
>   efforts to attain worthwhile goals and

improve the educational program and in
keeping them informed of the work of the
school.

"4.4   To encourage and sponsor a Parents' Asso-
        ciation and a School Council.

"4.5   To cooperate with other agencies in pro-
        tecting the health, moral well-being, and
        safety of children.

"4.6   To recognize valuable resource persons in
        the community and to interest them in
        giving of their special talents to the
        school."[16]

The language of such documents is informative.
The stress is on cooperation (by the people with the
school) not on participation; information, not involve-
ment. The principal "keeps them informed" but does not
report to, and is certainly not accountable to the
community. The community is a resource to be used at
the discretion of the administrator, approximately like
any other material. From a legal institutional point of
view, it is neither a source of authority nor of
direction. The result may be summarized by quoting
Myron Leiberman: "Local control by laymen should be
limited to peripheral and ceremonial functions of
education."[17] The manipulative version of the public
relations model concentrates on one-way communications,
selectively stresses support, assigns citizens a passive
and dependent consumer role, and preserves the autonomy
of professionals. Citizen involvement, regardless of the
intent with which it is offered, is acceptable only if
it is supportive and even then it is carefully
restricted to trivial and tangential concerns.

Obviously, the public relations efforts of
schools do not deserve a blanket indictment. Similarly,
Parent Teachers Associations (of which there are 43,000
units with nine million members) are not always the
creatures of this manipulative model. Many school
community involvement mechanisms are good vehicles for
interaction among citizens and administrators. But most
are not, and public relations, when it is practiced only
for manipulative purposes has some serious consequences.

In the first place, urban schools have lost a
lot of the trust and good-will which they used to enjoy.

That has been replaced with apathy and in some cases with
hostility. Mechanisms of community involvement which are
controlled by and for the very people who are viewed with
suspicion are not likely to reverse that feeling.
Robert Lyke, who has made several studies of represen-
tational practices between schools and communities, doubts
whether PTAs, advisory councils, etc., as they are
usually set up "can significantly improve substantive
representation. Since typically they originate and
depend upon either board members or school officials,
they are likely to lack legitimacy in communities where
citizens are already hostile and suspicious."[18] The
U. S. Office of Education's guidelines for parent involve-
ment in Title I makes a similar point: "A 'paper' or
'figurehead' council will accomplish nothing; in fact it
may increase the public's distrust of the school
system . . . ."[19] Another study of school building-level
constituency organizations concluded that, "PTAs maintain
the structural outlines of democratic organization but
fail to provide citizens with a useful wedge into edu-
cational policy making. In this sense, PTA participation
is not involvement in a democratic political process
structured to win changes in the urban educational process;
the PTA is an example of an administratively controlled
citizen-participation process."[20]

Beyond what they fail to do, manipulative public
relations-oriented involvement mechanisms still do have an
effect. For our thing, their very existence tends either
to dilute serious participation or to preclude the for-
mation of other more effective organizations. School
communities have a finite number of parents and other
interested people who might be recruited into education-
related groups. Splitting their numbers among two or more
groups may be an effective way to deprive parents of the
influence they might otherwise have.[21]

Perhaps the most serious of the consequences
attached to the manipulative version of the public relations
model is its debilitating effect on the public. When
citizen interaction is viewed as manipulative public
relations, the educator's conception of the citizen's role
is one of simple, uncritical supportiveness. That is
communicated to the public. The response expected from
the public is a minimal one which stresses an affective
orientation more than independent judgment or constructive
criticism. For example, the annual Gallup surveys taken to
help educators understand the public concentrate more on
public attitudes toward education, than on public infor-
mation about, or involvement in education.[22] When those
attitudes were supportive, professional educators were
satisfied and nothing more was required. But now that those

attitudes are no longer so consistently supportive, it
is important to recognize the difference between attitudes
and information. The rebuilding of urban education re-
quires a public that is informed and supportive. But
the disparity of information that exists between school
people and lay people has been used to disfranchise lay
participation. A major part of the justification offered
by those administrators who regularly over-ride community
expressed needs and interests for doing so is that they,
the administrators, are experts while the community is
uninformed. However, the rule that learning is a function
of incentives applies just as surely in communities as it
does in classrooms. Where involvement has little likeli-
hood of effecting significant change, then there is
little incentive to become involved or informed. Where
only the most trivial involvement is possible (the oppor-
tunity to support a status quo with which one disagrees,
for example) there is little incentive to become better
informed. The public relations model has a minimal
expectation of the public's role--to support what pro-
fessionals decide. Professionals rationalize that
restricted role because of the public's purported lack of
information, and that expectation then becomes a self-
fulfilling prophecy. Low expectations which were originally
justified by low levels of information produce inauthentic
opportunities for involvement and they in turn are met
with indifference and unimproved levels of information on
the part of the public.

In an extensive longitudinal study of citizen
participation in educational decisions, Robert Agger and
Marshall Goldstein collected evidence that indicated that
although poor people wanted to participate in decisions,
they did not vote as frequently as others. Agger and
Goldstein believe that the explanation lies in the
significance of the opportunity offered.

> We can see that the paradox in the data lies
> not in the fact that the less educated wish to
> decide but fail to vote. Rather, they wish to
> decide but are offered only the most limited,
> last-stage means of participation through the
> vote. By the time they are called upon, the
> definitions of the issues have been made by
> others without their being consulted, and thus
> the range of choice presented to them is
> narrowed. Typically, the alternatives are
> limited to approval of the program as defined
> by others, disapproval of the program with
> little hope that a major new definition will be
> presented for their evaluation, or wrecking the
> program entirely by consistently voting against
> the budget.[23]

This cycle of low expectations, insignificant opportunities, and unsatisfactory responses has some even more insidious reinforcements. When people believe that they can have no effect, they are unlikely to participate. When they do participate, it is not received as a legitimate political act. Thus, where there are no grievances expressed, and where they are expressed but not honored, there is no consequent change. In the absence of change the citizen receives no feedback or reinforcement for participation. The result is that many legitimate grievances go unexpressed and unresolved and that, too, contributes to further alienation and further loss of support.

The pattern also retards innovation and stifles change. Concentrating on eliciting support for the existing program of the schools makes it very unlikely that the same administrators who have been "selling" that program will recognize the need to change it. Their very identification with the existing program decreases the likelihood that they will see the need to improve it. Yet, assuming that they could be persuaded, the prior stifling of interest articulation deprives officials of exactly the signals that might be used to recognize the need for change. Since citizens are so carefully constrained in the kinds of inputs they are allowed to make, they do not act as outside sources of, or incentives for change. The whole method of interacting with the public designed as it is to gather support for the status quo is profoundly conservative.

Finally, since under the public relations model the most ever expected of people is that they should maintain a supportive opinion about schools, when something more than mere opinion is required, fewer people are equipped for serious participation than might otherwise be the case. After decades of having left education to educators, it should come as no surprise that people in cities have as little experience in decision-making about educational affairs as they do. As long as all one is ever asked for is support, civic abilities atrophy and are not available in those times of crisis when they are most needed. The stormy history of community control in New York City should be viewed as a process of civic education through which an enormous conurbation is learning to govern its educational institutions. The only question is not, will people take part, but how well will they take part. Or, as Betty Levin has said, "Whatever meaningful participation by ghetto parents may mean, it clearly does not

mean membership in the PTA.* What we need are new strategies of parental involvement, and new definitions and measures of parent participation."[24]

What is at issue here is a relationship which is absolutely basic to understanding and to operating effectively with community involvement. Community involvement is successful when it is significant. The benefits to be derived are related to the opportunities offered; important opportunities will be rewarded by goal achievement. It should come as no surprise that what you get depends on what is invested. Still, most mechanisms for community involvement fall short of effectiveness on precisely these grounds: they are not opportunities for significant involvement. The U. S. Office of Education, in its recommendations to local Title I programs, notes the relationship: ". . . While all parental involvement efforts are important, informal arrangements, largely because they have no advisory or decision-making powers built in, often have uncertain impact. It was with this understanding that Title I required parent councils, a structured organized means of involving parents in all facets--from the planning to the evaluation--of programs that affect their children."[25]

Several people have criticized community involvement practices on the grounds that they offer trivial involvement. Alan Altshuler notes: "The sense of participation varies with the immediacy of linkage between activity and decision. Thus, it is not surprising that the demand which touches a profoundly responsive chord in the ghettos is for community power to decide in some areas of intense concern, not just to appear at a few more hearings."[26] In her evaluation of the community school

_____

*Again, although it is a fair generalization to say that PTAs have historically operated as booster clubs for the school's administration, it would be incorrect to believe either that there have been no significant exceptions or that PTAs will always retain that role. In fact, in the recent past, the National Congress of Parent Teachers Associations has dropped the restriction from its national charter that local action could be taken only to support the local school. In addition, the National Congress has shown some interest in regaining membership lost in the central cities to the more independent and aggressive organizations sponsored by anti-poverty agencies. Success in that effort can only come by moving away from the tenets of the public relations model as it has been described above.

boards in New York City since decentralization, Marilyn
Gittell notes: "One of the hoped-for changes under
decentralization was the involvement of parents in the
selection of school principals, but the law provided only
for meaningful consultation. That phrase has been inter-
preted differently in various districts through the
city. . . Most districts (19 of them) have given a narrow
interpretation to meaningful consultation, allowing parents
to be present at interviews but not permitting them to
question the candidates.[27] And Edgar and Jean Cahn say of
citizen participation that,"it does not mean the illusion
of involvement, the opportunity to speak without being
heard, the receipt of token benefits or the enjoyment of
stop-gap, once-every-summer palliative measures."[28]

    Community involvement is a purposeful act, it is
intended to affect what happens in programs. The best and
most direct evidence documenting the positive relation
between the amount or significance of involvement and the
successful achievement of organizational goal is an un-
published study of citizen participation in DHEW programs
performed by Technical Assistance Programs, Inc., and the
RAND Corporation. That study related the amount of
authority (or involvement) which citizen governing boards
had to the responsiveness of the programs to community
interests. For each of the cases in their sample of
programs incorporating citizen participation, the following
question was asked: "Has the organization been successful
in obtaining implementation of ideas or approaches the
participants favor that would not otherwise been put into
effect?" The results were as follows:

Table 1

AMOUNT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT MECHANISM AUTHORITY
AND RESPONSIVENESS OF PROGRAM[a]

Responses	Advisory/Limited Authority (N=23)	Governing Bodies (N=16)
Not at all, to a small degree...	48%	31%
To a significant or high degree...	52%	69%
	100%	100%

[a]Source: Robert K. Yin, William A. Lucas, Peter L.
Szanton, and James A. Spindler, "Citizen Participation in
DHEW Programs" (Washington, D.C.: TARP/RAND, #R-1196-HEW,
January, 1973), p. vii.

In another national study confirming this relationship, Brandeis University examined twenty community action agencies to determine the conditions which led to successful community representation in the governance of such programs. The Brandeis findings reinforce the general relationship between the significance of the involvement and the chances of its success. The study's general conclusion was that "the significance of target area membership on the CAA [community action agency] is increased if the CAA board itself controls a wide range of substantive decision-making."[29] More specifically, the study found:

> The significance of target area participation through membership on the CAA board is reduced by restrictions on the ability of the entire CAA board to make important decisions. Federal ear-marking of funds for particular programs, and reductions in local initiative funds have reduced the range of program choices with which the board can deal. . . . The significance of participation is also limited by a restricted definition by the CAA board of its responsibilities.[30]

These studies of trivial involvement cannot be expected to elicit a significant community response. "The more passive the board or committee and the fewer decisions it has the authority to make, the less interest citizens will have in its activities and the less basis it will have for widespread participation."[31]

This relation also affects program goal achievement. The study inquired into several other areas of community involvement goal achievement and related the amounts of that achievement to the significance of the involvement. The summary table which follows shows the "Form of Citizen Participation" column in an order of increasing scope and significance. The second column, "Devolution of Power" indicates that as the significance of involvement increases so does the amount of program control which is realized. No amount of involvement affects trust, but feelings of self-efficacy among participants do increase as the significance of the involvement increases. Finally, program effectiveness generally increases as involvement increases.[32]

Table 2

EFFECTS OF THE VARIOUS TYPES OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION[a]

| Form of Citizen Participation | Reduction of Alienation | | | | Improvement in Program Effectiveness |
| | Devolution of Power | | Efficacy | | |
		Trust	Participants	Nonparticipants	
Individual					
Volunteering	0	0	0	0	0 to 1
Paraprofessionals	0 to 1	0	0 to 2	0	0 to 2
Grievance Procedures	0	0	0 to 2	0	0 to 1
Aggregative					
Citizen Surveys	0 to 1	0	0 to 1	0	0 to 1
Citizen Evaluations	0	0	0 to 1	0	0 to 1
Advisory Committees	0 to 2	0	-3 to 2	-1 to 1	-1 to +1
Board of Limited Authority	1 to 3	0	0 to 2	0 to 1	-1 to +2
Governing Boards	2 to 4	0	0 to 2	0 to 1	-1 to +2

Key: Degrees of effect: (+) or (-) indicates whether effect is positive or negative; 0= none; 1 = very weak; 3 = moderate; 4 = high; 5 = very high.

- 14 -

The fairly straightforward proposition about community involvement--that its effectiveness rests on its significance--is crucial to moving beyond the manipulative public relations models of involvement. The implication is clear: something more must be done. This simple relation is at the heart of all of the literature dealing with the research and the practical goal achievements of community involvement. It is related to the often-cited difficulties that stand in the way of effectively mobilizing urban communities and is clearly related to those instances where that mobilization has been the most successful. In the sections dealing with the goals of community involvement, we will review that evidence. Before that, we should define the concept of shared control.

<h2 align="center">Shared Control Defined</h2>

The inadequacy of the manipulative public-relations model has been shown. If public relations does not work, what does? The evidence (which is discussed in greater detail below) indicates that when community involvement reaches the level of shared control, the the probability of its success is much greater. Shared Control is a relatively simple idea--even if operationalizing it is not. It means that the decisions which stick about what happens in the school, are made with the participation of the community. Shared control has three characteristics: (1) the regular opportunity for community participation in the determination of a range of policy matters; (2) the inclusion of all relevant points of view; and (3) the probability that the community's participation will at some meaningful level have an effect on policy. Control sharing means a partnership in decision making between communities and administrators. Wilson Riles, the California State Commissioner of Education, distinguished such a control-sharing arrangement from both weaker and stronger forms of community involvement.

> "1. As <u>participation</u> is conceived here, with its possible combination of advisory and policy-making functions, there is no guarantee that community parents and residents would really have an effective role in the governance of programs in their local schools. . .

"2. With partnership described here as a
    division of authority, there is a sharing
    of the decision-making power--either in an
    informal arrangement (e.g., a set of under-
    standings worked out with the local school
    board and administration) or a formal
    agreement (e.g., a legal contract stipula-
    ting the precise division of authority and
    responsibility). . .

"3. With control conceived here as full authority
    in fiscal, programmatic, and hiring matters,
    the community board or authority legally
    replaces the central school board. Within
    the limits of state laws and municipal
    regulations, including any other agencies
    with which it must deal (e.g., the teachers'
    union), the community can operate its
    school or sub-system making such changes as
    it deems necessary and can afford."[33]

        Control sharing is easily contrasted with the
public-relations model. The definition of the control-
sharing situation precludes a passive role for the citizen
and an autonomous role for the administrator. Communi-
cations must occur in both directions, and there is no
guarantee that the status quo will be supported.

                        Table 3

              PUBLIC RELATIONS-AS-MANIPULATION
                COMPARED TO CONTROL SHARING

	Public Relations	Shared Control
Communications	one-way	two-way
Citizens role	passive consumer	active participant
Orientation	support for status quo	situationally determined
Administrator's role	autonomous	partnership

Defining shared control as a regular opportunity for all points of view to be heard and to some extent heeded on significant educational matters immediately provokes a number of questions. First, of course, is what is the meaning of "to some extent"? Who is "the community"? How are they to be organized to share control? On which questions should they be how much involved? These are reasonable matters which are somewhat subtle, complex, and interrelated. The operational sections of this work (Sections III, IV, and V, "Who?," "What?," and "How Organized?") deal with those topics at length. At this point we have preliminarily defined shared control and distinguished it from the manipulative public-relations model. Shared control is legitimated by its purposes. Administrators should consider its adoption because of its ability to deliver goal achievement. Thus, in the next section we shall take up the goals of community achievement, and the evidence about how and to what extent those goals have been realized through community involvement.

The Goals of Community Involvement
in Education Decision Making

At the level at which it is being advocated here,
community involvement is a distinct departure from current
practice. Why should administrators change those prac-
tices? What are the goals of such involvement that could
justify extensive modifications in a relatively comfortable
pattern? Being a school principal takes years of training,
a great deal of judgment, and lots of energy. Most school
principals feel that they have little enough power to
deal with the tasks they face. Why should they diminish
their own control by sharing it with others? The most
persuasive reason would be if that sharing resulted in
the increased achievement of the school's goals. This
section presents four major goals, each one of which
can be held in common between administrators and
citizens. This common interest in the achievement of a
set of goals for community involvement can serve as a
basis or rationale for control sharing.

The concentration on mutually agreed goals is
different from the approach of others who have written
about this field. Community involvement can be pursued
for many reasons but there is likely to be strong dis-
agreement about the legitimacy or desirability of several
of those reasons. When involvement is used to coopt or
placate dissidents, it can, for example, serve the par-
tisan purposes of administrators who wish to defuse such
participation. Involvement can also be used for the
material gain of citizens, as in the "job strategy" which
Arnstein suggests was one of the principal participation
goals of OEO programs.[34] Radical critics of involvement
have suggested that it is a ruse to shift responsibility
for the failure of urban schools onto poor, central city
residents themselves, who can then be abandoned even more
completely. (But given the tenacity with which teachers'
and administrators' unions cling to current control
patterns, it seems unlikely that that criticism is very
valid.) Edmund Burke has suggested that two of the goal-
oriented strategies of involvement are to provide citi-
zens with "education - therapy" and to encourage
"behavioral change."[35] Other authors have suggested that
increasing participation is supposed, among other things,
to "relieve psychic suffering"[36] and to develop "community
cohesion."[37] Many of those goals are contradictory with
each other, many are the subject of considerable disagree-
ment, some are not very laudable as purposes for public
policy. Some of the goals suggested by some of the
authors cited are really instrumental to other purposes.

Some goals are specific to the institutiona- context or
social service being provided.

For education, a reasonably comprehensive set
of goals to be achieved through community involvement
would seem to be the following.

Table 4

GOAL SET FOR COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT
IN EDUCATION DECISION   KING

I.   Educational Achievement
II. Institutional Responsiveness
III. Support for Schooling
IV. Democratic Principle

The set is somewhat self-explanatory. It includes the
pedagogical and political purposes of community involve-
ment. Both administrators and citizens share an interest
in seeing the achievement of each goal increased. In
addition, the set includes the purposes for community
involvement which evidence shows can indeed be increased
through involvement.

The first goal listed, educational achievement,
is widely regarded as the most important. The achieve-
ment levels of urban schools are substantially below
national norms and a hope for community involvement has
been that it would increase such levels. The second goal,
that of increasing the responsiveness of urban schools
to their community clientele, is aimed at increasing the
congruence between what schools do and what their urban
clientele want them to do. The third goal is a more
general one of increasing the affective and material
support which communities give to schooling as an insti-
tution. The fourth goal expresses the norm in a
democratic society that the people who are affected by a
public institution should participate in governing that
institution.

Achievement of some of the goals is instru-
mental to some others. A more responsive school, for
example, should lead to more support for the school and
also to higher student achievement levels. Presumably,
support for the school also affects student achievement
levels and vice versa. Where there is evidence about
their interrelationships, it is discussed. But each of
the goals is an important objective in its own right and

the conditions under which community involvement leads to
increases in achievement of individual goals are them-
selves complex. Therefore, each goal is discussed
separately.

A second preliminary remark is necessary about
the nature of the evidence employed. The empirical
content relating community involvement to goal achieve-
ment varies wildly from nil through thoroughly valid and
reliable documentation. Unfortunately, there is not as
much of the latter as anyone might wish. Where good
studies disclose important facets of phenomena that are
reasonably related to an important relation, we have not
hesitated to make use of such tangential evidence. Where,
as often happens, the only "evidence" available is
anecdotal, we have considered the reliability of the
observor along with the contributions which (even) con-
jecture may make to an important topic. The procedure
strains the limits of inference but can be justified
since the guidance which it yields may be better than
nothing at all for people who cannot afford the luxury
of inaction.

GOAL I: EDUCATION ACHIEVEMENT

Student educational achievement is the reason
for the school's existence and the most widely accepted
measure of school quality. When it is absent or lagging,
it is the focus of discontent. Historically, proponents
of community involvement have argued that educational
achievement could be increased by increasing community
involvement. The goal has usually been clearly stated,
but the means have not.

Involvement can take many forms. Parents can
be encouraged to tutor their children, they can become
teacher aides and paraprofessionals in the classroom,
they can perform volunteer work, attend meetings, and/or
participate in the governance of the school. There are
several widely different sites for this involvement--
the home, the classroom the school building, the district,
etc. There are also several very different roles en-
tailed. These include involvement as a parent, as a
tutor, as a school-based pedagogical worker, as a parti-
cipant in decisions about governance (at various levels)
as a voter, and so on. The very general proposition that
increasing (undifferentiated) involvement is associated
with increases in student achievement, is true but not
helpful. It says nothing about the requirements of
particular roles and how those requirements may be met.
This essay concentrates on the involvement of the
community in decisions about educational governance at
the level of the local school building.

Thus, it can be seen that involvement may impact
pupil achievement through a parent educational stream and
through a parent (and community) political stream. This
essay concentrates on the latter. The distinction is
made by Robert Hess, Marianne Bloch, Joan Costello, Ruby
T. Knowles, and Dorothy Largay, who write:

> A compelling line of argument . . . contended
> that early experience affects subsequent
> intellectual and educational growth and
> achievement, and that children who grow up in
> homes disadvantaged by racial discrimination
> and poverty have a deficit of the experiences
> presumably essential for academic achievement
> in the public schools. . . . Therefore com-
> pensatory programs should involve parents and
> assist them in providing a more adequate
> educational environment for their young
> children. In view of our present knowledge

about early experience in ghetto and low income
homes, this view obviously is simplistic and
in some aspects false. However, it provides a
significant part of the motivation and justifi-
cation for involving parents in their chil-
dren's education . . . .

Parallel to this line of argument, but not
entirely consistent with it, was an influence
that came primarily from social and political
origins. One feature of the civil rights move-
ment was a bitter and articulate criticism of
the public schools, especially in urban areas.
Criticisms concentrated upon the lack of
relationship between the educational experiences
offered by the school and the local community's
cultural experiences and needs. The rise in
ethnic nationalism. . . combined with criticisms
of the school to create demands for community
control over educational policy and decision
making in the schools and other institutions
which serve the local community.[38]

With the important distinction between parental
and decisional involvement in mind, we may turn to the
evidence relating involvement to achievement. Carol
Lopate, Erwin Flaxman, Effie M. Bynum, and Edmund M.
Gordon's 1969 statement is a good introduction to this
area. Their review of the literature indicates that

when parents are involved in the decision-
making process of education, their children
are likely to do better in school. This
increased achievement may be due to the
lessening of distance between the goals of
the home and to the changes in teachers' atti-
tudes resulting from their greater sense of
accountability when the parents of the child
are visible in the schools. It may also be
related to the increased sense of control the
child feels over his own destiny and to a
greater sense of his own worth when he sees
his parents actively engaged in decision-
making in his school. Very important for this
achievement is the heightened community in-
tegrity and ethnic group self-esteem which can
be enhanced through parent and community
groups affecting changes in educational policy
and programs.[39]

Lopate, et al., cited some of the sources which
indicated an association between community involvement
and achievement.

Schiff (1963) reports that parent partici-
pation and cooperation in school affairs lead
to greater pupil achievement, better school
attendance and study habits, and fewer disci-
pline problems.

Brookover, et al., (1965) found that low
achieving junior high school students whose
parents had become involved in the school and
made more aware of the developmental process
of their children showed heightened self-
concept and made significant academic progress.

Rankin (1967) found differences between the
ability of mothers of high achievement and
low achievement inner-city children to discuss
school matters and initiate conferences with
school officials.

Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968) report that
children who profited from positive changes
in teachers' expectations of their ability
all had parents who had demonstrated some
interest in their child's development and who
were distinctly visible to the teachers.[40]

At what was about the high water mark for rhe-
torical support of the direct linkage between community
involvement and achievement, Maurice Berube wrote:

There is every reason to believe that community
control of city schools will enhance educational
quality. Equality of Educational Opportunity
discovered that the secret to learning lay
with student attitudes. Attitudes toward self,
of power to determine one's future, influence
academic achievement far more than factors of
class size, teacher qualifications or condition
of school plant. "Of all the variables measured
in the survey, the attitudes of student interest
in school self-concept, and sense of environ-
mental control show the greatest relation to
achievement," Coleman concluded. Furthermore,
a pupil's attitude--"the extent to which an
individual feels that he has some control over
his destiny"--was not only the most important
of the various elements studied but it "appears
to have a stronger relationship to achievement
than do all the 'school' factors together."[41]

Another very prominent defender of community
involvement, Marilyn Gittell, evaluated those aspects of

New York's Intermediate School 201 and Two Bridges experiments in local control. In defending the beneficial impact of community involvement, she wrote:

> To a certain extent, the results of these educational experiments were reflected in the standardized testing. The hard data on I.S. 201 and Two Bridges shows that the school district was able to at least keep their children on reading level and in some cases in some schools there was marked improvement. Both I.S. 201 and Two Bridges reflected a stable standardized test achievement at a time when the city declined in reading achievement primarily because of the teacher strike. Figures indicate that the two districts did not decline at a period of general decline. Moreover, some individual schools in I.S. 201 made considerable advance. One school in the I.S. 201 complex, C.S. 133, recorded a dramatic increase in reading ability, due to the successful implementation of the Gattegno method. The reading level of the entire school was raised some 26% in the short three years that Gattegno was in effect.[42]

Some recent research, reported by the Educational Policy Research Center at the Stanford Research Institute, lends additional support to the assertion that high levels of parent involvement in educational decision making are associated with higher student achievement levels.

> A recent survey of Head Start by Charles Mowry and colleagues at MIDCO, in Denver, repeated the Coleman finding that higher levels of parent involvement were associated with higher levels of achievement in children. Mowry measured the impact--on children, on the parents themselves, and on the community--of parent involvement in decision making and in learning roles. With regard to effects on the children, he and his colleagues found that children of parents highly involved with both decision making and learning had the greatest achievement, while children of parents involved in either one of the roles had better achievement scores than children of non-participating parents. However, since there is self-selection involved in participation, is is very likely that the children of parents who participated were already better achievers.[43]

The self-selection problem is only one of several difficulties of interpreting the evidence which links achievement to involvement. Those difficulties are central to the implementation of shared-control mechanisms since they affect what is done, the evaluation of its results, and the continuation of efforts in this important area. The first and most important distinction that should be made concerns the difference between a causal relation and an association. Because more middle class parents participate in more school activities than do lower class parents, and because middle class children perform at higher levels on standardized tests does not mean that the parents' participation causes the students' achievement. Increasing the involvement of lower class communities in education decisions will not, either by itself or directly, make up for the tremendous range of educational advantages which are not available to them or their children. Claims for a causal effect between involvement and achievement had more political uses than empirical foundation. Those claims were initially useful to mobilize communities but they have also led to disappointment and premature termination of many efforts at community involvement. Still, as we shall discuss below, the possibility remains that involvement can and does contribute to increased achievement. The point is that that contribution is more subtle and less substantial than was originally hoped.

A related lesson concerns the limits of reform strategies such as lay involvement. However, the linkages were to have occurred; the fact is that involvement was supposed to improve achievement. But changing the decision-making patterns of schools will not by itself dramatically alter the school's performance. A critic of community control, Diane Ravitch, has noted:

> It still remains true in New York City as elsewhere, that schools with middle-class children --whether white or black--record higher achievement scores than schools with lower-class children, no matter who controls the schools. And it is equally true that the problems of poverty--hunger, family instability, sickness, unemployment, and despair--cannot be solved by the schools alone. No amount of administrative experimentation seems to be able to change these facts.[44]

A RAND Corporation report which made an extensive survey of the question of educational achievement and its causes for the President's Commission on School Finance found that:

The current status of research in this area
can be described by the following propositions:

Proposition 1: Research has not identified a
variant of the existing system that is con-
sistently related to students' educational
outcomes.

Proposition 2: Research suggests that the
larger the school system, the less likely it
is to display innovation, responsiveness, and
adaptation and the more likely it is to depend
upon exogenous shocks to the system.

Proposition 3: Research tentatively suggests
that improvement in student outcomes, cognitive
and non-cognitive, may require sweeping changes
in the organization, structure, and conduct of
educational experience.[45]

With hindsight, it is possible to say that we
should have known better than to expect either very
dramatic, quick or widespread results from the sorts of
changes in community involvement which have usually been
instituted. The problems are too severe to yield to
only a management reform; serious attempts at improving
achievement in urban schools will require quantum jumps
in material resources. In addition, the new practices
of involvement have been in place too short a time for
their effects to be manifest. When those effects do
emerge, they may be very slight and they will certainly
be very difficult to attribute to involvement. It may
also be that the effects of involvement will not be
adequately registered by standardized tests. And finally,
it seems certain that we will not get important changes
in achievement associated with involvement until we have
moved that involvement to a level of significance such
as shared control.[46]

There are several implications which need to
be drawn from this experience. The first is that commu-
nity involvement in education remains an important
strategy for the improvement of urban education: it
should not be discarded simply because it turns out to
be as complicated and subtle as other education change
strategies. The gains may be modest and slow to arrive.
The second implication is that the resources devoted to
community involvement (time, energy, support, etc.) need
to be increased if significant gains are to be realized.
In order to improve the community involvement experience
we will need to be clear about the possible ways in
which it is related to educational achievement. The
remainder of this section describes the ways in which

involvement is thought to affect achievement and reviews the available evidence about each of those paths.

