This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received

70-4064

DUGGAL, Satya Pal, 1931-

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENT UNREST, STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT, AND DOGMATISM AND PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY OF SCHOOL STAFF IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1969
Education, administration
University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENT UNREST, STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT, AND DOGMATISM AND PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY OF SCHOOL STAFF IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS

by
Satya Pal Duggal

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in
The University of Michigan
1969

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Lester W. Anderson, Chairman
Assistant Professor Mark Chesler
Professor Stewart C. Hulslander
Professor Burton E. Voss

ABSTRACT

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN STUDENT UNREST, STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT, AND DOGMATISM AND PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY OF SCHOOL STAFF IN THE HIGH SCHOOLS

by

Satya Pal Duggal

Chairman: Lester W. Anderson

PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to discover:

1. the relationship between student unrest and student participation in school life, pupil control ideology and dogmatism of teachers;
2. what combination of independent variables of school size, pupil teacher ratio, size of the school district, standard equalized valuation per resident member and current operating expenditure per pupil has high correlation with the incidence of unrest?

PROCEDURE

Sixty schools that had unrest in 1968 (schools-u) were identified on the basis of responses received from 328 high schools (out of 385 contacted). Thirty schools-u were requested to participate in the study; seven of them agreed. Consent to participate in the study was obtained from seven schools without unrest (schools-n) comparable

on the following five criteria: (1) school size, (2) school district size, (3) standard equalized valuation (SEV) per resident member, (4) current operating expenditure per pupil, and (5) geographical location. The instruments used in the study were: (1) Rokeach Dogmatism Scale Form E, (2) Custodialism-Humanism Scale (Form CI) developed by Terry L. Eidell, and (3) a rating scale for student participation in school life. Usable responses were received from 1,100 students and 390 teachers. Mean scores, "t" values for differences between means, probabilities for the obtained "t" values and intercorrelations of item scores on Form SPSL were calculated.

FINDINGS

1. Larger school districts had more schools-u than smaller school districts.

2. More schools-u belonged to school districts with higher SEV per resident member than to school districts with lower SEV.

3. The higher the current operating expenditure the greater was the number of schools-u.

4. Half of the schools-u had enrollments of more than 1,500.

5. Schools-u had a significantly lower pupil teacher ratio than schools-n.

The hypothesis, "Student unrest is related to student participation in school management" was not accepted.

The hypothesis, "Student unrest is related to custodial pupil control ideology of teachers" was accepted. The hypothesis, "Student unrest is related to dogmatism of teachers" was not accepted.

CONCLUSIONS

1. Unrest is a response to the psychological rather than the material environment.

2. Student participation in school management creates new aspirations and new frustrations.

3. Student councils are poor channels of student participation in school life.

4. Student-faculty and student-administration communications seem to be better in schools-u (after unrest).

5. Level of student participation in school life is low for all the schools.

6. Sensitive areas of student participation are: student publications, a voice in determining who shall receive non-academic awards, selecting speakers for the general assembly programs, and evaluating the way the courses are taught.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Experience in the area of student participation should be pooled in order to develop guidelines for new administrators.

2. More research should be undertaken in order to develop a theory of student participation.

3. "Evaluative Criteria for Student Participation in School Life" should be standardized.

4. Grievance procedures should be instituted as preventive rather than remedial measures.

5. Teacher-education programs should include exposure to public schools organized on the basis of humanistic control ideology.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Cooperation of more than two thousand people made this study possible. The Department of State and the Office of Education of the Government of the United States extended my stay for the duration of this study. I am grateful to the officials of these departments for their cooperation and consideration.

Discussions with Dr. Frederick L. Goodman and Professor Dwyer were helpful in planning the analysis of this study. Mr. McKenzie and other staff of the Statistical Research Laboratory were helpful in the selection and execution of computer programs.

I sincerely appreciate the encouragement and guidance received from the committee members, Professor Stewart C. Hulslander and Dr. Mark Chesler in every phase of this study. I express my gratitude to Professor Burton E. Voss for generously giving his time, especially during the absence of Professor Lester W. Anderson.

I am indebted to Professor Lester W. Anderson, Chairman of my doctoral committee, for patiently piloting my doctoral program culminating in this study. It is because of his keen interest in this study that I could collect the data from 14 schools on this delicate issue.

This study is based on the information provided by principals of 328 high schools. I sincerely appreciate the decision of the 14 principals to get involved in the study and collect the data. I thank Basic Books, Inc., for permission to make copies of Rokeach Dogmatism Scale for use in this study.

Finally, the emotional support from my wife, Prakash, and sympathy and stamina of Mrs. Helen M. Candiotti were my assets.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ii

TABLE OF CONTENTS iv

LIST OF TABLES vi

LIST OF APPENDICES vii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Hypotheses for Student Unrest 4
The Hypotheses Based in Psychology . . . 6
The Hypotheses Based in Sociology . . . 9
The Hypotheses Based in Political Situation 13
The Hypotheses Based on Impact of Science and Technology 15
The Hypothesis Based in Economics . . . 18
The Hypothesis Based in Management . . . 18
School-Related Hypotheses 20

Student Participation in School Management 27
The Concepts of School 28

Need for the Study. 29

Statement of the Problem 31

The Hypothesis 33

Delimitation of the Study 33

Procedure 34
Selection of Schools for Study 34
Definition of Terms 36
Instruments Used 40
Rating Scale for Student Participation in School 44

Collection of the Data 51

Table of Contents (Continued)

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Analysis of Data	52
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	53
	Historical Perspective	53
	Theoretical Perspective	56
	Student Participation in Practice	58
	The Concept of Participatory Management	62
	Related Research	65
	Studies in the Sixties	72
	Summary	78
III.	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	81
	Selecting Schools for the Study	81
	Matching Schools for the Study	84
	Analysis of the Schools that Had Unrest	87
	Summary of Findings--Analysis of Independent Variables	89
	Test of Hypothesis: Student Unrest is Related to Student Participation in School Management	90
	Test of Hypothesis: Student Unrest is Related to Custodial Pupil Control Ideology of Teachers	113
	Test of Hypothesis: Student Unrest is Related to Dogmatism of Teachers	116
IV.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	118
	Summary	118
	Need for the Study	118
	Statement of the Problem	119
	Hypothesis	120
	Delimitation of the Study	121
	Procedure	121
	Limitations of the Study	124
	Findings	125
	Conclusions	129
	Recommendations	135
APPENDICES		137
BIBLIOGRAPHY		179

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.	Evaluation of Proposed Criteria by Experts	45
2.	Countywise Distribution of Schools with Unrest, Schools Giving no Response and Schools Participating	82
3.	Matched Schools for the Study	86
4.	Analysis of Financial Data of Schools-u . .	88
5.	Schools-u Categorized According to School Size	88
6.	Mean Scores of Students on Form SPSL (Student Participation in School Life)	92
7.	Itemwise Mean Scores of Students on Form SPSL	95
8.	Form SPSL: "t" Values and Probabilities (P) for the Differences between Mean Scores of Matched Pairs of Schools (M_u-M_n)	97
9.	Correlation of the Item Scores with Total Score on Form SPSL	104
10.	Intercorrelations of Items of Form SPSL . .	105
11.	Mean Scores of Teachers on Form CI (Pupil Control Ideology Scale)	115
12.	Mean Scores of Teachers on RDS Form E (Rokeach Dogmatism Scale Form E)	117

LIST OF APPENDICES

		Page
APPENDIX I:	Letter to Schools--First Enquiry. .	138
APPENDIX II:	Letter to Schools Requesting them to Participate in the Study	140
APPENDIX III:	Letter of Endorsement from the Chairman of the Doctoral Committee	143
APPENDIX IV:	Letter to the Graduate Faculty of the School of Education, The University of Michigan Requesting them to Evaluate the Proposed Criteria for Student Participation in School Management	145
APPENDIX V:	Proposed Criteria for the Evaluation of Student Participation in School Management	147
APPENDIX VI:	Form: Student Participation in School Life for Tryout.	152
APPENDIX VII:	Form SPSL--Final Form	157
APPENDIX VIII:	Form CI--Custodialism Humanism Scale	162
APPENDIX IX:	RDS Form E--Rokeach Dogmatism Scale	166
APPENDIX X:	School Data Form	172
APPENDIX XI:	Directions for Collecting the Data	174
APPENDIX XII:	Letter to Schools sent along with Instruments and Directions for Collecting the Data	177

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Student unrest is an area of increasing concern. The Research Division of National Education Association conducted a sample survey of the nation's public secondary school teachers. The Questionnaire was mailed to 1,219 teachers from a sample of 380 school systems enrolling 50 or more students and having secondary grades and 92.3 percent questionnaires were returned.[1] Iwamoto reported the findings of this survey as follows:

> Organized strikes or demonstrations have become a well publicized vehicle for student protest against teachers, administrators, or school regulations. About 4 percent of the survey respondents said that they knew of one or more demonstrations in their school during school hours. In addition, 3.4 percent recalled such demonstrations outside school hours.[2]

---

[1] Student Behavior in Secondary Schools, 1964, Report 1965-R 12 (Washington, D. C.: Research Division, The National Education Association, 1965), p. 5.

[2] David Iwamoto, "Student Violence and Rebellion--How Big a Problem?" National Education Association Journal, LIV (December, 1965), 12.

It has been reported that forty-four percent of all recorded civil disorders in the first four months of 1968 involved schools and there has been a three-fold increase over the entire year 1967.[1]

An opinion poll of the high school principals was conducted before the beginning of the school year 1968-69. Forty-five percent principals expected the current student unrest in colleges to filter down to high schools in fall.[2] Stephen Hofer spoke for the student viewpoint at the National Conference of the National Association of Student Councils. He said, "They question this thing of authority mainly: Should administrators in schools have the authority to make all rules and regulations without going through the school, the student body, the student council?"[3]

---

[1]Mark Chesler and Jan Franklin, "Interracial and Intergenerational Conflict in Secondary Schools," Center for Research on the Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, University of Michigan, 1968, p. 1. (Mimeographed)

[2]"Student Unrest will Spread to High Schools, Many Fear," Opinion Poll, Nation's Schools, LXXXII (September, 1968), 71.

[3]Stephen Hofer, participant in discussion, "Youth Faces Today's Issues," in The 1967 Council Yearbook, (Washington, D. C.: National Association of Student Councils of the N. A. S. S. P., 1967), p.22.

Referring to the publication of "Schools Campaign Guide" by the National League of Young Liberals in England Anna Sproule states:

> Foremost among their proposals is a suggestion that school councils should be set up to enable all pupils to take part in running their own school. . .Guide tells children to demand this step and to set up a council of their own accord if permission is refused. . .If you are faced with really bad conditions, and if all other methods fail, organize a strike within the school.[1]

The American Civil Liberties Union has recently published a pamphlet on Academic Freedom in the Secondary School. It presents the case for students' rights in the following areas: freedom of expression and communication, freedom of association, freedom of assembly and the right to petition, student government, student discipline, personal appearance, and freedom from discrimination.[2]

Presenting a historical review of student unrest, Cowley writes:

---

[1]Anna Sproule, "Children Urged to Strike," Times Educational Supplement, 2750 (February 2, 1968) 358.

[2]Margaret Nielsen, ed., Activism in the Secondary Schools: Analysis and Recommendations, (Eugene: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Oregon, 1969), p. 9.

> Parents, professors, and politicians troubled by today's student unrest can take heart from the knowledge that collegians have been ever thus. . .In fact, violence has been fairly frequent during the long history of higher education which extends back in identifiable institutions to the founding of Plato's Academy in 387 B. C.
> . . . . . .
> Student criticism of educational practices will be increasingly recognized as a valuable resource and will be facilitated by better channels of faculty-student communication.[1]

HYPOTHESES FOR STUDENT UNREST

Three differences have been observed between routine discipline problems in high schools and the new activism. These are:

> . . .today's problems involve <u>groups</u> of youth rather than individuals. . . problems today often result from an activity <u>calculated</u> to disrupt the school and immobilize the educational process.
>
> A third difference is that many demonstrations are executed with carefully manipulated techniques of collective protest.[2]

---

[1] W. H. Cowley, "Student Unrest in Perspective," <u>Journal California Teachers Association</u>, LXII (March, 1966), 30-33.

[2] Margaret Nielsen, ed., <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 10.

Two major kinds of student unrest are identified--the kind displayed by restive students who honestly wish to find cooperative solutions to existing school problems, and the kind displayed by anarchistic, anti-authority students who seek not solutions but continual confrontations.[1]

Halleck states that periods of unrest seem to run in cycles, and it is conceivable that we happen to be in an active phase of a predictable cycle.[2] This proposition is reassuring to those who look forward to a quiet future. Pointing out the weakness of this approach Halleck adds:

> . . .it assumes that those forces which make for cyclical behavior will remain relatively constant. My opinion is that the world is changing so rapidly that using historical precedents to predict future behavior is a risky business.[3]

Various hypotheses have been suggested to explain this phenomenon. Most of the hypotheses are based in specific disciplines, and therefore, have limited applicability.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 19.

[2] S. L. Halleck, "Hypotheses of Student Unrest," Phi Delta Kappan, XL (September, 1968), 3.

[3] Ibid.

THE HYPOTHESES BASED IN PSYCHOLOGY

Many people believe that student unrest is the manifestation of psychological tensions working within individuals and groups.

The Permissiveness Hypothesis--According to Halleck[1] student unrest may be the result of too much permissiveness in rearing children. Some parents have, through painstaking efforts to avoid creating neuroses in their children, abdicated their responsibility to teach and discipline their children. In so doing they have reared a generation of spoiled, greedy youth who are unable to tolerate the slightest frustration without showing an angry or infantile response. The findings of the sample survey of the nation's public secondary school teachers are:

> The four most significant factors, according to teachers were closely related to the students' family life. These were: Irresponsible parents
>
> Unsatisfactory home conditions (low income, inadequate housing, broken families.)
>
> Lack of training or experience of students in moral and spiritual values.
>
> Increasing availability of automobiles to teenagers.[2]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Iwamoto, op. cit., p. 13.

The Non-Responsibility Hypothesis--Halleck hypothesizes that our culture has been "psychologized" to an extent where youth become unwilling to assume responsibility for their own behavior. When a behavior is totally explained, there is a tendency for people to act as though they are no longer responsible for that behavior.[1]

The Family Pathology Hypothesis--According to Halleck,[2] activist and alienated students behave as they do because they are responding to an unresolved conflict within the family unit. The restless student may have been subjected to too much pressure by his parents or he may be "acting out" a need of his parents.

"Learning-Leads-to Anxiety" Hypothesis--Crane states, "Some rebelliousness we must have, for dissatisfaction is a part of this anxiety-laden process called learning. Unrest in learning is a certainty, else no real intellectual development can take place."[3]

Adolescent-Nature Hypothesis--Nielsen states that adolescent life normally is filled with individual misgivings as to whether or not he or she will be a successful

---

[1]Halleck, op. cit., p. 4.

[2]Ibid, p. 4.

[3]Robert M. Crane, "Unrest on Campus--Revolution or Evolution," College and University, XLII (Winter, 1967), 211.

man or woman in tomorrow's world. The natural uncertainties as to their future occupations and their future vocational success add to the personal unrest typical of adolescents. Activism partially fulfills the need of adolescents for excitement.[1]

Military-Obligation Hypothesis--Nielsen describes the psychological impact of military obligation as follows:

> The military obligation for boys now represents a far greater cause of youth unrest than most adults realize. The possibility of death or crippling as a result of active military service cannot be lightly dismissed by high school boys. Girls in high school also are affected by the fact that boys face from two to four years of military service. This does not leave girls in a normal life situation when a portion of eligible young men are removed from the community.[2]

Early Maturation Hypothesis--Nielsen hypothesizes as follows:

> It is probable that schools are treating high school freshmen much as they did many years ago. In general, authorities agree that today's high school freshmen have matured faster and are psychologically three years older than those of 1900 and are more impatient to attain adult powers.[3]

---

[1] Margaret Nielsen, ed., op. cit., p. 25.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid.

THE HYPOTHESES BASED IN SOCIOLOGY

A number of hypotheses have been suggested that attribute student unrest to sociological forces. These hypotheses have been discussed below.

"The-Younger-Generation-too-Moral" Hypothesis--Greeley expounds this hypothesis as follows:

> Concern about racial justice, peace, service to one's fellowmen, honesty, integrity, sincerity, are, I think, far more explicit in today's highly personalist generation of college students than they were in the past. . . The difficulty, then, is not that young people are immoral, but rather that they are almost too moral for the ethical systems which are available to them. . .The young person, therefore, finds himself faced with the need for constant decision making fraught with moral implications.
>
> Our pretense that the young are about to evolve their own morality is merely an admission of how morally bankrupt we adults are.[1]

Racial-Confrontation Hypothesis--Chesler and Franklin observe:

> . . .conflicts that appear to be between racial groups of students. . . seem to develop from community tensions and structures, from students' ignorance of each other, as well as from racial fears and hostilities. They may be

---

[1]Andrew M. Greeley, "Student Stress Because of a Moral Change," Texas Outlook, LII (September, 1968), 16.

> catalyzed in the high school because such institutions sometimes provide youngsters of different races and community sub-groups with their first sustained, perhaps competitive, contact.[1]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Those few teachers who are openly resistant to interracial education may deliberately contribute to a negative experience in interpersonal and intergroup relations in the classroom.[2]

The Deterioration-in-the-Quality-of-Life Hypothesis--Student unrest is an appropriate response to the deterioration of the quality of life in America.[3,4] Overcrowding, mass production, and impersonal relations have taken much of the joy out of life in towns and cities. Student unrest is a reaction to this kind of life. Vredevoe also points out that the general breakdown in our society of agreement relative to moral and ethical standards of conduct is creating problems of discipline within the school itself.[5]

---

[1]Mark Chesler and Jan Franklin, op. cit., p. 3.

[2]Ibid., p. 17.

[3]Halleck, op. cit., p. 6.

[4]Lawrence E. Vredevoe, "Practices in School Discipline," American School Board Journal, CIXL (July, 1959), 19.

[5]Ibid.

Changing-Attitude-toward-Law-Enforcement Hypothesis--Vredevoe states that the changing emphasis and attitude toward law enforcement is also creating problems of discipline within the school.[1]

Trend-toward-Youth-Freedom-and Initiative Hypothesis--Likert states:[2]

> The trend in America, generally, in our schools, in our homes, and in our communities, is toward giving the individual greater freedom and initiative. There are fewer direct, unexplained orders in schools and homes, and youngsters are participating increasingly in decisions which affect them.

Norton observes that at an earlier age youth assume more freedom of action than at the turn of the century.[3] Adolescents who act to maximize social needs and who strive for what they see as positive qualities (independence, social status and respect) come into conflict with the intermediate goals and policies which teachers establish for them (high grades, preparation for careers, etc.).[4]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961), p. 1.

[3] John K. Norton, "The Contemporary Scene," in Administrative Behavior in Education, ed., by R. F. Campbell and Russel T. Gregg, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), p. 43.

[4] Mark Chesler and Jan Franklin, op. cit., p. 6.

The Generation-Gap-Hypothesis--Listing four characteristics of the new breed of students Cutler states:

> There seems to me to be a serious lack of understanding between the present college generation and its elders; a gap between generations of sufficiently serious proportions so that communication between ourselves and our students is most difficult.[1]

Anderson adds in this context:

> Elders have been protesting ever since. Now, as in the days of ancient Greece, youth continue to distress adults with brash and disrespectful conduct. There are built-in differences, physical and psychological, between older and younger people which make it difficult for them to fully understand each other.[2]

Padgett lists three concrete criticisms of middle-class America levied by some members of the younger generation: 1) depersonalization of life; 2) the phoniness and lack of authenticity of so much of life today; 3) social complacency and the failure to act to bring about needed social reform.[3]

---

[1]Richard L. Cutler, "The Berkley Rebellion," New York State Education, LIII (June, 1966), 15.

[2]Lester W. Anderson, and Lauren A. Van Dyke, School Administration, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963) p. 407.

[3]Jack F. Padgett, "The New Breed in Search of a New Morality," Liberal Education, LIV (October, 1968), 435.

Chesler and Franklin describe the school situation in terms of student and adult sub-systems as follows:

> The school situation not only prohibits such membership across student and adult sub-systems, it also so inhibits cross group loyalties and interpersonal commitments that the two status-linked groups of teachers and students can be often and easily lined up against one another. . . In some instances the delineation and resistance of adults as the "common enemy" may provide white and black students with a "superordinate goal" around which they can organize for confrontation.[1]

Kvaraceus points out that a heavy stress on external and adult controls, "tends to deepen the misunderstanding and resentment that exists between youth and adult."[2]

HYPOTHESES BASED IN POLITICAL SITUATION

Halleck proposed four hypotheses relating student unrest and current political situation.

The Political-Hopelessness Hypothesis--Halleck explains this hypothesis thus:

> An increasing number of radical students are convinced that the forces of government, industry, and education are totally interdependent and allied to one another,

---

[1]Mark Chesler and Jan Franklin, op. cit., p. 25.

[2]W. Kvaraceus and others, Negro Self Concept, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), p. 109.

