DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 258 UD 013 817

AUTHOR Noblit, George W.
TITLE Managing Student Desegregation: A Comparative Study of the Functioning of Principals and Implications for Policy Research.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE [79]
CONTRACT 400-76-009
NOTE 46p.; Not available in paper copy due to reproduction quality of original document ; Document prepared through the Desegregation Studies Team

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Policy; *Administrator Role; Educational Practice; *Integration Effects; *Principals; School Administration; *School Integration; Social Problems; *Social Science Research

ABSTRACT

This paper examines and compares the administrative styles of two principals who worked in a southern desegregated school. The emphasis in this study is on the policies and practices which were either effective or ineffective in helping each of the principals deal with the task of managing a desegregated school. Different actions taken by the principals in response to student, teacher, parent, and community demands, and their respective consequences, are described and discussed. It is pointed out that despite the different approaches used by the principals in dealing with desegregation related problems, resegregation was the result. It is concluded that applied social research must be made more relevant to the issues and problems surrounding desegregation. Policy considerations for such research are outlined. (EB)

Managing Student Desegregation: A Comparative Study of the Functioning of Principals and Implications for Policy Research

George W. Noblit
Desegregation Studies Team
National Institute of Education

The research upon which this paper is based was performed pursant to Contract 400-76-009 with the Field Studies in Urban Desegregated Schools Program of the National Institute of Education. It does not, however, reflect necessarily the views of that agency.

It is probably unfortunate that educators are to be held accountable for school desegregation, for it is hardly an educational issue. Rather, it is better understood as an issue of the political economy of this country. This is evident, for example, in the Constitutional justification for school desegregation which assumes that the real issues are not educational ones but issues of access and opportunity in the world of work. Were it otherwise, equal educational opportunity would not be a major public policy debate but an aesthetic discussion of academicians. Nevertheless, the practical scholar will realize that public schools are more vulnerable than the economy and, given the interface of schooling and employment in this country, are destined to be the vehicles of public policy, albeit indirect, to amend the political economy.

Further, the political economy analysis has great credence on the local level. A close analysis of local desegregation controversies suggests that, at least in the South, the debate centers more on the political and economic implications than upon educational issues. Blacks and whites alike understand southern school desegregation to be closely tied to the development of political power. While some have maintained that desegregation threatens the political self-sufficiency of Blacks (cf. Hamilton 1968 and Chisholm 1975), others see desegregation as a major vehicle to reapportion the availability of socio-economic mobility relative to the races. One administrator for the school district in which this study took place argued

that the public schools have traditionally been a vehicle for white mobility both to the city from rural areas and to the middle class. Desegregation of school staffs opened this mechanism to the Blacks, and with limited school budgets the mobility of whites was consequently being limited.

Further, this same administrator and other school district personnel argued that school desegregation threatens to make each southern city "another Atlanta." This fate is ominous to whites inasmuch as it signifies the loss of political dominance by whites as well as the loss of control over public funds and employment.

While school desegregation may not be properly conceived as an educational issue, it is the schools and the school systems that will be held accountable for its implementation and success. This creates a significant problem for school administrators since "success" has various meanings. To satisfy the courts,, a numerical balance must be maintained. To satisfy federal policy makers, a boost in the academic achievement of minorities, or at least a possibility of such, seems to be required. To satisfy the local community, however, quality education and discipline must remain sacrosanct, and this accountability falls largely on the individual schools and principals.

As a result, the individual principal is largely left to manage a complex set of pressures and forces. Principals, however, are hard-pressed to find guidance for their response to the challenge and threat of school desegregation. Normative texts like Lipham and Hoeh (1974), for example, ground the

principal's role in existing social theories, but only hint at the notion that the individual principal in a desegregated school setting will have to manage the vested interests of the local political economy. Of course, some would argue this is not an impossible task given that schools have always served the existing political economy well. Katz (1971), Karier, Violas and Spring (1973) and Rist (1972) all point to a historical continuity in the practices and procedures of American education to perpetuate the stratification of our society. Nevertheless, desegregation has the potential to redistribute educational rewards and skills and in the long run could affect the local political and economic order, and local communities understand it in this way.

Seemingly then, a school principal has a massive task with desegregation. He must manage the challenge of desegregation to the local political economy, integrate desegregation as a major educational goal (even though it is not an educational issue), and ultimately integrate immediate desegregation into an existing logic of education that is based upon notions of stratification and long-term assimilation.

Patience and Prudence

Wolcott (1973) has portrayed the school principal as a "man in the middle," buffetted about by his/her superiors, the demands of the educational setting, and the various participants in the school. Coupling this with a noteworthy lack of role clarity on the part of principals, Wolcott sees the school principal vacillating between "patience" and "prudence" in

responding to the challenges s/he must face. In some ways, one might argue that this distinction is analogous to "the sacred and the profane" (Eliade 1959), given that patience represents a concern with the normative, ethical and moral, and that prudence represents a concern with the practical and functional.

In the eternal searching for an "improved" role, patience, in Wolcott's terms, is "the one possible hope in which most of them are willing to invest energy as well as concern" (p.296), even though there is little expectation that it will ever be resolved. This preoccupation with the changing role of principals has two components. One emphasized the historical changes in duties and responsibilities. The other reflects a more normative upgrading of the principalship in quality and as a profession. As Wolcott notes for this latter component:

> This quest was echoed constantly in the recurring rhetorical question that principals ask: What <u>should</u> we be doing as principals (p.297) (Emphasis in the original).

