DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 127 700   EA 008 618

AUTHOR   Wright, Darrell
TITLE   School-Community Conflict: Discipline.
PUB DATE   1 Jun 75
NOTE   26p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Clergymen; Community Characteristics; *Conflict;
                Court Litigation; *Discipline; Due Process; Norms;
                Political Power; Punishment; Rural Education; *School
                Community Relationship; *School Policy; Sex
                Education; Student Behavior; Student Rights; *Values;
                Voluntary Agencies

ABSTRACT
                Adoption by the local school board of a new student
discipline and conduct code required by the state department of
education generated conflict in a rural community around the values
inherent in the discipline of young people. Discipline was narrowly
defined by community members in terms of establishment of order,
adult control, and student acquiescence. The issue was the extent to
which youth should and could be punished by local school officials.
Background information is supplied on the community and on the local
ministerial association that focused the opposition to the adoption
of the code. Past occurrences are analyzed and possible social and
political impacts resulting from the lack of conflict resolution are
examined in terms of current community conflict theory.
(Author/MLF)

SCHOOL—COMMUNITY CONFLICT:

Discipline

Prepared by

Darrell Wright

EDAD 507 School Community Relations

Dr. Philip K. Piele

June 2, 1975

2

I

Small, self-contained economy towns can generate intense
responses to incidents related to the economy or to values
such as religion or subversion causing splits just as sub-
urbs are split.[1]   One such small, self-contained, rural town
in an agricultural environment generated conflict around the
values inherent in the discipline of its youth. The event
was the adoption by the local school board of a new student
discipline and conduct code being required by the State
Department of Education. The issue was the extent to which
youth should and could be punished by local school officials.

Discipline has several definitions and various shades
of implied behavior.[2] One authority lists six separate
uses of discipline in education:

> 1. the process or result of directing or subordin-
>   ating, immediate wishes, impulses, desires,
>   or interests for the sake of an ideal or for the
>   purpose of gaining more effective, dependable
>   action;
>
> 2. persistent, active, and self-directed pursuit
>   of some considered course of action in the face
>   of distraction, confusion, and difficulty;

3. direct authoritative control of pupil behavior
   through punishments and/or rewards;

4. negatively, any restraint of impulses, frequently
   through distasteful or painful means;

5. a branch of knowledge;

6. a course of training designed to develop a mental
   or physical ability or an attitude.

The issue here centers on the direct authoritative control
of pupil behavior as in the third definition above, focusing
most clearly on the control of student behavior in and about
the school facilities during school time. Quiet classrooms,
empty hallways, quiet voices, students in lines, and polite
encounters with visitors would be signs accepted as good
discipline. Students appearing on downtown streets, boist-
erous adolescent behavior, students out of classroom seats
and loitering in school hallways would be signs of weak
discipline.

Whereas self-discipline can be defined as control of
conduct exercised not by an external authority, but by the
learner who accepts a task as his own including whatever
effort is involved and controls his activities accordingly,[3]
this writer has never detected a school-community issue of
discipline that revealed concern for student self-control,
development of responsibility or fostering of creative ex-
periences. Discipline is narrowly defined in terms of est-
ablishment of order, adult control, and student acquiescence.
Testimonial letters from patrons who observe good behavior

4

are read at school board meetings. And, a teacher's complaint

about a polite, but direct student was that, "He treated me

as an equal, and I don't want students to be my equal."

Punishment is administered fairly and consistently, but only

when students break adults' rules, not when adults break

student rules or even when students break student rules.

This analysis of the school community issue is based on

the punitive definition of discipline that pervades the community

and influences the school.

The discipline issue is a procedural issue as implied in

the contextual definition. The evidence is collected in

terms of community complaints about students who are truant,

students who are fighting, students who hassel fellow students,

and teachers who allow students to leave their seats, their

classrooms, their buildings. The school principal when hired

is clearly directed to maintain order in the building, punish

the wayward and to "run a tight ship."

There are substantive elements in the discipline policy

that guarantee certain student rights such a freedom of speech,

freedom to learn without harassment and freedom to appear as

their life-style dictates.[4] The procedural elements out number

and out weigh the substantive elements, however, because

the orientation of the community influence causes the school

people to act on the procedures, and pay only lip service to

the substance.

