DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 157 193 95 EA 010 753

AUTHOR Noblit, George W.; Collins, Thomas W.
TITLE Order and Disruption in a Desegregated High School.
INSTITUTION National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Hackensack, N.J. NewGate Resource Center.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Feb 78
CONTRACT 400-76-0009
NOTE 37p.; Chapter 25 of "Theoretical Perspectives on School Crime, Volume I"; For other papers in this volume, see EA 010 729-768

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role; Bureaucracy; Delinquent Behavior; Disadvantaged Youth; *Discipline Policy; *Discipline Problems; High School Organization; *Principals; School Environment; *School Integration; School Vandalism; Secondary Education; *Student School Relationship

ABSTRACT

One of 52 theoretical papers on school crime and its relation to poverty, this chapter, by utilizing ethnographic data, develops an understanding of the interrelationships among administrative styles, deterrence, commitment, and disruption. The effect of change in administrative styles on the character of order and disruption in a desegregated southern high school is examined. The concern of this paper is primarily with control systems and their effects, and not with the incidence of misbehavior. The data were drawn from an ongoing ethnographic study geared to investigate the process of interracial schooling. Additional data are presented from an ethnography of another high school in a different southern city to facilitate the formulation of conclusions. The paper concludes that a highly representative governance system fosters commitment in the vast majority of school participants. The participants have a major role in making and revising the rules, and, thus, when caught violating them, they are hard pressed to question the legitimacy of those rules. (Author/MLF)

A paper from
"Theoretical Perspectives on School Crime"

Submitted to
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
February 1978

Submitted by
NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY
Hackensack, N.J.

ORDER AND DISRUPTION IN A DESEGREGATED HIGH SCHOOL*

George W. Noblit and Thomas W. Collins

Memphis State University

* The research upon which this paper is based was performed pursuant to Contract 400-76-0009 from the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, necessarily reflect the views of that agency.

ABSTRACT

It has been assumed that schools play a dramatic role in creating school crime. This paper, by utilizing ethnographic data, develops an understanding of the interrelationships among administrative styles, deterrence, commitment, and disruption. It appears that legitimacy of rules even within a school's bureaucracy needs to be developed through negotiating order with students.

Introduction

For the past 10 years, at least, it has been argued that schools are somehow implicated in the development of youthful misbehavior.[1] However, it was not until quite recently that the argument began to have credence. This credence seemingly was established by the increased clamoring of school officials that the problem was threatening to undermine the efficacy of public education in our society (Bayh, 1975; McPartland & McDill, 1976).

Intriguingly, the emergence of school crime as a problem and the implementation of school desegregation as a standard policy seemed to have occurred concomitantly. Some research suggests that this could be expected, since as black-white racial composition approaches equal distribution, interracial violence seems to increase (Havinghurst, 1970; Bailey, 1969).

---

[1] In 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice published consultation papers on juvenile delinquency and youth crime that were particularly critical of the process of American schooling. Schafer and Polk (1967), in particular, developed an analysis that argued that the organization of the educational experience is a vital factor in the development of youthful criminals. Of course, there were much earlier studies (Kvaraceus, 1945; Stinchcombe, 1964), but for the most part they did not find their way into public awareness until after the publication of the conclusions of the Commission.

It would seem more difficult to argue that the crime situation across all categories would worsen for schools as a whole merely as a result of the mixing of racial and ethnic groups. However, school desegregation seems to have promoted changes in the policy and practice of everyday schooling that may be directly responsible for the assumed changing character of school crime. Any casual observer in schools will note changes in curricular offerings, teacher attitudes, and administrative styles that can be attributed to the responses of school administrators to the influx of seemingly "different" students.[2] It could be that the changes that result from school responses to desegregation are factors in the school crime problem. This paper examines the effect of a change of one of these factors, administrative styles, upon the character of order and disruption in a

---

[2] While it will not be discussed in this paper, a topic of concern that needs further examination is the relative necessity and appropriateness of these changes. For example, in the city in which this study took place, school desegregation was the impetus that one high school system administration saw as necessitating the transformation of ability grouping from an optional to a standard policy in the secondary schools. Given the research on the effects of ability grouping, this would not seem to promote the equality of educational opportunity that is the goal of desegregation for the courts. Nevertheless, the change persists and even has had increased support of late.