The community involvement scene is a compli- cated one which includes (A) the individual parents and community members who take part in educational decisions; (B) the community as a whole; (C) children; (D) the school. Research indicates that those groups can be combined to affect achievement in four distinct patterns. The titles indicate where the key change occurs for each pattern.

Pattern 1: Parent Self-Efficacy. Parents as citizens participate in educational decisions, become more knowledgeable and confident, and then encourage their children to higher levels of achievement.

Pattern 2: Institutional Response. Parents and other citizens participate in educational decisions; in so doing, affect the school, which becomes more respon- sive to the children who then perform better.

Pattern 3: Community Support. Parents and other citizens participate in educational decisions, be- come themselves more interested in the school, turn to the community to get more support for the school, which is then better able to help children to higher achieve- ment levels.

Pattern 4: Student Self-Efficacy. In this simple pattern, the child notices the parent's involve- ment in the school and is stimulated by that example to perform better.

These patterns are graphically represented below and then explained in more detail.

FIGURE 1: PATTERNS OF INCREASED EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT
THROUGH DECISIONAL INVOLVEMENT

DECISIONAL
INVOLVEMENT

INCREASED
EDUCATIONAL
ACHIEVEMENT

(#1)
participates in school
governance and
feels more affect-
ive

parent encourages
child

(#2)
participates in school
governance

school improves inter-
action with child

(#3)
participates in school
governance

parent works to build
support in community

other citizens
make inputs to
school

school improves
interaction
with child

(#4)
child sees parent
involvement
is encouraged to
increase performance

Pattern 1:   Parent Self-Efficacy

This pattern is both the most logical means of
stimulating achievement gains through involvement and
also the most thoroughly documented.   It begins with the
parents' involvement in school decision making.   That
involvement (A) increases the parents' knowledge about
education and also the parents' self-confidence.   Those
two changes then (B) encourage parents to pay more
attention to the education-related work of their own
children.   And that increased attention to the child
(encouragement, assistance, etc.) in turn pays off in
increased achievement by the children.   The pattern has
two steps, the evidence about the effect of parental
involvement on parents themselves is considered first,
then the evidence which relates parental changes to in-
creases in attention to the child.

Professor Robert Hess at Stanford University
has made an extensive survey of the literature bearing
on parent involvement in programs of early childhood
development.   Hess summarizes that research:

> There are indications that many Black mothers,
> and probably those of other ethnic minority
> groups, feel a sense of powerlessness regard-
> ing their ability to help their children
> achieve in school (Kamii and Radin, 1967;
> Hess, et al., 1968, Slaughter, 1970). . . .
> Feelings of "futility" in the role
> mothers play in the education of their chil-
> dren appear to be a necessary but not suffi-
> cient explanation of many Black children's
> poor achievement (Slaughter, 1968).[47]

Hess continues with this important point.   "While mater-
nal membership in community organizations and feelings
of control or power in the schools increases children's
achievement (Hess, et al., 1969), it is necessary to
examine other experiences of children that might account
for differential abilities for school achievements (e.g.,
children's self-concept and sense of efficacy).[48]   Hess's
reservation quite properly stresses the other points of
intervention which should be utilized to raise achieve-
ment.   However, for present purposes the important thing
is the relation between the sense of powerlessness and
organizational membership or involvement.   The sense of
powerlessness can be decreased through organizational
participation.   [Involvement decreases powerlessness most
when it goes beyond decisional participation to partici-
pation in teaching the parent's own children.   Hess notes:

Participation may have some impact on the de-
velopment of competence and self-esteem in the
parents involved (Miller, 1968; Scheinfeld,
1969; Hadger, 1970). It can be noted that
these programs actively engage and involve
parents in teaching their own children while
emphasizing respect for their potential worth
as individuals and confidence in this potential
for continuous development."[49]

Participation also leads to increases in knowledge
about the schools. Gittell's evaluation of community
school board in New York City ". . . indicated that the
knowledge, perceptions and attitudes of board members
were developed in the new citizen boards. All the board
members showed increased knowledge as a result of their
participation and became more articulate about their
views." She continues: "The net effect of [the] develop-
ing sense of community in at least two of the demonstra-
tion districts was to reduce the amount of alienation of
parents towards the schools and to make them more aware
of educational policy.[50] The result is not surprising
since participation is an excellent teaching device, but
the absence of parent-learning opportunities is seldom
remarked. Carl Marburger has made the point that,
"Parents who are not involved, who do not know what is
taking place in the school, can certainly not reinforce
what the school is doing with their children."[51]

An additional piece of evidence indicating the
extent to which decisional involvement contributes to
the personal development of participants comes from the
Yin, et al., TARP/RAND study of citizen participation in
the governance of local social-welfare programs sponsored
by DHEW. That study inquired into the extent to which
leadership skills had been developed by citizens as a
result of their service on the board. The study indicated
that not only did significant numbers of people develop
those leadership skills as a result of their service,
but also that more leadership skills were developed where
the responsibility of the board was the greatest.[52]

The sense of political efficacy measures the
confidence which an individual feels that government
will be responsive to his or her inputs. People who feel
that their actions will be responded to are more likely
to take part in government activities than those who do
not. In addition, the act of participating itself en-
courages people to feel more efficacious. There is a
circular relationship here between efficacy and partici-
pation and it works to decelerate involvement as well
as to accelerate it. Lester Milbrath, in his summary of
political scientist Robert Dahl's work on this relation-
ship, says "Dahl has hypothesized that participation in

politics and feelings of efficacy feed on each other, producing a circularity of effects . . . . Failure to participate contributes to . . . [a] sense of political impotence and [the] lack of sense of efficacy increases the probability that they will not participate."[53]

Milbrath's work is a useful summary of the literature about participation in political affairs generally. Carole Pateman has made a similarly comprehensive review of the literature on worker's participation in decision making at their place of employment.[54] Pateman's findings, which parallel those from the more general political field, are particularly relevant for the most actively engaged participants, those for whom involvement in the school either is or approximates full-time employment. Pateman's review concludes that:

> . . . participation was cumulative in effect; the more areas in which an individual participated the higher his score on the political efficacy scale was likely to be. . . . It is the lower SES group that in the general run of things have the least opportunities for participation, particularly in the workplace. It is almost part of the definition of a low status occupation that the individual has little scope for the exercise of initiative or control over his job and working conditions, plays no part in decision making in the enterprise and is told what to do by his organizational superiors. This situation would lead to feelings of ineffectiveness that would be reinforced by lack of opportunities to participate, that would lead to feelings of ineffectiveness . . . and so on. . . . Evidence has now been presented to support the argument of the theory of participatory democracy that participation in non-government authority structures is necessary to foster and develop the psychological qualities (the sense of political efficacy) required for participation at the national level.[55]

Thus, there is an established relation between feelings of personal efficacy and participation in decision making both in general political life and also in organizations. It would be more comforting if there were direct empirical evidence on the proposition that increases in participation in educational decision making led to increased personal efficacy (and through it, to student achievement), but the problems of conducting

research on the direction of influence are severe.
In the meantime, available evidence lends enough support
to the idea of increasing efficacy through participation
to warrant its further exploration in educational
settings.

The sense of political efficacy is an important
thing in its own right and also deserves to be cultivated
for its contribution to other values (see Goal IV,
"Democratic Principle," below). However, in the
achievement context, the sense of efficacy is important
because of its bearing on the parent's interaction with
the child. It hardly needs to be said that parenthood
is an important responsibility that most people approach
with caution. If, in addition to ordinary care, some
parents feel powerless to help their children in school,
or feel that such help would be futile, then ways to
ameliorate that situation should be explored. Parents
who build decisional skills by participating in school
policy determination should also be more inclined to work
with their own children. The knowledge gained about
education as a process, as well as specific information
about what the local school is doing with children should
enhance parents' ability to work with their own children
(evidence on this proposition is cited below). Thus, it
does not seem unrealistic to expect some spillover from
political to parental efficacy.

Parents' involvement with their own children has
a clearly beneficial impact on achievement. David Cohen
writes:

> There is abundant evidence that parents who
> are involved in a direct way in their
> children's education tend to have children
> who achieve at higher levels. Involvement
> of this sort includes reading to children,
> taking them to libraries, talking to them,
> explaining things, and otherwise providing
> lots of cognitive stimulation and support
> for intellectual accomplishment. [57]

Adelaide Jablonsky reports that compensatory
programs in "schools which have open doors to parents
and community members have greater success in educating
children... The children seem to be the direct beneficiaries
of the change in perception on the part of their parents."[58]

Joe L. Rempson states that,

> "School-parent programs can help to increase
> the school achievement of the disadvantaged
> child. Both Schiff ... and Duncan ... dis-
> covered that children of low SES parents
> who participated in programs of planned
> contacts made significantly greater achieve-
> ment gains in reading and in new mathematics,
> respectively, than comparably matched children
> of no- or few contact parents."[59]

Richard A. Cloward and James A. Jones suggest that "efforts
to involve lower-class people in educational matters are
quite likely to be rewarded by increased interests in the
academic achievement of the children."[60]

The evidence indicating that children of parents
who are actively involved in their education perform
better than do other children hardly needs emphasis. The
The point here is that successful involvement in school
decision making can provide parents with the confidence
and the knowledge to support a more active role at the
more immediate family level.

Pattern 2: Institutional Responsiveness

The second pattern is one which begins with
parent participation in school decision making. As a result
of that participation, the school becomes more responsive
to its clientele, the students perceive it as a more
relevant, less threatening, more supportive institution,
and their achievement improves. This path to enhanced
achievement is essentially one of institutional
responsiveness. The research which links increased
involvement to increased responsiveness on the part of the
schools is fairly extensive and fairly well founded. Since
institutional responsiveness is, by itself, one of the
goals of community involvement, we will defer examining
evidence about how and to what extent involvement conduces
to improved achievement. (See Goal II, "Institutional
Responsiveness," p.   ). The following quote from
Reconnection for Learning (The Report of the Mayor's
Advisory Panel on Decentralization of the New York City
Schools) illustrates the mechanisms which are believed to
link involvement to responsiveness to achievement.

> There is an intimate relation between the
> community climate and the ability of
> public education to function effectively.

Within the environment, parents and neighbors
shape the child's attitude. If peers and
family regard the school as an alien,
unresponsive, or ineffective institution in
their midst, the child will enter school in
a mood of distrust, apprehension, or
hostility. If on the other hand, the
community regards the school as an agency in
which they have an investment, with which they
can identify, which acknowledges a
responsbility for pupil achievement---in
short as their own---children will enter
school with positive expectations.[61]

Pattern 3: Community Support

In the first two patterns, educational achievement
was effected through the actions of participants on the
schools. In this pattern the focus of the participants'
action is not the schools but rather other citizens.
Participation in the school's affairs arms the participants
with more information about the school and its needs and
more motivation to work to improve them. Information and
motivation become resources to be employed with other
citizens, who although they do not participate directly,
are nonetheless more supportive of the schools. That
support enables the school to do a better job of educating
students.

The Coleman Report, Equality of Educational
Opportunity, included a sample of 684 urban elementary
schools. Coleman's researchers asked the principals of
those schools to indicate the proportion of parents who
ordinarily attended PTA meetings. PTAs are, as Yin, et al.,
remark "Weak organizational forms of participation"[62]
which are better indicators of general citizen support than
of active involvement. Coleman found that there was a
significant relationship between the amount of community
participation in the PTA and the achievement of the school's
students. Where PTA attendance was reported as being high,
children's performance was two to four months ahead of
those schools which had no PTA. Christopher Jencks
reanalyzed the Coleman data in order to discover whether
or not race and social class might explain the relationship
between PTA attendance and achievement.

PTA attendance was ... significantly related
to achievement. Race and class explained
about 15 percent of the variance in schools'

PTA attendance. But even after this was taken
into account, schools whose principals
reported that almost all parents attended
PTA meetings scored between two and four
months above schools whose principals reported
not naving a PTA. Schools with more moderate
PTA attendance were strung out between. PTA
attendance seems to be a proxy for district-
wide parental interest in education. Variations
in PTA attendance within a given district
were not associated with variations in
achievement within that district. Differences
between districts accounted for the overall
relationship. The relationship of PTA
attendance to student achievement did not
change much when other school characteristics
were controlled. Thus if the PTA was having
an effect on achievement, it was an indirect
effect on the attitudes of the district staff,
or other unmeasured factors, not a direct
effect on measurable characteristics of the
district. The relationship did hold for
reading or math scores.[63]

The community support pattern is one in which
involvement of some people leads them to encourage others
to support the schools and that general support then
translates into a more effective school with higher
achievement. The evidence cited bears on only part of that
pattern: The existence of involvement mechanisms and the
amount of support in the community for the school are
related to higher achievement levels. Whether or not those
people who are actively involved in the schools then recruit
others to support the schools is not something about which
there is yet data. However, a long line of research in
social psychology suggests that that is exactly what is at
work (See the discussion of Goal III, Support below).

Pattern 4: Student Self-Efficacy

In some ways, this is the simplest and most
direct of the patterns. It suggests that the children observe
their parents taking part in school decision making and
are therefore encouraged to think more highly of themselves
as students. In one of its publications, the US Office
of Education made the case succinctly for this pattern.
"There is a subsidiary asset of parental involvement. As
children see their own parents more involved in school
affairs, they will be encouraged to take a more active
interest in school."[64] The phenomenon is akin to the sense

of self-efficacy discussed with respect to adults in the first pattern. The logic underlying this pattern is apparent: without motivation, very little is done. If you believe that there is no way to suceed, you are unlikely to try. If you think that "the system" is against you, that "you can't beat City Hall," etc., you will never expand the energy which might have been rewarded. Thus, a sense of self-efficacy is almost a necessary precondition to success.

Coleman measured three attitudes of students toward themselves: (1) "Student's interest in school," (2) "self-concept specifically with regard to learning, and success in school," and (3) "sense of control of the environment."[65]

Coleman's analysis demonstrated that, "Of all the variables measured in the survey, including all measures of family background and all school variables, these attitudes showed the strongest relation to achievement, at all three grade levels"[66] /Grades 6, 9 and 12/. Coleman's data indicate how important it is that students believe in themselves and in their ability to achieve. It is clear that parents can affect the child's attitudes toward school and toward their prospects of success in the school. Parents who have themselves had successful experiences of involvement are more likely to be supportive of the school. In the first pattern discussed, Parent Self-Efficacy, that supportiveness encourages parents to take direct and purposeful action with their children. This pattern, Student Self-Efficacy, does not involve purposeful communication from parent to child; rather the parent's actions are an example which the child notices.

The key attitude, here, may be what Coleman called "The sense of control of the environment." For educational achievement that environment is the school itself, its administrators, teachers, procedures, roles, etc. Students who perceive that their parents are successful in interacting with that environment are more likely to believe that they, too, can successfully negotiate it. In addition, they are also more likely to perceive that environment as one that is supportive of them.

Mario Fantini has suggested that there is an analogy here between community involvement in urban schools and the control of Catholic schools. Andrew Greely and Peter Rossi speculated that students in Catholic schools performed well academically at least in part because of the sense of security generated by those schools. Similarly, Fantini says "Under community-directed schools,

the educational environment is far less likely to be
hostile or intimidating to the minority child. He will
thus have a sense of being able to function in the school
environment and, in turn, a greater sense of internal
control - the prime prerequisite to effective learning,
according to a growing body of educational evidence as well
as psychological insight."[67]

Paul Lauter and Florence Howe express a similar
conclusion:

> One often forgotten correlation of the Coleman
> Report suggests that students do better when
> they sense that the school is relevant and
> responsive to them; that it is in some sense
> theirs; that, in short, they have power in it -
> even if they will, Black Power. There is a
> lesson to be learned from that correlation, a
> lesson proved every day by the banality and
> intellectual brutality of suburban education:
> Only so long as schools honestly serve the
> interests of the students can they succeed.
> Whether schools are responsive to boards,
> administrators, teachers, or parents will not
> finally ensure that they are responsive to
> children.[68]

The Coleman findings linking the generalized
concept "Sense of fate control" to educational achievement
have been criticized by some. Judith Kleinfeld in an
article "'Sense of Fate Control' and Community Control of
the Schools"[69] has questioned Coleman's findings on three
grounds. First, fate control as it was measured by
Coleman is not the same as the meaning of the term used in
the political debate about community control. Second,
because of measurement problems, Coleman's findings with
regard to student achievement have more to do with the
respondents' estimate of their own ability to succeed
academically than with whether the students feel that their
academic achievement is controlled by forces internal or
external to them. And, third, from Kleinfield's own
research she argues that the self-estimate of academic
ability is more closely related to academic achievement
than the estimate of internal/external control. On the
first point, Kleinfeld points out that "fate control" in
the context of community control has overtones of racial
self-determination and aspects of racial and ethnic
pride and self-esteem. Coleman's measure of fate control
did not refer to the community's self determination but

rather to whether or not the student felt his or her
own academic achievement was controlled by others or by
self. Kleinfeld then attacks the validity of Coleman's
fate control idea by demonstrating its ambiguity and by
suggesting that the items on which it was based are
susceptive to measurement errors of various sorts.
Kleinfeld's own research (with 166 Black eleventh and
twelfth grade students in Washington, D.C. public schools)
shows that those students who believe their fates to be
externally controlled do not achieve less in school than
those who feel themselves to be in more personal control.
Second, Kleinfeld's factor analysis of the Coleman data
indicates that student attitudes toward academic
achievement and not student attitudes toward fate control
are related to their measured achievement levels. The
question then becomes whether or not increases in control
by the community (or more specifically, decisional
involvement by parents) can increase students' sense of
their own fate control and from that enhanced sense,
then also increase their estimate of their own academic
ability. Kleinfeld is pessimistic. "...It is hard to see
how redistributing power from external forces to the
black community would affect black students' estimates of
their academic ability."[70] However, just two pages before
that statement, Kleinfeld notes, "Community control of
the schools might well increase black students' self-esteem
and racial pride, and this increased sense of self-worth
may increase achievement..."[71] A more encouraging
conclusion than the one reached by Kleinfeld would turn
around such factors as the availability of role models,
and an identification (and cooperation) with officials
presumed to be less discriminatory and more sympathetic.

In a more intensive look at fate control, Marcia
Guttentag administered the Coleman instrument to Black
fifth graders in New York's Intermediate School 201 where
community involvement has been intense, prolonged, and
visible. Coleman had found that poor children and those
who attended ghetto schools had a low estimate of the
prospects for their own success. Moreover, they believed
(perhaps realistically) that people were against them
and that good luck would play a major role in determining
their success or failure. Guttentag indicates that,

> Perhaps the most striking finding in this
> fifth grade group is the percentages of yes
> (19%) and no (79%) to the first question:
> "Everytime I try to get ahead something or
> somebody stops me." Typically, ghetto

children overwhelmingly answer "yes" to this
question. These I.S. 201 fifth graders had
answered overwhelmingly "no." Particularly
the boys feel that they are not being stopped
in their attempt to get ahead. Answers to
this attitude item are directly related to later
academic achievement. This data is markedly
different from the Coleman finding...It
seems reasonable to suppose that the new
atmosphere induced by community control of
schools was related to this dramatic
difference in attitude. It should also
be noted that this was one item which
explained much of the variance in later
achievement test scores for black children
in the Coleman report. This difference in
attitude is therefore likely to be related
to later changes in achievement.[72]

The earlier discussions about reforming urban
education through increased involvement have held that
that involvement would simply, rather directly, and rather
dramatically, increase achievement levels. While there
is reason to believe that pupil achievement can be affected
by parental (and other) involvement, the relationship is
more subtle and the paths linking the two are more
tortuous than was originally suspected. Evidence about
the second route, institutional responsivenes is also
fairly well developed and is discussed in detail in the
next section. The third pattern, community support, still
lacks a demonstrated link between the participation of
individual and subsequent proselytizing of the school's
cause among the individual's peers. Although the proposition
that involvement leads to support among those so involved
is very well documented (See Goal III, "Support") it has
yet to be demonstrated that the school's supporters do what
we may reasonbly expect them to do--i.e., recruit other
supporters.

A similar problem afflicts the student self-
efficacy pattern. It seems clear that self-efficacy is
associated with achievement, and it seems reasonable to
believe that parental self-efficacy (generated through
decisional involvement) can generalize to the children
of the involved parents, yet evidence documenting that latter
linkage is not yet conclusive.

Thus, the state of our research-based knowledge
concerning the individual patterns through which decisional
involvement leads to increased achievement must be described
as promising but uneven. If, for any given relationship

it appears that the linkage has been definitively
established, then the cumulation of all four patterns
would be even more encouraging. In reality, of course,
the influence attempts from involvement to achievement
occur in precisely that cumulative and simultaneous
fashion.

GOAL II: INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIVENESS

Schools are public institutions with complex
tasks to perform. Part of their ability to foster
educational achievement and part of their ability to gain
community support rests on the responsiveness of
the school to the needs and interests of the community.
However, because of the complexity of educational programs,
and because of certain unavoidable features of reality
such as bureaucratic inertia, it is difficult for schools
to respond to community demands---expecially when those
demands come from new groups, when the changes involved
are substantial, or when professional educators do not
agree with what is being requested. In those cases, the
impetus for responsiveness must often be supplied from
outside the educational system. (Recall the proposition
put forward by Averch et al., "Research suggests that the
larger the school system, the less likely it is to display
innovation, responsiveness, and adaptation and the more
likely it is to depend upon exogenous shocks to the
system.")[73] One goal of community involvement is to insure
the responsiveness of their schools by supplying such shocks.

The importance of achieving the goal of
institutional responsiveness is probably inversely pro-
portional to the quality of education being provided by a
school. Where the community has reason to be satisfied,
responsiveness may be less important as a goal than where
the school is not performing well. In a study conducted
in the Boston public schools Jeffrey Raffel found that,
"...a majority of those in the sample $/\bar{n} = 397/$ see
difficulties with their ability to influence the system,
the system's response to their preferences, and the
system's ability to do the right thing without the input of
people like themselves. Whatever the cause, there is
widespread cognition that the schools are unresponsive and
thus don't do 'what is right.'"[74] To the extent that urban
schools are failing, they need to become much more responsive
to the community they serve.

Responsiveness, of course, requires that the
community present its demands and interests. The content
of what is learned, the process through which it is taught,
the identities of the people who do the teaching, and
other similar factors are often of considerable interest
to neighborhoods. As the neighborhood presence grows in
terms of numbers, time, and scope of involvement, the
likelihood increases that demands will be presented and
their resolution pursued in ways that ensure greater
congruity between school and community. That process

-41-

works in both directions. The more professionals and lay
people interact, the more opportunities professionals
have to persuade lay people of the wisdom of professionally
recommended policy. In the first instance, the school
changes in response to the citizens; in the second, the
citizens' own goals come to coincide with those of the
institution. Both processes are part of responsiveness
and both fall within the definition of shared control.

This relation between what the community wants
the school to do and what schools in fact do is a complicated
one that deserves careful attention. What if, for example,
the community wants something which is not in its best
interest? What if it advocates the use of inefficient or
ineffective methods? What place does institutional
responsiveness leave for leadership by professionals?
These are important questions which have no definitive
answers. They will be considered after we have presented
the evidence about the relation between involvement and
institutional responsiveness.

The evidence which most clearly relates increases
in community involvement to increases in the responsiveness
of social welfare institutions (including schools) is
the report for the Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare prepared by RAND/TARP. In that study of
citizen participation on the governance of local programs,
Yin et al., reported that only about half of the involvement
mechanisms which had only "advisory" or limited authority
over their programs suceeded in getting agency
implementation of new ideas. Yet 69% of those boards
with "governing" authority got their agencies to accept
new ideas.[75] Thus, as the involvement of the community
increases, so does the responsiveness of the institution.

The most easily visible proxy for responsiveness
is innovation. (Schools are also being responsive where
communities do not want change, and schools accommodate
that desire. But there is considerable evidence on the
discontent, especially in the big cities, with school
performance, so the cases of a status quo school being
responsive to a status quo community are probably much
less frequent than administrators would have people believe.)
Marilyn Gittell and T. Edward Hollander conducted a
study of the propensity to innovate in six large cities
around the United States. They argued that because of the
changing socio-economic characteristics of the school
populations of big cities, the ability of those cities'
school systems to adapt themselves to new demands was
their single most important characteristic. They found that,

"...The most direct and clear cut cause and effect
relationship with innovation appears to be public
participation."[76] Gittell and Hollander studied the
effect of (1) administrative organization, (2) citizen
participation, and (3) the allocation of financial
resources on the propensity to innovate.

> Of the three functions, the most direct
> and clear cut cause and effect relationship
> with innovation appears to be public
> participation. The only apparent difference
> in any of the several conditions or functions
> among the cities was in that area. The
> Detroit school system is a more open
> participatory system encouraging wider
> public participation than any of the other
> systems. More alternative choices are
> presented for policy-making because of the
> proliferation of influence wielders and
> reactors and supportors. This circumstance
> can explain the greater flexibility and
> innovativeness of the Detroit school system.
> Similarly, the process of change and reform
> in Philadelphia further supports the
> relevance of broader public participation
> to change in the school system.[77]

The Gittell and Hollander study looked at
district wide responsiveness. In a 1970 study of 168
school administrators, Mann found responsiveness on the
part of individual administrators to be clearly related to
the degree of organization present in the community to ac-
commodate community involvement. In communities and
neighborhoods without any education-related interest groups,
87 per cent of the school administrators were quite willing
to substitute their own preferences for those of the
community. Where PTAs existed, 69 per cent of the
administrators were somewhat less willing to act in that
fashion; and where in addition to the PTA there were
independent interest groups working on educational problems
(e.g., community action agencies), 55 per cent of the
administrators were willing to attempt to override the
expressed preferences of the public.[78] Thus, the number
and kind of organization present in a community affects
the responsiveness of local school administrators.

A related finding appears in James Vanecko's
study of community action programs in one-hundred cities.
In those cities where the programs stressed the provision

of services to clientele there was very little change
in the service-providing institutions themselves. In
those programs that emphasized community organization and
citizen mobilization, the institutions themselves changed
and became more responsive. Vanecko found that the simple
presence of a school-related community organization was
often all that was necessary to provoke change in the
schools. "Schools are less susceptible to the threat of
militant activity and the pressures of citizens. /Compared
to other kinds of social welfare organizations, DM/ (t)hey
are most likely to change simply because the neighborhood
is organized."[79]

    It is hardly surprising that community organization
should be associated with institutional responsiveness since
most people participate in educational matters exactly
because they would like to have some impact on what the
schools do. Given the need for change in the schools
which many urban citizens feel, and given the fact that
they bring new perceptions, new biases, new attitudes to
the school, some response of the part of the school is a
logical outcome. Gittell notes the eagerness that newly
elected community school board members brought to their
responsibilities in New York. "There is no question but
that boards and their professional staffs in the districts
sought new methods which would produce immediate results."[80]

    But thorny questions remain. Is the school,
for example, to attempt to respond to every demand?
Clearly, it cannot do that. It is inevitable that over
time, only some parts of some groups' interests will be
met. But then who is to determine which groups interests
get how much accommodate how soon? Who makes those decisions?
That is exactly the purpose of the shared-control mechanism
described in the handbook. Its job, along with the
administrator's, is to make those decisions. That shared
responsibility leaves room for leadership (or persuasion,
or influence, or whatever) on the part both of the school's
professionals and the community. What if there is
disagreement? Conflict is to be expected within shared
control and it is such an important topic that the entire
third part of this essay is devoted to it. The ability to
channel conflict for constructive purposes, and to resolve
it fairly is a measure of the skill with which the
involvement mechanism has been created.

GOAL III: SUPPORT FOR SCHOOLING

There is a lot of rhetoric about the drastic plight of urban schools and the culpability of adminis- trators for that condition. Those indictments help to call attention to needed reforms, they mobilize commu- nities, and they sensitize administrators. They serve useful puposes even if they are overdrawn. The fact is that no single group bears total responsibility for what hasn't been done in urban education and no single solution will deliver the needed changes. One unfortu- nate consequence of pointing with alarm at school administrators is that positions become polarized. Both the school's friends and its detractors demand total loyalty to their cause and therefore infer that their opponents are completely wrong. But if professional educators are believed to have bad intentions and the failures at urban education are their fault, then it is only an easy step to believing that the schools run by those administrators do not deserve the support of the community. Thus, if left unchecked, the momentum built up in an attempt to mobilize people's concern for the schools can damage the very institution it should be helping. Two questions arise: Is increasing support for the schools a goal which can be shared by communities and administrators; and, can support be increased by increasing community involvement.

The availability of alternative schools (free- dom schools, schools-without-walls, etc.) has sometimes prompted people to believe that the current system may be abandoned with impunity. That is not, however, the case. Alternative schools accommodate the educational needs of only a very small fraction of the urban population. Their costs, especially when combined with school taxes which parents continue to pay, place them out of reach of many of the people who could profit most by education. In addition, the physical plant of the urban schools--although often dilapidated--still repre- sents an enormous sunk cost. There is little reason to believe that it could be replaced very easily or that governments would be willing to cover the salary and expense cost for alternative schools on a very com- prehensive basis. Thus, like it or not, the public school system in some configuration is the reality within which most efforts at improvement must be made.

