

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 386

UD 015 114

AUTHOR Phillips, W. M., Jr.
TITLE Educational Policy, Community Participation and Race;
Black Participation in Educational Decision Making
[Seminar Discussion].
PUB DATE 10 May 74
NOTE 69p.; Paper presented at Seminar on Public Policy
(Center for Urban Studies, Harvard University,
Cambridge, Massachusetts, May 19, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Black Community; Boards of Education; *Case Studies;
Change Agents; Change Strategies; *Community
Involvement; Decision Making; Educational Change;
*Educational Policy; Longitudinal Studies; Policy
Formation; Political Power; School Community
Relationship; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS *Newark; New Jersey

ABSTRACT

The seminar began with a report of some research that W.M. Phillips, Jr. had done in Newark. Three purposes guided the design of that study of educational change and race from 1958 to 1972: First, there was the fundamental curiosity to discover the changing nature of participation by the Black community in the creation and implementation of public educational policy. This general purpose was transformed into an empirical description and analysis of Black involvement in selected aspects of the educational institution. The nexus between the Newark Board of Education and the Black community was the primary object of study. A second basic purpose was to develop an interpretative understanding of the changes which occurred in the arenas of race and education. The third basic purpose was to gain systematic insights that have applied significance for those concerned with revitalization of the Black community and in the improvement of the educational institution in Newark. Following the presentation of this paper, the author participated in a seminar discussion of his paper with 21 scholars, educators, administrators and concerned citizens chaired by Ron Edmonds, Director, Center for Urban Studies, Harvard Graduate School of Education. (Author/JH)

5

ED106386

EDUCATIONAL POLICY, COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION, AND RACE

W. M. Phillips, Jr., Director
Bureau of Educational Research
Graduate School of Education
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

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

May 10, 1974

UD 015114

EDUCATIONAL POLICY, COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION, AND RACE*

The manifest purpose of this forum, for me, is to report on some research I have done in Newark. The real purpose, however, is quite different. It is to try to (1) discover how hard or easy it is for me to communicate what I have learned to you who were not involved directly in the research process; (2) share my enthusiasm about the potential of combining applied with basic research to aid in the resolution of vexing problems of public policy; and (3) obtain your ideas and suggestions.

The Background

In preparing to study a problem sociologically what difference is made in constructing a methodological strategy, and in the final outcome of the research process, if the following values are held explicitly? First, that racism is an integral element of the Newark community; that it is central to the culture and the interests of the white superordinate group; and that its breakdown will only occur through

*This paper is taken in large part from the final report entitled "Participation of the Black Community in Selected Aspects of the Educational Institution of Newark, 1958-1972" (July, 1973). The research was supported by a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, Project #3972.

a protracted process of social struggle and at least some substantial degree of restructuring of the institutional arrangements of the community. Second, that the traditionally held postulate of ethical neutrality in the study of social problems is of doubtful utility to social scientists under contemporary conditions of urban community life. Third, that social problems are best understood and solved if approached by an inductive, empathic, diagnostic, and applied sociology. No definitive answer to the question is available, but these were the central issues confronted in devising a research study of educational change and race in Newark from 1958 to 1972.

Three purposes were in mind in conceiving and doing the research. First, there was the fundamental curiosity to discover the changing nature of participation by the Black community of Newark in the creation and implementation of public educational policy. This general purpose was transformed into an empirical description and analysis of Black involvement in selected aspects of the educational institution. Major attention was paid to three parts of the total educational institution: (1) the changing structure and function of the Board of Education; (2) the participation of the Black community in educational affairs, and especially in the ceremonies or rituals of public meetings of the Board of Education; and (3) incumbency in the central administration of the educational institution. In addition, the attempt was made to analyze the actions taken by the Board of Education in the forms of policy

determination, or the relations of the Board of Education with other decision-making structures of the community. To put it shortly, the nexus between the Newark Board of Education and the Black community was the primary object of study in this research project.

Several reasons justify this selection. First, of course, is the fact that by law and custom the Board of Education has the formal responsibility for providing "a thorough and efficient system of education" to the community. Distinction is made between the central administration of the educational institution, or the techno-structure, and the Board of Education. The former is made up of a hierarchically organized cadre of executives, administrators, and technicians charged specifically with operating the schools. They are viewed collectively as an instrumentality of the Board of Education.

Additionally, the Newark educational institution was subject to considerable change during the time period studied. A major component of this change was the Board of Education, its changing membership, and the way in which it functioned, particularly with regard to the Black community. In the changes that occurred, the Board of Education served as a primary center of turbulence and conflict. It represents the confluence of many ideological, racial, political, economic, personal, and community forces. As such, it was mandatory that any research made on Black participation in the educational institution include some analysis of the structure and function of the Board of Education.

Attention was fixed upon the way in which the Board of Education operated as a policy-determining entity longitudinally, as well as a cross-sectional analysis of the actions or decisions taken by the Board of Education for all of 1971. An attempt was made to analyze the techno-structure. Just as participation on the Board of Education is reflective of the exercise of formal influence or power, so is incumbency in central administrative office. Occupation of personnel position is included because it constitutes one of the major means by which Blacks gain both position and power, and thus affect the educational institution. The analysis covered some part of the movement of Blacks into these positions in the educational system historically, especially the kinds of administrative roles occupied and their function in the school system.

A central phase of the research was devoted to the Black community, particularly in terms of its changing organizational structure over the past decade. The attempt was made to isolate principles guiding the organization of this community, and in locating those individuals who played significant roles in bringing about changes in the educational institution. Considerable effort was devoted to noting the organizational base of Black community action, as well as its changing demands and emphases. Black organizations serve numerous functions for the Black community, including, among others, the development of political experience, and the

accumulation of economic and psychological resources that serve to make for success in purposive change.

A second basic purpose of the research was to develop an interpretative understanding of the changes which occurred in the arenas of race and education. The intent was to develop a model of change in race and education that made sense of the events observed and experienced by the researchers, as well as permitting some degree of prediction about the future of race relations and educational change in Newark. The model was meant to be sociological, that is, to employ conceptual tools at the middle-range level of abstraction for institutional systems rather than at the personal level (Merton, 1968).

Since the research period covered generally the period from 1958 to 1972 the model was expected to permit the management of the problem of social change. In attempting to create this model, the overriding interest was directed toward accounting for change in race and education rather than the development of a general model of social change (Moore, 1957).

The third basic purpose of the research was to gain systematic insights that have applied significance (Gouldner, 1957) for those concerned with revitalization of the Black community and in the improvement of the educational institution in Newark.

Put bluntly, the benefit of the research for any conceivable set of abstract interests was subordinated to the

objective of benefit for the Black community and to the educational institution of Newark. It is not an issue here of pure, original, or basic research versus praxis or applied research; nor is it an issue of involvement or an insider approach versus objectivity or detachment (Tumin, 1968, and Frank, 1961). Above all theory and methodology was the attempt to study seriously the rhetoric and reality of social change--that which is observable and that which is experienced in addition to that which can be imagined--culminating with findings in the form of statements of public policy capable of implementation (Gouldner, 1968). First and foremost, the research was seen as a case study of race and education in an urban community.

Between 1958 and 1972, an era of discontent and protest, Newark was an urban community featuring predominately racial but as well ethnic and class tensions which culminated often in social conflict at the community level as well as conflict between organizations within the community (Drake, 1971). There is no hyperbole in stating that a culture of fear, hostility and animosity appeared to permeate the city at times. Such a conflict-potential setting was interpreted as being symptomatic of profound social change, of radical institutional reorganization within the community, and of basic alteration of key relationships between Newark and its surrounding metropolitan environs.

Public participation, and in particular Black participation, in matters of educational policy was low during

this period. In other words, the Newark educational institution was largely controlled by professional educators who managed to maintain isolated from and unaccountable to their publics, whether Black or white. This condition is viewed as being rather typical of urban school systems and as being unlike the pattern commonly found in middle and upper income suburbs, and in rural areas. As a corollary of the above the position is accepted as stated by Clark (1965/1966:51-53) that the public educational institution in American communities tends to be organized and to function on racial and economic class lines; and that a lower quality of education is commonly found in those schools attended by Black and poor children.

Findings and Implications

Since discovery and utility were twin purposes of this research a mixed theoretical and applied, historical and cross-sectional strategy was designed and carried out. The methodology was essentially inductive. An assortment of social science tools and techniques, including what is labelled involved participation, were used to collect, analyze, and interpret quantitative and qualitative data. With this strategy and design was blended an orientation that best can be described as a Black frame of reference. A consequence is that instead of the customary sociological approaches of psychopathology, disorganization, and deviance to the social

life of Blacks in the United States there was substituted an approach guided by the notions of collective Black survival and adaptation, with a scarcity of those individual and collective resources requisite for successful participation in public life, within a particular situational context. While a definite sociological framework guided this study the common demands and values of academic or disciplinary research were made secondary to those demands considered to hold significant applied and policy importance for the Newark community and its educational institution.

Selecting the educational institution of the largest metropolitan area of New Jersey, Newark, the changing pattern of Black participation in this complex organization was examined systemically. Avoiding explicitly the issues of inequity and injustice, the legal mandate specifying the establishment and maintenance of "a thorough and efficient educational system," and the national norm of local school control, the concepts of race, community, social power, conflict, authority, bureaucracy, voluntary association, and social control were applied consistently to provide insight and understanding of race and the changing structure of community relations. Stated simply, yet in all its complexity, the problem studied was that of social power: for the Black community, how to secure control of and then effectively manage community power; for the white community, how to deal with the loss of community power. Only the former was within

the direct boundaries of this study.

The Findings

1. Between 1958 and 1971 the educational institution of Newark operated in the environmental context favoring rapid and drastic change. Sources of this strain toward change originated at the local, the state, and the national levels. In a word, the fundamental structure of governance of the Newark schools was under almost continuous attack during this period. Black citizens were the leading edge of this attack.
2. Between 1958 and 1971 litigation challenging the powers and the authority of the Newark Board of Education was commonplace. This mode of inducing change was a favorite weapon of the Black community during the early phase of this period, but it declined in favor during the latter part of the time period. This decline in favor in all likelihood was due to the combined effect of three factors: time required for the settlement of legal disputes, the costly nature of litigation, and a despair of equity and relief from a legal system inherently predisposed toward the maintenance of social order and systemic equilibrium.
3. Demographically, the population of Newark became predominantly Black and Spanish-speaking after 1960. All evidence indicates that the size of the Black and Spanish-speaking majority of the Newark population will

persist, and even increase, within the immediate future. Associated with this change in the racial structure of the city are changes directly and indirectly linked with participation in educational policy determination; for example, the ecological structure of the community, characteristics of the work force, the family system, and the stratification system.

