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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

A special report, "High School Student Unrest," opens with the following statement:

Bubbling like supercharged soda, student unrest exploded in 1968 and sprayed the high school landscape with boycotts, demonstrations, sit-ins, picketing, vandalism, and violence.¹

Mark A. Chesler reminds educators that the major problems of American society have always been reflected in the nation's schools and that the current student activist movement has roots deep within the fabric of our society.

Chesler suggests several causes of the student activist movement that has become a universal trend throughout the United States. He believes that unrest has resulted from the Vietnam war, the pain of poverty, the guilt of affluence, the mutual corrosion of black and white people, and the constrictions of adult-run bureaucracies.²

²Mark A. Chesler, "Student and Administration Crises," Educational Leadership, XXVII, No. 1 (October, 1969), 34.
Harold Taylor, former president of Sarah Lawrence College and author of *Students Without Teachers: The Crisis in the University*, feels that there is a general dissatisfaction with the quality of education that the more sophisticated students are obtaining.\(^3\)

In "High School Student Unrest," the editors of *Education, U.S.A.* explored the attitudes of youth regarding their widespread discontent with secondary schools. According to this report, youth offer several urgent pleas:

1) listen to us—for all you know, we might have something.
2) treat us like adults and maybe we'll act that way.
3) cut us in on the action; it's our school as well as yours.
4) teach us what we need to know now so we can use it in our lives.\(^4\)

The author is currently serving as a high school principal in a suburban setting and as a result has been in a position to experience the pressures of student activism. He has found that pressure from various groups is becoming a routine event. Kenneth

---


Erickson concurs:

Yesterday's protests by individual students are being mobilized into group protests in today's new activism. 5

The present student activist movement is being generated predominately from within the high school. In describing this movement the editors of *Education, U.S.A.* reflect:

Despite the widespread wish to pin the blame on some conspiratorial plot hatched off-campus, the facts don't usually bear out this theory. For example, only 5 percent of the principals in the NASSP survey reported SDS involvement in their schools. The Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence investigated the school disorders of 1968 and could find no evidence of outside plotters. Other knowledgeable observers agree. The unrest, it seems, is largely homegrown in the schools themselves—and the answers must be found there. 6

Lawrence M. Brammer, chairman of the department of Educational Psychology at the University of Washington in Seattle,

---


6 "High School Student Unrest," p. 3.
stresses that teen-age youths have awakened:

Teen-age youth are discovering that organized demonstrative protest is effective in provoking change.\(^7\)

Brammer describes the middle-class American high school student as docile but in discussing the new breed of student, he states:

There are signs that the docile student image is being replaced by a more rebellious, activist, involved one.\(^8\)

A review of the current professional literature regarding student activism indicates that national, state, and local educators and political leaders are extremely concerned about the potential threat of the activist movement.

On September 10, 1969, United States Commissioner of Education James E. Allen, Jr. informed state superintendents that 340 incidents of serious student disturbances had occurred in thirty-eight states during a four-month period in the past school year. Commissioner Allen appealed to educational leaders to address themselves to the issues which cause student unrest and to plan actions which will minimize avoidable tensions in our school districts.\(^9\)

---


\(^8\) Ibid, p. 18.

Gregory Anrig, director of the division of Equal Educational Opportunity, United States Office of Education, also reminded school administrators of the potential for student disturbances in the high schools. While there are only sixteen hundred four-year colleges and universities in the United States there are twenty-six thousand high schools which enroll two and a half times the number of students enrolled in four-year colleges. Anrig conveys the unpleasant thought that the younger high school student is potentially more volatile than his college counterpart. Anrig's concern is clearly evident in the following comment:

While the press and television are not yet focusing prime attention on high school unrest, school boards must share the concern that alternatives to violence and repression must be found and put into effect before the situation in the high schools becomes explosive.

Anrig believes that high school confrontations are more often volatile. As a result, he believes that high school disorders are usually more physically dangerous than college disorders.

In the State of Illinois, Cook County School Superintendent, Robert Hanrahan, sent a memorandum to all district superintendents on June 11, 1969, (See Appendix A) summarizing a Student Unrest

Conference that he sponsored on May 21, 1969. Hanrahan's memorandum listed eight suggested procedures to obviate student unrest and violence.

The theme of the National School Boards' Association Convention scheduled for April 11-14, 1970, was "School Boards in an Era of Unrest." Obviously, the theme indicated the concern of this national association regarding the current threat of student activism. School boards unsure of how much larger a voice to give students in shaping educational policy should attend to the recent actions of the United States Office of Education.

Add to the USOE's recent proliferation of new faces and units a young man named Anthony J. Moffett, Jr., who will direct the newly established Office of Students and Youth. The administrator who takes a positive attitude toward student activism seems to be in a more tenable position than those who do not. The editors of School Management point out:

School administrators who have emerged unscathed from recent encounters with the 'new student' appear, by and large, to have operated on the premise that activism is basically a good thing.

Scott Thomson, Superintendent of Schools in Evanston, Illinois, points out some positive aspects of student activism:

Activism in the high school can also be valuable. It can get young people involved in profound social issues. It can present a working exercise in the relationship between freedom and responsibility.

Unfortunately, activism was initiated and is presently led by student radicals with a political purpose. The purpose is revolution, the replacement of our present institutions. Schools are to be the beachhead for this invasion. What is most needed now is for students and teachers to wrest initiative from the radicals and to place the movement in the hands of responsible leaders committed to the democratic process as well as to the solution of burning inequities.¹³

School administrators are finding that it is a routine part of their daily responsibilities to interact with activist students. Anrig concurs:

While we may be offended by some of their techniques, we ought to recognize that many student demands are sound and legitimate demands for educational improvement.¹⁴

Thomas Shaheen, Superintendent of Schools in Rockford, Illinois, believes that secondary schools have long been in need of change. Shaheen feels that administrators have attempted to solve their problems by "getting tougher" and that technique serves no more to ensure better behavior than it serves as a curb on

crime. Superintendent Shaheen comments:

Let me prophesy that, even when the problems go away through the use of these methods, they go away to come another day, because the problems have been a long time abuilding in our schools--I have seen them for 17 years as a student, and for another 29 years as an educator. 15

Richard H. Ichord, Congressman from Missouri and Chairman of the Committee on Internal Security, sent a letter to the nation's school superintendents alerting them of recent activities of the militant Students for a Democratic Society. (See Appendix 3) This communication of December 15, 1969, also included a pamphlet entitled, "SDS Plans for America's High Schools." 16

Congressman Ichord extended the assistance of the Committee on Internal Security to high school administrators whose schools face the challenge of disruption by the militant Students for a Democratic Society. He also reminded administrators that the secondary schools of America serve as significant bulwarks in our democratic way of life.

The high school principal is in the direct path of the student activist movement. Erickson explains:

School administrators cannot postpone involvement: they cannot wait until all the answers are in. They are the ones that must react to the forces of student activism and provide the answers. The high school principal, in particular, is the man on the spot.  

Erickson in stressing the principal's role in the current educational scene, comments:

Today's secondary school administrator needs to analyze and keep in perspective the conflicting demands that face him. He needs to study his own emotions and motives, and to be in control of them at all times. He must work toward understanding why others act and react as they do. He should be a genuine facilitator of the two-way communications process with students. He must improve his decision-making skills, knowing when to act, and when to wait and investigate. His decisions should not be made at a time of emotional involvement, nor should they be made hastily without proper counsel when warranted. (Each principal should have access to legal counsel when needed.) He should try to foster greater involvement of students, faculty, and parents in the formulation of local policies and procedures. Finally, the administrator should try to be secure in the face of criticism and realize that he can never please all people at all times.

In addition to the pressures of the student activist movement, the high school principal has found that his role has been changed by other pressures that are related to the student activism so prevalent in today's secondary schools.


18 Ibid, p. 28.
Bernard Bard describes the changed role of the high school principal in the New York City school system. Bard comments:

On the high school level the principal's defensiveness is extended not only to the school system but to his own career. While he tries to fend off assaults from those aspiring to his position, the principal is confronted by assaults on this authority from within the school house. His freedom of action has been abridged especially by the teachers union. What were once his prerogatives of office must now be negotiated with a chapter chairman. 19

In summary of the principal's changing role in the New York City school system, Bard concludes:

His position as chief executive of the school, free to work out problems through 'professional cooperation' is now covered by, of all things, a grievance procedure. He can't just let an incompetent teacher go but must defend his low rating at a hearing and provide documentation if challenged. 20

William B. Boyd, President of Central Michigan University, in summarizing the administrator's current position, states:

My own conclusion is that we must rely less on authority and more on leadership if we are to be effective in reshaping American education to meet the needs of the youth. If student radicals believe that coercion is necessary to produce a change, we must have the courage to oppose them in those tactics and the wisdom to offer effective alternatives. 21

The medium of television has brought to this generation of students instant exposure to the world around them. Television has also provided the current generation with a new and refreshing method of learning. Harold Taylor, former college president and a prolific writer, feels that television has had a profound effect upon teen-agers. He believes that the 18,000 hours boys and girls spend before a television set, as against the 10,000 to 12,000 hours they spend in classrooms are showing their effects. Students have found television to be another source of information about themselves and their culture. Television provides instant knowledge. Students see campus violence as it happens hundreds of miles away. They watch as men land on the moon. Television has caused young people to seek instant answers to problems, no matter how complex. Students have become more cognizant and perceptive as a result of television. Television provides information and education in an informal manner. It requires much less effort to watch a

television set than it does to read a book or newspaper. While it brings information to youth in an easily digestible fashion, it also contributes much to student unrest and to the impetuousness of pressure groups.

Charles D. Jay, Office of Public Instruction, State of Illinois, stresses the importance of the activist movement for all Americans. Jay states:

No thinking American can ignore the youth rebellion. He need not endorse the demands of youth, but he cannot support his position by a refusal to study carefully and analyze the conditions of modern-day life which have culminated in the phenomenon.

Academic officials describe the current youngsters as the "new breed" to whom the traditional campus seems wholly outdated. Dr. Samuel B. Gould, chancellor of the State University of New York, explains:

Instantaneous communication through newly developed electronic means has cut very deep into the university's earlier

---


monopoly on learning. Students come to the university campus with a greatly conditioned vision of life and the world around them. They quickly begin to look upon the university as any bold adventurer might at an unnecessarily fussy, but well-meaning aunt or uncle who keeps warning about wearing one's galoshes to prevent the common cold, when he is already busy putting on his space suit.

Purpose of the Study:

The purpose of this study is to analyze the specific effects of student activism upon the perceived leadership role of the secondary school principal. An interview instrument has been developed to obtain principals' interpretations of their leadership roles as they view these roles in keeping with the present day student activist movement. This study attempts to transcend the complex aspects of this movement and to focus upon the effects that activism has upon principals' perceived leadership roles.

Method and Procedure:

The following six hypotheses were formulated to determine the effects of student activism upon the perceived leadership role of secondary school principals.

I. Principals, in dealing with student activism, should think more in terms of positive educational change than in terms of repression and control.

II. Principals have experienced the need to open new channels of communication to develop better understanding among students, staff, and parents.

III. Principals have recognized the need for student involvement in the planning and implementation of student extracurricular activities.

IV. Principals have the direct responsibility to provide alternatives and solutions that will prevent conflict and confrontation by student activist groups.

V. Principals must rely less on authority and more on leadership to develop rapport with dissident student groups.

VI. Principals, in responding to the potential threat of student activism, have developed specific plans to maintain school decorum.