desegregated high school in the South. The concern of this paper is primarily with control systems and their effects, and not with the incidence of misbehavior. This is for a number of reasons. First, incidence is an elusive animal. It refers to offenses "known" by someone -- which, obviously, may or may not be a true indicator of actual misbehavior. Second, incidence studies are not often policy-relevant, since they do not allow an assessment of the trade-offs that an organization under study has made and/or must make to resolve a problem effectively. Third, our knowledge of those with power is extremely limited, while our knowledge of the vulnerable attests that they cannot resist the intrusion of social researchers. Fourth, our own research indicates that little empirical research on principals exists (Collins & Noblit, 1976), even though they manage the lives of the youth of our society. Fifth, and finally, power relations and the participation of students in decision making have repeatedly been argued to be significant factors in understanding school disruption (Scott & El-Assal, 1969; Chesler, 1967; McPartland & McDill, 1976). In the end, we hope that our analysis and synthesis will inform social scientists, policy makers, and practitioners in their attempts to resolve the complex issues surrounding the

problem of school crime.

Research Procedures

The data for this investigation were drawn primarily from an ongoing ethnographic study of a desegregated high school with approximately 500 students in the South funded by the National Institute of Education. The study is currently in its second year, and was primarily geared to investigate the process of interracial schooling. The data were gathered via intensive, unstructured interviews, observations, and document review conducted primarily by the authors of this paper. Additional data will be presented from an ethnography of another high school in a different Southern city to facilitate the formulation of conclusions.

It is important to review the nature of ethnographic research, since it is a technique often misunderstood by non-anthropologists. Spicer (1976) argues that ethnographic research is emic, holistic, historical, and comparative in nature. That is, it gathers data directly from the people involved in the categories that are relevant to them (emic); it places events in context of the total experience under study (holistic); it incorporates history as a natural event in the studied experience (historical); and it considers and compares the variety

of classes of events that make up that experience (comparative).

Further, the collection and analysis of ethnographic data is conducted under rigorous rules of analytic induction. The most significant of these rules for data analysis concerns data exhaustion. Simply put, a hypothesis that is inductively derived must explain all the data relative to the relationships and classes of events contained in the hypothesis. If the "heuristic" hypothesis does not meet this standard, then either it must be modified so that all data are exhausted by it or a substitute hypothesis must be formulated that satisfies the standard. In short, an ethnographic analysis and/or synthesis is "true" for all relevant data collected, albeit it may not be generalizable across other settings. Further discussion of the ethnographic technique and a response to its critics can be found in Noblit (1977).

Finally, it should be noted that ethnographic data is best used to gain an interpretive understanding of an experience or event, and as such is vital to deriving a scientific proof concerning the nature of the experience or event. Both interpretive understanding and causal explanation (as derived from enumerative research strategies) are necessary to satisfy

the notion of a scientific proof (Turner & Carr, 1976).

The School

Crossover High School (a pseudonym) was build in 1948, and graduated its first class in 1951. The structure was built on a 35-acre tract of land for the expanding residential areas of a Southern city. From the beginning, its program, kindergarten through 12th grade, was established as a sort of college-prep school for the children of this economically affluent area of Memphis. In reflection of the political character of the community, the district boundaries were simply gerrymandered to exclude most children of working-class parents. And, of course, the dual system that existed under total racial segregation excluded the Black children from the neighborhood of Crossover located two blocks to the north, just across the tracks.

With this highly homogeneous school population, the academic program of Crossover High School (CHS) developed a reputation for excellence. Regularly, 95 percent of the senior graduating class enrolled in college. In one year, during the 1950's, there were 11 Merit Scholar students in one graduating class. Many of the local influential middle-management executives, professional people, and

political leaders are graduates of CHS. During the 1950s and 1960s, competition at the school was intense across the gamut of academics through the available social activities, and parents supported the school financially and spiritually.

THe all-white faculty found the teaching situation highly attractive at Crossover. They received the best equipment and generous volunteer support. Only the select teachers were permitted to transfer to Crossover, and only the very best maintained a position. Hence, the teacher turnover up until 1969 was minimal.