> . . .Guided by the philosophy of Herbert Marcuse, many students are convinced that constructive change within our society is not possible by working through the system. . . they are convinced that our society is fundamentally irrational and must be destroyed. They do not reject illegal acts or even violence as agents of destruction.[1]

The Two-Armed-Camps Hypothesis--Halleck sums up this hypothesis as follows:

> Since the Russians launched their first satellite, the competition has also been educational. Students today are trained in a school system which emphasizes the competitive acquisition of knowledge as a source of power and stability. By the time they leave high school they are better educated than any previous generation of students, but they are also more over-worked. . . .by the time the student reaches graduate school he increasingly asks himself whether the competitive search for knowledge is worth it. At this point he begins to view our competition with the Communist world (and sometimes competitiveness itself) as a form of mass paranoia. . . . He reacts by protest or withdrawal.[2]

The War-in-Vietnam Hypothesis--Halleck describes this hypothesis as follows:

---

[1]Halleck, op. cit., p. 6.

[2]Halleck, op. cit., p. 5.

> There can be little doubt that in the past few years this conflict (the war in Vietnam) has been the major factor influencing the behavior of students. . .The major issue here is fear. The average male student is plagued with fears that he will fail in school, will be drafted, and will run the risks of being killed in a conflict he may not consider vital to our interests. A second issue is guilt. The university student knows that he is spared from military service only because he is richer or smarter than someone else. . . .
>
> Students also feel shame in not participating in those aspects of military service that might make them feel more masculine.[1]

The Civil-Rights Hypothesis--The Civil Rights movement not only increased youth's awareness of an historical injustice which made it difficult for them to be proud of this country, but also served as a training ground for future radicals. Students' commitment to the Negro cause has taught them the psychological meaning of oppression and has encouraged them to seek out and attack sources of oppression in their own lives.[2]

HYPOTHESES BASED ON IMPACT OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Science and technology are important variables in our environment. Five hypotheses have been mentioned in literature which trace student unrest to developments in science and technology.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Ibid., p. 6.

The Technology Hypothesis--The present era is characterized by a massive and continuous growth of technology. Moreover, the rate at which technology changes our lives is itself increasing. Youth come to perceive that the values of the past are totally inappropriate for the world in which they will be adults. They feel powerless to anticipate or direct the future. Life in the present is a selfish life which is incompatible with the growth of that intimacy and passion which man has always found to be essential to a fulfilled life.[1]

The Media Hypothesis--Halleck sums up hypotheses pertaining to media and presents his own hypothesis as follows:

> By being available to publicize the activities of protesters and hippies the media exaggerate the importance of these groups. . .the medium may be creating a "climate of expectation" in which youth are subtly seduced into dissenting roles which may not represent their actual interests. . . . Young people are made more aware of their potentialities and sometimes develop an exaggerated sense of their own power. . .McLuhan believes. . . . Our youth who have grown up with the new media are ready for such a (truly communal and shared) society. Elders who are committed to sustain such institutions are not. . .Frederick Weotham believes that the massive degree of violence which young people see on television makes them more violent and less responsible. . . .

---

[1] Ibid.

> . . . . . .
>
> I would like to propose my own hypothesis of student unrest. . . . the media influence the character structure of youth prematurely confronting them with the harsh truths and realities of life. . . .
>
> The hypocrisies of the older generation have always been with us. What is new today is that it is ridiculously easy to expose them. The effect on our youth of premature emergence of truth has been to create a deep skepticism as to the validity of authority.[1]

The Reliance-on-Scientism Hypothesis--The restless student is one who has taken the message of science, rationality, and perfection literally. He is more open to action and change than were earlier generations of students. At the same time, however, he is not equipped to understand or deal with the depth of that irrationality in man which resists change and which leads man to seek his own destruction.[2]

Availability-of-Automobiles Hypothesis--Iwamoto reports on the basis of a sample survey of the nation's public secondary school teachers that teachers recognize the increasing availability of automobiles to teenagers as one of the four most significant factors for student violence and rebellion.[3]

Drugs Hypothesis--Nielsen states:

> Widespread use of drugs by youth is causing unpredictable student behavior

---

[1]Halleck, op. cit., p. 7-8.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Iwamoto, op. cit., p. 13.

> and adding to student unrest. Drug experimentation and abuse among youth has occurred with pep pills, depressants, marijuana, LSD, and in some areas, hard narcotics.[1]

HYPOTHESIS BASED IN ECONOMICS

The child raised in an affluent society has difficulty finding useful goals. He does not learn to use work or creativity as a means of mastering some aspect of the world. He is trapped in a never ending search for new diversions and new freedoms which sooner or later begin to feel sterile and ungratifying.[2]

HYPOTHESIS BASED IN MANAGEMENT

Argyris hypothesizes with regard to employee-employer relations on the basis of investigations in the field of industry as follows:

> The more rigidity, specialization, tight control, and directive leadership the worker experiences, the more he will tend to create antagonistic adaptive activities. . .One way to resolve these activities is to institutionalize some of them by developing a new organization that has equal power--a trade union, for example.[3]

This hypothesis may have bearing on student unrest as Steinberg observes:

---

[1]Margaret Nielsen, op. cit., p. 20.

[2]Halleck, op. cit., p. 8.

[3]Chris Argyris, Integrating the Individual and the Organization, (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964), p. 59.

> In a N.E.A. research report published in September, 1965, more than 1,000 teachers responded to a question "Do you think that school should have the authority to prohibit students from wearing objectionable clothing in school, such as tight-fitting sweaters and blue jeans, sheer blouses, etc?" Ninety-six percent of the teachers responded "yes" with no significant difference between men and women or elementary or secondary teachers. . . . And remember, the restrictions don't stop at school. There are the restrictions imposed by the home, by the police, by their own teen age society. . .The question we all must answer--educator and citizen alike--is, "Is the battle worth while, is it being fought by the right people in the right place?"[1]

Kowitz draws attention to the lack of productive relations between students and administrators in schools. He states:

> As long as public school instruction operates on a class-group basis,. . . the result will be the emergence of a game between the student group and the administrator group. The students will attempt to beat the system; the administrators will try to block their attempts. In the past, the administration has refused to enter the game with a spirit of good sportsmanship. It reserved to itself all rights to make the rules and to revise them while the game was in progress.[2]

---

[1]Warren L. Steinberg, "Behavioral Standards for Youth," Journal of Secondary Education, XLIII (January, 1968), 37-38.

[2]Gerald T. Kowitz, "The Management of Motivation," Phi Delta Kappan, IXL (October, 1967), 80.

SCHOOL-RELATED HYPOTHESES

Nordstrom, Friedenberg and Gold state the following propositions related to schools as institutional presses:

> . . .ressentiment is an important element in the institutional press of secondary schools; . . .ressentiment has unwholesome consequences for the young people attending schools where its influence prevails.
>
> . . .ressentiment begins when an angry individual feels an oppressive sense of impotence which he cannot imagine actively transcending. This impotence results from his having lost out in competition with others over the course of his life. . .he retains a desire for revenge, a desire that stands in conflict with his essential impotence. . .Resolution comes,. . .,through an extraordinary value transformation,. . .he derogates what Scheler calls "vital values" such as those of well-being, health, beauty, freedom; in short, values associated with youth, with growth, and with authentic maturity.[1]

The ressentiment generated by the institutional press of secondary schools may not be resolved and find expression in disruptive behavior. The factors that may be responsible for producing unresolved tensions in the student body have been hypothesized as described below.

---

[1]Carl Nordstrom, Edgar Z. Friedenberg, and Hilary A. Gold, Society's Children: A Study of Ressentiment in the Secondary School, (New York: Random House, 1967), pp. 12-13.

Theory-Practice-Gap Hypothesis--Chesler and Franklin state:

> . . .it is apparent that many progressive educators have not been able to actualize their own liberal values in the organization of instruction. Despite administrative lip service to terms such as individuation of instruction, intellectual freedom, autonomy in course selection, the realization of each student's potential, the stimulation of controversy and the promotion of independent thinking, these values have not been sufficiently clarified or operationalized in the life of most public schools. Some protests have been undertaken in order to force the clarification and encourage the operationalization of such values on the part of adult instructors.[1]

Negative-Attitude Hypothesis--Students are assumed to want to go to school and to want to absorb both the cognitive and normative input desired by the larger society. But Chesler and Franklin observe:

> . . .students are often in school only because they are forced to be, and because there is nothing better for them to do. For this reason, it is often assumed that their organizational lives must be tightly structured and arranged so they will not waste time with frivolous and non-educational pursuits.[2]

As a result of a study conducted in 1960 involving some 440,000 high school students it was found that some fifty-three percent of the boys, compared with thirty-seven percent of the girls, lack personal interest in their

---

[1]Chesler and Franklin, op. cit., p. 43.

[2]Ibid., p. 19.

school life at least half the time. The negative attitudes toward school increase with senior students.[1]

Irrelevant-Curriculum Hypothesis--Required or elective courses generally have relevance for those students who will enroll in or graduate from a degree-granting university. Unfortunately, the entire trend tends to idolize academic offerings.[2] Hess points out in relation to student protests:

> The position of the school as a socializing agent for the community and its need for consensual support often forces it to be conservative, to evade the most sensitive issues and conflicts and by so doing, to promote apathy and ignorance. This evasion makes more likely the possibility of attack by dissenting groups because of the lack of response to obvious problems. . .[3]

> The experience of conflict, the experience in which one not only observes but also confronts the emotions and actions of others (student protests on campus are one example; . . .) is one for which our present practices do not prepare the student. He is not typically in a position to understand the feelings and responses of others or of himself, in such events. In short, the <u>teaching of social and political interactions omits both the components of emotions and of action</u>--the two elements that are most likely to effect change.[4]

---

[1] Margaret Nielsen, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 21.

[2] <u>Ibid.</u>, pp. 21-22.

[3] Robert D. Hess, "Political Socialization in the Schools," <u>Harvard Educational Review</u>, XXXVIII (Summer, 1968), 535.

[4] <u>Ibid.</u>, 534.

Emphasis-on-Questioning Hypothesis--Nielsen remarks:

> For years schools have been teaching youth not to accept on blind faith everything they read or hear. Educators have encouraged youth to raise questions and seek new solutions to problems that plague society. Have schools taught too well?[1]

Outmoded-Methodologies Hypothesis--Teachers tend to make desperate attempts to "cover the ground" of their subjects. This results in overemphasis on lecturing, examination and grades and a decreased emphasis on the human element and less personal concern for youth as individuals.[2]

Deviants-in-School-Hypothesis--Compulsory school attendance laws impose school education on all boys and girls, including many youth with special problems. But the society has failed to provide special facilities or staff for the deviants--the delinquent, the neurotic, and the psychotic; in many schools. Unrest is fostered within such schools.[3]

Teacher-Inadequacy Hypothesis--Nielsen points out ill-conceived personnel practices too often lead to the assignment of more difficult classes to beginning teachers. Experienced teachers often seek transfers to

---

[1] Margaret Nielsen, op. cit., p. 21.

[2] Ibid., p. 22.

[3] Ibid.

schools where there are fewer deprived students.[1] Another type of teacher inadequacy is suggested when students report, "what disturbs them most is their teacher's lack of courtesy and respect for them as individuals."[2]

Inadequate-Facilities Hypothesis--Overcrowded and poorly maintained school facilities place youth in close jostling proximity so that opportunities for conflict and strife are greatly increased. Students in need of special care and attention tend to be processed as part of a mass of unknown strangers. This adds to a general feeling of student worthlessness, unimportance, and alienation.[3]

Paternalism Hypothesis--There is little concern for due process in schools. Students are rarely granted the right to appeal teachers' authority. There are few ways to prevent grievances from becoming crises.[4] Administrative paternalism promotes student unrest by eliminating student involvement and imposing one man's authority and values.[5]

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Chesler and Franklin, op. cit., p. 30.

[3] Margaret Nielsen, op. cit., p. 23.

[4] Chesler and Franklin, op. cit., p. 26.

[5] Nielsen, op. cit., p. 23.

Poor-Communication Hypothesis--Inadequate communication between students and administrators is one of the basic causes of unrest in high schools. Sit-ins, leafleting, strikes, picketing, etc., are non-verbal communication and these are resorted to when students find no ear to listen to their concerns and complaints.[1]

Student-Self-Awareness Hypothesis--Chesler and Franklin observe, "In many schools large numbers of students feel that if they organize together they have enough power to so disrupt the ongoing activities of the school that they can bring it to a grinding halt. And at that point administrators can no longer run right over students, but must sit down and attempt some kind of negotiation or bargaining procedure."[2]

Outside-Leadership-and-Interschool-Organization Hypothesis--Nielsen states the following in relation to student unrest:

> Much of the student activism on high school campuses is instigated by individuals outside the student body. . .They often seek to develop an area-wide organization of high school militant leaders. . .
>
> Student protest groups with outside leadership are frequently in contact with adult peace groups or civil rights organizations. Often they gain legal advice regarding precisely what may be done on school property without stepping outside the limits of the law. . .

---

[1] Ibid., p. 24.

[2] Chesler and Franklin, op. cit., p. 34.

> The national council of Students for a Democratic Society voted in 1968 to begin an active program of recruitment in high schools. Their adopted resolution reportedly declared that "instead of education of young people, the high school attempts to press upon them bankrupt values of a decaying society."[1]

Chesler and Franklin enunciate two principles about school conflict:

> (1) certain aspects of the structure and operation of schools make student-student, student-adult, and professional community conflict inevitable; (2) certain aspects of educator's roles and assumptions prevent the use of mediating processes that could intervene between the existence of grievances and conflict and the development of protest and rebellion.[2]

This review of hypotheses of student unrest may be concluded with the following remarks by Halleck:

> This review. . .attempted to demonstrate the intellectual futility of searching for simpler explanations of a highly complex phenomenon. . .The critical hypotheses remind us that youth are not always as wise or powerful as we might suspect. . .The sympathetic hypotheses emphasize the unusual degree of stress this generation of students has experienced. . .Other hypotheses raise

---

[1] Nielsen, op. cit., p. 23-24.

[2] Chesler and Franklin, op. cit., p. 27.

> many questions. . .Should youth be encouraged to remain in a passive role as students throughout the first third of their lives? Are there means of bringing young people in the power structure of our universities and our social system before they reach the age of 25 or 30?[1]

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

The reaction to the issues raised by Halleck in the foregoing quotation would depend upon the belief about man and the concept of school. Seward brings out the relationship between personal beliefs about man and the approach to management problems as follows:

> What is our philosophical belief about man? We need to know this of ourselves because the answer undergirds and colors our expectation of others. There are at least three possible choices:
>
> (a) Do we feel man is essentially evil, a savage to be tamed, a wild spirit to be captured, a rollicking force not to stand free without harness? OR
>
> (b) Do we feel man is neutral, a breathing vegetable capable of action and reaction to be conditioned for productive, facilitating activity if conditioned in a correct, knowledgeable manner? OR
>
> (c) Do we conceive of man as good, that is well intentioned, flourishing when in harmony with the world about him, and desirous of this harmony.

---

[1]Halleck, op. cit., pp. 8-9.

> Your choice of answer will relate to whether you are more comfortable with a supporting structure of regulations, . . .or whether you believe that you can develop appropriate skills and reactions by wise, benevolent manipulation of responsive, eager, young minds as situations and needs arise; or whether you prefer a free, vitalized specifically unpredictable surge of continuously flexible decisions, evaluations, modification based on interchange of young and older minds committed to common desired goals. . . .
> . . . . . .
> Most of us recognize that acceptable social behavior is usually not instinctive and that learning situation must be provided. . .Do we honestly regard our discipline procedures as learning opportunities, or are we in practice committed to automatic punitive procedures?[1]

THE CONCEPTS OF SCHOOL

John Dewey said that school is a miniature society. He explained this concept as follows:

> I believe that the school is primarily a social institution. . . .
> . . . . . .
> I believe that the school must represent present life--life as real and vital to the child as that which he carries on in the home, in the neighborhood, or on the play ground.

---

[1]Doris M. Seward, "Educational Discipline," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XXIV (June, 1961), 193.

> I believe that the school, as an institution, should simplify existing social life; reduce it, as it were, to an embryonic form.[1]

Carlson gives another concept of school. He believes that school is a service organization in which clients have no control over own participation in organization, and organization has no control over admission. State mental hospitals, reform schools, and prisons are other institutions of this type.[2]

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Student unrest is an important but relatively recent problem in the area of school administration. Chesler and Franklin state the outcome of student unrest in the following words:

> One of the most distressing products of these situations is the perspective that nothing of any educative value can be accomplished. The resulting administrative postures of instituting

---

[1] John Dewey, My Pedagogic "Creed", The School Journal, LIV (January 16, 1897), 77-80. Reproduced in Dewey on Education, ed. by Martin S. Dworkin, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959), pp. 22-23.

[2] Richard O. Carlson, "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients," in Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, ed. by Daniel E. Griffiths, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964), pp. 266-67.

> repressive school or police controls, of expelling students, of surrendering a school to chaos, or of wholesale teacher resignations are essentially disastrous examples of our inability to resolve conflicts productively. Often schools are patched enough to delay or drive underground the expression of real concerns and the exploration of important issues; a strategy guaranteed to create other explosion later.[1]

The hypotheses suggested to explain this phenomenon cover all the areas of individual and collective life. The variables that are within the control of school administrators may be investigated in order to discover guidelines which may help restore harmonious relations in schools. The basic assumptions are that the schools are to function in a democratic society, and the students of schools shall be participating in the democratic process all their lives. On the basis of a research study Skogsberg predicted in 1950, "Lay people will work with professional staff. Pupils will have a hand in their own destiny. All will work as one large committee to plan and carry out the expanding role of education in the community setting."[2] Student participation in school management is being recommended as a remedial measure for student unrest.

---

[1] Chesler and Franklin, op. cit., p. 1.

[2] Alfred H. Skogsberg, Administrative Operational Patterns, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950), p. 40.

Crane remarks:

> We must, at all possible points of contact between students and faculty, initiate clear and open lines for listening to one another, always caring about what each has to say and carefully considering each others proposals for solving issues, and problems and, most certainly, for jointly assuming responsibility for the characteristic of the academic community to which we belong. Councils of faculty and students, ad hoc committees, open hearings, and all kinds of protempore as well as permanent structures and organizations are media for meeting the need of openness to each other's concern and conditions.[1]

The hypothesis that "student participation in school management will reduce the frequency of student protests" needs testing.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In the study of "student unrest" the independent variables are: (1) opportunities available to students for participation in the management of the school, (2) the ideology of the school administrators and teachers, (3) the quality of decisions by the administration, (4) location of the school, (5) size of the school, (6) student-teacher ratio in the school, (7) socio-economic background of parents of students, (8) ethnic composition of students, (9) ethnic composition of faculty, (10) type of housing in the area, and

---

[1]Robert M. Crane, op. cit., p. 215.

(11) expenditure per pupil in the school. The present study is an attempt to find out the degree of relationship between these independent variables and the incidence of student unrest. Specifically, the study is directed to discover:

1. What is the relationship between student participation in school management and the incidence of student unrest?

2. What is the relationship between pupil control ideology of the school staff and the incidence of student unrest?

3. What is the relationship between dogmatism of the school staff and the incidence of student unrest?

4. What combination of independent variables of school size, student-teacher ratio, ethnic composition of students, ethnic composition of faculty, and expenditure per pupil in the school, has high correlation with the incidence of student unrest?

THE HYPOTHESIS

Student unrest as evidenced by walk-out, sit in, or mass demonstration, is related to:

(a) student participation in school management,

(b) custodial pupil control ideology of the school teachers,

(c) dogmatism of the school teachers,

(d) the enrollment of the school,

(e) the student teacher ratio.

DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

This study was confined to the public high schools in the state of Michigan. Junior high schools were excluded. The incidence of unrest during the year 1968 was considered. Generalizations were made for the schools studied and for the period of 1968.

The study was limited to the independent variables listed in the hypothesis. Factors such as home background, socio-economic group of the parents, and political, economic, psychological, sociological, and technological factors discussed under hypotheses were not included in the present investigation.

PROCEDURE

A letter (see Appendix I) was mailed to 385 high schools in Michigan with an enrollment of 300 students or more in grades 10 to 12. The letter sought information regarding the following:

1. Was there unrest (strike, boycott, demonstration, sit-in, walk-out) in your school during 1968?

2. If answer to the first question is yes, did this result in the closing of the school?

Responses were received from 328 schools.

Identifying Schools with Unrest--The reply postcard sent along with the above mentioned letter was coded. Each school was assigned a number. A dot was placed on certain letters on the address side of the postcard with a black ballpoint pen. For example, if the assigned number of the school was 543, then a dot was placed on the fifth letter of the first row, fourth letter of the second row and third letter of the third row. This coding helped in identifying schools that had disruption and the schools that did not respond to this request.

Selection of Schools for Study--Schools of Michigan were divided into two groups:

a. Schools where student unrest occurred at least once during the year 1968--referred to as schools-u

b. The schools where student unrest did not result in the form of boycott, demonstration,sit-in, or walk-out--referred to as schools-n

A letter along with an endorsing letter from the chairman of the doctoral committee (see Appendix II and III) was mailed to thirty of the sixty schools that had unrest during 1968 requesting the following information:

PLEASE CHECK ONE.