The hypotheses were formulated after a review of the current literature, and they were initially screened by three superintendents, three assistant superintendents, and five principals. All of these administrative officials are currently serving at the secondary school level. After the initial screening process was completed, a final draft was prepared which resulted in the hypotheses in their final form.

An interview instrument in the form of a series of questions was developed to establish or negate the hypotheses of the study.

A total of thirty-four principals were interviewed in high schools, many of which had experienced student activism, racial violence, parental pressures, and teacher militancy. The principals interviewed also represented schools with widely varying socioeconomic backgrounds. Schools ranged from totally Caucasian
student bodies to racially integrated schools, and from those that experienced little, if any, activism, to those where violence necessitated the temporary closing of the school.

The personal interview offered the respondents the opportunity to react to the questions in keeping with their perceptions of the principal's leadership role. A weighted scale enabled the author to evaluate the responses to the interview instrument and to relate these evaluations to the specific hypotheses of the study.

In addition to an analysis of the current literature regarding student activism and the personal interviews with principals, an in-depth study was made of five secondary schools where violence resulted in the temporary closing of the schools. The standardized interview format was supplemented by specific questions which probed and focused upon the effects of student activism and their relationship to the perceived leadership roles of secondary school principals. These queries addressed themselves to the following issues:

1. Communication techniques that facilitated principals' leadership roles during periods of conflict
2. Operational plans principals developed to prevent further confrontations or disorders
3. Specific techniques principals utilized in interaction with dissident student groups
4. Utilization of law enforcement officers—time, location, method
5. Utilization of community leaders—time, location, method

This study was conducted in selected school districts in the west suburban and southwest suburban counties of DuPage, Cook, and Will. No respondent or school that participated in this study will be identified by name in any part of the study.

Limitations and delimitations:

The personal interview technique provides for two-way communication, and it gives both the interviewer and the respondent the opportunity to obtain immediate clarification of an inference or statement that is not clear.

Personal interview techniques present situations for error and bias to occur. Several positive factors, however, were of assistance to the author in conducting this study. The author is employed in the same kind of a professional position as the respondents. He has some knowledge of the current problems that high school principals encounter in exercising their leadership roles. Also, the author is familiar with the terminology and the language of the profession as used by principals in the discussion of their roles and responsibilities. The author having served his present school district for the past fourteen years is personally acquainted with many secondary school principals within the geographic boundaries of this study. He is also aware of special characteristics that make some schools within this study unique.
The purpose of this study is limited to the effects of student activism upon the perceived leadership role of the secondary school principal. The study is further limited to the perceptions of principals in secondary schools only. It is also delimited to selected secondary schools in the suburban counties of Cook, DuPage, and Will, in the State of Illinois.

Much has been written with respect to student activism, but the vast majority of literature contains an abundance of opinion and a dearth of factual information.

The candid information obtained from high school principals who experienced on-the-spot confrontation and violence is an invaluable part of this study. The in-depth probe of five selected secondary schools that were temporarily closed because of student activism was conducted to obtain information from principals who were directly involved in confrontation.

Within the past year, high school principals have learned a great deal about how to anticipate and how to cope with disruption of the school as a result of student activism. Many principals were not prepared, and they did not have specific plans developed to adequately control confrontation and violence.

Principals who experienced extreme forms of student activism gained valuable and painful experience in coping with school disruptions. These principals have since developed operational techniques that are proving to be effective in maintaining the orderly
processes of the school.

The author found that nearly every principal who had experienced violent confrontation had some specific information to impart regarding techniques that he found to be effective during the period of crisis in his school. Techniques that some principals found to be highly effective during confrontation were not even utilized by other principals during their periods of crisis. Also, techniques utilized effectively by some principals were found to be totally ineffective by other principals in different school settings.

While conducting interviews with secondary school principals regarding student activism, the author found them to be cooperative and sincere. In discussing this subject, principals spoke with deep emotion and their facial expressions, mannerisms, tones of voice, and total sincerity of response indicated their perception of the serious nature of the student activist movement. The deep feeling these administrators revealed when discussing student activism was often as significant as the specific words they chose to express themselves.

Some administrative officials, especially secondary school principals in racially integrated schools, have developed extensive plans to cope with student confrontation. One secondary school principal who was a respondent in this study has prepared a detailed plan for the security of his building. The plan provides
for four levels of building security; the specific level utilized would depend upon the severity of the emergency at the moment. Proceeding from mere routine awareness to the most intense security procedures, each level of security is described as follows: Condition One - Surveillance, Condition Two - Minimum Security, Condition Three - Intermediate Security, and Condition Four - Maximum Security. This security plan is extremely detailed. (See Appendix C).

The editors of *Education, U.S.A.* describe the strategy of some administrators as follows:

School tactical plans for handling disorders describe officials with responsibility for action; how the rest of the staff will be deployed; what will be done about bells, false alarms, the intercom, the telephone; how to flash fast information, scotch rumors, and keep out unauthorized visitors; how and when to use bullhorns, walkie-talkies, still and movie cameras, and tape recorders; how to call in the police; and who will talk to reporters. The seriousness with which some systems have gone about their planning gives their strategy a distinctly military ring; the 'command post' is designated, liaison teams are assigned, nurses are designated to treat injuries, methods of 'securing' the library, the lavatories, the records and office areas are outlined, as are provisions for mobile units for 'perimeter control', citizen's arrests, 'staff runners', location of plainclothes officers in unmarked cars, and so forth.25

---

CHAPTER II

RELATED LITERATURE AND CURRENT AFFECTING FORCES OF THE STUDENT ACTIVIST MOVEMENT

Donald Barr, headmaster of New York's Dalton School and a former administrator at Columbia University, is deeply concerned by the ruthless, reckless spirit in today's young activists.

Barr believes that the rebellion that parents are financing is not one revolution, but three. In discussing these revolutions, Barr notes:

The first is political. It is carried on by New Left students, who want to change not only the university, but society. The second revolution is radical. It is organized by Black militants who are tired of asking for a little share and are going to take a big share of Whitey's good life and education. The third revolution is the personal revolt against reason, which embraces superstition, fate, mysticism, hipherarchy, and a dreadful, mindless dabbling in drugs. Parents are directly financing the New Left revolution and the drug cop-out, and indirectly they are supporting the black militants.1

Scott D. Thomson, superintendent of the Evanston Township High Schools, identifies specific alienated student groups. Thomson states:

We all know of at least four different alienated student groups; (1) the New Left activists, (2) the advocates of

1 Donald Barr, "A parents' guide to the age of revolt," McCall's ICVII, No. 1 (October, 1969), 73.
Black Power, (3) the Hippies, and (4) the Third World Liberation Front. All make headlines, but each is a unique group. The hippies are largely apolitical. They have dropped out, separating themselves from a society considered grossly competitive and hopelessly materialistic. Hippies are heavily involved with drugs, with mysticism, and with communal living. The movement is diminishing rapidly, perhaps because the fashion world has appropriated for middle-aged matrons many trappings of hippism.

The New Left activists, in contrast, are deeply committed to political action. They want change, the more radical desiring revolutionary change. They organize protests and engage heavily in political education. They tolerate hippies but scorn them as whimsical, not to be counted on for the tough in-fighting. Activists plan to reshape society by assaulting schools and gaining power. Hippies flee from power.

Another group, the advocates of Black Power, sometimes form alliances with the activists, however, most Black Power leaders are extremely cautious about white influence and will accept assistance with skepticism. The Black Power students of high school age concentrate on specific issues of radical discrimination such as proposals for an Afro-American curriculum, the hiring of black teachers and administrators, the purchase of black products, the display of black art, etc. Black Power groups have become increasingly demanding of 'White Institutions,' Black initiative seems the order of the day.

The Third World Liberation Front, a relatively new group, resulted from a partnership of the more radical black and white students into a united front for 'the rights of all oppressed peoples.' Because they are almost exclusively political revolutionaries, this group's influence at the high school level may not develop—until next year.

Each movement enshrines its intellectual heroes. The New Left loves Sartre for the nihilism in his existentialism, Che Guevara for a consuming personal commitment to revolution against privilege, Herbert Marcuse for dissecting contemporary institutions, and Ho Chi Minh for embarrassing a computerized Pentagon. The Black Power activists worship W.E.B. DuBois
for a prophetic insight into the condition of the black man in America; they revere Malcolm X for publicly challenging the superiority of whites; and they respect Stokely Carmaniel for popularizing the movement. For the Third World people, Eldridge Cleaver and MaoTse-tung are saints to save all non-whites everywhere. And of course our Hippies, the lovable Schmoos of the 1960's are dedicated to Papa Pot and Mama Meth.

Although a great majority of students remain content, conservative, and apathetic, a determined minority of restless college students has forced us to re-examine and change many regulations that were once thought of as inviolate. Lewis B. Mayhew, professor of education at Stanford University, comments on dissent:

Virtually every student uprising during the last four years has been caused because an administrator denied students procedural rights. . . . Behind every successful student outbreak stands some administrator who exercised discretion without legitimacy. Properly structured grievance procedural rights could have kept grievances within legitimate bounds.

The technique of direct administrative handling of disciplinary matters has lost its legitimacy in the eyes of students and of many faculty and this should be recognized and changes made.

Whether or not a student burns a draft card, participates in a civil rights march, engages in premarital or extra-marital sexual activity, becomes pregnant, attends church, sleeps all day and drinks all night is not really the concern of ... an educational institution.

When colleges regulate such behavior, as many do, they are by implication taking responsibility for developing

---

3 Lewis B. Maynew, "Quotes on Dissent," Phi Delta Kappan, XL, No. 1 (September, 1968), 19.
6. Alienated students live at the edge of despair. Although they seem at times to be enjoying life, there is always a sense of foreboding about them. Often they become depressed and suicidal. Activist students are more emotionally stable but are also prone to deep feelings of hopelessness and self-pity.4

Educators are extremely concerned today about the mounting wave of lawlessness that often crests into violence. The riots on the University of California campus at Berkeley and the violence at Columbia University set the tone of the new breed of activists.

Sidney Hook, professor of philosophy at New York University, elaborates upon the consequences of the events at Berkeley:

Shortly after the riotous events at the University of California at Berkeley in 1964, I predicted that in consequence of the faculty's refusal to condemn the student seizure of Sproul Hall, the administration building, American higher education would never be the same again, that a turning point had been reached in the pattern of its development. I confess, however, to surprise at the rapidity of the change, if not its direction, and by the escalation of the violence accompanying it.

Equally significant in determining the changing intellectual climate of our universities are some of the secondary consequences of the accelerating disorders. Among them are infectious, sometimes paralyzing, fear in administrative ranks lest their campuses erupt; confusion, bewilderment, and divided loyalties among faculties, together with some Schadenfruede over the humiliation of their administrations at the hands of disrespectful student militants; outright encouragement of student violence by disaffected, younger members of teaching staffs; sustained apathy among the majority of

students whose education has been interrupted by radical activists; and the mixture of rage and disgust among the general public whose political repercussions already have been damaging to the cause of higher education.5

Donald Barr in describing the mode of operation of students at Columbia University states:

In April, 1968, for instance, some students at Columbia University set the new pattern for modern campus insurrection. The rebels' parents believed--some tell me they still do--that their sons were rioting in order to keep the university from building a segregated private gymnasium in a public park. Actually the SDS, after trying and failing with other issues, picked up the gym issue as an afterthought and thereby managed to stir up just enough vague turmoil to enable the activists to 'liberate' a building--and in the excitement another, and another.