In a 1972 desegregation plan, the Black neighborhood of Crossover, located just across some railroad tracks from CHS, was included in the school district. Not unlike other Black enclaves in residential areas of Southern cities, the community was established early in the century to house a labor force for service in white homes and business. While the sense of community is strong in the neighborhood, it is plagued by property, violent, and victimless crimes. In many ways, it can be characterized as a "street corner society."

The former Black high school (now a feeder junior high school for CHS) was a source of pride for the neighborhood. Business and parent groups, as with the

segregated CHS, were active supporters of the school.

Needless to say, both Black and white communities were apprehensive about pairing and desegregation of Feeder School and CHS, and responded with mixed emotions. When desegregation was ordered in 1972, most white parents with children in the senior high permitted them to remain and graduate. But many parents with students in the junior high, particularly girls, removed them to private schools rather than send them to what was considered an inferior Black junior high school. The Black community had no choice but to comply. The white principal at Crossover High School resigned rather than face the inevitable problems of desegregation. Thus, the Black principal at Feeder, with half his staff, moved to take charge of a desegregated Crossover High in September, 1972.

The Black principal was faced with the unenviable task of merging not only two racially different populations, but also two populations with widely different socio-economic levels and concomitant lifestyles. Moreover, the white parents were among those influentials of the district who maintained informal networks with some school board members. To add to this situation, the local media had selected CHS as a sort of barometer for measuring the response of the entire district. Thus, the school has

received the continual focus of the news media. The principal stated it concisely when he spoke to the entire student body the first year: "We are living in kind of a fishbowl on how desegregation can work."

One of the primary sources of school stability, community support, was lost from the beginning. The Black community looked on CHS as a white institution controlled by forces they could not match, and the Feeder community would not identify with the new school. White community support was already strained by the long litigation over desegregation prior to 1972. The major political issue in the 1971 mayoral election was busing. Thus, when desegregation did arrive, many white parents sent their children to CHS with a sense of defeat. Their school support was less than dramatic. Expectedly, adult attendance at sports, musical, and drama events dropped. Parent organizations became nonexistent within three years. Parents were critical of the administration, but offered little aid.

To add to the principal's dilemma, it was necessary to reorganize a curriculum to meet the needs of the two different school populations. However, any adjustment in course offerings was met with suspicion by the old guard teaching staff. This segment established themselves

as "the protectors of academic standards." Moreover, when the principal attempted innovations in relaxing codes of dress and demeanor or provided a study hall for those students who did not choose to be quiet or study, this was interpreted by the old guard teachers as somehow related to lower academic standards. Therefore, the first principal quite often found himself without the full support of his own faculty. Given all these obstacles, he admitted that it would be only a matter of time before he was transferred to another school. This prophecy proved correct in 1976, and a new principal took his place.

In sum, the first principal did not begin his tenure from the strong position usually ascribed to this administrative role (Anderson, 1973; Khleif, 1971; Wolcott, 1970). He had to build a new academic subsystem without the support of the community, parents, and significant segments of his teaching staff.

Given the politics of race among the members of the board of education, it was necessary to replace one Black administrator with another Black. As a result of the four years of experience with desegregation and the further reduction of the white/Black student ratio to 30 percent/70 percent, the second principal began his

tenure with a different frame of reference. Moreover, school district policy was changing, and CHS was increasingly taking on the image of a vocationally oriented school, whether the new administrator and his staff were willing to accept it or not. A vocational skill center, one of the six in the district, had been built adjacent to CHS. Although the center was administratively separate, the vocational programs were attractive to a large percentage of CHS students, if for no other reason than a half-day break from the routine of academic classrooms. This loss of students ultimately weakened the program at CHS by lowering the teacher/student ratio to the point where some of the staff had to be declared surplus and hence transferred.

In the way of background information, the second principal had derived all his administrative experience in the school system, but, unlike the first principal, he had been moved through several posts at a variety of levels of primary and secondary education. He had been transferred from an all-Black high school where he had achieved a great deal of administrative success, according to his reputation. However, this school was located in a large Black community where a majority of the residents

were stably employed and owned their own homes and where the principal had had full parent cooperation in support of both academic and disciplinary policy. At CHS he obviously faced a different situation.