Prudence, on the other hand, is described as "how to survive the principalship," and "survival does not seem to entail doing the job outstandingly well--no one can persistently satisfy so many individuals representing so many divergent interests--but rather doing it well enough to remain in the position at all" (p.306). Further, Wolcott notes:

> The school principal is successful in his work to the extent that he is able to contain and constrain the forces of change with which he must contend as matter of daily routine; whatever force he exerts on the dynamics of the school contributes to its stability, even when he wants to act, or believes he is acting, in a way that will encourage an aura of change (p.304).

Nevertheless, Wolcott reflected upon the principal's prudence, and concluded, "his freedom was to make no serious mistakes" (p.306) as the principal served "...their institutions and their society as monitors for continuity" (p.320).

In short, the principalship engender both approaches, patience and prudence, in everyday action. However, each principal must strike his or her own balance of these approaches without any concrete knowledge of the implications and consequences of any specific balance. Nevertheless, desegregation dramatically effects the efficacy of the balance since, as noted earlier, it requires the school principal to manage the school in the face of its new implications for the local political economy and participants therein. Unfortunately, we know little of the consequences of various balances, even though principals may have heightened vulnerability in desegregated school settings.

An Ethnographic Study

Fortunately, data from an ethnographic study of a desegregated high school in the South[1] provides an opportunity to better understand administrative styles and their consequences in a qualitative manner. On occasion, natural sequences of events which are the substance of ethnographic studies also allow unique research experiences. The high school studied, Crossover High School, did afford such an experience by constructing a natural experiment for this investigation. The dynamics of desegregated schooling prompted a change in principals during the two years of data collection. Each principal

had his own style and possibly can best be understood, in idealtypic ways, as real life embodiments of patience and prudence, respectively. Patience in this case was the first man to assume the principalship of CHS and prudence was his successor.

The Demise of Patience

As is obvious to even the unitiated to school routines, principals play a major role in the dynamics of schooling. To the students, parents, and teachers, he or she is both a threat and a protection. He is empowered to make decisions that can almost destroy a student's or teacher's school career, while concomitantly serving as a moral and behavioral guardian who is responsible for the inculcation of appropriate values and skills in children, and for the successful negotiation of teacher role by those who ascribe to such a status. As such the principal's role is a duplicitous one. He is responsible for an orderly instructional and educational setting which has become the hallmark of quality education while knowing that such order is not necessarily educational or responsible behavior. Nevertheless, the principal's charge is to manage the career development of parents' children and the teachers, and he is empowered to act as both an advocate and as a police officer.

While this dilemma which is engendered in the principal's role seems ominous even in itself, school desegregation makes the resolution of it even more problematic. It was with this realization that the white principal of CHS retired prior to the beginning of the 1972-73 school year. The central administration turned to the Black assistant principal of the former

Black high school that was to become the feeder junior high school to CHS, and offered the principalship to him with the provision that his decision be made within two days. He accepted the position.

From the outset, it was evident to him that he was potentially a marked man. The central administration regarded CHS as a showcase for desegregation.[2] Further, the news media chose to use CHS as the "barometer" of desegregation and regularly invaded the school. As the principal related it to the newly desegregated student body: "We are living in kind of a fishbowl on how desegregation can work."

The problems to be faced were far too many to be discussed here. Nevertheless, the primary problem as far as the central administration was concerned was "to keep the lid on"--no matter what. The principal recognized this and further realized that one faction of the student body and one faction of the teachers were particularly influential within the community. The "honor students," as we call them, came from elite families within the city who, while being liberal enough to "try" desegregation,[3] were not above using their influence. The "old guard" were the remains of the faculty which had served this elite class and, given their recognized reputation as the best teachers in the system, were capable of mobilizing influence in the community as well as within the school system.[4]

Given the power of these factions and their allegiance to one another, the principal, Patience, allowed them considerable influence within the school. The old guard received the better

classes (populated by the honor students) and were the last to receive the additional teaching assignments which later became necessary. The honor students were allowed control of student government and student honors. Whenever possible, both whites and Blacks received awards for "best dressed," "best student," etc. The selection of representatives for the student council was controlled by minimum grade and behavior requirements, teacher approval, and, finally, student elections--all of which gave the elite white students an advantage over the other students.

For about three years, the "lid" stayed on. The school and the principal maintained their "showcase" designation. Further, while white enrollment dropped dramatically in the system and fewer and fewer students were promoted to CHS, the white students were not leaving CHS in any large numbers. Thus desegregation, a cause in which the principal believed fervently, was seemingly being accomplished. However, it should be noted that desegregation meant the retaining of white students--not Black. Black students were regularly suspended for offenses for which whites were merely reprimanded. The lack of discipline exercised toward the white students was commented upon by both the teachers and the white parents. As one teacher put it: "When I send a student--white--down to the office, the student is right back in my class again." The disgruntlement of the school participants was evident; nonetheless, the lid stayed on.

By the time we began our observations, optimism was fading fast. Small enrollments had prompted the elimination of some

advanced placement and foreign language classes. The old guard teachers had begun to transfer to suburban schools. Black students and parents had been and continued to be alienated from the school. White parents complained about a lack of discipline within the school.

