295. knowledge of secretaries about what happens in the school

296. students going into the military

297. student/principal relations

298. 6th period girls' gym class

299. the Viet Nam War

300. teacher concern for teacher peer approval

301. student friendships or lack of friendships with people from other schools

302. substitute teachers

303. parents' attitudes toward high school

304. attitudes toward independent study

305. calendar in front of main office

306. politics in general; world news

307. subject of art

308. teacher evaluations

309. CTA calendar issue

310. job of student council president

311. students travelling

312. tri-district in service meetings

313. girls' athletic events

314. administration/janitors relationship

315. janitors' perception of community

316. discipline cycles

317. peer teaching

318. teasing fieldworker because of absence from school

319. senior dinner and prom
320. 7th period accounting class
321. Literary Journal Club
322. 1st period art class
323. 2nd period speed reading class
324. 7th period Voch. Ed. Rock Poetry class
325. teachers bringing siblings or other guests into the school
326. student/board relations
327. introduction program for 8th graders
328. field trips
329. formal role of a teacher
330. McDonald's controversy
331. teacher territoriality
332. 2nd period clothing I class
333. 3rd period pastry and deserts class
334. 4th period culinary arts class
335. 5th period culinary arts class
336. nurse's office
337. new courses
338. Project Friend
339. 1st period psych. class
340. where students live
341. teacher/cafeteria staff relations
342. waiting behavior
343. student careers

344. 2nd period English Lyric Poetry class

345. 7th period German III class

346. teachers' salaries: merit committee

347. students under pressure of work and commitments in school

348. values of students

349. role of principal

350. Rotary Club award

351. Bell Awards

352. academics

353. track team

354. great swamp

355. winter sports award

356. International Language Club banquet

357. campus life

358. PRRF

359. Photography

360. tennis team

361. Devil's Triangle

362. staff parties

363. community/school relations

364. paraprofessionals

365. weight lifting

366. The Chat

367. the judiciary committee

368. student doing volunteer work

369. visiting British students

370. golf team

371. commons committee

372. executive council

373. teachers playing sports in school

374. rock club

500. non-school talk among teachers

501. Curriculum Coordinators

502. United Fund

503. Sheffield/state relationship

504. fund raising

505. student-teacher conference

506. students who are problems - as seen by administrators

507. teachers who live in Sheffield

508. free days

509. senior lounge

510. student switching classes

511. freshman orientation

512. going to college

513. faculty meeting

514. French IV

515. low History II

516. teachers' perceptions of sexual differences among students

517. Homecoming Queen Elections Assembly

518. English Composition 12

519. independent study

520. Humor class

521. work strategies

522. advanced History 12

523. jokes and remarks about teaching and work in school

524. attitude towards student privacy

525. sports

526. college conferences

527. History I

528. teachers' views of students - intellectual capacity and personality "Students are..."

529. general perception of themselves

530. Literature of Sports

531. teachers' perceptions of courses ("fun")

532. cafeteria duty

533. Enlgish composition 9

534. teaching strategies

535. 19th century literature 12

536. New York

537. students who are permitted to do what they want

538. students' perception of teaching

539. cafeteria staff

540. Advanced History 11th grade - 1st period

541. students' opinions of teachers' duties and performance

542. teachers' attitudes towards mini-courses

543. teachers talking about teaching methods and school policies

544. political identification among students and teachers

545. obvious pairing and petting in school

546. German V - 1st period - 12th grade

547. German III, 2nd period

548. Students helping to teach

549. job of "coordinators"