The key phrase here is "in some configuration." Supporting the schools as an institution does not mean supporting every feature or consequence of the status quo. Nor does it mean that support cannot be conditional

on important changes. What support for the institution
of schooling means as a goal for community involvement
is that the local school is an object worthy of assist-
ance, cooperation, and reinforcement. Both communities
and administrators share an interest in seeing schools
become stronger, more effective places for teaching and
learning.

Can support for the school as an institution
be generated through the involvement of urban communi-
ties. The question can be answered affirmatively with
an unusual degree of confidence. Part of the confidence
stems from a famous line of research which began with
Kurt Lewin's studies of the social-psychological effect
of group participation on the attitudes of individuals.
Ronald Havelock made an extensive survey of the literature
bearing on educational innovation including that of Lewin
and his associates. In the course of that survey,
Havelock summarized the effects and causes which lead
those who have been involved in a group to be more sup-
portive of the group decision.

> . . . Group atmosphere has certain important
> effects in and of itself. Anderson and
> McGuire demonstrate the lowered resistance
> that results from peer support. The greater
> the peer support the lower the resistance,
> and therefore, the greater the susceptibility
> to influence from sources acceptable to the
> group. That sources unacceptable to the group
> lead to greater resistance under peer support
> has also been demonstrated. . . Thus, parti-
> cipation with others in decision-making groups
> usually leads to a commitment to the group's
> actions. This kind of reaction can be
> described as a form of indirect interpersonal
> influence; i.e., those group pressures which
> affect an individual's adoption or rejection
> of new knowledge as a result of his exposure
> to events for reasons other than those related
> to the innovation or new knowledge being
> disseminated.[81]

Havelock also discusses Edith Bennett Pelz's
validation of Lewin's early studies on the efficacy of
group participation as a way of influencing individual
behavior. Havelock notes that the two factors most
closely related to an individual's acceptance of a new
behavior were "(1) the perceived consensus among their
peers and (2) the fact that they had made a decision."[82]

For the individual, the act of involvement
requires the expenditure of some minimum amount of

resources. Investing personal resources--time, con-
centration, emotional involvement--nas the effect of
increasing one's commitment to the group or entity being
participated in, regardless of the outcome of any parti-
cular decision, simply because most people are loath to
invest resources without receiving some benefits in
return. If they do make the effort to participate, yet
nothing happens, then their effort was wasted. Because
of a reluctance to acknowledge the waste of their re-
sources, people tend to identify with the group or
institution that has elicited their participation; they
tend to value it more highly than they might otherwise
have done (after all, it was good enough to have made
use of them); and they tend to view most of its sub-
sequent outcomes in a biased fashion. There is a ten-
dency to re-interpret unfavorable decisions as favorable
or at least neutral ones rather than have to face the
unpleasant outcomes of their own involvement. In addi-
tion to these effects, once the involvement is under
way, other people identify the involved person with the
institution. They call on the involved person to ex-
plain or justify institutional actions, and that
identification and its concomitants increase the felt
commitment. Participation in an institution familiarizes
one with that institution. Simply by virtue of the act
of participation, the individual has become more accessible
and also more amenable than individuals who do not
participate. Involvement in the school exposes the
community person to a group of professionals and other
community members, all of whom are much more likely to
support the institution than are people who are uninvolved.
Where poor school/community relations are a product of a
lack of knowledge and familiarity, broadening the base
of community participation in institutional decisions
may decrease hostility and increase support. By participating,
the individual has changed his or her relation to the
school. Thus, at a personal psychological level, the
involvement of individuals may aggregate to community
support.[83] Perhaps the clearest example of these effects
in urban education has been the experience of community-
based paraprofessionals, many of whom have moderated
their criticism of the schools precisely because of the
effects just discussed.

Frederick C. Mosher has summarized these effects:

> Participation in decision-making within a
> group or larger organization increases one's
> identification and involvement with the group
> and the organization; it also identifies him
> affectively with the decision itself and
> motivates him to change his behavior and to
> make the decision successful; it contributes

to his motivation toward the accomplishment
of organizational or group goals - i.e., it
helps fuse group and organizational goals
with individual goals; it contributes to
morale in general, and this usually
contributes to more effective performance
on the job--i.e. higher productivity; a
primary factor affecting "participativeness"
is leadership style; participative practices
contribute to the "self-actualization" of
the individual in the work situation and to
the lessening of the differentials in power
and status in a hierarchy.[84]

There is also evidence on the proposition that
involvement leads to supportiveness in the education
literature. Cloward and Jones found that participation in
school affairs - even at the level of attending PTA
meetings - resulted in a 15% increase in supportiveness
for education among lower class respondents. (63 per cent
of those who did not attend felt that more than a high
school education was necessary to success while 78 per
cent of those who did attend PTAs thought more education
a necessity.[85]) Andrews and Noack in their paper on
"The Satisfaction of Parents with Their Community Schools"
cite, in addition to the Cloward and Jones study, the
work of Hess and Shipman, and of Rankin as confirming
that, "The participation of parents in various facets
of the school's operation was found to improve the
parent's attitude. . . .[86]

Gittell's evaluation of the Ocean Hill-
Brownsville experience also indicated that the amount of
support by that community for its schools increased during
the first years of the community control experiment
despite the disruption which marked much of that period.
In two surveys taken a year apart, support for building
principals jumped from 40 per cent to 75 per cent, support
for the community superintendent doubled from 29 per cent
to 58 per cent, and support for the community school board
itself increased from 31 per cent to 57 per cent. Even
the central Board of Education shared in these more
supportive attitudes, going from 24 per cent approval to
a 50 per cent rating in a year. " . . . When asked to
evaluate the schools in the district in comparison to the
way they were before the creation of the Ocean Hill-
Brownsville district, 72 per cent rated the schools better
or about the same while only 17 per cent thought that
they were worse and 10 per cent were not sure."[87]
Gittell's findings lend support to an earlier speculation
by Lyke: "It is likely that community control of the

schools will very quickly change the character of
political interaction in ghetto communities. Citizens
will no longer trace all problems in the schools to a
repressive white society, hostility and tensions are likely
to diminish as reforms are made, and future debate over
education policy will be less likely to be as ideological
as it currently is."[88]

The participation hypothesis holds that as the
involvement of the community increases so does its
supportiveness. There is sufficient evidence about the
general relationship so that it can be accepted with some
confidence. In a moment we will turn to the evidence
about relations between involvement and support for specific
aspects of the schools such as personnel, program and
finance. Before reviewing that evidence, however, we need
to consider an exception to the general relationship
between increased involvement and increased support.

Two studies have found that as involvement
increases, so does the tendency to be critical of the
schools. Working with a national sample of 2,000 parents,
Kent Jennings found that those parents who were PTA
members had fewer grievances against the school than did
parents who, in addition to being PTA members, also belonged
to other education-related groups.[89] Interestingly
enough, PTA members, too, had grievances although fewer of
them. For all groups, once a grievance had been expressed
and pursued, there was a tendency to have another.

The second study was that of Cloward and Jones,
("Social Class: Educational Attitudes and Participation")
which has been cited before. The study was conducted in
the early 1960's with about a thousand residents of
New York's Lower East Side. The authors found that the more
a person was exposed to the schools, the more likely it
was that that person would define education as either the
first or second greatest problem in the community. (Middle
class respondents were more likely to lower their
appraisals of the school as a result of exposure to it than
were working or lower class people.) Cloward and Jones
interpreted this finding as follows:

These results would tend to suggest that
school administrators must be prepared to
deal with more negative attitudes toward the
school if greater efforts are made to involve
people in school activities. Such
involvement, . . . is functional for
attitudes toward the importance of education
generally; but as attitudes toward education

-49-

improve the school as an institute is more
likely to come under attack. Skillfully
managed,hower, these negative attitudes
can become a source of pressure for
better educational facilities and programs.[90]

That complaints increase as involvement increases
will have the clearing of truth for many school principals.
However an important distinction needs to be made in both
cases. Neither Jennings' "grievances" nor Cloward and
Jones' "negative appraisals or "problem" finding are
necessarily related to support. An individual may believe
that cancer is an enormous problem, and may be very
critical about research to discover its cure, yet still
support the program. That an individual thinks of the
local school as the most significant problem in the community
can simply mean that that person thinks effort at
educational improvement should have the highest priority.
The task, as Cloward and Jones rightly point out, is to
use the criticism which occurs for constructive
purposes.

One way in which the prospects for constructive
criticism can be increased is through the institution of
a mechanism for shared control. Donald Haider points out
that, "representational devices tend to be important to
a citizen's sense of efficacy and overall support for
a political system. It is at the heart of the democratic
process and should not be minimized."[91] Similarly, two
political scientists, Norman Luttbeg and Richard Griffin
set out to see whether or not a lack of accurate
representation by education officials (including building
principals) of citizen preferences would affect the amount
of support those citizens had for the system. They
hypothesized that, "the low salience of politics for
the average man means that the lack of representation in
no way affects the level of public support for the political
system";[92] but instead they found that as misrepresentation
increased, support decreased. Although the amount of
the association was slight (about 10 per cent of the
variance in public support was explained by misrepresentation)
it was still significant.

To this point, we have discussed the evidence
which indicates that general support for the schools
may be built through increasing community involvement.
The same means can be used to generate support for specific
areas of education. In a typical finding, Bullock
reported a positive association between attendance at PTA
meetings and approval of the schools' programs. The
evidence suggests that non-approvers of the educational

-50-

program tend also to be non-attenders at PTA.[93] The
US Office of Education has also counseled administrators:
"Parental involvement offers the school administrator
a number of ways for improving public confidence. First,
it gives parents an opportunity to see firsthand the
real problems school officials face. The more knowledgeable
they are about the problems and needs of the schools,
the more likely they are to support funding to meet
those needs."[94] And, continuing on the relationship
between involvement, understanding and support for
programs, the US Civil Rights Commission in an extensive
national survey dealing with school desegregation
found " . . . a close relation between understanding the
facts and more favorable response toward desegregation.
The more people know, the less willing they are to
restrict the Constitutional rights of black children."[95]

Similar relations obtain in the area of personnel.
In the year after the community control experiment was
instituted in the Ocean Hill-Brownsville district of
New York City, Gittell found that support for the teachers
more than doubled from 38 per cent responding positively
to 77 per cent.[96] She continues:

> As compared to results in other surveys of
> ghetto neighborhoods, however, we did conclude
> that more parents were in the schools more
> frequently and felt more positively towards
> the locally selected professional staff and
> the local board. Informal visits to the
> schools were greater and knowledge of what
> was going on appeared to be more widespread.
> Certainly, parents felt school personnel
> were more responsive to them. Participant
> observations and interviews with staff
> suggested greater parent attendance and
> interest at meetings and more use of the
> schools as community facilities.[97]

The area of financial support for the schools is
crucial now and still growing in importance. The school-
community communications study conducted by Richard
Carter and others at Stanford University,

> . . . begin with the hypothesis (and implicit
> hope) that public understanding leads to support
> for public education. We found some
> evidence for this hypothesis. But we found
> it for the degree of understanding among
> informed observors in school districts, not

among the citizens as a whole. From what
we have seen of citizen participation, there
is little to suggest that we would find
support related to understanding among
citizens generally.[98]

Carter's findings indicate that understanding is indeed
related to support but understanding itself is also
related to and increased by participation in school
affairs. Thus, to retrace the chain discussed earlier,
involvement leads to increased knowledge which in
turn conduces to support, in this case willingness to
financially support the schools. The same relation is
traced in the opposite direction by George Gallup based
on his 1969 national survey of public attitudes towards
the schools:

> "1. While the American people seem reasonably
>   well informed about school activities,
>   they are ill-informed about education
>   itself.
>
> 2.   Since they have little or no basis for
>   judging the quality of education in their
>   local schools, pressures are obviously
>   absent for improving the quality.
>
>   "Thus, in the absence of more sophistication
>   and information, they can hardly be
>   expected to be stronger supporters of
>   more money."[99]

The so-called "turnout" hypothesis in school
finance election points in the same direction. School
bond issues pass more easily when voting is light than
when it is heavy. In Voters and Their Schools, Richard
Carter and John Sutthoff report that far more than a
thousand school districts over more than a decade, bond
election experience indicated that, "when the percentage
of voters is less than 30 percent, many more elections
succeed than fail; when a moderate turnout of 30 to 60
per cent of the voters occurs, more elections fail than
succeed; and when the turnout is over 60 per cent, the
chances of success and failure are equal."[100] Although
the relationship is roughly curvilinear, most school
people have concentrated on the diminished chances of
success in the portion of voter turnout from 30 to 60
per cent. The relationship exists because of the differences
in attitudes which characterize successive strata of the
electorate. In general, the stratum of frequent voters

contains a higher proportion of people favorable to
government action (requests for additional money, in this
case) than does the stratum of infrequent voters. Thus,
as voter turnout increases, it comes initially from a
stratum of voters which has a higher proportion of "anti"
attitudes. Evidence is not unanimous on this relation,[101]
but the conclusion ordinarily drawn from it is that success
can be enhanced if voting can be depressed.

There are two difficulties with this conclusion.
In the first place, it is morally objectionable for
public educators to rely on restricting the public's
franchise for the schools' success. The second objection
is a practical one. It is difficult to control voter
turnout. When issues are important and opinions are
strongly held, turnout may be heavy. Since in exactly the
most important issues that is the case, it seems much more
preferable for educators to work on the attitudes that
characterize all strata of the electorate prior to the
need for mobilizing support. A reservoir of informed
voters is a much more reliable resource in times of crisis
than people who are intermittently called upon for only
marginal participation. After one of the few longitudinal
research efforts examining school/community interaction,
Robert Agger and Marshall Goldstein concluded that there
was an ominous gap between professional educators and the
less mobilized stratum of citizens. They found an,

> . . . increasing tendency for the alienated
> to organize and be organized by what the
> dominant overstructure might term "demagogues."
> The increasingly effective leaders of the
> opposition are demagogues but not the
> pejorative sense. They are men and women who
> represent the less articulate but substantial
> numbers of people whose potentially sympathetic
> support has increasingly been wasted by an
> elite which partly does not comprehend the
> existence of an alien cultural perspective,
> partly does not care, partly does not know
> how to cope with it, and partly fears both
> personal and professional self-searching and
> the kinds of professionally prohibited
> political involvement which might then have
> to follow.[102]

What Agger and Goldstein are talking about is
the manipulative use of involvement, the practice of
asking for community inputs only at the point of crisis,
in only one direction (support), and then only for

-53-

something that has already been unilaterally determined.
Russell Isbister and G. Robert Koopman make the case
against this manipulative public relations model nicely:

> When citizen participation is looked on as a
> way to get out of a community conflict or to
> put over a bond issue, the very process is
> degraded. Emphasis should be placed on the
> essential nature of democracy -- on the basic
> right of the interested citizen. Education,
> being a matter of great public concern,
> should be planned by all members of the
> community. Without participation in educational
> planning, only the most common and traditional
> of needs may be perceived and met.[103]

GOAL IV: DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLE

One of the root norms of a democratic society
is that those people whose lives are affected by a public
institution should, in some fashion, participate in the
control of that institution. Schools affect important
aspects of the social and material well-being that their
students will enjoy. Schools are directly relevant to the
ambitions which parents have for their children, and
they are major public agencies in terms of taxes spent
and social missions performed. At the neighborhood level
these effects suggest that there should be neighborhood
participation in school decision making. In fact, this
basic democratic principle is so strong that even if
involvement could not be expected to affect educational
achievement, institutional responsiveness, and support
for schooling, it would still be justified on this
principle alone. Melvin Mogulog, whose wide practical
and academic experience with citizen participation in
social welfare makes him an exceptionally well-qualified
observer, has pointed to the democratic principle as an
intrinsic and sufficient justification for community
involvement:

> It is not that citizen participation helps
> us to get any place faster; although it may
> in fact do all the good things that have been
> claimed for it (e.g., decrease alienation,
> create a program constituency, calm would-be
> rioters, etc.). Rather we base the case for
> a broadly conceived Federal citizen
> participation policy on the argument that
> participation represents an unfulfilled
> goal in and of itself. It fits us well as
> a society. It is what the American
> experiment is all about. And perhaps in the
> process of giving aggrieved groups influence
> over their resources and communal decision
> because it is right we will increase the
> life chances for all of us.[104]

The problem is that decision about many parts
of the schooling enterprise are facilitated by expert
knowledge. That knowledge is not very widely spread
through the population. Those who possess it have
inevitably used it to control the course and outcomes of
education which they believe in. Whereas in urban
education, major parts of the community disagree with
the values and actions of the experts, it is necessary
for the community to assert, on its own behalf, its

own interests. The problem of lay involvement in areas
that are at least in part technical is a persistent one.
Almost fifty years ago, John Dewey wrote:

> No government by experts in which the masses
> do not have the chance to inform the experts
> as to their needs can be anything but an
> oligarchy managed in the interest of the
> few. And the enlightenment must proceed in
> ways which force the administrative specialists
> to take account of the needs. The world has
> suffered more from leaders and authorities
> than from the masses. The essential need, in
> other words, is the improvement of the
> methods and conditions of debate, discussion
> and persuasion. That is the problem of the
> public.[105]

A mechanism for shared control is defined as
something which provides to all relevant points of view
in the community a regular opportunity to be heard and to
have an effect on the determination of school policy
matters. At that level of authenticity, it is obvious
that shared control is consistent with the democratic
principle of involvement in school decision making.
When schools and communities institute such mechanisms, they
are ipso facto realizing the democratic principle.

NOTES

1. Bernard E. Donovan, "Guidelines for Individual Schools to Achieve Community Involvement in the Schools" (Brooklyn: Board of Education of the City of New York, September 28, 1967).

2. Abraham Bernstein, The Education of Urban Populations (New York: Random House, 1967), p. 283.

3. For a similar conclusion, see Frederick M. Wirt and Michael W. Kirst, The Political Web of American Schools (Boston: Little, Brown, 1972), p. 61.

4. Luvern L. Cunningham, ed., Governing Schools: New Approaches to Old Issues (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill, 1971), p. 176.

5. Michael Y. Nunnery and Ralph B. Kimbrough, Politics, Power, Polls, and School Elections (Berkeley: McCutchan, 1971).

6. Clifford Lee Brownell, Leo Gans, Tufie Z. Maroon, Public Relations in Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955), p. 70.

7. Richard F. Carter and John Sutthoff, Voters and Their Schools (Stanford University: Institute for Communication Research, 1960), p. 1.

8. Mario Fantini, Marilyn Gittell, and Richard Magat, Community Control and the Urban School (New York: Praeger, 1970), pp. 91-92. Italics in original.

9. Sherry R. Arnstein, "Eight Rungs on the Ladder of Citizen Participation," in Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change, ed. by Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett (New York: Praeger, 1971), p. 74.

10. Brownell, et al., Public Relations in Education.

11. Arthur B. Moehlman and James A. van Zwoll, School Public Relations (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957), p. 441. (Emphasis added.)

12. Leslie W. Kindred and Associates, How to Tell the School Story (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1960), p. 390.

13. Moehlman and van Zwoll, School Public Relations, p. 441.

14. See Robert H. Salisbury, "Schools and Politics in the Big City," Harvard Educational Review, v 37, n 3 (Summer, 1967), p. 413.

15. Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962), p. 502.

16. Board of Examiners, "Preliminary Notice: Next Examination for License as Principal of a Day Elementary School" (Brooklyn: Board of Education of the City of New York, 1970), pp. 3-4.

17. Myron Leiberman, The Future of Public Education (Chicago: Phoenix, 1960), p. 261.

18. Robert F. Lyke, "Representation and Urban School Boards," in Community Control of Schools, ed. by Henry M. Levin (Washington, DC: Brookings, 1970), p. 158.

19. U.S. Office of Education, "Parental Involvement in Title I ESEA: Why? What? How?" (Washington, DC: DHEW Publication No. OE 72-109, 1972), p. 5.

20. Joseph L. Falkson and Marc A. Grainer, "Neighbor-hood School Politics and Constituency Organizations," School Review, v 81, n 1 (November, 1972), p. 57.

21. Cf. Fantini, Gittell, and Magat, Community Control and the Urban School, p. 74.

22. Cf., George Gallup, How the Nation Views the Public Schools (Princeton: Gallup International, 1969). The surveys are sponsored by CFK Ltd. and are available from I/D/E/A Information and Services Division, Box 446, Melbourne, Florida 32901. The first survey in the series (Fall, 1969) included measures of the amount of information relevant to local schools and to the process of education itself.

23. Robert E. Agger and Marshall N. Goldstein, Who Will Rule the Schools: A Cultural Class Crisis (Belmont, California: Wadsworth, 1971), p. 146. See also William A. Gamson, "Stable Unrepresentation in American Society," American Behavioral Scientist, v 12 (Nov.-Dec., 1968), pp. 15-21, reprinted in Group Politics: A New Emphasis, ed. by Edward S. Malecki and H. R. Mahood (New York: Scribner's, 1972), pp. 60-81.

24. Alan Altshuler, <u>Community Control: The Black Demand</u> <u>for Participation in Large American Cities</u> (New York: Pegasus, 1970), p. 54n.

25. U.S. Office of Education, "Parental Involvement in Title I ESEA," p. 5.

26. Altshuler, <u>Community Control</u>, p. 126.

27. Marilyn Gittell, <u>et al.</u>, <u>School Boards and School</u> <u>Policy: An Evaluation of Decentralization in New</u> <u>York City</u> (New York: Praeger, 1973), pp. 33-39.

28. Edgar S. Cahn and Jean Camper Cahn, "Maximum Feasible Participation: A General Overview," in <u>Citizen Parti-</u> <u>cipation: Effecting Community Change</u>, ed. by Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett (New York: Praeger, 1971), p. 39.

29. Brandeis University, "Community Representation in 20 Cities," in <u>Citizen Participation</u>, ed. by Cahn and Passett, p. 212.

30. Brandeis, <u>ibid.</u>, p. 210.

31. Robert K. Yin, <u>et al.</u>, "Citizen Participation in DHEW Programs" (Washington, DC: RAND, #R-1196-HEW, January, 1973), p. 63. Joe Falkson and Marc Grainer, of Technical Assistance Research Programs, Inc. (TARP) designed the study, collected the data, and performed the initial analysis. The study is referred to as "Yin, <u>et al.</u>, 'Citizen Partici-pation,' TARP/RAND."

32. Measures of successful programs used by the TARP/RAND study were as follows:

    o Has the citizen participation organization been successful in obtaining implementation of ideas that would not have otherwise been put into effect?

    o Has participation resulted in the development of significant new political and/or manage-ment skills among individuals from the target population?

    o Has citizen participation had: (a) a unify-ing effect, (b) no effect, or (c) a fragment-ing effect on the target population?

    Yin, <u>et al.</u>, "Citizen Participation in DHEW Programs," TARP/RAND, p. 15.

33. The Urban Education Task Force Report, Wilson
    C. Riles, chairman (New York: Praeger, 1970),
    pp. 269-272, quoted in John Hughes and Anne O.
    Hughes, Equal Education: A New National
    Strategy (Bloomington: Indiana University Press,
    1972), p. 118. (Emphasis added.)

    See also Peter K. Eisinger's definition of "control
    sharing."

    A control-sharing arrangement is, for the pur-
    poses of this paper, a form of administrative
    and political organization of municipal service
    agencies in which the authority to make policy
    decisions about service levels and general
    administrative standards is shared among pro-
    fessional bureaucrats, elected officials, and
    citizen representatives of geographical neigh-
    borhoods of particular client groups. . . There
    are two principal forms of control sharing. One
    may be called decentralization, a form of
    organization designed to share control through
    the transfer of some policy-making authority
    to residents of particular neighborhood
    territories. The second may be called client
    representation, a scheme for sharing control
    by institutionalizing representation of client
    groups on bodies vested with policy-making
    powers over bureaucratic agencies.

    "Control Sharing in the City," American Behavioral
    Scientist, v 15, n 1 (Sept./October, 1971), pp. 36-
    39. Our definition goes beyond Eisinger's scope to
    include aspects of service delivery.

34. Arnstein, "Eight Rungs," in Cahn and Passett, Citizen
    Participation, p. 96.

35. Edmund M. Burke, "Citizen Participation Strategies,"
    Journal of American Institute of Planners (September,
    1968), p. 288 ff.

36. James V. Cunningham, "Citizen Participation in Public
    Affairs," Public Administration Review, v 32 (October,
    1972, Special Issue), p. 597.

37. Douglas Yates, "Neighborhood Government," Policy
    Sciences, v 3, n 2 (July, 1972), p. 213. The
    authors cited in notes 34 through 37 have each
    suggested a set of goals for community involvement.
    In general, their sets can be reconciled with that
    suggested here, except for the special instances
    cited. Most of the authors believe that the range

of goals purportedly achievable through involve-
ment is unrealistic. For yet another approach, see
Henry J. Schmandt, who suggests that, "The arguments
supportive of municipal decentralization tend to
fall into four broad categories: administrative,
psychological, sociological, and political."
"Municipal Decentralization: An Overview," <u>Public
Administration Review</u>, v 32 (October, 1972, Special
Issue), p. 576.

38. Robert Hess, <u>et al.</u>, "Parent Involvement in Early
     Childhood Education," in <u>Day Care: Resources for
     Decisions</u>, ed. by Edith Grotberg (Washington, DC:
     Office of Economic Opportunity, reprinted by the
     Day Care and Child Development Council of America,
     Inc., no date), pp. 265-266. The authors also
     distinguish among the various roles for parent
     involvement. See <u>ibid.</u>, p. 276-278.

39. Carol Lopate, <u>et al.</u>, "Some Effects of Parent and
     Community Participation on Public Education" (New
     York: ERIC Information Retrieval Center on the
     Disadvantaged, Teachers College, February, 1969),
     pp. vi-vii. ERIC ED 027 359.

40. Lopate, <u>et al.</u>, <u>ibid.</u>, pp. iv-v. (Emphasis added.)

41. Maurice Berube, "Educational Achievement and Commu-
     nity Control," <u>Community Issues</u>, v 1, n 1 (November,
     1968), p. 3. Italics in original.

42. Marilyn Gittell, <u>et al.</u>, <u>Demonstration for Social
     Change: An Experiment in Local Control</u> (New York:
     Institute for Community Studies, 1971), p. 112.

43. Marian Sherman Stearns and Susan Paterson, "Parent
     Involvement in Compensatory Education Programs:
     Definitions and Findings" (Menlo Park: Educational
     Policy Research Center, Stanford Research Institute,
     March, 1973), p. 26. As of this writing, Mowry's
     research is unavailable.

44. Diane Ravitch, "Community Control Revisited,"
     <u>Commentary</u>, v 53, n 2 (February, 1972), p. 74.

45. Harvey A. Averch, <u>et al.</u>, <u>How Effective is Schooling?
     A Critical Review and Synthesis of Research Findings</u>
     (Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, March, 1972),
     p. X. R-956-PCSF/RC.

- 61 -

46. For related points, see also Maurice R. Berube, "Educational Achievement and Community Control"; Mario Fantini, "Quality Education in Urban Schools" in Community Control of Schools, ed. by Levin, pp. 40-75; John H. Strange, "The Impact of Citizen Participation on Public Administration," Public Administration Review, v 32 (Sept., 1972, Special Issue), pp. 457-469; and especially, Wallace Roberts, "The Battle for Urban Schools," Saturday Review (November 16, 1968), pp. 97-99, 117.

47. Robert Hess, et al., "Parent Involvement in Early Education," in Day Care: Resources for Decision, ed. by Grotberg, p. 269.

48. Hess, ibid., p. 269.

49. Hess, ibid., p. 279.

50. Gittell, et al., Demonstration for Social Change, p. 32 and p. 12.

51. Carl L. Harburger, "Considerations for Educational Planning," in Education in Depressed Areas, ed. by A. Harry Passow (New York: Teachers College Press, 1963), p. 303.

52. TARP interviewers asked: "Has the community participation organization developed significant political and/or organizational skills for more than five participants who did not have those skills a year before the analysis?"

Response	Advisory/Limited Authority (N=17)	Governing (N=16)
Yes	47%	75%
No	53%	25%
	100%	100%

Yin, et al., "Citizen Participation," RAND/TARP, p. 34.

53. Lester W. Milbrath, Political Participation: How and Why do People Get Involved in Politics? (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965), p. 58. Milbrath's citation is to Robert Dahl, Who Governs? (New Haven: Yale, 1961). For a discussion of the involvement/attitudes relation which reaches a conclusion similar to that of Dahl, see Richard A. Cloward and James A. Jones, "Social Class: Educational Attitudes and Participation," in Education in Depressed Areas, ed. by Passow, p. 210.

54. Carole Pateman, Participation and Democratic Theory
     (London: Cambridge University Press, 1970),
     especially Chapter III, "The Sense of Political
     Efficacy and Participation in the Workplace,"
     pp. 45-66.

55. Pateman, ibid., pp. 50-51.

56. David Cohen notes: "We have no studies of the re-
     lationship between parents' political efficacy (or
     their sense thereof) and their children's test scores;
     the few studies that relate parents' general sense of
     environment and control to their children's achieve-
     ment are inconclusive and contradictory." "The
     Price of Community Control," Commentary, July, 1969,
     p. 26.