4. Beginning with a profound sense of discontent and grievance, based in part upon the common experience of racial oppression, exploitation, and hostility as expressed through a crucial series of critical events, the Blacks of Newark created adaptively an action-capable community. This mobilized community unified around the educational institution or identified it as the most likely target for inducing change in their group predicament, and thereby reciprocally reinforced the creation and viability of an associational form of community organizational structure.
5. Heterogeneity rather than homogeneity is the major characteristic of the associational structure of the Newark Black community. Participation in the educational institution by voluntary associations of the Black community is intermittent, sporadic, and heavily dependent upon forces and processes external to the local community. Consistency of participation is found largely in only one slice of the associational

structure of the Black community; that featuring a coherent ideology of revolutionary Black nationalism.

6. Despite determined and sophisticated opposition or resistance, significant change took place in the pattern of Black participation in the national structure of Newark's educational institution between 1958 and 1971. Most conspicuous were the changes in the composition of the Board of Education, the administrative echelon of the techno-structure, and utilization of professional personnel. The opposition or resistance emanated most clearly from, and was maintained most persistently by, the cadre of professional educational administrators occupying offices of leadership, executive responsibility, and privilege within the educational institution.
7. The institutional character of policy determination and decision-making by the Board of Education remained fairly fixed over the period of study. Measures of the substantive nature of formal actions, decisional output, the forms of taking action, and the essential quality of the deliberations of the Board of Education demonstrate this absence of substantial change. There are some indications of a possible shift from a consensus body to a body of cleavage or one that exhibited less cohesiveness in the passage of time from 1958 to 1971.
8. There is found little change in the basic features of structural dependency of the Board of Education as it

confronted or attempted to respond to demand for change emerging from the Black community. At least two levels of structural dependency are identified. First, the Board of Education is vulnerable to the political subsystem by way of the mechanisms of mayoral appointment and city council fiscal control. Second, the members of the Board of Education as lay-people are dependent upon the technical knowledge, reputation, organizational skill, and availability of time possessed by the professional educational administrators. The central role of these educational leaders, aided and abetted by the traditional professional educational organizations or associations, in blocking change in the educational institution begs for serious study. Some evidence suggests that these structural characteristics operated functionally to facilitate favorable response to the demands for change made by the Black community.

9. Formal and informal processes of cooptation were favorite responses used by the educational institution, during the period of study, to respond to the pressures for change generated by the Black community.
10. Some directional shift is observed in the strategy of the Black community toward coping with the traditional racist practices and policies of the educational institution between 1958 and 1971. This change apparently involves a modification of tactical emphasis. Instead of approaching

decision-making or policy determination input by way of the Board of Education and the legal institution reliance is put upon access to and influencing the mayor's office, the city council, and the Board of Education.

11. From 1958 to 1971 the pattern of use of the public meetings of the Board of Education by the Black community as an instrument for participation in Newark's educational institution changed substantially. During the earlier phase of this study period, public meetings of the Board of Education were found to tend toward assuming the trappings of formal social settings where with due ritual, ceremony, and institutionalized deceit those affairs of the community directly or indirectly touching education were managed quietly by the representatives of the white community. Black participation was near or at the zero point: an occasional Black individual attended silently in what was described most graphically as a semiobserver role; the stilted presentation of an arranged-beforehand request or statement alleged to represent the concerns of the Black community; or public exhibition as the Black "token" member of the Board of Education exhausts the extent of Black participatory roles. By 1970 the fabric of the entire social setting of public meetings had become transformed. Considered as a prototype of the public forum found in representative and participatory democratic theory the public meetings of the Board of

Education were dominated in all essential aspects by the Black community.

12. This domination of the public meetings of the Board of Education by the Black community carried with it a distinctly different form of procedure, style or routinized structure, and process even though the outcomes may not have been altered significantly. In other words, the fundamental social order of these occasions had been radically altered. The norms of parliamentary and essentially white personnel formality, status distinction, privilege, secrecy, and bureaucratic ritual appear to have been superseded by imperatives of suspicion, challenge, expressiveness, and a deadly serious concern with schools educating children and serving functionally the other needs of the resident community as had been the customary practice in the recent past. Great reliance was placed by Black participants upon the political device of intentionally breaking the ground rules usually observed at public meetings for the double purpose of self-expression and to convey contempt.
13. Two major uses were made of the public meetings of the Board of Education by the participation of the Black community. First, these meetings were used strategically in the sense of being means by which the educational institution could be compelled to operate more responsibly to the immediate needs of the Black community.

Thus, the meetings became vehicles for getting the positions of the Black community on controversial issues covered by the mass media. Having limited and problematic access to the major channel of communications, and no other means of accurate and rapid transmission of information, the Black community almost without exception was at a disadvantage in any communal dispute. Atrocious and outrageous conduct in a public setting insured, at the least, that their positions had a chance of entering the public domain. The second way in which participation by the Black community was used at the public meetings was for the enhancement of solidarity or unity. This process took, in its general character, the substance of a revitalization or social movement. In its particular expression many forms were assumed. For those aspiring to leadership roles in the affairs of the Black community participation at public meetings became a rite de passage. Voluntary associations competed for community recognition and influence by participating in these public affairs. Community coalitions and alliances were tested, and then brought into serious play as needed. The associational structure of the Black community was, in part, a device to cope with the immediate opportunities offered by these public meetings and, at the same time became a way, by a trial and error process, of acquiring a higher perfection of their organizational effectiveness. Subtle and not-so-

subtle resocialization to their duty as Board of Education members, Black and white, was a constant tactical objective pursued through participation in public meetings. The evidence at hand, at the least, strongly suggests that the Black and white communities of Newark defined and behaved differently toward public meetings of the Board of Education.

14. Finally, field studies of sociological problems under at least two sets of situations today will find especially appropriate the use of types of investigative approaches such as conflict methodology, involved participation, grounded theory, ethnomethodology, and social interactionism. The two sets of situational contexts are (1) when problems of race relations are selected for study, and (2) when the development and implementation of social policy is of paramount importance.

Implications

Research in education has found nothing that consistently and unambiguously makes a difference in learner outcomes. In part this may be due to the fact that scholarly inquiry in virtually every area of research in education suffers from severe problems of methodology. The findings and interpretations of this study should be received in light of these considerations. The limitations of essentially a sociological case study, featuring an inductive, applied, and discovery-oriented approach demands prudence and caution in the treatment of findings. Replication of this macroresearch study, with the

application of a comparative design, merits serious consideration. The questions more cogently raised at the completion of a research undertaking, and those emerging for the first time, will be answered more fully through replicative and comparative study.

Throughout, social change has been found taking place, simultaneously, in the educational institution, in the social organization of the Black community, and in the general or total Newark community. The precise articulation of adaptive change among these interdependent social entities has not been shown. It has been demonstrated clearly, however, that the change taking place in each is essential and indispensable for understanding the change taking place in the other. The structure of community relations, in other words, provides the environmental context that limits and facilitates certain kinds of actions in Boards of Education, their committees, and in the professional role of educational administrators. Thus, the analysis and resolution of social problems in Newark requires an analytical grasp of the intrinsic complexity of the interdependency of these structural systems. Educational policy development and program implementation based upon simplism rather than upon reflective wonder and the imaginative confrontation of social complexity would be almost predictably tragic in their consequences.

The prominence of race as a central factor throughout the chronicle of community change in Newark between 1958 and

1971 is established firmly. The exact role of this factor in the major streams of change is unknown. Yet to interpret any social phenomena in Newark during the period of this study without attempting to isolate the play of race is unthinkable. Thus, any social problem approached in the Newark of today, or in the immediate future, inevitably must consider openly a racial perspective in terms of goals, means, and payoffs.

The issue of race as played out in the cauldron of social change in Newark may be viewed abstractly as a problem of social power. Massive reorganization of the Black community through new values or ideologies of radical nationalism, through the adaptive design of an associational structure of social organization, and by way of mass movements is interpreted as attempts to develop countervailing power permitting the attainment of the goal of control and management of community power. The responses of the white community, on the other hand, are interpreted similarly as attempts to develop countervailing power permitting the control of a process of losing power.

One consequence to the greater Newark community of this period of massive social change has been the democratization of the entire structure and process of participation in public policy-making. In short, such an outcome benefits the white as well as the Black communities of Newark. While undergoing an intense socialization process of decolonization

the Black community acquired and built up a reserve of theory, skills, and techniques requisite for more effective participation in the public affairs of a metropolitan community. They have passed through a process of demystification of participation in public affairs. Its members must now learn how to practice the arts of defense against and those of coping with the external and largely fortuitous events that impinge upon their lives. The problems associated with control of the local educational institution cannot be coped with merely by minding only the complexity of the local scene.

Clear understanding of the primary function of the Board of Education, functioning as a public policy-making body responsible for the educational fates of the children, must be obtained. To a large extent the single most overriding mission of the Board of Education, as a component of the educational institution, is to sanction or legitimize decisions, policies, and actions arrived at in advance, and in camera, by those making up the educational and governmental "establishments." Recognition must also be given to the fact that there exist powerful alternative sources to the Board of Education that are capable of exercising, singly or in combination, profound influence on educational policy.

Finally, community conflict generated by participation in public educational policy-making is, on the whole, beneficial to the goal of progress toward the liberation of the Black community. Even though there is evidence which suggests

that educational decision-making is largely a product of political, economic, and other non-educative forces, the safety provided by creative participation in the public arena is essential for the structuring and mobilization of the Black community toward attainment of its unique survival needs.

It is possible to offer a lengthier set of comments upon the implications of the above findings. All such comments ultimately would have to do with the cumulation of handicaps which uniquely seem to afflict Black Americans of all racial and ethnic groups. It is imperative for urban communities, and the nation, that some solution be reached for the general finding that the Black community tends increasingly to view with disillusionment and despair the ability of the existing system of justice to prevent racial injustice and to insure a quality of virtue in urban communal life. Similar, what are the consequences for the urban community in general, and the Black community in particular, of the process involving Black replacement of whites in the governance of the educational institution? Such questions demand the serious thought and deliberate actions of those concerned with social policy and with social problems.

In conclusion, this work as reported herein is submitted as provisional. I believe that its assumptions and procedures are sufficiently explicit to enable those with continuing interests in the interrelations of race, educational

change, and community relations to reconstruct and extend it. Finally, I trust that relief will be obtained for all from the recurring problems of racial injustice.