Rules and Enforcement

In any school there are rules that attempt to prompt "appropriate behavior." As with most rules in our society, school rules are based on the assumption that penalities will deter illicit behavior. Unlike much of the research on deterrence, which reveals it to be a complicated issue (Tittle & Logan, 1973), the rationale for deterrence in schools is rather simplistic. Each principal of the CHS argued that order is necessary for learning to take place in the classroom, and that schools should be safe places for students to attend. Yet they did vary in how they saw rules and in their understanding of "deterrence."

These differences between the two principals can be somewhat elucidated in an analysis of rules and rule enforcement. In any setting for which rules have been developed, there appear to be at least two distinct sets of rules. One set of rules is more or less universalistic

and impartial. This set of rules is considered legitimate by most of the constituents, and when it is enforced the offender will display more vexation at being discovered than at the existence of the rules. The second set of rules is negotiable. This negotiability stems from two sources. First, the legitimacy of these rules is challenged by some body of constituents. The challenge is usually on the basis of unfair discrimination either against a constituent group or against youth in general. Second, the administration sees it as in its best interests to withhold enforcement selectively so that the offender is indebted to the administration. In this way, nonenforcement of this set of rules is intended to elicit students' commitment to and compliance with school authority.

Thus, for both principals, deterring illicit behavior via rules and rule enforcement involved two levels of understanding of deterrence. On one level, and for the impartial rules, deterrence was argued to be promoted by strict and universalistic enforcement of rules. For these rules, the invoking of penalties was believed to reduce the likelihood that students would engage in illicit behavior. On the second level, the negotiability of some

rules was allowed so that commitment to the school could be fostered by personally indebting students to the administration for the nonenforcement.

It is now possible to define bureaucratic order and negotiated order more clearly. The former is characterized by more reliance on impartial rules (which from now on we will call bureaucratic rules), and the latter is characterized by more reliance on negotiable rules. The styles of each type of order are distinct, but they have many similarities and are bound by the parameters common to all public schools. In CHS, the first Black principal established primarily negotiated order, whereas the second established primarily bureaucratic order. Bureaucratic order, as seen in this school, assumed the legitimacy of the principal's authority and the recognition of that legitimacy by all constituents. Thus, bureaucratic order, overall, enforced rules with impunity. Negotiated order, as we observed it, did not take that legitimacy as given. Rather it was something that had to be developed and cultivated, even as rules had to be enforced.

The two types of order were characterized by different enforcement strategies. Bureaucratic order was enforced

by the principal himself. He administered discipline and he patrolled the halls. Further, the bureaucratic principal developed a mechanism to circumvent some of the due process rights of students. He allowed students three "official visits" to his office, which he recorded on cards in a file in his office. By and large, these infractions were ones for which the formal administration of discipline would have been difficult, since evidence of the infraction was lacking or not collected. Thus, an "informal" disciplinary talk occurred. After three of these visits, the student became subject to suspension for an infraction for which evidence was present. Without three unofficial visits, a student with a similar offense generally would not be suspended.

The negotiable principal enforced order via a network. He, the vice-principal, and the administrative assistant all were responsible for administering discipline. Usually, however, the negotiable principal would not make the discipline decision. The vice-principal and/or administrative assistant would do so, and would call in the principal only when extenuating circumstances were present. Conferences between the three were frequent, however, as discipline decisions were made. The negotiable principal patrolled the halls, as did the bureaucratic

principal. Yet the negotiable principal put more emphasis on teachers enforcing order in their classrooms and in the halls than did the bureaucratic principal. Further, the athletic coaches were given responsibility for maintaining order in the halls under the negotiable principal, which was discontinued under the bureaucratic principal. The coaches were, thus, informal disciplinarians. They would "prompt" movement on to classes, the removal of hats, and elimination of jostling in the halls. Their approach, by and large, was to cajole students into compliance. Yet, only rarely would they in fact refer a student for formal discipline. In practice, they engaged in supervision but not in disciplinary behavior. Thus, the negotiable principal attempted to enforce rules informally through a wider network of teachers and coaches, as well as through the formal discipline meted out by the administrators.