550. "Because I am a H.S. teacher" - definition of job

551. tests and exams

552. disagreement over teaching philosophies

553. getting to know students

554. superintendent/teacher relationship

555. German IV - 6th period - 12th grade

556. senior projects

557. the importance of belonging to organization

558. being a person

559. being better than everybody else

560. the difficulty of making friends

561. being sick

562. student council classes

563. homerooms

564. the meaning of electing representatives

565. what is bad for kids, psychologically

566. student elections

567. nurses aides

568. the use of first or last names

569. perception of commons

570. perceptions of independent study

571. to date or not to date - boy friends

572. Business English, 9th period - 10-11 grade

573. individualized instruction

574. typing, 3rd period

575. the room at the back of the library desk

576. not being middle class in Sheffield

577. gossip among students

578. French, 4th period, 11th grade

579. sharp exchanges between students

580. walking the halls during class time

581. teacher attitudes towards students walking the halls during class time

582. the coke machine by the girls' gym

583. steno 7th period

584. fishing club

585. the release of the freshman class

586. the philosophy of disciplining - positive/negative

587. student/teacher relationship - joking with each other

588. change of student behaviors from 1st to 7th period

589. being paid twice a month/once monthly

590. perception of what students should know

591. competitive relationship with township h.s.

592. teeny bopper - doing the h.s. thing

593. being liberal

594. being a sophomore

595. being smart

596. the junior year

597. working hard

598. Jesus movement

599. how hard it is without friends

600. the meaning of having friends

601. students studying

602. individualized instruction

603. chemistry

604. grades

605. coaches

606. senior lounge

607. "relatives"

608. teacher's out of school activities

609. Catholic Youth Organization

610. card playing

611. audio-visual program

612. scheduling

613. gym

614. "third floor"

615. winter ball

616. assistant principal's perception of community

617. weather

618. drama room exit

619. student lexicon

620. student messengers for office

621. office phones - intercom system

622. 3rd period drama class

623. pregnancy

624. 5th period speech class

625. announcements

626. student participation in academic programs outside of high school

627. dating behavior

628. cross-country

629. bowling

630. stage crew

631. student lockers

632. auditorium

633. health room

634. cafeteria gangs

635. teacher's life history

636. students painting the school

637. coffee house

638. students' perceptions of time

639. students on their personal philosophy

640. nucleonics class

641. academic awards

642. 2nd period art class

643. 3rd period art class

644. athletic awards

645. Sheffield newspapers

646. hockey bus

647. cafeteria music

648. art major's class

649. Christmas assembly gifts

650. varsity club banquet

651. other adults' perceptions of cafeteria

652. trashing

653. students in school after it closes

654. parent dress

655. music room

656. band

657. cafeteria parties

658. CYO

659. AV room

660. faculty/janitors relationship

661. 7th period health

662. 18 year old rights

663. Christmas assembly

664. students' perceptions of community

701. talking politics

702. tag day

703. homosexuality

704. cutting class

FINDINGS

(See STUDENT MANUAL, INSTRUCTORS' MANUAL, READINGS)

SOCIAL ORGANIZATION OF THE HIGH SCHOOL: EVALUATION REPORT

The evaluation of Social Organization of the High School (SOHS) is based on data collected during two separate field tests [Test 1 and Test 2] conducted under the auspices of the Department of Educational Administration, Teachers College, Columbia University, from January through June, 1975. Each field test consisted of a graduate course in Educational Administration called "Social Organization and Administration."

Length of Tests

Test 1 consisted of a class that met for two hours once a week for 14 weeks [January 23 through May 8], for a total of 28 hours; the class for Test 2 met for two hours twice a week for 6 weeks [May 20 through June 26], for a total of 24 hours.

Objectives

The primary objective of both Test 1 and Test 2 was to determine the extent to which SOHS[1] was ready for use by the target population--educational administrators, educational researchers, and teachers--by using two small samples from the population as judges as well as subjects.

[1]Note that SOHS refers to the entire instructional package.

There were, of course, instructional objectives as well, but a serious effort to implement them was made only in Test 2, much as Test 1 was more of a preliminary try-out than a full-scale field test. The overall objectives of the course of instruction are given below; more detailed behavioral objectives geared to each unit of SOHS are stated elsewhere [Appendix A].