The claim made here that the discipline issue is procedural

is supported by the evidence that students are suspended and

expelled from school for breaking behavior rules or for not
attending classes, but not case exists where a student has been
expelled for failure to learn. Evidence is available to
show that teachers have been released for breaking moral
codes or failing to maintain "good discipline", but no case
exists where a teacher has been released for poor teaching.
Transcripts of interviews with prospective administrators would
show that successful candidates promise to establish order.[5]
There is little evidence to show promises made to create a
viable learning climate that encourages success, but under-
stands failure; that promotes civilized behavior, but anti-
cipates inconsistencies; and that provide responsible models,
but accepts not blame for student transgression.

The discipline issue in its broadest definition including
both external and internal controls is educational. The dis-
cipline each individual must exert internally is vital to
learning at all levels whether cognitive, affective, or
psycho-motor. The substantive matters of freedom to learn
and grow are basic to education and required facets of educational
institutions. Self-discipline can be taught and responsibi-
lity is a proper educational topic.

However, in the narrow definition offered for the issue
here between school and community, the matter is political
in the sense that political behavior is an attempt to gain
from someone else for one's own good. The community influences
the school to adopt its values and orientation in the manner
of a conflict model of society suggested by Dodson[6] wherein

decisions are made collectively by participatory set of actors
who have an equity in the issues. Dodson continues by stating
that it is no longer possible for a board of education to make
decisions unilaterally; even though it is legal to do so, it
will have no legitimacy in a large portion of the community.[7]
The school normally accepts this assumption for survival.
When suggested guidelines from the State Department of Education
influence the school to pay more attention to freedom and
student rights, the backlash from the community, again, is
political.

Discipline is political in that it is the instrument of
government (school is the government, in this case) for
controlling its constituents. The school as government
legislates, administers, and judges the behavior of students.
The behavior is political.

Another dimension of the discipline iss is seen in
terms of norms. The matter is normative and the norms are
set in school board policy, published in student handbooks,
mailed to parents, and posted on school bulletin boards.
The norms, historically, arise from Judeo-Christian tradi-
tions having passed through Puritannical practices and into the
hands of middle-class, conservative, achievement-oriented,
value sponsors.

The current standards were developed by a student-
parent-teacher committee appointed by the School Board.
This ad hoc committee developed rules based on consideration
of recent court litigation and State Department of Education

recommendations about what rules, and procedures are legally
defensible, guarantee due process, and protect student rights.
These two sources were the only empirical contributions.
The deliberations and final product were mainly guided by
individual value positions, hearsay, amateur psychology and
compromising. The empirical contributions acted as restraints
on intense beliefs and affective judgements about students
behavior and the manner in which it should be controlled.

The discipline policy delineates the many facets of
unacceptable behavior and conduct which represent standards
and norms which if followed obediently will create the image
of a moral person, but reveal little about what it is to be
educated and responsible for one's own actions.

II

The organization that focused the opposition to the
adoption of a new student discipline and conduct code is a
local ministerial association. There is a historical back-
ground of hostility and misunderstanding in the relations
between Protestantism, Catholicism, and Judaism, wherein
basic doctrinal differences as to the status of Jesus, the
scriptures, the church, and the clergy have caused much
friction in times past. Increasingly, an attitude of tolerance

of doctrinal differences has arisen. The different religious faiths do not minimize their doctrinal differences, but have learned to get along with each other despite these differences, giving rise to ecumenical associations. This process of inter- faith cooperation has been aided by the search for common areas of basic values on which the major faiths largely agree, and by the experience of interfaith cooperation in various types of social endeavor in the community.[8]

A ministerial association is difficult to classify in terms of organizational theory. Blau and Scott list five[9] basic types of organizations:

1. The voluntary association of equals, where members freely join for a specific purpose; examples include sects, clubs, and professional associations.

2. The military model which emphasizes a fixed hierarchy of authority and status.

3. The philanthropic model, consisting of a governing lay board, an itererant professional staff, and clients served such as hospitals and univer- sities.

4. The corporation model with its stockholder, board of directors, managers, and staff.

5. The family business.

The local ministerial association would seem to fit best in the first class of voluntary associations of equals, if for no other reason than it doesn't fit any of the other classes.

The local ministerial association holds one over-arching
umbrella substantive objective in the individual members'
belief that a Christian religion is vital to an ethical,
moral, and psiritual existence. The organization of local
ministers meets monthly without by-laws, rules, written objectives
or guidelines. In the membership of the association, each
representing substantial congregations, are found concommitant
membership in other civic, business, and charitable organi-
zations increasing the commûnications network of one small
organization and creating inter-locking membership. Coleman[10]
states that:

> "Organizational affiliations and informal
> relations provide the chain which links
> different members of the community together;
> if these affiliations are confined mostly within
> ethnic groups, and economic strata, or religious
> groups, and fail to tie these groups to one
> another, the lines of cleavage are already set."