The styles, then, differ in some crucial dimensions: the degree to which authority is vested in the principal and how informal discipline is managed. The bureaucratic-order principal was <u>the</u> disciplinarian of the school, and managed both formal and informal discipline. The negotiated-order principal delegated his disciplinary

authority and separated formal from informal discipline by asking the coaches to manage the day-to-day supervision and enforcement of minor rules and by allowing them discretion on enforcement. In essence, he delegated negotiable as well as bureaucratic authority.

The Dynamics of Power and Order in a Desegregated High School

School desegregation in the United States has found many educators unprepared for a multicultural educational setting, regardless of the educational rhetoric of the late 1960s and early 1970s. Both principals of CHS, during the two years we observed it, had to face the issue of student power, and each responded differently. However, a fuller understanding of the context can be gained from a history of race and power in the student body and their interaction with teacher and administrative subsystems.

Desegregation at CHS meant a dramatic transformation for the school. Not only had it previously been all-white, but it also had a history of being a public "prep" school for middle - and upper-class youth in the city. For the new Black principal, the school represented both a threat and a promise. The promise was that if desegregation

went smoothly at the school, then he would gain the publicity and reputation that would bring further advancement in the school system and prestige in the general community. The threat was that if it did not go smoothly, both he and desegregation, a cause in which he believed fervently, would be panned.

The influx of Black students and some school flight by middle - and upper-class whites led to the development of essentially four large student groups that were, for practical purposes, networks of students. These networks can be termed honor students, freaks, active Blacks and Red Oaks Blacks. Each network was relatively distinct, both on racial and class characteristics. The honor students were middle - and upper-class white students who, by and large, populated the "accelerated" classes offered at CHS. The freaks were whites who demonstrated less commitment to success in school and more to the street; some were middle-class but most were working-class. The active Blacks were a small group of students relatively committed to success in school, and some were in the "accelerated" classes. They were from higher-status families than were the Red Oaks Blacks. Yet their social class was more akin to that of the freaks than to that of the honor students, inasmuch as they came from essentially working-class homes and had parents who were stably employed.

The Red Oaks Blacks were from the housing projects in the neighborhood and were poor. They had a relatively strong commitment to behavior, attitudes, and styles that are common on the "streets."

In short, three variables differentiated the students: class, race, and commitment (school vs. street). Blacks have been, and are, a numerical majority in the school (approximately 60 and 70 percent for each year of observation, respectively). However, the first Black principal was in the spotlight to make desegregation "work" -- which included satisfying educational and order requirements of all concerned. As a result, the principal established a system of negotiated order whereby each of the groups could have influence. But the honor students were from highly politically influential families -- whose loss from the school would demonstrate the failure of desegregation. Thus, the principal felt obligated to grant some additional influence to the honor students. This influence ended up guaranteeing them essential control of student activities and honors. In those arenas where control was not complete, most notably sports and elected honors (best-dressed, etc.), the honor students either withdrew (as they did for most sports) or were guaranteed equal representation with the Blacks (elected honors had Black and white victors). The honor students

were able to maintain their support by mobilizing the teachers (who "respected" these students), the freaks, and the active Blacks (who were attempting to gain admission into the honor student network). The Red Oaks Blacks were the contenders in the student power confrontations, and on occasion were able to pull some support from the active Blacks, usually via ridicule ("You've been eating cheese" or "You're a Tom"). However, many of the active Blacks felt it was necessary to maintain their "street" repertoire so that they would be able to actualize that option if the school denied them access to success in academics and the world of work.

Thus, negotiated order had the intriguing facet of permitting issues of race to be salient to the process of schooling. Racial and cultural differences could be discussed, and tolerated to some extent, although the street culture was not tolerated to any significant degree. This carried over into the discussions of school crime and disruption. That is, attributions concerning the whites and Blacks as perpetrators and victims were allowed and were common. Disagreements could be phrased as racial in origin, as the groups were allowed to segregate themselves in informal activities if they chose. The annex to the school was the "recreational study hall," which

quickly became a "Black" area. The library was the scene of the "nonrecreational study hall", which was largely white. Overly simplistically perhaps, two schools did seem to exist under one roof, a school for Blacks, and a school for whites. Each style was respected in the school.