___ Willing to participate in the study and will collect the data for you.

___ Willing to participate in the study but would like you to collect the data.

___ Not willing to participate in the study.

Seven schools expressed willingness to participate in the study. These seven schools-u were matched with fourteen schools -n (two schools-n for each school-u) in consultation with the chairman of the doctoral committee and keeping the following factors in view: (1) size of the school, (2) geographical location, (3) standard equalized valuation per pupil, and (4) annual expenditure per pupil. This information was obtained from two publications--one of Michigan Education Association,[1] and

---

[1] Michigan Public School District Data: 1968-69, (East Lansing: Michigan Education Association, 1969).

another of Michigan Association of School Boards.[1] Letters of request to participate in the study were sent to fourteen matched schools-n. Seven of them agreed to participate in the study, five of them after telephone contacts by the chairman of the doctoral committee.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Boycott--Students purposefully avoid a given campus activity or service such as classes or cafeteria.

A Closed Minded Individual--A closed minded individual perceives the world as threatening; he is often fearful of the future as well as the present. A need to ward off threat predominates. There is relatively high degree of intolerance. The personality characteristics of a closed minded individual appear to foster a client control ideology which emphasizes atmosphere where client misbehavior is viewed as a personal affront; an atmosphere where there is a minimum communication both within and across status lines; an atmosphere where clients are expected to accept the decisions of their superiors without question; an atmosphere characterized by pessimism and mistrust; an atmosphere where strict control is central.[2]

---

[1] Summary of Estimated Enrollment and Selected Financial Data, (East Lansing: Michigan Association of School Boards, 1968).

[2] Wayne Kolter Hoy, "Dogmatism and the Pupil Control Ideology of Public School Professional Staff Members," (unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1965), p. 31.

Custodialism--Humanism--Eidell[1] defines custodialism in terms of the traditional viewpoints of control while humanism connotes the conception of organization as a community in which the diverse needs of the individuals are to be met. Custodialism and humanism are extremes on the continuum. The traditional school, mental hospital, or prison serves as a prototype for the custodial organization. These organizations provide a highly rigid atmosphere; the primary objective is the maintenance of control. In a custodial school students are regarded as unruly and irresponsible persons who must be controlled through punitive sanctions; hence, teachers fail to try to understand student misbehavior and its cause. On the contrary, misbehavior is viewed as a personal affront to the teacher. Teacher pupil relationships must be kept impersonal for personal teacher-pupil relationships weaken the control structure. The custodial school is an autocratic organization with a rigid pupil-teacher status hierarchy; both the flow of power and communication is unidirectional downward. Students must accept the direction of their teachers without question.

The model humanistic school is viewed as an educational community in which students learn through cooperative interaction and experience. Learning and behavior are thought of and examined in psychological and sociological terms, not moralistic terms. Misbehavior is examined as to cause with the goal of removing the cause and aiding the student with his personal problems. Consequently, there are close, personal

---

[1]Terry L. Eidell, "The Development and Test of a Measure of the Pupil Control Ideology of Public School Professional Staff Members," (unpublished D. Ed. thesis, Pennsylvania State University, 1965), pp. 22-24.

teacher-pupil relationships. Humanistic orientation leads teachers to desire a democratic atmosphere with two-way communication that flows spontaneously.

Demonstration--A mass gathering of students at a particular place on the campus for the purpose of expressing disapproval is considered to be a demonstration.

Dogmatism--It refers to the general degree of open and closed mindedness; thus, high dogmatism is synonymous with closed mindedness and low dogmatism is synonymous with open mindedness.[1]

High Schools--The high schools may include any of the following grade combinations: 7-12; 8-12; 9-12; or 10-12; depending upon the organizational structure of the local school.

An Open Minded Individual--An open minded individual perceives the world as a friendly place; he is not fearful of the future. There is an absence of the need to ward off threat. The personality characteristics of the open minded individual appear to be consistent with a client control ideology which stresses an atmosphere where behavior is examined in psychological and sociological terms, not moralistic terms; an atmosphere where client will be self-disciplined rather than disciplined; an atmosphere where a democratic climate with its flexibility in rules and regulations prevails; and an atmosphere that fosters friendliness and optimism.[2]

---

[1]Hoy, op. cit., p. 5.

[2]Hoy, Ibid., p. 30.

Sit-in--A group of students occupying a given facility or outdoor area on the campus refusing to allow the ordinary flow of traffic and function is classified as a sit-in.

Student-Participation--Student participation may be through formal student organization on a permanent basis, or it may be informal and on ad hoc basis. Participation implies that the students are involved, either directly or through peer representatives in determining those policies, regulations, and practices which affect student academic, personal, and social behavior in the school.

School Management--The term school management has been preferred to school administration or school government. School management includes all the operations in a school which directly or indirectly regulate the conduct of students in the school. The term student participation in "school management" is more commonly used than the term "student government" as is pointed out by Elicker. He states:

> The fact that the phrase, "student participation" in the management of the school has replaced the term "student government" is mute evidence that school administrators have not in the least relinquished their final responsibility for control of the school, although they recognize the advantages of delegating to students some participation in the management of the school.[1]

---

[1]Paul E. Elicker, "The Development of the Student Participation Movement," in The Student Council in the Secondary School, (Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1955), p. 1.

Student Unrest--"Student unrest" is a phenomenon which comes to the notice of society as a mass protest. In the present study, this term has been used to signify any form of mass protest such as "boycott," "demonstration," "sit-in," or "walk-out."

INSTRUMENTS USED

The following instruments were used in the study:

1. A questionnaire seeking information about the school. (Appendix X)

2. A "Rating Scale for Student Participation in School Life" was prepared, FORM SPSL (Appendix VII), using the criteria given in Evaluative Criteria,[1] and adding a few more criteria signifying emerging areas of student involvement in school management on the basis of review of literature on this subject. One more criterion developed by Wahler was included. The criterion is: The student council has status as the spokesman for the student body in cooperative relations with the administration.[2]

---

[1] Evaluative Criteria, (Washington, D. C.: National Study for Secondary School Evaluation, 1960), pp. 242-45.

[2] A. G. Wahler, "The Development of Evaluative Criteria for Student Participation in School Government in Private High Schools," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1967), p. 146.

3. The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale[3] Form E was used to determine open or closed mindedness of teachers (Appendix IX).

4. Measure of pupil control ideology (Form CI) prepared by Eidell. (Appendix VIII)

Rokeach Dogmatism Scale--This is a forty item instrument and yields score on seven point scale. To obtain a dogmatism score, the constant +4 was added to the algebraic value of each item; hence, each score was converted into a positive number ranging from one to seven. The sum of these forty converted scores yielded a dogmatism score ranging from 40 to 280.[2]

Odd-even reliability for the English Colleges sample was 0.81 and 0.78 for the English worker sample. In other samples subsequently tested at Michigan State University, Ohio State University, and at a VA domiciliary, the reliabilities ranged from .68 to .93.[3] Regarding validity Rokeach states; "We have demonstrated thus far that our scales perform essentially the same diagnostic function as those performed by the comparable Berkley scales. It is, therefore, premature to conclude from the data that the Dogmatism and Opinionation Scales are general measures.[4]

---

[1]Milton Roheach, The Open and Closed Mind, (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960), pp. 35-108.

[2]Milton Rokeach, op. cit., p. 88.

[3]Milton Rokeach, op. cit., p. 89.

[4]Ibid., p. 107.

The Rokeach Dogmatism Scale has been used in many research studies. Bridge found, "teachers express significantly more positive attitudes toward principals with low score on the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale than toward principals who have higher scores."[1] Bridge concluded, "the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale shows promise for studying the attitudes of teachers toward their work situation."[2] Erickson[3] and later Croft[4] used the RDS as a measure of personality structure and perception. McCarthy, Ehrilich, Adams and others have also indicated that the RDS has been a useful tool in the measurement of certain aspects of personality structure.[5]

---

[1]Edwin Bridge, "Teacher Participation in the Decision Making: Interaction of Personal and Situational Variables," (unpublished Ph. D. thesis, University of Chicago, 1964), p. 43.

[2]Ibid., p. 68.

[3]Eldridge Albert Erickson, "A Study of the Relationship between Personality Structure and Perception," (unpublished Ed. D. thesis, Colorado State College, 1962).

[4]John C. Croft, "Open and Closed Mindedness and Perceptions of Leader Behavior," (unpublished D. Ed. thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, 1964).

[5]Wayne Kolter Hoy, "Dogmatism and the Pupil Control Ideology of Public School Professional Staff Members,' (unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1965), pp. 16-20.

Pupil Control Ideology Scale--It is an adaptation[1] of Gilbert and Levinson's "Custodialism Humanism Scale" by Eidell.[2] The instrument consists of 20 items. Split-half reliability coefficient is .9095 (.9526 corrected by Spearman Brown formula). Validity of this instrument was determined by asking the principals to identify their most custodial and humanistic teachers. A t-test of the difference of the means between those teachers the principals identified as custodial and those identified humanistic was found to be significant at .01 level. Hoy used this scale to verify the hypothesis that the pupil control ideology of closed minded teachers is significantly more custodial than the pupil control. ideology of open minded teachers.[3] Chesler used it in the project, "Conflict Intervention in the Secondary School."[4]

---

[1] Doris C. Gilbert and Daniel J. Levinson, "Custodialism and Humanism in Mental Hospital Structure and in Staff Ideology," in Milton Greenblatt et al, editors, The Patients and the Mental Hospital, (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1957), pp. 20-34.

[2] Eidell, op. cit., pp. 41-53.

[3] Hoy, op. cit.

[4] Mark Chesler, Teacher Questionnaire, Project "Conflict Intervention in Secondary Schools," (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, The University of Michigan, 1968), pp. 11-12.

RATING SCALE FOR STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL LIFE

A list of thirty criteria of student participation in school management was prepared (Appendix V). The first nine criteria in this list were taken from Evaluative Criteria.[1] The tenth criterion was taken from Wahler's study.[2] These proposed criteria were mailed (for letter see Appendix IV) to sixty-six members of the graduate faculty of the School of Education of The University of Michigan for evaluation as suitable criteria on a four point scale--highly important, important, unimportant, and no opinion. Thirty-seven evaluations were returned. The results of these evaluations are shown in Table 1.

Criterion 20 was held important by less than fifty percent experts and was, therefore, rejected. On the basis of comments by the experts some of the criteria were modified as follows:

Criterion 5. "Decide" was changed to "advise" to read as follows:

Students advised what student organizations should be instituted in the school.

Criterion 7. The phrase "by the school administration" was added and the criterion was changed to:

---

[1]Evaluative Criteria, op. cit.

[2]Wahler, op. cit.

TABLE 1

EVALUATION OF PROPOSED CRITERIA BY EXPERTS

CRITERIA	PERCENT HI	I	U	NO
1. Students participate in a representative form of student government, such as a student council	83.7	13.5	2.7	0
2. Any student may be a candidate as an officer in student government if he possesses the qualifications stated in the constitution and bylaws of the representative government	75.6	10.8	10.8	2.7
3. Officers of student government are elected by the entire student body or representatives of the entire student body	83.7	10.8	2.7	2.7
4. Student representatives assist the faculty and administration in developing school policies with regard to student conduct.	81.0	16.2	2.7	0
5. Students decide as to what student organizations should there be in the school	51.3	37.8	8.1	2.7
6. Students plan and execute the programs of student organizations	72.9	18.9	8.1	0
7. Students are delegated authority for student publications including review and censor	40.5	40.5	10.8	8.1
8. Students have a voice in determining who shall receive non-academic honors	56.7	27.0	16.2	0
9. Students plan and execute programs to introduce new students to school life and activities	56.7	24.3	16.2	2.7

TABLE 1--Continued

CRITERIA	PERCENT HI	I	U	NO
10. Student representatives act as the spokesmen for the student body in cooperative relations with the administration	72.9	27.0	0	0
11. Student representatives participate in developing grievance procedures	64.8	35.1	0	0
12. Student officers are consulted when selecting students to represent the school in summer workshops, district, state and national meetings	37.8	37.8	16.2	8.1
13. Students select speakers for the general assembly programs	32.4	48.6	16.2	2.7
14. Students are members on grievance committees	70.2	27.0	2.7	0
15. Students are consulted regarding the course offerings in the school	27.0	54.0	18.9	0
16. Students evaluate the way the courses are taught	40.5	37.8	10.8	8.1
17. Each student decides his own courses	20.3	29.7	21.6	20.3
18. Students evaluate the food service	21.6	56.7	21.6	0
19. Students evaluate the library service	35.1	51.3	13.5	0
20. Students evaluate the secretarial or office service	10.8	27.0	51.3	10.8
21. Students evaluate the guidance service	37.8	48.6	10.8	2.7
22. Students evaluate the transportation (bus) service	18.9	51.3	27.0	2.7
23. Students are consulted regarding the school schedule	18.9	62.1	13.5	5.4

TABLE 1--Continued

CRITERIA	PERCENT HI	I	U	NO
24. Students evaluate their own performance in subject matter areas	32.4	35.9	16.2	5.4
25. Students convey suggestions concerning school affairs to the faculty	62.1	35.1	2.7	0
26. Students convey grievances concerning school affairs to the faculty	62.1	32.4	5.4	0
27. Students convey suggestions concerning school affairs to the administration	62.1	37.8	0	0
28. Students convey grievances concerning school affairs to the administration	56.7	40.5	2.7	0
29. Faculty meetings are open to student representatives	27.0	35.1	18.9	18.9
30. There are student-faculty-meetings in which students are equal members	51.3	27.0	21.6	0

Students are delegated authority by the school administration for student publications including review and censor.

Criterion 11. The phrase "for students" was added and the criterion was changed to:

Student representatives participate in developing grievance procedures for students.

Criterion 14. The word "student" was added to change the criterion to:

Students are members on student grievance committees.

Criterion 17. The phrase "within bounds of state law and college entrance requirements" was added to "Each student decides his own courses."

Criterion 24. The phrase "contribute to evaluation of" was added and the criterion became:

Students contribute to evaluation of their own performance in subject matter areas.

Criterion 29. The phrase "for student affairs" was added and revised statement of the criterion was:

Faculty meetings for student affairs are open to student representatives.

The following three criteria were added on the basis of suggestions of experts:

1. Student opinion is respected by faculty and administration.

2. Orientation and training programs are planned to prepare students for participation.

3. All groups of students have a fair chance of being represented in the student government.

Try-out of the Validated Criteria of Student Participation in School Life--The revised version of the rating scale for Student Participation in School Life (Appendix VI) was administered to sixty students of the ninth grade of a junior high school. On the bases of the reaction of a high school principal and the suggestions of students the following changes were made:

1. A new category of response "rarely" was added.

2. In criterion 2, the phrase "the constitution and the bylaws of the representative government" was replaced by "the constitution of the student government."

3. In criterion 5, the word "instituted" was eliminated and the wording was modified to: Students advise what student organizations there should be in the school.

4. In criterion 6, the word "execute" was replaced by "carry out."

5. In criterion 7, the word "given" was added in parenthesis after "delegated," and the last phrase "including review and censor" was deleted.

6. In criterion 8, an addition of "e. g., in dramatics, debating, etc. "was made.

7. In criterion 9, the word "execute" was replaced by "carry out."

8. In criterion 10, the word "school" was added before "administration."

9. In criterion 11, the phrase "grievance procedures for students" was replaced by "procedures to rectify grievances of students (to correct wrongs done to students)."

10. In criterion 15, the phrase "course offerings" was replaced by "courses to be offered."

11. In criterion 17, "state law" was changed to "state regulations."

12. In criterion 20, "guidance service" was changed to "guidance and counseling service."

13. In criterion 24 and 26, "convey" was changed to "give."

14. In criterion 25, "convey grievances to the faculty" was replaced by "tell the faculty their grievances (hardships)."

15. In criterion 26, "convey grievances to the administration" was changed to "tell the administration their grievances (hardships)."

16. In criterion 31, "participation" was changed to "participation in school activities."

COLLECTION OF THE DATA

Sufficient copies of the instruments for the collection of the data along with directions for collecting the data (Appendix XI), were mailed to the fourteen schools that expressed willingness to participate in the study. A letter (Appendix XII) was mailed under a separate cover informing about the package and soliciting cooperation. A maximum of twenty-five and a minimum of half of the teachers of the senior class were selected to respond to each of the opinionnaires--RDS Form E and Form CI. In schools having a track system, students of three English sections, including one from each track, were requested to respond to the Form SPSL. In schools not having a track system, students of any three senior English sections were selected.

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

RDS Form E and Form CI were scored manually. The responses of students on Form SPSL were transferred to IBM cards by key punch operations--one card for each student. The letter responses "a, o, s, r, n" were converted into numerical responses "4, 3, 2, 1, 0" respectively.

The facilities of The University of Michigan Computing Center were utilized to process and print the results of the data punched on the IBM cards.

Significance of the difference between the means of each matched pair and for schools-u and schools-n as groups were computed. In case of Form SPSL mean score of each school was calculated for each item and "t" ratios found for each matched pair as well as for the two groups--schools-u and schools-n. Intercorrelations were computed to study the relationships between the items of SPSL.

Analysis of the data is presented in Chapter III.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Elicker states that student government in ancient Greece was a reality. The president or leader of the school was in the first instance nominated by the founder; afterwards the office was generally filled by election.[1] During the intervening centuries Smith draws attention to Vittorino da Feltra (1428), Valentino Trotzendorf (1531), Joseph Lancaster (1797), Planta (1760), Fellenburg (1825), Froebel (1816), and Hill (1825),[2] as exponents of student participation. Tracing the history of student participation in this country, Frederick points out:

> As early as the eighteenth century the college of William and Mary (1779) and the William Penn Charter

---

[1]Theodor Gomperz, Greek Thinkers, A History of Ancient Philosophy, Vol. III, (London: J. Murray Publishing Company, 1905), p. 272 quoted in The Student Council in the Secondary School, (Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1955), p. 2.

[2]Joe Smith, Student Councils for Our Times, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951), p. 2.

> School (1777) were experimenting with rudimentary forms of student government, as were Eton and Rugby (1786) in England.[1]

But according to Elicker early New England high schools provided meagerly for participation of students in school government. He adds:

> It was not until 1825 that a really notable example was recorded when a New York school adopted a monitorial system. The Temple School in Boston furnished another early example in 1834. Here the pupils elected a superintendent from among their number, and they became subject to his control. Probably the best example of student government in the earlier years of the history of American Secondary schools was that of the Hartford Public High School, Connecticut, in 1852. . . .In 1897, Wilson L. Gill introduced a form of self government known as a "school city" in the Norfolk Street Vacation School, New York City. . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The early proponents of so called self-government, however, recognized a certain degree of difference between constitutional authority and delegated authority. These men blazed a trail for the participation of students in the management of activities in which adolescents as chief participants, were most vitally concerned.[2]

---

[1]Robert Wendell Frederick, Student Activities in American Education, (New York: The Center of Applied Research in Education, 1965), p. 6.

[2]Paul E. Elicker, "The Development of the Student Participation Movement," in The Student Council in the Secondary School, (Washington, D. C.: N. A. S. S. P., 1955), pp. 3-4.

The number of schools experimenting with some form of student participation gradually increased. It was reported that in 1941, 91.9 percent of the schools sampled had some form of student participation.[1] The National Association of Student Officers was formed in 1931; its name was changed in 1940 to the National Association of Student Councils.[2] There were about 10,000 NASC member schools in 1967.[3]

The impact of the student participation movement on educators may be noted from the fact that Encyclopedia of Educational Research, published in 1960, contained no article or sub-article on "student participation," "student councils," or "self government in education." The Encyclopedia of Educational Research published in 1941, however, has the following observations:

> In some school systems, democracy in administration is extended to include the pupils. In such an organization pupils participate with teachers and administrators to formulate and execute school policies. While it should be recognized that pupils may not participate to the extent nor always in the same area as the teachers or administrators, the plan seeks to utilize and develop the

---

[1]Harry C. McKown, The Student Council, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1944), pp. 14-15.

[2]"The NASC: How it Began--How it Grew--What it Does," Student Life Highlights, XI (September, 1967), 10.

[3]Ibid., p. 11.

> contributions of pupil leaders in the administration of the schools. Fundamentally, it serves to foster in the student body a sense of belonging and participation in the work of the school. Pupil participation is frequently secured through the organization of a student council.[1]

Student government was a reality in ancient Greece and there had been exponents of student participation in school government during the past seven centuries. At present almost all public schools have some student organization to foster in the student body a sense of belonging and participation in the work of the school. But no data are available regarding the problems faced by such organizations.

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

Student participation in school management receives support from the fact that "democracy" is the American way of life. According to Tompkins, "The desire of the principal to share the management of the school with the teachers, pupils, and patrons is without doubt the single most important factor in democratic administration."[2]

---

[1] Walter C. Reusser, "Administration, School," in Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed., by Walter Scott Monroe, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941), p. 15.

[2] Ellsworth Tompkins, "What are Good Techniques in Achieving Democratic Administration of the High School," National Association of Secondary School Principals, Bulletin, XXXIII (April, 1949), 218.