REFERENCES

- Clark, Kenneth B.
1965/1966 "American Education Today," in Integrated Education (December/January).
- Drake, St. Clair
1971 "The Black University in the American Social Order," in Daedalus (Summer) 848.
- Frank, Phillip (Ed.)
1961 The Validation of Scientific Theories.
New York: Collier Books.
- Gouldner, Alvin W.
1957 "Theoretical Requirements of the Applied Social Sciences," American Sociological Review (February). 97-102.
- 1968 "The Sociologist as Partisan," in The American Sociologist (May). 103-116.
- Merton, R.
1968 Social Theory and Social Structure.
New York: Free Press.
- Moore, W. E.
1957 "A Reconsideration of Theories of Social Change," American Sociological Review (December, 1960), 25, No. 6. 810-818.
- Tumin, Melvin
1968 "Some Social Consequence of Research on Racial Relations," in The American Sociologist (May). 122.

5

Black Participation in Educational Decision Making

W. H. Phillips, Jr.

May 10, 1974

Participants in seminar:

- Ron Edmonds - Director, Center for Urban Studies, Harvard Graduate School of Education
- Duncan Walton - Department of Psychological Foundations, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University
- Chester H. Jones - Professor, Graduate School of Social Work, Rutgers University
- Gregory Coffin - School of Education, Northeastern University
- Charles Martin - Educational Research, Howard University
- Kenneth Tollet - Institute for Study of Educational Policy, Howard University
- Sherman Beverly - Center for Inner City Studies, Northeastern Illinois University
- Ron Lewis - Director, Bureau of Urban Education, New Jersey Department of Education
- William Phillips - Director, Bureau of Educational Research, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University
- Phillip Hart - College III, University of Massachusetts, and Federation of Boston Community Schools
- Charles Lawrence - Public Advocates, Inc., San Francisco; formerly Highland Park Free School, Roxbury, Massachusetts
- Reynaldo Macias - Bilingual specialist and community activist, Chicano Studies Center, UCLA, and Azthan Publications
- Evelyn Moore - Director, Black Child Development Institute, Washington, D. C.
- Rita D. Holt - Teaching Education, EDC, Cambridge, Massachusetts
- Charles Cheng - Doctoral candidate, Harvard Graduate School of Education
- Paul Yivisaker - Dean of the Faculty of Education, Harvard University
- Kenneth Haskins - Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Washington, D. C.
- Leah Gaskin - Doctoral candidate, Harvard Graduate School of Education

- Ruth Farmer - Office of Human Rights, National Institute of Education,
Washington, D. C.
- Bernice Miller - Associate Director, Center for Urban Studies, Harvard
Graduate School of Education
- Larry Reddick - Professor of History, Temple University
- Jim Dyer - The Carnegie Corporation

Larry Reddick: I have a question about the methodological approach rather than with the concrete substance of the paper. How do you handle the approach in terms of scholarship? There is a whole body of social science knowledge with certain norms and all that. Do you try to keep in contact with that? Do you develop some way of departing from that and still maintain status as a scholar? Or do you disregard scholarship as such and become a kind of advocate? I'm just wondering if you can do this type of paper and do it in terms of scholarship.

William Phillips: Let me tell you what we did. We were concerned with the values of researchers. We accepted the legitimacy of technique and tools, but we were agreed that we would not necessarily conform with the traditional way of perceiving the people whom we would be working with. We had a staff orientation in which we attempted to achieve a formal understanding of where we would be. We agreed also that we would work with organizations in the community, we would work with the school and the several echelons of the school, but that we would use other contacts in that community to check, to help us correct, to help us get at the quintessence of what was going down before we would take any action. We agreed that we ought to make our work contribute in some way to the ongoing efforts of the people in the community and of the school officials. That remains one of the unanswered policy problems of this report. We have not devised and we don't know the extent to which we can

identify the payoff to the people of Newark. Finally, we didn't pay much attention to conforming to the canons of objectivity and detachment and rigor which we thought of as usually a way to justify or rationalize the privilege or the unique position of a university researcher coming into a community. And we didn't have extreme loyalty or allegiance to that, either. We used the methodology but we were careful about the values.

Greg Coffin: The thing that struck me about Bill's paper in particular was the great similarity between the situation in Newark and -- even though there are many dissimilarities -- between what actually happened as blacks began to assert themselves in the situation, and the democratization that took place consequently. But a couple of things in particular. One, he mentioned the fact that the institution of education in Newark was essentially controlled or blocked; that is, change was blocked by the school establishment and especially by the administration. I assume he was talking about the administration across the board, not a particular point in the administration. It occurs to me as I look around the country that this is a national phenomenon, and that in fact, institutional change in education and making education responsive to whatever minority groups exist in any particular school system, be they racial, cultural minorities, or other kinds of minorities, is a consequence of the blocking actions taken by the administration. I think of the survey taken by the National Association of School Boards which indicated, I think, that something in excess of 90 per cent of the superintendents in the country are against busing for integration purposes. I also think, Ron, that there may be some value in a case study of former superintendents, like Mark Shedd, now at HGSE, and Neil Sullivan, who is now also a professor out in California, and Harvey Scribner, who's a professor out in Amherst, or Tom Sheehan. I think the school administrators who have, in fact, played an activist role in this, would make an interesting case study.

Sherman Beverly: I suppose my question hinges on the idea of the social scientists' responsibility to those whom they claim to be aiding. I'm a little confused. I didn't see that dramatic changes evidenced in the paper that I heard in the question and answer session today. I'm wondering if the paper gave the true picture or if, indeed, the dramatic changes about which you spoke did take place.

William Phillips: Dr. Beverly, why don't you cite one of the instances of dramatic change that I mentioned? I don't intend for the fabric of the work to be one true and the other untrue, naturally; I want it to be factual. Feed me an example.

Sherman Beverly: I got the impression this morning that the members of the board of education who were black, evolved into some kind of cohesive body that was indeed able to bring about change on the board of education. Someone mentioned something about hiring practices changing. Certainly the policy of the hiring practice is changing. I got the impression that this may be a model that other cities might want to use in their particular situation.

William Phillips: When we first began to look at their work, we tended to get a kind of consensus model that there was little rancor represented on the board of education. We used two or three measures there of demanding separate votes. There are several actions that they can take on issues that come before them. Our indicators led us to believe that in the earlier parts of this period, '58, '59, '60, up until '62 or '63, the board was very smoothly involved in policy determination and in operating the school system. Then suddenly we began to get sort of a fragmentation in this small group, the board of education. Cleavages began to appear. Factions began to appear, and our indicants told us that the consensus pattern was decreasing and, at the very end, opinion was tremendously varied. Even at the end, when the majority of the members of the board of education was black, cleavage and disagreement

still existed as they went about attempting to take action and to resolve the decision. We have tampered with that just a little bit, and since the completion of this stage of the work, we know that there is a certain kind of development that has to take place among these members who have now been appointed to the board, and they are involved in getting themselves together so that they can, in fact, achieve more unity as they tend to their business of representing the political structure and the community.

Ron: One of the things we're interested in is whether or not this discussion of a tangible set of institutional experiences has implications for the kinds of institutions and experiences you represent, the varied kinds of institutions and experiences that you represent that are not necessarily immediately analogous to the operation of the newer public schools.

Ken Haskins: You've indicated that the black community begins to see itself as having control when there are more black professionals within the system itself. You've also talked about the political structure of the board and this kind of representation. And the third thing, of course, is that you, with a group of people in a university, have tried to look at ways to work with the community and help it to evaluate and develop what you call a kind of cohesiveness. I wonder whether or not there are implications for the training of black professionals, so that as they move into these positions, they see their loyalty toward those who move them into, or worked toward that which would move more towards cohesiveness than the kind of division that you get many times where, when we talked about the union and so forth before. They identify with the profession first and the community second, and I just wondered whether out of your experience in working with professionals to do this kind of research, there might be some implications for how we might train the future school administrators and teachers and so forth so that they bring this with them.

William Phillips: This is in the realm of something that should be explored and that should be looked at very deliberately and very seriously. We did not do that. One of the things that we discovered is that they do respond to persistent and continuous community pressure. That is, people who occupy policy positions, positions which are structurally designed to make them responsive to public pressure like board of education members, for example, tend to appreciate a continuous flow of information and they pay attention to this. We think, however, that they tend to look inward too much. From our position and our involvement, we think that they should know a little bit more about what is going on at the state level and we also think they should know a little bit more about what is going on at the national level, particularly, if they are going to have the capability of doing what they have to do -- making decisions, choosing alternatives at the local level.

Ken Tollet: Does it make any difference who participates in decision making as far as what you call "learner outcomes"^{*} is concerned? In other words, did the changes in the Newark system in any way beneficially impact upon the education of black youngsters in Newark?

William Phillips: We were fascinated by this dimension of the activity. What the black community was demanding was that bad mouth would not continuously be put on their children, but that wasn't all. Their children have to read, and to master all the basic communicative skills and cognitive skills so that they can make out as adults as well as black people. All right, they were interested in that. But that community was saying something else. That community was saying that when we say we want the schools to be responsive to our needs, we want to have the administrators live in our community, we want to have the teachers live in our community. They were saying, "All of them run away to the suburbs and they don't neighbor with our people. They don't share with them the knowledge and contribute their knowledge and know-how and be

^{*}Footnote: "learner outcomes" - give page reference in paper.

into the community and into the neighborhood as we would want. They run away and take up their residence in the suburbs." They were also saying that there is a tremendous amount of physical resources that are being used by that school system as a whole apparatus of contract, and there's a whole world of negotiating and agreeing. Why do the contracts go the way they do? Why are the bank deposits put here? And they were saying that the benefit of these aspects of a school system should accumulate to those who live in the city. And they were saying we want to be in control of processes. So, they were concerned not only with the functioning of their children, or the abuse of their children, but also with other kinds of things.

Ken Tollet: That's well and good, but it still doesn't tell me anything about whether there is any improvement in the performance of black students in Newark.

William Phillips: This study was not able to say that. We took no measurement and we have no indicators of that.

Ron Lewis: Let me tell you about other kinds of academic indicators that began to emerge. We began to talk to the board of education and they were receptive to things like learning style and cognitive style of the black child, relating that to the teaching style, and what impact an administrative style would have upon that. We began to talk then about the specific role, the specific, distinct, and substantive role that parents have as it relates to their child and a total educative process. We mentioned specific things that could be addressed by parents and boards of education, that particular boards of education previously wouldn't entertain as possible. Newark has a very large Spanish-speaking population. We had been approached for two or three years for some assistance in that area for the Spanish-speaking population, relative to Spanish-speaking teachers. That was a rhetorical game because they never wanted Spanish-speaking teachers in this district of Newark. This change occurred, and we were able to place thirty Spanish-speaking teachers

in the system. We began to see other indicators in the system that for some people were indicators of massive change that could possibly come about. I am saying that if you change the structure of something, rather than look for immediate achievement results as a process or a part of education decision making, the possibility of performance indicators being brought about is increased proportionately.