Under the negotiated order, students seemed to perceive the rules as legitimate, inasmuch as they were the product of the peace bond that had evolved to keep the lid on the desegregation of the school. The bond was continually evolving as the constituents in the school vied for influence. Thus, while there was no formal mechanism for students to participate in governance, their role in rule formulation was evident. Further, since enforcement of rules was largely informal, and of "prompting" character, the offenders rarely needed to consider whether or not to confront the legitimacy of the rules, and, thus, they never developed a stance of defiance. That is, the enforcement strategy did not force students to face the issue of whether or not to remain committed to the rules of the school. Simply, the penalties were rarely severe enough to cause a reconsideration of commitment to the school.

Of course, some students were forced to face that decision and were essentially uncommitted to the school. For students exhibiting a street style of behavior or an obvious lack of respect for "appropriate" school behavior, formal authority was quick to be imposed and negotiability of enforcement and punishment was drastically reduced. Further, a student exhibiting such behavior and/or attitudes was not permitted the range of negotiability of enforcement that committed students had. As it turned out, this seemingly penalized Blacks more than whites, and it was a common complaint by both teachers and Black students that whites were often not sufficiently disciplined. One teacher put it this way: "When I send a student--white--down to the office, the student is right back in my class again." However, teachers commonly complained of a general leniency on the part of the principal. Conversely, one Black student commented on what she thought was overly harsh treatment of the street-wise Black youth, "They do all the dudes in Red Oaks like that." While these accusations of discrimination are alarming, most persons familiar with the schools will realize that they are not really unusual. But there is something significant about these accusations in this case. School participants under

negotiated order felt free to lodge these complaints in the company of other participants, whether they shared the same network or not. Thus, negotiated order allowed participants to express their opinion quite freely.

In many ways, it was this freedom that damaged the principal's credibility and led to his transfer to another assignment. His replacement was led to believe that the "failure" of his predecessor was due to "lack of order." Further, the new principal had a reputation of "running a tough ship." Since desegregation had thus far "failed" at CHS, and since that was believed to have resulted from a "weak" administration, bureaucratic order became the vehicle to turn this around. The new principal centralized authority into his own hands and began to formulate and enforce rules. His concern was to "turn the school around" and increase the quality of education at CHS. Success in these endeavors seemed to require the opposite of what was assumed to have caused the "failure". Therefore, rule enforcement was to be less negotiable and more impartial. The new principal ran the ship. His administrative assistant (a Black female) and vice-principal (a white male carry-over from the former principal) were assigned to curriculum development and attendance,

respectively. Teachers and students alike were held accountable and disciplined for infractions.

The same networks of students were evident, even though some of the faces had changed. Overall, the white population had decreased. This was most evident in the honor students, who suffered the greatest loss in terms of the size of their network. Seemingly more important than the shrinking size of this network was the power loss they suffered under bureaucratic order. Because rules were impartial, the quotas for white representation in elected honors were no longer in force. The honor students at first were not dismayed because they felt that the Blacks, who were even more in the majority this year than last, would continue to respect them and in the end vote so that both whites and Blacks would receive honors. However, the Blacks did not vote for many of the white candidates, and the elected honors of the school no longer went to the "best" students in the eyes of the honor students.

While race was no longer a salient issue as far as the bureaucratic principal was concerned, the school's identity became more firmly Black in the eyes of the students. While under the former principal it had been

easy to discern the variables that differentiated the students, i.e., class, race, and commitment, it became more difficult. These variables continued to be important for the teachers, who used them to refer students to the principal; and with the centralization of authority, the referrals of students by teachers increased. Note, for example, the following episode:

> A Black male entered the room wearing a stocking cap. The teacher (a white female) ordered him to remove it, which he did. However, as he removed the hat, he assumed a stance with his shoulders held back, arms falling straight down a little behind his sides, his chin thrust forward, and sauntered back towards his seat. The teacher, at the sight of this, ordered him to the office. Within one minute a white male entered wearing a baseball cap. She said in a stern tone, "Robert, your hat!" He responded by whipping his hat off, and turning his head to show the sides and rear of it, said, "See my new haircut." The teacher responded, "Yes, it's very nice." He strutted to his seat triumphantly.