Dewey[1] has emphasized that democratic tenet is participation of each individual in the formation of the values that regulate the common life of the group. Weber and Weber qualify participation as follows:

> Leadership should guarantee the rights to participate in planning to children, parents, teachers, board members, non-professional employees, and citizens in direct proportion to the abilities of such groups to predict the results of their actions.[2]

Kilpatrick argues in defense of democratic methods of education without limitations suggested by Weber, He states:

> The critics of democratic educative processes have. . .stressed the ignorance, shortsightedness, and emotionality of children and have urged, therefore, the unwisdom of trusting any decisions to them. Such critics overlook two things: first, that common people (any people anywhere)

---

[1]John Dewey, "Democracy and Educational Administration," School and Society, CL (April 3, 1937), 457-62; in Francis M. Crowley, and F. Cleminson Geraldine, "The Role of Authority in Democratic Educational Administration," American School Board Journal, CIVL (June, 1963), 16.

[2]Clarence Adam Weber, and Mary E. Weber, Fundamentals of Educational Leadership, (New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955), p. 173.

> and children are quite able to reason with a high degree of reliability about things that really concern them. Their reasoning is in itself likely to be good, their weakness (where it exists) is largely in a present lack of knowledge and range of informed concern. They have the ability; they lack experience. Secondly, these critics overlook the capital fact that the way for their group to learn is to start practicing with what they now have. . . .
> . . . . . .
> Children as they grow older should, in proportion to their maturity, make--under wise guidance--conscious choice of their conduct.[1]

The concept of student participation in school management has been defended on the basis of democratic values. Children have the ability but they lack experience.

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN PRACTICE

On the extreme of total involvement of students in school management there is Summerhill School, a private school. Neill states about the school:

> Summerhill is a self-governing school, democratic in form. Everything

---

[1]William Heard Kilpatrick, Group Education for a Democracy, (New York: Association Press, 1940), pp. 26 and 108.

> connected with social, or group life, including punishment for school offenses, is settled by vote at the Saturday night General School Meeting.[1]

Experiments of delegating full responsibility to students in specific areas have been reported by Anderson[2] and Flanzer.[3] These experiments have more significance to administrators in public schools as these studies have been tried in schools with an enrollment many times more than forty-five--the enrollment at the Summerhill School, and they also were public schools.

Whittemore remarks about student participation in the classroom as follows:

> This era of "permissiveness" in the classroom (wherein the students gather round and plan their work with the haloed teacher standing by) is as unnatural for school as it is for postgraduation life. In our great democracy we choose people who will lead us. We authorize great power to our leaders, but we demand that they lead us.[4]

---

[1] A. S. Neill, Summerhill, (New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1960), p. 45.

[2] Stuart A. Anderson, "Where Students Maintain Their Own Government," Nation's Schools, LXVII (May, 1961), 71-74.

[3] Paul Flanzer, "How Students Maintain Their Own Discipline," School Management, VI (April, 1962), 68-71+.

[4] R. G. Whittemore, "Poor Discipline," Clearing House, XXXIV (May, 1960), 527.

Svoboda comments on the functioning of non-democratic student governments. He says:

> Many, perhaps most, student governments in schools today are operated in a manner that is inconsistent with the theory on which such activities are justified. . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> Frequently the consequences of non-democratic student governments are misunderstandings of democratic theory and processes, cynicism about the mistrust of school officials, and apathy about participation by the students themselves in democratically organized institutions.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> . . .The most important area of responsibility to be defined is that area where students are given autonomy in making decisions. School officials must set aside certain areas of policy making where the students can make the decisions that influence them, where the students are responsible for carrying out the decisions, and where the students have to live with the decisions--be they good or poor.[1]

Wahler points out that authority is delegated, and students have an opportunity to share in the democratic process by permission--not by any inherent "right."[2]

---

[1]William S. Svoboda, "Student Government: Contradiction in Theory and Practice," Social Education, XXX, (March, 1966), 179-80. For demarcation of the area of responsibility of student council, also see: The 1967 Student Council Yearbook, p. 91.

[2]Arthur Gerhardt Wahler , op. cit., p. 6.

Janzer gives the student reaction to phony student governments in the following words:

> Student government is the biggest put-on there is. We are encouraged to make decisions and then we must wait until someone else approves the decision.[1]

Brammer recommends that students should be delegated responsibility for their own affairs even if some risk is involved. But he warns that it must not be done through "sand-box government." He adds in the context of student unrest:

> We must not only permit but also encourage them to work on more real social problems and to experience these directly. They must have more opportunity in school to discuss freely any topic that concerns them--no matter how controversial or innovative.
>
> Students, teachers, and administrators must strive to listen to each other about matters which annoy and eventually alienate them from one another. Each should be willing to face up to the hypocrisy, inconsistency, and distortions in his own attitudes and behavior.[2]

---

[1] Nielsen, op. cit., p. 10.

[2] Lawrence M. Brammer, "The Coming Revolt of High School Students," Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, LII (September, 1968), 19-21.

Total involvement of students has been practicable in the small Summerhill School. Delegation of full responsibility to students in specific areas has also been successful. A few teachers feel that schools have gone too far in the direction of "permissiveness;" and quite often doubts are expressed by educators, sociologists and students regarding the intentions of administrators when they delegate responsibility to student governments.

THE CONCEPT OF PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT

Studies in industrial administration have provided psychological reasons for introducing participatory management. Gregg states:

> The classic studies conducted in the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company started a trend toward the end of this era of "scientific" management. Such studies indicated that the major problems of management are found in the realm of human relations rather than in technical process. . .The cooperative, rather than the manipulative, process is utilized in obtaining the contributions of personnel to the attainment of organizational goals. Personnel needs of members of the organization as well as organizational goals are recognized.[1]

Leavitt observes regarding the new theory of organization:

---

[1]Russell T. Gregg, "Administration," in Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed., by Chester W. Harris, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965), p. 21.

> The social psychologist has hit at the idea of influence, pointing out that any satisfactory theory of organization or management has to worry about influencing people instead of assuming that people automatically want to do what is best for management.[1]

Fundamentals of the new theory of management as stated by Argyris are given below:

> . . .it is important to point out that psychological energy is postulated thus:
>
> 1. It exists in all individuals.
>
> 2. Its expression cannot be blocked permanently. If a barrier is placed on its expression, it will find a way to overcome the barrier or to get around it.
>
> 3. Its amount varies with the "state of mind" of the individual. The amount is not fixed nor is it limited.[2]
>
> We may hypothesize that the more rigidity, specialization, tight control, and directive leadership the worker experiences, the more he will tend to create antagonistic activities. . .developing a new organization that has equal power.[3]

---

[1] Harold J. Leavitt, Managerial Psychology, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958), p. 298.

[2] Chris Argyris, op. cit., p. 22.

[3] Ibid., p. 31.

> With trust, the management may tend to feel less a need to develop tight control mechanisms, thereby creating greater opportunity for psychological success.[1]
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The organic organization is variously called "participative group" (Likert), "problem solving" (Bennis), "human relations" (Litwak), "and "Theory Y" (McGregor). The organic organization is characterized by (1) decision making widely done throughout the organization, (2) an emphasis on mutual dependence and cooperation based on trust, confidence, and high technical or professional competence, (3) a constant pressure to enlarge tasks and interrelate them so that the concern for the whole is emphasized, (4) the decentralization of responsibility for and use of information, rewards and penalties, membership, (5) participants at all levels being responsible for developing and maintaining loyalty and commitment at as high a level as possible, and (6) an emphasis on status through contribution to the whole and intergroup and interindividual cooperation. Such an organization assumes that people are capable of being responsible, committed, productive, and desire a world in which the rationality of feelings and interpersonal relationship is as valued as cognitive rationality.[2]

These emerging concepts in the field of business management and social psychology emphasizing trust, mutual dependence and status need testing in educational--school--setting.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 59.

[2] Ibid., p. 185.

RELATED RESEARCH

The following observations refer to an earlier period in the history of student councils:

> . . ., student councils were allowed to discuss school policies and programs but could take little or no action leading to their modification. It was common during this period, however, for administrators to assign their councils tasks which no one wished to do--these tasks included supervision of corridor conduct of students, traffic safety outside the school building and other police and regulatory duties--pursuance of which frequently resulted in negative student attitude toward student councils.[1]

These remarks raise an important issue--involvement of students in the performance of regulatory duties. In the absence of substantiating data the above statements are unverified hypotheses.

Kelley conducted a survey in 1941 and reported that of 1,904,775 students in schools answering his survey, 91.9 percent were in schools maintaining some form of student participation.[2] Nancarrow's study in

---

[1]Franklin A. Miller, James H. Moyer, and Robert B. Patrick, Planning Student Activities, (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1957), p. 216.

[2]Earl C. Kelley, "Student Cooperation," The Education Digest, VI (March, 1941), 45-49.

1940 supported Kelley's hypothesis that adult and student purposes for student councils differ widely.[1] Vanderlip established standards of a good council in 1945.[2] The Citizenship Education Study was initiated in Detroit in 1945 and it was reported that the practice of assigning a regulatory function to the student council was found to exist in at least two of the eight high school studied.[3]

Smith's study, conducted in 1947-48, was directed to find answers to the following questions:

1. What, actually, is the student council, in terms of what it does?

2. What should the student council ideally be; what would it be if its educational effectiveness were fully realized?

3. What gaps exist between theory and practice, between reality and ideality?

---

[1]James E. Nancarrow, "The Student Council in Pennsylvania," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1940), as quoted by Weaver, p. 22. (see p. 69)

[2]Robert G. Vanderlip, "The Student Council in American Secondary School: Criteria and Instruments of Evaluation," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, Washington, D. C., 1945). Also "Standards of a Good Student Council," The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXVIII, (October, 1944), 105-114.

[3]Arnold R. Meier, Florence D. Cleary, and Alice M. Davis, A Curriculum for Citizenship, (Detroit, Michigan: Wayne State University Press, 1952), p. 176.

4. What means hold promise for overcoming such gaps, hold promise for making the high school student council more educationally effective?[1]

Some of the answers discovered by Smith are:

> If any generalization on gap is possible, it is that the council is considered not as a learning device but as an extra in the school, operating in the area of activities. The purpose reflects this: it is generally stated in such a manner as to imply that through the council the school is getting something extra. The functions reflect this: the great emphasis on discipline and internal organization tend to remove youngsters from creative operation in the more important learning areas in the school. The position reflects this: the place of the council is delegated and restricted, and that position is not at all illogical so long as the council is conceived of as a compartment for teaching citizenship or as an agency for discipline and control.[2]

It may be pointed out that Smith's report does not contain statistically treated quantitative data.

---

[1] Joe Smith, Student Council for Our Times, (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951), p. 2.

[2] Ibid., pp. 74-75.

Hildreth evaluated student councils in Southern California in 1949. He found that the positive aspects of council operation such as school service projects are being given increasing attention in the high schools of California, while negative aspects control and policing are being given less attention.[1]

Fisher evaluated student council programs in 1956 in Connecticut. His questions were:

1. Do you regard student council potentially important part of the educational experience of the pupil?

2. If yes, is its value primarily in reducing discipline problems in the schools?

3. Or, is it primarily in developing competency in democratic government?[2]

With questions so obviously loaded in favor of the correct response, it is not surprising that questions

---

[1]Elon E. Hildreth, "A Critical Evaluation of the Student Councils in the High Schools of California," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1956), as quoted by Weaver, p. 16. (see p. 69)

[2]William T. Fisher, "A Critical Evaluation of Student Council Programs in Selected Public High Schools of Connecticut," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1956), as quoted by Weaver, p. 16. (see p. 69)

one and three were favored overwhelmingly.[1]

Weaver's study based on data collected in 1958-59 reported the primary aims of student councils in the high schools of Michigan as follows:

> Encourage participation in the affairs of the school by the students
>
> Provide an organization through which student opinions, interests and desires may be conveyed to staff of the school
>
> Create a harmonious relationship between faculty and students
>
> Gain support of the total student body in solving problems of the school
>
> Provide a central clearing house for coordinating student activities[2]

---

[1] Donald Clifford Weaver, "Primary Aims and Appropriate Activities of Michigan Public Secondary School Student Councils," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1961), p. 16.

[2] Ibid., pp. 74-75.

Weaver also discovered:

> Activities which make the greatest contribution toward the implementing of the primary aims of the student council, namely, "assisting in policy formulation," and "planning an orientation program for the school" are sponsored in fewer than 25 percent of the Michigan secondary schools sampled.
>
> Furthermore, such activities as "supervision of school elections, "publication of a student handbook," and "participation in adult community projects" were considered by national experts to be highly contributory to the primary aims of the student councils, yet, these activities were also reported as council activities in fewer than 25 percent of Michigan secondary schools.[1]

Vredevoe reported a study in 1959 on the basis of responses of students who were questioned about the practices which they believed created the best relationship. The following practices were mentioned in the order of their frequency:

1. Interpreting the reasons and purposes of the rules
2. Fairness in enforcement
3. Treatment which recognizes maturity of student

---

[1] Ibid., p. 112.

4. Consistency in enforcement

5. Enforcement without embarrassment whenever possible

6. Obedience of rules by teachers

7. Opportunity to participate in making rules in areas where students are capable.[1]

Kounin and Gump studied children's concept of school misconduct and discovered:

> . . .as compared with children who have non-punitive teachers, children who have punitive teachers: manifest more aggression in their misconducts, are more unsettled and conflicting about misconduct in school, are less concerned with learning and school-unique values, show some, but not consistent, indication of a reduction in rationality pertaining to school misconduct.[2]

---

[1] Lawrence E. Vredevoe, "Practices in School Discipline," American School Board Journal, CXXXIX (July, 1959), 21.

[2] Jacob S. Kounin and Paul V. Gump, "The Comparative Influence of Punitive and Non-punitive Teachers upon Children's Concepts of School Misconduct," Journal of Educational Psychology, LII (February, 1961), 44-49.

STUDIES IN THE SIXTIES

Eight studies have been done during the last five years which have bearing on the present investigation. Three studies deal with student councils; one study is directed toward the development of the evaluative criteria for student participation in school government; one study is aimed at discovering the relationship between dogmatism and pupil control ideology of the school staff; and the last one is a study of student participation in policy making and the use of direct action at the midwest universities.

Frank discovered in 1964 that participation in planning and decision making was not a significant factor in pupil morale where as student "attitude toward group and its policies" was found to be a highly significant factor.[1]

A study conducted by Educational Testing Service in 1964-65 revealed that school size was often a factor influencing the extent of protest activity.[2]

---

[1]Robert L. Frank, "A Study of Specific Factors which will Differentiate between Schools Possessing Higher and Lower Pupil Morale," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1964), p. 230.

[2]Thomas David Aceto, "Student Participation in Policy-Making and the Use of Direct Action at the Midwest CIC Universities," (unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1967), p. 35.

Detwider investigated the status, role and relationship to school administration of junior high student council. He states:

> . . .most sponsors indicated that their councils had emphasized council objectives in the following order: (1) school welfare, (2) citizenship, (3) leadership, (4) student expression, (5) school management.
> . . . . . .
> According to most council members, the success of the student council was influenced by the attitude, support, and interest demonstrated by the sponsors and the faculty.
> . . . . . .
> Several authorities indicated that the ability of junior high students was underestimated by administrators and teachers. . ."Shared" concept of responsibility and control was the principal philosophy governing student participation in the administration and operation of the junior high school.[1]

Harper studied student councils in Ohio and found:

> Student council functions do not tend to be of such a nature that, through them, it is possible for students, by applying democratic means, to participate in maintaining and improving an environment in which freedom of

---

[1]Thomas Patrick Detwider, "The Junior High Student Council: Status, Role, and Relationship to School Administration," (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1965) Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI: 5809.

> of each individual is tempered by equality for all.
>
> The functions of student councils as practiced do not involve students in activities that require the recognition of democratic ends, and the provision of opportunities to apply democratic means to achieve them.
>
> The position of the student council in the administrative structure of the school tends to eliminate student participation in the real problems of the school, at all levels, and in all areas of school life.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> All aspects of intra-school communication are in need of improvement if student councils are to function at optimum level.[1]

Lekander[2] analyzed purposes, values and practices of student councils in southern California high schools. In his list of sixteen primary purposes, "democratic student government" occupies third place, "student faculty cooperation" ranks eighth and "training in democratic procedures" is ninth. His other findings are:

1. Student participation in school government is a firmly established practice in southern California high schools.

---

[1]James Arthur Harper, "Student Councils in Selected High Schools of Northern Ohio, (Western Reserve University, 1965). Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII: 69A.

[2]Lawrence Michael Lekander, "Student Participation in Secondary School Government: An Analysis of Purposes, Values, and Practices," (unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1967), p. 154.

2. The most important benefit is development of leadership.

3. Student participation in school government does not promote good citizenship in the degree predicted by major writers in the field.

4. Student participation in school government does not promote respect for democratic procedures and ideals in the degree predicted by major writers in the field.[1]

Wahler developed criteria for student participation in school government in private high schools under the administration of the Lutheran Church. He used all the criteria for "Student Participation in School Government" developed by National Study of Secondary Evaluation. He developed sixteen more criteria, twelve of them are church related or are suitable for residential schools only. One criterion that may be useful in this study is: "The student council has status as a spokesman for the student body in cooperative relations with the administration."[2]

---

[1] Ibid, p. 162.

[2] Wahler, op. cit., p. 147.

Aceto investigated "Student Participation in decision making and the use of direct action at midwest CIC universities." He found that: (1) the deans of students perceived the greatest amount of student involvement and the SDS presidents the least, (2) the deans and AWS presidents were generally satisfied with present student involvement, while other groups favored increased student involvement.[1] His findings regarding direct action are:

> For policy governing academic issues, direct action was perceived, by all but the SDS presidents, as being clearly inappropriate. . .For policy governing student personal and social behavior, direct action was perceived as being inappropriate by the deans, AWS presidents and editors; and viewed as appropriate by the AAUP presidents and SDS presidents. The student government presidents had no major opinion in this area of university policy. . . .
>
> . . . . . .
>
> The varying degrees of difference in the perceptions and attitudes between the deans of students and the student government presidents, AWS presidents and editors, relative to student participation in policy making and the appropriateness of direct action, suggests the potentiality for disagreement and conflict over certain aspects of these issues.

---

[1] Aceto, op. cit., p. 74.

> Student participation in policy making can be effective only to the extent that members of the faculty and administration welcome it in theory and in fact.
>
> A majority of students on the university campus today could probably be characterized as needing leadership rather than domination, desiring participation rather than obedience, and seeking involvement rather than alienation.[1]

Eidell developed and tested a measure of pupil control ideology of public school professional staff members. He discovered:

> The pupil control ideology of principals was less custodial than that of teachers; further, secondary teachers were more custodial than elementary teachers in their pupil control ideology. The pupil control ideology of more experienced teachers was found to be significantly more custodial than the pupil control ideology of less experienced teachers.[2]

Hoy conducted an investigation of relationship between dogmatism and the pupil control ideology of professional staff members of public schools. He verified the following hypotheses:

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 132-39.

[2] Hoy, op. cit., p. 72.

> The pupil control ideology of closed minded teachers will be significantly more custodial than the pupil control ideology of open minded teachers. The pupil control ideology of closed minded principals will be significantly more custodial than the pupil control ideology of open minded principals.
> . . . . . .
> Hypotheses of the present study were subjected to empirical tests;. . . these hypotheses were affirmed at a level of significance beyond 0.01.[1]

Hoy did not relate his findings to student unrest or student participation in school management.

SUMMARY

The concept of student participation in school government is as old as the academies in ancient Greece. Still, in the early nineteenth century, schools experimenting with rudimentary forms of student government were exceptions rather than the rule. But by 1940 almost all public schools had some student organization to promote in the student body a sense of belonging and participation in the work of the school.

Democracy and participatory management provide two conceptual bases for introducing some agency to share the management of the school with students. Children

---

[1]Wayne Kolter Hoy, "Dogmatism and the Pupil Control Ideology of Public School Professional Staff Members," (unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1965), pp. 8 and 70.

should be permitted to make conscious choice of their conduct in proportion to their maturity. In addition to learning organizational skills through first hand experience, students may not need tight control mechanisms to regulate their conduct. This, in turn, creates greater opportunity for psychological success.

There had been few qualitative studies of student participation. "Student participation in school management" is still in the empirical stage. There is no well defined theory to serve as the basis for student participation in school management; and in the absence of such a theory it is not possible to evaluate the performance of students in this area.

Even with whatever little participation students have in school life some teachers label this as the era of "permissiveness." But frequently the operation of student governments in schools is inconsistent with the theory on which such activities are justified. The consequences of non-democratic student governments are misunderstandings, cynicism about the mistrust of school officials, and apathy about participation by the students themselves. Experiments of delegating full responsibility to students in specific areas have been successful. But the number of such experiments is limited.

Nancarrow's study supported the hypothesis that adult and student purposes for student councils differ widely. But no study has been reported so far which may be directed to determine the objectives of a student council as perceived by students.

Student councils are still regarded as "extra" rather than an integral part of the total learning situation--the school. One of the primary aims of student councils as perceived by principals and other experts is "to encourage participation in the affairs of the school by the students." But in 1960 less than 25 percent of the Michigan secondary schools sponsored activities which make the greatest contribution toward "assisting in policy formulation," and "planning an orientation program for the school."