Charles Cheng: There is a suggestion in Brother Phillips' paper of the interdependency of the structural systems that's very important to understand. It's also important to understand other social developments. Furthermore, there's a discussion of the loss of power within the white community. I think a few years ago I wouldn't have asked this question, but I would like to know what "white power" means in the sense of the educational system, within the context of powerful economic institutions within communities. I'm referring to Prudential in Newark, for example, or Dow Chemical in Midland, Michigan. When we talk about white power or yellow power or black power in the rhetoric of the '60's, do we not have to come to much more concrete definitions of where power that oppresses Third World people and poor white people in this country really rests? Don't we have to look at some very key economic institutions that have a great deal of control over what happens in public schools, regardless of who sits on boards of education? That's the question that I'm throwing out, and that's where I believe we have to do further work to look at the interdependency and the connecting relationships between very key economic institutions and the impact that those particular institutions have on public schooling.

Chuck Lawrence: The question that I asked myself when reading this paper was whether, in fact, a transfer of decision making -- so-called power -- to a different group of people, in this case, minority persons, especially black persons in Newark, made a difference in the decision making process, not simply

in the ultimate goal of that process, in terms of whether children are being affected by it, but even in the way decisions are made. I think that there are two things that impinge on that: One is the thing that Charlie points out, which has to do with whether people who sit on a board of education make any decisions which make any difference, or are making decisions within a context that makes any difference when one looks at the powers of administrators, unions, etc. The second question is whether or not people who assumed these roles -- administrators, the incumbency of the administration, or the board members -- whether they assumed those roles in a new kind of way. I would say, on the basis of experience in other institutions, that in fact, they don't. Unless one recreates the institution in a way that it is less insulated from the people it works upon, so that people are of necessity directly responsible to the people they serve, it matters very little who serves on that institution, unless those people who come to serve are committed to recreating the institution and that what in fact happens is that people are into the role and assume the role with all the trappings. Both in terms of the way it's perceived and in reality, nothing changes except the color of the faces. So I want to look at some of the variables. In what ways can we create institutions in which we don't have to worry so much about the person who assumes that role being able to make an about-face, but can depend upon the institution forcing people to play certain kinds of roles?

Leah Gaskin: One of the things that concerns me most has to do with our expectations. Studies have shown that it is not realistic to expect achievement improvement from participation unless people are specifically trained to work with youngsters, to induce higher level cognitive skills, and that frequently, the expectation that global participation should result in specific academic achievement is incorrect. The thing that concerns me about Chuck's comments and also the other comments is the implication that participation necessarily

leads to achievement. I would like to suggest that training is needed, and the crucial element in training has to do with time. How concerned do we have to be about the component of time in which people are exposed to the decision making process; in which people have an opportunity to acquire skills in decision making? I think time is a very important component, and is directly related to what we want the output to be. In addition to that, Dr. Phillips, how significant do you feel training is as a component of any expectation for change involving community participation?

Bill Phillips: There is a kind of inertia of institutions or of structures like boards of education and school systems, and when you disrupt processes of recruitment, when you disrupt processes of rewards, and when you disrupt all of the processes which have been conceptualized as part of these kinds of institutions, you are going to have to let a track record be established. I think the assumption is that the payoff, in terms of performance achievement and gain, will flow as a result of their responsiveness and as a result of these kinds of interventions. I'm not sure about the nature of training someone to serve as a lay official on the board of education. I don't have a brief for it. I don't have a brief against it. My intuitive feeling is that if you know what you are there for and who you are, you might be able to learn and to perform in that very intense process that you get into when you get into a board of education. Boards of education go through a lot of sham with respect to legalistic kinds of things. Lay people are very easily snowed or intimidated by the legalistic aspects of the problems that are brought before them. A board's secretary is involved in a heavy activity of contract awarding and letting and hiding of funds and handling of funds. For one thing, he really doesn't want to get you involved in this, so he tries to disguise it and hide it from you as a board member. You might want to look at the skeleton or the structure of the budget arrangement of the board of education. Basically,

I just don't know, beyond participation, and beyond having the kind of courage and stamina to react out of knowing who you are and who you represent in terms of your performance there.

Ron: I'm going to take advantage of my position to make three quick observations on the basis of what I've heard so far. The first is that a sociological analysis and ordinary inquiry into instruments of decision making, particularly as regards boards of education, means that appointed boards of education are not analogous to elected boards of education, and that a good deal of our information and a good deal of our analysis treats communities as though there is no substantial difference between appointed boards and elected boards. That seems to me one of the variables that has to be controlled far more rigorously than has historically been the case. The second observation is that that relates, in my judgment, to the question of the origin of the definition of the institution itself. One of the issues that has not been addressed is whether or not, in Newark, the board of education is the final community institution that is responsible for the definition of the uses to which the school will be put. That question needs to be answered before we can attend to the relative importance of the decision making that is being analyzed. And finally, the normal kind of data that is yielded by either normative performance measures or criterion performance measures is of particular interest at this moment to me because it is an instrument of accountability for communities that are presided over by people who don't necessarily represent them. Now in my judgment, the traditional measures of school effectiveness, such as pupil acquisition of basic skills, are not applicable and ought not to be applied in a place like Newark, because if it turns out that the principal decision making body in the community is in fact representative of the population that must be served, then that means that we are in another conversation altogether, and that means that we do not have the kinds of precedence of

black control of public institutions that permit us to know whether or not it is a proper thing to make a value judgment about the behavior of the school system and other kinds of social service institutions on the basis of the kinds of measures that traditional social scientists have developed and that some of us have, if you will, taken unto ourselves as a means of assisting people to make schools accountable and so forth.

Bill Phillips: May I comment on that? Particularly, the first two. The point is well made that there is a significant difference in a community setting between an elected board and an appointed board, insofar as process in decision making is concerned. I cannot overemphasize to you the crucial significance of the political subsystem which is the quarter found^{*/} return in Newark, the Mayor's office and all of the tactics, all of the weapons that are used by those in politics to control outcome will be found operating with respect to the relationship between the Mayor's office, the Board of School Adjustments, the City Council and the Board of Education. There does need to be a clear understanding of that and it's not well known.

Ruth Farmer: I think sometimes we have the tendency to expect that if the color of our policy board changes, that all things are going to change. That's dangerous. But I think that we ought to look at traditional forms and whether or not those people who are new to the decision making group have really any models other than the traditional forms in which to begin to function. Further, I think we are in danger, often, of expecting school systems that have been left to deteriorate over centuries to be rejuvenated and revolutionized overnight by people who really have not had their hands in it for very long. One of the things we might want to look at is how to develop, maybe not train, but develop educational leadership which can look at how to make institutional changes that serve the population now predominant in most urban school systems. I

*Footnote

don't know how to go about that, but it seems to me that it's almost necessary to come up with some kind of approach to orientation and somehow point out the differences between what we want for our children now, as opposed to what Eastern European immigrants wanted when the school systems were most responsive to the population they served. I think they are different, and I think we almost have to define that difference before we can even talk about developing leadership and policy decision making potential in our community.

Rita Holt: I have nothing against training, Ruth and Leah, and I think I'm in favor of it. But the big question to me is what kind of training. I don't feel that what takes place in classrooms, public classrooms, today is due to lack of training. As a matter of fact, I think quite a bit of public money goes into training people to perform in those classrooms. To me, it's the kind of training, and training to do what? I have observed the patterns of confrontation in cities between communities and school board policy makers, administrators. There are changes that occur, in the school boards and in the communities, for example, as the communities find out more about themselves and a little bit more about their public responsibilities. The school boards change in complexion of one kind or another, sort of become more responsive to certain elements in communities. The amount of change that occurs in both of these entities seems to be unrelated to the amount of change that occurs in classrooms, that is, between teachers and students.

Reynaldo Macias: I'd like to maybe emphasize some aspects of the paper if only to integrate them into what is a trend of both analysis and model testing and development of relationships between Chicanos and school systems and districts in the Southwest that has been going on for the last few years. Some of those, and if I take them out of context or distort them in some way, I hope that you'll take into account that I'm reinterpreting them from a different viewpoint and perspective and use that is more a point of dialogue rather than criticism.

One of them is that of contextual analysis of the communities that are being related to the school districts and the school districts that are being analyzed relative to structure and elements affecting that community. I think that we have overlooked in the Southwest the relationship of schools in general to society, and that schools play a societal role that is not apolitical. It is very political, not only in the content and form of the school districts, but also in relation to what the relationship of the community we're talking about is to the society at large. And for Chicanos that has been a source of cheap and elastic labor force within the Southwest, and I think there are parallels with other Third World groups throughout the country in that sense.

But taking that kind of cursory look, we then have to look at the school districts in their different forms and how they then relate to the communities that we are talking about, and whether or not any single element of those school districts and their activities really is to the benefit of the communities as the communities define it themselves. The question of repression and co-optation of schools and school districts to demands and to protests, to walk-outs, to manifestations of different kinds of communities, I think, is part of a self-supporting and self-survival mechanism of that institution itself, not only in relation to integrating selected and limited numbers of the community that's protesting, but also to more effectively repress and control the community that is supposedly being served.

Stated in another way, it's not only a co-optive mechanism to repress the protest, but to then use the knowledge and the expertise, the experiences of Chicanos and of blacks to better do what the school districts are doing now. And there are different ways that school districts can do that. Because of a lack of analysis and research that is at the service of the community as opposed to the service of the institutions of higher education, the school districts, the foundations, the governments and so on, I think that we as

community people have been short-changed in how we view the institutions that we're protesting, and in that sense, the demands and requests and changes that we propose take on that coloring and become more reformist in nature and more integrated in nature rather than radical change that meets the needs from which we base those demands and reforms. To put those last two points together, I'd like to give an example.

In 1968 through 1971, there were massive walk-outs of students from the elementary to the high school level in Los Angeles. There was a basic list of thirty-two demands that came from the initial walk-outs which closed down the major Chicano schools in Los Angeles for over a week's time in March of 1968. There were only three demands that really dealt with substantive structural changes of community control over local schools of representation and structural changes of the board of education and so on. Very few of those thirty-two demands have been met, but the impetus and the associational coalition of community groups was fantastic, and I use fantastic in the sense that there are few times that activities enter the collective consciousness of the community, where, regardless of whether you are involved or not, you have to take a position and it has to become a part of the daily life of the members of that community, and for the Chicano community in LA, both walk-outs were a kind of collective consciousness activity. Older people, families, younger children, it cuts across the board, professionals, unemployed, welfare and so on were involved. And probably the most commonly stated phrase from the older generation was, "I knew how bad the schools were, but it took my kids' walking out of those schools for me to really get up and do something about it." That kind of attitude and those kinds of associational organizations came together in the Educational Issues Coordinating Committee, which pushed for the reforms and the changes that were being demanded. What the LA City School Board did was form the Mexican-American Education Commission, which

became an advisory, and I stress advisory, commission to the Board and was then forgotten, structurally, in terms of input for decisions, and was basically left to spin its own wheels on the basis of the needs of the community that had prompted its creation in the first place. The statistics that were taken from the school district as proof of the district not serving the Chicano community were then revised by other aspects of the technostructure of the board to rationalize the problems within the school district itself on the people who were protesting on the basis of those scores. The San Fernando Valley, which the school district serves, is predominantly white and they wanted to know why their children, according to the scores, were not learning to read. The school board's response was, "four kids are learning to read. The reason the school reading scores are low and lower than the national average is due to the Chicanos on the East side and the blacks on the South side." The dropout rates were then re-done and restructured on the basis of those that went from one school to another school -- those who dropped out for academic reasons, those who dropped out, etc. But what happened was that they then focused on a much smaller drop-out rate as proof, from their viewpoint, that the schools were not doing as bad a job as they had been painted as doing earlier.