In this setting, the demise of the "marked" principal was effected. The white female social science teacher, a member of the old guard, transferred to a suburban school and was replaced by a Black female who had been in a professional development program at the central administration offices. While no one knew this at the time (except possibly the principal), this teacher had been administratively transferred a number of times and was regarded as incompetent by at least one of her superiors in the central administration.

Almost immediately, the honor students became dissatisfied with her teaching. She assigned homework, required them to pay attention in class, and chided them for their laziness. While her competence may have been questionable, it appears that what caused the students' disgruntlement may well have been her "standards." Their performance on her examinations was poor; they rarely completed their homework, and she was unyielding to their demands. Nevertheless, she was lax in returning homework and examinations and was reluctant to take class time to go over basics and computational errors the students had made. She maintained they should already know such things in order to be in the advanced classes or, at the very least, should be able to sharpen these skills on their own.

It was this multiperspectival reality that forced a confrontation. Many of the honor students were angry and went directly to the principal to complain. The principal looked into the situation and decided to support the teacher. After continued complaints to the principal were met with support for the teacher, the majority of the honor students declared war. They went to the old guard whose allegiance would seem to require a sympathetic response. The old guard began to complain but were reluctant to confront the principal, even though they made it known whose side they supported.

The honor students had not previously mobilized their parents for support. In fact, parents had all but ceased to exist as far as the school was concerned. The P.T.A. had not yet met that year. The Principal's Advisory Committee consisting of parents had been essentially recruited by the principal and rarely met. To this point, parents had been successfully "cooled out." The honor students had been so secure in their power that even though they might complain at home, they requested their parents to stay out. One mother related her daughter's response to an offer of intervention: "Mother, I can handle it."

With their influence stunted, however, the honor students initiated the mobilization of their elite parents. The parents were concerned. They called the principal, came to the school, and talked with both the principal and the teacher. The teacher wavered but little in the face of the onslaught, and the principal stood firmly in support of her--after all, "standards"

were at stake and the old guard had repeatedly demanded that standards be maintained. Unfortunately, in reprospect, it appears that only their standards were to be immutable.

The elite parents were in a dilemma. As they had originally viewed it, their liberal ideology supported desegregation even though it might result in some possible educational costs to their children, but were the costs now too high? They met and discussed the dilemma. With the support of their children, they decided that the teacher incident was an indication of the ineptness of Patience as a principal. They recounted the discipline problems and the principal's low key response to their complaints. They noted the erosion of the academic program as fewer and fewer accelerated classes were offered.[5] Actually, the first issue was added to the bill of particulars late in the process of the parents' determinations of the bases for action and remained somewhat secondary throughout the year.

It seems that the development of these two issues was a major determinant of what further action, if any, was to be taken. Being influential people in the community, the parents were not going to take on the school just to resolve the incidents their children brought to them. The result of their search for the "basic issue" was that there were significant quality of education problems at Crossover. Of course, this conclusion was based largely upon the reports of the honor students to their parents.

The parents went to the area superintendent with their complaints instead of to the principal. They interpreted his response as protecting the principal. The area superintendent explained the course offering problems, recited his faith in the principal, and promised to look into the situation further. As a result of this action, the only P.T.A. meeting of the year was called. It was hoped the meeting would result in once again "cooling out" the parents. Both the principal and the area superintendent spoke about the problems, actions that had been taken, and the recalcitrance of some problems. The parents, Black and white, were generally not convinced; they began to vocalize their concerns and left still disgruntled.

The elite white parents decided to use their influence. They utilized their social networks and developed a direct "white line," as Patience was later to term it, to the central administration and the school board. In most instances, they began to by-pass the principal and the school, and went directly to the sympathetic ear of a school board member. Finally, however, the school board member convinced the parents that for their concerns to have a proper hearing, they would have to go through channels and appeal through the lines of authority within the bureaucracy.

As the parents worked up the bureaucracy, a significant event occurred. At the school level, the principal and parents understood the problems in the same way, although Patience, quite defensively, argued he was powerless to make the necessary changes. When the white elite parents got to

the school system's central administration, they were pressed to define precisely what they menat by "quality of education." Possibly through the design of the Administrator to "ccol out" the parents, the end result was that the parents defined the problems in a way that left them uneasy. It was resolved that the problem was defined as inadequate bureaucracy within the school. The parents were certainly ready to agree that the principal was a problem, if not the major problem, and the central office administrator argued that what was needed was a principal who could enforce the bureaucracy and thereby guarantee "quality" education, or, in other words, someone who heralded prudence over patience.

The parents left the meeting with assurances that something would be done. Their impression was that the principal would be removed, probably by transfer to an elementary school.

Following the advice to work the bureaucracy, they went back to the area superintendent and then directly to the Superintendent of Schools. According to one parent, they left the latter meeting "feeling let down," and some of these parents began to reanalyze the problems at CHS. They indicated subsequently that at least some of the problems were "system" problems, and could be directly attributed to the Superintendent.

A malaise resulted from these encounters. The parents were still concerned but were unsure as to how to act, and the mobilization began to wane. Even with the formation of a new P.T.A. for the next year and some action by Blacks to keep Patience as the CHS principal, some began to interpret the battle as futile.