It has been found that attitude, support and interest of faculty influences the operation of a student council. There is an evidence that dogmatism of teachers has a positive relationship with their pupil control ideology. But there has been no study to discover any relationship between pupil control ideology of teachers and operation of student council or student participation in school management. In another study it has been found that pupil control ideology of secondary teachers is more custodial than that of the elementary teachers; and more experienced teachers are more custodial than the less experienced. The results of such studies indicate that role performance is based on role expectations of the organization and the need dispositions of the role incumbent.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

SELECTING SCHOOLS FOR THE STUDY

The information about schools that had disruption during 1968 was collected directly from each school by mailing a letter to 385 high schools in Michigan along with a coded reply postcard. Three hundred twenty eight schools responded--a return of 84.6 percent. Thirty of the sixty schools that had disruption were requested to participate in this study and seven of them agreed. Two schools-n were selected as matching schools for each school-u. Letters were mailed to these fourteen matching schools. Seven of them expressed willingness to cooperate in the study. Countywise analysis of this data is shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

COUNTYWISE DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS WITH UNREST, SCHOOLS GIVING NO RESPONSE AND SCHOOLS FARTICIPATING

(NUMBER OF SCHOOLS)

NAME OF COUNTY	UNREST	HAD TO BE CLOSED	NO RESPONSE	SCHOOLS-REQUESTED	PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS u	PARTICIPATING SCHOOLS n
Allegan	-	-	1	-	-	-
Bay	1	-	-	-	-	1
Berrien	4	1	2	1	-	-
Branch	-	-	1	-	-	-
Calhoun	3	-	-	1	1	-
Cass	-	-	1	-	-	-
Cheboygan	-	-	1	-	-	-
Chippewa	-	-	1	-	-	-
Eaton	-	-	1	-	-	-
Genesee	3	1	5	2	-	-
Gladwin	1	-	-	-	-	-
Grand Traverse	-	-	1	-	-	-
Ingham	1	-	2	1	-	-
Ionia	-	-	1	-	-	-
Iosco	1	1	-	1	1	-
Jackson	1	-	3	-	-	1
Kalamazoo	2	1	-	1	-	-
Kent	3	1	4	1	-	-
Lapeer	-	-	1	-	-	-
Lenawee	-	-	2	-	-	-
Livingston	2	-	1	1	-	-
Macomb	1	-	2	-	-	-
Marquette	-	-	1	-	-	-
Montcalm	1	-	-	-	-	-

TABLE 2 (Continued)

NAME OF COUNTY	UNREST	HAD TO BE CLOSED	NO RE-SPONSE	SCHOOLS-REQUESTED	PARTICIP-ATING SCHOOLS u	PARTICIP-ATING SCHOOLS n
Muskegon	2	-	-	-	-	-
Oakland	9	-	2	5	3	3
Oceana	-	-	1	-	-	-
Ottawa	1	-	2	-	-	-
Presque Isle	-	-	-	-	-	1
Saginaw	3	1	2	3	-	-
St. Clair	1	-	1	1	-	-
Washtenaw	5	2	-	4	-	-
Wayne	15	2	18	8	2	1
TOTAL:	60	10	57	30	7	7

The following facts may be noted from the above analysis:

1. Schools in 63 counties did not report the incidence of unrest during 1968.

2. Out of the remaining 20 counties, four counties--Wayne, Oakland, Washtenaw and Berrien, accounted for 50 percent of the reported unrest.

3. Forty-four of the 57 cases of no response were from the 12 counties in which one or more schools reported the incidence of disruption. Ten of the 22 Detroit high schools did not respond.

4. Nine of the 10 schools that had to be closed due to unrest declined to participate in this study.

MATCHING SCHOOLS FOR THE STUDY

The following criteria were used for matching schools-u and school-n: (1) enrollment of the school, (2) geographical location, (3) standard equalized valuation per resident member, and (4) current operating expenditure per pupil. Information about geographical location of schools-u and schools-n has been shown in Table 2. Schools-u participating in the study were from four counties--Calhoun, Iosco, Oakland and Wayne. Schools-n were from Bay, Jackson, Oakland, Presque Isle and Wayne Counties. Other data about the matched schools including the data obtained from the schools are shown in Table 3. The choices were limited in selecting matching schools, however, suitable matched

schools provided data for this study. It may be noted that the participating schools were mostly white schools. The highest number of Negro students is in school-n-2, a matching school without incidents of disruption. Eight schools had no Negro students and 12 schools had no negro teachers. This precluded racial factors from this study.

TABLE 3

MATCHED SCHOOLS FOR THE STUDY

SCHOOL	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT (hundreds)	SENIOR CLASS ENROLLMENT (hundreds)	PUPIL TEACHER RATIO	NEGRO STUDENTS PERCENT	NEGRO TEACHERS PERCENT	TEACHER RANK IN THE STATE (nearest10's)		
						SCHOOL DISTRICT SIZE	SEV PER RESIDENT MEMBER	CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURE
u-1	20	6	19.0	0.0	0.0	10	10	10
n-1	26	10	18.6	0.0	0.0	30	20	10
u-2	12	2	23.9	0.0	0.0	140	210	130
n-2	22	6	20.6	13.0	2.8	40	210	30
u-3	16	4	21.2	0.0	1.3	40	360	60
n-3	21	7	20.6	0.1	0.0	30	380	60
u-4	8	2	17.1	3.0	0.0	120	440	80
n-4	7	1	22.4	0.0	0.0	320	100	140
u-5	30	8	20.3	0.0	0.0	30	450	160
n-5	9	3	20.3	0.2	0.0	90	490	430
u-6	5	1	16.1	2.5	0.0	260	160	660
n-6	5	1	17.2	0.0	0.0	250	360	300
u-7	15	3	20.0	0.3	0.0	70	480	320
n-7	11	2	24.0	0.0	0.0	120	160	310
MEAN								
Schools-u	15.0	3.7	19.7	.8	.2	100	300	120
Schools-n	14.4	4.2	20.5	1.9	.4	120	240	180

ANALYSIS OF THE SCHOOLS THAT HAD UNREST

NUMBER OF PUPILS AND FINANCIAL DATA

The schools that reported unrest were analyzed on the basis of number of pupils in the school district, state equalized valuation per resident member and current operating expenditure per pupil.[1] This analysis is summarized in Table 4. Instead of using absolute values for making comparisons, ranks were used for categorizations, and this analysis revealed the following facts:

1. Thirty-one schools-u belonged to the 50 largest school districts in the state. No school-u belonged to the last 231 school districts, i. e., school districts with less than 2,500 pupils did not report any disruption.

2. The economic level of a school district as reflected by state equalized valuat'on per resident member may have had positive relationship ith the incidence of disruption. Fifty-one percent cases of reported disruption occurred among the top 150 school districts according to this criterion. Four out of the top seven school districts reported unrest.

3. Sixty-five percent of the schools-u belonged to the top 150 school districts in terms of current operating expenditure per pupil. Among the top 50 school districts, 44 percent had unrest and this constituted 36.6 percent of the total reported unrest in the state.

---

[1] Michigan Public Schools: Ranking of Michigan High School Districts by Selected Financial Data-1966-67, (Lansing: The State Board of Education, 1968)

TABLE 4

ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL DATA OF SCHOOLS U
(Number of Schools U)

RANKS	RANKS ACCORDING TO		
	NUMBER OF PUPILS IN SCHOOL DISTRICT	SEV PER RESIDENT MEMBER	CURRENT OPERATING EXPENDITURE PER PUPIL
1-50	31	7	22
51-100	7	20	7
101-150	8	4	10
151-200	3	5	7
201-250	4	8	3
251-300	7	3	2
301-350	-	5	4
351-400	-	3	2
401-450	-	1	1
451-500	-	4	1
501-531	-	-	1

School Size--Schools-u were categorized according to school size as follows:[1]

TABLE 5
SCHOOLS-U CATEGORIZED ACCORDING TO SCHOOL SIZE

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS-u	SCHOOL ENROLLMENT	NUMBER OF SCHOOLS-u
301-600	7	1801-2100	12
601-900	8	2101-2400	6
901-1200	8	2401-2700	2
1201-1500	7	2701-3000	1
1501-1800	5	3001 or more	4

[1]Michigan Education Directory, (Lansing: Michigan Education Directory, 1967-68), pp. 123-223.

Thirty out of 96 schools with enrollments of 1501 or more had experienced student disruption to schools whereas 418 schools with enrollments of less than 1500 also had only 30 schools with disruption.

Pupil Teacher Ratio--Data for this analysis were obtained from a publication of the Michigan Education Association.[1] The mean pupil teacher ratio for the high schools of Michigan was 24.7, the standard deviation being 1.02. Standard error of the mean for any 60 cases was 0.13. But mean pupil teacher ratio for 60 schools-u was 23.3, a difference of 1.4 from the mean for the state. Value of "t" being 10.77 showed that the difference was highly significant. The value of "t" should be 2.66 for one percent level of confidence.[2] Schools-u had significantly lower pupil teacher ratio.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS--ANALYSIS OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

The results of the analyses of five independent variables have been presented in Tables 4 and 5 to find an answer to the question, "What combination of independent variables of school district size, economic level of school district, current operating expenditure per pupil, school size and pupil teacher ratio has high correlation with the incidence of student unrest?" The findings are:

---

[1] Michigan Public School District Data, op. cit., pp. 2-67.

[2] Robert K. Young, and Donald J. Veldman, Introductory Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965), pp. 170 and 415.

1. The 50 largest school districts reported 51.7 percent of the disruption in the state. School districts with less than 2,500 pupils did not report any disruption.

2. School districts with higher state equalized valuation per resident member had more incidence of disruption than school districts with lower state equalized valuation per resident member.

3. School districts with higher current operating expenditure per pupil had more cases of reported disruption than school districts with lower current operating expenditure per pupil.

4. The higher the enrollment of a school, the greater was the number of cases of reported disruption.

5. The schools-u had significantly lower pupil teacher ratio than schools-n.

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS: STUDENT UNREST IS RELATED TO STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

The instrument used to collect the data utilized for testing this hypothesis was Form SPSL.[1] It consisted of 33 items, 32 of which were multiple choice. The possible responses to these 32 were, "always, often, sometimes, rarely, never." The last item was, "Please state any other activity

---

[1]See Appendix VII.

which could give you more participation in school life and has not been included in the list." Responses to the first 32 questions were assigned numerical values as follows:

4	3	2	1	0
always	often	sometimes	rarely	never

The maximum score on Form SPSL could be 128. Using program "BMDX70" of the Statistical Research Laboratory of the University of Michigan the following statistics were computed from student responses which had been transferred to IBM cards: (1) mean scores, (2) "t" value for the difference between means of schools-u and schools-n, (3) and probability for the computed "t" value. The values of these statistics were found for each matched pair and schools-u and schools-n as two groups. These statistics were also calculated for each item.

In order to establish the relationship between student unrest and student participation in school life, probabilities for obtained differences between means should be 0.05 or less.

Mean Scores of Students on Form SPSL--Mean scores of students on Form SPSL are shown in Table 6. The mean score of schools-n was slightly higher than the mean score of schools-u; the two means being 61.00 and 61.28 respectively. Probability for this difference was 0.81 and hence, the difference was not significant. Differences between the means of the matched pairs of schools were significant in five out of seven cases. In three cases (pairs 2, 5 and 6) mean score of school-n was higher than

TABLE 6

MEAN SCORES OF STUDENTS ON FORM SPSL

SCHOOL	n[1]	N	MEAN SCORE	DIFFERENCE $M_u - M_n$	"t" VALUE	PROBABILITY
u-1	-	86	60.08			
n-1		71	62.90	-2.82	-0.98	0.331
u-2	4	74	58.93			
n-2	2	94	64.47	-5.54	-1.99	0.048
u-3	1	85	71.93			
n-3	8	52	64.94	6.99	2.28	0.029
u-4	-	100	59.92			
n-4	7	89	59.73	0.19	0.07	0.94
u-5	5	53	59.92			
n-5	3	56	69.95	-10.03	-3.23	0.002
u-6	1	80	54.60			
n-6	1	92	61.04	-6.44	-2.00	0.047
u-7	2	69	61.35			
n-7	2	99	52.49	8.84	3.54	0.000
Schools -u	14	567	61.00			
Schools -n	23	533	61.28	-0.28	-0.24	0.81

[1]"n" means number of unusable questionnaires.

the mean score of school-u and in two cases (pairs 3 and 7) the situation was reversed. It may be pointed out that one school reporting unrest (u-3) had the highest mean participation score and one school reporting no disruption (n-7) had the lowest mean participation score.

On the basis of the above data, therefore, the hypothesis, cannot be accepted.

Itemwise Mean Scores of Students on Form SPSL-- In order to discover the items whose mean score may be significantly different, itemwise mean scores were computed. These data are presented in Table 7.

The difference in means were statistically significant for seven of the items. Schools-n had a higher mean score on items 7, 8, 13, and 16 whereas schools-u had a Hgher mean score on items 14, 17, and 25. Students of schools-n perceived a significantly higher participation in the following areas of school life:

Item 7. Students are delegated authority by the school administration for student publications.

Item 8. Students have a voice in determining who shall receive non-academic honors, e. g., in dramatics, debating, etc.

Item 13. Students select speakers for the general assembly programs.

Item 16. Students evaluate the way the courses are taught.

Students of schools-u perceived a significantly higher participation in the following aspect of school life:

Item 14. Students are members on student grievance committees.

Item 17. Each student decides his own courses within bounds of state regulations and college entrance requirements.

Item 25. Students tell the faculty their grievances (hardships) concerning school affairs.

TABLE 7

ITEMWISE MEAN SCORES OF STUDENTS ON FORM SPSL

ITEM	MEAN SCORE S_u	S_n	$MEAN_u - MEAN_n$	"t"	PROBABILITY
1.	2.47	2.56.	-0.09	-1.38	.17
2.	3.25	3.30	-0.05	-0.76	.45
3.	3.51	3.56	-0.05	-0.83	.41
4.	2.12	2.21	-0.09	-1.28	.41
5.	2.99	2.06	-0.07	-1.19	.24
6.	2.43	2.52	-0.09	-1.68	.095
7.	2.30	2.50	-0.20	-2.92	.004*
8.	1.03	1.23	-0.20	-3.05	.002*
9.	1.58	1.53	0.05	0.64	.52
10.	2.47	2.40	0.07	1.06	.29
11.	1.69	1.67	0.02	0.23	.82
12.	1.53	1.41	0.08	1.78	.08
13.	1.38	1.66	-0.28	-3.90	.000*
14.	2.13	1.84	0.29	3.47	.000*
15.	1.66	1.56	0.10	1.18	.24
16.	1.37	1.56	-0.19	-2.43	.016*
17.	3.24	3.02	0.22	3.68	.000*
18.	1.53	1.43	0.10	1.09	.28
19.	1.23	1.26	-0.03	-0.44	.66
20.	1.14	1.15	-0.01	-0.11	.91
21.	1.00	1.06	-0.06	-0.77	.45
22.	1.24	1.25	-0.01	-0.19	.85
23.	1.58	1.64	-0.06	-0.96	.34
24.	2.18	2.11	0.07	1.13	.26
25.	2.47	2.32	0.15	2.44	.015*

TABLE 7 (Continued)

ITEM	MEAN SCORE S_u	MEAN SCORE S_n	$MEAN_u - MEAN_n$	"t"	PROBABILITY
26.	2.23	2.14	0.09	1.29	.20
27.	2.09	2.04	0.05	0.78	.44
28.	1.34	1.31	0.03	0.41	.69
29.	0.96	1.01	-0.05	-0.67	.51
30.	1.85	1.78	0.07	0.94	.36
31.	1.95	1.98	-0.03	0.34	.73
32.	2.05	2.17	-0.12	-1.40	.16

*Probability less than .05.

The average response of students on the items of Form SPSL was 1.9, i. e., "sometimes." On three items--2, 3 and 17, the mean score was 3.0 or more indicating "often" participation. On 11 items, the mean score was 2.0 or more. There were 18 items with a score of less than 2.0 signifying rare participation. The pattern of responses was the same in schools-u and schools-n except for items 5 and 14. A reference has already been made to the statistically significant difference in the mean scores of item 14. The difference between the mean scores of item 5 was not significant.

Itemwise Differences Between Mean Scores of Matched Pairs of Schools. Data regarding "t" values and probabilities for the differences between itemwise mean scores for matched pairs of schools are presented in Table 8. In addition to

TABLE 8

FORM SPSL: "t" VALUES AND PROBABILITIES (P) FOR THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ITEMWISE MEAN SCORES OF MATCHED PAIRS OF SCHOOLS (M_u-M_n)

Item		Pair 1	Pair 2	Pair 3	Pair 4	Pair 5	Pair 6	Pair 7
1.	t	.03	1.73	-1.90	.08	-2.80	.18	-.70
	P	.98	.08	.06	.94	.005	.86	.49
2.	t	.64	2.86	-.29	-.91	-2.39	.43	-2.97
	P	.53	.005	.78	.37	.019	.003	
3.	t	-.52	1.01	-.82	1.78	-2.83	-.29	1.89
	P	.61	.32	.42	.08	.006	.78	.06
4.	t	-3.11	3.26	-.22	-1.81	-1.19	-4.59	3.65
	P	.002	.001	.83	.07	.24	.000	.000
5.	t	.30	1.65	-2.28	.10	-.88	-4.38	1.17
	P	.77	.10	.025	.92	.39	.000	.25
6.	t	-1.16	.57	-1.37	.44	-3.20	-1.34	.78
	P	.25	.58	.17	.67	.002	.18	.44
7.	t	-4.09	1.27	-1.17	3.17	-1.65	-2.43	-2.78
	P	.000	.21	.25	.002	.10	.016	.006
8.	t	-3.18	-.12	2.38	-4.35	-1.75	-1.87	.10
	P	.002	.91	.019	.000	.08	.06	.92
9.	t	-.48	-4.03	4.50	-1.000	-.77	.91	.47
	P	.63	.000	.000	.32	.45	.37	.64

TABLE 8 (Continued)

Item		Pair 1	Pair 2	Pair 3	Pair 4	Pair 5	Pair 6	Pair 7
10.	t	-.49	1.55	-.88	.80	-.41	-2.31	2.69
	P	.63	.12	.38	.43	.69	.023	.008
11.	t	-1.98	-.83	-1.29	-.93	-.13	-.40	4.50
	P	.050	.41	.20	.36	.90	.69	.000
12.	t	1.01	.17	-.63	.82	1.04	-3.91	5.78
	P	.32	.87	.53	.42	.30	.000	.000
13.	t	-1.45	-1.80	-.92	-3.05	-2.76	-5.50	3.34
	P	.15	.07	.36	.003	.007	.000	.001
14.	t	.04	-2.18	-1.28	1.71	-1.72	2.94	7.85
	P	.97	.031	.20	.09	.09	.004	.000
15.	t	-2.40	-2.16	2.54	2.55	-.63	.18	1.55
	P	.018	.033	.013	.012	.53	.86	.12
16.	t	.90	-3.68	1.31	-5.73	-2.40	2.82	.44
	P	.38	.000	.20	.000	.018	.005	.016
17.	t	-.38	3.42	1.55	4.00	-.06	.83	.20
	P	.71	.001	.13	.000	.96	.41	.85
18.	t	.29	.23	5.27	2.52	-5.33	-2.92	.99
	P	.77	.82	.000	.013	.000	.004	.33

TABLE 8 (Continued)

Item		Pair 1	Pair 2	Pair 3	Pair 4	Pair 5	Pair 6	Pair 7
19.	t	.53	-.86	2.70	-.46	-2.83	-2.59	1.78
	P	.60	.40	.008	.65	.006	.011	.08
20.	t	.45	-1.30	2.71	.86	-2.74	-2.14	1.44
	P	.65	.20	.008	.40	.008	.034	.16
21.	t	.71	-1.80	2.89	1.57	-4.60	-2.02	.45
	P	.48	.075	.005	.12	.000	.046	.67
22.	t	-.23	-.30	3.74	-.27	.07	-2.80	-.67
	P	.82	.77	.000	.79	.95	.006	.51
23.	t	1.38	-4.01	3.25	-1.46	-1.44	-.57	.27
	P	.17	.000	.001	.15	.16	.57	.79
24.	t	1.70	-3.37	2.09	.71	-.59	-.40	1.35
	P	.09	.001	.039	.48	.56	.70	.18
25.	t	1.79	-2.22	1.76	.61	-.58	1.70	2.14
	P	.08	.028	.08	.54	.57	.09	.034
26.	t	2.36	-2.46	.88	-.49	-.16	1.12	2.54
	P	.020	.015	.38	.63	.88	.27	.012
27.	t	1.74	-3.66	1.15	-1.99	-.87	.11	3.01
		.09	.000	.25	.048	.39	.92	.003

TABLE 8 (Continued)

Item		Pair 1	Pair 2	Pair 3	Pair 4	Pair 5	Pair 6	Pair 7
28.	t	-.50	-4.14	-.42	.25	-.35	1.80	2.74
	P	.62	.000	.68	.81	.73	.07	.008
29.	t	-.98	-4.86	1.82	.10	-1.13	-.56	2.50
	P	.33	.000	.07	.93	.26	.58	.014
30.	t	-1.81	.72	.77	.14	-.30	-.66	2.81
	P	.07	.48	.45	.89	.77	.52	.006
31.	t	-3.52	-5.19	2.33	.15	1.41	-1.35	2.68
	P	.000	.000	.022	.88	.16	.18	.008
32.	t	-2.03	.37	.84	-.22	-1.42	-2.36	.41
	P	.045	.71	.40	.83	.16	.020	.68

the significant differences in the mean scores of items 7, 8, 13, 14, 16, 17 and 25 mentioned earlier in the discussion of mean scores of schools-u and schools-n, it may be noted that there were significant differences in the mean scores of all the items for at least one of the matched pair group. Items 1, 3, and 6 show there was a significant difference in the mean score in one pair of schools--school-n having a higher mean score. For item 30 school-u had the higher mean score in pair 7. For items 5 and 32 the mean scores were significantly higher for schools-n in two pairs. The mean score was significantly higher for school-u in one pair and for school-n in another for items 9, 10, 11, 12, 22, 23, 24, 28, and 29. The mean scores were significantly different in three pairs for five items. The mean score of school-n was significantly higher in two pairs and lower in one pair for items 19, 20, 21, and 27. For item 26 school-u had a significantly higher mean score in two pairs and significantly lower in one pair. There was a significant difference in the mean scores in four pairs for items 4, 15, 18, and 31; for each of these items the mean score was significantly higher for schools-u in two pairs and significantly lower also in two pairs.