There are a couple of other things that I would like to mention in relation to decision making participation of Chicanos within schools. One of the strategies employed, as I stated, has been trying to reform the existing school districts. Another strategy, related to the political and social action activities that are taking place outside of schools, is the takeover of small cities, Crystal City in Texas, for example, the one in California, and many others. I doing that, whether on the basis of an appointive board of education members or elected board of education members, the entire structure has to be challenged, if not attacked, and reformed, and not merely a single institution that may be intimately tied with other institutions that are not being touched or challenged.

In that sense, the schools, then, are being turned around slowly and more often than not in reform ways rather than radical ways, but systematically and not in isolation.

Another way that Chicanos have been approaching decision making within the schools and schooling in general, is that of alternative schools. And let me make a distinction between parallel systems in schools, that is, not schools and schooling processes that parallel only with Chicano participation in the existing school districts and activities, but actually provide an alternative from a philosophy of education to methodology to content to physical environment to training, etc. As a result of that, in the last three to four years, there have developed at least six Chicano universities and colleges, quite a number of schools that are alternatives, from pre-school to twelve that, as such, makes the changes at different levels both immediate and long-range. The immediate is that of an attitudinal change, and the relationship of that institution or semi-institution is alternative to the communities being served. Parents and children are able to say, "This is our school," not "We are going to school." I think that is an important distinction that we can see in terms of immediate change at the child's level, at the teachers' level, and at the parents' level, and I think all three have to be taken into account. We obviously will be experimenting, making mistakes, having to come back and maybe radically altering the course of activities. But those are the kinds of things that take place in any kind of new venture, and by new, I mean possibly a new phase as opposed to beginning anew, because these kinds of activities, I think, if we look at Chicano history, have taken place before. If you look at black history, it's taken place before, and so on. In that light, I think it's particularly important that we exchange information, particularly among Third World people, because the kind of institutional attachment to black colleges that has been taking place in the South has important

institutional and manipulative kinds of implications for those fledgling Chicano organizations and colleges that are being organized in the Southwest.

To wrap up, then: there are some aspects of the Chicano situation that have parallels with the Puerto Rican community on the east coast that have implications for the larger cultural view of all Third World people in the United States. For Chicanos, any of the demands, any of the changes, any of the institutions have to reflect the community, and as such, Spanish must be spoken, we must have some kind of prestige, there must be participation of our own kind, and of those sympathetic to our own kind. There has to be a certain cultural milieu, and there has to be a distinction between transitional versus permanent respect for those cultural milieus and those bilingual aspects. That is, when we speak about bilingual institutions relative to a bilingual community, we're not speaking about it in a transitional sense to learn English in order that we can join the mainstream, but of radically altering institutions that oppress us, presently on the basis of the aspects of the community in order that that oppression as expressed specifically through the schools, not continue. Those are some thoughts that came from my reading of the paper and from other Chicanos reading the paper prior to coming to the seminar. And I'd like to wrap up by saying that they're not necessarily criticisms of the paper, but statements using the paper as a launching point.

Bernice Miller: It may seem foolish to go back, but let me just say one thing about boards. I've made an informal study of board membership, and I noticed that when I was in Chicago, as long as only middle and upper-middle class people were on boards, there was a school to train people to be on boards. If you didn't get to go to the school, then only upper and middle class blacks were chosen, and the assumption was that you would pick up the mannerisms and the heuristics of your betters or your constituents, which people did rather quickly, which also led to nothing changing. I'm saying that those people

who were on the board of education certainly didn't go in and talk about pluralistic education. They talked about some kind of patchwork such as, maybe you should give us a little bit more money or maybe our high school should change. I'm saying that no real change is made. However, I think nothing is worse than impotent participation. So I don't know, maybe there should be some kind of training ground for people who are going to be on boards. And then, if you are from the Third World, perhaps you should practice being what one of our brothers who's not here, Preston Wilcox, said we should be -- conspiratorial. After you learn all of those methods, then you get on the board and then you use them to do your thing, and if we don't do that, there's no point being there.

Charles Martin: I think Bea has hit on a very important point. Very often it's not the important thing to actually be on that board, but it is actually important to participate in the process, the skirmish that gets you on the board. Because it is then that you begin to understand that there is not only, as Paulo Freire suggests, a culture of silence, but also a culture of power. And one begins to understand exactly how that culture of power operates. All too often there are manipulators behind the scenes who actually predetermine what's going to happen on a board of education, and those manipulators actually affect educational policy. We found, in the Evanston situation, that the banks very definitely controlled educational decisions. We found that the Chamber of Commerce did this also. So when we get a lone black member on the board in a city like Newark or wherever, very often that individual participates as a loner unless the person involved wishes to become an adaptor to that kind of mechanism. But by participating in the process, one begins to understand clearly what blacks have to do in very specific terms in order to bring about social change. We have to learn by participating in the skirmish or in the process in order to understand more clearly where educational systems

are vulnerable, where social service delivery systems are vulnerable, so that we can either formulate options to those systems, or we can create the kind of communication system or network within communities so that blacks have the opportunity to understand how the system operates and hopefully to learn how it can best operate for them. Now what does that mean? It simply means that I have no faith at all in changing schools vis-a-vis school board participation. I have no faith in that at all. I do have faith in being a part of a process, the process for instance that is described by Bill Phillips and his colleagues in his report on Newark. Furthermore, we have been talking about traditional research as being socially or culturally neutral, at least the way I've heard it talked about, not only around this table but in the larger plenary session. It has not been. If we take a look at the work of Oscar Lewis or Melville Herskovitz^{1/}, we find that their ethnocentrism is very much incorporated into their research. For black social scientists to buy the idea that researchers, social scientists, have been traditionally neutral is absurd. And I think Bill points out the fact that we cannot afford to be neutral in the research that we do. I refer to a quote of Oliver Cox^{2/}, reading the last sentence of that quote, "In a word, the reason for the existence of the social scientist is that his scientific findings contribute to the betterment of the peoples' well-being." Earlier, Cox indicates we should be passionately partisan in favor of the welfare of the people and against the interest of the few when they seem to submerge that welfare. I would ask Bill and his colleagues if they have plans for taking on an advocacy role in the continued development of black leadership vis-a-vis the schools in Newark, or will this simply be the type of research that is hit and run?

Bill Phillips: We stand on the notion that we could not do research under

^{1/}Footnote Lewis and Herskovitz titles

^{2/}Footnote Cox

the hypocrisy of being detached and value free, that it was deceitful to paint that the way the black community had been traditionally studied was without bias. We also were committed to involvement with the people with whom we were working. I'll just say it that way. It's all, in an understated kind of way, put into the basic report. But we have not been able to come up with substantive plans with respect to how we bring this about. I think it is important that I had to come out of the university context. I had to go to Washington to get some resources to allow us to try to learn something and to help. There are constraints that operate on us. It could very well be that groups who are seriously involved in massive change, might want to save something out so that they could have social scientists as a part of their operation look and think and study cogent matters and issues which are of concern to them and it's all out before you.

Ron Edmonds: The agenda that was just articulated is one of the reasons we're all here.

Sherman Beverly: We have talked about the communication system that existed prior to blacks getting on the board in Newark, and also about their not knowing the intricacies of the different areas in which they had to work once they got on the board. Maybe we touched on something significant when we said, if the social scientist was within the community and communicating through this system, then once that person got on the board, he would know the kinds of commitments that he should live up to. So the social scientist probably has a responsibility to involve himself in whatever kinds of communication systems that exist prior to his membership on the board. Furthermore, even with a body of trained or qualified board members, if it's a nationalistic board or nationalistic school system, it's going to respond to the dominant society. That's going to be its commitment. And with such a board or school system, it seems almost inevitable that any black board member committed to change will fail in his attempts.

It's very, very difficult, it seems to me, to bring about the change that we seem to be talking about. We've had evidence that the kind of change we're talking about is very difficult, if not impossible. With those things in mind, maybe what we ought to be talking about is the alternative that some people have mentioned already, the alternative that will speak specifically to the needs of the people with whom we are concerned.

One other point: we've talked about the responsibility of the social scientist to the community. This is a very good study that Bill has done, a very useful study of a community. But we certainly cannot submit the study to the community in the form it's in. Maybe some kind of reinterpretation of it in understandable language, a vernacular, might be necessary.

Phil Hart: I have three things to say that aren't necessarily all connected. The first thing that kind of took me off was what Ken Haskins said about training and looking at the work that Bill Phillips has done, which I would call, for lack of a better term, empathic social research. There's some affective component in there, and I don't know the process that Bill went through in making a decision relative to research and his role and relationship in carrying out that research. But I would suggest that by talking about such things as "involved participation" in the methodology, "ethno-methodology," "social interactionism," and suggesting that those are methodologies that are appropriate, perhaps in looking at race relations and social policy, we are narrowing the categories too far. And also, I would suggest that any kind of training, whether we're talking about training at an institution like Harvard or training at the community level, should involve both cognitive and affective elements. That is, elements which include some problem-solving skills, some substantive skills, as well as some skills in the ability to put the trainee in the other person's shoes and to feel some empathy for the position of the other person, which would fall under the affective category. I think that those training

elements are probably more difficult to get at, but I think that they are still very critical, critical especially for someone who's serving on a board level or in a technostructure level, as Bill called it.

Another point I would like to make is in relationship to black researchers and future areas of work. I think we need some understanding of why we don't have a number of research institutes at the community level which formulate the problems from the perspective of those individuals and groups working at the community level so that when we're talking about trying to get an understanding of how a school board operates, how it impacts upon the community that that problem formulation and the paradigm that is developed within isn't necessarily decided by whether it's a black person or white person within the university. I think that the institutional constraints of a university color the perspective that is taken, and that we need to have a better understanding of why foundations and government agencies are averse to putting money into black communities to set up research institutes. We have some historical background for institutes that have been set up around the country, like the Black Strategy Center in Chicago, which is no longer in existence, and a place here in Boston, the Community University Center, which undertook a comparative study from the community level of how Harvard and M.I.T. perpetuate themselves as institutions with relation to the decision making, how they impact upon the communities surrounding them, and that was done from a community level rather than from a university level. I think that provides a different perspective. I think that we need to get, as black social scientists and black educators, a much more systematic understanding of how those institutions impact upon what we're doing, and also try to get a perspective from a level that is not necessarily within the university, because I think that that somehow constrains us, and I'm not exactly certain of all of the constraints that enter in.