57. Cohen, ibid., p. 26.

58. Adelaide Jablonsky, "Some Trends in Education of the
     Disadvantaged," quoted by Carole Lopate, et al.,
     "Decentralization and Community Participation in
     Public Education," Review of Educational Research,
     v 40, n 1 (February, 1970), p. 142.

59. Joe L. Rempson, "School-Parent Programs in Depressed
     Urban Neighborhoods," in Robert A. Dentler, Bernard
     Mackler, and Mary Ellen Warshauer, The Urban Rs:
     Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education
     (New York: Praeger, 1967), p. 145. Rempson also
     cites six studies that associate increased achieve-
     ment with increased parent participation even though
     the type of participation is below the level of
     intensity discussed here.

60. Cloward and Jones, "Social Class: Educational
     Attitudes and Participation," pp. 215-216.

61. Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentralization of the
     New York City Schools, McGeorge Bundy, chairman,
     Reconnection for Learning: A Community School System
     for New York City (New York: Mayor's Advisory Panel,
     November, 1967), p. 12.

62. Yin, et al., "Citizen Participation," TARP/RAND,
     pp. 44-45.

63. Christopher Jencks, "The Coleman Report and the Con-
     ventional Wisdom," in On Equality of Educational
     Opportunity, ed. by Frederick Mosteller and Daniel
     P. Moynihan (New York: Vintage, 1972), pp. 89-90.

64. USOE, "Parental Involvement in Title I ESEA," p. 1.

65. James S. Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity
    Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education, USGPO,
    1966), p. 319.

66. Coleman, ibid., p. 319.

67. Fantini, et al., Community Control, p. 192-193.

68. Paul Lauter and Florence Howe, "The School Mess,"
    The New York Review of Books (February 1, 1968),
    pp. 16-21; also available in The Politics of Urban
    Education, ed. by Marilyn Gittell and Alan G.
    Hevesi (New York: Praeger, 1969), p. 260. Italics
    in original.

69. Judith Kleinfeld, "'Sense of Fate Control' and Commu-
    nity Control of Schools," Education and Urban
    Society, v III, n 3 (May, 1971), pp. 277-300.

70. Kleinfeld, ibid., p. 283.

71. Kleinfeld, ibid., p. 281.

72. Marcia Guttentag, in Gittel, et al., Demonstration
    for Social Change, pp. 118-119.

73. Averch, et al., How Effective is Schooling?, p. X.
    David Austin has arrived at a similar conclusion
    with respect to social welfare agencies as a whole.
    The Brandeis University study of twenty Community
    Action Agency programs in which Austin participated,
    "raises a question as to whether federal regulations
    embodying sanctions but no rewards and that deal
    with controversial subjects in federally supported
    locally administered programs can ever bring about
    consistent and substantive changes in local prac-
    tices unless supported by organized pressure groups
    and/or the legal compulsion of a court order."
    David M. Austin, "Resident Participation: Political
    Mobilization or Organizational Co-optation?," Public
    Administration Review, v 32 (Sept., 1972, Special
    Issue), p. 49.

74. Jeffrey Raffel, "Responsiveness in Urban Schools: A
    Study of School System Adaptation to Parental Prefer-
    ences in an Urban Environment" (unpublished Ph.D.
    dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology,
    1972), p. 311.

75. Yin, et al., "Citizen Participation," TARP/RAND,
    p. vii. See Table 1, p. 12, infra.

76. Marilyn Gittell and T. Edward Hollander, <u>Six Urban School Districts: A Comparative Study of Institutional Response</u> (New York: Praeger, 1968), p. 51.

77. Gittell and Hollander, <u>ibid.</u>, pp. 51-52.

78. Dale Mann, <u>Administrator/School/Community Relationships</u> (New York: New York State Commission on the Quality, Cost, and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1971), pp. 200-201.

79. James J. Vanecko, "Community Mobilization and Institutional Change: The Influence of the Community Action Program in Large Cities," <u>Social Science Quarterly</u> (December, 1969), pp. 615-619, and 628-629.

80. Gittell, <u>Demonstration for Social Change</u>, p. 129.

81. Ronald G. Havelock, <u>Planning for Innovation through Dissemination and Utilization of Knowledge</u> (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research CRUSK, 1971), p. 5-3.

82. Havelock, <u>ibid.</u>, p. 5-2. Pelz's research is available in "Discussion, Decision Commitment and Consensus in 'Group Decision,'" <u>Human Relations</u>, 1955, 8:251-274. The Levin study cited by Havelock is "Group Decision and Social Change," in G. E. Swanson, et al., <u>Readings in Social Psychology</u> (New York: Holt, 1952), pp. 459-473. Sidney Verba also reviews this literature and relates it specifically to political action in his <u>Small Groups and Political Behavior: A Study of Leadership</u> (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), especially Chapters IX and X, which deal with the participation hypothesis.

83. In addition to the sources cited immediately above, much of the literature from the human relations school is collected in <u>Readings in Social Psychology</u>, ed. by E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. E. Hartley (3rd. ed; New York: Holt, 1958). For a treatment of the participation hypotheses in a general political context, see Lester W. Milbrath, <u>Political Participation: How and Why People Get Involved in Politics</u> (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965). The participation hypotheses in an educational context are dealt with in Fred D. Carver and Thomas T. Sergiovanni, eds., <u>Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools</u> (New York: McGraw Hill, 1969).

84. Frederick C. Mosher, <u>Governmental Reorganizations: Cases and Commentary</u> (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967), p. 518.

85. Cloward and Jones, "Social Class: Educational Attitudes and Participation," pp. 210-211.

86. Richard L. Andrews and Ernest G. S. Noack, "The Satisfaction of Parents with their Community Schools as a Measure of Effectiveness of the Decentralization of a School System," American Education Research Association, Annual Meetings (New York, February, 1971), p. 3. The studies cited are: Robert D. Hess and Virginia C. Shipman, "Maternal Attitudes Toward the School and the Role of Pupils: Some Social Comparisons." Paper prepared for the Fifth Work Conference on Curriculum and Teaching in Depressed Urban Areas, New York, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966 (mimeographed); Paul T. Rankin, Jr., "The Relationship Between Parent Behavior and Achievement of Inner City School Children." Paper presented at the 1967 Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, February, 1967.

87. Gittell, Demonstration for Social Change, pp. 54, 51.

88. Lyke, "Political Issues in School Decentralization," in The Politics of Education at the Local, State, and Federal Levels, ed. by Kirst, p. 127.

89. M. Kent Jennings, "Parental Grievances and School Politics (ERIC ED 010 0900, June, 1966). A revised version is available under the same title in Public Opinion Quarterly, v 32, n 3 (Fall, 1968), pp. 363-378.

90. Cloward and Jones, "Social Class: Educational Attitudes and Participation," pp. 212-213.

91. Donald Haider, "The Political Economy of Decentralization," American Behavioral Scientist, v 15, n 1 (Sept./Oct., 1971), p. 121.

92. Normal R. Luttbeg and Richard W. Griffin, "Public Reactions to Misrepresentation: The Case of Educational Politics," Florida State University, no date. (Mimeographed.)

93. Robert P. Bullock, School-Community Attitude Analysis For Educational Administrators, The School-Community Development Study, Monograph Series No. 7 (Columbus, Ohio: State University, 1959), p. 48.

94. USOE, "Parental Involvement in Title I ESEA," p. 2.

95. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, "Public Knowledge and Busing Opposition: An Interpretation to a New National Survey," Washington, DC, March 11, 1973. (Mimeographed.)

96. Gittell, Demonstration for Social Change, p. 59.

97. Gittell, ibid., p. 133.

98. Carter, et al., "The Structure and Process of School-Community Relations: Vol. V, A Summary," USOE ERIC ED 017 058, pp. 53-54.

99. Gallup, How the Nation Views the Public Schools, p. 23.

100. Carter and Sutthoff, Voters and Their Schools, pp. 108-ff. See also: Warner Bloomberg and Morris Sunshine, Suburban Power Structures and Public Education (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1963); Marshall H. Goldstein and Robert S. Cahil, "Mass Media and Community Politics," in the Local Community (1964), pp. 171-173, and Agger and Goldstein, Who Will Rule the Schools, pp. 185-190.

101. See the sources cited by James D. Wilson, "Research for School Board Members: School-Community Relations," No. 7-D, "Community Support for Education: Elections Involving School Issues" (USOE ERIC ED 034 085, 1969).

102. Agger and Goldstein, Who Will Rule the Schools, p. 190. See also Wirt and Kirst whose review of the evidence ". . . suggests that substantial community involvement provides both the pressure for change and a community atmosphere favorable for obtaining the necessary financing." The Political Web of American Schools, pp. 217-218.

103. Russell Isbister and C. Robert Koopman, "Citizen Participation in School Affairs," in Vital Issues in American Education, ed. by Alice and Lester D. Crow (New York: Bantam, 1964), pp. 37-38.

104. Melvin B. Mogulof, "Citizen Participation: A Review and Commentary on Federal Policies and Practices" (Washington, DC: The Urban Institute, 1970),p. 80. (Mimeographed.)Cited by John H. Strange, "The Impact of Citizen Participation on Public Administration," Public Administration Review, v 32 (Sept., 1972, Special Issue), p. 469. Italics in original.

105. John Dewey, The Public and Its Problems (Chicago:
     Sage Books, The Swallow Press, Inc., 1927, 1954),
     p. 208. Cited by Harry L. Summerfield, The Neigh-
     borhood-Based Politics of Education (Columbus:
     Merrill, 1971), p. 2.

II.   WHEN TO SHARE CONTROL AND WHAT TO EXPECT?

Urban schools are famous for the demands they
place on their administrators. The pressures are intense,
the resources are scarce, the tasks are hard and important.
The demanding nature of the job is true in general and
also for particular areas such as community relations.
In the previous part we have discussed the gains which
may be expected from community involvement. Increased
goal achievement is the "why" of community involvement;
control should therefore be shared when increased goal
achievement is sought. Shared control occurs within
an environment which determines a great deal about the
implementation of the mechanism. The expectations
and beliefs of administrators also affect control
sharing. One central preoccupation of administrators
has to do with conflict. This section discusses:
(a) the ubiquity of conflict in the urban environment;
(b) the problem of apathy; (c) administrative responses
to conflict; (d) the impact of conflict on the schools;
and (e) the prospects that shared control can improve
the conflict situation.

Is conflict a good thing or a bad thing? That
depends on the answers to several questions: Conflict
between whom? About what? How is it pursued? What are
the outcomes? When teachers and boards disagree and
teachers strike or take "job actions" that may or may not
be acceptable. When administrators seek new kinds of
pension rights and struggle with different groups and factions
in the state legislature, the struggle may or may not be
justified. When national coalitions fight for full
funding of Federal legislation that too may be all right
In each case, one's attitude toward the acceptability of
the disagreements pursued to the level of conflict will
depend on how you feel about the issue at stake (is it
important to you? Do you agree with what is being
demanded?); the methods being used (are theyffair and
appropriate to the grievance at stake); and, the different
protagonists (this judgment is usually closely linked
with the one about the merits of the issue itself.)

All of those considerations are somewhat abstract.
Most people resist saying how they might apply any of them
until they have more particulars about specific issues.
But, there are areas where overall judgments guide reaction.
One such area is that of community relations where the
first reaction of most administrators to the prospects for
conflict is a negative one . . . "It's bad . . .",

"The children can only suffer . . .," etc. However, that is not necessarily true. In what follows, we will be applying the standards mentioned above to the question of community school conflict.

A good deal of the discontent which is focused on urban schools falls there simply because every neighborhood has a public school and practically everyone has had enough experience with education to feel competent to express opinions about it. George La Noue and Bruce Smith point out:

> Unlike institutions in other policy areas, most citizens have had some sustained involvement with schools. Although that may not give them any insights into the technical problems of either budget or pedagogy, it does provide an important reservoir of intuitive evaluations and value judgments that ought to be represented in the policy process. Further, if a school system is serious, motivation often exists among parents to learn enough to participate competently in policy discussions. What is involved after all is the policy that will develop the civic attitudes and vocational options of children. Society at large has an important interest in these questions, but there is a particular stake for parents. There is nothing analogous in other policy areas to the special emotional ties and responsibility of parents and their children.[1]

In addition to this proximity, it is often the case that the local school is one of the neighborhood's most material resources. This built-in potential for controversy is remarked by Fantini et al.,

> The movement for real community voice in the public school unavoidably contains potential for conflict, not only in ideological terms but also in more earthy currency. The public schools are a major enterprise, possessing all elements that surround vast corporate undertakings - a physical plant, millions of jobs, contractors who depend on the schools for commissions, textbook publishers, and various forms of organizations concerned with their own perquisites and positions. In the

simplest sense, the public schools are an
enterprise with a nearly $30 billion annual
budget and more than 2 million teaching and
other jobs, both constantly expanding; the
money and jobs--both are at issue.[2]

The local school is a visible institution with
which practically everyone has had some experience; it
affects central values having to do with cultural and
political identity and economic mobility; there is
great uncertainty about how education can be improved
yet everyone is positive that it needs to be. Given all
of that it is little wonder that conflict and the
potential for conflict is always near the surface.
What the Brandeis University study said of citizen
participation in 20 big cities in general is particularly
true for education: "Disagreements, controversy, and
conflict over the implementation of target area participation
can be expected regardless of the nature of the program
or the nature of the community setting."[3] But the point
here is not that every urban school is surrounded by a
constantly critical community. Some are, but more are
not. In fact parent apathy and quiescence are major
problems (which are discussed below). But where
conflict is not now apparent, the conditions for conflict
are still present. Although controversy may be latent,
its possible eruption is a source of considerable
apprehension for school people. Almost by definition,
conflict between the school and the community threatens
control of the institution. It has certainly ended or
compromised a number of careers. For administrators who
take seriously their responsibility for what happens to
the school, the emergence of dissension is often
regarded as a personal failing. Beyond that, it is unlikely
that the principal will have had much professional training
for conflict resolution, especially when it takes place
outside the staff.

On the one hand, there is the prospect for
serious, damaging, and uncontrolled conflict. On the
other hand is a situation in which the neighborhood is
relatively uninvolved, quiet, and perhaps even apathetic.
It is little wonder that many principals prefer
apathy to involvement. At least apathy leaves the
direction of the school unchanged and in the hands of
professionals. In addition, urban parents have a
reputation for being notoriously difficult to involve
in school affairs. In a 1967 article, Joe L. Rempson
summarized the reasons offered for the gulf between urban
schools and parents.

- 71 -

It is held that parents do not care, that
they resent the school, that they think that
the teacher, whom they perceive as belonging
to a higher social class, looks down on
them; that they do know how to help their
children; that they do not think they can
influence their children's school life; that
they have had unpleasant experiences with
the school; that they have no concern for
long-range problems and therefore do not see
the need to go to school unless their
children are in trouble; and that they are
pessimistic and uncertain about the future.

On the other hand, the schools are held
responsible for the gulf because teachers
fear parents; because teachers live outside
the school neighborhood; because school
authorities are not interested in the welfare
of the pupil, some even being antagonistic
toward parents and children; because teachers
use educational jargon; because the reading
level required by communications from the
school is too high; because the school does
not know what should be done; because the
formalized activities of the school
discourage parents; because the school has
not developed sound machinery to provide for
improved relations and because inadequate
staffing precludes having the time for
parental contacts.[4]

Rempson points out that most of the characteristics
which make urban parents difficult to involve in the
school are class-linked, that is, it is harder to
mobilize lower class people for civic action. Heriott
and St. John, "found that parents whose children attended
working class schools were less likely to attend school
events, less likely to come to school to discuss their
children's problems on their own initiative, and less
likely to be interested in school affairs. For example,
87 per cent of the parents whose children attended schools
serving pupils with high social-economic backgrounds were
reported by principals to have attended school at least
once during the school year; principals reported that only
49 per cent of working class school parents visited school
as often."[5]

The fact that lower class parents are difficult to
involve in school affairs does not mean that it is
impossible to involve them. Many of the features of the

accompanying handbook have been designed specifically
for use with lower class communities.

There is a great deal of difference between
writing about something and actually doing it. Telling
other people that they need to risk, recognize, and cope
with conflict between their schools and communities is
a perfect example of the gap. Nonetheless, conflict and
the potential for conflict are part of the urban reality.
A mechanism of shared control can help overcome apathy
and manage conflict, but before administrators can be
convinced of that they may need to have the dysfunctional
nature of apathy demonstrated.

Given the alternative, a quiet community may
seem to be an asset, but if it is, it is a questionable
one. Mann found that almost one third of the administrators
described their communities as being apathetic or passive
about education but then interpreted that apathy as
support for the school.[6] That is a dubious leap since
there is often quite a gap between the administrators'
estimate and the public's reality. Luttbeg and Griffin
compared evaluations of the job that principals and the
public thought schools and teachers were doing. Among
principals, 90% felt that the teachers were doing either
a "good" or a "very good" job and 98% felt the same
way about the local schools. But the percentage of the
public holding the same high evaluation of the school
was only 49% for both objects.[7] Thus, lay people are
not nearly as favorably disposed to the schools as are
administrators. Principals who chose to believe that
people are quiet because they are satisfied may be
misleading themselves.

Administrators may also be mistaken about the
question of conflict. As long as they stay apathetic,
these communities undoubtedly allow their professionals
considerable autonomy. But when they do become involved
in controversy, that conflict is much more likely to be
destructive. The Carter et al., study of school
community communications found that "Achieving support
through quiescence is largely fortuitous -- at least it
is for now. There is no control on the emergence of
conflict, only attempted control of it when it becomes
threatening."[8] The suggestion is that administrators in
such communities may be living on borrowed time.
Robert Crain, Eliku Katz, and Donald Rosenthal made a
nationwide study that determined, among other things,
the conditions under which ordinary conflict became
destructive or rancorous. The apathy of the community

was one of those factors that contributed to such
uncontrollable conflict.[9]

Communities which are truly apathetic are
unlikely to become interested in any school affairs until
the needs, problems, controversies, or whatever have
become too acute for any but major changes. But, because
they have little or no civic experience, such communities
are not very likely to help with those changes. Since it
takes a major event to arouse interest, an apathetic
community is much more likely to be severely critical,
demanding, and dogmatic at precisely the point
when those qualities are least useful. Leigh Stelzer
says that, "A body of literature on school as well as
generalized conflict suggests that the anomic outbursts
that plague school politics are the results of closed
decision procedures (Coleman, 1957; Iannaccone, 1967)."[10]

As long as apathy obtains, the school lacks
the signals it needs in order to serve the community. When
no interests are expressed, there is no guidance and the
school can get seriously uncoordinated with its
clientele. In discussing the subject of one of his case
studies, Summerfield says, "Ironically, Mr. Lowe tries
to keep conflict down - and he succeeds - when in the
case of Lawrence conflict is perhaps an essential missing
ingredient needed to raise the quality of education.[11]
The points that Laurence Iannaccone and Frank Lutz make
with respect to the relations between superintendents
and boards can be applied to principals and communities
as well:

> There are few if any effective political
> mechanisms for loyal dissent in the typical
> American local school district . . .
> Without the development of viable political
> mechanisms for provoking district-wise
> discussion and debate and without provisions
> for legitimate public dissent with
> confrontation between opposing views on
> educational matters, the school administrator
> is usually reduced to manipulating his board
> by posing as more of an expert than any one
> man or single group of professionals can
> ever be. Thus the board is faced with the
> extreme alternatives of accepting staff
> recommendations in total or rejecting its
> professional staff."[12]

Robert Alford makes a related point when he says, " . . .

The more buraucratization, the more need for special
issue-publics to form to focus pressure upon particular
sets of officials and the elites."[13]

Moreover, neighborhoods that are temporarily
quiet may also be very unstable. They may tip easily
into rather disruptive conflict that other more stormy
neighborhoods, with different patterns and mechanisms
might handle more effectively. The choice facing the
principal in an apathetic community is rather like that
facing a boiler room engineer. The engineer may prefer
the steady hiss of an escape valve to the occasional roar
of an explosion. Apathy may not be entirely eliminated by
a successful mechanism of community involvement, but it,
and its affects should certainly be ameliorated.

Still, not many administrators are willing to
risk conflict for the benefits it may entail. Education
is a discipline that draws heavily on the knowledge base
of several sciences; the practice of education is a
profession requiring extensive preparation. The more
seriously an educator takes the scientific and professional
aspects of education, the less likely it is that the
participation from an inevitably less informed public
will be seen as legitimate. In Education and Public
Understanding Gordon McCloskey writes about what is a
common approach among professionals: " . . . Any
consideration of school-community relationships quite
rightly involves consideration of a basic question
frequently phrased as follows: "Is school policy to be
based on scientific definitions of the educational needs
of children and youth, or on the whims of public opinion?
Are educators going to sacrifice educational principles to
the pressures exerted by uninformed groups?"[14] Put that
way, the answer is obviously - NO, educators should not
sacrifice principles to whims. But who is to say what is
a whim and what is a principle? Are whims the exclusive
province of the public and principles the whole property
of professionals? It is obviously possible to abuse the
cloak of expertise as Harold Howe pointed out. "Educators
sometimes tend to regard themselves as anointed by a
holy oil that confers a unique wisdom upon them, and they
literally regard laymen as their flock: sheep to be herded
toward a destination they have picked out."[15] In New
York City, the Bundy Commission reported to the Mayor that
"Often the right of the layman to an account for
professional performance while given lip service, is in
effect nullified by challenges to his competence to
inquire into what are considered basically professional
affairs. But education is public business as well as

- 75 -

professional business. Public education in the United
States was never intended to be a professional monopoly."[16]

Expertise and professional standing are used to
exclude a public that is defined as uninformed. Those
attitudes coincide with a belief in the virtues of non-
partisan, neutral, and technically objective government.
Louis Masotti summarizes his research on school
administrators and conflict as follows:

> Nonpartisanship and conflict avoidance are the
> common themes, technical authority (represented
> by professional administrators) is a common
> mechanism. . . Controversy over public policy
> and partisan competition for public office
> are seen as a threat to the "good life" and
> are resented as a disruption. . . One of the
> major functions of the professional
> administrator in these communities is to
> contain or suppress social conflict; his job
> may depend on his ability to do this.[17]

These tactics worked for quite a while: Until
recently the public as a whole has been content to leave
education in almost solely professional hands. But it
is always necessary to return to the public for financial
support, for sanctions, for help with controversy. In
those times, educators have paid a high price for their
non-partisan and non-public politics. When public
business is conducted wtih only intermittent involvement,
the emphasis can seldom be on issues (which have been
defined as "technical" and not appropriate for the
public) and instead tends to focus on personalities.
That leaves the school administrator, who has sought
to avoid conflict, instead personally spotlighted by it.
Crain, in The Politics of Community Control notes,
". . . avoiding controversial matters does not, of course,
make them go away; indeed, the political executive's
neutrality should lead, in the long run, to greater
controversy, since he is not using his influence to prevent
issues from being brought up. Thus 'personality'
politics, weak political leaders, and high levels of
controversy all seem to be products of nonpartisanship. ."[18]
David Minar suggested that the isolation of education
from other municipal functions also meant that conflict
and opposition could be easily mobilized against such
a lonely target rather than dispersed among numerous
others. "The consequence of this situation is not only
that demands are focused on specifics, as we suggested
above, but also that the authority system usually is not
accustomed to being opposed and therefore lacks resilience.

Conflict is likely to be disorganizing shock.   Whereas, in most democratic governments, structured conflict is recognized as the way the game is played, in school government it often seems to be regarded as a rude and foreign intrusion."[19]

Where does that leave us? Harmon Ziegler, a political scientist whose research interests for the last several years have been in the area of school system responsiveness writes:

> School systems are not equipped to deal with conflict, and therefore, respond to escalated demands defensively. Defensive reactions anger those who made the original demands, and thus conflict -- normal in any well functioning system -- becomes a _cause celebre_. The constant _brouhaha_ about schools should not mask the relatively routine nature of most educational decisions. City councils and legislatures deal with equally intense conflicts in the normal course of doing business. In contrast, school systems do not contain personnel emotionally or intellectually capable of handling _conflict_ (remember the watchword of educational administration is unity).[20]

And Luvern Cunningham, the Dean of Ohio State's School of Education has reached a similar conclusion:

> Inability to deal with discontent has caused school people to withdraw, to isolate themselves from their constituencies (even their students), and to communicate an intensely defensive posture. The tragic part of this phenomenon is that no one really wills that it   be this way. Such institutional withdrawal and protectionist behavior is simply the natural response of an organism that has failed to locate an adequate coping capacity . . . "[21]

Some of the apprehension which administrators feel has to do with a preference for the simplest and most direct control arrangments. But, other apprehensions stem from a concern over the effect which conflict may have on support for the school. In the preceding chapter, we discussed the evidence which indicates that, in general, community involvement is positively related to support for the school. But

conflict is a special case of involvement; what happens
to support for the schools when involvement turns into
conflict?

Before turning to that question, it should be
stressed that there is no necessary relation between
involvement and conflict. More involvement does
not increase the prospect for conflict except under
the circumstances in which involvement is not accompanied
by institutional responsiveness. Stelzer's research on
school board's as mediating agencies between the public
and the superintendent is relevant here. Stelzer's
data indicates that boards which are more receptive to
the public, do not originate opposition to the
superintendent's policies any more often than those that
are less receptive. Thus, openness to the public does
not imply conflict with the administration. On the
other hand when conflict already exists in the community,
then the more receptive board is more likely to oppose
the superintendent.[22]

It should be obvious that some kinds of conflict
do decrease support for the schools. In looking at
relationships between school boards and urban communities,
Kent Jennings and Harmon Ziegler found that "Both
support and consensus vary inversely with metropolitanism
($r=$ -.57 and -.45 respectively). The social complexity
indicator of greater power in accounting for responsiveness."[23]
Thus, the more urban the area, the less likely it is that
there will be either much agreement about or much
support for the schools. The Carter study of school/
community relations found that "The nature of the
pattern of nonsupport can be seen in the regularity with
which . . . multiple relationships contain the same
elements: conflict and lack of acquiescence. And, in
all but one, they contain lack of understanding."[24]

Carter's findings are interesting at least in
part because they emphasize the extent to which a lack
of understanding is related to conflict and through it,
to lack of support. The lack of understanding does not,
however, extend to judgments about what school policies
benefit which groups. In that case, the evidence
indicates that lower class people are good judges of
their own self interest. Agger and Goldstein found that
"lower cultural-class groupings are not antieducation.
Rather, the degree of approval which they exhibit is
greater for programs perceived to be of benefit to them
than for programs for the few others, the so-called
academically able or the presumably underpaid teacher
or administrator."[25] In fact, whether or not the

school is serving the interests of its clientele may
be a key ingredient in determining the extent to
which conflict emerges. Gittell looked at whether or
not service on a community school board had made its
members more or less militant.

> When asked if they became more radical or
> conservative as a result of membership on
> the governing board, most of the board
> members chose either to ignore answering the
> question or to say that they were about the
> same. Our participant observers have noted,
> however, that in the sense that they advocated
> greater social change the governing board
> members became more militant. Whereas
> suburban school boards tend to become more
> moderate as a result of their experience,
> the impact of governing board service in the
> three demonstration projects resulted in
> growing militancy. The extent of this
> radicalism did, however, differ in the
> districts.[26]

Thus, the action of the administrator and of
the school are key to determining how much school-related
conflict there will be. The RAND/TARP study of DHEW
programs by Yin et al., found, for example that "Weaker
boards, mostly in the form of advisory committees can
have negative effects on alienation reduction in those
cases wehre raised expectations among citizens are not
satisfied by changes in service delivery."[27] Gamson's
study of rancorous conflict makes a similar point:
". . . Participation does not automatically remove
strain. . . As long as the underlying sources of
stress are not dealt with, such participation simply
increases structural conduciveness and thus makes
other expressions more likely. Of course, if the action
also helps to remove the strain, for example by
aiding the passage of remedial legislation, then the
net effect may be to reduce the possibility of other
less orderly expressions."[28] Gamson's study is an
important one because it emphasizes that institutions can
foster involvement and avoid the worst kinds of
conflict as long as those institutions meet the needs of
their clientele.

On the other hand, there is considerable
evidence about the extent to which some conflict is
functional. Functional conflict is that in which
interests clash, are pursued aggresively and even
abrasively, but the essential mission and performance of

the school is not hindered, and may even be brought
closer to the interests in dispute. (The objective
assessment of whether or not any given controversy harms
the school is, itself, likely to be a matter of some
disagreement.) It is hard to see how conflict can be
avoided. Urban schools deal with parents whose interests
differ according to their aspirations for their children
(college-bound, vocational etc). The ages of their
children (early childhood, grade levels etc), their
beliefs about politics, race, religion, the role of the
school and so on. For some purposes parents and school
people are at odds whether or not taxes should be
increased and if so, who is to get the increase. Other
community groups frequently attempt to use schools for
their own purposes. Abraham Berstein is partly right
when he says: "Lay determination of public school policies
occurs only because educational procedures are indefinite
and imbedded in private, armchair philosophy. Were
they grounded in research, lay interference would
disappear. Because the educational research that does
exist is low-level and full of contradictory findings,
any number, even if uninformed, can play in setting
educational policy."[29] In areas where research
findings are "high level," controversy is not impossible
(important aspects of policy about medicine and space
exploration for example) but insofar as uncertainty
reinforces conflict borne of differing interests,
Berstein is right.