Schools-u had significantly higher mean scores in more pairs than schools-n for the following items:

Item 26. Students give the administration suggestions concerning school affairs. (2 schools-u and 1 school-n)

Item 30. Student-opinion is respected by faculty and administration. (1 school-u and 0 school-n)

Mean scores of schools-n were significantly higher for the following items in a greater number of matched pairs than schools-u:

Item 1. Students participate in a representative form of student government, such as a student council. (1 school-n and 0 school-u)

Item 3. Officers of student government are elected by the entire student body or representatives of the entire student body. (1 school-n and 0 school-u)

Item 5. Students advise what student organizations should be in the school. (2 schools-n and 0 school-u)

Item 6. Students plan and execute (carry out) the programs of student organizations. (1 school-n and 0 school-u)

Item 19. Students evaluate the library service. (1 school-n and 0 school-u)

Item 20. Students evaluate the guidance and counseling service. (2 schools-n and 1 school-u)

Item 21. Students evaluate the transportation (bus) service. (2 schools-n and 1 school-u)

Item 27. Students tell the administration their grievances (hardships) concerning school affairs. (2 schools-n and 1 school-u)

Item 32. All groups of students have a fair chance of being represented in the student government. (2 schools-n and 0 school-u)

Correlations of Item Scores with Total Score and Inter Correlations on FORM SPSL--Correlations of item scores with total score and inter correlations of item scores were computed in order to determine internal consistency of the FORM SPSL and discover closely related areas of school life. This information was helpful in interpreting the differences in itemwise mean scores. The calculations were done by using program "BMD2D" of the Statistical Research Laboratory of The University of Michigan. These data are presented in Table 9 and 10.

Correlations of item scores with the total score were less than 0.30 for items 1, 2, 3, and 17. Three of these items referred to participation in student government. These items were:

Item 1. Students participate in a representative form of student government, such as a student council.

Item 2. Any student may be a candidate as an officer in the student government if he possesses the qualifications stated in the constitution of the student government.

Item 3. Officers of student government are elected by the entire student body or representatives of the entire student body.

TABLE 9

CORRELATIONS OF ITEM SCORES WITH TOTAL SCORE ON FORM SPSL

ITEM NO.	CORRELATION	ITEM NO.	CORRELATION
1.	.26	17.	.29
2.	.22	18.	.57
3.	.25	19.	.63
4.	.52	20.	.60
5.	.45	21.	.57
6.	.40	22.	.54
7.	.37	23.	.53
8.	.41	24.	.55
9.	.53	25.	.49
10.	.55	26.	.54
11.	.52	27.	.48
12.	.47	28.	.50
13.	.45	29.	.58
14.	.47	30.	.60
15.	.53	31.	.53
16.	.51	32.	.49

This indicated that participation in student government was not an index of participation in other areas of school life.

Item 17 elicited response about participation in the selection of courses.

Score on Item 7 had a correlation of 0.37 with the total score. For the remaining 27 items these correlations were 0.40 or more.

TABLE 10

INTER CORRELATIONS OF ITEMS OF FORM SPSL

ITEM NO.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1.	1.0	.3	.2	.2	.1	.2	.2	.1	.1	.2	.1	.03	.1	.1	.1	.04
2.	.3	1.0	.2	.1	.1	.2	.2	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.01	.02	.04	.04
3.	.2	.2	1.0	.2	.1	.2	.2	.1	.1	.2	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.02
4.	.2	.1	.2	1.0	.4	.3	.3	.2	.2	.4	.4	.2	.2	.2	.2	.1
5.	.1	.1	.1	.4	1.0	.4	.3	.2	.3	.3	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2
6.	.2	.2	.2	.3	.4	1.0	.3	.2	.2	.3	.2	.1	.2	.2	.1	.1
7.	.2	.2	.2	.3	.3	.3	1.0	.2	.1	.3	.1	.1	.1	.1	.2	.1
8.	.1	.1	.1	.2	.2	.2	.2	1.0	.3	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2
9.	.1	.1	.1	.2	.3	.2	.1	.3	1.0	.3	.3	.3	.3	.2	.3	.2
10.	.2	.1	.2	.4	.3	.3	.3	.2	.3	1.0	.4	.3	.2	.2	.2	.1
11.	.1	.1	.1	.4	.2	.2	.1	.2	.3	.4	1.0	.3	.2	.4	.2	.2
12.	.03	.1	.1	.2	.2	.1	.1	.2	.3	.3	.3	1.0	.3	.3	.3	.1
13.	.1	.01	.1	.2	.2	.2	.1	.2	.3	.2	.2	.3	1.0	.3	.2	.2
14.	.1	.02	.1	.2	.2	.2	.1	.2	.2	.2	.4	.3	.3	1.0	.2	.2
15.	.1	.04	.1	.2	.2	.1	.2	.2	.3	.2	.2	.3	.2	.2	1.0	.4
16.	.04	.04	.02	.1	.2	.1	.1	.2	.2	.1	.2	.1	.2	.2	.4	1.0

TABLE 10 (Continued)

Item No.	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
1.	.2	.02	.04	.03	.02	.1	.1	.1	.1	.05	.03	.1	.1	.2	.1	.2
2.	.2	.04	.05	.03	-.01	.02	.03	.1	.1	.03	.04	.01	.02	.1	.04	.3
3.	.2	.04	.03	.01	.00	.1	.03	.1	.1	.03	.05	.01	.01	.1	.05	.3
4.	.1	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.4	.2	.3
5.	.1	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.1	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2
6.	.2	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.2	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.3	.2	.2
7.	.2	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.2	.1	.1	.1	.1	.2	.3	.2	.2
8.	.00	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.1	.1	.1	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2
9.	.04	.2	.3	.3	.2	.2	.3	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.4	.3	.3	.2
10.	.2	.2	.2	.2.	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.2	.3	.3	.3	.3	.3
11.	.1	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.3	.3	.3	.3	.3	.3
12.	.03	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.3	.3	.2	.2
13.	.1	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.3	.2	.2
14.	.1	.2	.2	.2	.2	.1	.2	.3	.3	.3	.3	.3	.2	.2	.2	.2
15.	.1	.3	.3	.3	.3	.5	.3	.3	.1	.2	.2	.3	.3	.3	.3	.2
16.	.1	.4	.4	.5	.4	.3	.4	.3	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.2	.2	.1

TABLE 10 (Continued)

Item No.	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32
17.	1.0	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1	.03	.1	.2	.1	.2
18.	.1	1.0	.7	.6	.6	.3	.3	.3	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.2	.1
19.	.1	.7	1.0	.8	.7	.4	.4	.3	.2	.3	.2	.2	.3	.3	.2	.2
20.	.1	.7	.8	1.0	.7	.3	.4	.3	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.3	.2	.2
21.	.1	.6	.7	.7	1.0	.4	.4	.3	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.2	.2	.1
22.	.1	.3	.4	.3	.4	1.0	.4	.3	.2	.2	.2	.3	.3	.3	.3	.2
23.	.1	.3	.4	.4	.4	.4	1.0	.4	.2	.3	.2	.3	.3	.3	.3	.2
24.	.1	.3	.3	.3	.3	.3	.4	1.0	.5	.5	.4	.2	.3	.3	.2	.2
25.	.1	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.5	1.0	.6	.6	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2
26.	.1	.2	.3	.2	.2	.2	.3	.5	.6	1.0	.7	.3	.3	.2	.3	.2
27.	.1	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.4	.6	.7	1.0	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2
28.	.1	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.2	1.0	.6	.3	.3	.2
29.	.03	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.3	.3	.2	.3	.2	.6	1.0	.4	.4	.3
30.	.2	.3	.3	.3	.2	.3	.3	.3	.2	.2	.2	.3	.4	1.0	.4	.4
31.	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.3	.2	.2	.3	.2	.3	.4	.4	1.0	.3
32.	.2	.2	.2	.2	.1	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.2	.3	.3	.4	.3	1.0

Intercorrelation of item scores with scores on items 1, 2, 3, and 17 were 0.20 or less except correlation of scores on items 1 and 2. The highest intercorrelations were between scores on items 18, 19, 20, and 21 (evaluation); the values being more than 0.6. Scores on items 24, 25, 26, and 27 (communication) had intercorrelations of 0.5 or more. These two clusters of items may be helpful in identifying "factors" of student participation.

Responses of Students to Item 33 and Other Comments on FORM SPSL.--Student responses to item 33 contained the following suggestions regarding the functioning of a student council:

> Letting homerooms know what the student council has done or is planning.
>
> Have interested students who are not representatives but sincerely interested attend meetings.
>
> To have pre-election meetings for all prospective candidates for offices to inform them of the responsibilities.
>
> Redefine what student council is supposed to do.

Students suggested the following activities which could give them more participation in school life:

geology courses, science club, hockey-
golf teams, coin and stamp club;

more rallies, more social trips, dress
up days;

more active drama club;
smoking privileges or smoking in the
Johns; smoking lounge;

legalize grass parties;

future teachers club;

a Spanish club;

future farmers of America;

a varied athletic season for both sexes;

tennis and golf club for girls;

girls sports--swimming, basket ball,
more music courses;

exchange student program;

some of those promised assemblies;

more meetings after school between students
where we could discuss sex, drink our seeds,
smoke our pot, take our pills;

Student Civil Liberties Union;

form a Student Democratic Society;

freedom of the press;

club concerned with conservation;

lunch hour recreation facilities and
the time to use them.

Students made general comments on participation in school life. A summary of these comments is given below.

I do not think we need more activities in which to participate but more participation in the activities which we have.

There should be more social activities to provide with leisure activities and it might possibly get the kids off the streets and help them become better citizens.

Perhaps one class period every week or two could be used to discuss student affairs. Then either the teacher or a student could report the class discussion at a student administration meeting.

More chances where the opportunity is given for students, faculty, and administration to meet together and discuss grievances, problems, and reasons behind previously taken action.

Rules must be enforced. Authorities should see that the students realize that they cannot break authoritative rules and laws and get by easily.

All students should meet and decide some of the things--school would run more smoothly.

Students should have more respect for the opinion of faculty and administration.

Open panels which could truly give all students a voice.

Student court; voice in setting up punishment for other students;

Students evaluate teachers; an opportunity for discussion with individual teachers.

Students on board of education; non-harassment by the boards;

> The administrators and students working together as they are now doing more often, and we, the students are feeling the results.

> Students should help select faculty members.

> Students should be able to do as they please with their free time; open campus.

Feelings of student powerlessness and apathy were reflected in the following statements:

> There seems to be a taboo on saying or showing what we really feel or think.

> I would like to know just what power the students in this school have.

> Power lies in a few people.

> School life is not my life, nor any other student's life.

> Unfortunately, going to school seems to interrupt the educational process.

> There is general student apathy because of school policy.

The following comments of students regarding the items in FORM SPSL may be helpful in revising this instrument for future use.

Item 15-23. What becomes of it (evaluation or suggestion)?

Items 24-27. Never heeded though.
If they will listen.

Item 30. Opinion respected but may not be used in making decisions.

Item 33. It should have been, "Do you, the student, care what is happening in student government, any other organization of a similar structure, or to your fellow students?"

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS: STUDENT UNREST IS RELATED TO CUSTODIAL PUPIL CONTROL IDEOLOGY OF TEACHERS

The data to test this hypothesis was secured through FORM CI. This instrument consisted of 20 multiple choice items and the possible responses were: "Strongly agree, agree, undecided, disagree, and strongly disagree." These responses were assigned numerical values according to the recommendation of the author of FORM CI as follows:

5	4	3	2	1
Strongly agree	agree	undecided	disagree	strongly disagree

This order was reversed for items 5 and 13. The maximum score on FORM CI could be 100; the higher the score, the more custodial the individual. After scoring the responses, the total scores were transferred to IBM cards. Using the program "BMDX70" of the Statistical Research Laboratory of The University of Michigan mean scores, "t" values for the difference between means of schools-u and schools-n, and probabilities for the obtained "t" values were computed. These statistics are given in Table 11. In order to establish the relationship between student unrest and custodial pupil control ideology of teachers, mean scores of teachers of schools-u should be higher than the mean scores of teachers of schools-n; and the differences between means should have probabilities of 0.05 or less.

In three matched pairs the mean scores of teachers of schools-u were higher than the mean scores of teachers of schools-n; and the probabilities for the differences between means were 0.05, 0.014, and 0.004 respectively. In two pairs, the mean scores of teachers of schools-u were higher than the mean scores of teachers of schools-n, the differences, however, were not statistically significant. In two pairs, the mean scores of teachers of schools-u were lower than the mean scores of teachers of schools-n but the means did not differ significantly.

The difference between the mean scores of teachers of schools-u and schools-n was 3.17, and "t" value was 2.58. The probability for this difference was 0.011.

On the basis of the above data, therefore, the hypothesis, "Student unrest is related to custodial pupil control ideology of teachers," can be accepted for all of the participating schools.

TABLE 11

MEAN SCORE OF TEACHERS ON FORM CI

SCHOOL	N	MEAN SCORE	DIFFERENCE $M_u - M_n$	"t"-VALUE	PROBABILITY
u-1	23	53.26			
n-1	20	48.15	5.11	2.03	0.05*
u-2	14	58.79			
n-2	14	51.71	7.08	2.64	0.014*
u-3	24	54.29			
n-3	18	52.11	2.18	0.70	0.49
u-4	20	54.40			
n-4	6	45.83	8.57	3.14	0.004*
u-5	14	54.29			
n-5	4	55.00	-0.71	-0.20	0.85
u-6	7	42.43			
n-6	15	50.13	-7.70	-1.59	0.13
u-7	22	51.91			
n-7	6	51.33	0.58	0.15	0.89
Schools-u	124	53.53			
Schools-n	83	50.36	3.17	2.58	0.011*

*The difference in mean scores is significant at a level of confidence of 5 percent or less.

TEST OF HYPOTHESIS: STUDENT UNREST IS RELATED TO DOGMATISM OF TEACHERS

RDS FORM E was used to collect data to test this hypothesis. The form consisted of 40 multiple choice items. The possible responses were:

+1 = I agree a little	-1 = I disagree a little
+2 = I agree on the whole	-2 = I disagree on the whole
+3 = I agree very much	-3 = I disagree very much

To obtain a dogmatism score, the constant +4 was added to the algebraic value of each item; hence, each score was converted into a positive number ranging from one to seven. The sum of these 40 converted scores yielded a dogmatism score ranging from 40 to 280. Total scores were transferred to IBM cards. Mean scores, "t" values for the differences between means, and probabilities for these differences were obtained by using the program "BMDX70" of the Statistical Research Laboratory of The University of Michigan. These data are presented in Table 12.

In order to accept this hypothesis the mean dogmatism scores of teachers of schools-u should be higher and the probabilities for the obtained differences between means should be less than 0.05. Out of 7 matched pairs, the mean dogmatism scores were lower for schools-u in four cases; the probabilities for the differences between means however, were more than 0.05. The mean dogmatism score for teachers of schools-u was 134.00 and the mean dogmatism score for teachers of schools-n was 136.18, the probability for the difference between the means being 0.56.

TABLE 12

MEAN SCORE OF TEACHERS ON RDS FORM E

SCHOOL	N	MEAN SCORE	DIFFERENCE $M_u - M_n$	"t" VALUE	PROBABILITY
u-1	11	137.45			
n-1	20	132.00	5.45	0.57	0.58
u-2	15	134.52			
n-2	15	136.20	-1.67	-0.22	0.83
u-3	21	133.90			
n-3	12	128.50	5.40	0.52	0.61
u-4	17	132.64			
n-4	5	155.20	-22.56	-1.81	0.09
u-5	15	140.27			
n-5	3	153.33	-13.06	-0.69	0.50
u-6	7	122.43			
n-6	14	140.86	-18.43	-2.03	0.058
u-7	23	132.52			
n-7	5	128.80	3.72	0.33	0.74
Schools-u	109	134.00			
Schools-n	74	136.18	-2.18	-0.59	0.56

On account of the evidence presented above, therefore, the hypothesis, "Student unrest is related to dogmatism of teachers," cannot be accepted.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A summary of the total study, conclusions, and recommendations resulting therefrom are presented in this chapter.

SUMMARY

NEED FOR THE STUDY

Sixty percent of all the high schools of America have experienced some kind of student protest during 1968.[1] The hypotheses suggested to explain this phenomenon cover all aspects of individual and collective life. The variables that are within the control of school administrators may be investigated in order to discover guidelines which may help restore harmonious relations in schools. It is assumed that the schools are to function in a democratic society, and the students shall be participating in democratic processes all their lives.

---

[1]Nicholas Pileggi, "Revolutionaries Who Have to Be Home by 7:30," Phi Delta Kappan, L (June, 1969), 560-61.

Lack of student participation in school life and teacher attitudes may be responsible for creating conflict situations in schools. Student participation in school life is still in the empirical stage. There had been no study to discover any relationship between student participation in school management and teacher attitude toward it. In such a situation, it is worthwhile to investigate the relationship between student protests, student participation in school life and dogmatism and pupil control ideology of teachers.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In the study of "student unrest" the independent variables are: (1) opportunities available to students for participation in the management of the school, (2) the ideology of the school administrators and teachers, (3) the quality of decisions by the administration, (4) location of the school, (5) size of the school, (6) student-teacher ratio in the school, (7) socio-economic background of parents of students, (8) ethnic composition of students, (9) ethnic composition of faculty, (10) type of housing in the area, and (11) expenditure per pupil in the school. The present study is an attempt to find out the degree of relationship between these independent variables and the incidence of student unrest. Specifically, the study is directed to discover:

1. What is the relationship between student participation in school management and the incidence of student unrest?

2. What is the relationship between pupil control ideology of the school staff and the incidence of student unrest?

3. What is the relationship between dogmatism of the school staff and the incidence of student unrest?

4. What combination of independent variables of school size, student-teacher ratio, ethnic composition of students, ethnic composition of faculty, SEV, and expenditure per pupil in the school, has high correlation with the incidence of student unrest?

THE HYPOTHESIS

Student unrest as evidenced by walk-out, sit-in, or mass demonstration, is related to:

(a) student participation in school management,

(b) custodial pupil control ideology of the school teachers,

(c) dogmatism of the school teachers,

(d) the enrollment of the school,

(e) the student teacher ratio.

DELIMITATION OF THE STUDY

This study was confined to the public high schools in the state of Michigan. Junior high schools were excluded. The incidence of unrest during the year 1968 was considered. Generalizations were made for the schools studied and for the period of 1968.

The study was limited to the independent variables listed in the hypothesis. Factors such as home background, socio-economic group of the parents, and political, economic, psychological, sociological, and technological factors discussed under hypotheses were not included in the present investigation.

PROCEDURE

The following steps were taken to collect and analyze the data for this study.

1. A letter was mailed to 385 high schools along with a coded reply postcard. Responses were received from 328 schools.

2. A letter was mailed to 30 of the 60 schools that reported unrest during 1968 requesting the school to participate in the study. Seven schools agreed to participate in the study.

3. A letter was mailed to 14 matching schools that did not report disruption requesting the school to participate in the study. Seven schools agreed to participate in the study.

4. A "Rating Scale for Student Participation in School Life" was prepared and validated on the basis of the evaluations received from 37 members of the graduate faculty of the School of Education, The University of Michigan.

5. The "Rokeach Dogmatism Scale Form E" was selected for measuring dogmatism of teachers.

6. The "Custodialism Humanism Scale" developed by Eidell was selected for measuring pupil control ideology.

7. Sufficient copies of these instruments were mailed to schools that expressed willingness to participate in the study. Responses were received from 1,136 students and 390 teachers.