Evelyn Moore: As some of you know, there is legislation in process at this

time which is going to impact on lots of lives of black children and black families and, in fact, create a new institution. So we at the Black Child Development Institute are trying to identify the factors that make for parent and/or community control. We're interested in pursuing that, and we pursue after some experience with Head Start and other programs that had, like the board of education, boards where parents were making decisions and so on. Yet when the government got ready to cut Head Start, move it into the State Department, whatever they got ready to do, all of a sudden we didn't have any power any more, but we had lots of people on boards. So I'm interested in pursuing that whole process of what a board really is, board power-parent power. In looking at this, we have been very interested in the alternative school, the independent schools that folks have mentioned here. And I would really be interested in seeing social scientists go into some of those schools to identify factors where people really are in control of the institutions that are working on behalf of their children. And to see how those factors compare to, or what we can learn that may be utilized as we try to reform the public school situation. As you have gotten into this study, Bill, you mentioned state, you mentioned national, but I didn't get very much more than that. You know the necessity for those kinds of hookups, so that when people do have power on the local level, that it is not eradicated suddenly by the federal government or by the state government, but have you uncovered any factors that we ought to be looking at, any implications from the Newark experience that we might utilize as we try to hook up the three?

Bill Phillips: Yes, we have some hunches about this. I left the university for a couple of years and went down and worked with a friend of mine named Carl Marberger. He was attempting to do something on the state level. Sometimes in the evening, we would talk about various things, sometimes on weekends, and I got him involved once in talking with a few of us about this business of board and community control and the system. And he made the observation to

me, "To understand about boards of education at the local school district, you have to take into consideration that that's politics." He said that traditional educators have not been trained to think about the politics of education, that you can't understand much about decision making and participation of vested interest groups in education unless you know something and are aware of something with respect to local politics, the role of the county organizations in the state politics, the impingement of inputs into the state legislature, and of course, the role of the state agencies of education and other agencies in their connection with correspondent agencies at the national level. I suggested in the paper that the community people learned that they couldn't get on top of a basic process of educational change merely by controlling the board of education. It's impossible. Therefore, they are going to have to learn to develop ways to cope with the other kind of extended arrangements that exist with other systems. Certainly these are vital questions, but this is about as much as can be said about it now.

Leah Gaskin: I would like to make two points. One is in response to a comment made by Sherman concerning the further development of a document like this for use at the community level. I would think that, again, the question of expectations would be important in that when people asked questions this morning, some of those questions had to do with understanding issues that were part of the document and some of those questions had to do with how to implement something. If a document like this is to be prepared for the community, it would be important to decide in which direction it would be prepared. If people are expecting a "how to" document, then another kind of document would not be helpful. But I think it's the combination of both kinds that is needed. The other comment has to do with the question of alternatives, which several people have mentioned. Having just recently completed an analysis of an alternative experience, I am committed to the point that people in alternative situations either train them-

selves over time, or acquire training through the assistance of other people.

I raised the question initially about the component of time, because it has been my experience that the skills people develop in alternative situations are developed over time, and participation is a process and not an event.

It is not a meeting or a protest, but it is an ongoing activity over time.

And I think the time component is crucial, because if people expect to acquire certain skills in a relatively short period of time, or if they expect to manage an institution without exposure over time, then expectations are distorted and you get a different kind of output. We've talked about training and Ruth mentioned development, and I don't know quite what we call it, but specifically, if we're going to talk about alternatives, or if we talk about participation within the system, I don't understand how that will occur at the level that we're interested in unless there are specific opportunities for people to understand that certain skills are needed and the way you acquire those skills is to work at a process over time. And that does mean work. It does not mean chance, or casual participation. Parents who became most skillful, based on my analysis, were involved in the school on a day to day basis. Then we designed the term parent-manager to refer to those parents. The people who had the greatest amount of time during the day participated more in the school during the day, acquired greater skills, and became the most effective decision makers over time. We couldn't get around that. We had to look at levels of participation because certain parents were not available to participate every day yet were to have some kind of participation. Parents who could participate every day then had to assume a greater responsibility for the management of the school, for the parents who did not have that opportunity. But the thing that rings true again and again is that you can't get away from the concept of time. Most of the people who work most effectively in the process have been involved in the school at least two years before they begin to feel competent to move in a managerial

position. Secondly, the longer they're in the school, the more they come to realize that they need training. And Chuck Lawrence, whom I worked with in that situation, might be able to talk about that.

Bill Phillips: One comment. At the end of our project, we wrote a paper for the good of the order, for the good of the house. This paper was not intended to be circulated. It is a very valuable document that I have in the files. The point of a manual or a way of converting and translating all of our formal as well as our informal knowledge about this activity was one of the key suggestions that we made. We were not able to secure any help or support in allowing us to do that. We attempted to get some support to do that very thing because of our contact with many of the organizations in the community and our knowledge of them. We have not been able to get the means to do that yet.

Chester Jones: I hate to change the thought, but one of the problems I have as a community organizer is that when we begin to gain entry into policy making arenas, like public education, like city government, we find that the level of decision making has shifted. It's somewhere else and we're late again. The school board of Newark in 1958 had different powers than the school board of Newark in 1974. For example, you think in terms of personnel, tenure, unions, and associations, state rules and regulations. Who controls personnel? You think in terms of funding. The City Council decides on funding. The federal government has guidelines for projects and you have foundations of all kinds there. Several weeks ago, I was in Newark looking around for another project, and I ran into more people from other establishments making decisions than from the local school. In fact, the entire meeting was made up of people from everywhere else, so I wondered about the funding, what powers are there. With this in mind, as we think about participating in a decision making process, do we have to keep the power in the school board as we begin to take it over? That would be one question. Do we know what power they really have? And where is

the power? What is citizen participation? Do the citizens have participation in Newark? This was not a local decision. This was a federal decision. It was something called a guideline that came down from somewhere, and if you want the money, you have citizen participation. The decision was never made on the local level as such. So I'm wondering as we talk about black participation in education decision making, what are we talking about, and where? And do we have it at the board of education in Newark after all of our work?

Duncan Walton: I think at this point, we probably have more questions than answers. The biggest question I have is, if black participation changed with the character of policy, determination did not. What do we learn from this? I think we're left with some important questions to answer. What are the effects of black participation? I read the paper carefully. I'm sure Bill has searched it out in his own mind, but I'm not really sure what he believes black participation has been in Newark. It is critical that we identify what it is so that we can develop strategies, comparisons to develop new and different methodology.

Ron Lewis: I'd like to refer quickly to some comments made by Charlie and Chet Lawrence, comments about the economic stranglehold in this country. I think, Charlie, we have to deal with the fact that this country is economically based, out of which comes a social order, out of which comes an ideology to justify all of that, rather than the country being based upon an ideology out of which comes a social order, out of which comes an economic base. You must know the institution, it seems to me, before you make up your mind as to what your tack is. Is it to change the institution from without, or is it to change from within? And where do you find yourself along that spectrum? And I see it as participation, plus a coalition effort that is your external support. I think you have to be part of the mechanism, but that participation can't be isolated from the coalition effort.

Bill, I've been intrigued, knowing how suspicious the entire community

in Newark has been, knowing that you were there amid the teachers' strike, you were there amid the rise of black nationalism, you were there amid the rise of community control of the white backlash with the white citizens' council, by how you managed to maintain your integrity and your health. I'm very serious. How did you maintain the integrity of the research process and also the integrity of the community over a thirteen, fourteen-year period without getting ripped off yourself? Were you under cover? How open were you as a researcher when you began to approach the varying elements that are in one of the most explosive communities in the United States today?

Bill Phillips: You're asking for secrets.

Ron Lewis: Let me tell you why I ask you. Ron's question is, "What implications does this have for any kind of future venture?" Now, there are a lot of people who would like not to be neutral, and they would like to involve themselves in research efforts in urban communities, but how do you go about that and maintain the various levels of integrity that we're talking about, starting with the integrity of the research?

Bill Phillips: I think I can answer it very simply in that I was pretty faithful to what I posed to be and what I was in the community. There are several ways in which outsiders can be of use in a community of this sort if, as you work with your colleagues, you are aware of the danger of its contaminating your research process and you're able to make a decision or not make a decision to get involved, and you can do that. You might be able to make out. There is a kind of ambiguity about an outsider coming in, and there is a particular kind of negative attitude towards Rutgers University in the community. But there is also at the same time a kind of inquisitiveness and curiosity and a desire to help. That could be used. There's only one incident or one thing that you might find interesting where we initially met a rebuff. As you well know, boards of education have private meetings over and beyond that of public meetings.

One of the understandings that we had when we began as we were preparing to go in and work with the group was that we would be able to attend, or at least they said that I could attend these meetings. I went in the first time and was summarily ejected. And it took me three to four months to arrive at a level of confidence which would permit me to attend these in camera sessions. No other members of the staff were permitted to go into these working sessions. But there was no mystery about it; they knew who I was, they knew why I was there, they knew I would help and they knew that I kept my promises. Actually, no great threat to my integrity was ever involved, and I think that I still have the respect of every major segment of Newark's very complex black community.

Charles Cheng We have another struggle here with the Harvard Graduate School of Education faculty coming up this afternoon. It happens to have a lot to do with what's been going on here today. I've learned a great deal and I want to underscore Reynaldo's suggestion for broadening the whole notion of the relationship of Third World people so that we can learn more from one another. I'm particularly concerned about the Asian perspective. We need to learn from, particularly, the black experience and the black movement much more than some of my brothers and sisters seem willing to admit. And at the same time, we need to make contact with people like Phillips and the work that's being done. I really want to underscore that.

I agree completely with my brother here who said that neutrality was absurd. I think the faculty at this school goes where the political direction is, in the mood of the times, and that a part of the research that's going on here has not so much to do with the ethical approach of some of the esteemed faculty members, as much as it has to do with where the funding is coming from, and who is in office in Washington, D.C., at the time. Their research is in no way neutral at all, and much of it, at this time in history, is serving to oppress a number of Third World students and people in the country. Finally, and I don't intend

to be facetious, the point that Chuck Lawrence raised about "changing faces" is real. That is to say, the racial change. We must bear the burden of S. I. Hayakawa, former president of San Francisco State University. I don't look at his coming to power as a great over-simplifying. There was certainly someone who gained power in an institution, but what ideas he had in his head and the content weren't much different from those of the people who had been ruling for quite some time. He was the representative of the ruling class, and I think that's what we have to challenge.