Toward the end of the year, the old guard became aware of the possible transfer of Patience. They became concerned. They began to realize their influence had persisted through the desegregation process only because Patience had allowed it. The old guard spirited and manned a petition to retain the principal. They maintained they had not anticipated the transfer outcome; they had only wished for the principal to be more susceptible to their influence.

The honor students showed only slight remorse. The lower class Black students who had been disproportionately subject to the principal's discipline were, in many cases, glad to see him go. Patience was transferred during the summer. He was not even notified. He learned of the transfer from his secretary who obtained this information from the secretary who wished to transfer to CHS with the newly assigned principal. A call to the superintendent confirmed the transfer.

The reputation of the new Black principal preceeded him. He was known to be a "tough cookie" who ran a "tight ship." The coaches had heard through their network that he was a "student's principal." Other schools began to recruit the old guard teachers; they wanted to "skim off the cream." A few transfers resulted, and the new year began with apprehension.

Given the preceeding controversy, Prudence, the new principal, believed the problems at CHS were two-fold--discipline and quality of education. His strategy was to attack the former immediately and develop the latter. His discipline was strong, which, in his mind, was what the school participants had demanded.

He cleared the halls of students. He declared a guidance counselor surplus and then replaced her, even though the impropriety of this action was noted by many of his staff. While Patience had lacked dramatic community support, he was at least well connected in the Black networks within the school system and in the Black neighborhood which Crossover served. Prudence, while having achieved great administrative success in the past, lacked the support of networks in and out of the school. He was not as much a part of the Black school system network, not part of the Black neighborhood network, lacked the immediate support of any teacher faction, and quickly lost the support of even the honor student network by eliminating their preferred status within the schcol. However, the elite white parents' network was full of praise, even as some of their children transferred to other schools for a higher quality education and for access to student honors. In any case, these were not seen as problems due to the new principal, but to desegregation, the past principal, and the school system. Prudence reassigned the coaches from study hall duty to large sections of social studies classes, and he increased teaching loads, even to the point of assigning each of the two guidance counselors two classes a day in addition to their guidance responsibilities. He was very visible within the school, and very coercive. He said he would eliminate anyone, teacher or student, who was "not on the program," and he did.

The school became uneasy, quiet, and closed. Students initially feared him, as did the faculty. No allegiances could be counted on to insulate oneself from possible punishment. It was said faculty meetings became lectures in which questions were not to be raised or comments made. Student assemblies were patrolled by teachers as the principal chided the students for misbehavior and noise. His assembly dismissals were dotted with what seemed like paternalistic praise for their cooperation. Control was the order of the day. If that was lacking in the past and the previous principal had "failed" because of it, the new principal was going to succeed by establishing order.

As the year progressed, the situation "normalized" somewhat. Prudence received tacit support from most networks since their interests required at least some support from him, although, once again, the halls were not clear of students during classes. Teachers put in for transfers and students transferred, withdrew or were pushed out, even though some students did develop friendly ties with Prudence as they became accustomed to his procedures. One teacher even commented that "things were fine," but he also noted that he had been unaware of the problems attributed to the former administration.

The Natural Experiment

With this background, let us return to the natural experiment our study was able to document. Obviously, the central problem is defining what was actually changed over

the two year period. For example, each principal had a distinct personality; each also perceived and had a somewhat different setting and context in which to act. Nonetheless, the similarities outweigh the differences. What varied was the philosophy and the everyday action that the philosophy required. In the setting, however, the effects of the philosophy and the action were not distinguishable. They were intertwined in the everyday action of the school.

Further, it would seem that for the natural experiment to be of most utility for researchers and practitioners alike, a higher level of analysis needs to be employed. Nevertheless, this analysis must be grounded in the observations and accounts that depict the setting and constitute our data. Given these understandings, it appears that the requirements of a higher level of analysis, groundedness of the analysis and an assessment of what changed in the setting, are best captured by developing characterizations of "order" as engendered in the administrative styles of the two principals. A consideration of the rules and their enforcement in Crossover High school will help "ground" these characterizations. Following the grounding of the characterizations of order we will attempt to assess the most direct effects of change on the school participants.

Rules and Enforcement: Elements of Administrative Style

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 penalties will

deter illicity behavior. Unlike much of the research on deterrence, which reveals it to be a complicated issue (Tittle and Logan 1973), the rationale for deterrence in schools is rather simplistic. Each principal of 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 varied in how they saw rules and in their understanding of "deterrence."

These differences between Patience and Prudence can be elucidated somewhat 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 rules. This negotiability stems from two sources. First, the legitimacy of these rules is challenged by some body of constituents, usually on the basis of unfair discrimination 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, non-enforcement of these negotiable 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, it was argued that deterrence was promoted by strict and universalistic enforcement of rules. The invoking of penalties for the infraction of these rules 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 the students' personal indebtedness to the administration for the nonenforcement.

It is now possible to better understand the implications of Prudence and Patience for the everyday operation of the school. The former is characterized by more reliance on impartial rules (which 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 a primarily negotiated order, wheras the second established a primarily bureaucratic order. As seen in this school, bureaucratic order assumed both the legitimacy of the principal's authority and the recognition of that legitimacy by all constitutents, and thus, overall, rules were enforced with impunity. Negotiated order, as we observed it, did not take that legitimacy as given, but rather as something that had to be developed and cultivated, even as rules had to be enforced.