A school principal is widely regarded as an
expert and as an educational leader. To justify that
reputation, and also to keep the school functioning,
administrators must inspire confidence, they must seem
strong, literally "decisive" people. Faced with
problems requiring a choice, the principal must move
with apparent certainty. But, as experienced administrators
know, that facade is often a cloak for profound
uncertainty. For the most significant questions of
education (what causes effective learning, for example)
there is _very_ little definitive knowledge. In fact the
knowledge base on which education is premised is
scandalously deficient (a situation for which
academics bear a greater responsibility than do
practitioners). Because it is so deficient, while
successful practice seems to demand certainty,
many principals seek to maintain the myth of their own
sufficient competence by the simple expedient of
excluding practically everyone from decisions.

In The Real World of Public Schools Harry
Broudy writes

- 80 -

Schools not only lack the autonomy for
making the decisions that determine the
success or failure of the enterprise, but
more important, there is no professional
cadre to provide criteria for judging the
educational process. Public school personnel
simply do not acknowledge any coherent body
of knowledge on the basis of which they
might legitimately and convincingly claim
the authority of the expert.' For one thing,
no coherent body of such knowledge exists;
what knowledge there is fills to command
sufficient acceptance to render tne notion
of professional expertise plausible.
There is no professional teacher or
teacher of teachers feels obliged to learn
or to consider. Members of coteries cite
each others' works, but not the works
of other coteries. Research is rarely
replicated.[30]

Educators may find a little comfort in the fact
that they are not the only ones in this uncertain fix.
In a general discussion of citizen participation and
its impact on public administrators, Robert Aleshire
has remarked how uncomfortable it is to have to share
our (relative) ignorance.

". . . Participation puts the spotlight on
the fact that as a nation we really don't know
very much about social problems or their
solution. We are still very much in an
experimental stage. We don't like to make
our /un*]   certainty a matter of public record,
burned into tne minds of men through endless
hours of debate and conflict. The quiet
frustration of an administrator or an
elected official making a decision masks
the uncertainty more than the open process
of participation. The official is allowed
the margin of failure or error, but poor, what
do they know? How could they decide?"[31]

Janet Reiner, Everett Reiner and Thomas A. Reiner extend
that point. "Given diverse aims, unequal resources,
and the consequently different demands on public
and other institutional resources, we believe conflicts
can best be resolved and allocation decisions most
rationally made by bringing tacit disagreements into
the open, making them explicit and thus subject to
public scrutiny and debate."[32]

---

*sic?

Several authors point out the beneficial
results of some conflict. In his study of neighborhood
school politics, Summerfield found that "close contact
with community and neighborhood groups provides the
principal with a power base which he uses to expand and
protect school interests.[33] Gittell says, "Some
conflicts may well be healthy and in themselves, may
activate new elements in the community. If the goal is
greater participation and citizen interest, conflict
may be a necessary component. Such clashes should not
be viewed as necessarily negative in their impact.
They must be evaluated in terms of the goals set or the
model of political relations considered most productive
to developing responsive policies."[34]

Gittell also notes the effect which Preston
Wilcox believes conflict had on eliminating apathy in
parts of the New York City Puerto Rican community.
"The Puerto Ricans in District 4 no longer are submissive
to the degree they once were -- the community corporation
played an important role in waking them from their
apathy. Conflict perhaps contributed to this mightly;
as Clinard has said, 'The excitement and activity it
generates tend to maintain the enthusiasm and support of
the slum dweller.' The success of the community
corporation in District 4, therefore, perhaps owes
much to the high level of conflict that has characterized
local school politics."[35] David Austin's report on the
results of the Brandeis study documented that conflict
stabilized the gains from social programs. "The
political and social movements among black citizens
that were strengthened through adversary patterns of
participation were able to maintain those gains and move
forward on an independent basis."[36]

Iannaccone and Lutz note the beneficial results
which accrue to districts that make use of involvement
mechanisms:

> The analysis of the operation of the semiformal
> mediating organizations that clustered around
> the formal decision making organizations of
> the Jefferson School District indicated that
> the parents and teachers of Jefferson had
> developed mechanisms through which they
> simultaneously resolved their differences and
> attempted to influence school policies. The
> machinery had a healthy effect on the school
> district because the Jefferson Teachers'
> Association and the Jefferson Parent Teachers'

Association "fought out" their differences
in joint committees.[37]

Bloomberg and Kincaid draw similar
encouraging conclusions about the results of widespread
participation but they are not as optimistic about
the prospects that the results will indeed emerge.

> Extensive efforts to optimize the understanding
> and operational skills of activist parents
> and to educate and train a majority of
> teachers and administrators to react
> positively to the new situation could minimize
> the disruptive consequences of such movements
> and projects and maximize their contributions
> to changes that enhance the educational
> opportunities and experiences of ghetto
> children. Although methods to carry this
> out among school personnel and resident
> are known, there is little evidence that
> such efforts will be made on the needed
> scale.[38]

Bloomberg and Kincaid indicate the considerable
responsibility which building principals bear in this
regard. Part of their job is to make it possible for
citizens to participate. Emmette Redford, writing in
Democracy in the Administrative State says, "We
cannot accept the idea that the citizen must depend
upon self-help to learn what the government is doing
and how it affects him. In a democratic society each
agency must bear a responsibility for informing people
of the benefits and liabilities of its program and
except as required for national security or the privacy
of its staff, for making its processes know to
society."[39]

It may be appropriate to close this discussion
of the prospects for conflict and its impact on the
school with two quotations about some basic relations.
The first is from the Bundy Commission and states the
case very clearly for parent responsibility in any
court controversy.

> Some of the concerns the Panel heard about
> local election of Community School Board
> members reflected a deep-rooted fear of
> provincial interests - Black power or white
> power, left wing or right wing, . . . the
> evidence before us confirms our own initial
> conviction that parents can be trusted to care

more than anyone else for the quality of
education their children get. There may
be errors and excesses, especially at the
start. But we do not hesitate to put our
trust in the collective good sense of the
public school parents of New York.[40]

The second is a quotation from Sidney Verba's
article dealing with democratic participation. "Wide-
spread participation may lead into something resembling
chaos, but it is chaotic because there are many different
people involved with many different goals. Under such
circumstances, clear-cut policies are difficult to
achieve. But such are the circumstances of democracy."[41]

Finally, we need to ask, can principals expect
that changing the structure of their relations with the
community will contribute to the conflict situation.
Part of the answer to that question has already been
given in the first part of this essay. There, increased
involvement was related to increased goal achievement.
The very reasonable presumption is that the more
effective a school is in achieving its goals, the less
conflict it will experience. Thus, to the extent that
shared control contributes to goal achievement, it
should also reduce the possibility of rancorous
conflict.

Nonetheless, many principals would prefer to rely
on the chain of command. Cities are, after all,
equipped with school boards who are specifically charged
with representing public interests and governing the
schools in accordance with those interests. Since there
is already such formally constituted and authoritative
community group, why should anything else be necessary?
Unfortunately, the National Advisory Commission on
Civil Disorders found that dissatisfaction with the
school board (and with educational policies in general)
was one of the most prominent grievances of people
in those cities where riots had occurred.[42] Lyke's
research indicates that despite the formal presence of
school boards at the top of city systems, "The wide-
spread frustration and discontent are evidence of the
lack of substantive representation. The formal
representing institutions simply do not prove adequate
means for urban citizens either to direct or control
educational policy."[43]

"Substantive" representation means the willingness and
ability to press for the satisfaction of demands from
groups. It is basic to the idea of representation yet
because of the extremely wide range of interests in
any given city, and because of the scarce resources
which plague every system, no board can do an adequate
job of representation. Lyke concludes that "Neither
increasing a centralized board's authority or resources
nor appointing members that better reflect the social
characteristics of the community will change the situation.
Because they face a heterogeneous constituency with
conflicting community organizations, board members
prefer to minimize community influence rather than face
continual conflicting pressures."[44]

    The situation is one in which city-wide school
boards give up the attempt to respond to the demands that
are pressed because responding to one set would increase
the pressure on them to respond to others. The logic of
this may be functional for members of city-wide boards
in that it simplifies their lives but it reckons
completely without the fact that city systems already
satisfy- some interests at the expense of others. By
failing to respond to new demands they are endorsing and
satisfying those who benefit from the status quo. Thus,
a strategy which is functional on the personal level
('don't listen to "them"') is dysfunctional on the
social level since it freezes a distribution of benefits
which reflects a prior urban population. Still, given
the extreme range of interests in any city, it may be
extremely difficult for city-wide board members to be
much more responsive than they are. Thus, one way to
achieve greater responsiveness may be to shift the
representational function to a much small area base.

    A great deal of the function and the justification
of establishing shared control groups at the school building
level is precisely this, to provide representation on an
areal base small enough so that it can be responsive
to local needs which would otherwise go unsatisfied.
The importance of providing more adequate representation
is highlighted by the widespread reluctance of people
to take more personal action. In a sample of Florida
citizens, Luttbeg and Griffin found that

        . . . 94 per cent of the public would not
        resort to organizing a protest demonstration,
        going to court, or threatening school officials
        with the ballot box to correct the situation.
        It appears, then, that the public has indeed
        bought the story of the school professional

that "only they are qualified to make
policy," since alternative political controls
such as voting and court action are seen as
inappropriate ways to shape educational
policy.[45]

Two points should be made about this--the first is that
this sort of reluctance makes citizen representation by
established groups even more vital than it might other-
wise be. The second is that although the 94 per cent
figure may seen high, the 6 per cent who are left for
more active personal intervention is about comparable
to the size of the group who would take a more active
role in politics anyway. And assuming that we would
generalize from the Luttbeg and Griffin Florida sample
to the country as a whole, the tiny 6 per cent
there becomes more than a million people who are willing
to protest, sue and politic in order to get the schools
to change. Few social revolutions can count on a
mobilizing base that large.

We also need to consider who the people are
who are not now well represented by the existing
arrangements. Obviously, there are the urban poor.
Recent research has documented that, "the larger the
percentage of poor households in the district, the less
accurate are the legislators' assessment of constituent
opinion."[46] In addition, poor people are more inclined
to seek redress of grievances through institutional,
not personal means. "Riley and Cohen's study of
Boston parents, for example, indicated that middle class
parents prefer personal contact with teachers and
principals; and working class were more likely to want
institutional (i.e., community political boards)
mechanism for increased parent involvement in schools.
Riley and Cohen attribute this difference to non-
dominant political groups seeking new ways to influence
schools."[47]

NOTES

1. George R. LaNoue and Bruce L.R. Smith, The Politics of School Decentralization (Lexington: Lexington Books, 1973), p. 238.

2. Fantini, et al., Community Control, p. 19.

3. Brandeis University, "Community Representation in 20 Cities," in Citizen Participation, ed. by Cahn and Passett, p. 205.

4. Rempson, "School Parent Programs," in Dentler, Mackler, and Warshauer, The Urban Rs, pp. 134-135. Rempson's twenty-five sources supporting the reasons listed have been omitted here.

5. Raffel, "Responsiveness in Urban Schools," p. 99.

6. Mann, Administrator/Community/School Relationships, p. 321.

7. Luttbeg and Griffin, "Public Reactions," p. 14.

8. Carter, et al., "The Structure and Process of School Community Relations, Volume V, A Summary," pp. 105-106.

9. Robert L. Crain, Elihu Katz, and Donald Rosenthal, The Politics of Community Conflict: The Flouridation Decision (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969), p. 223.

10. Leigh Stelzer, "School Board Receptivity," Education and Urban Society, v V, n 1 (Nov., 1972), p. 84.

11. In discussing the subject of one of his case studies, Summerfield says, "Ironically, Mr. Lower tries to keep conflict down--and he succeeds--when in the case of Lawrence, conflict is perhaps an essential missing ingredient needed to raise the quality of education." Neighborhood-based Politics, p. 44.

12. Laurence Iannaccone and Frank W. Lutz, Politics, Power and Policy: The Governing of Local School Districts (Columbus: Merrill, 1970), p. 21

13. Robert R. Alford, Bureaucracy and Participation (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969), p. 28.

14. Gordon McCloskey, Education and Public Understanding (2nd ed.; New York: Harper and Row, 1967), p. 27.

15. Harold Howe, "Should Educators or Boards Control our
    Public Schools," Nation's Schools, 78 (December, 1966).
    Cited in Michael D. McCaffrey, "Politics in the
    Schools," Educational Administration Quarterly, v 7,
    n 3 (Autumn, 1971), p. 54.

16. Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentralization, p. 6.

17. Louis H. Masotti, "Education and Politics in
    Suburbia: The New Trier Experience" (Cleveland:
    Press of Western Reserve University, 1967). Quoted
    in Philip Meranto, School Politics in the Metropolis
    (Columbus: Merrill, 1970), p. 49.

18. Crain, et al., in The Politics of Community Control
    note that, ". . . avoiding controversial matters does
    not, of course, make them go away; indeed, the
    political executive's neutrality should lead, in the
    long run, to greater controversy, since he is not
    using his influence to prevent issues from being
    brought up. The 'personality' politics, weak poli-
    tical leaders, and high levels of controversy, all
    seem to be products of nonpartisanship. . . ," p. 200.

19. David Minar, "Community Politics and School Board,"
    in the American School Board Journal (March, 1967),
    p. 35.

20. Harmon Ziegler, "Creating Responsive Schools," Urban
    Review, v 6, n 4 (1973), p. 41. Italics in original.

21. Cunningham, Governing Schools, p. 177.

22. See Stelzer, "School Board Receptivity," p. 34.

23. M. Kent Jennings and Harmon Ziegler, "Response Styles
    and Politics: The Case of School Boards," Midwest
    Journal of Political Science, v XV, n 2 (May, 1971),
    p. 304.

24. Carter, "The Structure of School Community Relations,"
    p. 96.

25. Agger and Goldstein, Who Will Rule the Schools, p. 196.
    See also Summerfield, "If clients of the school per-
    ceive delivery of adequate educational service, then
    parents actively support the school, and, as peti-
    tioners, remain quiescent." Neighborhood-based
    Politics of Education, p. 88.

26. Gittell, Demonstration for Social Change, p. 32.

27. Yin, et al.,'Citizen Participation in DHEW Programs,"
    RAND/TARP, p. 47.

28. William A. Gamson, "Rancorous Conflict in Community
    Politics," in Willis D. Hawley and Frederick M. Wirt,
    The Search for Community Power (Englewood Cliffs:
    Prentice-Hall, 1968), pp. 251-252.

29. Abraham Bernstein, The Education of Urban Populations
    (New York: Random House, 1967), p. 374.

30. Harry Broudy, The Real World of the Public Schools
    New York: Harcourt Brace, 1972), pp. 146-147. See
    also David Rogers, 110 Livingston
    Street: Politics and Bureaucracy in the New York
    School System (New York: Random House, 1968).

31. Robert A. Aleshire, "Power to the People: An Assess-
    ment of the Community Action and Model Cities Ex-
    perience," Public Administration Review, v 32
    (Sept., 1972, Special Issue), p. 438.

32. Janet S. Reiner, Everett Reiner, and Thomas A.
    Reiner, "Client Analysis and the Planning of Public
    Programs," in Urban Planning and Social Policy, ed.
    by Bernard J. Frieden and Robert Morris (New York:
    Basic Books, 1968), p. 378.

33. Summerfield, Neighborhood-based Politics, p. 22.

34. Marilyn Gittell, "Urban School Reform in the 70's"
    in Confrontation at Ocean-Hill Brownsville, ed. by
    Maurice R. Berube and Marilyn Gittell (New York:
    Praeger, 1969), p. 332.

35. Gittell, et al., School Boards and School Policy,
    p. 21.

36. Austin, "Resident Participation," p. 419.

37. Iannaccone and Lutz, Politics, Power, and Policy,
    p. 19.

38. Warner J. Bloomberg and John Kincaid, "Parent Parti-
    cipation: Practical Policy or Another Panacea,"
    The Urban Review, v 2, n 7 (June, 1968), p. 11.

39. Emmett S. Redford, Democracy in the Administrative
    State (New York: Oxford, 1969), p. 139.

40. Mayor's Advisory Panel, p. 68.

41. Verba, "Democratic Participation," p. 75.

42. See Lyke, "Representation and Urban School Boards,"
    p. 138.

43. Lyke, ibid., p. 155.

44. Lyke, ibid., p. 154.

45. Luttbeg and Griffin, "Public Reaction to Misrepre-
    sentation," p. 15.

46. Ronald D. Hedlund and H. Paul Friesman, "Perceptions
    of Constituency Opinion," Journal of Politics, v 34,
    n 3 (August, 1972), p. 749.

47. Raffel, "Responsiveness in Urban Schools," p. 100.

III   WHO SHOULD BE INVOLVED?

The thrust of the Handbook is toward increasing the involvement of the lay community in school decision-making. This section is the first of the "operational" sections and takes up the topic of how such a group comes into being and how its members may be selected. Everyone agrees that the group should be "representative of the community" but actually ralizing that goal requires careful attention. The various bases for representation and the various methods of selecting representatives are considered in this section.

The handbook itself discusses the origins of different groups. That treatment does not need much elaboration. The sporadic, and special purpose nature of most community involvement in education (except for PTAs) is well known. Many groups arise in reaction to a particular crisis and just as rapidly go out of business when the crisis is resolved or subsides. Administrators tend to think of educational issues as being in a world apart from all others, including from all other municipal issues. Thus, they prefer that citizens approach educational matters not as members of groups but as individuals supposedly acting on the merits of each specific issue. Wallace Sayre described the community which most school administrators would prefer: "The community, when it confronts educational questions should be an unstructured audience of citizens. These citizens should not be influenced in their response to educational questions by their structured association or organizations; not as members of interest groups of any kind (save perhaps in parent groups) or as members of a political party."[1]
The lack of continuing education-related interest groups means several things for administrators. Not many people will know very much one way or the other about schools (which contributes to rumors and crises). There will be very few controls on controversies since people cannot take leadership from establishing groups. Those groups that do come into being, since they lack the commitment and sophistication associated with continious participation will be more extreme in their demands than would otherwise be the case. · All of that contributes to the prospect for dysfunctional conflict - exactly what principals seek to avoid. The creation of a shared control group is recommended for this reason as for the several others mentioned earlier.

A crisis about discipline or a need for a new building, or a controversy about money or curriculum, can

often lead to the creation of an ad hoc group. These
groups can serve as the basis for a shared control group
but only if special attention is paid to several features.
In order to be legitimate a shared control group must
be as broadly representative of the community as possible.
However, crisis-oriented groups form around only a
single side of a particular issue. By definition, a
"pro" group will exclude the "antis" and vice versa.
Moreover, a group formed around the issue, say student
groupings practices, will not be fairly representative
of those people who are concerned with extending the school
day or adopting open classrooms. Special purpose groups
must always be modified. Special purpose groups do help
to mobilize some parts of the community, they do identify
people and issues which probably need attention, and they
often give their members important skills, experience,
and training. But, precisely because of their limited
focus, special purpose groups must always be modified.

The same point applies when Parent-Teacher
Associations, Parent Association, Home-School Leagues, and
other similar organizations serve as the basis for a
shared-control group. The need for broad representation
and for an independent and legitimate point of view must
be considered. Research indicates that the groups with
the best prospects for success are those in which members
have had some prior experience with each other in a
group setting.[2] The presence of prior organizational ties
increases the cohesion of the new groups and facilitates its
involvement with the institution.[3] In addition, when
conflict arises, the extent to which members have worked
together prior to the conflict is positively associated
with successful resolution. These are important benefits
from building the shared control group on an existing base,
but the necessity of modifying that base so that it
serves its new purpose should be kept in mind.

The Handbook makes the case for the use of
elections to help insure those things and that recommendation
will be documented here. The principal's activity at the
point of group formation is one of the several junctures
at which care and discretion are essential. On the one
hand the principal has a responsibility for and an interest
in the group's success. The temptation is obviously to
use the organizing resources and other advantages of the
position to set up a shared control group quickly and
efficiently. On the other hand, there are several
factors which argue strongly against that approach. The
ability of the group to strengthen the school through an
involved community will depend on how people in the
neighborhood perceive the group. If it is seen as simply

an extension of the school's established powers it may not do much to reduce mistrust and alienation. But, if neighborhood people take the lead in its creation and play a central role from the beginning in setting it up, then the group will be seen as a much more legitimate vehicle of involvement. Thus, the professional's job is essentially one of technical assistance---that of providing some guidance and help without displacing community people and their decisions. This is very important if the group is to have the legitimacy, identification, and information which comes from early indigenous leadership.

The crucial activity in creating the group is the process of selecting its members. The kind of group it is, the quality of its activities, the value of its contribution to the school depend on its membership. Selection determines those aspects by determining the personnel. The selection process is also the key ingredient in keeping the group responsive to the community. Selection can occur by appointment, by election, and by a combination of the two.

Regardless of who does the appointing, its use for selection of group members is not recommend. The evidence shows that appointment leads to mistrust and does not contribute to an effective group.[4] Group members who are appointed have a difficult time establishing their independence from those who appointed them. Stelzer's research on school board members indicates that appointed board members are more likely than elected ones to have prior ties to educators and educational associations and that those members are less receptive to community opinion than their colleagues without such associations.[5] And, despite the best intentions, appointing a group of people who will display the proper range and balance of important characteristics (age, sex, parental standing, race, ethnicity, occupation, and so on through a long list) is very nearly an impossible job. If it is attempted solely through the appointment route it is a thankless task and an inevitable target for criticism.

Most observers agree that elections are the preferable method of member selection. Yin, et al., conclude: "Election mechanisms appear to be the most desirable."[6] With respect to board members, Stelzer says, "Most informed observers who have discussed the mode of selection of board members have favored direct election because of the association of elections with the democratic choice of leaders."[7] And Lyke, whose research has demonstrated the practical impossibility of

adequate representation at the city-wide level, has this
to say about the prospects for neighborhood boards:

> By and large under a decentralized system the
> willingness of school board members to respond
> to demands of the citizens will increase
> significantly. In part, this will come simply
> because members of decentralized boards will be
> from smaller districts: they will have closer
> ties to the separate communities and will be
> able to understand and appreciate citizen
> complaints. Moreover if members on the
> decentralized school boards must run they will
> be forced to respond to local demands more than
> centralized board members, whether appointed
> or elected. Most important, substantive
> representation will be improved because
> decentralized school boards will not face as
> heterogeneous a community as does the centralized
> board.[8]

The theoretical path through which elections
are thought to increase responsiveness to the public
runs something as follows: Office holders would like
to stay in office or candidates who like to get into office
compete in order to win the support of the public. The
competition between the "ins" and the "outs" goes on in terms
of which one can better satisfy the interests of the public.
This simple description of electoral dynamics has three
important parts: (1) incumbents who would like to stay
on; (2) candidates who oppose them; and (3) an electorate
that judges the competition in terms of what the
candidates have done or will do for it. The aspects of
ambition, competition, and consciousness are not nearly
as vividly present in public life in general as they
are thought to be.[9] Jennings and Ziegler, for example,
after their examination of school board politics, conclude
". . . The force of competition, the threat of defeat,
and the desire to remain in office are of little
moment for many school boards in keeping them responsive
to their publics."[10] The problem is, that in a
constituency as small as a neighborhood, there may be
even less interest in serving on the shared control
group to keep these forces operative. The problem is a
real one but in the absence of other more viable control
patterns, there seems to be no alternative but to face it.

There is some evidence, again at the level of
school boards to indicate that elected boards do a better
job at representing constituent opinion to the school's
administrators than do appointed boards. Stelzer found

that, in general, the more competition there was for places on the board, the more receptive board members were to citizens. " . . . members with high receptivity increases by 9 percentage points, from 12 to 21%, when all three competitive aspects are present in the respondent's first election. The aspects of competition were (1) opposition candidate for board seat (2) active contention between candidates (3) differences of ideas among candidates."[11]

Peterson found that competition among candidates in poverty program boards was associated with "universalistic" rather than "particularistic" representation. That is, where there was no competition, board members tended to pay most attention to satisfying the needs of individuals not groups. Where competition was a factor, representatives concerned themselves with more broadly based interests.[12]

Mann's research on administrator responsiveness demonstrated that there was a marked decrease in the willingness to override community opinion from those administrators who worked for appointed boards to those who worked for elected boards. 74% of those working in districts with appointed boards took a "trustee" representational role orientation while 61% of those working for elected boards did so.[13] Even Jennings and Ziegler found some differences in responsiveness between the two methods of member selection. They distinguished between responsiveness to group interests and responsiveness to individual interests and found that " . . . Elected boards are indeed more sensitive to individual voters because of the potential sanctions . . . but they are less sensitive than appointed boards to group interests."[14] And after an exhaustive analysis, they finally conclude that there is some reason for faith in the ability of electoral machinery to deliver some increases in responsiveness:

> Electoral characteristics of the school districts do leave an imprint on the responsiveness of school boards because these characteristics provide differential settings within which the strong elements of sociopolitical complexity (and mass support) operate. It seems probable therefore, that tinkering with the legal framework and fostering more competition for office would - sooner or later - affect the response linkage between constituents and school boards.[15]

Thus, with modest expectations and realizing full well that elections are the only appropriate tool available for the job, we may turn to a consideration of the various features of the election itself. These features are very important for as Ralph Kramer notes in his comparative study of community action programs: "An election might appear to be intrinsically more democratic and more likely to insure a representative /target area organization/ than any other process, but its success depended on the conditions under which it was conducted, the criteria established for candidates and voters, and the extent to which the neighborhood was organized for voting, as well as the number of persons casting ballots."[16]

The first matter for consideration is who should be eligible to vote? It is clear that only those people who reside within the attendance district should be allowed to vote in the school election. Teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals and other school employees should be allowed to vote in the election even though they cannot hold office in the control sharing group (see below). But the underlying question is, should residents other than parents be allowed to vote? Opinions are split about this matter. Some people argue that parental interest in the school is too important to risk it being overridden by non-parent interest. If other than public school parents can vote, it may be that the control sharing group can be captured by a private parochial school faction, a group vehemently opposed to the cost of public education, or a militant political group. On the other side, proponents of a wider franchise argue that interest in the school is more broadly shared than simply the parent group and it is desirable on moral and pedagogical grounds to allow those interests an opportunity to participate. As an example of the first position Gittell recommends that ". . . only parents, the true clients of the school system, vote for the community board members."[17]

The second position, that all residents should be allowed to vote, is recommended in the Handbook. Cloward and Jones observe that, "one of the most striking things about our educational system is that there are virtually no formal channels through which persons without children in the public schools can make known their feelings about educational matters. Those without children in school are restricted to participation in the educational system through budget hearings or ad hoc 'citizens for better schools' committees. Thus, involvement in educational matters is virtually restricted to persons with children in public schools."[18] But, non-parents are affected by what happens in the school. They help pay for education

just as do parents. And as we learn more about the
non-institutional ways in which learning occurs, that is,
as we learn more about truly "community-based" educational
opportunities, it is clear that non-parents also have
a role to play in the education of children and should be
allowed to vote. This need not cause parents much concern
because it is natural and inevitable that far more
parents than non-parents will take an interest in the
local school election and turnout to vote.[19]

The Handbook recommends that any resident who
shows proof of residence should be allowed to vote. No
other restrictions on the franchise (except of course age)
are advisable. Fantini, et al., say that "Strictures on
district board elections--pre-registration of parents,
residency requirements, and a complex system of proportional
representation - are such as to minimize voting by the
poor."[20]

A second and often controversial question
revolves around whether school employees should be allowed
to hold office. In a special note, the Handbook defends
the position that because they are already well
represented in the policy-making process and because
their participation on a control-sharing group would
constitute a conflict of interest, both paraprofessionals
and professional employees of the local school should be
excluded from holding office even when they reside within
the school's attendance area. Fantini, Gittell, and
Magat, in commenting on a similar policy with respect to
NYC community school boards have observed that "this
policy deprives communities of the participation in either
school work or school policy-making, of some of their
most interested and energetic residents."[21] But
Gittell, writing alone about the exclusion of teachers,
defends that policy. "Teachers and administrators
when acting as representatives of their community
groups should not sit on local governing boards. The
experience in the demonstration districts also indicates
that teachers and administrators largely view community
control as a threat to their own status and will not be
especially cooperative."[22]

Most of the other election procedures are
straightforward adaptations of fair election practices to
the neighborhood situation. The single exception may be
the areal or other basis for election. The Handbook
recommends that all candidates run-at-large, that is that
they not run either for specific position (chairperson, etc.),
"second grade representative," or from a particular part

- 97 -

of the neighborhood. The important consideration here is
the physical size of most urban attendance areas.
Because of population density and neighborhood life
styles, such areas are already quite compact, often
comprised of an area not more than a few blocks on a
side. This is especially the case with elementary schools.
The complications introduced by the larger attendance
districts of junior and senior high schools will be
discussed in a moment.

The TARP/RAND study of citizen participation in DHEW
programs concluded, ". . . that success is negatively
related to the size of the target population. Of the
citizen participation organizations involving activities
serving less than 20,000 citizens, 68 percent were successful
in implementing their ideas, compared to less than one-half
of those involving over 20,000 citizens. The greater
success for all criteria was for target populations between
5,000 and 20,000 citizens."[23] Andrews and Noack found
that, within one large city school system, parents
residing in a decentralized community school district
were found to be significantly more satisfied with their
community schools than parents residing in a centralized
school district.[24] Similarly, Kramer's comparative study
indicated that smaller election units resulted in better
representation of low-income residents.[25]

On a related topic, Jencks reexamined the
Coleman data to discover whether or not the size of the
school district had an effect on achievement scores.