8. Scores of teachers on FORM CI and RDS FORM E were keypunched onto IBM cards.

9. Responses of students on each item of FORM SPSL were keypunched onto IBM cards.

10. The program "BMDX70" of the Statistical Research Laboratory was selected to compute mean scores, "t" value for the differences between means and probabilities for the obtained "t" values.

11. The program "BMD2D" of the Statistical Research Laboratory was selected to calculate intercorrelations of the items on FORM SPSL.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

1. Unrest resulted in the closing of 10 schools. All of these schools were requested to participate in the study, only one school, however, could agree to participate in the study.

2. The percentage of schools that did not respond to the first enquiry was abnormally high in cities like Detroit, Flint, Grand Rapids, Jackson, Kalamazoo, Livonia and Saginaw. None of the schools in these cities expressed willingness to participate in the study.

3. There was a time lag between the incidence of unrest and the time of collection of data for this study. The psychological conditions in the schools might have changed during this interval. There was no other option, however, because the chances of getting the cooperation of administrators are slim for many months after unrest.

4. The data had to be collected through the cooperation of the principals. A student's comment was, "This questionnaire would have been more effective had less 'involved' people participated. Officers are in the midst of all the involvement and it is often hard for us to be objective and see what really goes on."

5. There was considerable difficulty in securing the approval of matching schools to participate in the study. One school had a "walk out" after the approval for participation had been given. Moreover, the schools were compared on five independent variables. It is quite

likely that other independent variables like the philosophy of the board of education, the philosophies of the administrators, traditions of the school, socio-economic background of the community, etc., might have affected the results.

6. It is likely that the more dogmatic teachers might not have responded to the questionnaires. One of the conscientious objectors stated, "In all, I feel that I did not care to participate when I did not know the sponsors of the survey nor could I respect the validity of their questionnaire."

7. Items on FORM SPSL could be worded differently in order to communicate the meaning of the items unambiguously.

FINDINGS

Incidents of disruption in 1968 were reported by 18.2 percent of the 328 high schools responding to the first enquiry. These schools were analyzed for independent variables of school district size, economic level of school district as indicated by standard equalized valuation per resident member, current operating expenditure per pupil, school size and pupil teacher ratio. The results of this analysis were:

1. More than half the cases of disruption were reported by schools belonging to the 50 largest school districts. There was no reported disruption in school districts having less than 2,500 pupils.

2. The higher the state equalized valuation per resident member, the greater was the number of reported cases of disruption.

3. The higher the current operating expenditure per pupil the greater was the number of schools reporting disruption.

4. Half of the cases of reported disruption occurred in 96 schools with enrollments of more than 1,500.

5. The pupil teacher ratio was significantly lower in school districts that had disruption than schools having no disruption.

Student Participation in School Management--The mean score of schools-n on FORM SPSL was 61.28 and of schools-u the mean score was 61.00. Probability for this difference was 0.81. The differences between mean scores were significant in five out of the seven matched pairs. In three pairs, schools-n had a higher mean participation score and in the other two pairs schools-u had a significantly higher mean score. On the basis of this data, the hypothesis, "Student unrest is related to student participation in school management," was not accepted.

Itemwise mean scores were significantly different for seven items. Students of schools-n perceived higher level of participation for the following items:

Item 7. Students are delegated authority by the school administration for student publications.

Item 8. Students have a voice in determining who shall receive non-academic awards, e. g., in dramatics, debating, etc.

Item 13. Students select speakers for the general assembly programs.

Item 16. Students evaluate the way the courses are taught.

Mean scores of schools-u were higher on the following items:

Item 14. Students are members on student grievance committees.

Item 17. Each student decides his own courses within bounds of state regulations and college entrance requirements.

Item 25. Students tell the faculty their grievances (hardships concerning school affairs).

Analysis of itemwise mean scores for matched pairs of schools showed that schools-u had significantly higher mean scores for items 26 and 30. Item 26 referred to conveying suggestions concerning school affairs to the administration; and item 30 stated, "Student opinion is respected by faculty and administration." Students of schools-n expressed significantly higher participation in more number of matched pairs for the items dealing with student participation in a representative form of student

government, election of officers of student government by the entire student body, students advising what student organizations should be in the school, students planning and executing the programs of student organizations, student evaluation of library, guidance and transportation services, students telling the administration their grievances, and all groups of students having a fair chance of being represented in the student government.

The average response of students to the items on FORM SPSL was 1.9, signifying "sometime" participation in the aspects of school life listed in the questionnaire.

Correlations of item scores with the total score were 0.40 or more except for items 1, 2, 3, 7, and 17. The first three of these items referred to participation in student government and correlations for these items were 0.26, 0.22 and 0.25 respectively. Item 7 had a correlation of 0.37 and it elicited response about student participation in student publications. The correlation of the score on item 17 with the total score was 0.29 and this item sought information about participation in the selection of courses.

Intercorrelations of item scores followed the same pattern; the values were 0.20 or less for items 1, 2, 3, and 17. Scores on items 18, 19, 20, and 21 had the highest intercorrelations--0.60 or more. Items 24, 25, 26, and 27 formed another group having intercorrelations of 0.50 or more.

The student comments in response to item 33, "Please state any other activity which could give you more participation in school life and has not been included in the list," included: (1) a varied athletic program for both sexes, (2) open campus for seniors, (3) more discussions at the school and class levels between faculty and students and (4) more social activities. The comments also indicated lack of student power and apathy.

Pupil Control Ideology--The mean score of teachers of schools-u on FORM CI was 53.53 and for teachers of schools-n 50.36. The probability for a difference of 3.17 between the means was 0.011. For three matched pairs mean scores were significantly higher for teachers of schools-u, the probabilities being 0.05, 0.014, and 0.004. The mean scores of schools-u were lower in two pairs, the differences, however, were not significant.

On the basis of the above evidence, the hypothesis, "Student unrest is related to custodial pupil control ideology of teachers," was accepted.

Dogmatism--RDS FORM E was used to collect the data about dogmatism of teachers. The mean score of teachers of schools-u was 134.00 and for teachers of schools-n it was 136.18. The probability for the difference -2.18 was 0.56. Teachers of four schools-u had lower mean dogmatism scores than the teachers of matched schools-n, the differences however, were not significant. On the basis of this analysis the hypothesis, "Student unrest is related to dogmatism of teachers," was not accepted.

CONCLUSIONS

Several conclusions can be drawn on the basis of the data presented in this study.

Unrest is a Response to the Psychological Environment--The mean pupil control ideology score of teachers in schools-u is significantly higher than the mean score of teachers in schools-n; i. e., teachers in schools with unrest are significantly more custodial than teachers in schools without unrest. In a custodial organization the atmosphere is rigid, the primary objective is the maintenance of control. Students are regarded as unruly and irresponsible persons who must be controlled through punitive sanctions. The fact that school districts with higher current operating expenditure per pupil had more cases of reported disruption than school districts with lower current operating expenditure per pupil indicates that lack of material comforts does not often generate frustrations which ultimately find expression in disruptive behavior.

Student Participation in School Management Creates New Problems--Mean participation scores were significantly higher for schools-u in two cases and significantly lower in three cases. It seems that lack of student participation in school management does create the psychological conditions that may result in disruptive behavior. Student participation, however, stimulates new aspirations and causes new frustrations. School authorities are not able to meet the demands for student court, student participation in the selection of faculty, students on board of education, etc.

Students are not accustomed to accept these new frustrations as a part of the reality of school life. This may explain the incidence of disruption in schools with higher ratings by students for participation in school life.

Student Councils are Poor Channels of Student Participation in School Life--The following four items sought information about student participation in school life through representative student government:

Item 1. Students participate in a representative form of student government, such as a student council.

Item 2. Any student may be a candidate as an officer in student government, if he possesses the qualifications stated in the constitution of the student government.

Item 3. Officers of student government are elected by the entire student body or representatives of the entire student body.

Item 32. All groups of students have a fair chance of being represented in the student government.

Items 2 and 3 had the highest mean scores indicating that almost all schools always allow any student to be a candidate as an officer in student government if he possesses the qualifications stated in the constitution; and

officers of student government are almost always elected by the entire student body. This information, however, is not useful in knowing the level of student participation in school life. Scores on items two and three have low correlations with scores on other items as well as with the total score on FORM SPSL. In any future use of FORM SPSL these items may be excluded. Item 32 has a correlation of 0.49 with the total score whereas score on item one has a correlation of 0.26, therefore, of items 1 and 32, item 32 better serves the purpose of eliciting information about participation of students in a representative form of student government.

Student-Faculty and Student-Administration Communication--The following items dealt with student-faculty and student-administration communication:

Item 10. Student representatives act as the spokesmen for the student body in cooperative relations with the school administration.

Item 11. Student representatives participate in developing procedures to rectify grievances of students (to correct wrongs done to students).

Item 12. Student officers are consulted when selecting students to represent the school in summer workshops, district, state and national meetings.

Item 14. Students are members on student grievance committees.

Item 24. Students give the faculty suggestions concerning school affairs.

Item 25. Students tell the faculty their grievances (hardships) concerning school affairs.

Item 26. Students give the administration suggestions concerning school affairs.

Item 27. Students tell the administration their grievances (hardships) concerning school affairs.

Item 28. Faculty meetings for student affairs are open to students.

Item 29. There are student-faculty-meetings in which students are equal members.

Except item 29, mean scores on all other items were higher for schools-u than schools-n. The differences between means were statistically significant for items 14 and 25. From these findings, it appears that faculty and administration of schools-u have better communications with their student body. There is only one evidence to indicate that

better communications developed after unrest. One student of a school-u commented, "The administrators and students working together as they are now doing more often, and we, the students are feeling the results." This might be the case in other schools too.

Low Level of Student Participation in School Life--For 18 out of 32 items, the mean score was less than 2.0 signifying students rarely participated in evaluation of food service, library service, transportation service, etc. An average score of 1.9 for all the items indicating "sometimes" participation is not a satisfactory educational environment for a democratic set up.

Sensitive Areas of Student Participation in School Life--Differences between mean scores of schools-u and schools-n were significant for seven items. The items with higher mean score for schools-n dealt with the following areas of school life: (1) delegated authority for student publications, (2) a voice in determining who shall receive non-academic awards, (3) selecting speakers for the general assembly programs, and (4) evaluating the way the courses are taught. It is likely that frustrations in these areas contribute more to the building of hostile attitude among students.

Revision of FORM SPSL--Keeping in view the findings of this study, changes should be made in the FORM SPSL.

1. Items 1, 2, 3, and 17 should be removed.

2. Items 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 30 should be stated as given below:

Item 18. Evaluations by students are used to improve the food service.

Item 19. Evaluations by students are used to improve the library service.

Item 20. Evaluations by students are used to improve the guidance and counseling service.

Item 21. Evaluations by students are used to improve the transportation (bus) service.

Item 24. Faculty listens to the suggestions of students concerning school affairs.

Item 25. Faculty listens to the grievances (hardships) of students concerning school affairs.

Item 26. Administration listens to the suggestions of students concerning school affairs.

Item 27. Administration listens to the grievances of students concerning school affairs.

Item 30. Student-opinion is used by faculty and administration in making decisions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following suggestions are made on the basis of findings of this study:

1. It seems that school administrators are reluctant to widen the area of student participation in school life. More attention should be paid to the problems of "student participation in school management" in the preparation of secondary school administrators. There is an urgent need to pool experience in the area of student participation and develop some guidelines for new administrators.

2. It is recommended that more research should be undertaken to develop a theory for student participation in school management which may serve as a basis for evaluating the performance of students in this regard. "Student participation in school life in order to avoid unrest" has proved to be an unsatisfactory frame of reference. Student participation implies new learning situations which should be evaluated in the light of educational objectives of the school.

3. It is recommended that grievance procedures should be instituted as preventive rather than remedial measures.

4. It is suggested that "Evaluative Criteria for Student Participation in School Life" be standardized which may be useful as an instrument of research. This study was handicapped by the absence of such an instrument.

Evaluative Criteria published by National Study for Secondary School Evaluation does not include criteria for student-faculty and student-administration communication, evaluation of various school services by students, and student involvement in decision making.

5. It is suggested that research should be undertaken to define the areas in which a student council could serve as the agency for student participation. It needs to be determined as to what other options are available if a student council cannot discharge this funciton efficiently.

6. It is recommended that research should be undertaken in control ideology of teachers in order to discover or evolve procedures that may make teachers less custodial in their outlook. Teachers need to be convinced that an atmosphere of sharing and two-way communication is a better learning situation than an autocratic atmosphere and uni-directional communication. During their preparation in schools of education, teachers may be exposed to such successful schools as are organized on the basis of humanistic rather than custodial ideology.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I

Dear

One of the most difficult problems confronting secondary school principals today is how to deal effectively with situations of student disruption to schools, such as strikes, boycotts, demonstrations, sit-ins, or walk-outs. Unfortunately, it is a problem also that has little research data on which to draw.

In an effort to assist in long-range solutions to the problem, a study is being undertaken to identify factors relating to such student behavior. A first step in the study is to identify the schools that experienced this phenomenon of unrest--strike, boycott of school activity or service, demonstration, sit-in, or walk-out.

Without the assistance of school administrators, studies of this type cannot be completed; consequently, your help is solicited. Will you please work with us by providing information requested on the enclosed postcard?

Depending upon results of this initial survey, decisions will be made for further follow-up in certain situations. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Satya Pal Duggal
c/o Professor Lester W. Anderson
School of Education

APPENDIX II

The University of Michigan
School of Education
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Dear _____:

One of the most difficult problems confronting secondary school principals today is how to deal effectively with student disruption to schools, such as strikes, demonstrations, boycotts, sit-ins, or walk-outs. Very little data are available concerning the conditions within the schools which may be related to such forms of behavior.

In an effort to assist in long-range solutions to the problem, a study is being undertaken to identify factors relating to such student behavior. Without the assistance of school administrators, studies of this type cannot be completed. Consequently, your help is solicited. If you are willing to work with us, I will contact you in the near future to make necessary arrangements for the collection of data from teachers and students.

This study is designed to collect information about the attitudes of teachers and students regarding teaching and school life. Specifically, three instruments shall be used.

1. Members of the senior class will be requested to express their views through an inventory of "student participation in school life." This will take ten to fifteen minutes of students' time.

2. Information from teachers will be gathered with the help of two inventories--an inventory of school situations containing 20 items and an inventory of important social and personal questions containing 40 items. A teacher will be requested to respond to one of the two inventories.

These instruments will be mailed to you, with directions for collecting the data. If you are willing to participate in the study but prefer me to collect the data, I will do so personally at a time convenient to you, your faculty and students. Enclosed is a card to indicate your response to this request.

Your response will be strictly confidential. No individual or school will be named in any report of the research. Your cooperation will be greatly appreciated as it is a prerequisite to the success of this research.

Thank you in advance for your help and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Satya Pal Duggal

Encl.

APPENDIX III

Dear _____:

Recently you replied to a questionnaire concerning the extent of student unrest and disruption in your school. It was rather surprising to learn that more than fifty principals indicated their schools had experienced some form of student disruption. It appears as though there is a need to determine some of the factors related to this problem if we are to deal effectively with it.

Mr. Satya Pal Duggal has undertaken a study under my direction designed to identify some of the relationships between student participation in school affairs, faculty attitudes, and student behavior. Enclosed is a description of his study and a request for your willingness to allow your school to be included in the study.

I realize this is a problem in which there is acute sensitivity as to how such data is collected and used. No doubt, there is reluctance to get involved. On the other hand, our only hope of securing information useful in designing appropriate administrative procedures is through the cooperation of principals, teachers, and students in schools in which the problem exists. It is my hope, therefore, that you are willing to participate with us in this study. Be assured procedures for handling the data will be followed which protect all parties involved.

Sincerely yours,

Lester W. Anderson
Professor of Education

LWA/hmc

APPENDIX IV

Dear _____:

Secondary schools are being confronted with forms of student unrest and, in some cases, strikes and other forms of rebellion. Very little data are available concerning factors which may be related to such forms of behavior. Many writers, as well as complaints of students, suggest that students wish to be actively involved in the management of the schools. The extent of participation of students in management may be related to the extent of unrest by students.

It seems important that efforts should be made to collect data that will provide a basis for testing conditions related to student unrest. As a result, a study is being planned to accomplish this task.

A first step in the study is to identify criteria which might be indicative of the degree of student participation in school management. One source of such criteria is the Evaluative Criteria. An instrument will be developed to measure the extent of student participation in school management based on these criteria.

In order to validate criteria which may be used to construct such an instrument, a number of experts are being requested to give their opinion as to the appropriateness of the suggested criteria. Will you please cooperate in this venture by checking the appropriate place which reflects your opinion concerning the following list of criteria for judging the extent of student participation in school management. The students will evaluate their school on the selected criteria on a four point scale--always, often, sometimes, never.

Please return the proposed criteria to: Satya Pal Duggal, C/o Lester W. Anderson, School of Education.

Sincerel yours,

Satya Pal Duggal

APPENDIX V

PROPOSED CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION OF STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT

Criteria for the evaluation of student participation in school management as provided by the school policies, administrative rules and regulations and the behavior of school administrators are given below. Please evaluate the suitability of these criteria on a four point scale--highly important (HI), important (I), unimportant (U), and no opinion (NO).

	HI	I	U	NO
1. Students participate in a representative form of student government, such as a student council	—	—	—	—
2. Any student may be a candidate as an officer in student government if he possesses the qualifications stated in the constitution and the bylaws of the representative government	—	—	—	—
3. Officers of student government are elected by the entire student body or representatives of the entire student body	—	—	—	—
4. Student representatives assist the faculty and administration in developing school policies with regard to student conduct--dress, hair style, etc.	—	—	—	—
5. Students decide as to what student organizations should there be in the school	—	—	—	—
6. Students plan and execute the programs of student organizations				
7. Students are delegated authority for student publications including review and censor	—	—	—	—

	HI	I	U	NO
8. Students have a voice in determining who shall receive non-academic honors	—	—	—	—
9. Students plan and execute programs to introduce new students to school life	—	—	—	—
10. Student representatives act as the spokesmen for the student body in cooperative relations with the administrators	—	—	—	—
11. Student representatives participate in developing grievance procedures	—	—	—	—
12. Student officers are consulted when selecting students to represent the school in summer workshops, district, state and national meetings	—	—	—	—
13. Students select speakers for the general assembly programs	—	—	—	—
14. Students are members on grievance committees	—	—	—	—
15. Students are consulted regarding the course offerings in the school	—	—	—	—
16. Students evaluate the way the courses are taught	—	—	—	—
17. Each student decides his own courses	—	—	—	—
18. Students evaluate the food service	—	—	—	—
19. Students evaluate the library service	—	—	—	—
20. Students evaluate the secretarial or office service	—	—	—	—
21. Students evaluate the guidance service	—	—	—	—

	VI	I	U	NO
22. Students evaluate the transportation (bus) service	—	—	—	—
23. Students are consulted regarding the school schedule	—	—	—	—
24. Students evaluate their own performance in subject matter areas	—	—	—	—
25. Students convey suggestions concerning school affairs to the faculty	—	—	—	—
26. Students convey grievances concerning school affairs to the faculty	—	—	—	—
27. Students convey suggestions concerning school affairs to the administration	—	—	—	—
28. Students convey grievances concerning school affairs to the administration	—	—	—	—
29. Faculty meetings are open to student representatives	—	—	—	—
30. There are student-faculty-meetings in which students are equal members	—	—	—	—

Suggest any modification in the criteria given above which you feel is appropriate:

Suggest other criteria you feel important in evaluating the extent of student participation in the management of high schools:

APPENDIX VI

STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN SCHOOL LIFE

On the following pages a number of statements about school experiences are presented. Our purpose is to gather information how students feel about their participation in school life. You will realize that the statements are of such a nature that there are no correct or incorrect responses. We are interested only in your frank opinion of them.

Your responses will remain confidential, and no individual or school will be named in the report of the study. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Following are thirty three statements about school life. Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of the statement. Also, please circle the words or phrases that seem ambiguous to you and restate them in your own words at the end of the questionnaire.

Always = a; Often = o; Sometimes = s; Never = n.