The types of order were characterized by different enforcement strategies. Bureaucratic order was enforced by Prudence himself. He administered discipline and patrolled the halls. Further, the bureaucratic Prudence developed an informal record-keeping mechanism. He allowed students three "unofficial visits" to his office, which he recorded on cards in a file in his office. By and large, these visits dealt with infractions 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 occured. After three of these visits, the student became subject to suspension for an infraction for which evidence was present. Generally, without three unofficial visits, a student with a similar offense would not be suspended.

The negotiable Patience enforced order via a network. He, the vice-principal, and the administrative assistant were all responsible for administering discipline. Usually, however, the negotiable principal would not make the discipline decision. The vice-principal and/or the administrative assistant would do so, and they 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 Patience patrolled the halls, as did the bureaucratic Prudence, but Patience put more emphasis on the teachers enforcing order in their classrooms and in the halls than did Prudence. Further, the athletic coaches were given responsibility for maintaining order in the h lls under Patience,

a practice that was discontinued under Prudence. The coaches under the negotiable Patience were informal disciplinarians. They would "prompt" movement on to classes, the removal of hats, and the elimination of jostling in the halls. Their approach, by and large, was to cajole students into compliance; only rarely would they actually refer a student for formal discipline. In practice, they engaged in supervision but not in disciplinary behavior. Thus, the negotiable Patience attempted to enforce rules informally through the wider network of teachers and coaches, as well as through the formal discipline meted out by the administrators.

The styles, then, differed in some crucial dimensions: the degree to which authority was vested in the principal and how informal discipline was managed. The bureaucratic-order principal was the 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 found many educators unprepared for a multicultural educational setting, regardless of the educational rhetoric of the late 1960's and early 1970's. During the two years we observed CHS, both principals had to face the issue of student power, and each

responded differently. However, a fuller understanding of the context can be gained by examining the history of race and power in the student body and the interaction of these factors with the teacher and the administrative subsystems.

Desegregation meant a dramatic transformation for CHS. Not only had the school previously been all white, but it also had a history as a public "prep" school for the middle- and upper-class youth of the city. To the new negotiable Black principal, the school represented both a threat and a promise. The promise was that if desegregation went smoothly at CHS 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 the middle- and upper-class whites led to the development of four large student groups that were, for practical purposes, networks of students. We have termed these networks honor students, blue-collar whites, active Blacks, and lower class Blacks. Each network was relatively distinct as to racial and class characteristics. The honor students were middle- and upper-class whites who, by and large, populated the "accelerated" classes offered at CHS. The blue-collar whites demonstrated less commitment to success in school and more to the street; some were middle-class but most were from working-class homes. The active Blacks were a small group of students

relatively committed to success in school, and some were in the accelerated classes. These students were from higher-status families than were the lower-class Blacks, yet their social class was more akin to that of the blue-collar whites than to that of the honor students in that they came from essentially working-class homes and had parents who were stably employed. The lower-class Blacks were from the housing projects in the neighborhood and were poor. They had a relatively strong commitment to behaviors and attitudes and styles that are common to the "street."

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, respectively, for each year of observation). However, as noted earlier, the first Black principal was in the spotlight to make desegregation "work", which included satisfying the educational and order requirements of all concerned. As a result, he, in his patience, 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, Patience 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 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 blue-collar whites, and the active Blacks (who were attempting to gain admission into the honor student network). The lower class 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" repertoires so 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 and patience 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 common. Disagreements could be phrased as racial in origin, and 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. An overly simplistic view perhaps, but 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 of the school vied for influence. Thus, while there was no formal mechanism for students to participate in governance, their role in rule formation was evident. Further, since enforcement of rules was largely informal, and of a "prompting" character, the offenders rarely needed to consider whether or not to confront the legitimacy of the rules and therefore they never developed a stance of defiance. That is, the enforcement strategy did not compel students to face the issue of whether or not to remain committed to the rules of the school. Put 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

noted before, 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." Teachers commonly complained of a general leniency on the part of Patience. 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 the housing project) like that." While these accusations of discrimination are alarming, most persons familiar with 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 and Patience felt free to lodge complaints in the company of other participants, regardless of whether they shared the same network. 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. His replacement was led to believe that the "failure" of his predecessor was due to lack of order. Further, the new principal had the 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, Prudence, 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. Prudence ran the ship. His administrative assistant (a Black female) and the 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 were disciplined for infractions.

The same networks of students were evident, although some of the faces had changed. Overall, the white population had decreased, even though Prudence brought in four classes of multiply-handicapped students in what seemed an effort to boost the white enrollment. This white loss was most evident in the number of 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 the honor students 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 in the eyes of the honor students, the elected honors of the school no longer went to the "best"students.