Then, when the university began to surrender on the 'issues', the rebels altered the issues. When the authorities hesitated to call in the police, the rebels intensified the provocation, until the administration felt it had no choice. The university's president (who was eventually compelled to resign) glumly reported that 'the mere shock of seeing a large force of helmeted police on campus, followed by the sight and the firsthand experience of violence, brought to a head the unease and emotions of many students'.

The rebels won by being beaten. There is an art to making demands. A good demand rallies the crowd, divides the faculty, and forces the administrators to take a stand. Often it is difficult to think of demands to which the college president will not surrender. But somehow he must be shown to be 'unwilling to listen,' so students now demand things that have nothing to do with college; an end to the Vietnam war or the release of some Black Panthers somewhere. The more arbitrary the demand, the more 'idealistic' it will seem to the Sociology Department and to the radicals' parents.6

Sidney Hook discusses the implications of the lack of disciplinary procedures that followed the violence at Columbia University, Hook concludes:

At Columbia, Acting President Andrew W. Cordier had petitioned the courts through the Dean of the Law School to dismiss the criminal charges against the Columbia students arrested for serious offenses last spring. The court was assured that the University would apply appropriate disciplinary measures to those guilty. The cases were therefore dismissed. In December, a Columbia College disciplinary tribunal of two teachers—one of them an instructor serving as chairman—two students, and an administrator decided to impose no penalties on the students whatsoever despite the fact that the students proudly admitted violating University regulations and, to boot, denied the authority of the tribunal to judge them. This incredible decision was taken in order 'to re-establish student relationships to the university'. These students had won complete amnesty for actions that had been deemed worthy of criminal prosecution when they had occurred. Twice hearings in the Law School were violently disrupted by invading SDS students, and the faculty members of the panel were insulted with gutter obscenities. No one even dared to suggest that disciplinary action be taken against this new wave of disruption. The administrators and many of the faculty of Columbia University for months were deeply distraught. It appeared to some observers as if the University petition to have the criminal charges dropped against the students was a ruse by the administration to ingratiate itself with the militant students, to prove its 'good will' toward them and, in this way, buy some campus peace. If so, the strategy failed. It provoked only contempt, jeers, and a stream of foul, four-letter epithets from the militants who held out for complete amnesty, from the outset.

Encouraged by the amnesty, the Columbia SDS, with aid from outsiders, began to disrupt classes; a leaflet was distributed to justify such 'classroom intervention'. In some instances, students tore the notes out of their teachers' hands; in others, they shouted them down. By December, according to one source, as many as thirteen 'interventions' had been perpetrated. No action was taken either by the faculty or by the administration. An inquiry from an education editor, who had gotten wind of the situation, went unanswered. No one on campus would talk for publication.
Their appetites whetted by the complaisance or timidity of their victims, the students of the SDS escalated the scale of their disruptions. The Columbia Spectator of February 27 reported that 'Members of the SDS yesterday interrupted nearly forty classes in six University buildings'.

Finally on March 10, a public statement in response to these outrages was issued by a hundred, mostly senior, professors. In it they declared that the University had an obligation to defend itself against hooliganism. Referring to the policy of amnesty, they criticized the abandonment of disciplinary proceedings for previous serious infractions. President Cordier immediately rushed to endorse the statement taking care, at the same time, to minimize the number of class disruptions, but failing to explain why he had remained silent about the breaking up of classes in December, although he was aware of it, and why he had welcomed the abandonment of disciplinary proceedings.7

Fortunately, many college administrators are handling student protests in a more positive fashion, and many protests are conducted for causes and changes that are legitimate.

A recent editorial from the Chicago Daily News appeared as a guest editorial in the Worth-Palos Reporter. This editorial summarized a survey by the Urban Research Corporation of Chicago. The editorial is as follows:

If you believe that protests on campus are always led by leftists, that they are always violent, that they always disrupt normal operation, that the protestors always present inflexible demands, that college administrations always surrender meekly--then you're wrong, according to a survey conducted by the Urban Research Corp. of Chicago.

In fact, the agency said, 76 per cent of the protests among the 292 studied resulted in no destruction or violence

of any kind; 60 per cent did not interrupt college routine; 'nonnegotiable demands' were made in only 6 per cent; the New Left participated in only 28 per cent; of the 215,000 direct participants, 3,652 were arrested, 956 suspended or expelled and 708 placed on probation, and 69 per cent of student 'demands' remain unmet. The major issues at stake were local--such as student participation in college affairs--and not the draft or other national policy; and the higher the 'scholastic aptitude' of a student body, the more likely the students are to conduct protests.

Urban Research studied protests on 232 campuses (including 17 in Illinois) with an enrollment of 2,200,000, about one-third of the nation's total. Its conclusions are borne out by a recent insurance study that shows 1968--a lively year in campus protests--to have been comparable to the five preceding years in insured losses on campus.

We present these considerations in the interest of setting the record straight, reassuring parents and doing justice to both protesting students and the institutions that were their targets. Most student protesters, whether right or wrong in their aims, are sincere young people who see wrongs and attempt to eliminate them.8

It is apparent that while student dissent and militancy originated at the university level, it has filtered down into the secondary schools where it is a growing movement. The news media are presently shifting the focus from the college scene to extensive coverage of the secondary school dilemma.

Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Robert H. Finch, addressed the convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals and spoke within the convention's theme "What's Right With American Education." Finch stated:

U.S. high schools are in a state of breakdown, whose symptoms are all too clear, violence, drugs, dropouts . . . the passive acquiescence of boredom . . . incredibly mobile but profoundly unhappy students.9

Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, syndicated columnists writing in the Los Angeles Times, attribute much of the student unrest at the high school level to race turmoil. Evans and Novak state:

While the black ghettos and college campuses have been relatively quiet, the nation's public high schools are suddenly developing into the most violence-prone and divisive battleground of American society.

No single high school disturbance has the magnitude of a Berkeley rebellion or a Watts riot to stir national attention. But the beginning of the school year last Labor Day brought with it an epidemic of small-scale violence in high schools in every section of the country—racially connected in nearly every instance and frequently starting with Negro students assaulting white students.

Federal officials here are deeply aware of the grave problem but can pinpoint neither cause nor cure. Although the Black Panther Party and Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) are actively agitating at the high school level, their efforts can be traced to only a tiny fraction of the violence. Rather, high school turmoil seems a spontaneous reflection of national racial tensions and black militancy which, in turn, may well breed deeper white hatred and still greater tension.

Since high schools reopened in September, no day has passed without an incident somewhere in the country. As of Nov. 18, with the school year less than one-third completed, over 225 disorders and disruptions had been reported.

9"What's Wrong With the High Schools," Newsweek, LXXV, No. 7 (February 16, 1970), 65.
Throughout the entire previous school year, there were only 320 such disruptions. More significant, racial battling was minimal five years ago and almost unknown just a decade ago.

Up to Nov. 18 there had been nearly 900 arrests on charges including murder, assault on police, and conspiracy to commit arson. The casualty list includes over 200 persons injured, including 20 policemen and 12 teachers. Damage to schools from habitual window-breaking and occasional arson is anybody's guess.

This sampling of high school incidents during November alone reveals a national blackboard jungle dominated by racial hatred.¹⁰

The College Entrance Examination Board, the Danforth Foundation, and the Institute for Development of Educational Activities Inc., recently sponsored a colloquium on the provocative topic of student activism and the relevancy of American education. Students, teachers, and veteran administrators participated in this symposium. The intent of this colloquium was to identify areas of student dissatisfaction and ascertain components of the curriculum which need strengthening. The following nine recommendations came as a result of this colloquium:

1. Every school system should anticipate student activism in advance and develop a coping strategy based upon sound information on the issues of rights and privileges of students.

2. The development of new curricula of diversity, integrity, and relevance with particular treatment to the questions of education for knowledge of self.

3. Viable programs of independent study taking into consideration that the knowledge which is of most worth is that which is self-learned.

4. Deliberate use of the confrontation as an administrative strategy and development of a repertoire of techniques for coping with this type of dialogue.

5. Open communication—a continuing student-faculty-administration dialogue over problems important to the school.

6. A reaffirmation of national goals by a national group such as a President's Commission on National Goals.

7. A new focus on both school system and local school goals.

8. Secondary schools should recognize that youth needs experience in volunteer service as an avenue to adventure and an outlet for its restlessness and enthusiasm. Opportunities for service should be an integral part of the school program.

9. When a situation becomes acute and disruption appears imminent the schools should avail themselves of the concept of the ombudsman.  

Whitney Young, Jr. Executive Director of the National Urban League in New York City, offers several reasons why he feels that America is in turmoil:

The reason we are in serious trouble is that America has lived a lie. America wrote a Constitution in which it guaranteed freedom and equality for all of its citizens. It then adopted a Judaeo-Christian ethic which talked about inherent dignity and worth of the human being and then proceeded to exclude black people. I was in Williamsburg,

[11]

David Mallery, "Student Activism and the Relevancy of Schooling," College Entrance Examination Board, the Danforth Foundation and (I) (D) (E) (A) (1969) p.5.
Virginia, not too long ago and I saw in a motel lobby a picture of Thomas Jefferson writing the Declaration of Independence, and he was just about to finish that line; 'We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal. The interesting thing was that there at that very moment was a slave that he owned who was fanning him, and I'm sure Jefferson saw no inconsistency because the way that the society had achieved this was to ignore the fact that the Negro existed as a human being. For 250 years he was a piece of chattel, and then for another 100 years society rationalized itself into saying that black people were basically inferior. This is the reason that your textbooks hardly mention a black person in history, unless it's somebody like Booker T. Washington or George Washington Carver. The textbooks could not have mentioned people like Nat Turner or Denmark Vesey or Frederick Douglas. They could not have talked about black people who have made great contributions in history, people who have in fact discovered the process for refining steel, people who have discovered the first clock, discovered the process for blood plasma, people who have been great writers and great artists. They could not talk about these people because to have done so would have been to have made a lie out of the fact that the black man was inferior and so deserved an inferior status.

Education in fact failed to prepare people to live in a democratic society. Our educational institutions, like most American institutions, have for the most part been concerned with perpetuating what is and for serving those people who were useful to the system. They have not been structured to prepare people to grow out of poverty, to rehabilitate themselves. They have not been prepared to educate poor, white people from Appalachia, the American Indian, the Mexican-American, or the black American. And so while education deserves to be indicted, it is also to the credit of education that today we have a revolution at all. Because it was in the books that black people learned what in fact the Declaration of Independence was all about and proceeded to engage in a revolt. That's not unusual for our history.12

12 Whitney M. Young, Jr., "Order or Chaos in our Schools," The National Elementary Principal, XLIX, No. 3 (January, 1970), 26.
Recent court decisions have tended to increase the individual rights of students and at the same time to limit the authority of the principal. Robert L. Ackerly explains this new trend:

Recent court decisions have tended in the direction of restraining the school from exercising many of the forms of control over student conduct which it and the community formerly accepted as normal and proper. But whatever the reasons for these legal actions may be and whatever their outcomes are, the impact of court decisions relating to the control of student behavior is felt more immediately and heavily by the building principal than by anyone else in the administrative or teaching hierarchy.¹³

Thus, along with the many other pressures that are directed toward the secondary school principal, he is also faced with indecision and uncertainty in the courts. Education U.S.A.'s Special Report on "High School Student Unrest" presents the significance of the recent case "Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community School District":

School officials, said the U.S. Supreme Court in the famed Des Moines 'black armband' case, 'do not possess absolute authority over their students. Students in school as well as out of school are 'persons' under our constitution. They are possessed of fundamental rights which the state must respect, just as they themselves must respect their obligations to the state. In our system, students may not be regarded as closed-circuit recipients of only that which the

state chooses to communicate. They may not be confined to
the expression of those sentiments that are officially ap­
proved. In the absence of a specific showing of constitu­
tionally valid reasons to regulate their speech, students are
entitled to freedom of expression of their views.