Overall Objectives

A. After working through these units, one should be able to identify the rules of behavior specific to any school which one observes, in the following manner:

(1) Starting with discrete episodes of behavior, the social constraints influencing interpersonal interactions are identified and distinguished from the purely idiosyncratic content of the interaction.

(2) The patterns of behavior which are inferred from individual episodes are progressively checked against other episodes and against the total knowledge available about the school. Thus, an idea of the pervasiveness of the pattern as well as of the exceptions and deviations from the pattern is established.

(3) Identified patterns of behavior are related to the larger structural characteristics of the school, such as size, formal organization, and the relation of the school to the community it serves.

(4) If possible, the identified patterns of behavior then serve as guides towards predicting the impact on the school and the

feasibility of various policies and strategies for change and problem-solving.

B. Having identified the specific patterns of behavior in more than one school, one should be able to formulate a comparative analysis of some sector of activity, e.g. programming, curriculum, classroom organization, in two or more schools.

Samples

The sample for Test 1 consisted of 21 male and female graduate students of Educational Administration, Special Education, Higher and Adult Education, Curriculum and Teaching, Applied Linguistics, and Science Education. They ranged in age from the early twenties to the mid-fifties. The sample for Test 2 consisted of 32 male and female graduate students who were of the same age range as Sample 1 and who also came from essentially the same major fields. The names, present or former positions, and major fields of the subjects in both Test 1 and Test 2 are included in this report [Appendix B].

Instructional Staff

Francis A. J. Ianni, the project director, served as the principal instructor. Other project personnel were occasionally brought in on an "as-needed" basis.

Evaluation Instruments

Test 1

The instrument consisted of a set of guidelines [Appendix C1] used by the students in the preparation of written critiques of both the discussions in class and the written materials ["handouts"] prepared by the project staff. Students were required to write a critique of each handout as well as one of the course as a whole. Critiques of the lectures and class discussions were optional.

Test 2

The instrument used consisted of a similar set of guidelines [Appendix C2] used in the preparation of critiques. Apart from the different form used, there were also the following differences: (1) no critique of the discussions was solicited; (2) a critique of the course as a whole was not required. In addition, a final examination [Appendix C3] was given, and the students' reactions to the assigned readings were recorded.

In both cases, the evaluator was present at every class meeting. He was responsible for collection of the critiques and transmittal of their contents to the project personnel. The critiques, as well as informal observations made by the evaluator and the instructional staff, formed the basis for revision of SOHS.

Results

Test 1

In Test 1, the students were not asked to read and criticize anything other than the two sets of handouts written by the project staff. Appendix D1 consists of the school descriptions originally given to the students; the school descriptions in the current form of SOHS reflect their criticisms and suggestions for revision. Appendix D2 consists of a unit called "You Can't Teach Me Because. . . ." as originally written. The corresponding unit, again reflecting the students' critiques, is called "Sorting, Territoriality, and Autonomy" in the most recent form of SOHS. The following also resulted from Test 1: (1) the abandonment of grounded theory[2] as a pedagogical technique, since Test 1 showed that it does not work very well, given the demands for more structure in the course, more theoretical and methodological readings either in advance of, or concurrent with, the presentation of any material from the three schools, less non-directiveness on the part of the instructional staff, and progression from the general to the particular, rather than the reverse; (2) the adoption, in Test 2, of several recommendations made by the students and staff during, and immediately after, Test 1. These recommendations were:

---

[2]Grounded theory states that one must proceed inductively from one's raw data, i.e., one should collect the data without reference to theory initially, and allow the data to suggest testable hypotheses that are checked against the data already at hand and the data one is about to collect, rather than proceeding deductively with the theory such that data are collected with the purpose of testing hypotheses generated by the theory.

(a) Proceed deductively, rather than inductively. Grounded theory may well be excellent in research--its utility as a pedagogical device is practically nil. In connection with this, it might be helpful to reverse the order of the three units, i.e., to begin with "Bureaucratic and Organic Structures," proceed to "Formal and Emergent Roles," and end with "Sorting, Territoriality, and Autonomy."