While race was no longer a salient issue as far as the bureaucratic Prudence was concerned, the school's identity became more firmly Black in the eyes of the students. While under Patience it had been easy to discern the variables that differentiated the students, i.e., class, race and commitment, it now became more difficult. These variables continued to be important to 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, as had been done during the negotiable principal's reign, these students continued to use or "hustle" the discretionary interpretations of their behavior in the classroom. 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 Prudence 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, Prudence did introduce a form of punishment that previously had not been used. The academic and conduct history of a student beyond the age of compulsory attendance determined, in large part, whether a rule violation would result 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 unofficial visits to the principal's office would simply be withdrawn without official expulsion from public schooling, while a student guilty of fighting who was a good student and did not have three unofficial 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 Prudence's unilateral discretionary power. They saw the bureaucratic Prudence as having discretion, but they were not allowed to attempt to negotiate it. As Prudence put it:

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

Under bureaucratic order and Prudence, students seemingly did more questioning of the legitimacy of rules and the principal's right to enforce them. The student role was passive and weak. The increased severity of penalties (withdrawal from school) and the relative lack of negotiability under bureaucratic order seemed to have led to the emergence of an organized front challenging the school. In general, street-type clothing styles were worn more often within the school, and hats, particularly hats that connote "pimp," became more common. Further, open defiance of rules was more prevelant and organized. Male students, Black and white, from the vocational school behind CHS refused to wait in the auditorium for the bell indicating time to change classes. While students under negotiated order would "skip" and "hide," these students now stood at the doorway in the center of the hall that the classrooms opened upon, wore their hats, and glared down the hall. They did not scatter or move back as the principal approached; they stood quietly and defiantly. In one of these encounters, witnessed by the author, 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 seemed to have begun responding collectively. Defiance had resulted.

This rather elaborate analysis of the effects on student behavior of the change in styles of order are characteristic of the two principals, and can be extended to assess the effects of the change upon teachers, instruction, and the influence of parents. As noted earlier, the situation had rather dramatically altered with the change in administrative leadership. While we certainly do not believe that principals are omnipotent in defining the school milieu, it does seem that, within the limitations of school system policy and expectations and "good educational practice" as defined by staff and others, the principal does negotiate order. The style of order, while possibly influenced by the expectations of others as noted above, is largely the result of the principal's decision on how to conduct the school. Given this, it could be expected that a change in style of order would most affect students since they usually are not permitted to place strict limits on the principal's behavior. We have seen how the first principal, Patience, did allow students to set limits because he believed that to be the only way to retain whites and to keep the lid on, and seemingly this plan worked. The controversy that had erupted led the second principal, Prudence, to believe that the problem was one of too much student freedom; unfortunately, he was unaware of the negotiated power arrangements. He saw discipline as the answer.

We would expect the change in style of order to have less influence on the teacher and parent networks. The former is insulated somewhat given the principal's need for the support of his/her staff, unionization, and other sources of power available to lower participants in an organization. The latter network is obviously independent of the principal and therefore represents a source of threat to him, particularly in the case of Crossover High School. Nevertheless, the change in the style of order did have some effect on both networks.

The teachers, like the students, were subject to a new bureaucracy within the school. Impersonal rules were applied to them as they were to the students. Teachers were required to be on time for work, to have more class preparations and to submit lesson plans, which they had never been forced to do at Crossover. They argued that until the second principal took charge they had been respected as professionals who did their jobs with minimal supervision. They were disgruntled at this encroachment upon their professionalism and saw it as an almost personal affront. The coaches were moved from study halls and hall patrol to large social studies classes in which their teaching effectiveness was observed and reported to be minimal. Faculty meetings became but forums for Prudence to address his teachers without any expectation of feedback. The staff became reluctant to be seen talking informally in the halls for fear that Prudence would charge them with abdicating their responsibilities.

However, the bureaucratic rules which were newly imposed upon the faculty did not bind Prudence. At the beginning of the school year he confronted a Black female guidance counselor who was seemingly irresponsible in meeting the recording demands of her position. He decided to replace her. He declared her "surplus" since enrollments had declined (a request Patience had been denied by the central administration), and after her reassignment replaced her with a new guidance counselor. The teachers were miffed at this, but were obviously threatened by it, and therefore were silent. This event seemed to prove to them that rules were something which they had to live by, but by which their principal did not.

The teachers began to see that there was a totalitarian element to the new bureaucratic order, and at first they sought only to maintain a low profile in order to avoid ridicule and punishment. As the year progressed, however, the situation was not as well tolerated, particularly by the old guard. Transfers were sought and retirements taken, all seemingly with the tacit approval of the principal. The teachers who initially did not seek transfers were somewhat repressed, but they also believed that the school's becoming "tighter" was beneficial. However, some of these faculty were later reported to have wished they had put in for transfers early enough so that they would have been able to seek an acceptable position in a different school.

The parents, white and Black, who had complained about the school were quite happy with the change. The school was the "tight ship" that hallmarked a quality educational program. The other parents, as they had done before, stayed out of the school except for the occassions when they were invited by Prudence to come and meet with faculty. On one such occassion, report cards were withheld until Parent's Night when parents were to pick them up from the homeroom teacher and discuss their children's progress. While many parents, particularly white parents of at least moderately good students, were glad to participate, the Black parents felt somewhat affronted given that the Black community had the tradition of "turning out" the entire family with an element of celebration. Dress clothes were worn and relatives attended.

The disgruntlement of these parents was the result of Prudence's opening remarks in which he chided the parents for not enforcing their children's attendance, and for their lack of respect for "time" and thus punctuality. The principal took on the Black neighborhood. While the uncomfortable Black parents had no recourse, this disgruntlement may have had a part in the degradation ceremonies that were to follow.

While few whites engaged in these ceremonies, numerous Black families with children who received low marks picked up the report cards and embarrassed their offspring by using this forum with the homeroom teacher as a vehicle to demand better performance and behavior. These Black parents would demand that their student, who accompanied t em, promise to shape

up--with the teacher and other parents and children as witnesses. These confronted students acquiesed, but resentment was high.