This case--Tinker v. Des Moines Independent Community
School District--enunciated a landmark decision which has
enormous implications for every school board and school admini-
istrator:

It arose in December 1965 when a group of pacifist-
minded citizens decided to publicize their objections to the
Vietnam war by wearing black armbands during the Christmas
season.

School principals, aware of the plan, met in mid-December
and barred the practice of wearing black armbands, adopting
a policy that students refusing to remove them would be sus­
pended from school. In reversing that policy, the Supreme
Court said that the demonstration amounted to 'symbolic speech
that was protected by the First Amendment so long as it did
not intrude on others."

C.A. Hollister in a speech to the National School Boards
Association in April, 1969, concluded:

One can only hope that school officials will view the
Tinker findings as did a New York Times editorial February
26, 1969: 'Freedom of expression--in an open manner by those
holding minority or unpopular views--is a part of the strength
and vigor of our society. So long as it does not obstruct the
right of others in the classroom or on campus, it must be
allowed in this country. If dissent ever has to go under-
ground, America will be in real trouble'.


Ibid, p. 23.
The now famous "Gault decision" made it clear that school officials have to afford the protection of the Bill of Rights and of the Fourteenth Amendment to all with whom they deal, regardless of age. Robert L. Ackerly quotes the Gault decision:

Whatever may be their precise impact, neither the Fourteenth Amendment nor the Bill of Rights is for adults alone. 16

The editors of School Management also stress the changed attitude on the part of the courts:

A few years back, public school authorities had a free hand in student discipline. You could interrogate, transfer, suspend, or expel youngsters pretty much as you saw fit. The standards of dress and conduct you set were not subject to judicial supervision. In the eyes of the courts, you acted in loco parentis—and that was that.

The power of the superintendent or building principal is not drastically reduced today. But it is no longer unlimited. Increasingly, in recent years, students have turned to the courts for relief from arbitrary school rules and discipline. And, increasingly, they have won their judicial battles.

The courts are agreeing that the student, just as much as the adult citizen, is entitled to constitutional rights of free expression, free assembly, and due process. Deprivation of the right to receive an education is important enough to the future of the pupil and his family that protests against unreasonable administrative authority can be expected with increasing frequency.

In short, the actions you take to control student expression or behavior are subject to judicial veto as never before. You might, at some future date, find a traditional policy or recent disciplinary action overruled by a judge more 'liberal' than you are. It looks like you'll have to live

with this possibility for some time, barring a rightward swerve from the libertarianism that currently holds sway in our courts.

Unless you're willing to risk the embarrassment of court reversal, you must be sophisticated in the drafting and enforcement of school rules.17

The editors of Newsweek emphasize the present unrest in our nations' schools as follows:

The signs of disruption and discontent are evident on all sides. Last year, some 6,000 'incidents'--ranging from racial strife through political protests to arson attempts--were registered in the nation's public high schools. An estimated one-third to one-half of the U.S.'s 14.5 million high-school students have tried a variety of drugs, and the number of users is steadily rising. The wave of student activism that engulfed college campuses in the late '60s is now beginning to hit high schools in full force, 'radicalizing' many of the brightest and most politically aware students just as it did their elders a few years ago (significantly, SDS's Weatherman faction now plans to direct its major recruitment effort at urban high school students.) And high-school administrators, entangled in a labyrinth of local, state, and federal bureaucracies, lack the flexibility of their university counterparts in adjusting to the new student demands.18

Today's youth seem to have less enthusiasm for school. Many students dread going to school because they are bored with outdated curriculums, and they feel that schools restrict them in everything from dress and deportment to curriculum. J. Lloyd

18 "What's Wrong With the High Schools?" Newsweek, LXXV, No. 7 (February 16, 1970), 65.
Trump, Associate Secretary of the National Association of Secondary School Principals feels that schools are not meeting the needs of students; as a result, students from all socioeconomic classes are developing a dislike for their schools. Trump states:

Our schools fail the middle class as much as they fail the deprived. 19

The percentive high school principal will also be familiar with the recommendations on academic freedom released in October, 1968, by the American Civil Liberties Union. This organization has intervened on behalf of many student disciplinary penalties recently. In addition to keeping informed on court decisions, the principal must function within the framework of the individual rights of students.

According to the American Civil Liberties Union students have the following rights:

To organize political groups, hold assemblies and demonstrations, and wear buttons and armbands with slogans, so long as these do not disrupt classes or the peace of the school.

To receive formal hearing, written charges, and the right to appeal any serious violation of conduct charge.

To dress and to wear one's hair as one pleases. So long as the student's appearance does not disrupt the educational process or constitute a threat of safety, it should be of no concern to the school.

To attend school while married or pregnant, unless this 'in fact' disrupts the educational process.

19 Ibid, 65.
To publish and distribute student materials without prohibition or contempt unless they 'clearly and imminently' disrupt, or are libelous.

To live under a 'written rule by law.' In other words, students should be told in writing the extent and limits of faculty authority so that their rights 'are not compromised by faculty members who while ostensibly acting as consultants or counselors are, in fact, exercising authority to censor student expression and inquiry'.

There are those who view the student activist movement as presenting a real danger to our society. An intelligence report based upon months of nationwide research and the accumulation of documented findings by Congressional probers, U.S. law-enforcement agencies, and state and local authorities is presented by William Schulz. He discusses the present threat:

The revolutionary menace consists of a highly dangerous minority of perhaps 20,000 activists embedded within an overall movement of 200,000 activists and radical dissidents. At the core of the movement, security officials agree, are two groups, one white and one black, both with grandiose plans for the overthrow of a 'decadent' American society. They are:

The Students for a Democratic Society, activated in 1962 by a handful of students from less than a dozen campuses. Today, SDS claims 70,000 followers on 350 campuses, and its national leaders--virtually all non-students--proudly rattle off a string of revolutionary victories scored last year at schools from Harvard to San Francisco State.

The Black Panther Party is a virulent, self-styled 'armed revolutionary vanguard.' In less than two years, the Panthers have mushroomed from a 125-man contingent based solely in Oakland, California to a nationwide operation with 60,000 sympathizers and chapters in two dozen cities. 'Schooled in the Marxist-Leninist ideology and the teachings of Mao Tse-

tung', reports the FBI, 'Panther members have perpetrated numerous assaults on police officers and engaged in violent confrontations with police throughout the country'.

Throughout the early part of 1969, national leaders of SDS and the Black Panther Party held top-secret strategy sessions to discuss plans and coordinate strategy. The meetings were hardly surprising, for the extremist blacks and the revolutionary whites have much in common: a hatred for present-day America, an idolization of Fidel Castro and Mao Tsetung, an abiding faith in violence as the means of destroying American society.

The Panthers are no more representative of American blacks than the Students for a Democratic Society are of the country's seven million collegians. But both groups have a capacity for disruption that far exceeds their numbers. By carefully selecting issues--from the Vietnam war to 'police brutality'--and by exploiting them fully, they have stirred to action thousands who would not normally become involved. And the havoc they have wreaked has had far-reaching consequences. It has jeopardized the struggle for civil rights, severely disrupted the normal processes of our academic system and posed a major threat to the continued existence of our democratic system.21

The doctoral dissertation abstracts indicate a lack of studies with respect to the effects of student activism upon the perceived leadership role of the secondary school principal. The student activist movement at the high school level is such a recent phenomenon that little time has elapsed for completion of research studies.

Dr. Kenneth Fish conducted a study from January to April in 1969 to provide principals with an analysis of student power and to offer suggestions for coping with it. His study of student

unrest in fifteen selected high schools from Connecticut to California was funded jointly by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, the Ford Foundation, and the Montclair, New Jersey Board of Education.

Fish interviewed students and staff to record the chronology of conflict and to analyze viewpoints toward it. Principals, black militant students, and involved citizens participated in this study. Schools participating in the study ranged from twelve hundred to four thousand in student enrollments, and a wide variety of minority racial groups were represented. Minority group enrollments were represented in schools with less than five percent to schools with ninety-five percent. The study also included schools whose corridors have been patrolled by more than one hundred policemen as well as schools where no trouble resulted, even though significant elements of conflict were present—bigness, urban location, and a racially mixed student body.

Fish concluded in this study that principals should muster prior to conflict the resources of administration, staff, students, and citizens in cooperative efforts to resolve differences. The basic obligations the principal bears, according to Fish, include:

1. To communicate continually and fully with students
2. To make needed reforms in the student council
3. To expand the activities program
4. To call for and use outside help when it is needed
5. To develop an emergency plan
6. To work positively with the news media
7. To reform the curriculum

The study proposed by the author differs from Fish's study in that the hypotheses test the effects of student activism upon the perceived leadership role of the principal. Fish places emphasis upon the chronology of conflict and on suggested procedures to cope with actual conflict. The author limits this study to the effects of activism.

During the 1968 school year nine regional conferences were conducted throughout New York State in an effort to cope with the new movement of student power. These conferences provided for the participation of students, teachers, administrators, and the New York State Education Department officials. The meetings were directed by Bernard F. Haake, assistant commissioner for instructional services, and Philip B. Langworthy, assistant commissioner for pupil services and continuing education.

At the conclusion of these nine regional conferences, the New York State Education Department prepared a memorandum entitled, "Student Activism in the High Schools of New York State."

This memorandum contained twelve recommendations for administrators. These recommendations are as follows:

---

1. Educational leaders must take the initiative in convincing their profession and their community that student activism is potentially a constructive force compatible with democratic principles.

2. Guidelines for handling student activism should be developed at the local level, with participation by students, parents, teachers, administrators, and board members.

3. Because of constant changes occurring in all communities, the superintendent and his staff should maintain a continuous system of community analysis.

4. New ethnic and minority groups should be recognized as quickly as possible, and involved in school affairs.

5. Minority group participation should be given high visibility.

6. Effective communication is a key ingredient, and new channels should be sought and existing channels strengthened.

7. Educational goals and purposes should be reviewed cooperatively and realistic programs should be devised, with the involvement of all those affected by the programs.

8. Curriculum should be examined for significance, relevance, and integrity.

9. Staff organization and development should be reviewed in order to provide greater opportunities for peer-group personnel.

10. A deliberately planned training program should be provided to improve staff sensitivity to the perspective of others.

11. Activism in the form of protest should be anticipated, and strategy for dealing with it should be planned in advance.
Professional organizations should join in promoting constructive utilization of increased student activism.

The report of these conferences concluded that many superintendents were not prepared to deal with student activism when it occurred at the high school level. The findings did indicate that administrators were developing more sensitivity to the need for developing new answers that will be effective in interaction with the new style of students filling their schools.

In summary, the New York State Department of Education made a sincere effort to go beyond opinion and to obtain factual information to help administrators cope with the new phenomenon of student power. This study, while somewhat related to the author's study, was directed toward superintendents and was conducted by the conference technique, not by interviews with high school principals as the author's study does. Unlike the author's study, this report includes the views of teachers, administrators, and State Department of Education officials. Many of the recommendations suggested in the report are supported by recent professional literature and by current writers who have focused upon the student activist movement.