(b) Prepare a more extensive reading list, and require that the articles and excerpts be read in order.

(c) Specify a set of training objectives and prepare a series of exercises to determine if the training objectives are met.

Test 2

Although the class indicated that some revisions needed to be made in the materials (including the descriptions of the three high schools involved, which had already been revised), there was no opportunity to effect the recommendations. The criticisms made have been transmitted to the project staff, however, and if the opportunity (especially the requisite funds) presents itself,it would be possible to implement most of the suggested changes. (The criticisms made with respect to the assigned readings have already been implemented.) With respect to the examination administered to students, the results suggest that the instructional objectives have been substantially met. The instructor, one of the writers, and the evaluator all served as raters (independently of each other) and reached essentially the same conclusions with respect to the success of the instructional program. Two representative examination papers are included [Appendix E].

Recommendations

(a) Conduct several additional field tests, using the entire set of materials. Neither Test 1 [which used only the school descriptions and "You Can't Teach Me Because . . ."] nor Test II [which used only the school descriptions, "Bureaucratic and Organic Structures," "Formal and Emergent Roles," and a much curtailed reading list] constituted an adequate field test.

(b) Conduct the additional field tests at different sites. The two samples used may very well been representative [but not randomly chosen] of one geographic stratum of the population, but they were certainly neither randomly chosen from, nor even representative of, other strata of the population, geographic or otherwise.

(c) Conduct the additional field tests with different instructional personnel. There is, at present, no evidence that the course is transportable, nor that the materials are self-contained.

(d) Prepare an accessing system for the raw field notes. Given an adequate index to them, they would constitute an invaluable data bank for researchers not already familiar with them. At present, only the project personnel know how to locate the field notes they need.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

While the objectives of this phase of the research program were product rather than knowledge oriented, there are a number of interesting generalizations which emerged in all three schools:

1. School Size as a Factor in Socialization

One of the most frequent factors which surfaced throughout the year as we compared field notes from the three schools was the effect of size on the socialization process in the schools. Sheridan, which was far larger than either Sheffield or Green Valey, seems to be a qualitatively different social environment from the other two schools as much as a result of its size as its urban location. In both of the other schools, for example, the sorting process operates as it does elsewhere in society as a mechanism for categorizing individuals into convenient "groupings" to reduce the effort required to discriminate among numbers of individuals. In both Green Valley and Sheffield, this process centers around behavioral characteristics ("jocks," "freaks," "good students," etc.) At Sheridan, however, there are so many students that only gross sorting into racial groupings seems operative. Thus, Chinese students are "good" students while Black students are not. Similarly, school size seems to have some effect on the socialization process itself as it operates within the school. In each of the schools we

found that there are a variety of socialization patterns involving different levels and segments of the school population. While it is customary to speak of the socialization of the students, it is, of course, a transactional function since teachers are socialized to the school, to the adult networks and to students as well. Once again we found that at Sheridan, because of its size, the socialization function is at once more restricted--that is, subunits within the school rather than the school itself serve as the environmental base for socialization--and yet the pressures for conformity for teachers is stronger since physical security is a much stronger force here. There are enough other characteristics of size that, although the structural differences between small schools and big schools have been described in other literatures, we feel that an important focus for the second period of field work should be the question of optimal size groups for a variety of teaching, learning, value orienting, socialization structuring and similar groupings. The following dimensions seem pertinent:

a. number of students

b. budget of school

c. complexity

   1. organizational structure

   2. number of communities students were drawn from

   3. external complexity--how it is part of a district

d. number of square miles of district

e. feeder schools--number and size

f. population density

g. staff size and role patterns

h. average class size

i. scheduling complexity

j. course offerings

1. hierarchical by level

2. lateral by course variety

2. The "Culture" of the High School

When we first undertook this research program, we hypothesized that "there are within the typical high school two distinct cultures, that of the adults and that of the youth and that the dissonance between these cultures is at the heart of the failure of the high school." Further, we made the assumption that "the discovery of mediation points between these two cultures is an important area for further research." As a result of our field experience, we now feel convinced that the "two cultures" notion is an appealing but inaccurate view of the social structure of high schools, at least of the three high schools we have been observing. We have found that the concepts of individual resources and resource negotiation as they operate in classical exchange theory better describe what we have seen as operative in the schools. The structure of the school determines the ability of any one person within that school--whether adult or child--to negotiate his role within that system. Thus, as we illustrated elsewhere, students negotiate a role for themselves in relation to other students, to teachers, and, in general, to all of the activities of the school. In Sheffield, where individualized instruction has become an important school goal, this process is most visible in classroom situations where the

student is expected to negotiate an individual "contract" with the teacher, thus changing the classroom process from a continuing, informal, group to teacher negotiation to a formal one-to-one negotiation. As a result, the mediation points between student and teachers seem not to involve conflicting adult-child cultures and are less subject to group processes and more oriented to individual performance schedules.

3. Structural Dimensions of the High School

Throughout the three years of field work, it became increasingly obvious that the usual dimensions of school structure--adult-child, administration, teaching staff, students and community, curriculum, teaching, and so on--are not appropriate as categories within which to examine the social organization of the high school. From the field experience we developed three dimensions--sorting, territoriality and rule making and rule breaking --as behavioral foci through which social organization can be examined. As we indicated earlier, these dimensions operate within the school to organize behavior and it is within them that mediation points may be found. Again, these are negotiation points centering around individual resources of teachers and students. Thus, a student "sorted" as a "good student" is differentially allowed to negotiate both territorial rights and his adherence to the formal and informal rules of the school.

4. The Rule Structure of the High School

One of the most promising areas for further investigation is the rule structure of the high school. In all three schools we were able to identify the "charter" of the school, those formal rules and directives

which eminate from federal and state regulations and guidelines, administrative directives, teachers' contract negotiations, in effect, all of the behavioral requirements imposed on the school. We found that this charter is in many ways a latent set of rules and that there is no group in the school, not students, not teachers, and not even administrators that sees it as operationally effective. Generally, it operates as a repository of authority and we found numerous examples in each of the schools where this charter is ignored, superseded or adapted to fit the reality of the school. If this charter is considered the authority structure of the school, then an interesting question is what is the opposing structure of rules which mediates it so as to establish the parameters of acceptable/not acceptable behavior. There are a number of ideological domains from which this "counter charter" seems to be drawn. To some extent it comes from community pressures, at least in Green Valley and in Sheffield. At Sheridan, despite its location in a highly volatile community where educational issues are paramount, its administrative separation from the local community school board and the dispersion of its feeder schools insulates and isolates it from the community. The counter-charter also comes from youth culture, from teacher militancy, from a sense that the day-to-day life of the school is not easily subject to regulation and regularizing and a number of other counter pressures. In all three schools there is an observable process by which the charter is renegotiated on an almost daily basis. Behavior is allowed to drift from the charter requirements until some crisis, some new issue or some conflict arises and then the administration of the school has a "charter crack-down," attempting to re-establish the authority structure. Yet, there are also

numerous examples of where this re-imposition of authority was unsuccessful because behavioral standards had "drifted" too far from the charter to be re-directed. In the next period of field work, we plan to identify this "counter charter" in terms of its origins and operation. We are hypothesizing that this behavioral structure is the school equivalent of myth and ritual and that it can be subject to the same analytic processes once it has been identified.

Recommendations

1. After three years of field experience, we are convinced that the use of field work perspectives and methodologies is an important and promising approach to the study of schools and of education. Moreover, we feel that this perspective will provide an important new dimension for both the study of education and for the preparation of educators.