Thus, life in the classroom still granted more negotiability to the higher-status, white, and committed students, and these students continued to use or "hustle" in the classroom the discretionary interpretations of their behavior, as had been done during the negotiable principal's reign. Further, students were quick to discern, but did

not openly or freely discuss, that grades, "achievement" scores, and "conduct" history (another indicator of school commitment) were the crucial factors in the disciplinary decision the principal made for any particular infraction; that is, the punishment decision depended not so much on the actual infraction, but on the student's history. While corporal punishment continued not to be the policy of the school, the bureaucratic principal did introduce a form of punishment that previously had not been used. For a student beyond the age of compulsory attendance, his/her academic and conduct history in large part determined whether a rule violation resulted in suspension or being "dropped from the rolls". For example, a student guilty of fighting who had low grades and a history of at least three official visits to the principal's office would simply be withdrawn from public schooling, without official explusion and the due process it required, while a student guilty of fighting who was a good student and did not have three official visits would receive a short suspension.

As a result of the more formalized enforcement of rules, "prompting" of acceptable behavior by school staff was replaced with action and punishment by the principal.

Students were more and more often faced with the decision of whether or not to comply willingly with school rules. They had to face and evaluate the costs incurred by remaining committed to the school. They had openly complained about racial discrimination under negotiated order, but now did not openly complain about the injustice they felt from the principal's unilateral discretionary power. They saw the bureaucratic principal as having discretion, but they were not allowed to attempt to negotiate it. As the principal put it:

> No one can argue with me...when I have all the cards (records of official visits) in my hand. I don't kick them out of school, they do.

Under bureaucratic order, students seemingly do more questioning of the legitimacy of rules and the principal's right to enforce them. The student role is passive and weak. The increased severity of penalities (withdrawal fron school) and relative lack of negotiability under bureaucratic order seems to have led to the emergence of an organized front challenging the school. Hats, and particularly hats that connote "pimp," are seemingly more common in the school. In general, street-type clothing

styles are more often worn within the school. Further, open defiance of rules is more common and organized. Male students, Black and white, from the vocational school behind CHS refuse to wait in the auditorium for the bell indicating time to change classes. However, while students would "skip" and "hide" under negotiated order, these students now stand at the doorway in the center of the hall that the classrooms open upon, wear their hats, and glare down the hall. They do not scatter or move back as the principal approaches. They stand quietly and defiantly. In one of these encounters, witnessed by the authors, the principal demanded, "Why aren't you in the auditorium? Don't you know the rules?" One student responded, "You weren't there." The principal retorted, "You mean I have to be there for you to obey the rules?" There was no response from the five males, except quiet and emphatic defiance. The bell rang and the principal shook his head sadly. The students went on to class.

In short, under bureaucratic order the rules of the school became "his rules" -- the rules of the principal. Their legitimacy was not established, and the students seem to have begun responding collectively. Defiance has resulted.

Discussion and Conclusions

Even though to this point it may seem otherwise, the purpose of this paper is not to relate two tales of "failure," however defined. Rather, it has been to examine critically the two styles of order and their effects on the nature of student misbehavior. It should be emphasized that both principals acted in good faith, and tried to achieve quality education. Further, even though one principal lost credibility and was transferred and the other promoted student defiance, they were not incompetent. In fact, both were highly competent but were, in large part faced with a situation for which no ground rules have as yet been developed. We know little about how school desegregation affects the general process of schooling. Given the circumstances for each, neither probably could have done better.

However, their experiences can instruct us and can possibly begin the process of establishing ground rules for the orderly and safe operation of a desegregated school. However, given only the information about these two principals, specific lessons are difficult to formulate. Generally, it would seem that each principal only had half of a possible formula to reduce school crime and facilitate the credibility of the system of the school

to all possible constitutents. This formula seems to require that traditional notions of deterrence need to be informed by something like Hirschi's (1969) control theory. In a very simplistic form, to be able to use rules to prevent misbehavior the school seemingly must maximize the involvement and commitment of students to the everyday process and experiences of the school.