This seems important here as it may provide insight into the
static nature of the community conflict at a stage less than
full scale conflict. The inter-locking memberships would seem
to offer power: to arrest or instigate the conflict.

A second factor adding importance is that the ministerial
association is the only local group with which the school
administration schedules regular meetings.

The association objectives tend to be general in view of
the lack of formal organizational structure, written rules,

by-laws, and stated goals. The general understanding of ob-
jectives rests entirely in the minds of those present at
meetings. As membership changes over time, the objectives
change, but only slightly. As the annually-elected president
changes the informal procedures may change. As community
issues, civic and moral, change there is shifting of objectives
to accomodate current issues or needs.

The variance in value orientation of the members would
seem to preclude the development of specific objectives with
the exception of procedural rules which they choose to avoid.

The objectives very generally stated are to provide an
ecumenical base for inter-church cooperation, to coordinate
community church activities, and to promote a moral and
spiritual community climate based on Christian principles.
Though unwritten, the evidence of these objectives is provided
during bi-monthly meetings between the association and the
school administration.

Although not primarily school or educationally related,
the school system is important to the association in the
sharing of constituents, scheduling of community events, and
the common concern for the well-being of youth. School
programs and church programs are coordinated and conflicts
aboided through the ministerial association which creates
a procedural relationship. The educational objectives of the
association are related to its carefully exercised scrutiny
of student, teacher, and administrator conduct, and one may
not totally be accurate in allowing these objectives to be
called "educational."

To test the orientation of the association's objectives
one might ask if the school system were suddenly to disappear
could the ministerial association carry on its work. The
answer is most clearly, "Yes."

The general interests of the ministerial association
as stated above in objectives remain reasonably stable over
time due to the unifying thread of Christian principles, and
the abiding hope for establishing religion as a community
priority. However, the specific interests change with time;
sometimes quickly, sometimes slowly.

This writer has met regularly with the association for
several years, and a gradual acceptance of sex education has
been emerging during that time. Currently, the association
officially approves of the school's sex education curriculum.
Certain individual members still hold reservations, but
refrain from creating conflict. However, the discipline
and conduct issue rose quickly, and maintained itself, and is
currently holding at a peaceful stage. Other interests
rise and fall with currency and relevancy to news and community
affairs. Small changes do not produce conflict, but do
require the school administration to provide accurate infor-
mation and complete explanations.

With respect to schools, one must generally conclude
that the association interests are relatively stable under
that umbrella objective related to behavior and value oriented
curriculum. Although variation occurs with personality
changes in membership, the stability of the congregations
tends to hold the general value orientations constant and
predictable.

The association is reflected in current activities of
the ministers that are multiple in nature. The format is
flexible, the minds are active, and the energy is abundant.
This organization is not a single-minded group with a special
purpose or "axe-to-grind." With the umbrella objective
constantly in mind, side-trips are welcome and adventure
is not spurned; however, the limits are well known and rarily
debatable within the group.

It may be fair to say that the procedural issues are
met with flexibility and open-mindedness, and may give rise to
different objectives. The substantive issues, however,
remain constant and when variation occurs it is slowly and
carefully considered.

The advent of the discipline issue made it clear that
the ministers considered the new policy a means to deter-
iorating student behavior and contributing to the general
moral decline of the community in the end. The policy changes
that were requested were seen as means to reestablish authority
and to teach students respect for law and order. The mental
pictures of disobedient children untouched by the paddle
created larger images of future parents lawless and unchurched
rearing children without conscience of fear. The outcry was
not directed as much at the policy provision that limited
spanking of students, but at the awesome consequences imagined
from the unspanked children's behavior. This writer has
no doubt, based on personal confrontation, that the association
sees school policy as means rather than ends.

Ministers do not normally engage in conflict producing activities. Although it is true that the association played an instrumental role on one side of a community conflict. The sermonds to their congregations, their informal conversations in the community, and their dir=ctness with the school administration delineated the issue. Even so, the history of the association does not reflect a conflict oriented posture.

The breadth and intensity of feelings are difficult to judge and elusive to measure. According to Coleman,[11] community conflict can produce polarization of social relations, formation of partisan organizations, and new community leaders. None of these situations have yet developed, unless one could suspect a positive correlation between the discipline issue and the increase in John Birch Society membership. One can wonder. There is, on the whole, little evidence to support a contention that serious, unhealing community conflict was fully developed during the peak of the controversy that has developed to date.