Bernard F. Haake, and Philip B. Langworthy, "Recommendations on Student Activism in High Schools," School and Society, XCVII, No. 2319 (October, 1969), 342-343.
Warren O. Hagstrom and Leslie L. Gardner of the Center for Cognitive Learning at the University of Wisconsin recently completed a study entitled, "Characteristics of Disruptive High School Students." The study was funded by a grant from the United States Office of Education. This report pertains to one type of student deviation: rebellion--active alienation from authority. The findings of this research study reveal some implications for high school principals who must deal with the current group of rebellious students.

The data reported in this study were gathered in eight Wisconsin communities in March, 1967. The sample for this study includes 1,318 high school students from fifty-six classrooms in ten high schools. The major dependent variables are students' reports of being sent from classes for disciplinary reasons and truancy from school with groups of students. The sample for this study was not random. The most serious limitation of the sample is that it includes only relatively small communities, not selected in any random fashion. The schools are homogeneous in terms of race not a single negro student participated in this study. This factor presents a serious limitation in the attempt to generalize the findings reported.

The findings reported that rebels are more likely to be boys than girls and especially boys who do not plan to go to college. Boys and girls from high socioeconomic status who are not college-bound are likely to become discipline problems. Students whose
Intelligence quotients are in the average range are more likely to be rebellious than students with either high or low intelligence quotients. Boys who are marginal leaders and who have some followers are more likely to be behavior problems in high school than either non-leaders or the top leaders. This is true, however, only for boys not planning to attend college.

These results are consistent with Stinchcombe's findings in 1964. Hagstrom's and Gardner's findings decisively refute the idea that high school rebellion comes primarily from working class boys and girls. The data support but do not prove Stinchcombe's theory that student rebellion is a reaction caused by failure in school and that school is irrelevant and threatening to the self-esteem of the non-college-bound student.

Male adolescence is centered around the problem of autonomy. Adolescent girls are mostly concerned with their expressive relationships. Boys because of their desire for personal autonomy will engage in more confrontation with authority figures who expect them to behave passively. Failure in school is especially critical to boys' self-concepts. Boys must be orientated to a universal labor market; hence failure in school is threatening to the ego-aspirations of boys.


In summary, this study concludes that frustrated aspirations lead to aggressive behavior in schools. A way must be found to reduce the degree of frustration before aggression occurs. Teachers, counselors, and administrators motivate students to develop high aspirations of success. Frustration results when these aspirations are not realized. There must be a process developed to "cool out" the students who want college degrees but are not capable of obtaining them. If school staff members are unable to initiate effective cooling out procedures to reduce school anxiety and frustration, then policy changes must be implemented to make school more meaningful and rewarding to those students most likely to become rebellious.

Since rebellion occurs in group settings, additional research studies are needed to relate characteristics of individual rebellious students to the characteristics of the groups in which they interact.

This study of the "Characteristics of Disruptive High School Students" presents some significant information for high school principals; however, the emphasis of the study was upon the specific kinds of misconduct and misbehavior on the part of rebellious students. The study reveals causes for the misconduct of certain types of dissident and rebellious students; consequently it relates to the author's study.

---

A national survey on student activism was conducted by J. Lloyd Trump, Associate Secretary of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and Jane Hunt, an Editorial Associate with the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Questionnaires were sent to a random sample of 1,982 principals. A total of 1,025 principals responded. This survey indicated that student activism is widespread. Three out of five principals reported some form of active protests in their schools. Included in the survey were junior and senior high school principals in all kinds of schools—public, private, large and small. Protests have occurred in sixty-seven percent of the suburban schools; and in fifty-three percent of the rural schools. This survey reports principals' opinions about what is happening regarding student activism and differs from the author's study of the effects of student activism upon the leadership role of the principal. This study by Trump and Hunt emphasizes the need for new channels of communication. Nearly every respondent indicated that a need exists for pupils, administrators, parents, and teachers to know each other better.


28 Ibid, p. 150.
New York City with its large concentration of high schools was the scene of a recent study. Bernard Bard in referring to the city's ninety high schools describes the effects of this study in relation to the schools. Bard elaborates:

Their milieu has been penetrated in a year-long study for the U.S. Office of Education. The study involved depth interviews with twenty-three principals and auditing of seminars attended by twelve others.

Approximately eighty percent of the high school principals in New York City are Jewish. The Jewish principals are in a position of conflict as they place a high value on education, and at the same time they are sympathetic to minority groups who need a chance to rise. These principals tend to resent members of minority groups, however, who are not committed to or respectful of education.

The findings of the study indicate that principals were defensive of their jobs and schools, angry at their critics, but confident of their leadership abilities and of their knowledge to administer the schools.

This study of the New York inner city principals by the United States Office of Education suggests that perhaps the principalship should be divided into two phases. One principal would operate as

---

"manager of a complex business." The other as chief educator, free to experiment and innovate. Bard comments:

"With such a division of labor, there presumably would be fewer principals who, when asked what their schools needed most, would reply, 'Well, we could use a few more phones here or 'I could use another administrative assistant.'"

This study of the New York inner city principals is related to the author's study; however it does differ in several respects. The Jewish principals serving in the inner city tend to be older and a more staid group than the more youthful principals that are found in the suburban area of Chicago where the author completed his study.

In closing, the study of the New York City high schools included a study of all forces that affect the schools and the principals's administrative functions. This study differs from the author's study in that the author has limited his study to the effects of student activism upon the perceived leadership role of the secondary school principals.

---

31 Ibid, p. 73.
CHAPTER III
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES
BY SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Three approaches were utilized in developing this study. The first approach was to conduct a research of the current professional literature relating to the student activist movement. After this research was conducted, six hypotheses were formulated to serve as the basis for the study. (See Appendix D)

The second approach to the study was the development of an interview instrument to test the six hypotheses of the study. The interview instrument contains twenty-nine propositions. (See Appendix E) A total of thirty-four high school principals were interviewed, and they responded to the propositions of the aforementioned instrument. Their responses were analyzed and evaluated by the author's use of a Likert scale.

The third approach utilized was an in-depth probe of five secondary schools where violence erupted and necessitated the temporary closing of the schools.

Chapter III contains the propositions used to test the hypotheses of the study and an analysis of the principals' responses relating the propositions to the hypotheses of the study.
In conducting the interviews with principals, the author spent a minimum of forty-five minutes with each respondent. In most instances at least one hour was spent in discussion with the responding principal. Some interviews lasted for two hours when respondents were willing to relate recent experiences they had encountered in interaction with dissident students.

A modified Likert scale was utilized in this study to relate the degree of response of each proposition to the related hypothesis. The respondents were asked to select one of five possible answers in keeping with the degree to which they were in agreement or in disagreement with the proposition. The choices were as follows: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). To score the scale, the responses are weighted 1, 0.5, 0, -0.5, and -1 respectively, from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree.

If all respondents Strongly Agree to a proposition, the proposition will receive a score of +34. As the total number of respondents equals 34, the maximum positive score is +34.

Conversely, if all respondents Strongly Disagree with a proposition the proposition will receive a negative score of -34. The maximum negative score possible is a -34.

Following herewith is an example of how to interpret the data.
(Total points received +17)

1. SA - Strongly Agree, A - Agree, U - Undecided, D - Disagree, and SD - Strongly Disagree

2. The number in parenthesis refers to the number of principals who selected that particular response.

3. The number to the right of the parenthesis is the number of principals selecting that particular response converted to a percentage.

4. The specific example illustrated above would read as follows: seventeen principals or fifty per cent of the respondents selected the alternative Strongly Agree. Nine or twenty-six and five tenths per cent selected the alternative Agree. Two or five and nine tenths per cent were Undecided. Three or eight and eight tenths per cent selected the alternative Disagree. Three or eight and eight tenths of the respondents were in Strong Disagreement with the proposition.

5. The proposition was calculated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Weight</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>+1.0</td>
<td>+17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+0.5</td>
<td>+4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1.0</td>
<td>-3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Points +17.
Hypothesis I

Principals, in dealing with student activism, should think more in terms of positive educational change than in terms of repression and control.

The first hypothesis deals with the principal's perception of the student activist movement and his ability to channel activism into positive educational reform. Propositions one, ten, sixteen, twenty-two and twenty-six pertain to this hypothesis.

Proposition 1

The perceptive high school principal will distinguish between constructive and destructive student activism.

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23) 67.6%</td>
<td>(8) 23.5%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
<td>(2) 5.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +26)

Over two-thirds of the principals responding strongly believed that the perceptive principals can distinguish between constructive and destructive activism. Over ninety-one percent of the respondents agreed with this premise. It is quite evident that the principals feel a school administrator should have little difficulty in determining whether a display of student activism is really fundamentally constructive or destructive in nature.

If this is true principals should be able to determine whether to channel constructive activism so as to achieve improvements in the educational program or contain the destructive activism.
to preserve what is good.

The three principals who did not agree with this proposition questioned whether the inexperienced principal would be able to discriminate between constructive and destructive patterns of student activism.

Two principals stated, "We certainly should be perceptive in serving in the suburban area; we have experienced all forms of student activism."

The majority of secondary school principals view student activism as an opportunity to change some school policies and procedures that have been in need of change for several years.

Proposition 10

Initial pressure from students is often the impetus for desirable educational change within the high school.

Principals' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7) 20.5%</td>
<td>(20) 58.9%</td>
<td>(4) 11.8%</td>
<td>(2) 5.9%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +15)

More than three-quarters of the principals feel that pressure from students often brings desirable educational change. In contrast to the seventy-nine percent responding in agreement with this proposition, only twelve percent were uncertain. Less than nine percent disagreed that sometimes student pressure has caused desirable changes. These results indicate that far from being all bad
student pressure has really helped secure desirable changes in the educational programs of secondary schools.

The consensus of opinion of the seven principals who did not agree with this proposition indicated their strong feelings that school improvement and positive educational change should be an ongoing thing. Two prominent principals remarked, "Why should I wait for pressure from students to initiate educational change?" These principals not in agreement with the proposition also stressed that student demands for undesirable educational change must be rejected by administrators.

In summary, the data indicate that student pressure has brought about changes in school dress codes, in basic school regulations, and in curricular areas—particularly in English and Social Studies courses.

Proposition 16

When student activism is ignored or "put down" it may result in disruptive activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +21.5)

Student activism cannot be ignored or repressed in the opinion of over eighty-five percent of the principals participating in this study. Not one responding principal strongly disagreed with this proposition.

Principals must face up to the situation when some difficulty
occurs or real trouble follows. Ignoring disturbances or student gripes or trying to discipline them away simply does not work.

Principals in racially integrated schools believe strongly that a volatile situation can develop if student activists are merely "brushed off" or ignored.

The findings indicate that principals are meeting the challenges of the dissident student openly and directly. The successful principal has developed the skills and leadership abilities that are necessary in coping with the activist and the dissident. In developing rapport with these students, the principal will also become more perceptive and cognizant of future potential problems.

**Proposition 22**

High school principals have found that repression of a problem resulting from student activism is not an effective administrative technique.

**Principals' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(7)</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>(10)</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +5.5)

Although in the proposition analyzed previously principals overwhelmingly indicated that student activism could not be ignored or "put down", they were divided in Proposition 22 as to whether repression of a specific problem resulting from activism is an effective technique.