> I also compared large and small school districts.
> The differences were trivial. First, I compared
> sample schools in the 8 largest cooperative
> EEOS districts (Baltimore, Detroit, Milwaukee,
> New York, Philadelphia, St. Louis, San
> Francisco, and Washington, D.C.) with schools
> in the 116 smaller cooperative districts.
> After racial and socioeconomic factors had been
> taken into account, the "true" difference was
> somewhere between a three-month advantage for
> the big districts and a one-month advantage
> for the small districts. . . . . These
> results provided cold comfort to reformers
> who claim that student achievement in the great
> cities could be improved by Balkanizing the
> cities into smaller districts, such as those
> in the surrounding suburbs. No district,
> large or small, seems to have been very
> successful in boosting achievement in
> predominantly black or lower-class schools.

This suggests that decentralization and community control have primarily political rather than pedagogic effects.[26]

It should be noted that Jencks was looking at district size, not school building attendance area size.

Ziegler has also recently dissented from the notion that small constituencies yield better representation. Using the willingness of boards to challenge the superintendent's judgment as one indicator of responsiveness, he found that boards in small communities were less willing to engage in such challenges than those in metropolitan areas. Ziegler's conclusion is that

> Proximity is not good enough. One can predict the results of the current wail of decentralization with gloomy accuracy. Initially, in community schools, there will be a burst of conflict, realistic debate over educational goals, a high rate of turnover in personnel. Gradually, the urge for a competitive educational product, the complexity, the governing process, and the staff monopoly of information will result in the destruction of accountability. Structural changes do not generally produce behavioral changes. Ironically, then, the current quest for reform will produce more politically crippled boards, providing one more layer of legitimacy for administrators.[27]

Ziegler's reasoning is certainly plausible; neighborhood residents may be reluctant to challenge professional judgment because their interaction is so close. On the other hand, it may also be that, because of that proximity, principals will anticipate neighborhood reactions, incorporate more of their wishes and interests in professional decision, and thus render such challenges moot because of that prior responsiveness. Research on that alternate explanation has yet to be conclusively executed in education. We may only point out that the second explanation for a lack of challenges is well grounded in the premises of democratic government,[28] and there does not seem to be available a more reasonable alternate to achieve the goals which have been outlined for community involvement in school decision making.

.•   Larger attendance districts - those which
encompass more than a single neighborhood - present
complications. It may be desirable to break such areas
into smaller election sub-districts and select
representatives from the smaller areas. If that seems
desirable its probable impact on the composition of the
group needs to be weighed very carefully. The evils
of gerrymandering are well known. The effect of drawing
lines around any given area should not unnecessarily
diminish ethnic or racial or other representation.
This is a very complicated subject which cannot be
assessed without attention to specific voter distributions.
One plan, for example, may concentrate a school's
opponents in one area where they have but a single
representative; another plan may distribute opponents
so evenly that they have no representatives. The
guidelines here have to do with the critical importance
of representing whatever characteristics are salient
to school policy, fairly and impartially on the shared
control group.

COMBINED ELECTION AND APPOINTMENT

        Elections are the preferred method of selecting
group members since they begin the process of involvement
early and on a broad basis. They contribute to adequate
representation between group members and their
constituents and they are perceived as fairer and more
legitimate in their results than are other methods of
selection. However, there are special circumstances
which may require another procedure.

        One of these circumstances might be a neighborhood
that has a firmly established base of organizations and
voluntary associations. If those groups have a history
of interest and interaction with the school, it may
be desirable (and sometimes unavoidable) to allow them
to send organizational representations to the local
school's control sharing group. One big potential
problem with this procedure is establishing just which
groups should be allowed this sort of representation. If
minimum standards of size and longevity are used as
criteria, any group that is excluded is very likely to
complain of discrimination.

        Two other circumstances may justify the use of
this selection procedure. If election turnout is
extraordinarily low and if it cannot be raised, then there
may be no alternative but to turn to established groups.
Or, if the election itself seems unlikely to deliver

a shared control group that is broadly inclusive of
the neighborhood's legitimate points of view, then this
alternative may be considered. If it is considered, the
principal needs to be acutely aware that allowing some
organizations to send representatives will be perceived
as special and perhaps unfair treatment. Who is to
decide what "broadly inclusive" means? On whose
authority is the selection process "supplemented"? The
procedure may well debase the selection process itself,
and that is a very serious consequence.

Altshuler's warning about the undesirable
consequences of allowing existing groups to choose
representatives: "The arguments against explicit group
representation on neighborhood councils are obvious
and rather overwhelming. Such a reification of
particular criteria for categorizing voters would eliminate
from the system nearly all capacity to evolve; it would
intensify and ensure the persistence of today's most
salient group conflicts; and it would force many
people into molds that they found Procrustean."[29]

Still, the delegate assembly approach worked
fairly well on a city-wide basis for coordinating program
decisions in the community action area. The crucial
difference between that experience and the neighborhood
experience is very likely to be the relative dominance
of established organizations. If the strategy is
employed it should be done with great care to minimize
the possibility of abuse and to minimize the damage done
to more broadly-based selection procedures. It
seems reasonable to conclude that a shared control group
should be only partially constituted through this procedure,
and then only with the cooperation and assistance of as
many of the appropriate neighborhood people as possible.

NOTES

1. Wallace Sayre, "Additional Observations on the Study of Administration," Teachers College Record, v 60, n 2 (Nov., 1958), p. 75.

2. Wendell Bell and Maryanne Force, "Urban Neighborhood Types and Participation in Formal Associations," American Sociological Review (February, 1956); Robert Hollister, "Citizen Participation in Health Planning," Planning for Health Services and Facilities and Its Relation to City and Regional Planning Activities (Cambridge: Joint Center for Urban Studies of MIT and Harvard University, June, 1968).

3. Neil Gilbert, Clients or Constituents (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970).

4. Sherry R. Arnstein, "Eight Rungs on the Ladder of Citizen Participation," in Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change, ed. by Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971), pp. 69-92; Sumati N. Dubey, "Community Action Programs and Citizen Participation: Issues and Confusions," Social Work, v 15 (January, 1970), pp. 77-84. See also Melvin Mogulof, "Coalition to Adversary: Citizen Participation in Three Federal Programs," Journal of the American Institute of Planners (July, 1969), pp. 225-232.

5. Stelzer, "School Board Receptivity," p. 82.

6. Yin, et al., "Citizen Participation in DHEW Programs," RAND/TARP, p. 60.

7. Stelzer, "School Board Receptivity," p. 77.

8. Lyke, "Representation," in Levin, Community Control p. 163.

9. See for example the analysis of their faint impact on city councils as reported in Kenneth Prewitt and Heinz Eulau, "Political Matrix and Political Representation: Prolegomenon to a New Departure from an Old Problem," American Political Science Review, v LXIII, n 2 (June, 1969), pp. 412-427; Kenneth Prewitt, "Political Ambitions, Volunteerism, and Electoral Accountability," American Political Science Review, v LXIV, n 1 (March, 1970), pp. 5-17. For a recent discussion of the extent to which issue consciousness governs the electorate's judgment, see Gerald M. Pomper, et al., "Issue Voting," American Political Science Review, v LXVI, n 2 (June, 1972), pp. 415-428.

10.   M. Kent Jennings and Harmon Ziegler, "Response Styles
       and Politics: The Case of School Boards," Midwest
       Journal of Polical Science, v XV, n 2 (May, 1971),
       p. 311.

11.   Stelzer, "School Board Receptivity," p. 80.

12.   Paul E. Peterson, "Participation of the Poor,"
       American Political Science Review, v LXIV, n 2
       (June, 1970), pp. 491-507.

13.   Mann, Administrator/Community/School Relationships,
       p. 121.

14.   Jennings and Ziegler, "Response, Styles and Politics,"
       p. 309.

15.   Jennings and Ziegler, ibid., p. 313.

16.   Ralph M. Kramer, Participation of the Poor: Comparative
       Case Studies in the War on Poverty (Englewood Cliffs:
       Prentice-Hall, 1969), pp. 195-196.

17.   Gittell, School Boards, p. 164.

18.   Cloward and Jones, "Social Class Educational Attitudes
       and Participation," in Passow, Education in Depressed
       Areas, p. 196.

19.   Louis Massotti comments on the natural dominance of
       parent interests in "Patterns of White and NonWhite
       School Referenda Participation in Cleveland 1960-64,"
       in Educating an Urban Population, ed. by Marilyn
       Gittell (Beverly Hills: Sage, 1967), pp. 240-256.

20.   Fantini, Community Control, p. 170. See also, Ellen
       Lurie, How to Change the Schools (New York: Vintage,
       1970), p. 249.

21.   Fantini, et al., Community Control, p. 170.

22.   Gittell, "The Balance of Power," in Levin, Community
       Control, p. 125.

23.   Yin, et al., "Citizen Participation in DHEW Programs,"
       TARP/RAND, pp. 50-51.

24.   Andrews and Noack, "The Satisfaction of Parents with
       their Community Schools," p. 5.

25.   Kramer, Participation of the Poor, pp. 195-196. For
       additional discussions of the scale of the governance

unit, see, Altshuler, Community Control, p. 130 ff;
Fein, The Ecology of the Public Schools, pp. 89-93;
Kotler, Neighborhood Government, p. 2; and Schmandt,
"Municipal Decentralization: An Overview," pp. 571-
588.

26. Christopher S. Jencks, "The Coleman Report and the
Conventional Wisdom," in On Equality of Educational
Opportunity, ed. by Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P.
Moynihan (New York: Random House, 1972), pp. 69-115.

27. Ziegler, "Creating Responsive Schools," Urban
Education Review, v 6, n 4 (1973), p. 42.

28. See for example, Gittell, "The Balance of Power,"
in Levin, Community Control, pp. 123-124.

29. Altshuler, Community Control, p. 142.

IV WHAT SHOULD THEY DO?

A shared control group exists in order to realize the goals of the school and the community. Its contribution to that is made in terms of the group's involvement in the substance of school policy. Earlier sections of this essay defended the basic proposition that that involvement is successful when it is significant. In this section, various policy areas are examined, the evidence dealing with community participation is presented, and some of the overall limitations are examined.

Kenneth Clark's study of a dozen big city community action programs indicated that among the features which distinguished successful from unsuccessful programs was some form of involvemnt or representation of the program's clientele on the policy-making level.[1]

Significant involvement also helps the group with its own tasks. Lyke found that, "In general, the more authority decentralized school boards have the easier it will be for them to reflect the demands of citizens within their respective areas.[2]

Significant involvement means involvement that may make a difference in what happens in the school: it is involvement which can determine, influence, or change what the school does. The existence of a neighborhood-based group that can express community interests is not enough. The possiblity has to exist that those expressions can impact school policy. It should be obvious that what is intended here is not as one-to-one correspondence between community expression and school policy. Some of what the community wants may, on some occasions, be reflected in school policy and sometimes not. Whether it is or not depends on a number of contextual factors which have already been discussed (e.g., legal restraints, availability of material resources, the power position of other relevant participants, etc.) Other factors are about to be discussed.

But the essential point remains. Involvement must on some level make a difference. Harold Savitch's discussion of "nominal" versus "effective" access makes some illuminating points: "We can begin to clarify the concept by distinguishing 'effective access' from 'nominal access' which is not effective. Effective access

is the ability of a group not only to be heard but over
the course of time to obtain some kind of satisfaction.
This satisfaction is in a sense assured because
groups exercising effective access are in a position to
apply sanctions and inducements so that their demands
are not continually frustrated. Access which is
nominal or not effective is simply the ability of a
group to be heard in the strictest sense of the word, or
as Dahl would say, the ability to make noise."[3]

But, whether or not such an impact is justified
depends inter alia on the substance of the decision. The
handbook suggests four major areas of school policy:
curriculum, budget, personnel and student affairs. Many
observers have agreed on these as an appropriate
categorization of school policy matters.[4]

One study measured the range of policy
areas in which parents in the Boston public school system
said they wished to participate. Using five policy
areas, instead of the four suggested here, Raffel found
that Black parents were interested in participation in
more policy areas than were the parents of any other
group. "The five areas included personnel (teachers and/or
administrators), curriculum, methods, and budget review.
While the average Boston parent respondent thought
that parents should have a role in a average of over three
areas, this average differed greatly by ethnic group. . .
While Chinese respondents sought a role in fewer than
two decision areas, Italian and Irish respondents in three,
Black respondents believed that parents should play a role
in at least four of the five areas. Within the ethnic
groups, only the more educated Italians sought a greater
role than their less educated group members."[5]

Mann sought to discover the areas in which
school administrators thought that lay participation
would be the most appropriate and those where they thought
such participation would be least appropriate.
Administrators ranked lay participation in "budget and
finance" as the most appropriate, followed by student
matters, curriculum, and teacher personnel as the least
appropriate.[6] It is possible that administrators believe
that the lay participation in "budget and finance" may not
go further than simply paying for the schools or voting
in board elections. The interesting and volatile aspect of
the administrators ranking is the last place position
of lay participation in teacher personnel decisions.
Many community demands center around exactly this area
where administrators are least willing to grant communities
a legitimate role. In her evaluation of the New York

city demonstration districts, Gittell, for example
says, "The one power most desired by activist parents
who pressured for community participation in education
policy was over personnel. Most poor parents wanted
the ability to hold teachers and principals
accountable, a Center for Urban Education study of parental
attitudes showed that the greatest percentage of
respondents wanted the right to remove school personnel
they deemed incompetent."[7] But to repeat a point made
earlier, "involvement" can mean many things. "In New York
City one community school district has recently
developed guidelines for school Personnel Practices
Committees (PPC's). These committees must include parents
from each grade level; representation on them must
reflect the ethnic composition of student population.
The PPC's are given a large voice in the recruitment
and selection of all tax levy and Funded Programs staff,
in developing job descriptions and recommending staffing.
patterns. They may also conduct an on-going evaluation
of all staff by visiting classrooms with supervisory
personnel."[8]

        With respect to the budget area there is some
evidence linking significant participation with program
success. Yin, et al., report that "When the Citizen
Participation Organization (CPO) has substantial
influence over the services budget, 79 percent of the time
it was successful in implementing citizen views into
policy. Moreover, with control over the budget comes
opportunity for managerial responsibility, and 83
percent of the CPOs with budgetary influences saw the
development of new leadership skills."[9]

        However, in general very little research
has been done about the impact of involvement on specific
program areas. While the over-all proposition linking
significant involvement to goal achievement is well
documented, the component attributes of that involvement
are less clearly demonstrated.

        Typical is the comment of a 1970 Urban
        Institute report referring to the evaluation
        of social programs generally and specifically
        to Model Cities and Title I of the Elementary
        and Secondary Education Act: "Relatively little
        is known about the effectiveness of such
        programs in meeting their objectives." The
        report states that the programs include the
        difficulties of defining program objectives
        and output measures; methodological,

bureaucratic, and practical constraints;
shortages of trained personnel, lack of
funds, and the absence of clearly defined
evaluation policies.[10]

This lack of detailed documentation has now
however, dissuaded the protagonists in the involvement debate
from discussing the overall subject. As the Handbook
explains, control can be shared in rather precise amounts
and those amounts can vary according to local circumstances
and the policy areas implicated. Both "how much" and
"in what" can be modified to achieve a balance which school
people and neighborhood people can agree on. However,
legitimate questions can still be raised about what sorts
of decisions should be shared with respect to particular
matters. The diagnosis of the reading problems of a
group of children, the location and evaluation of various
alternate reading curricula, the selection and adoption
of one curriculum and the assessment of its results pose
- - - very specific dilemmas for school people and
laymen. What should be done in any particular decision
will depend to a large degree on such factors as the
knowledgeability of the participants, the history of their
interaction, and their relative influence over one
another. None of those things can be determined except by
reference to specific situations which obviously cannot
be described here except in terms of general overall
components.

It may be that uncertainty about situational
aspects of any given instance of involvement is one of
the things which makes administrators reluctant partic-
ipants in share control arrangements. The fierce
rhetoric which characterized the early part of the 1960's
drive for increased participation is certainly another
contributing factor. In order to justify a movement,
school people were often pictured as incompetent villains
and community people often arrogated to themselves suf-
ficient decision-making power and authority. Reality
is of course more complicated than rhetoric. Out of
that strife has come a much more realistic mutual
appraisal of the strengths and weaknesses of both sides.

One important part of that reappraisal is the
recognition that very, very few communities want to run
schools themselves. They do not wish to replace pro-
fessional educators, only to participate with them in
important policy decisions. Philip Meranto, for example,
in School Politics in the Metropolis, writes:

Although the degree of envisioned local control
is often ambiguous, the proponents feel that
community control can only be successful if
there is "significant" community involvement
in key policy decisions, particularly in the

- 108 -

areas of personnel, curriculum, budget, and
overall evaluation. This does not mean that
parents and other community participants seek
to run the school themselves. It does mean
that they want to be involved in key policy
decisions and want to insure that the profes-
sionals working in the schools are responsive
to the needs of the community and its children.[11]

And Fantini, et al., have observed, "Most parents want
nothing more than the assurance that their children's
schools are being run by men and women who truly believe
in the capacity of all children to learn. Ironically,
the more accountable the school is to the community,
the lower the degree of community control is likely to
be."[12] The relationship here is an interesting one
since it suggests that as long as the school is account-
able, professional autonomy may be largely unhindered.
A good deal of the justification of a shared-control
group is to deliver accountability from the school to
the community. If the group increases that accountabi-
lity, then it may also increase, not decrease, the
personal autonomy of the administrator. (The possibi-
lity of this paradoxical result emerging has been
discussed in Section II: "When to Share Control and
What to Expect.")

Nonetheless, the temptation to use community
involvement for manipulative purposes remains a strong
one. The definition of manipulation is always diffi-
cult--there is an old say about "I teach but you
manipulate!" Where professionals have a responsibility
for leadership; that is, a responsibility for encourag-
ing and stimulating people to do things they would not
do unassisted, it will always be difficult to know where
leadership stops and manipulation begins. Referring to
people's "best interests" will not help much since those
interests are so varied, and practically no action is
ever undertaken except in the sincere belief that it
is serving "The Public Interest." However, it is pro-
bably accurate to say that when a different version of
people's interests is substituted for the version which
people themselves have expressed, then manipulation is
taking place.

The temptations to do that are strong. What
happens when the neighborhood persists in wanting to do
something which the principal feels is mistaken? The
principal's first resort is to persuasion and exhor-
tation. The principal may also wish to marshall his or
her own supporters. If that fails, the principal may
wish to resort to legal authority (if the action is
within the legal province of the administrator) or

perhaps if the issue is important enough, to consider resigning. There is an alternate. If the consequences are not too severe, and if the estimated results-- although regrettable--are still acceptable, the principal may wish to accede to something in which he or she does not believe. The freedom to fail is, after all, one of the prices which all responsible decision makers (including administrators) pay. Two long-time observers of the community involvement scene, S. M. Miller and Martin Rein, say, "Efficiency and Participation do not necessarily converge. It may not always be possible to bring together without conflict ideals of efficiency, humanity, and democracy. But we cannot surrender to efficiency as the highest social value."[13]

Communications

A frequent criticism of education is that it has become so bureaucratized, especially in the big cities, that it is a closed-decision system in which public decisions are made in private beyond reach of public scrutiny. Practically every feature of the shared-control mechanism described here can be interpreted as an assault on the closed nature of that decision system. The introduction of new groups into school policy formation and implementation will certainly contribute to more adequate communications between schools and the public. Gittell and Hollander make a typical point: "Public participation in school policy formation is circumscribed by the lack of visible decision-making, the general shortage of information available to the public, a deficiency in the means for participation."[14]

Mann's research on the conditions of administrative responsiveness found that the number and kind of people to whom administrative decisions were visible, and the frequency of that visibility were related to responsiveness to the community. Where only bureaucratic superiors could oversee program decisions, the tendency to override community interests was strong. But, when oversight by a neighborhood group was added to the supervision found in the chain of command, that tendency diminished sharply.[15] Similarly LaNoue and Smith recommend more use of the public opinion devices to assess the attitudes of the system's clients and in keeping minority view points from being buried.[16]

- 110 -

NOTES

1. Kenneth Clark, A Relevant War Against Poverty: A
    Study of Community Actions Programs and Observable
    Social Change (New York: Metropolitan Applied
    Research Center, Inc., 1968), p. 212.

2. Lyke, "Representation, in Community Control, p. 159.

3. Harold V. Savitch, "Powerlessness in an Urban Ghetto:
    The Case of Political Biases and Differential Access
    in New York City," Polity v V, n 1 (Fall, 1972),
    p. 50.   Italics in original. See also Gittell,
    Demonstration for Social Change, p. 7.

4. Cf., Gittell, "Community Control of Education" in
    The Politics of Urban Education, ed. by Marilyn
    Gittell, p. 366; Fantini, "Community Participation,"
    Ibid., pp. 334-335; P. J. Cistone and B. Hennessy,
    "School Board Members' Attitudes and Administrative
    Forms: An Exploration of Public Regardingness,"
    Midwest Journal of Political Science, v XV, n 3
    (August, 1971), pp. 592-593, and Neal Gross, Ward
    S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern, Explorations
    in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Super-
    intendency Role (New York: Wiley, 1958), pp.
    125-128.

5. Raffel, "Responsiveness in Urban Schools," p. 153.

6. Mann, Administrator/Community/School Relationships,
    p. 316.

7. Gittell, Demonstration for Social Change, p. 66.

8. Gittell, School Boards and School Policy, p. 4.

9. Yin, et al., "Citizen Participation in DHEW Programs,"
    RAND/TARP p. 53.

10. Joseph S. Wholey, et al., Federal Evaluation Policy:
    Analyzing the Effects of Public Programs (Washington,
    DC: The Urban Institute, 1970). Cited by Yin,
    et al., "Citizen Participation in DHEW Programs,"
    TARP/RAND, pp. 17-18.

11. Meranto, School Politics in the Metropolis,
    pp. 76-77.

12. Fantini, et al., Community Control, Preface, p. xviii.

13. S. M. Miller and Martin Rein, "Participation, Poverty
    and Administration," in Public Administration Review,
    v 29, n 1 (Jan./Feb., 1969), pp. 15 and 25.

14. Gittell and Hollander, _Six Urban School Districts_, p. 176.

15. Mann, _Administrator/School/Community Relationships_, p. 215.

16. LaNoue and Smith, _The Politics of School Decentralization_, p. 239.

V hOW SHOULD THE GROUP BE ORGANIZED?

The responsibilities of a shared control group require that it be organized carefully. It must have a structure that is appropriate to the community- and school-related tasks it performs. It must make its decisions in a democratic fashion and it must be organized to utilize the best expert opinion available. The organizational features of the group include its decisions procedures, constituent relations, aspects of its meetings and provisions for self-change.

Procedures for group decisions are discussed in the Handbook itself. A distinction made earlier aboout the difference between consensus and consent is reintroduced there. Briefly, where groups are cohesive, where they share goals, most decisions can be expected to emerge by mutual agreement. But where those characteristics are not present, the prior establishment of fair procedures for arriving at a decision is very important. The Handbook also refers to the standard reference for group decision-making, Robert's Rules of Order. In a neighborhood where most participants are known to each other and where the group is created and operates under amicable circumstances, adopting parliamentary procedures may seem unnecessarily formal. In one sense that is true: if decisions can be reached fairly and with little effort, more formal structure is not necessary. However, if the shared-control group is to engage significant policy matters, some disagreement is to be expected. The entire purpose of formal procedures is to channel conflict, to ensure fairness to all interests, and to preserve the integrity of the group. Prior familiarity with formal decision procedures, in non-stressful circumstances can help groups through disagreement that might otherwise be much more acrimonious.

The sort of relation which individual group members should have with their constituents is always a thorny business. Practically everyone is agreed that any group which intends to pursue a neighborhood's interests or which will be acting on behalf of a neighborhood should include in its membership the salient descriptive characteristics of the neighborhood. This does not mean that Puerto Ricans cannot represent the interests of Chicanos, or that Blacks from the American South cannot act on behalf of those who come from the West

Indies. Italians do not have to have Italians for
representatives and so on. On the other hand, where
a large and vocal part of the school's clientele
consists of mothers who work outside the home, a shared-
control group will be hampered in its operation without
some representation of that point of view. Gittell, for
example states " . . . There is strong merit in the
argument that CSB's and school staffs may be educationally
more effective if they are ethnically representative of
those they are supposed to serve."[1] A neighborhood group
that is not accurately representative of its community
constituency will have a difficult time acting on their
behalf. And, in addition, that unrepresentativeness will
hinder the group's acceptance by another important group,
the teachers. If the group is not a representative
one, professionals feel it is less legitimate and are
less likely to cooperate with it.[2] Despite the
desirability of having a fairly close match between
the descriptive characteristics of the group and the
neighborhood, there is not much that the principal can
do about an imbalance if that imbalance results from an
election. Where elections are used to select group
members, about all the principal can do is to be alert
to the possibility of an imbalance or gap in
representation, and perhaps encourage people to run for
office in order to avoid those situations.

        Another aspect of constituent relation is the
extent which a group acts to satisfy individual interests
rather than group interests. (An earlier discussion
pointed out that competition for positions on the group
reduces the tendency of groups to serve only individual
interests.) What are the conditions which inhibit the
tendency of a group to "do favors for certain people"?
In their study of a national sample of school boards,
Jennings and Ziegler found that the more complexity present
in the community being represented (measured by
metropolitianism, urbanism, and size) the less likely the
group was to represent individual as opposed to group
interests. Thus, to the extent that the shared control
group indeed represents or is chosen to reflect the
entire range of interests in a community, to that extent
it will be less likely to enact individual's wishes
and interests at the expense of those groups.[3]

NOTES

1. Gittell, <u>et al</u>., School Boards and School Policy,
   p. 21.

2. See for example, Neil Gilbert's discussion of the
   attitudes of community organizers in <u>Clients &</u>
   <u>Constituents: Community Action in the War on</u>
   <u>Poverty</u> (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970),
   pp. 137-138.

3. Jennings and Ziegler, "Response Styles and Politics,"
   p. 301.

VI HOW TO HELP

The entire Handbook is organized around the specific things which school principals may do to help shared control groups succeed. Each topic considered here is an operational answer to the "how to help" question. This concluding section of the interpretive essay considers some additional things that principals may do for the group. It deals in sequence with requisite features for democratic participation.[1]

The first requisite is of course, the opportunity to share control. That is not as tautological as it may seem, since schools ordinarily offer many citizen involvement opportunities that do not reach the level of authenticity or intensity of shared control. Saul Alinsky stressed,

> . . . the necessary physical links to start
> the communication and the democratic bargaining.
> Without that it becomes literally impossible.
> You cannot have the democratic process and you
> cannot have the democratic involvement of
> people in the community as long as they do not
> have representation. If they are not
> organized, they don't have the circumstances
> from which they can derive legitimate
> representation. This is the fundamental
> requirement for the democratic mix. . .
> This idea of the importance of
> being organized in order to have true
> representation from the community holds true
> for the schools as well. Principals or
> administrators who have ideas about
> community involvement in the operation of
> the school must, of necessity, have a
> method of securing legitimate representation
> from the community.[2]

The existence of a mechanism of shared control is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for successful involvement. As Edgar and Jean Cahn say, "Wherever there is any form of representation--on boards, through employment of staff, elections, public meetings, volunteer service, in the day-to-day administration, through complaint bureaus, grievance procedures or adversary contests---there must be access to knowledge and to the resources necessary to present the best possible case for the position taken."[3]

One of the most important of those additional
resources is the material support for neighborhood
people. In many circumstances, the participation of urban
residents is precluded because of family responsibilities
as a mother or father, or because of the necessity to work
at two or more jobs, or because of the single inability
to pay the small amounts entailed in carfare between
home and meeting place. Per meeting or lump sum stipends
can be used to make up for those lacks. They can allow
participants to arrange for baby sitters, pay carfare,
and compensate for income foregone. They can also
contribute to the neighborhood group's motivation and
attention to details of its work.

Title I of ESEA specifically provides for
stipends to parent representatives.[4] Several
researchers agree about the usefulness of this provision.
Lyke, for example, recommends that city-wide school board
members be paid as full-time legislators as are many state
and federal representatives.[5] Gittell says, "The
traditional civic concept of unpaid board membership
developed by a middle-class community and for a limited
concept of the role of a school board is not practical
in a system of community control."[6]

In addition, stipends can encourage representation
of a neglected group in the politics of education at
the neighborhood level---men. Altshuler points out that
the Kerner Commission determined that three times as
many men as women participated in urban riots. From
the evidence, he concludes that it is men "who threaten
the stability of the political order," and thus it is
particularly important to attract male participation in
neighborhood government. That participation can be
induced with a stipend. Altshuler cites a study of
Denver Model Cities groups which provided $15 per meeting
stipends and which with 70% male representatives had
reversed the usual proportion.[7]

The information on which to base involvement
is a vital support component. It is so important that the
US Office of Education has mandated that each parent
representative on a Title I ESEA advisory council must,
as a minimum, receive free of charge

    "1. Title I legislation
     2. Federal regulations, guidelines, criteria
         pertaining to Title I
     3. State Title I regulations and guidelines
     4. The LEA's current Title I application and past
         applications and evaluations.
     5. Any other information the council members may
         need to perform their duties effectively."[8]

OE's 1970 regulations also referred to an "affirmative
information program" for parents which included, in
addition to the above things, recommendations about
exemplary programs, a description of the process for
planning and developing grant applications, and full
information about the starting and ending dates of all
programs.[9] Malcolm Provus, who has wide experience in
educational evaluation has expanded on the goals of
information to be provided and the likely effects of
its availibility.