Yes, sermons were devoted to the issue. Letters to the editor, though few, reached print. School administrators were confronted by the Ministerial Association. Teacher groups met to discuss the policy and to develop a position with regeₐd to it. However, the major activity was informal dialogue through general community conversation.

This writer was intense and harbors deep feelings about the justness and rightness of the new discipline policy;

and was called to defend its adoption. There was increased

attendance at the several school board meetings during the

adoption, but the audiences were controlled and rational.

III

The slumbering, but smoldering, issue of discipline

remains unresolved with unknown potentials for future impact

and resumption of overt community conflict. What predictions

can be made based on the experience of the past and the

wisdom of scholars?

The education community will deal most directly with the

issue in its present state, and with whatever impact occurs.

The policy is written, approved, and filed with the State

Department of Education.[12]   Teachers, students, and admini-

strators will abide by the policy and derive some security

from it. Many school administrators agree with Campbell[13]

when he suggests that school should have policies with respect

to discipline and that they should be clear with the respon-

sibility of the teachers understood. Teachers and administra-

tors may enforce the new policy and accept the new freedom

it prescribes. One might expect a learning climate to develop

that recognizes an increased respect for human dignity and an

emphasis on self-discipline. The provisions of policy would

allow such a prediction and in a normal course of events,

the prediction should develop into reality.

However, having suggested that the issue still smolders,

one must look at the possible social and political impacts

in that lack of conflict resolution.

Coleman[14] presents the criteria for community conflict

in three statements:

1. The event must touch upon an important aspect
   of the community members' lives---education of
   their children, their means of livelihood,
   religion, taxes, or something similar.

2. The event must affect the lives of different
   community members differently.

3. The event must be one in which the community
   members feel action can be taken---not one
   which leaves the community helpless.

The conflict over student discipline and conduct fulfills the

first two criteria, but fails to meet the third---an event

over which the community members feel that action can be

taken. The opponents of the new policy now concede that

parts of the liberalization of the policy are necessary due

to the court decisions which guarantee students the right to

due process, enforce civil rights, and prevent the tyranny

of the minority view by the majority view. Some of the

ministers who feel strongly that discipline should be fearful,

also recognize that the school district must operate within

the law and in a manner defensible in court. The issue began

to hold as the vocal opponents began to realize that local
control has been superceded by State mandate and overpowered
by the U.S. Constitution.

Although the issue has stalled, it cannot be considered
dead. Socially, the matter remains an issue in the minds of
those who find it important to quarrel with society's
institutions, and in local communities, the school district
is an undisguisable target. Reason to remain alert is
furnished by two expert sources.

In the first place, Iannaconne and Cistone[15] report
on research by Minar that found community social structure
has a compelling effect on decision-making in the local school
system. Communities with higher levels of better educated
people in professional-managerial occupations were identified
as low-conflict communities because of their larger supplies
of conflict management skills and attendant attitudes.[16]

Secondly, Coleman[17] has delineated six steps in the
development of community conflict:

1. The administration in power becomes the defend-
   ant in controversy.

2. A few active oppositionists, men who are con-
   tinually in opposition, oppose the administration.
   These men are sometimes motivated by the hope
   of power, but they are ideologically committed
   to a "cause."

3. A large group exists—often the majority of
   people—who are ordinarily inactive, acquiescent
   to the administration, but not actively supporting it.

4. An active group exists, usually a minority
   of the population, who continually support ad-
   ministrative policies, and who were responsible
   for putting the administration in office.

5. The large possive group, or a part of it becomes
   active in one of two ways: a change in general
   climate of opinion; administration commits a
   series of blunders.

6. The ideologically-commited, active oppositionist
   is not able to use this new hostile atmosphere
   to gain his ends.

In an attempt to synthesize the two sources and apply
that synthesis to the local issue, one can see the rural,
self-contained community with a low percentage of professional
people as lacking conflict resolution skills. The recess in
conflict issue may be, then, the result of its being harbored
within professional men, the ministers, who do have conflict
resolution skills. If one analyses the issue to be in a state
of recess or stalled at one of the stages of conflict devel-
opment, then it could be reasonably seen as resting at stage
five waiting for the administration to err or for some change
of opinion to take place. If another group, less professional
than ministers, takes hold of the issue the matter may come
in from recess very soon.