Larry Reddick: I might say on a sort of a facetious note that when I give out final grades at Berkeley, the understanding is that the envelopes will not be opened for five minutes. That gives me a chance to jump out and get in my automobile and escape before my students get me. But I think that our conference here today is a little unfair to the social scientist, in that we have so many people who are strongly community action oriented. I think we need, in this whole culture, some place where a social scientist can function as a social scientist. There are not very many social scientists, and I would classify Bill Phillips as a social scientist. What is happening is that he's having so many calls beyond what I would identify as his chief role that he will either collapse, be used up, or not have any time left to be a social scientist. Let me make two concrete illustrations of what I am trying to say. His paper is an excellent paper, but it's a discrete study and it needs to be merged with studies of other disciplines in order to catch the shift of power. The study, the broad study, as I see it, should be the location of power, and, if with economics and sociology and the other social sciences, Bill could be given the time so that he could deal with his colleagues and gather a group, not only would he be able to catch the shifting power, but he would also be able to deal with questions in terms of the appearance of power, the appearance of change over against real change. But he cannot do that if he has to attend ten meetings

every day of some action group. So my plea is that this group which is sponsoring this series of lectures should pull in a little and maybe cut down their attendance a little and have more social scientists get together to see how they can use the tools of social science, understanding that social science historically has not been neutral at all, to identify more closely their community orientation and obligation, but try to keep from getting involved in so wide a sweep of community action that they don't have time to do the very necessary work in the most sophisticated manner with the new tools of scholarship that are coming out. Without the use of those new tools, we cannot really engage in the intellectual barrage.

Jim Dyer: I want to reinforce Larry's point by citing one concrete example, something I didn't bring up before because the flow of the discussion would have been, I think, significantly altered by it. I noted when I read the paper, that perhaps the most fundamental influence in Newark and elsewhere around the country over the period of time that the study deals with, was the altering of power by the introduction of faculty unionism, which is fundamentally a shift of control of school boards away from the local school board to other areas as yet at this moment not fully settled. Yet the tools of analysis that you bring to bear on this really don't deal with that. This is not a criticism of what you were dealing with, Bill, but it's clear that in order to get a snapshot of the overall picture as it impinges upon the black community, this is a fundamental influence that can't be ignored. And this is really to underscore Larry's point that what we need is to have, not necessarily an economist, but some other discipline to look at that aspect and put it next to your own analysis to see how that alters the way in which you view the possibilities of community control.

Bill Phillips: There is a monograph out by Phillips and Conforti (?) which deals with one part of the very thing that you mentioned. We are aware of

this and you might want to check it out. Phillips and Conforti (?), teacher strikes from something like '63 up to '71. It is a very valuable point that you make. We have tried to do something about it.

Reynaldo Macias: There are a couple of things I'd like to underscore and emphasize and not really summarize. One of them is in relation to areas that are not traditionally viewed as research areas, as implications of this paper and other papers. To some extent I think, we've talked about them in relation to the perspective of the community, analyses of power-structural relationships, political economy of the financial and economic institutions and their impact on other institutions within the society, things of that nature. But there is also the analysis of Chicanos, Black Native Americans, Asians, and others within the United States and their relationship to those institutions and to those power centers within the United States that are equally as important and in need of analysis and research. The histories that have been written about us, the descriptions and stereotypes, have not been without value or without purpose for the powers that be. I have one comment about neutrality, and that is, I don't think we have a choice. The question is what kind of non-neutrality we're going to adopt. Are we going to enjoy the values, consciously or unconsciously, that most social scientists and researchers have taken for granted within the institutions of higher education, or are we going to explicitly deal with those questions and decide on what values we are going to base our activities? It's not a choice of being neutral or not, but a question of defining explicitly what purposes and what directions we're involved in.

Next, I'd like to mention that very often the perspective of the research is in relation to those who oppress us, and in that sense, I think there is a history of studies on blacks being compared to whites, studies of Chicanos in comparison to whites, studies of Asians in comparison to whites, studies of Native Americans in comparison to whites. And in that sense, we have been main-

tained in divided communities and view ourselves via media and the stereotypes that the rest of society puts forth about us. And some comparative research coming out of some institutions is comparing blacks and Chicanos. The spill-over effects of those previous studies are very evident. It's the kind of popularization of intergroup relationships about the Buffalo soldiers and the demoralization of Native Americans in the Southwest, as opposed to the kinds of relationships that Mexicans had in running a slave freedom railroad through Texas for Africans that were being oppressed in the South as slaves, to leave and resettle communities in other places. I think those kinds of relationships in terms of the historical analyses of our communities and how we have been used in this country deserve attention. I'd like to call your attention to the case study of Casa La Raza, that was part of the experimental schools program for the Berkeley unified school district that was closed through pressure from the Office of Civil Rights for probable non-compliance with the anti-discrimination clause in the various legislation that they were being funded through, with no criteria, and I believe someone mentioned the edict and the forces of guidelines from the federal government having the impact of change. I think the implications of this study, both for Casa de La Raza and Black House^{*} which were closed down as a result of that decision, are rather tremendous. Also, the paper on Chicano alternative education describes, and is one of the first attempts to begin to analyze, the utilization and the role of Chicano alternative schools and activities within the Chicano community. As an ongoing kind of thing, there is a journal called Aztlan, Chicano Journal of Social Sciences and the Arts, and I think you'll possibly be interested in any number of the topics that we've mentioned here from the Chicano perspective that you will find.

Sherman Beverly: yesterday I heard on the radio that Maynard Jackson was denied the right to fire his police chief down in Atlanta. He's the mayor of a city

*Footnote Black House and where to get case study

and suddenly he can't fire his own police chief and the courts handed that edict down. So the rules do change, and we should understand that they change, and the community should be given the tools with which to work quickly to come to that conclusion. I'd like to read just a few sentences from a paper that I wrote in response to this. I'll give it to you. "The sooner we discover that whatever we attempt in concert with entrenched powers will likely fail, the sooner we will begin to develop our own educational system, indeed our own society. No group wants to include those it classifies as deviants among them on the same level as itself. No deviant group should even expect this. Certainly in this society, once you're classified as deviant, you most likely remain a deviant."^{*/} I say Dr. Phillips' study provides us with a method of discovering this fact expeditiously. I think time is important.

Evelyn Moore: I would like to see us pursue, with some amount of vigor, education within the context of community development which gets into the economic flow; who has the jobs and who gets the contracts, and the relationship of all that to power and control. We have been pursuing such an agenda at the Institute and I'd like to see it pursued further. Secondly, I would like to see alternative education pursued. We surveyed twelve black independent schools in the country for the Office of Child Development. Our surveys have not been published because of the political nature of these programs across the country, but the programs did have some common threads running through them such as the expectation level of the children, the kind of political rituals that they did to further our ethnicity and heritage. I would again like to emphasize how valuable this could be to us in terms of power and the trust that they have in the leaders of those institutions, and that it does not mean all of them have to sit on the board, but there is a trust and a flow from the educational institution into the community. I would like to see us pursue that.

*Footnote Sherman's paper

Ruth Farmer: You know, what power is and where it is located and how one grasps it was brought into focus by Chester over here, who talked about the funding resources, or the funding sources as power blocks. I think as long as we are economically dependent upon foundations and government grants and that sort of thing, we're never really going to have power, ultimate power. Funding sources affect both the public systems, through the guidelines at state, local, and federal levels, and the alternative systems, because they need funds to operate. I don't think we're ready as a people to talk about the ultimate power, particularly in relation to schools, and that is as parents in control of the comings and goings of children. We really might have the ultimate power in our hands in that we can determine whether or not schools have a reason to be. But I don't think we're ready to talk about that just yet. And I guess what I think needs to come out of some study, or some study needs to be focused on, is the description of the changes desired. I don't think we have anything like a unified position about what kinds of changes we want to see, and I think that some investigation of that is an absolute prerequisite to anything else. In terms of all of the Third World people, there could possibly be work done to identify common concerns among them, and then some attempt to study and develop strategies for change around these common concerns, allowing for additional approaches to adapt to specific ethnic and localized concerns. The results of such an effort would be extremely valuable toward beginning to unify or develop a unified approach, even though the ultimate power, the funding sources, still contain the power block; there is an approach to development programs using those guidelines that would then sort of funnel into a common way of operating even with those constraints.

Ken Haskins: Somewhere in the paper, at least once or twice, it was indicated that race is a major factor, and I think we've pursued that throughout. I think, though, that at least in the discussion, if not in the research, we focused on boards and community in a way without identifying where the black people are

in a variety of places, and if I use some of the smaller situations that I've worked in, and if we talk about time and training, there are a lot of things that go on. For instance, people who study to be teachers or administrators are in training, and if we look at them as a piece of power in the black community and schools, we might look at what we could put into that training while they're being trained. I have seen a group of teachers and custodians, etc., carry on alternative school for years while the parents are getting themselves together so they may become managers. If we talk about power in the schools and really see race as a factor, then we have to find ways that we pull all of the parts of the black community together. As Dr. Phillips said earlier, one of those ways is to get teachers to live in the community and be a part of the community.

Bernice Miller: I'm interested in how Bill went about getting the powers that be, or whoever, to be interested enough to be observer-participants, and how he would suggest we here in Boston might solicit and encourage from the black community their enablement, because we would need it very much. I was also interested in a question that was asked Bill by Ron Lewis, and that was how he operated in the community with all factions, having the confidence of all of them. Is that translatable into something that we could use? I'm pretty sure we're about to face something like a change in Boston, hopefully a peaceful sharing of the power. One other thing I'd like to know is why blacks should be more arduously immaculate about the rules of evidence and about unmessy research than their counterparts.

Paul Ylvisaker: Ron's question of Dr. Phillips intrigued me. As a matter of fact, I think if I were to have a question at all about his methods, it locks his tongue. Bill knows that I was working in Newark about the time he began. And I've gone through just about every phase of Newark, including the revolution. I miss, in the level of abstraction to which you've driven this, the real stories

of Newark that I hope somewhere to see. That makes me wonder whether black researchers are going to get trapped into white research. That is, you've got to match white for-- you know, abstraction for abstraction; when really the beauty and the soul, I think, of what you've got to say comes in the experience that you were able to put together there, and you and I could talk shorthand. Ron hit it right on the button. You know how you stayed alive through some of that. I kind of wonder, particularly, when everybody else was collecting information and using it for very insidious purposes indeed. But the beauty of Newark for me is that I went through it. Once having shed the preconception that you judge a community by the looks of its buildings and all the rest of it, Newark is one of the most exciting communities going, and its twenty-five years of history are beautiful American urban history. Your preoccupation with black, I think, robs one perception here, which is white gets to be a homogeneous monolithic thing. That's not Newark. White in Newark was two things in the 1950's. They were Mayor Carling (?), the last Irish hurrah of the white Protestant establishment, having his power taken away by Adonizio (?) and the new kind of ethnic community coming up. And then the suddenness with which Adonizio (?) is then faced by the rise of a black community to which he had to lose his power. And by the way, what was worse with the Italians was that he corrupted, as Nixon is now corrupting, the very image of ethnic leadership for his time and his people.