> Information about the daily, weekly, or
> monthly travails of community program operations
> can be exciting stuff. When the successes and
> failures of programs serving real and pressing
> community needs are observed and examined,
> an increasing number of people will commit
> themselves to the challenge of improving
> affairs. When specific shortages of materials
> or human skills are made apparent, the
> community will find. its voice and hands.
> Where it is publicly demonstrated that
> essential human resources cannot be found
> within a community, the need for their
> importation will be acknowledged even by
> militants. A sense of interdependence
> with a large community will be established and
> a sense of control over one's own life-space
> will begin to unfold. Only if the public is
> fully informed about a program as it develops
> will the benefits of that program occur, and
> only then will proofs and evidence of its
> effectiveness be forthcoming. . .
>
> Public and educators alike can come to expect
> that all programs will be described in terms
> of:
>
> Who is to be changed by the program?
> In what way and by what time?
> How are the changes to be brought about?
> Who must be involved?
> What process will be used?
> What is the sequence of the steps in each
> process and what are the immediate effects of
> these steps?
> What staff training is needed?
> What administrative functions are essential?
> What kind of institutional cooperation is needed?
> What facilities, material, and equipment are
> needed and   will these be used?

What dollar and nondollar costs are involved?
How mcuh money comes from federal, state, and
local resources?[10]

Along with more information, members of the
shared control group are also likely to profit by training
in its use and application to school-level decision making.
Again, the Title I guidelines stress the need for
"long-term, on-going training of Parent Advisory council
members."[11] The study of DHEW programs by Yin, et al.,
indicated that in two-thirds of the cases where training
was provided to group members, the participants developed
new skills and were successful in getting their views
translated into policy.[12]

The provision of formal training experiences can
reinforce the learning that will already be taking place
simply by virtue of membership in the group. Fantini,
et al.,point out the benefits to be had by this "learn-
by-doing" approach: "The question should involve not
what parents know now about the technicalities of
education, but what they can come to know. Participation
affords direct knowledge and facilitates understanding
and insights far more effectively than attempts to
learn and understand from a distance. Experience is
the great teacher."[13]

The availability of staff help is also
extremely important. On the basis of eight years of
study at CASEA, Zeigler has concluded that " . . . elected
bodies must be provided with full time staffs, capable
of matching the administration fact for fact, jargonistic
phrase for jargonistic phrase. Otherwise, the
inevitable erosion will occur."[14] The study of citizen
participation in DHEW programs reached a similar and
emphatic conclusion.

The most important organizational characteristic
for a CPO is that it has staff under its own
control. As the following responses indicate,
the simple presence of staff was associated
with a 75 percent success rate.

o Does the CPO have its own staff?

Response	Yes (N=20)	No (N=26)
Not at all, or to a trivial degree...........	25%	58%
To a significant but limited or to a high degree...................	75%	42%
	100%	100%

No other feature is as critical to success in affecting the services and the reasons for this are not difficult to infer.[15]

But, despite this clear indication of the relation between staff assistance to community boards and program success, Gittell reports that by 1972 not more than 5 of New York City's 32 decentralized boards had executive assistants at the district level.[16]

The final characteristic to be considered is probably equally important. The professionals within the schools, especially the teachers must be receptive to and supportive of community involvement. The Handbook discussed some specific ways in which those attitudes can be fostered. The importance of staff attitudes has been remarked by several authors. Fusco says "If school officials expect parents to be noncooperative their impressions will convey itself to parents and cause a negative attitude."[17]

NOTES

1. See Verba, "Democratic Participation," p. 53-78.
    For a similar list of resources necessary to support
    popular participation, see Michael Lipsky, Protest
    in City Politics: Rent Strikes, Housing, and the
    Power of the Poor (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1970),
    pp. 167-168.

2. Saul Alinsky, "Organizing Low-Income Neighborhoods
    for Political Action," in Urban School Administration,
    ed. by McKelvey and Swanson, p. 43. See also Hess,
    "Parent Involvement," in Day Care: Resources for
    Decisions, p. 280; Kirst, The Politics of Education,
    p. 124; Russell L. Isbister and G. Robert Koopman,
    "Citizen Participation in School Affairs," in Vital
    Issues in American Education, ed. by Crow, p. 86.

3. Cahn, "Maximum Feasible Participation," in Citizen
    Participation, ed. by Cahn and Passett, p. 51.

4. O.E., "Parental Involvement," p. 11.

5. Lyke, "Representation," in Community Control, ed. by
    Levin, p. 167.

6. Gittell, "The Balance of Power," in Community Control,
    ed. by Levin, p. 133.

7. Altshuler, Community Control, pp. 144-145.

8. "Parental Involvement in Title I ESEA," p. 6.

9. USOE, "Memorandum to Chief State School Officers/
    Advisory Statement on Development of Policy on
    Parental Involvement in Title I, ESEA Projects (Washing-
    ton, DC: USOE/DHEW, October 30, 1970), pp. 2-3.

10. Malcolm Provus, "In Search of Community," Phi Delta
    Kappan, v 54, n 10 (June, 1973), p. 661.

11. OE, "Parental Involvement," p. 10.

12. Yin, et al., "Chief Participation in DHEW Programs,"
    TARP/RAND, p. 56.

13. Fantini, et al., Community Control, p. 97. See also
    Cunningham, Governing Schools, p. 171; and Rempson,
    "School-Parent Programs," in The Urban Rs, ed. by
    Dentler, Mackler and Warshauer, p. 140.

14. Zeigler, "Creating Responsive Schools," p. 43.

15. Yin, et al., "Citizen Participation in DHEW Programs," TARP/RAND, p. 55. See also Rempson.

16. Gittell, School Boards and School Policy, p. 64.

17. Fusco, Improving School Community Relations, p. 8. See also Kramer, Participation of the Poor, p. 230, and Fantini, "Quality Education," in Community Control, ed. by Levin, p. 57.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1) Agger, Robert E.; Goldrich, Daniel; and Swanson,
   Bert E. "Classifying Power Structures and
   Political Regimes." The Search for Community
   Power. Edited by W. D. Hawley and F. M. Wirt.
   Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

2) _____, and Goldstein, Marshall N. Who Will Rule
   The Schools: A Cultural Class Crisis. Belmont,
   California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc.,
   1971.

3) Aleshire, Robert A. "Power to the People: An
   Assessment of the Community Action and Model
   Cities Experience." Public Administration
   Review, v XXXII (September, 1972), 428-442.

4) Alford, Robert R. Bureaucracy and Participation;
   Political Cultures in Four Wisconsin Cities.
   Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

5) Alinsky, Saul. "Native Leadership." Citizen Parti-
   cipation in Urban Development. Vol. I:
   Concepts and Issues. Edited by Hans B.C.
   Spiegel. Washington, DC: NTL Institute for
   Applied Behavioral Science, 1968.

6) Altshuler, Alan A. Community Control: The Black
   Demand for Participation in Large American
   Cities. New York: Pegasus Western Publish-
   ing Co., 1970.

7) Andrews, Richard L., and Noac-, Ernest G.S. "The
   Satisfaction of Parents with Their Community
   Schools as a Measure of Effectiveness of
   Decentralization of a School System," American
   Education Research Association Annual Meetings,
   New York, February, 1971.

8) Arnstein, Sherry R. "Eight Rungs on the Ladder of
   Citizen Participation." Citizen Participation:
   Effecting Community Change. Edited by Edgar S.
   Cahn and Barry A. Passett. New York: Praeger
   Publishers, 1971.

9)   Austin, David. "Resident Participation: Political
        Mobilization or Organizational Cooptation?"
        Public Administration Review (September, 1972,
        Special Issue), 409-420.

10) Averch, Harvey A.; Carrol, Stephen J.; Donaldson,
        Theodore S.; Kiesling, Herbert J.; Pincus,
        John. How Effective is Schooling? A Critical
        Review and Synthesis of Research Findings.
        Santa Monica: The Rand Corp., March, 1972;
        R-956-PCSF/RC.

11) Bachrach, Peter, and Baratz, Morton S. "Two Faces
        of Power." American Political Science Review,
        v LVI, n 4 (December, 1962), 947-962. Reprinted
        in Political Power: A Reader in Theory and
        Research. Edited by Roderick Bell, David V.
        Edwards, and R. Harrison Wagner. New York:
        Free Press, 1969.

12) _____. "Decisions and Nondecisions: An Analytic
        Framework." American Political Science Review,
        v LVII, n 3 (September, 1963), 632-642. Re-
        printed in Political Power: A Reader in Theory
        and Research. Edited by Roderick Bell, David V.
        Edwards, and R. Harrison Wagner. New York:
        Free Press, 1969.

13) _____, ed. Political Elites in a Democracy.
        New York: Atherton Press, 1971.

14) _____. The Theory of Democratic Elitism. Boston:
        Little-Bronw, 1967.

15) Bailey, Stephen. "Preparing Educational Administrators
        for Conflict Resolution," American Educational
        Research Association Annual Meetings, New York,
        1971.

16) Barth, Ernest A.T., and Johnson, Stuart D. "Community
        Power and a Typology of Social Issues." The
        Search for Community Power. Edited by W. D.
        Hawley and F. M. Wirt. Englewood Cliffs:
        Prentice-Hall, 1968.

17) Bell, Roderick; Edwards, David V.; and Wagner, R.
        Harrison, eds. Political Power: A reader in
        Theory and Research. New York: Free Press,
        1969.

18) Bell, Wendell, and Force, Maryanne. "Urban Neighborhood
    Types and Participation in Formal Associations."
    American Sociological Review. February, 1956.

19) Bellin, L.E., Kavaler, F., and Schwartz, A. "Phase One
    of Consummer Participation in Policies of Twenty
    Two Voluntary Hospitals in New York City." Paper
    at American Public Health Association, Minneapolis.
    1971. (mimeo)

20) Bernstein, Abraham. The Education of Urban Populations.
    New York: Random House, 1967.

21) Berube, Maurice R., and Gittell, Marilyn. eds.
    Confrontation at Ocean Hill-Brownsville. New
    York: Praeger, 1969.

22) _____. "Educational Achievement and Community
    Control." Community Issues, v I, n 1 (November,
    1968).

23) Bible, Bond L., and Brown, Emory J. "Role of
    Community and Clientele Leaders--Coopting Clientele
    in Decision-making." Policies, Decisions and
    Organization. Edited by F. J. Lyden, G. A. Shipman,
    and H. Kroll. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts,
    1969.

24) "Bibliography on School Decentralization and Community
    Control" Community Issues. Vol 2, No. 3 (June 1970).

25) Bloomberg, Warner, Jr. and Kincaid, John. "Parent
    Participation: Practical Policy or Another Panacea."
    The Urban Review, V 2., N 7 (June, 1968), 5-11.

26) Board of Examiners. "Preliminary Notice: Next
    Examination for License as Principal of a Day
    Elementary School." Brooklyn: Board of Education
    of the City of New York, 1970.

27) Bonjean, Charles M., Clark, Terry N. and Lineberry,
    Robert L. Community Politics: A Behavioral
    Approach. New York: The Free Press, 1971.

28)   Bonjean, Charles M. and Olson, David M. "Community
      Leadership: Directions of R search." . The Search
      for Community Power. Edited by Hawley and Wirt.

29)   Booz-Allen/HUD, "Citizen Participation in the Model
      Cities Program", HUD Community Development
      Evaluation Series #2, January, 1972.

30)   Bromage, Arthur W."Political Representation in
      Metropolitan Areas." American Political Science
      Review. V 52, N 3 (September 1958) pp 406-413.

31)   Broudy, Harry S. The Real World of the Public Schools.
      Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc. N.Y. 1972.

32)   Brandeis University. Florence Heller School for Advanced
      Studies in Social Welfare. Community Representation
      in Community Action Programs, Report No. 5:
      Final Report. Waltham: Brandeis University, March
      1969..

33)   Brandeis University. "Community Representation
      in 20 Cities."   · Citizen Participation: Effecting
      Community Change. Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A.
      Passett (eds.) New York: Praeger, 1971. ·

34)   Buchanan, James M. and Tullock, Gordon. The
      Calculus of Consent: Logical Foundations of
      Constitutional Democracy. Ann Arbor: University of
      Michigan Press, 1962.

35)   Bullock, Robert P. CP EA in Ohio, School-Community
      Attitude Analysis for Educational Administrators.
      The School-Community Development Study Monograph
      Series No. 7. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State
      University, 1969.

36)   Burke, Edmund M. "Citizen Participation Strategies."
      Journal of American Institute of Planners
      (September, 1968), 287-294.

37)   CFK, Ltd. "A Look into Your School District."
      Englewood, Colorado: CFK Publications, undated.

38)   Cabrera, Patricia, and McCormick, George T. "Recom-
      mendations Relative to the Organization of Advisory
      Committees When Working with Adults with Spanish
      Surnames." Sacramento: California State Depart-
      ment of Education, 1967. (ED 017 844)

39) Cahill, Robert S., and Hencley, Stephen P., eds. The Politics of Education in the Local Community. Danville, Ill.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1964.

40) Cahn, Edgar. "Discussion of the Division of the Role of the Community in Developing Improved Health Care." Community Participation for Equity and Excellence in Health Care, 1970 Health Conference, New York Academy of Medicine, pp. 1031-1037.

41) ____, and Cahn, Jean. "Citizen Participation." Citizen Participation in Urban Development. Edited by Hans B.C. Spiegel. Washington, DC: NTL Institute, 1968-1969. Vol. I, pp. 225-240.

42) ____. "Maximum Feasible Participation: A General Overview. Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change. Edited by Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passett. New York: Praeger, 1971.

43) ____, and Passett, Barry A., eds. Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1971.

44) California State Department of Education. "Education for the People." California State Legislature, Joint Committee on Educational Goals and Evaluation.

45) ____. "Handbook for California School District Advisory Committees. Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title I." Sacramento: Bureau of Community Services and Migrant Education, 1968. (ED 030 177)

46) Carter, Richard F.; and Odell, W. R. The Structure and Process of School Community Relations. Vol. V: A Summary. Stanford: California Institute for Communications Research, Stanford University, 1966. Other studies in this series include: Carter, Richard F.; Greenberg, Bradley S.; and Haimson, Alvin. Vol. I: Informal Communications About Schools; Carter, Richard R., and Chaffee, Steven H. Vol. II: Between Citizens and Schools. June 30, 1966. (ERIC ED 017 055); Carter, Richard F.; Ruggels, W. Lee; and Olson, Richard F. Vol. III: The Structure of School-Community Relations; Carter, Richard F., and Ruggels, W. Lee. V. IV: The Process of School-Community Relations.

47) Carter, Richard F., and Sutthoff, John. Voters and Their Schools. Stanford University: Institute for Communication Research, 1960.

MANN

48) Campbell, Roald F., and Layton, Donald H. **Policy Making for American Education**. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1969.

49) Carlson, Richard O. "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences; the Public School and Its Clients." **Behavioral Science and Educational Administration**. Edited by D. E. Griffith. The 63rd yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II, NSSE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

50) Carrell, Jeptha P. "Citizen Participation and Decentralization." **Midwest Review of Public Administration**, III, N. 1 (February, 1969), 3-12.

51) Christiansen, Dorothy, compiler. **Decentralization Bibliography**. New York: Center for Urban Education, April, 1968.

52) Cistone, Peter J., ed. **School Boards and the Political Fact**. Toronto: Ontario Institute for the Study of Education, 1972.

53) _____, and Hennessy, B. "School Board Members' Attitudes and Administrative Forms: An Exploration of Public Regardingness." **Midwest Journal of Political Science**, XV, No. 3 (August, 1971), 587-594.

54) "Citizens Action in Model Cities and CAP Programs: Case Studies and Evaluation." **Public Administration Review**, 32 (Special Issue, September, 1972).

55) Clark, Kenneth. **A Relevant War Against Poverty: A Study of Community Action Programs and Observable Social Change**. New York: Metropolitan Applied Research Center, Inc., 1968.

56) Cloward, Richard A., and Jones, James A. "Social Class: Educational Attitudes and Participation." **Education in Depressed Areas**. Edited by Harry A. Passow. New York: Teachers College Press, 1963.

57) Citizens' Committee for Children of N.Y., Inc. "Modernization of the Public Meeting Process of the New York City Board of Education." Part I, 1970.

MANN

58) Cohen, David K. "The Price of Community Control."
    Commentary (July, 1969), 23-32.

59) Coleman, James S. "Community Conflict." New York:
    The Free Press, 1957. (Pamphlet)

60) Columbia Law Review (March, 1966). (Issue devoted
    to citizen participation in urban renewal.)

61) Crain, Robert L.; Katz, Elihu; and Rosenthal,
    Donald B. The Politics of Community Conflict,
    The Fluoridation Decision. New York: The
    Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1969.

62) Crecine, J. P. "The Politics of Education: Some
    Thoughts on Research Directions." State, School
    and Politics. Edited by Michael Kirst. Lexington,
    Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1972.

63) Crow, Alice and Lester D., eds. Vital Issues in
    American Education. New York: Bantam Books,
    1964.

64) Cunningham, James V. "Citizen Participation in
    Public Affairs." Public Administration Review,
    v. 32 (October, 1972, Special Issue), 589-602.

65) Cunningham, Luvern. "Educational-Governance and Policy
    Making in Large Cities." Public Administration
    Review, v 30, n 4 (July/August, 1970), 333-340.

66) _____, ed. Governing Schools: New Approaches
    to Old Issues (Columbus: Charles E. Merrill
    Publishing Company, 1971.

67) _____. "Trends and issues in Client Demands and System
    Responses." Theory into Practice, v 8, n 4
    (October, 1969), 249-254.

68) _____, and Nystrand, Raphel O. "Citizen Parti-
    cipation in School Affairs: A Report to the
    Urban Coalition," Ohio State University,
    November, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

69) "Curriculum Essays on Citizens, Politics, and
    Administration in Urban Neighborhoods." Public
    Administration Review, v XXXII (October, 1972,
    Special Issue).

70) Dahl, Robert A. A Preface to Democratic Theory.
    Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.

MANN

71) De Cocq, Gustav A. Citizen Participation: Doomed
        to Extinction or Last Foothold of Democracy?
        Leyden: A. W. Sijthoff, 1969.

72). Dentler, Robert A.; Mackler, Bernard; and Warshauer,
        Mary Ellen, eds. The Urban Rs: Race Relations
        as the Problem in Urban Education. New York:
        Praeger, 1967.

73) Donovan, Bernard E. "Guidelines for Individual
        Schools to Achieve Community Involvement in
        the Schools." Brooklyn: Board of Education of
        the City of New York, September 28, 1967.

74) Dubey, Sumati N. "Community Action Programs and
        Citizen Participation: Issues and Confusions."
        Social Work, v 15 (January, 1970), 77-84.

75) Edelman, Murray. Politics as Symbolic Action: Mass
        Arousal and Quiescence Chicago: Markham, 1971.

76) _____. "Symbols and Political Quiescence."
        Empirical Democratic Theory. Edited by C. F.
        Cnudde and D. E. Neubauer. Chicago: Markham,
        1969.

77) _____. The Symbolic Uses of Politics. Urbana:
        University of Illinois Press, 1967.

78) Edelston, Harold C., and Kolodner, Ferne K. "Are
        the Poor Capable of Planning for Themselves?"
        Citizen Participation in Urban Development,
        Vol. I. Edited by Hans B.C. Spiegel. Washing-
        ton, DC: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral
        Science, 1968.

79) Eisinger, Peter K. "Control Sharing in the City."
        American Behavioral Scientist, v. 15, n 1
        (September/October, 1971), 36-51.

80) Elazar, Daniel. "School Decentralization in the
        Context of Community Control: Some Neglected
        Considerations." State, School, and Politics.
        Edited by Michael W. Kirst. Lexington, Mass.:
        D. C. Heath and Company, 1972.

81) Elboim-Dror, Rachel. "Some Characteristics of the
        Education Policy Formation System." Policy
        Sciences, v 1, n 2 (Summer, 1970), 231-255.

82) Eulau, Heinz. "Changing Views on Representation."
    Micro-Macro Political Analysis: Accents of
    Inquiry. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.

83) _____. "The Informal Organization of Decisional
    Structures in Small Legislative Bodies." Mid-
    west Journal of Political Science, XIII, n 3
    (August, 1969), 341-367.

84) _____, and Eyestone, Robert. "Policy Maps of
    City Councils and Policy Outcomes: A Develop-
    mental Analysis." American Political Science
    Review, v LXII, n 1 (March, 1968), 124-144.

85) Everett, John R. "The Decentralization Fiasco and
    Our Ghetto Schools." Challenges to Education.
    Edited by Emanuel Hurwitz, Jr., and Charles A.
    Tesconi, Jr. New York: Dod, Mead & Co., 1972.

86) Falkson, Joseph L., and Grainer, Marc A. "Neighbor-
    hood School Politics and Constituency Organi-
    zations." School Review, v 81, n 1 (November,
    1972), 35-61.

87) Fantini, Mario; Gittell, Marilyn; and Magat,
    Richard. Community Control and the Urban
    School. New York: Praeger, 1970.

88) Featherstone, Joseph. "Community Control of Schools."
    The New Republic (July 19, August 16, and
    August 30, 1969).

89) Fein, Leonard J. The Ecology of the Public Schools.
    New York: Pegasus, 1971.

90) Fessler, Donald R. "Citizen Participation in Commu-
    nity Development, Part 2: Workshop Manual."
    Virginia Polytechnic Institute, March, 1967.
    (ED 014 042)

91) Finer, Herbert J. "Administrative Responsibility
    in Democratic Government." Bureaucratic Power
    in National Politics. Edited by F. K. Rourke.
    Boston: Little-Brown, 1965.

92) Foskett, John M. "The Influence of Social Partici-
    pation on Community Programs and Activities."
    Community Structure and Analysis. Edited by
    M. B. Sussman. New York: Crowell Co., 1959.

93) Freeman, L. C.; Fararo, T. J.; Bloomberg, W., Jr.;
and Sunshine, M. H. "Role of Community and
Clientele Leaders--Identifying Community Lea-
ders in Decision-Making." Policies, Decisions,
and Organization. Edited by F. J. Lyden, G. A.
Shipman, and M. Kroll. New York: Appleton-
Century-Crofts, 1969.

94) Frieden, Bernard J., and Morris, Robert, eds.
Urban Planning and Social Policy. New York:
Basic Books, 1968.

95) Friederich, Carl J. "Public Policy and the Nature
of Administrative Responsibility." Bureaucratic
Power in National Politics. Edited by F. E.
Rourke. Boston: Little-Brown, 1965.

96) Friedman, Robert S.; Klein, Bernard W.; and Romani,
John H. "Administrative Agencies and the
Publics They Serve." Public Administration
Review, v XXVI (1966), 192-204.

97) Frey, Frederick W. "Comment" [on Wolfinger's "Non-
decisions and the Study of Local Politics"].
American Political Science Review, v LXV, n 4
(December, 1971), 1081-1101.

98) Fusco, Gene C. "Improving Your School-Community
Relations Program." Englewood Cliffs, NJ:
Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

99) _____. "School-Home Partnership in Depressed
Urban Neighborhoods." Washington, DC: U. S.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
1964. (ED 001 579)

100) Gallup, George. How the Nation Views the Public
Schools (Princeton, NJ: Gallup International,
1969.

101) Gamson, William A. "Stable Unrepresentation in
American Society." Group Politics: A New
Emphasis. Edited by E. S. Malecki and H. R.
Mahood. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons,
1972. Reprinted in American Behavioral Scientist
v 12 (Nov.-Dec., 1968), 15-21.

102) Gaynor, Alan K. "Some Implications of Political
Systems Theory for Alternative Demand Proces-
sing Mechanisms for Public School Systems.
Educational Administration Quarterly, v VII, n 1
(Winter, 1971), 34-45.

103) Gellhorn, Walter. When Americans Complain: Govern-
      mental Grievance Procedures. Cambridge: Harvard
      University Press, 1966.

104) Gilbert, Charles E. "Operative Doctrines of Repre-
      sentation." American Political Science Review,
      v LVII, n 4 (Dec., 1963), 604-618.

105) _____. "The Framework of Administrative Responsi-
      bility." Journal of Politics, v 21 (1959),
      373-407.

106) Gilbert, Neil. Clients or Constituents. San
      Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1970.

107) Girvetz, Harry K. Democracy and Elitism. New York:
      Scribners, 1967.

108) Gittell, Marilyn. Local Control in Education. New
      York: Praeger, 1972.

109) _____. Participants and Participation: A Study
      of School Policy in New York City. New York:
      Center for Urban Education, 1967. (Monograph)

110) _____; Berube, Maurice R.; Boulton, H. Demas;
      Flavin, Daniel; Rosentraub, Mark; Spier, Adele;
      and Tatge, David. School Boards and School
      Policy: An Evaluation of Decentralization in
      New York City (New York: Praeger Publishers,
      1973.

111) _____; Berube, Maurice R.; Gottfried, Frances,
      Guttentag, Marcia, and Spier, Adele.
      Demonstration for Social Change, An Experiment
      in Local Control. New York: Institute for
      Community Studies, Queens College of the City
      University of New York, 1971.

112) _____, and Hevesi, Alan G., eds. The Politics
      of Urban Education. New York: Praeger, 1969.

113) _____, and Hollander, T. Edward. Six Urban
      School Districts: A Comparative Study of
      Institutional Response. New York: Praeger,
      1968.

114) Goldblatt, H. "Arguments for and Against Citizen
      Participation in Urban Renewal." Citizen Parti-
      cipation in Urban Development, Vol. I. Edited
      by Hans B.C. Spiegel. Washington, DC: NTL
      Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1968.

115) Goldhammer, Keith. "Factors Related to Citizen, Administrator, and Teacher Participation in Educational Decision-Making." Eugene: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1965.

116) Gottfried, Frances. "A Survey of Parental Views of the Ocean Hill-Brownsville Experiment." Community Issues, v 2, n 5 (October, 1970).

117) Green, Thomas F. "Schools and Communities: A Look Forward." Harvard Educational Review, v 39, n 2 (1969), 221-252.

118) Greenstone, J. David, and Peterson, Paul E. "Reformers, Machines and the War on Poverty." City Politics and Public Policy. Edited by James Q. Wilson. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1968.

119) Gromachi, Chester. "A Study of Current Practices and Development of an Advisory Committee Handbook." June, 1966. (ED 014 950)

120) Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: Wiley, 1958.

121) _____; Mason, Ward S., and McEachern, Alexander W. Explorations in Role Analysis: Studies of the School Superintendency. New York: Wiley, 1958.

122) Haider, Donald. "The Political Economy of Decentralization." American Behavioral Scientist, v 15, n 1 (Sept./Oct., 1971), 108-129.

123) Havelock, Ronald. Planning for Innovation. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1971.

124) Hawley, Willis D., and Svara, James H. The Study of Community Power, A Bibliographic Review. Santa Barbara, California: Clio Press, Inc., 1972.

125) _____, and Wirt, Frederick M. The Search for Community Power. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1968.

126) Hedlund, Ronald D., and Frieseman, H. Paul. "Representatives' Perceptions of Constituency Opinion." The Journal of Politics, v 32, n 3 (August, 1972), 730-752.

127) Herbert, Adam W. "Management Under Conditions of Decentralization and Citizen Participation." Public Administration Review, v 32 (October, 1972, Special Issue), 622-638.

128) Hess, Robert D.; Bloche, Marianne; Costello, Joan; Knowles, Ruby T.; Largay, Dorothy. "Parent Involvement in Early Education." Day Care: Resources for Decisions. Edited by Edith H. Grothberg. Washington, DC : Office of Economic Opportunity. Reprinted by Day Care and Child Development Council of America, Inc., no date.

129) Hirschman, Albert O. Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations and States. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970.

130) Hofstrand, Richard K., and Phipps, Lloyd J. "Advisory Councils for Education, A Handbook." Urbana: Rurban Educational Development Laboratory, College of Education, University of Illinois, 1971. (ERIC ED 057 213)

131) Hughes, John F., and Hughes, Anne O. Equal Education: A New National Strategy. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972.

132) Iannaccone, Laurence. "Increasi... Irresponsibility in Education: A Growing Gap Between Policy Planning and Operational Groups." State, School, and Politics. Edited by Michael W. Kirst. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1972.

133) _____, and Lutz, Frank W. Politics, Power and Policy: The Governing of Local School Districts Columbus: C. Merrill Publishing Co., 1970.

134) Indik, Bernard P. "Organization Size and Member Participation: Some Empirical Tests of Alternative Explanations." Human Relations, v 18 (1965), 339-349.

135) Institute for the Development of Educational Activities, Inc. Report of a national seminar. Toward a More Effective Involvement of the Community in the School. Dayton: I/D/E/A, 1972.

136) Isbister, Russell, L., and Koopman, G. Robert. "Citizen Participation in School Affairs." Vital Issues in American Education. Edited by Alice and Lester D. Crow. New York: Bantam, 1964.

MANN

137) Jackson, Kathleen O'Brien. The Politics of School-
     Community Relations. Eugene, The ERIC Clearing-
     house on Educational Management, University of
     Oregon, March, 1971. (ED 003 266)

138) Jacob, Charles E. Policy and Bureaucracy. Princeton:
     Van Nostrand Co., 1966.

139) James, H. Thomas. "Politics and Community Decision
     Making in Education." Review of Educational
     Research, v XXXVII, n 4 (October, 1967),
     377.386.

140) _____. "School Board Conflict Is Inevitable."
     The American School Board Journal (March, 1967),
     3-7.

141) Janowitz, Morris. Institution Building in Urban
     Education. New York: Russell Sage, 1969.