2. In our own field experience and as a result of reviewing the work of others, we continue to sense that methodological and conceptual knowledge in the area of anthropology and education is in need of considerable development. Thus, we propose to continue with the development of the conceptual glossary (part of which has been included in this report) and to further develop our field manual both as a basis for replication studies and as a methodological introduction for educators.

3. One of the unanticipated side effects of the first year of study, and one which persisted in diminishing degree throughout the program, was some experience with the problems as well as the promise of team research in the anthropological study of schools. Team research has not been a frequent mode in anthropology and the problems of distinctive styles an ividual

problem orientation deserve some special analysis. Specifically, we plan to prepare some specific protocols on such problems for dissemination as part of the field manual.

4. On the basis of the evaluation of the training materials, a number of recommendations were made by the evaluator as well; they are:

(a) Conduct several additional field tests, using the entire set of materials. Neither Test 1 [which used only the school descriptions and "You Can't Teach Me Because . . ."] nor Test II [which used only the school descriptions, "Bureaucratic and Organic Structures," "Formal and Emergent Roles," and a much curtailed reading list] constituted an adequate field test of the total system as a complete unit. Since there were different students in each of the field tests, there is no experience with the total system with the same class.

(b) Conduct the additional field tests at different sites. The two samples used may very well have been representative [but not randomly chosen] of one geographic stratum of the population, but they were certainly neither randomly chosen from, nor even representative of, other strata of the population, geographic or otherwise.

(c) Conduct the additional field tests with different instructional personnel. There is, at present, no evidence that the course is transportable, nor that the materials are self-contained.

(d) Prepare an accessing system for the raw field notes. Given an adequate index to them, they would constitute an invaluable data bank for researchers not already familiar with them. At present, only the project personnel know how to locate the field notes they need.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Amidon, Edmund J. and Hunter, Elizabeth. Student Teaching: Cases and Comments. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.

Amidon, Edmund and Flanders, Ned. Studies of Classroom Interaction and Influence. University of Minnesota: Bureau of Educational Research, 1963.

Barnard, Chester. "Functions and Pathology of Status Systems in Formal Organizations," Organization and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools, eds. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Barnes, J. A. "Class and Committees in a Norwegian Island Parish," Human Relations. 7: 1 (1954), 39-58.

_____. "Networks and Political Process," Social Networks in Urban Situations. ed. J. Clyde Mitchell. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1968.

Barth, Frederik. "Models of Social Organization." Occasional paper No. 23, London: Royal Anthropological Institute, 1966.

Becker, Howard S. "The Teacher in the Authority System of the Public School," Journal of Educational Sociology, XXVII (1953), 128-141.

Bernard, H. Russell and Killworth, Peter. "On the Social Structure of an Ocean-going Research Vessel and Other Important Things," Social Science Research, Vol. 2 (1973), 145-184.

_____. "Catij: A New Sociometric and Its Application to a Prison Living Unit," Human Organization, Vol. 33, No. 4, 1974.

Bidwell, Charles and Guba, Egon. Administrative Relationships: Teacher Effectiveness, Teacher Satisfaction, and Administrative Behaviour. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957.

Bott, Elizabeth. Family and Social Network: Rules, Norms, and External Relationships in Ordinary Urban Families: London. Tavistock Publications, 1957.

Burnett, Jacquetta Hill. "Ceremony, Rites and Economy in the Student System of an American High School," Human Organization. 28: 1, Spring, 1969, pp. 1-10.

_____. "Event Analysis in the Microethnography of Urban Classrooms," Cultural Issues in Education: An Anthropological Perspective. eds. Francis A. J. Ianni and Edward Storey. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1972.

Bush, R. N. "Teaching and Administrative Roles." Unpublished manuscript, Stanford University, 1962.

Carver, Fred and Sergiovanni, Thomas. Organization and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Chase. F. S. "The Teacher and Policy Making," Administrator's Notebook, 1952.

Coleman, James S. The Adolescent Society. New York: The Free Press, 1961.