1. Students participate in a representative form of student government, such as a student council	a	o	s	n
2. Any student may be a cnadidate as an officer in student government if he possesses the qualifications stated in the constitution and the bylaws of the representative government	a	o	s	n
3. Officers of student government are elected by the entire student body or representatives of the entire student body	a	o	s	n

4. Student representatives assist the faculty and administration in developing school policies with regard to student conduct--dress, hair style, etc.	a	o	s	n
5. Students advise what student organizations should be instituted in the school.	a	o	s	n
6. Students plan and execute the programs of student organizations.	a	o	s	n
7. Students are delegated authority by the school administration for student publications.	a	o	s	n
8. Students have a voice in determining who shall receive non-academic honors.	a	o	s	n
9. Students plan and execute programs to introduce new students to school life.	a	o	s	n
10. Student representatives act as the spokesmen for the student body in cooperative relations with the administration.	a	o	s	n
11. Student representatives participate in developing grievance procedures for students.	a	o	s	n
12. Student officers are consulted when selecting students to represent the school in summer workshops, district, state and national meetings.	a	o	s	n
13. Students select speakers for the general assembly programs.	a	o	s	n
14. Students are members on student grievance committees.	a	o	s	n
15. Students are consulted regarding the course offerings in the school.	a	o	s	n

16. Students evaluate the way the courses are taught	a	o	s	n
17. Each student decides his own course within bounds of state law and college requirements.	a	o	s	n
18. Students evaluate the food service.	a	o	s	n
19. Students evaluate the library service.	a	o	s	n
20. Students evaluate the guidance service.	a	o	s	n
21. Students evaluate the transportation (bus) service.	a	o	s	n
22. Students are consulted regarding the school schedule	a	o	s	n
23. Students contribute to evaluation of their own performance in subject matter areas.	a	o	s	n
24. Students convey suggestions concerning school affairs to the faculty.	a	o	s	n
25. Students convey grievances concerning school affairs to the faculty.	a	o	s	n
26. Students convey suggestions concerning school affairs to the administration.	a	o	s	n
27. Students convey grievances concerning school affairs to the administration.	a	o	s	n
28. Faculty meetings for student affairs are open to student representatives.	a	o	s	n
29. There are student-faculty-meetings in which students are equal members.	a	o	s	n
30. Student opinion is respected by faculty and administration	a	o	s	n

31. Orientation and training programs are planned to prepare students for participation. a o s n

32. All groups of students have a fair chance of being represented in the student government, a o s n

Any other activity which could give you more participation in school life and has not been included in the list.

Suggest any modification in the statements given above which you feel is appropriate.

APPENDIX VII

FORM SPSL

On the following pages, a number of statements about school experiences are presented. Our purpose is to gather information about how students feel about their participation in school life. You will realize that the statements are of such a nature that there are no correct or incorrect responses. We are interested only in your frank opinion of them. Your responses will remain confidential, and no individual or school will be named in the report of the study. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Following are thirty-two statements about school life. Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of the statement.

Always = a; Often = o; Sometimes = s; Rarely = r; Never = n.

1. Students participate in a representative form of student government, such as a student council.	a o s r n
2. Any student may be a candidate as an officer in student government if he possesses the qualifications stated in the constitution of the student government.	a o s r n
3. Officers of student government are elected by the entire student body or representatives of the entire student body.	a o s r n

4. Student representatives assist the faculty and administration in developing school policies with regard to student conduct--dress, hair style, etc.	a	o	s	r	n
5. Students advise what student organizations should be in the school.	a	o	s	r	n
6. Students plan and execute (carry out) the programs of student organizations.	a	o	s	r	n
7. Students are delegated (given) authority by the school administration for student publications.	a	o	s	r	n
8. Students have a voice in determining who shall receive non-academic honors, e. g., in dramatics, debating, etc.	a	o	s	r	n
9. Students plan and carry out programs to introduce new students to school life.	a	o	s	r	n
10. Student representatives act as the spokesmen for the student body in cooperative relations with the school administration.	a	o	s	r	n
11. Student representatives participate in developing procedures to rectify grievances of students (to correct wrongs done to students).	a	o	s	r	n
12. Student officers are consulted when selecting students to represent the school in summer workshops, district, state and national meetings.	a	o	s	r	n
13. Students select speakers for the general assembly programs.	a	o	s	r	n

14. Students are members on student grievance committees.	a	o	s	r	n
15. Students are consulted regarding the courses to be offered in the school.	a	o	s	r	n
16. Students evaluate the way the courses are taught.	a	o	s	r	n
17. Each student decides his own courses within bounds of state regulations and college entrance requirements.	a	o	s	r	n
18. Students evaluate the food service.	a	o	s	r	n
19. Students evaluate the library service.	a	o	s	r	n
20. Students evaluate the guidance and counseling service.	a	o	s	r	n
21. Students evaluate the transportation (bus) service.	a	o	s	r	n
22. Students are consulted regarding the school schedule.	a	o	s	r	n
23. Students contribute to evaluation of their own performance in subject matter areas.	a	o	s	r	n
24. Students give the faculty suggestions concerning school affairs.	a	o	s	r	n
25. Students tell the faculty their grievances (hardships) concerning school affairs.	a	o	s	r	n
26. Students give the administration suggestions concerning school affairs.	a	o	s	r	n

27. Students tell the administration their grievances (hardships) concerning school affairs.	a	o	s	r	n
28. Faculty meetings for student affairs are open to student representatives.	a	o	s	r	n
29. There are student-faculty-meetings in which students are equal members.	a	o	s	r	n
30. Student-opinion is respected by faculty and administration.	a	o	s	r	n
31. Orientation and training programs are planned to prepare students for participation in school activities.	a	o	s	r	n
32. All groups of students have a fair chance of being represented in the student government.	a	o	s	r	n
33. Please state any other activity which could give you more participation in school life and has not been included in the list.	a	o	s	r	n

APPENDIX VIII

FORM CI

On the following pages a number of statements about teaching are presented. Our purpose is to gather information regarding the actual attitudes of educators concerning these statements.

You will realize that the statements are of such a nature that there are no correct or incorrect answers. We are interested only in your frank opinion of them.

Your responses will remain confidential, and no individual or school will be named in the report of this study. Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

INTSTRUCTIONS:

Following are twenty statements about schools, teachers, and pupils. Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of the statement.

Strongly agree = SA; Agree = A; Undecided = U;

Disagree = D; Strongly disagree = SD.

1. It is desirable to require pupils to sit in assigned seats during assemblies.	SA	A	U	D	SD
2. Pupils are usually not capable of solving their problems through logical reasoning.	SA	A	U	D	SD
3. Directing sarcastic remarks toward a defiant pupil is a good disciplinary technique.	SA	A	U	D	SD
4. Beginning teachers are not likely to maintain strict enough control over their pupils.	SA	A	U	D	SD

5. Teachers should consider revision of their teaching methods if these are criticized by their pupils.	SA	A	U	D	SD
6. The best principals give unquestioning support to teachers in disciplining pupils.	SA	A	U	D	SD
7. Pupils should not be permitted to contradict the statements of a teacher in class.	SA	A	U	D	SD
8. It is justifiable to have pupils learn many facts about a subject even if they have no immediate application.	SA	A	U	D	SD
9. Too much pupil time is spent on guidance and activities and too little on academic preparation.	SA	A	U	D	SD
10. Being friendly with pupils often leads them to become too familiar.	SA	A	U	D	SD
11. It is more important for pupils to learn to obey rules than that they make their own decisions.	SA	A	U	D	SD
12. Student governments are a good "safety valve" but should not have much influence on school policy.	SA	A	U	D	SD
13. Pupils can be trusted to work together without supervision.	SA	A	U	D	SD
14. If a pupil uses obscene or profane language in school, it must be considered a moral offense.	SA	A	U	D	SD
15. If pupils are allowed to use the lavatory without getting permission, this privilege will be abused.	SA	A	U	D	SD

16. A few pupils are just young hoodlums and should be treated accordingly.	SA	A	U	D	SD
17. It is often necessary to remind pupils that their status in school differs from that of teachers.	SA	A	U	D	SD
18. A pupil who destroys school material or property should be severely punished.	SA	A	U	D	SD
19. Pupils cannot perceive the difference between democracy and anarchy in the classroom.	SA	A	U	D	SD
20. Pupils often misbehave in order to make the teacher look bad.	SA	A	U	D	SD

APPENDIX IX

RDS FORM E

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement below is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain about others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do. Please indicate your personal opinion about each statement by circling the appropriate response at the right of the statement.

Circle +1, +2, +3, or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

+1 - I AGREE A LITTLE	-1 - I DISAGREE A LITTLE
+2 - I AGREE ON THE WHOLE	-2 - I DISAGREE ON THE WHOLE
+3 - I AGREE VERY MUCH	-3 - I DISAGREE VERY MUCH

1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3

4.	It is only natural that a person would have a much better acquaintance with ideas he believes in than with ideas he opposes.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
5.	Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
6.	Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
7.	Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
8.	I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
9.	There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
10.	It is natural for a person to be rather fearful of the future.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
11.	Once I get wound up in a heated discussion, I just can't stop.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
12.	In a discussion, I often find it necessary to repeat myself several times to make sure I am being understood.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
13.	In a heated discussion, I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
14.	It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
15.	While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great man like Einstein, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3

16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
17. If given the chance, I would do something of great benefit to the world.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
18. In the history of mankind, there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
20. A man who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
21. It is only when a person devotes himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world, there is probably only one which is correct.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion, we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3

26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he considers primarily his own happiness.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
27. The worst crime a person could commit is to attack publicly the people who believe in the same thing he does.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
28. In times like these, it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
29. A group which tolerates too much differences of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
30. There are two kinds of people in this world; those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
31. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
32. A person who thinks primarily of his own happiness is beneath contempt.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
34. In this complicated world of ours, the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3

35. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
36. In the long run, the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
38. If a man is to accomplish his mission in life, it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3
40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.	+1	+2	+3	-1	-2	-3

APPENDIX X

SCHOOL DATA FORM

1. Enrollment of your high school . . . . . .
2. Number of white students . . . . . .
3. Number of Negro students . . . . . .
4. Number of teachers . . . . . .
5. Number of Negro teachers . . . . . .
6. Number of white teachers . . . . . .
7. Number of students in the senior class . . . . . .

APPENDIX XI

DIRECTIONS FOR COLLECTING THE DATA

1. The following material is enclosed for collecting the data:

INSTRUMENTS	NO. OF COPIES	TO COLLECT DATA FROM
School Data Form	1	The Principal
RDS FORM E	25	Teachers
FORM CI	25	Teachers
Student Inventory FORM SPSL	100	Students

2. FOR TEACHERS

Teachers of the senior class students should be selected to respond to the opinionnaires.

For the RDS FORM E select every third teacher for a total of 25 from your alphabetical list of teachers who teach senior classes. If the number of teachers is less than 75 then select every other teacher for a total of 25 respondents. In case the number of teachers is less than 50, the number of respondents will equal to one-half the total number of teachers.

For FORM CI select every third teacher (every other teacher if the total number of teachers is less than 50) for a total of 25 from your alphabetical list of teachers who teach senior classes, starting with the second teacher on the list so that the two groups of 25 include different teachers.

3. FOR STUDENTS

If your school has a track system, students of three senior English sections, including one from each track, be requested to respond to the inventory

If your school does not have a track system, students of any three senior English sections should be selected.

4. There are instructions with each inventory. The instructions should be read to the students by the teacher administering the inventory.

5. Please request the teachers to return the inventories to the principal's office by a particular date, giving about three days margin.

6. Please return the material after collecting the data to:

Satya Pal Duggal
c/o Professor Lester W. Anderson
School of Education
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

APPENDIX XII

The University of Michigan
School of Education
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

April 1, 1969

Dear _____:

We greatly appreciate your willingness to participate in the study concerning student unrest and student participation in school life. The following material has been mailed to you under separate cover:

1. Directions for the collection of the data
2. School Data Form
3. RDS FORM E for teachers
4. FORM CI for teachers
5. FORM SPSL for students

Please return the material after collecting the data to:

Satya Pal Duggal
c/o Professor Lester W. Anderson
School of Education
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Thank you for your help and consideration.

Sincerely yours,

Satya Pal Duggal

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aceto, Thomas David. "Student Participation in Policy-Making and the Use of Direct Action at the Midwest CIC Universities," Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1967.

American Civil Liberties Union. Academic Freedom in the Secondary Schools. New York: American Civil Liberties Union, 1968.

Anderson, Lester W., and Van Dyke, Lauren A. School Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.

Anderson, Stuart A. "Where Students Maintain Their Own Discipline." Nation's Schools, LXVII (May, 1961), 71-74.

Argyris, Chris. Integrating the Individual and the Organization. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.

Boardman, Charles W. "What are Good Techniques in Achieving Democratic Administration of the High School." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXIII (April, 1949), 206-15.

Bowden, A. O., and Melbo, Irving R. Social Psychology of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1937.

Bowers, Norman D., and Soar, Robert S. "The Influence of Teacher Personality on Classroom Interaction." Journal of Experimental Education, XXX (June, 1962), 309-11.

Brammer, Lawrence M. "The Coming Revolt of High School Students." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, LII (September, 1968), 19-21.

Brandt, Robert Gerard. "Selected Practices of Student Council Organizations in the Secondary Schools of New Jersey." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Fordham University, 1967.

Bridge, Edwin. "Teacher Participation in the Decision Making: Interaction of Personal and Situational Variables." Unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964.

Carlson, Richard O. "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: The Public School and Its Clients." Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. Edited by Daniel E. Griffiths. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Chesler, Mark, and Franklin, Jan. "Interracial and Intergenerational Conflict in Secondary Schools." Center for Research on the Utilization of Scientific Knowledge, The University of Michigan, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

Chesler, Mark. Teacher Questionnaire, Project "Conflict Intervention in Secondary Schools." Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1968.

Chesler, Mark. Student Questionnaire, Project "Conflict Intervention in Secondary Schools." Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1968.

Cowley. W. H. "Student Unrest in Perspective." Journal California Teachers Association, LXII (March, 1966), 30-33.

Crane, Robert M. "Unrest on Campus--Revolution or Evolution." College and University, XLII (Winter, 1967), 209-17.

Croft, John C. "Open and Closed Mindedness and Perceptions of Leader Behavior." Unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1964.

Crowley, Francis M., and Geraldine, F. Cleminson. "The Role of Authority in Democratic Educational Administration." American School Board Journal, CIVL (June, 1963), 15-17.

Cunningham, Ruth, et al. Understanding Group Behavior of Boys and Girls. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.

Cutler, Richard L. "The Berkley Rebellion." New York State Education, LIII (June, 1966), 14-15.

Detwider, Thomas Patrick. "The Junior High Student Council: Status, Role, and Relationship to School Administration.: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1965. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXVI: 5809.

Dewey, John. "Democracy and Educational Administration." School and Society. VL (April 3, 1937), 457-62.

Dewey, John. "My Pedagogic Creed." Dewey on Education. Edited by Martin S. Dworkin. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.

Eidell, Terry L. "The Development and Test of a Measure of the Pupil Control Ideology of Public School Professional Staff Members." Unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1965.

Elicker, Paul E. "The Development of the Student Participation Movement." in The Student Council in the Secondary School. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1955.

Erickson, Eldridge Albert. "A Study of the Relationship between Personality Structure and Perception." Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, Colorado State College, 1962.

Erickson, Ralph. "Student Councils when can They Become Effective." Clearing House, XXXVII (April, 1963) 495-98.

Evaluative Criteria. Washington, D. C.: National Study for Secondary School Evaluation, 1960.

Farmer, Sybil. "School Morale--A Fringe Benefit of the Student Activity Program." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, VL (September, 1961) 134-40.

Fisher, William T. "A Critical Evaluation of Student Council Programs in Selected Public High Schools of Connecticut." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1956.

Flanzer, Paul. "How Students Maintain Their Own Discipline." School Management, VI (April, 1962), 68-71+.

Frank, Robert L. "A Study of Specific Factors which will Differentiate between Schools Possessing Higher and Lower Morale." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska, 1964.

Frederick, Robert Wendell. Student Activities in American Education, New York: The Center of Applied Research in Education, 1965.

Garber, L. O. "Legal Outlook: More 1968 Clashes over Student Rights." Nation's Schools, LXXIV (January, 1968), 74+.

Gilbert, C. Doris, and Levinson, Daniel J. "Custodialism and Humanism in Mental Hospital Structure and in Staff Ideology.: The Patients and the Mental Hospital. Edited by Milton Greenblatt, et al. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1957.

Gage, N. L., ed. ;Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1963.

Greeley, Andrew M. "Student Stress Because of a Moral Change." Texas Outlook, LII (September, 1968), 16-17.

Gregg, Russel T. "Administration." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Edited by Chester W. Harris. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1965.

Halleck, S. L. "Hypotheses of Student Unrest." Phi Delta Kappan, XL (September, 1968), 2-8.

Harper, James Arthur. "Student Councils in Selected High Schools of Northern Ohio." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Reserve University, 1965. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts, XXVII: 69A.

Hess, Robert D. "Political Socialization in the Schools." Harvard Educational Review, XXXVIII (Summer, 1968), 534-535.

"High Schools Face New Challenges from Growing Student Unrest." Nations Schools, LXXV (November, 1968), 28+.

Hildreth, E. Elon. "A Critical Evaluation of the Student Councils in the High Schools of California." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1949.

Hofer, Stephen. Participant in discussion, "Youth Faces Today's Issues." The 1967 Student Council Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Student Councils, 1967.

Hoy, Wayne Kolter. "Dogmatism and the Pupil Control Ideology of Public School Professional Staff Members." Unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1965.

Iwamoto, David. "Student Violence and Rebellion--How Big a Problem?" National Education Association Journal, LIV (December, 1965), 10-13.

Kelley, Earl C. "Student Cooperation.: The Education Digest, VI (March, 1941), 45-49.

Kilpatrick, William Heard. Group Education for a Democracy. New York: Association Press, 1940.

Kounin, Jacob S., and Gump, Paul V. "The Comparative Influence of Punitive and Non-punitive Teachers upon Children's Concept of School Misconduct." Journal of Educational Psychology, LII (February, 1961), 44-49.

Kowitz, Gerald T. "The Management of Motivation." Phi Delta Kappan, IXL (October, 1967), 77-81.

Kvaraceus W., et al. Negro Self Concept. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1965.

Leavitt, Harold J. Managerial Psychology. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1958.

Lekander, Lawrence Michael. "Student Participation in Secondary School Government: An Analysis of Purposes, Values, and Practices." Unpublished D. Ed. dissertation, University of Southern California, 1967.

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1961.

McKown, Harry C. Extra-curricular Activities. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1956.

McKown, Harry C. The Student Council. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1944.

Meier, Arnold R., and Cleary, Florence D., and Davis, Alice M. A Curriculum for Citizenship. Detroit: Wayne University Press, 1952.

Miller, Frnaklin A., Moyer, James H., and Patrick Robert B. Planning Student Activities. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1957.

Nancarrow, James E. "The Student Council in Pennsylvania." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1940.

"The NASC: How it Began--How it Grew--What it Does." Student Life Highlights, XI (September, 1967), 10-11.

Neill, A. S. Summerhill. New York: Hart Publishing Company, 1960.

Nielsen, Margaret, ed. Activism in the Secondary Schools: Analysis and Recommendations. Eugene: Bureau of Educational Research, University of Oregon, 1969.

Nordstrom, Carl, Friedenberg, Edgar Z., and Gold, Hilary A. Society's Children: A Study of Ressentiment in the Secondary School. New York: Random House, 1967.

Norton, John K. "The Contemporary Scene." Administrative Behavior in Education. Edited by R. F. Campbell and Russel T. Gregg. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Padgett, Jack F. "The New Breed in Search of a New Morality." Liberal Education, LIV (October, 1968), 435-42.

Pileggi, Nicholas. "Revolutionaries who have to be Home by 7:30." Phi Delta Kappan, L (June, 1969), 560-66.

Reusser, Walter C. "Administration, School." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Edited by Walter Scott Monroe. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1941.

Rokeach, Milton. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1960.

Seward, Doris M. "Educational Discipline." Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, XXIV (June, 1961), 192-97.

Shoben, Edward Joseph, Jr. "Student Unrest: Some Forms within the Chaos." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, LII (September, 1968), 1-12.

Skogsberg, Alfred H. Administrative Operational Patterns. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1950.

Smith, Joe. Student Council for Our Times. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1951.

Sproule, Anna. "Children Urged to Strike." Times Educational Supplement, 2750 (February 2, 1968), 358.

Steinberg, Warren L. "Behavioral Standards for Youth." Journal of Secondary Education, XLIII (January, 1968), 37-38.

Student Behavior in Secondary Schools, 1964. Report 1965-R 12. Washington, D. C.: Research Division, The National Education Association, 1965.

"Student Protests and the Establishments." Journal of Higher Education XXXIX (April, 1968), 223-25.

"Student Unrest will Spread to High Schools." Nations Schools, LXXXII (September, 1968), 71.

"Student Unrest in the Public Schools." School Management, XII (November, 1968), 50-60.

Svoboda, William S. "Student Government: Contradiction in Theory and Practice." Social Education, XXX (March, 1966), 179-80.

Symonds, Percival M. "Teaching as a Function of the Teacher's Personality." Journal of Teacher Education, V (March, 1954), 79-83.

Tompkins, Ellsworth. "What are Good Techniques in Achieving Democratic Administration of the High School." Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, XXXIII (April, 1949), 215-22.

Vanderlip, Robert G. "The Student Council in American Secondary School: Criteria and Instruments of Evaluation." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, 1945.

Vredevoe, Lawrence E. "Practices in School Discipline." American School Board Journal, CIXL (July, 1959), 19-21.

Wahler, A. G. "The Development of Evaluative Criteria for Student Participation in School Government in Private High Schools." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, 1967.

Watson, G. ed. Concepts for Social Change. Washington, D. C.: The National Education Association, 1967.

Weaver, Donald Clifford. "Primary Aims and Appropriate Activities of Michigan Public Secondary School Student Councils." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Michigan, 1961.

Weber, Clarence Adam, and Weber, Mary E. Fundamentals of Educational Leadership. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1955.

Whittemore, R. G. "Poor Discipline." Clearing House, XXXIV (May, 1960), 527.