Almost half of the principals thought it was not an effective technique and twenty-three percent were not sure. Over one-fourth
of the principals believed the principal could use repression effectively, but some of them qualified this by indicating that it was effective for short-range problems which would ease with time and as a stalling procedure to obtain time for consideration.

The majority of principals were in agreement, however, that repression of long-range problems is not an effective technique. The principal who attempts to function by repressing long-range problems is certain to encounter serious difficulties.

Proposition 26

High school principals are finding many opportunities for school improvement inherent in student activism.

**Principals' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(5) 15%</td>
<td>(22) 64.6%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
<td>(4) 11.8%</td>
<td>(2) 5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +12)

Almost eighty percent of the principals found that student activism opened up opportunities for school improvement. Less than twelve percent disagreed with this proposition and less than six percent strongly disagreed.

It is quite evident that in the opinion of the respondents while student activism has caused much difficulty and worry it has given principals the opportunities to make improvements in their schools if they take advantage of these opportunities.

The data indicate that if the student activist movement is perceived from a positive aspect, much good can come from it in the form of educational improvement.
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### SUMMARY TABLE FOR HYPOTHESIS I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prop I</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Points +26)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Points +15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Points +21.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Points +5.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prop 26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Points +12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary and Analysis**

Principals were generally in agreement with Hypothesis I and the consensus of opinion among the respondents indicated their feelings that student activism should be approached from a positive aspect. The activist movement has motivated principals into taking a much closer look at the operation of their respective schools.

The student activist is entitled to the opportunity of at least being able to express his ideas and opinions through proper channels to administrative officials. The principals' skills and leadership abilities are extremely important when interacting with dissident students. Activism can be directed into desirable student activities and projects by capable principals who maintain contact with student activists.
While the student activist movement has presented principals with many opportunities to improve the operation of their schools, it has also resulted in student pressure for principals to initiate some changes that would be detrimental to the total school program. The capable principal is resisting student pressure for undesirable change and providing alternatives and activities to direct activism into positive change.

Hypothesis I is definitely supported by the data, and this hypothesis has been accepted.

**Hypothesis II**

Principals have experienced the need to open new channels of communication to develop better understanding among students, staff, and parents.

This second hypothesis focuses upon the importance of effective communication within the high school in this era of rapid sociological change. Propositions three, twelve, eighteen, twenty-three and twenty-eight pertain to this hypothesis.

**Proposition 3**

High school principals need to establish an atmosphere of trust and understanding that will facilitate continuous two-way communication between the staff and student body.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +32)

Over eighty-eight percent of the respondents were in strong agreement that it is the principal's responsibility to develop and
maintain open lines of communication. Everyone of the thirty-four principals participating in this study were in agreement or strong agreement with this proposition.

In the present era of student unrest, "communication" is a much overworked and misinterpreted word. One veteran principal stressed, "Communication does not necessarily mean that two people must agree. It does mean, however, that two persons have listened to each others point of view."

Principals strongly realize the importance of effective lines of communication and they are constantly striving to improve their communication structures. The data in proposition 3 strongly support the premise that principals consider effective communication to be important and a significant aspect in the prevention of student unrest.

**Proposition 12**

A knowledge of the power structure of the student body is important to the high school principal when immediate communication is essential.

**Principals' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(22)</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>(7) 20.5%</td>
<td>(3) 8.8%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +24)

The data from proposition 12 indicate that over eighty five percent of the respondents believe it important for the principal to have a knowledge of the power structure of the school. Less than six percent of the principals were in disagreement with this proposition while nine percent were undecided.
Four principals indicated that the power structure changes rapidly among black students; consequently it is often difficult to identify the leaders among the black students. In racially integrated schools, volatile confrontations can often be prevented by perceptive principals who are aware of the power structures within their schools.

Seven principals stressed that they knew exactly which students to contact in order to deter or prevent confrontation when a potentially volatile situation occurs.

It is quite evident in the opinion of the respondents that violence can be prevented and/or controlled to a greater degree by perceptive principals who maintain a keen awareness of student leaders.

**Proposition 18**

High school principals may prevent many potential problems if they maintain an "open door" policy to students.

**Principals' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(23) 67.7%</td>
<td>(7) 20.5%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
<td>(2) 5.9%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +24.5)

Over two-thirds of the high school principals were in strong agreement that a principal may prevent many potential problems by maintaining an "open door" policy to students. Less than nine percent of the total respondents disagreed with this proposition.

The "open door" policy means more than a principal being present in his office. It also infers that he is frequently seen
in the corridors. One prominent principal concluded, "I visit classrooms; this is the students' home and they like to see me interested enough to visit their classrooms." This educator feels that students are more likely to approach a principal whom they have seen in their classrooms.

Many principals like to keep right on top of current happenings in their schools. This, they feel, is possible only if they establish close contact with students.

The two principals who opposed this proposition feel strongly that the principal should be a bit aloof. They do not believe that dissident students should find the principal too accessible. Although in the minority, these principals favor a system where students must go through several channels before being granted a visit with the principal. They also favor a screening process that diverts student activists from the principal to other administrative personnel with assigned duties of conferring with dissident students.

In summary, the data indicate that over eighty-eight percent of the principals favor an "open door" policy and they definitely believe it advantageous to make themselves readily accessible to all students.

Proposition 23

In today's fast moving society, high school principals may encounter problems if rumors and untruths are not refuted immediately.
**Principals' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12) 35.3%</td>
<td>(8) 23.5%</td>
<td>(5) 15%</td>
<td>(6) 17.5%</td>
<td>(3) 8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +10)

While there was a widespread difference of opinion on the part of principals regarding the threat of rumors and untruths, over fifty-eight percent of the respondents believed it important for the principal to refute rumors promptly. Over twenty-five percent of the respondents were not in agreement with the proposition and fifteen percent were undecided regarding it.

The principals who were opposed to this proposition do not believe that principals can afford to react to rumors. Two principals from large suburban high schools commented, "Principals should not dignify a rumor by commenting upon it." One principal stated, "You cannot refute a rumor; you only make the situation worse."

Principals in racially integrated schools gave the strongest support to the importance of refuting rumors. The consensus of their feelings indicated the belief that any rumor which increases tension among students must be refuted immediately. These principals stressed that rumors should be refuted directly with student leaders. It should be done with care. It is unwise and ineffective to attempt to refute a rumor by using the school public address system or by utilizing the press. Principals in schools
where violence has previously occurred were in strong agreement with this proposition.

The findings tend to support the premise that a rumor can be effectively refuted by a skilled principal who handles the situation with care.

Proposition 28

A student communications committee that meets regularly with the high school principal can provide significant "feedback" regarding needed school reforms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(18) 52.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total points received +19.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seventy-three percent of the respondents were in agreement with the proposition that a student communications committee can provide significant "feedback" for needed school reform. Over fifty-two percent were in strong agreement with the proposition.

Student communications committees are not effective in all schools, however, as eleven percent of the respondents were in disagreement with this proposition. Also, fifteen percent were undecided in relation to student communication committees.

Comments made by respondents, however, indicate that the specific students selected for the communications committee determines to a large extent the success or failure of the committee.
Many administrators indicated that students distrust student councils because student councils are often not made up of students who are truly representative of the student body. Principals who establish communications committees must devise a selection plan that will result in a group of students who are representative of the total student population. If the communications committee is not a representative group of students, it will be just one more school group for students to classify as a part of the "establishment."

The data indicate that in the opinion of the principals student communication committees can function effectively if a representative group of students serve on the committee and if effective administrative leadership is provided.
HYPOTHESIS II SUMMARY GRAPH
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### SUMMARY TABLE FOR HYPOTHESIS II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30 (Points +32)</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
<td>(4) 11.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22 (Points +24)</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>(7) 20.5%</td>
<td>(3) 8.8%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9% (1) 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>23 (Points +24.5)</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>(7) 20.5%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
<td>(2) 5.9% (1) 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>12 (Points +10)</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>(8) 23.5%</td>
<td>(5) 15%</td>
<td>(6) 17.5% (3) 8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>18 (Points +19.5)</td>
<td>52.8%</td>
<td>(7) 20.5%</td>
<td>(5) 15%</td>
<td>(4) 11.8% 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary and Analysis**

There is agreement among principals that it is the principal's direct responsibility to develop and maintain open lines of communication within the high school. The data definitely support and establish this hypothesis.

The principal must strive to develop trust and understanding among students, parents, and staff members. While this is difficult to accomplish, it must be a continuous process involving the total school and community.

It is apparent that principals must maintain close contact with students, and they must be able to identify and communicate with student leaders of the school and especially with activist and dissident students.
Hypothesis III

Principals have recognized the need for student involvement in the planning and implementation of student extracurricular activities.

This hypothesis tests the importance of student participation and involvement in school activities that make up the extra curricular program of the school.

Propositions Four, seven, thirteen, and nineteen pertain to this hypothesis.

Proposition 4

High school students rebel against administrators who maintain autocratic control over student activities.

Principals' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(9) 26.5%</td>
<td>(17) 50%</td>
<td>(2) 5.9%</td>
<td>(6) 17.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +114.5)

Over three-fourths of the respondents believe that students will rebel against administrators who maintain autocratic control over student activities.

Seventeen percent of the respondents who were not in agreement with the proposition feel that students will conform to established regulations even if administrators exercise autocratic methods of control.

While the majority of principals do not favor the use of autocratic methods of control, many principals have been forced to develop rigid regulations to prevent teen-agers from outside
the school from disrupting evening functions of the school.

The data from proposition 4 indicate that principals do not support or favor the use of autocratic methods of control over the students enrolled in their respective schools. While it does not appear to be necessary or advisable to utilize autocratic administrative techniques within the high school, some principals have found it practical and necessary to utilize autocratic controls to prevent "outsiders" from disrupting after school and evening functions of the school.

Proposition 7

Student participation in school activities increases as administrative controls are decreased.

Principals' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) 11.8%</td>
<td>(5) 15%</td>
<td>(3) 8.8%</td>
<td>(15) 44.1%</td>
<td>(7) 20.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received -8.)

Nearly two-thirds of the respondents rejected proposition 7. The findings indicate that principals have found that students want their activities supervised and directed. Principals believe that if administrative controls are decreased student participation will also decrease. These beliefs are based upon the premise, of course, that effective leadership and not autocratic techniques are being provided for students.

Principals have found that not many students are actually willing to work and follow through on the responsibilities of planning and conducting an activity. Students often indicate an intent
to become involved in the planning and direction of an event but they rarely do so unless an element of fun or immediate recreation presents itself.

In rejecting proposition 7, principals clearly revealed their awareness of the need for effective administrative leadership. Administrative leadership and direction appears to be especially significant if student involvement and participation are to result.

**Proposition 13**

Students participate more enthusiastically in after school and evening activities when they have had the major part in planning these activities.

**Principals' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(8) 23.5%</td>
<td>(22) 64.7%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
<td>(3) 8.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +17.5)

Eighty-eight percent of the responding principals are in agreement with proposition 13. They are aware that students participate more enthusiastically in evening events that they have planned.

Several principals who were in agreement with this proposition qualified their response as follows: "The students who are involved in the planning participate more enthusiastically, but other students do not necessarily participate more fully."

The consensus of the principals' perceptions indicate that student participation in extra-curricular activities is declining.
One principal remarked, "Unless an activity has audience participation or is followed by the presentation of some award, the activity will soon be discontinued from lack of student interest."