142) Jencks, Christopher S. "The Coleman Report and the
     Conventional Wisdom." On Equality of Educational
     Opportunity. Edited by Frederick Mosteller and
     Daniel P. Moyniha-. New York: Random House,
     1972.

143) Jennings, M. Kent. "Parental Grievances and School
     Politics." Public Opinion Quarterly, v 32, n 3
     (Fall, 1968), 363-378. (Also available in
     ERIC ED 010 900.)

144) _____, and Zeigler, Harmon. "Interest Represen-
     tation in School Governance." People and
     Politics in Urban Society. Edited by Hahn and
     Harlan. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications,
     1972. (Also available in Urban Affairs Annual
     Review, 1972.)

145) _____. "Response Styles and Politics: The Case
     of School Boards." Midwest Journal of Political
     Science, v 15, n 2 (May, 1971), 290-322.

146) Kafoglis, Madelyn L. "Participatory Democracy in
     the Community." Public Choice, v V (Fall,
     1968), 73-87.

147) Kaufman, Herbert. "Administrative Decentralization
     and Political Power." Public Administration
     Review, v XXIX, n 1 (Jan.-Feb., 1969), 3-15.

148) Kerr, Norman D. "The School Board as an Agency of
     Legitimation." Sociology of Education, v 38,
     n 1 (Fall, 1964), 34-59.

149) Kimbrough, Ralph B. _Political Power and Educational Decision-Making_. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

150) Kindred, Leslie W., and Associates. _How to Tell the School Story_. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1960.

151) Kirst, Michael W., ed. _The Politics of Education at the Local, State and Federal Levels_. Berkely: McCutcheon Publishing, 1970.

152) _____., ed. _State, School, and Politics_. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1972.

153) _____, and Mosher, Edith K. "Politics of Education." _Review of Educational Research_ v 39, n 5 (December, 1969), 623-640.

154) Kleinfeld, Judith. "'Sense of Fate Control' and Community Control of Schools." _Education and Urban Society_, v III, n 3 (May, 1971), 277-300.

155) Knezevich, Stephen J. _Administration of Public Education_. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1962.

156) Knight, Frank H. _Intelligence and Democratic Action_. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960.

157) Kochen, Manfred, and Deutsch, Karl W. "Toward a Rational Theory of Decentralization: Some Implications of a Mathematical Approach." _American Political Science Review_, v LXIII, n 3 (Sept., 1969), 734-750.

158) Kornhauser, William. _The Politics of Mass Society_. New York: The Free Press, 1959.

159) Kotler, Milton. _Neighborhood Government: The Local Foundations of Political Life_. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969.

160) Kramer, Ralph M. _Participation of the Poor: Comparative Community Case Studies in the War on Poverty_. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1969.

161) Krause, Elliot. "Functions of a Bureaucratic Ideology: 'Citizen Participation.'" _Participatory Democracy_. Edited by Terrence E. Cook and Patrick M. Morgan. San Francisco: Canfield Press, 1971.

162) Krinsky, Fred. _Democracy and Complexity: Who Governs the Governors?_ Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1968.

163) Lane, Robert E. _Political Life: Why and How People Get Involved in Politics._ New York: Free Press, 1965.

164) Lang, Gladys Engel; Fontana, Leonard; Hallett, Ray; and Melville, Keith. _Responses to a Decentralization Crisis,_ "Pulse of the Parent," No. 1 New York: Center for Urban Education, Mass Media Committee, July, 1968. (Mimeographed)

165) LaNoue, George R., and Smith, Bruce L.R. _The Politics of School Decentralization._ Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and Company, 1973.

166) Lauter, Paul; and Howe, Florence. "The School Mess." _The New York Review of Books_ (February 1, 1968), pp. 16-21. Also available in _The Politics of Urban Education._ Edited by Marilyn Gittell and Alan G. Hevesi. New York: Praeger, 1969).

167) Lazar, Irving. "Which Citizens to Participate in What." _Citizen Participation: Effecting Community Change._ Edited by Edgar Cahn and Barry Passett. New York: Praeger, 1971.

168) Lee, Eugene C. _The Politics of Nonpartisanship._ Berkely: University of California Press, 1960.

169) Levin, Henry M., ed. _Community Control of Schools._ Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1970.

170) Lieberman, Myron. _The Future of Public Education._ Chicago: Phoenix, 1960.

171) Lindblom, Charles E. _The Intelligence of Democracy._ New York: The Free Press, 1965.

172) Lindquist, Donald M. "Development of an Instrument to Measure Group Participation in Administrative Decision-making in Public Schools." Unpublished Ed.D. dissertation. Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1960.

173) Lipham, James M.; Gregg, Russell T.; and Rossmiller, Richard A. "The School Board as an Agency for Resolving Conflict." Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin, August, 1967. (ED 016 280)

174) Lipsky, Michael. "Protest as a Political Resource."
     American Political Science Review, v LXII, n 4
     (December, 1968), 1144-1158.

175) _____. Protest in City Politics: Rent Strikes,
     Housing and the Power of the Poor. Chicago:
     Rand McNally & Company, 1970.

176) Litwak, Eugene. "Relationship Between School-
     Community Coordinating Procedures and Reading
     Achievement." (ERIC ED 010 376)

177) _____., and Meyer, Henry J. "Administrative
     Styles and Community Linkages of Public Schools."
     Schools in a Changing Society. Edited by Albert
     Riess, Jr. New York: Free Press, 1965.

178) Long, Norton E. "Inventorying the Human Condition
     and the Study of Local Educational Politics."
     State, School, and Politics. Edited by Michael
     Kirst. Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath and
     Company, 1972.

179) _____. "Public Policy and Administration: The
     Goals of Rationality and Responsibility (1954)."
     Administrative Questions and Political Answers.
     Edited by Claude E. Hawley, Ruth G. Weintraub.
     New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1966.

180) Lopate, Carol; Flaxman, Erwin; Bynum, Effie; and
     Gordon, Edmund. "Decentralization and Community
     Participation in Public Education." Review of
     Educational Research, v 40, n 1 (February, 1970),
     135-150.

181) _____. "Some Effects of Parent and Community
     Participation on Public Education." New York:
     Teachers College, Columbia University, ERIC-
     IRCD Urban Disadvantaged Series, No. 3; ERIC
     Retrieval Center on the Disadvantaged.

182) Lowenstein, Edward. "Citizen Participation and the
     Administrative Agency in Urban Development:
     Some Problems and Proposals." Social Service
     Review, v 45 (September, 1971), 289-301.

183) Lurie, Ellen. How to Change the Schools. New York:
     Random House, 1970.

MANN

184) Luttbeg, Norman R., and Griffin, Richard W. "Public Reactions to Misrepresentation: The Case of Educational Politics." Florida State University, occasional paper, undated. (Mimeographed)

185) Lutz, Frank W., ed. Toward Improved Urban Education. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing, 1970.

186) _____, and Azzarelli, Joseph J., eds. Struggle for Power in Education. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966.

187) Lyden, F. J.; Shipman, G. A.; and Kroll, M. Policies, Decisions and Organization. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

188) Lyke, Robert F. "Political Issues in School Decentralization." The Politics of Education at the Local, State and Federal Levels. Edited by Michael W. Kirst. Berkeley: McCutchan, 1970.

189) _____. "Representation and Urban School Boards." Community Control of Schools. Edited by Henry M. Levin. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 1970.

190) Mann, Dale. Administrator/Community/School Relationships in New York State. New York: State Commission on the Quality, Cost and Financing of Elementary and Secondary Education, 1971.

191) _____. "Political Representation and Urban School Advisory Councils." Teachers College Record, v 75, n 3 (February, 1974).

192) _____. "Public Relations as Political Control." American Political Science Association Annual Meetings, Washington, DC, September, 1972.

193) _____. "Public Understanding of and Involvement in Education: Theory and Potential Applications for School/Community Interaction." The Citizens and the Schools: Better Understanding and Fuller Participation. Edited by Donald E. Barnes. New York: Institute for Educational Development, 1972.

194) _____. "The Politics of Representation in Educational Administration." Education and Urban Society. Forthcoming, 1974.

195) Marburger, Carl L. "Considerations for Educational
      Planning." Education in Depressed Areas.
      Edited by Harry Passow. New York: Teachers
      College Press, 1963.

196) Harris, Peter, and Rein, Martin. Dilemmas of Social
      Reform. New York: Atherton Press, 1967.

197) _____. "The Voice of the People." Citizen
      Participation in Urban Development, Vol. I.
      Edited by Hans B.C. Spiegel. Washington, DC:
      NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science,
      1968.

198) Martin, John A. "Policy-making in Public Education:
      Who Really Decides the Issues?" Midwest Review
      of Public Administration, v 4, n 2 (1970), 63-70.

199) Mason, Robert G. "Securing Clientele Acceptance
      and Cooperation." Policies, Decisions and
      Organization. Edited by F. J. Lyden, G. A.
      Shipman, and M. Kroll. New York: Appleton-
      Century-Crofts, 1969.

200) May, Judith. Citizen Participation: A Review of
      the Literature. Davis: Institute of Govern-
      mental Affairs, University of California, 1971.

201) McCaffrey, Michael D. "Politics in the Schools:
      A Case for Partisan Board Elections."
      Educational Administration Quarterly, v VII, n 3,
      (Autumn, 1971), pp. 51-63.

202) McCarty, Donald J., and Ramsey, Charles E. The
      School Managers: Power and Conflict in
      American Public Education. Westport: Greenwood
      Publishers, 1971.

203) McCloskey, Gordon. Education and Public Understand-
      ing. 2nd ed. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

204) McCloskey, Herbert. "Political Participation." International
      Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, v XII.
      Edited by D. L. Sills. New York: Crowell
      Collier and Macmillan, Inc., 1968.

205) McKelvey, Troy V., and Swanson, Austin D., eds.
      Urban School Administration. Beverly Hills:
      Sage Publications, Inc., 1969.

206) McLaughlin, Milbrey. "Parent Involvement in Compensatory Education Programs," Cambridge: Center for Educational Policy Research, Harvard University, 1971. (Mimeographed)

207) Meade, Marvin. "Participative Administration--Emerging Reality or Wishful Thinking?," American Political Science Association Annual Meetings, New York, September, 1969.

208) Meranto, Phillip. School Politics in the Metropolis. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing, 1970.

209) Merelman, Richard M. Political Socialization and Educational Climates. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1971.

210) Metropolitan Applied Research Center, Inc. A Relevant War Against Poverty: A Study of Community Action Programs and Observable Social Change. New York, 1968.

211) Michel, Jerry B., and Dillehay, Ronald C. "Reference Behavior Theory and the Elected Representative." The Western Political Quarterly, v XXII, n 4 (December, 1969).

212) Milbrath, Lester W. "Individual Change During a Period of Community Interventions for Change: Problems of Race and Poverty in Buffalo," Political Science Association Annual Meeting, New York, 1969.

213) _____. Political Participation: How and Why do People Get Involved in Politics? Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

214) Miller, S. M., and Rein, Martin. "Participation, Poverty and Administration." Public Administration Review, v XXIX, n 1 (Jan./Feb., 1969), 15-25.

215) Minar, David W. "The Community Basis of Conflict in School System Politics." American Sociological Review, v 31, n 6 (December, 1966), 822-835.

216) _____. "Community Politics and School Board." The American School Board Journal (March, 1967).

MANN

217) Moehlman, Arthur B., and van Zwoll, James A.
       School Public Relations. New York: Appleton-
       Century-Crofts, 1957.

218) Mogulof, Mel. "Coalition to Adversary: Citizen
       Participation in Three Federal Programs."
       Journal of the American Institute of Planners
       (July, 1969), 225-232.

219) Morgan, D. id R. "Political Linkage and Public
       Policy: Attitudinal Congruence Between
       Citizens and Officials." Western Political
       Quarterly, v 26, n 2 (June, 1973), 209-224.

220) Mosher, Frederick C. Democracy and the Public
       Service. New York: Oxford, 1969.

221) _____. Governmental Reorganizations: Cases and
       Commentary. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill
       Company, Inc., 1967.

222) Moynihan, Daniel P. Maximum Feasible Misunderstand-
       ing: Community Action in the War on Poverty.
       New York: Free Press, 1969.

223) Muller, Edward N. "The Representation of Citizens
       by Political Authorities, Consequences for
       Regime Support." American Political Science
       Review, v LXIV, n 4 (Dec., 1970), 1149-1166.

224) Nisbet, Robert A. Community and Power. London:
       Oxford University Press, 1953.

225) Niskansen, William A., Jr. Bureaucracy and Repre-
       sentative Government. Chicago: Aldine-
       Atherton, 1971.

226) Nugent, Donald G. "Are Local Control and Lay Boards
       Obsolete?" Controversy in American Education.
       Edited by Harold Full. New York: Macmillan,
       1967.

227) Nunnery, Michael Y., and Kimbrough, Ralph B.
       Politics, Power, Polls, and School Elections.
       Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1971.

228) Nussel, Edward J. "Conflict and School--Community
       Relations," February, 1969. (ED 027 621)

229) O'Donnell, Ed., and Chilman, Catherine. "Poor
       People on Public Welfare Boards and Committees:
       Participation in Policy-Making?" Welfare in
       Review (May/June, 1969).

230) Ornstein, Allan. "Administrative/Community Orga-
nization of Metropolitan Schools." Phi Delta
Kappan, v 54, n 10 (June, 1973), 668-674.

231) Pateman, Carole. Participation and Democratic
Theory. London: Cambridge University Press,
1970.

232) Perel, William M., and Vairo, Philip D. Urban
Education Problems and Prospects. New York:
David McKay Co., Inc., 1969.

233) Peterson, Paul E. "Forms of Representation: Parti-
cipation of the Poor in the Community Action
Program." American Political Science Review,
v LXIV, n 2 (June, 1970), 491-508.

234) _____, and Williams, Thomas. "Models of Decision
Making." State, School, and Politics. Edited
by Michael W. Kirst. Lexington, Mass.: D. C.
Heath and Company, 1972.

235) Philadelphia Commission on Decentralization and
Community Participation. "Report of the Com-
mission on Decentralization and Community
Participation; A Multiple Option Approach to
School-Community Participation." (ED 042 843)

236) Pitkin, Hanna Fennichel. The Concept of Represen-
tation. Berkeley: University of California
Press, 1967.

237) Piven, Frances F. "Participation of Residents in
Neighborhood Community-Action Programs."
Citizen Participation in Urban Development.
Vol. 1: Concepts and Issues. Edited by
Hans B. C. Spiegel. Washington, DC: NTL
Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1968.

238) Pomper, Gerald M.; Boyd, Richard W.; Brody, Richard
A.; Page, Benjamin I.; Kessel, John J. "Issue
Voting." American Political Science Review,
v LXVI, n 2 (June, 1972), 415-428.

239) Pranger, Robert J. The Eclipse of Citizenship:
Power and Participation in Contemporary
Politics. New York: Holt-Rinehart-Winston,
1968.

240) Prewitt, Kenneth. "Political Ambitions,
Volunteerism, and Electoral Accountability."
American Political Science Review, v LXIV,
n 1 (March, 1970), 5-17.

MANN

241) Prewitt, Kenneth. The Recruitment of Political
       Leaders: A Study of Citizen Politicians.
       New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1970.

242) _____, and Eulau, Heinz. "Political Matrix and
       Political Representation: Prolegomenon to a
       New Departure from an Old Problem." American
       Political Science Review, v LXIII, n 2
       (June, 1969), 427-441.

243) Promising Practices for Expanding Educational Op-
       portunities. A Handbook of Current Effective
     ⁂ Programs. Los Angeles, California: Los
       Angeles City Schools, 1963.

244) Provus, Malcolm. "In Search of Community." Phi
       Delta Kappan, v 54, n 10 (June, 1973), 658-661.

245) Raffel, Jeffrey A. "Responsiveness in Urban Schools:
       A Study of School System Adaptation to Parental
       Preferences in an Urban Environment." Un-
       published Ph.D. dissertation. Massachusetts
       Institute of Technology, 1972.

246) Ranney, Austin, ed. Political Science and Public
       ‘ Policy. Chicago: Markham 1968.

247) Ravitch, Diane. "Community Control Revisited."
       Commentary, v 53, n 2 (February, 1972), 69-74.

248) Redford, Emmett S. Democracy in the Administrative
       State. New York: Oxford University Press,
       1969.

249) Rein, Martin. "Community Action Programs: A
       Critical Reassessment." Poverty and Human
       Resources Abstracts, v 3 (March-April, 1966),
       9-22.

250) Reiner, Janet S.; Reimer, Everett; and Reiner,
       Thomas A. "Client Analysis and Planning of
       Public Programs." Urban Planning and Social
       Policy. Edited by Bernard J. Frieden and
       Robert Morris. New York: Basic Books, Inc.,
       1968.

251) Rempson, Joe L. "School-Parent Programs in De-
       pressed Urban Neighborhoods." The Urban Rs:
       Race Relations as the Problem in Urban Education.
       Edited by Robert A. Dentler, Bernard Hackler,
       and Mary Ellen Warshauer. New York: Praeger,
       1967.

Peterson, Paul E. "Forms of Representation: Participation of
       the Poor in the Community Action Programs."
       American Political Science Review. v LXIV n2 (June
       1970) pp 491-508.

MANN

252) Report of the Mayor's Advisory Panel on Decentral-
      ization of the New York City Schools. Recon-
      nection for Learning. New York, 1967.

253) Riedel, James A. "Citizen Participation: Myths
      and Realities." Public Administration Review,
      v 32, n 3 (May/June, 1972), 211-219.

254) Roberts, Wallace. "The Battle for Urban Schools."
      Participatory Democracy. Edited by Terrence E.
      Cook and Patrick M. Morgan. San Francisco:
      Canfield Press, 1971.

255) Rogers, David. The Management of Big Cities:
      Interest Groups and Social Change Strategies.
      Beverly Hills: Sage, 1971.

256) _____. 110 Livingston Street: Politics and
      Bureaucracy in the New York City School
      System. New York: Random House, 1968.

257) Rokkan, Stein. "The Comparative Study of Political
      Participation: Notes Toward a Perspective on
      Current Research." Empirical Democratic
      Theory. Edited by C. F. Cnudde and D. E.
      Neubauer. Chicago: Markham, 1969.

258) Rossi, Peter H., and Dentler, R. A. The Politics
      of Urban Renewal: The Chicago Findings. New
      York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

259) Rourke, Francis E. Bureaucracy, Politics and
      Public Policy. Boston: Little-Brown, 1969.

260) Rudman, Herbert C., and Featherstone, Richard L.,
      eds. Urban Schooling. New York: Harcourt
      Brace, 1968.

261) Salisbury, Robert H. "Schools and Politics in the
      Big City." Harvard Education Review, v 37,
      n 3 (Summer, 1967), 403-424.

262) _____. "Urban Politics and Education." Plan-
      ning for a Nation of Cities. Edited by Sam
      Bass Warner. Cambridge: Massachusetts
      Institute of Technology, 1966.

263) Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and
      the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and
      Bacon, 1971.

MANN

264) Sarri, Rosemary C., and Maple, Frank F., eds.
     The School in the Community. Washington, DC:
     National Association of Social Workers, Inc.,
     1972.

265) Savitch, Harold V. "Powerlessness in an Urban
     Ghetto: The Case of Political Biases and
     Differential Access in New York City." Polity,
     v V, n 1 (Fall, 1972), 19-56.

266) Sayre, Wallace. "Additional Observations on the
     Study of Administration." Teachers College
     Record, v LX, n 2 (Nov., 1958).

267) _____, and Kaufman, Herbert. Governing New York
     City: Politics in the Metropolis. New York:
     Norton & Co., 1965.

268) Schmandt, Henry J. "Municipal Decentralization:
     An Overview." Public Administration Review,
     v XXXII (October, 1972, Special Issue), 571-
     588.

269) Scott, William G. "Organization Government: The
     Prospects for a Truly Participative System."
     Public Administration Review, v 29, n 1
     (Jan./Feb., 1969), 43-53.

270) Seaver, Robert. "The Dilemma of Citizen Partici-
     pation." Citizen Participation in Urban
     Development. Vol. I: Concepts and Issues.
     Edited by Hans B.C. Spiegel. Washington,
     DC: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral
     Science, 1968.

271) Sexton, Patricia C., ed. School Policy and Issues
     in a Changing Society. Boston: Allyn and
     Bacon, Inc., 1971.

272) Shalala, Donna. "Neighborhood Governance: Issues
     and Proposals." (ERIC ED 053 234)

273) Sigel, Roberta S. "Citizens Committees--Advice vs.
     Consent." Transaction, v 4 n 6 (May, 1967).

274) Simpson, Elizabeth L. Democracy's Stepchildren.
     San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.

275) Smiley, Marjorie B., and Miller, Harry L. Policy
     Issues in Urban Education. New York: The
     Free Press, 1968.

276) Smoley, Eugene R. "Community Participation in Urban School Government," Johns Hopkins, Baltimore. Washington, DC: USOE, Cooperative Research Project, S-029, 1965.

277) Sparer, Gerald; Dines, G.; and Smith, G. "Consumer Participation in OEO Neighborhood Health Centers." American Journal of Public Health (June, 1970).

278) Spergel, Irving A. "Community Action Research as a Political Process." Community Organization. Edited by Irving A. Spergel. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1972.

279) Spiegel, Hans B.C. Citizen Participation in Urban Development. Vol. I: Concepts and Issues. Vol. II: Cases and Programs. Washington, DC: NTL Institute, 1968-1969.

280) _____, and Mittenthal, Stephen D. "The Many Faces of Citizen Participation: A Bibliographic Overview." Citizen Participation in Urban Development. Vol. I: Concepts and Issues. Washington, DC: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1968.

281) Spiro, Herbert J. Responsibility in Government: Theory and Practice. New York: Van Nostrand, Rheinhold Co., 1970.

282) Stearns, Marian Sherman, and Peterson, Susan. "Parent Involvement in Compensatory Education Programs: Definitions and Findings." Menlo Park: Educational Policy Research Center, Stanford Research Institute, March 16, 1973.

283) Steinberg, Lois S. "Some Structural Determinants of Citizen Participation in Educational Policymaking in Suburbia: A Case Study," American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, New York, February, 1971.

284) Stelzer, Leigh. "School Board Receptivity." Education and Urban Society, v V, n 1 (Nov. 1972), 69-90.

285) Strange, John H. "The Impact of Citizen Participation on Public Administration." Public Administration Review, v 32 (Sept., 1972, Special Issue), 457-470.

286) Summerfield, Harry L. The Neighborhood-based
         Politics of Education. Columbus, Ohio:
         Charles E. Merrill, 1971.

287) Sutton, Richard L. "The States and the People:
         Measuring and Accounting for 'State Represen-
         tativeness.'" Polity, v V, n 4 (Summer, 1973),
         451-476.

288) Swanson, Bert E. Decision Making in the Desegre-
         gation-Decentralization Controversies. Bronx-
         ville: Sarah Lawrence Institute . . Community
         Studies, 1969.

289)   _____; Cortin, Edith; and Main, Eleanor.
         "Parents in Search of Community Influence in
         the Public Schools." Education and Urban
         Society, v 1, n 4 (August, 1969), 333-405.

290) "Symposium on Neighborhoods and Citizen Involvement."
         Public Administration Review, v 32, n 3
         (May/June, 1972).

291) The Urban Education Task Force Report, Wilson C.
         Riles, Chairman. New York: Praeger, 1970.

292) Thomas, Donald R. "Urban School Boards: The Need
         for Accountability." Education and Urban
         Society, v 1, n 3 (May, 1969), 289-294.

293) Torge, Herman. "Guidelines for Lay Participation
         at School Board Meetings in Ohio. A Mono-
         graph." Middletown: Southwestern Ohio Edu-
         cational Research Council, Inc., June, 1971.

294) Trecker, Harleigh B. Citizen Boards at Work: New
         Challenges to Effective Action. New York:
         Association Press, 1970.

295) Tugwell, R. G., and Banfield, E. C. "Grassroots
         Democracy--Myth or Reality?" Administrative
         Questions and Political Answers. Edited by
         C. E. Hawley and R. G. Weintraub. New Jersey:
         Van Nostrand Co., 1966.

296) Umpleby, Stuart. "Citizen Sampling Simulation:
         A Method for Involving the Public in Social
         Planning." Policy Sciences, v 1, n 3
         (Fall, 1970), 361-377.

297) U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. "Public Knowl-
     edge and Busing Opposition: An Interpretation
     of a New National Survey," Washington, DC,
     News Advisory, March 11, 1973. (Mimeographed)

298) U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. "Parti-
     cipation of the Poor in the Community Decision-
     Making Process," Community Action Program,
     August, 1969. (ED 037 645)

299) U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. "Summary of
     Survey Findings of Community Attitudes Toward
     Voucher Issues." Washington, DC: Executive
     Office of the President, April 24, 1972.

300) U. S. Office of Education. "Parental Involvement
     in Title I ESEA, Why? What? How?" Washington,
     DC: Department of Health, Education, and Wel-
     fare, DHEW Publication No. OE 72-109, 1972.

301) _____. "Memorandum to Chief State School Of-
     ficers," Washington, DC, USOE/DHEW, Oct. 30,
     1970.

302) "Urban Decentralization and Community Participation."
     American Behavioral Scientist, v 15, n 1
     (Sept./Oct., 1971).

303) Usdan, Michael D., and Nystrand, Raphael O. "To-
     wards Participative Decision Making; The Impact
     of Community Action Programs." Teachers College
     Record, v 68, n 2 (Nov., 1966), 95-106.

304) Vanecko, James J. "Community Mobilization and
     Institutional Change: The Influence of the
     Community Action Program in Large Cities."
     Social Sciences Quarterly (Dec., 1969),
     609-630.

305) Verba, Sidney. "Democratic Participation." Social
     Intelligence for America's Future: Explorations
     in Societal Problems. Edited by B. M. Gross.
     Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969. Also available
     in The Annals, v 373 (Sept., 1967), 53-78.

306) _____. Small Groups and Political Behavior: A
     Study of Leadership. Princeton: Princeton
     University Press, 1961.

307) _____, and Nie, Norman H. Participation in
     America: Political Democracy and Social
     Equality. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

308) Von Eschen, Donald; Kirk, Jerome; and Pinard, Maurice. "The Conditions of Direct Action in a Democratic Society." Western Political Quarterly, v XXII, n 2 (June, 1969), 309-326.

309) Walden, John C. "School Board Changes and Super-intendent Turnover." Administrator's Note-book, 15. Chicago: Midwest Center for Educational Administration, University of Chicago, 1967.

310) Warren, R. L., ed. Politics and the Ghettos. New York: Atherton Press, 1969.

311) Weiler, Daniel, and Guertin, Jeane. "School Com-munity Relations and Educational Change." (Washington, DC: USOE, ERIC Prep. Series No. 24, 1971. Also available in an earlier version as "School-Community Relations: Some Aids to Analysis and Planning for the School Administrator. Final Report." (ED 047 428)

312) Weisberg, Alan. "Urban Rural School Development Program, An Account of the First Two Years of an Office of Education Experiment in School-Community Parity." Washington, DC: USOE Dept. of HEW, February, 1973.

313) Wilcox, Herbert G. "Hierarchy, Human Nature, and the Participative Panacea." Public Adminis-tration Review, v 29, n 1 (Jan./Feb., 1969), 53-65.

314) Wilson, James D. "Research for School Board Members: School-Community Relations. No. 7-D, Community Support for Education: Elections Involving School Issues." Washington, DC: USOE, 1969. (ERIC ED 034 033)

315) Wirt, Frederick M., and Kirst, Michael W. The Political Web of American Schools. Boston: Little-Brown and Company, 1972.

316) Witherspoon, Joseph P. "The Bureaucracy as Repre-sentatives." Representation: Yearbook of the American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy. Edited by J. R. Pennock and J. W. Chapman. New York: Atherton Press, 1968.

317) Wittes, Simon. People and Power: A Study of Crisis in Secondary Schools. Ann Arbor: Center for Research on Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, 1970.

MANN

318) Wolfinger, Raymond E. "Nondecisions and the Study
     of Local Politics," and "Rejoinder" [to Frey's
     "Comment"]. American Political Science Review,
     v LXV, n 4 (DECEMBER, 1971), 1063-1080 and
     1102-1104.

319) Wynne, Edward. The Politics of School Account-
     ability. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing
     Corporation, 1972.

320) Yates, Douglas. "Neighborhood Government." Policy
     Sciences, v 3, n 2 (July, 1972), 209-217.

321) Yin, Robert K.; Lucas, William A.; Szanton, Peter
     I.; and Spindler, James A. "Citizen Parti-
     cipation in DHEW Programs." Washington, DC:
     RAND, #R-1196-HEW, January, 1973.

322) Young, Whitney M., Jr. "Minorities and Community
     Control of the Schools." Challenges to
     Education, Readings for Analysis of Major
     Issues. Edited by Emanuel Hurwitz, Jr., and
     Charles A. Tesconi. New York: Dodd, Mead &
     Co., 1972.

323) Zeigler, Harmon. "Creating Responsive Schools."
     The Urban Review, v 6, n 4 (1973), 38-44.

324) Zurcher, Louis A. "Selection of Indigenous Leader-
     ship." Citizen Participation in Urban Develop-
     ment. Vol. I: Concepts and Issues. Edited by
     Hans B.C. Spiegel. Washington, DC: NTL
     Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1968.

325) Zwiebach, Burton. "Democratic Theory and Community
     Control." Community Issues, v 1, n 4
     (March, 1969).