Luckily, an ethnographic study of another Southern high school recently completed by the authors provides an example of how the notions of negotiated and bureaucratic order can be effectively combined in a desegregated high school. Generally, all the constitutents of this school were convinced that the school was not only a showcase for desegregation but also for a safe, pleasant schooling atmosphere. This had been achieved, it was believed, because the principal was easily accessible to all, and particularly to the students; the governance system and decision-making mechanisms had significant student, faculty, parent, and administration representation (in fact, only the professional teacher organization committee lacked student and parent representation); the building was kept immaculate by constant cleaning of the building and grounds; and there was effective supervision of student activities and strict accountability for everyone--teachers, administrators, custodians, and students. Occasionally the

principal was accused of being too student oriented. However, this was the result of his strict adherence to rules of evidence and proof. Without corroborating evidence of an accusation, punishment did not ensue. With proof, however, the principal administered "cold, hard discipline," and was known to be a "tough cookie." He argued that this was only possible because he respected and consulted all school participants, kept their environment clean, and punished everyone proven guilty.

Thus, the seeming strength of negotiability may be better understood as an approximation of an highly representative governance system. The commitment that is fostered in the vast majority of school participants by this approach "legitimates," in the words of the principal of this second school, impartial and strict administration of discipline. The participants have a major role in making and revising the rules, and, thus, when caught violating them, they are hard pressed to question the legitimacy of those rules. In this situation, the deterrence effect of rules seems enhanced.

Of course, even this second school has its "piss-cutters," students not committed to the school, and, given the current organization of public education and schools,

this would seem to be expected. However, if educators can expand on what seems to have been learned here, if they begin to develop mechanisms to respect and guarantee cultural pluralism, if they are able to share their power and authority and insist on accountability for those with power and those with less power, then maybe even the "piss-cutters" can negotiate access to more conventional success via public education.

References

Anderson, B. D. School bureaucratization and alienation from high school. Sociology of Education, 1973, 46, 315-344.

Bailey, Stephen K. Disruption: In urban public secondary schools. Syracuse, N.Y.: Policy Committee, Syracuse University Research Corporation, 1969.

Bayh, Birch. Our nation's schools--a report card": "A" in school violence and vandalism. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975.

Chesler, Mark. What happened after you desegregated the white school? Atlanta: Atlanta Southern Regional Council, Inc., 1967.

Collins, Thomas, & Noblit, George W. The process of interracial schooling: A literature review and examination of the relationship between conceptual framework and research methodology in literature on interracial education. In Desegregation literature: A critical appraisal. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976.

Havinghurst, Robert. A profile of the large city high school. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970.

Hirschi, Travis. Causes of delinquency. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.

Khleif, Bud B. The school as a small society. In Wax, S. Diamond, & F. O. Gearing (Eds.), Anthropological perspectives on education. New York: Basic Books, 1971.

Kvaraceus, William C. Juvenile delinquency and the school. New York: World Book Company, 1945.

McPartland, James M., & McDill, Edward L. Violence in schools. Washington, D.C.: Council for Educational Development and Research, Inc., 1976.

Noblit, George W. Ethnographic approaches to evaluation: The myths, promises and perils of qualitative evaluative research designs for criminal justice. Paper prepared for the National Conference on Criminal Justice Evaluation, February 22-24, 1977.

Schafer, Walter E., & Polk, Kenneth. Delinquency and the schools. Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967.

Scott, Joseph W., & El-Assal, Mohamed. Multiuniversity, university size, university quality and student protest: An empirical study. American Sociological Review, 1969, 34 (5), 702- 709.

Spicer, Edward H. Beyond analysis and explanation. Human Organization, 1976, 35 (4), 335-342.

Stinchcombe, Arthur. Rebellion in a high school. Chicago: Quadrangle Books, 1964.

Tittle, C.R., & Logan, C.H. Sanctions and deviance: Evidence and remaining questions. Law and Society Review, Spring 1973, 7 (3), 371-392.

Turner, Stephen P., & Carr, David R. The process of criticism in interpretive sociology and history. Paper presented to the annual meeting or the American Sociological Association, New York, August 30 - September 3, 1976.

Wolcott, Harry F. An ethnographic approach to the study of school administrators. Human Organization, 1970, 29, 115-122.