Many students are engaged in part-time jobs, as our national economy has been at a high level. This has resulted in a decline in student participation of after school and evening activities. Several principals have indicated that students are not participating in extra-curricular activities because many of these activities are in need of revision and change.

The findings definitely indicate that principals look with favor upon student participation, and they encourage student involvement in the planning of activities. This student participation, however, is on the decline and principals believe that a reevaluation is necessary in school activity programs.

Proposition 19

High school students generally support an activity that they have had a part in formulating even though they may not be in accord with all aspects of the activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9) 26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total points received +18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data strongly support this proposition as ninety-one percent of the respondents were in agreement that students generally support a student-planned activity even though they may not be in accord with all aspects of it.
The three principals who were not in accord with this proposition feel that students are becoming completely unpredictable regarding their support of extra-curricular activities.

A few principals also indicated that students are vacillating in regard to their support of extra-curricular activities. They feel that definite changes are needed in the traditional activity programs. Several principals commented about the rapid social changes that are taking place within our society. One administrator stated, "With the changes taking place in our adult world, is it any wonder that student attitudes are changing?"

The data indicate that principals strongly believe that student endorsement of specific activities is advantageous and beneficial to the activity in question.
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## SUMMARY TABLE FOR HYPOTHESIS III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition 4</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Points +14.5)</td>
<td>(9) 26.5% (17)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>(2) 5.9%</td>
<td>(6) 17.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 7</td>
<td>(4) 11.8% (5)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>(3) 8.8%</td>
<td>(15) 44.1%</td>
<td>(7) 20.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Points -8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 13</td>
<td>(8) 23.5% (22)</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
<td>(3) 8.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Points +17.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 19</td>
<td>(9) 26.5% (22)</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2) 5.9%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Points +18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary and Analysis

Principals recognize the importance and need of opportunities for students to actively participate in extra-curricular activities.

While a few students are willing and capable of actively participating in the planning of activities, many students do not get involved in the planning of activities unless the element of fun is present.

Several principals remarked that sustained student involvement in activities rarely happens just by chance. Student involvement is usually preceded by leadership on the part of devoted teachers, counselors, and administrators. This quality of leadership holds the key to the future success or failure of student activities.

Rapid changes have taken place within our schools, communities, and the entire nation. Student activity programs must be reevaluated to adapt to the interests and needs of students who
will be enrolled in the nations' high schools during the exciting era of the seventies. Hypothesis III has been upheld and supported by the data of the study.

**Hypothesis IV**

Principals have the direct responsibility to provide alternatives and solutions that will prevent conflict and confrontation by student activist groups.

This hypothesis reflects the significant position of the secondary school principal in the student activist movement and the leadership qualities he must possess in meeting the challenge of dissident and activist students.

Propositions five, eight, fourteen, twenty, and twenty-nine relate to this hypothesis.

**Proposition 5**

The high school principal must analyze and keep in perspective the conflicting demands that he faces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(26) 76.5%</td>
<td>(8) 23.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +30)

The respondents were in strong agreement with proposition 5 as every principal indicated that keeping pressure groups in line and in perspective is one of the most important aspects of his responsibilities. Principals also stressed that they are serving in an era when the trend is for individuals to organize into groups to become more effective in exerting pressure tactics. Several
respondents mentioned the need for principals to develop skills in group dynamics and skills that will enable them to interact successfully with pressure groups.

Principals are extremely aware of the many individuals and groups who attempt to exert pressure upon them. The principal will continue to be the target of pressure from students, teachers, parents, and various community groups. The data from proposition 5 clearly indicate that principals feel it important that every principal must be perceptive and capable of determining all factors and forces that are affecting any given situation.

**Proposition 8**

When confronted with activism, the high school principal must know when to make a decision and when to wait and investigate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal's Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(26) 76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total points received +29.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents were strongly in agreement with proposition 8, as ninety-seven percent of the principals indicated their belief that it is very important for them to know when to act and when to wait and make a delayed decision in dealing with student activism. No respondent was in disagreement with this proposition.

Principals' responses indicate their awareness that anything disruptive to the orderly processes of the school must be stopped immediately.
Several principals also cautioned against over reaction or hasty response to many routine forms of student activism. A principal serving in a highly affluent community setting stated, "Our students test us every few days to see if we are 'up tight.' Many things that students do to gain attention are soon discontinued when they are not given an audience or consideration by administrators."

Principals, in responding to this proposition, displayed a fairly sophisticated attitude toward their leadership responsibilities in keeping with the student unrest movement. This is not surprising as most respondents were experienced principals serving in an area where a considerable amount of student activism has occurred.

The data strongly indicate that in the opinion of the principals the decision making process is an extremely important phase of the principals responsibilities, and knowing when to make a decision becomes especially important during a student confrontation.

**Proposition 14**

The high school principal must learn to feel secure when faced with student activist groups.

**Principals' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12) 35.3%</td>
<td>(17) 50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4) 11.8%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +17.5)
Eighty-five percent of the respondents were in agreement with proposition 14. Principals recognize that they must develop some feelings of security in their positions even though they will continue to be the targets of student activism.

Most principals who agree with this proposition feel that they must have specific guidelines from their superintendents and boards of education stating clearly that they will have the complete support and backing of these higher administrative officials. Two principals expressed strong feelings that school boards should develop written policies explaining what they consider to be acceptable forms of dissent and unacceptable forms of dissent. These policies should also state the specific action that will be taken against students who violate the written school board policies.

Some principals also indicated that many of the administrators' professional organizations are preparing excellent literature for principals regarding their rights, responsibilities, and functions in the student activist movement. The National Association of Secondary School Principals has been extremely helpful to the nation's principals.

Fourteen percent of the principals who were not in agreement with this proposition believe that principals will have to learn to live with pressure from many different sources. They feel there is no way to build-in a feeling of security for the principal. One principal stated, "How can a principal feel secure while fifty students are loitering in the corridor and shouting at him?"
Another principal stated, "It is not good to feel too secure; the principal who does tends to become complaisant."

The findings indicate the respondents concern that principals must develop "thick skin" so they can live with the day to day pressures that they encounter. Principals should feel a sense of security if they maintain close contact with their colleagues in membership in professional associations. The National Association of Secondary School Principals is providing considerable support and direction for the secondary school principal.

Proposition 20

The high school principal must be in control of his emotions at all times when reacting to student activism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total points received +29.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposition 20 obtained strong support from the respondents. Ninety-four percent of the principals indicated their agreement that the principal must be in control of his emotions at all times. Only two respondents were not in agreement with this proposition.

Many principals qualified their positive response to this proposition by expressing their belief that it is permissible and often advisable for the principal to display some anger and hostility. Some principals admitted that they often use an open display of anger as an effective technique in dealing with student unrest.
Principals are in strong accord with this proposition. Many principals do believe in displaying some anger and hostility at times, and many principals use this technique effectively. The data indicate decisively, however, that all anger and hostility on the part of principals must be controlled at all times.

Proposition 29

Principals have found that procedures used effectively in controlling one student confrontation may not be effective in controlling a second confrontation.

Principals' Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +21)

The data support this proposition. Eighty-five percent of the respondents were in agreement that procedures used effectively in controlling one student confrontation may not be effective in controlling a second confrontation. Less than nine percent of the respondents were in disagreement with proposition 29.

Principals serving in schools that have experienced previous student confrontations strongly supported this proposition. One principal whose school has been closed on three occasions because of violence, stated, "We never do the same thing twice in responding to student conflict; we keep the students guessing."

The findings indicate that principals are aware that there is no set procedure or pattern that will prevent or control any specific student confrontation. Principals who have been through
several student confrontations realize more so than do others that each situation must be handled individually in keeping with the local school setting. Principals have found, however, that carefully developed plans of a general nature to fit their local school situation have been effective during times of conflict.
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## SUMMARY TABLE FOR HYPOTHESIS IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 5 (Points +30)</td>
<td>(26) 76.5%</td>
<td>(8) 23.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 8 (Points +29.5)</td>
<td>(26) 76.5%</td>
<td>(7) 20.5%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 14 (Points +17.5)</td>
<td>(12) 35.3%</td>
<td>(17) 50%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(4) 11.8%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 20 (Points +29.5)</td>
<td>(28) 82.4%</td>
<td>(4) 11.8%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 29 (Points +21)</td>
<td>(16) 47.1%</td>
<td>(13) 38.2%</td>
<td>(2) 5.9%</td>
<td>(3) 8.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary and Analysis

The data strongly uphold Hypothesis IV. The secondary school principal is the "key" person in re-directing the student activist movement and in channeling activism into worthwhile activities and projects for students.

The principal must exercise leadership by providing alternatives and solutions that will enhance student participation and remove barriers that lead to student unrest.

In coping with student activism, principals must resist pressure for undesirable change; but they must rapidly develop skills in group dynamics that will enable them to initiate positive change. It is imperative that principals develop and sharpen communication skills and leadership techniques that will assist them when they are faced with pressure groups.
Hypothesis V

Principals must rely less on authority and more on leadership ability to develop rapport with dissident student groups.

This hypothesis focuses upon the leadership techniques that principals utilize effectively when interacting with dissident students.

Propositions six, nine, fifteen, twenty-one and twenty-seven pertain to hypothesis five.

Proposition 6

Dissident students respect the high school principal who is willing to listen and discuss topics that he considers non-negotiable.

Principal Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(8) 23.5%</td>
<td>(18) 52.9%</td>
<td>(3) 8.8%</td>
<td>(3) 8.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total points received +13.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over three-fourths of the respondents are in agreement with proposition 6, as principals realize the significance of developing rapport with dissident student leaders. Slightly less than one-quarter of the respondents were in disagreement with the proposition or were undecided regarding it.

Most principals prefer to communicate directly with dissident students and to give these students an opportunity to express their opinions. Principals who feel this way, prefer to refuse and deny dissidents requests or demands in as polite and professional manner
as possible. Principals who believe in establishing "grass roots" contact with students realize that they must be willing to discuss almost any topic that a student desires to discuss.

Principals who responded negatively to this proposition represented less than nine percent of the total respondents. These principals prefer not to discuss issues with dissident students—especially issues upon which they do not intend to yield. One principal summed up the feelings of the respondents who were in disagreement with this proposition: "Why should I make myself available to all the dissident students? They consider you 'weak' if they find they can manipulate you." This is definitely a minority opinion, however, when compared to the feelings of the total group of respondents.

The data indicate that principals feel that they must communicate and interact with the dissident student. The majority of principals are making themselves very accessible to students and are meeting the challenges of the dissidents and activists.

**Proposition 9**

High school principals leadership goals should focus priority on student involvement in the school program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) 11.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +13)

Principals presented a varied response in expressing their feelings to proposition 9. This proposition infers that the
principal's most important leadership goal is to effect student involvement in the school program. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents feel this to be an important responsibility of the principal. Eleven percent of the respondents were in disagreement with the proposition; they feel the principal has other more important responsibilities.

Administrators believe this to be one of a principal's important leadership goals but not necessarily his most important one. Many principals who responded positively to this proposition stated that it was important for responding principals to get students involved in the school program, but they expressed their beliefs that the principal has many other goals of equal importance.

The data indicate that the respondents feel it important for the principal to effect student involvement in the school program. The principal who is successful in accomplishing student involvement within his school will be less vulnerable to student unrest and appears less likely to become involved in student confrontation.