A large, passive group may be inferred from the support
for school budgets when one notes that the margin of approval
was passed by a 56 vote margin, [18] and that 33 percent of the

registered voters cast ballots.[19] These figures indicate a

normal to above normal voter turn-out. Can this definately

suggest that within the community their lies a large, passive

group? The evidence is speculative and fragmentary, but one

must not naively assume that the issue of discipline is

resolved socially cr politically, and totally unrelated to

the vote. It can be asserted that from what is known about

community conflict that the potential for the recess in conflict

to end and the conflict move into the final stages is a reason-

able prediction and one to cause school administrators concern.

The vote, alone, is not suggested as the evidence, but an

indication that administrative support is not overwhelmingly

reflected in the polls.

Again, Coleman[20] provides insight into the nature of

society in relation to such conflicts:

> "At this point in history, only a few things
>
> are clear; there are two systems of relations
>
> coexisting in modern society, there are impor-
>
> tant problems at their numerous points of contact,
>
> and there are ways to reduce the seriousness of
>
> these problems. There is the objective fact
>
> that persons have lost control over some of the
>
> events important to them, there is the subjective
>
> fact that distant and distantly controlled
>
> events are increasingly important to persons.
>
> And there are ways that persons can regain a
>
> sense of control."

The potential impact of the social and political worlds
of a small community lie in those last ominous words, "And
there are ways that persons can regain a sense of control."
Only the lack of method to gain control lies between peace and
conflict in the discipline issue. When the issue rises
again among people less professional than ministers, and when
there appears to be a method for change, the conflict may
resume more uncontrolled and dangerous in its transformation.

Solutions do not present themselves abundantly or clearly
marked. Complications arise by the weight of law, constitutional
rights and civil liberties on the side of the adopted policy.
A compromise between the opposing views is not available
because the School Board cannot act contrary to law or establish
policy denying due process to its constituents.

Sanders[21] talks about accomodation as the process used
for easing conflict so that people who have been wasting their
energies fighting each other can get busy doing something
else. He continues that rationale men begin to seek a way
out of impasse; it usually means that each party to the
conflict has to yield some ground in order to develop working
qrrangements again.[22] This solution does not seem available
for the reasons cited above.

One very general approach to solution would be to main-
tain the school district as an open system. Defined by Miles,[23]
an open system is a bounded collection of interdependent
parts, devoted to the accomplishment of some goals , with
parts maintained in a steady state in relation to each other

and the environment by means of (1) standard modes of operation,
and (2) feedback from the environment about the consequence
of system actions. The school district as an open system
can maintain balance with the community, reflect community
views and avoid confrontations arising from ignorance and
lack of information.

Narrowing the open system concept as a resolution tech-
nique and making it operational, the school district can use
community opinion polls. The point is illustrated by quoting
Thomas, Smith, and Hall:[24]

> "The result of no information or the wrong
> kind of information is the creation of a gap
> between a community and the administrator of
> its schools. This gap results in misunderstanding,
> distrust, and . . . defeated school budgets.
> As an added dimension, the troublesome situation
> works both ways: the same problems that keep in-
> formation from flowing out also keep information
> from flowing in. The result is that the admin-
> istrator knows as little about what the community
> thinks as the community knows about what the
> administrator is doing."

Correctly conducted through personal interviews, the
community survey could provide one solution to holding the
discipline issue at rest. The exchange of information could
build good will, provide outlets for discontent, signal the
administration when trouble brews, and possibly arrest the

the development of the active opposing majority needed to

nudge the conflict development into a higher gear.

The costs are sufficient to warrant scrutiny by budget

board members, and of a nature to be difficult to justify,

since it does not relate directly to the instruction of

students. The cost to a district for a survey program could

be as much as $2000.[25] The end value is adequately significant

to be worth the effort needed to include funds in the school

budget. If volunteers could be enlisted and trained as inter-

viewers the cost would be negligible and the device becomes

most attractive.

The community survey can be an on-going activity con-

ducted on a regular, periodical basis thus contributing to a

degree of permanence. The permanence of the solution will

lie in the answers the survey obtains revealing the mood and

tenor of the community attitude toward schools and the sense

of contribution created in community members.

Piele[26] cites research studies that clearly indicate

that individuals who have relatively strong community ties

and who feel that they contribute to community and educational

decision-making are likely to support school issues. The

weight of this evidence supports community surveying as a

viable method ro reduce community conflict.

Anticipating some negative reaction to interviewers

creating a suspcion of manipulation on the paranoid factions

in the community, the interviewers should be carefully selected

and highly trained in order to extract a maximum of positive

value and avoid the creation of negative side-effects.