Another thing that I missed in the history of this is very particular, which is the median age of the black and Puerto Rican population, which in 1967 rebellion period, in my memory, was probably 16 or 17 -- something like that. Participation for a 16- or 17-year-old median age population is a real problem, just statistically, because they can't vote and also during that period of time one is violence prone. You really blow it. When you get mad you can't participate. And a lot of the rebellion in the streets of Newark, I think, was in that age group, which under no circumstance would have been able to participate by the rules of the game.

Now what I've watched in a rapid progression is what is the median age of the black population now? It must have risen considerably during this period of time because in-migration has been minimal except for, obviously, the high birth rate that persists. But the part of the shift, it seems to me, from a preoccupation of power to performance, has to do, I would guess, with the number of black parents with kids in school who are seven years past 1967. The shift in their outlooks, I think, doesn't bear an abstraction. It bears almost the description of a novel, the inner play of all that. Another part of the white stereotype that creeps into this is Irish, Italian, WASP individuals. Orville Beal of the Prudential Life Insurance Company felt, change the rules of the ballgame so blacks could participate, because he grew up in the slums of Pittsburgh. And he took on, as Bob Lilly (?) of AT&T took on, the whole wrath of his jock club in the locker room, and so forth. Now the dynamics by which a Bob Lilly (?) called the shots on police riots in 1967, saying categorically that City Hall is corrupt, so that in effect you could then speed the day of black participation, that seems to me to be one of the again diverse parts of it.

Some of this stuff you probably will never be able to talk about, because you know the dynamics within the black community -- the Bob Curtises, and how Bob operated illegally as a representative of Rutgers University -- he was in political participation, on the payroll of the federal and state government. That story is some day going to have to come out. Bob put together that coalition that helped elect Ken Gibson. I can't forget either the problem that Ken Gibson faced when I headed his transition commission. We had a long argument. I was arguing that Ken ought to get elected and then declare bankruptcy. If you declare bankruptcy in Newark, you really would have gone after the white economic power, the establishment, which is municipal bond holders and the rest of it. Ken took the opposite position, that he could not discredit the black community

by getting elected as a black mayor and then saying I'm incompetent, and just say the whole damn community was incompetent. Now the dialogue between those two points of view is whether, having gained power, you use the power to confront. Or, having gained power, then you get into the very difficult game of incremental action. Whether you deal with performance questions and the rest of it is also part of this story, and I would love to see it come out.

I guess if I were to say one thing, Ron, about where this research ought to go next, or where we ought to be working, particularly if I were in the black community, it would be a study of linkages of networks of influence. Because all decisions now go into the whole conflict decision making tree throughout the whole society. In our experience with the medical school in Newark and some of the other things, it was really dreadfully important that linkages and networks got identified. And so that you could short-cut decision making processes by going immediately to where decisions were made in all sorts of complicated places. So the preoccupation here with one institution called the school board, I think, is still in the old bag of the hierarchical, the formal, the legal. If you're really to do a job now, I think of analyzing participation, what it would be if you could identify the decision making tree and say at what places you would have to have either friends of knowledge or whatever in order to make systemic decisions as against ad hoc. That would be the kind of research that I'd like to see go forward next. I don't want to leave that as sounding like a sharp critique at all; it's just that I think the way this group has been this afternoon is where an awful lot in our society is at. And I think that Bill has taken us into an area of research that is very important. I just hope that he doesn't hide there too deep, so the rest of us can get what he's learned.

Greg Coffin: I think that Ken Clark's self-fulfilling prophecy expressed some fifteen years ago remains today. We are probably afraid to step out and do what we know needs to be done, and the people higher up in the pyramid are afraid to

step into the arena of 15 Beacon St. and the State House and so on. They are not visible. The people who have the influence are, in fact, not visible. They are leaving it to the politicians and refuse to be politicians themselves, but continue with research and publications and recordings and transcripts, and unlike the President and his crowd, they leave out the expletives, etc., etc. And I think that that's really where it's at in terms of affecting change.

Duncan Walton: The dockets for educational policy, community participation, and race are here because games have been run down on minorities and the poor ad nauseum. All of us know that. For me, whether we act as social scientists or community activists, what we must do is translate our efforts into meaningful terms along the lines of increasing the effectiveness of community participation. And this must be our very clear focus. I'm a psychologist. I think more research needs to be done in the areas of black family, other ethnic families. I particularly like Hill's monograph on the strengths of black families. My major picture is to have minorities become more effective in terms of controlling their destinies, in terms of being more effective, in terms of making their communities the kinds of places they want to live in. Because it's very complex, we certainly need a multi-dimensional approach and we should just move on this task.

Rita Holt: I am still very much concerned with what happens in classrooms with kids and learning and what's transmitted in teaching. I assume that even though there are many good things going on in some classrooms, there are still too many classrooms where children, particularly minority children, are not attaining the skills necessary for a technological society. In fact, they don't even know what technology is or the effect that it has on their lives. They know even less about themselves and about others. I'd like to see them get some power over their own environment in terms of living and thinking. How can we more immediately translate the efficacies that communities get when they struggle with school boards, administrators, and confrontation politics? How can we more

Immediately translate that to kids so that they can use that in classrooms?

I'm not denying, not refusing to look at the struggles that high school kids have had with school systems and teachers. But what has happened, by and large, is that they go on for a while. They get put out of school or they get suspended and then the nature of teaching and learning goes on as it was before. That concerns me very much, and somehow or another, I feel that when we talk about educational policy makers, and particularly blacks in policy making positions, we have got to find a way to use those positions of power to empower people in a much more immediate way than we've been doing in the past, and particularly kids and community adults.

Chester Jones: Somehow, I think, as researchers, we have to develop new tools and new language. And then we also have to promote our own research to the community. Somehow I get the feeling that when people think about change, they think about moving forward. A lot of change is moving in the opposite direction. There are a lot of people busy operating in that kind of way, not moving forward but moving back to where we used to be some time ago. So there are two ways for changes.

When I did a study in Newark, I went to the Board of Education, knowing that the majority of the students in the school were black and the minority was white. But I discovered that they had all their documents listing the majority as white and the minority as black. They had reversed the whole thing. As a researcher, you begin to wonder what in the heck is going on here, because you knew what was happening, but you found yourself thinking like they were thinking. That's why we have to break away somehow from traditional research and traditional language and tools.

Phil Hart: I think that as social scientists, we have to be aware of neutrality as a false issue. Also, I think we have to be aware of the role of the black scholar. I think we need more case studies and comparative studies which can

lead to development of a theory of social change, whether they're talking about educational change, organizational change, or political change. I think we need more work dealing with the relationship between social, political, and economic elements at the macro level and at the micro level. More work on the processes, products, and the role of alternative educational institutions as those institutions serve as models of change for public education.

Ken Tollet: I'd like to comment on this problem of methodology and neutrality. First, I start from the premise that knowledge is power, and that the exercise of it in the Western world requires one to learn a certain kind of language to communicate it, that it is true within the concepts of social science that we deal with. There are biases that work against our interest, and yet, I think, the new rhetoric of Perlman has a lot to tell us about influencing people, and one of the definitions of power is the ability to influence other people's conduct, influence other people's thinking in that we need to develop new concepts, but we need to develop new concepts that will gain the adherence of those who have power or at least the adherence of opinion makers in the intellectual and academic world. I think we have to approach this matter of methodology with a little more caution. I think if we announce it in front that we're going to be propagandists, we may get into some difficulty as far as gaining the adherence of people we want. I think that the American dilemma has almost as much to do with the Brown decision as anything else. Of course we know about Myrdal's elaborate discussion of value-free social science, in that it is partly a false issue. And yet if one is not sensitive to it and adept at playing the game of the white intellectual and using his language against him, as in law, the rules are used against him, we might get into some difficulty in our advocacy research.

One thing that needs to be studied carefully is whether the great payoff in community participation is not so much the exercise of power, but the dramatic display on the part of participating blacks of their concern and interest in

higher education and whether this does not inevitably have a beneficial impact upon young people when they see their kind, so to speak, displaying, forcefully and dramatically, a concern about the educational enterprise. And of course, the matter of accountability, the amount of control insuring that the interest of the community is recognized in the schools, is another payoff for participation. I would be careful about our rhetoric because, certainly, I see social science research being cited in Supreme Court decisions, and what we write and what we do can influence decision-makers if it's done in such a way that it can gain their adherence. It means developing new concepts and, at the same time, being able to play with the concepts that are already there in our own interest.

Chuck Lawrence: In looking at participation in decision making, and in looking at decision making institutions, we ought not deal in the abstract, we must not work in a way that is divorced from a decision about what decisions we're concerned with. I think that some of the statements that were made about the ability of the powers that be to shift the decision making process from one form to another, as soon as minorities and Third World people gain control of a new form, is indicative of the need to think through what are the decisions we are concerned with in our studies of decision making institutions and participation in those institutions. The points that Reynaldo made about moving to control certain decision making institutions in a reformist rather than a radical way are very important. And that ties in with a second plea which I would like to make. I believe that man can only shape institutions if he comes to those institutions with a very clearly defined ideology and a very clearly defined sense of the decisions he would like to see made. It doesn't matter whether we do a study of a single school board or whether, as Paul Flivisaker suggested, we do a study of a linkage of decision making institutions and what those linkages are. We won't be any further along if we study the linkages rather than the school board if, in fact, we have not clearly defined exactly what we are trying to get done

with those linkages. We'll just know something more about an institution which will, at that time, be obsolete in terms of the decisions that are being made.

Leah Gaskin: I would like to see a further exploration of the relationship between social scientist and the black community activist or practitioner in an analysis of the design, implementation, and evaluation of educational innovations.

Ron Edmonds: Well, I'll conclude by saying that I think there is some message in there being fifty per cent more people here than we expected. It may be the mix of the topic of black participation in educational decision making, and the person who was doing it. Whatever it is, I think there is some significance in that. Second, we will, despite the fact that in my judgment, this conversation has been substantive and useful, we will, in subsequent seminars, reduce the numbers. And that is not to suggest for an instant that our unwieldy size dramatically intruded on the quality of the observations. And furthermore, I think that you will discover when you get a chance to see the transcripts, that today's remarks meld more easily than you would think as you sit at this table looking at twenty disparate people here, each of whom is presumably talking from his own point of view.