_____. Adolescents and the Schools. New York: Basic Books, 1965.

_____. "The Concept of Equality of Educational Opportunity," Harvard Educational Review. 38: 1, 1968, 17-27.

Conant, James. The American High School Today: A First Report to Interested Citizens. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

Corsini, R. J. and D. D. Howard. Critical Incidents in Teaching. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1964.

Corwin, Ronald G. "Education and the Sociology of Complex Organizations." In D. A. Hansen and J. E. Gerstl, eds. On Education: Sociological Perspectives. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1967.

Flanagan, John F. "The Critical Incident Technique," Psychological Bulletin. 51: 4, 1954.

Gluckman, Max. "Concepts in the Comparative Study of Tribal Law," Law in Culture and Society. ed. Laura Nader. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1969.

Gordon, C. Wayne. Social System of the High School: A Study in the Sociology of Adolescence. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957.

Halpin, A. W., and Croft, D. B. "The Organizational Climate of Schools," The Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 11 (1963), 1-4.

_____. The Organizational Climate of Schools. Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1963.

Hollingshead, A. B. Elmtown's Youth. New York: John Wiley, 1949.

Ianni, Francis and Storey, Edward (eds.). Cultural Relevance and Educational Issues. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1972.

Kelly, J. G. "The Coping Process in Varied High School Environments," Buffalo. State University of New York at Buffalo, May 1971, pp. 95-166.

_____. "Ecological Constraints on Mental Health Services," American Psychologist. 21 (1966), 535-539.

_____. "Naturalistic Observations in Contrasting Social Environments," Naturalistic Viewpoints in Psychological Research. eds. E. P. Willems and H. L. Raush. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969, pp. 183-199.

_____. "Social Adaptation to Varied Environments." Paper presented in symposium "Community Mental Health: A Challenge to Traditional Diagnostic Methods," American Psychological Association Meeting. New York, September 2, 1966.

_____. "Towards an Ecological Conception of Preventive Interventions," Research Contributions from Psychology to Community Mental Health. ed. J. W. Cater, Jr. New York: Behavioral Publications, Inc., 1968, Chap. VI, pp. 75-99.

Kimball, Solon T. and Marion Pearsall. "Event Analysis in the Study of Talladega, Alabama Self Study of Health," Social Forces, XXIV (October, 1955).

Klief, B. B. "A Sociocultural Framework for Training Teachers in a School Mental Health Program," Cultural Relevance and Educational Issues, eds. Francis Ianni and Edward Storey. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1972.

Kohl, Fred E. A Critical Incident Study of Idaho Extension Agricultural Agents. Ph.D. Thesis, 1968.

Lacey, Colin. Hightown Grammar: The School as a Social System. Manchester, England: Manchester University Press, 1970.

Levi-Strauss, Claude. Mythologiques. Paris: Plon, 1964-71.

Linton, Ralph. The Study of Man: An Introduction. New York: Appleton-Century Company, 1936.

Mayer, A. "The Significance of Quasi-Groups in the Study of Complex Societies," The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies, ed. Michael Banton. London: Travistock Publications, 1966.

Merton, Robert. "The Role Set: Problems in Sociological Theory," British Journal of Sociology, Vol. 8 (1957), 110-113.

Mitchell, J. Clyde (ed.). Social Networks in Urban Situations. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1969.

Moyer, D. C. "Leadership That Teachers Want," Administrator's Notebook, VII (1955).

Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. Structure and Function in Primitive Society. New York: Free Press, 1965. First edition published in Great Britain, 1952.

Rosenbaum, Peter. Peer Mediated Instruction. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.

Sarason, Seymour. Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Sharma, G. L. "Who Should Make What Decisions?," Administrator's Notebook, VIII (1955).

Waller, Willard. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Sixth edition, 1961.

Williams, Sylvia. Hassling. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970.

Zucker, Alfred. "An Investigation of Factors Contributing to and Interfering with the Successful Achievement of Remedial English Course Objectives in LA City Junior Colleges." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, UCLA, 1966.