A tempting solution lies in the election of a ministerial association member to the school board. According to this plan, then,that member would gain insight into the nature of the discipline issue from a different perspective, act as the opposition spokesman creating for them a sense of belonging, and eventually dispel the objections to the issue. The financial apsects, the time factors, and side-effects are negligible factors since they occur in the normal process of school operation. The solution would last as long as the cooptation existed with potential for a long life.

However, though tempting, this writer cannot suggest cooptation of this type as a serious solution to resolve the discipline conflict issue. Even though, the election of a minister to the School Board would be a positive action, it would likely not offer resolution to the issue since there is reason to anticipate conflict to resume its development from another sector of the community. When the conflict resumes, if it resumes, less professional, more emotional people are likely to initiate the action, and the minister- board member will be aligned with the defense. Obvious as it may appear, one cannot genuinely consider cooptation as viable to holding the discipline issue in a quiet stage.

IV

Community conflict arising from disagreements over
student discipline and conduct may be inevitable and resist
attempts at resolution. Indeed, Scherer[27] states that conflict
is necessary, that there are many types of conflict, and that
conflict can be beneficial.

The values generating positions on either side of the
issue are deeply felt and firmly rooted. External communication
methods, though valid and honest, may maintain the open system
and dilute the conflict to a single issue, but there is
reason to believe that the positions cannot be altered or
explained away. The openness of the school system may prevent
or retard the conflict from generalizing to other issues and
degenerating to name-calling, but the values held by people
with conviction and integrity cannot be mollified.

If the system is truly open and the feedback is objectively
analyzed, opinions are truly considered, and people accepted
as whole people with valid contributions to make, the school
system will be strong and able to survive conflict. The hopeful
view would turn conflict into dialectical growth where the
opponents interact to make the system grow.

Footnotes

1. James S. Coleman, Community Conflict (New York: The Free Press, 1957), p. 6.

2. Carter V. Good, ed. Dictionary of Education, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973), p. 185-6.

3. I Ibid., p. 525.

4. Jefferson County School District 509J Board of Directors, "School Board Policy Manual," #730, mimeographed (Madras, Ore.: JeffersonnCounty School District 509J, 1973).

5. Cited from confidential records.

6. Dan W. Dodson, "Authority, Power, and Education," in Delmo Della-Dorma and James E. House, eds. Education for an Open Society (Washington, D.C.:Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1974), p. 107.

7. Ibid.

8. Roland L. Warren, Studying Your Community (New York: The Free Press, 1965), p. 146.

9. Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, "The Nature and Types of Formal Organizations" in Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools, ed. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Col, 1969), p. 14.

10. Coleman, Community Conflict, p. 22.

11. Ibid., p. 11-12.

12. Jefferson County School District 509J, Madras, Oregon, "Board of Directors Minutes," November 13, 1973, unpublished.

13. Roald F. Campbell and Others, Introduction to Educational Administration, 4th ed., (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), p. 153.

14. Coleman, _Community Conflict_, p. 4.

15. Laurence Iannaconne and Peter J. Cistone, _The Politics
of Education_ (Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational
Management, University of Oregon, 1974), p. 31.

16. Ibid., p. 32.

17. Coleman, _Community Conflict_, p. 8.

18. _The Madras Pioneer_ (May 8, 1973), p. 1.

19. _The Madras Pioneer_ (May 15, 1975), p. 7.

20. James S. Coleman, _Power and the Structure of Society_
(New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc., 1974), p. 106.

21. Irwin T. Sanders, _The Community, An Introduction to a
Social System_, 2nd ed. (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1966),
p. 359.

22. Ibid., p. 360.

23. Matthew B. Miles, "Planned Change and Organizational
Health: Figure and Ground," in _Organizations and Human Behavior:
Focus on Schools_, ed. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni
(New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), p. 377.

24. John H. Thomas, Stuart C. Smith, and John S. Hall,
Polling and Survey Research (Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse
on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1973), p. 5.

25. Ian Templeton, _Communicating With the Public_ (Arlington,
Va.: National Public Relations Association, 1972), p. 9.

26. Philip K. Piele and John S. Hall, _Budgets, Bonds, and
Ballots_ (Lexington, Mass.: D. C. Heath Co., 1973), p. 147.

27. Jacqueline Scherer, _Contemporary Community: Sociological
Illusion or Reality?_ (London: Tavistock Publications, 1972),
p. 67-69.