While the white parents who had demanded the change of principals were happy with Prudence, they did not wait for the new situation to fully develop before pulling their children from the school. The number of honor students was dwindling due to transfers to private schools and other City Schools with better programs. Intriguingly, many of these transfers were the result of the new principal's style. While white parents continued to withdraw their children because of the lack of curriculum flexibility and accelerated courses, a new reason emerged a few months into the second school year.

White parents reported that their children were quite unhappy at the lack of social life at the school because the honors that CHS had to offer were now going to the undeserving. Prudence, by removing the stipulation that awards were to have Black and white recipients, allowed democracy to prevail in a majority Black school. Whites were rarely elected to office or to awards. The rewards of being a white honor student at CHS had disappeared, and the honor students and their parents began to seek alternatives--at other schools.

Conclusions

It is not the intent of this study to report two tales of failure, for neither principal actually did fail. Given their goals and conceptual frameworks for understanding the situations they faced, they were indeed successful. Patience

upheld his humanistic orientation as he searched for his proper role, and Prudence developed a functional system that reduced the complaints of parents.

What is of significance is that patience and prudence, while both necessary in a principalship, can be understood as distinct approaches to the position. Further, as Wolcott (1973) suggested, it may not be possible to integrate the two approaches. School principalships may well require a certain duplicity in order to be effective and survive. That is to say, both patience and prudence may be necessary to the management of the political economy of schooling. Parents, teachers, students, the central administration and the community all impinge upon the principal; as a result the principal seems to need both patient and prudent responses as part of his/her repetroire.

We have seen that different balances of patience and prudence engender different administrative styles and seem in part to create distinct school climates. Further, school desegregation seems to emotionally heighten the pressures a prinicpal must face, and may well heighten the consequences of any particular approach to the principalship. This latter notion is not without significance since it requires principals to be more astute in their management of that sector of the political economy which the school represents. Since school desegregation is understood by both Blacks and whites to be a political and economic issue, school principals will be challenged on more than the educational justifications for

their decision, and therefore must begin to understand educational stratification not as an objective reflection of a student's aptitudes and motivations, but as a preselection mechanism for the labor market and ultimately as an agent of power maintenance by society's elites. Desegregation has the potential to challenge the maintenance of this power by the existing elites, and ultimately may be the primary vehicle to alter the economic disadvantage of minorities.

There is an alternative implication of this study that needs some discussion. On our part, it is intriguing to note that Patience fostered something like cultural pluralism as the goal of desegregation, and even though he attempted to make it politically acceptable to the whites by allowing them disproportionate influence, it was ultimately unacceptable to the powerful whites: it did jeopardize their control. On the other hand, Prudence more embraced assimilation as the goal of desegregation, which ended up allowing the Black student majority control over many student statuses. This, as it turned out, was also ultimately unacceptable to whites--even as they praised his middle class emphasis on orderly schooling. Further, the alienation of the somewhat disaffected students seemed to increase. In short, our previous suggestion that principals need to better understand the political economy of schooling as they face desegregation may be a moot point. Inasmuch as desegregation challenges white supremacy in the South, it may not be possible to make it acceptable to white southerners who understand their status to be based on the control of a limited economy.

Some Policy Considerations

School desegregation has had many effects on our society. Not only has it mixed minorities and whites, courts and school systems, it has also mixed policymakers and researchers. Unfortunately, it is this last mixture that has yet to receive a critical evaluation. It seems appropriate to suggest one possible critique based on this ethnographic study.

School desegregation seems to have had dramatic effects on social research beyond that of providing topics for researchers to investigate. In many ways, school desegregation and the research it prompted has established the legitimacy of applied social research. Once eschewed as research that did little to advance the social sciences (only pure, basic research was assumed to do that), applied research has made the transformation to "policy research," and has found a new receptivity on the part of social researchers. No doubt the alchemy of that transformation to legitimacy was the expanded funding of applied research by the federal government with the provision that the research be somehow policy relevant.

Of course, policy relevance is not self-evidnet, and lacking other criteria policymakers have in large part allowed social researchers to formulate the definition. As a result, the definition of policy relevance has evolved to be an almost technical definition inextricably bound to the methodological biases of social research. That is, since the preeminent current in contrmporary methodological thought defines quantitative research as the best way of knowing, policy

relevance is largely established by sample representativeness, inferential statistical techniques and the resultant generalizibility of the results, rather than by the potential significance of the research for realigning or redefining existing policy issues.

This definition denigrates qualitative research such as is contained in this paper and in the other papers in this volume by arguing that they have little potential to inform policy. This is intriguing in at least two ways. First, quantitative research that lacks systematic qualitative precursors cannot establish the proper interpretations of statistically associated events. Rather, interpretations from other quantitative studies, existing societal folklores, and the authors' predilections are employed. All the concern over objectivity that researchers demonstrate when arguing for the superiority of quantitative techniques somehow is lost when interpretations of statistical patterns are at issue. Few quantitative researchers would demand a rigorous, albeit qualitative, investigation to establish the proper interpretations for their data.

Second, without the qualitative research to establish the proper interpretations, strict causal understanding cannot be guaranteed. As Turner and Carr (1976:7) note:

> The causal interpretation, taken as a whole, is adequate <u>if and only if</u> it is adequate on the level of meaning <u>and</u> on the level of established transition probabilities.

To establish causality, both interpretive understanding as gained from qualitative research and probabalistic association as established from quantitative research are necessary.

In the end, the positivistic definition of policy relevance is its own best critique. Its emphasis upon establishing causality quantitatively will eventually prove research to be of little value to policy makers. Nevertheless, qualitative research is finding some credence at this time with policy makers. On the federal level, this does not reflect an increasing understanding of the problems with quantitative studies but rather with the bureaucratic problems with the Office of Management and the Budget and its mandated review of data collection instruments used in contract, policy research.

This paper has attempted to be policy relevant even in its emphasis upon one school and two principals. Let us examine some of the policy implications that can be extracted. First, it is evident that desegregation when seen as a district-level phenomenon will not necessarily promote equal educational opportunity. The federal courts have usually assumed that equal opportunity between whites and minorities can be achieved by placing whites and Blacks in the same school, and therefore by implication Blacks will receive equal opportunities. There is great variety in how school systems, schools and principals can respond to desegregation. As we have noted, while system desegregation has occurred in the city in which this study took place, Patience established two schools under one roof, and Prudence more allowed a Black majority-controlled school

which led to more school flight by whites. In either case, resegregation resulted. Desegregation needs to be monitored at the school level as well as district-wide.

Second, existing school system practices (e.g., levels of instruction and minimum enrollments) and beliefs concerning the limited potential of minority students play a large part in the resegregation of students, and further are highly political. That is, parents and students will define quality education as segregative, at least by ability, unless other models are available and convincing. Without such models, it may be impossible for schools to meet the challenge of desegregation since it seems that desegregation is at odds with quality education as it is currently understood. Such mainstreaming models and justifications need to be developed, and school systems, principals and teachers need to be able to defend them even as the local political economy will challenge them as ineffective.

Third, patience and prudence are but two possible models for the administration of desegregated schools; negotiated order and bureaucratic order are but two possible organizational formats, and cultural pluralism and assimilation are but two possible models for integration. Other models and combinations of models need exploration and evaluation, particularly in the face of desegregation.

Fourth, regardless of the years of research and rhetoric, parents and schools are still at odds. In fact, parents are probably the main threat to the principal and the school. It

would seem that desegregation might even exacerbate this problem. Since even after desegregation schools have a specific clientele, further consideration of community involvement and control as a vehicle for effective desegregation is needed.

Fifth, academic standards as currently defined seem to be a major roadblock to desegregation within a school. Logically, it would seem that standards, like laws, are meant to be discriminatory in that they are only invoked when one does not behave in ways more powerful people would prefer. As a higher authority to define quality education, standards promise to be a thorn in the side of principals who must manage a multicultural setting. Nevertheless, teachers seem to need guidelines, and alternative standards need to be developed.

Last, there are implications for policy formation in general. We have revealed that a desegregated school is a complex social setting; however, it is more than complexity that is at issue. In human settings, multiperspectival realities are common (Douglas 1976) and difficult to analyze, so that clear and specific policy implications are quite problemmatic. Maybe in the end what Patience and Prudence have demonstrated is that social research can best inform policy by delimiting the multiperspectival realities of a setting or issue. The normative decision can hardly be expected to find its justification in research, even though survey research may be able to demonstrate which decision would be the most popular.

FOOTNOTES

1. For more detail on the setting, please see the chapter by Thomas W. Collins in this volume.

2. This, in fact, was one of the major reasons why this site was suggested to us. We asked for a "good" school and they gave us the one they thought was the best at that time. The central administration has since amended this assessment.

3. "Try" seemed to have two simultaneous meanings of "attempting" and "putting to the test" to these parents. Thus desegregation was at risk for these parents.

4. As will later be shown, the principal actually underestimated the power of these groups.

5. School system policy specified minimum enrollments for classes to be offered. The small number of white honor students when distributed across the desired number of accelerated classes, and the "active Blacks'" desire for higher grades which led them to enroll in "standard" classes conjoined to eliminate accelerated classes from the curriculum. Nevertheless, the principal was held responsible.

REFERENCES

Chisholm, Shirley
1975 "Desegregation and National Policy." Integrated Education 13:122-6.

Douglas, Jack
1976 Investigative Social Research. New York: Sage.

Eliade, Mircea
1959 The Sacred and the Profane. New York: Harper and Row.

Hamilton, Charles V.
1968 "Race and Education: A Search for Legitimacy." Harvard Educational Review 38:669-84.

Karier, Clarence, Paul Vidas and Joel Spring
1973 Roots of Crises: American Education in the Twentieth Century. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Kutz, Michael
1971 Class, Bureaucracy and Schools. New York: Praeger.

Lipham, James and James Hoeh
1974 The Principalship: Foundations and Functions. New York: Harper and Row.

Rist, Ray C.
1972 Restructuring American Education. New Brunswick, N.S.: Transaction Books.

Tittle, C. R. and C. H. Logan
1973 "Sanctions and Deviance: Evidence and Remaining Questions." Law and Society Review, Spring:371-92.

Turner, S. P. and D. R. Carr
1976 "The Process of Criticism in Interpretive Sociology and History." Presented to the American Sociological Association Annual Meetings, New York, August.

Wolcott, Harry F.
1973 The Man in the Principal's Office. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.