Proposition 15

The principals' ability to negotiate with student groups is imperative when conflict situations occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21) 61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data strongly support this proposition as the respondents expressed their feelings that the principal must possess the necessary skills that will enable him to negotiate effectively with student pressure groups. Eighty-eight percent of the principals were in agreement with the proposition.

Some principals do not like the word, "negotiate." A few of them feel that the word "negotiate" infers that the administrator always gives in and compromises his position. Two principals indicated that they would prefer to use the words "discuss alternatives" rather than to use the word "negotiate." One principal expressed the logical thought that "negotiation is the second step after a confrontation." He stated, "getting the students out of the halls and back into the classrooms is the first step."

Many principals feel that a principal should never negotiate with a large group or especially a disorderly crowd. These principals prefer to negotiate only with the leaders or representatives selected to represent any given group.

The data clearly reveal that principals feel it important to possess the necessary skills for individual and group negotiation. State Departments of Education could provide a valuable service if they would establish some formal training centers to train and sharpen the negotiation skills and group dynamic techniques of secondary school principals.

Proposition 21

Principals must be ready at a moments notice to negotiate
calmly with student leaders who may be emotionally involved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(12) 35.3%</td>
<td>(17) 50%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
<td>(3) 8.8%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +18)

Eighty-five percent of the respondents believe that the principal must be ready at a moments notice to negotiate with student leaders. This proposition received strong support as only four respondents were in disagreement with it.

Some principals offered ideas to reduce tensions when negotiation sessions immediately follow serious disturbances that have resulted in the temporary closing of a school. They feel it is sometimes advisable to conduct negotiation sessions at a location other than the high school. Also, if the sessions reach a stalemate and no progress is being made, it is often advisable to bring in a mediator from outside the school system. The mediator must be a person who is acceptable to both the students and the administration.

The data from proposition 21 indicate that in the opinion of the principals prompt negotiation sessions with student leaders is imperative when potential conflict situations occur. The presence of racial unrest in a school creates the potential for volatile student confrontations. The principals ability to identify dissident student leaders and to communicate and negotiate with them is extremely significant in preventing violence in a school.
Proposition 27

Principals have found that prolonged periods of conflict generates tensions and reduces the principal's intellectual resources for coping with conflict.

**Principals' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +116)

The data clearly support this proposition. A total of seventy percent of the principals were either in agreement or in strong agreement with this proposition. Seventeen percent of the principals were uncertain about the proposition, and eleven percent of the respondents were in disagreement with the proposition.

Although most respondents were in agreement with the proposition, many principals qualified their positive feelings with the premise that a "principal's effectiveness" is more likely to be reduced by prolonged periods of conflict than his "intellectual resources for coping with conflict."

Even though some respondents had not directly experienced prolonged periods of conflict, they expressed their feelings that few principals could endure continued conflict without adverse affects to their health.

Several respondents stressed the importance of the principal's health and their feelings that principals must obtain sufficient recreation, exercise, and adequate periods of relaxation. There
are times when the secondary school principal must get away from school for a few days. This will enable him to maintain a realistic perspective and to sustain a vigorous approach to his leadership responsibilities.

The data support this proposition and principals realize that they must utilize all available alternatives and techniques to prevent long periods of conflict from occurring in their schools.
SUMMARY TABLE FOR HYPOTHESIS V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition 6 (Points +13.5)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition 9 (Points +13)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>67.6%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition 15 (Points +23.5)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition 21 (Points +18)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>50.%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition 27 (Points +16)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary and Analysis

While the dissident students comprise a small minority of the total student enrollment in our high schools, they pose a significant challenge to secondary school principals. Hypothesis V is supported and firmly established by the data.

It is imperative that principals develop leadership skills and techniques that enable them to communicate and interact with students and with student groups. The principal must be skilled in group dynamics as he is the target of many pressure groups from both within and from outside the high school.

The principal must never lose sight of the responsibility he bears to protect the health, safety, and well-being of all students enrolled in the school.

It should definitely be made clear to dissident and activist
students that the principal is committed to this responsibility. He should also make it clear that students who engage in violence that results in physical attacks upon others or in damage to personal and school property will be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Hypothesis VI

Principals, in responding to the potential threat of student activism, have developed specific plans to maintain school decorum.

This hypothesis investigates the extent to which secondary school principals have formulated definite plans to follow in the event of a disruption or violent confrontation within their respective schools.

Proposition two, eleven, seventeen, twenty-four and twenty-five relate to this hypothesis.

Proposition 2

The high school principal must anticipate the possibility of a student disruption and be prepared to exercise immediate leadership that will stop violence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total points received +30.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This proposition was strongly supported by the data. Every respondent was in agreement that the principal must be ready to stop violence immediately.
Principals in the suburban area are aware that violence can happen in any school without warning. Many principals in responding to this proposition in the affirmative, commented, "There is no doubt about it; we must be prepared at all times."

No respondent appeared to be smug or coy about the potential threat of the student activist movement. The concern of many respondents was indicated by the specific written plans they have prepared, discussed, and distributed to their staff members.

Many schools the author visited, were utilizing the services of private security guards. Warning notices were posted on exterior doors informing all visitors that they must register in the principal's office as soon as they enter the building. These two operational procedures appeared to be accurate indicators of the extent of previous disruptions that the schools had experienced.

The data reveal that principals have made plans and they hope their plans are adequate. Principals who have experienced student disruptions usually emerge a bit more wiser regarding the handling of future disruptions. They often adjust their emergency plans so that they will be more effective if another confrontation occurs.

**Proposition II**

The potential threat of student disruptions has caused principals to exercise greater care in planning crowd control procedures for after school and evening events.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(26)</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>(2) 5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total points received +28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over ninety-one percent of the respondents supported proposition II quite strongly. Principals indicated that supervision and crowd control at evening athletic contests has become considerably more difficult and requires their utmost attention. Only one principal in this study did not view the supervision of evening activities as a problem.

Comments from principals reveal that there appeared to be more incidents of fights, assaults, and property damage during and after evening events in the current school year than ever before. One principal of a large urban school elaborated, "I look at the schedule to find the school we are going to compete against on Friday or Saturday evening and determine the number of police officers we need to assure proper protection."

Several principals stated, "It is the school drop out and outsider than causes most of our problems."

The increasing drug abuse problem and the ability of teen-agers to obtain alcoholic beverages also complicates the supervision of evening activities and events. Several principals commented, "Students frequently arrive at evening functions under the influence of drugs or alcohol. Sometimes it is immediately obvious to supervisors and law enforcement officials that a specific student's behavior is caused by the influence of drugs or alcohol."

Administrators have found it necessary to deny drop outs and other teen-agers who do not attend the school the opportunity to participate in many evening functions. Better supervision and
control of evening functions must result or some high schools will be discontinuing many activities.

Proposition 17

The high school principal must develop a close relationship with community leaders as he may need their support in emergency situations.

**Principals' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(27) 79.4%</td>
<td>(5) 15%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2) 5.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +28.5)

Ninety-four percent of the respondents were in agreement with this proposition. Only two principals in this study did not feel it important to work closely with community leaders.

The findings reveal the importance of frequent contact between principals and community leaders. There must be two-way communication and cooperation on the part of school officials and community leaders.

During periods of conflict and violent confrontation school administrators need backing and support from the community. This support is usually given if principals have previously fulfilled their responsibilities to community leaders.

Several principals stated, "Do not wait until you have a serious problem to seek community support." The principal who has been careless or negligent in maintaining good community relations will not get needed support during periods of crisis.

The data indicate that the principal cannot function effectively
as a separate entity. He must cooperate and communicate with community leaders. Community support provides the principal with an additional margin of security which is advantageous to him.

Proposition 24

Since each faculty and student body is unique, the high school principal must develop a specific emergency plan adapted to his local situation.

**Principals' Responses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(30) 88.2%</td>
<td>(4) 11.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Total points received +32)

The data strongly uphold this proposition. There was total agreement among all respondents in this study that the principal must develop a specific emergency plan for his local situation. No two schools are exactly alike. Students, teachers, and communities vary considerably from one locality to another. Eighty-eight percent of the principals were in strong agreement that emergency plans are necessary.

In developing emergency plans, principals must take many factors into consideration. The larger the high school staff, the more personnel the principal has available to assist him during emergency situations.

An emergency plan that has been carefully explained to the entire staff and discussed by the staff will prove to be invaluable when an emergency occurs.
The plan must also be carefully presented to community leaders and their comments to the plan must in turn be studied by school administrators.

Orientation and advance preparation is imperative to a well organized emergency plan. Police and law enforcement officers should be completely informed and a copy of the school's emergency plan should be given to the local police department.

Proposition 25

Deliberate confrontation that has been planned to disrupt the orderly processes of the school must be stopped immediately.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principals' Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(27) 79.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total points received +29.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principals' responses indicated strong support for proposition 25, as ninety-four percent of the principals indicated that deliberate confrontation must be stopped immediately.

Sometimes activists and alienated students who believe in complete destruction of our present society will plan confrontation for the sake of confrontation. Students with revolutionary tendencies must not be permitted to disrupt the orderly processes of the school.

One principal differentiated between acceptable dissent and unacceptable dissent as follows: "Twenty-five students marching on the front lawn with picket signs are not a disruption at 3:30
P.M. Twenty-five students conducting a sit-in and blocking the corridor at 8:30 A.M. are disrupting the operation of the school."

Many principals expressed the feeling that schools should have written school board policies which clearly state that any student demonstration that disrupts the decorum of the school will not be tolerated. Students who violate such regulations should be suspended from school. Repeated violations should result in a student expulsion from school.
HYPOTHESIS VI SUMMARY GRAPH
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SUMMARY TABLE FOR HYPOTHESIS VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposition</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 2 (Points +30.5)</td>
<td>(27) 79.4%</td>
<td>(7) 20.5%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 11 (Points +28)</td>
<td>(26) 76.5%</td>
<td>(5) 14.7%</td>
<td>(2) 5.9%</td>
<td>(1) 2.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 17 (Points +28.5)</td>
<td>(27) 79.4%</td>
<td>(5) 15%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(2) 5.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 24 (Points +32)</td>
<td>(30) 88.2%</td>
<td>(4) 11.8%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposition 25 (Points +32)</td>
<td>(27) 79.9%</td>
<td>(5) 14.7%</td>
<td>(2) 5.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary and Analysis

In summary, the data confirmed and established all six of the hypotheses that were formulated for this study. In responding to the interview instrument, principals also provided other significant information in relation to the student unrest movement.

Respondents gave their strongest support to Hypothesis VI.

Principals in the suburban area encompassed by this study are keenly aware that any school could experience a student confrontation at the least expected time.

The data indicate that principals are exercising much greater care and supervision of crowd control procedures for evening events.

The school drop out and/or the "outsider" is causing a significant part of the disruption of evening functions as well as disruption during the school day.

Security guards and locked doors are becoming a routine part of control procedures at many suburban schools.
Principals are seeking the support of community leaders in attempting to combat the rising pressure from individual students and from various pressure groups. There is no substitute for the development of a detailed emergency plan adapted to the needs of the specific local school. Suburban principals openly admit that they are prepared for the potential threat of student activism and violence. They also realize that militant groups from outside the school will continue to be a source of agitation to currently enrolled high school students.

A frequent comment of the responding principals was, "I am not going to be caught unprepared; I have given much thought to how I will function in an emergency."

Principals seem to be maintaining a positive approach to the student unrest movement, and they are initiating significant changes to enable their schools to meet the needs of students in this era of rapid social change.

This study reveals that principals must be able to establish and maintain effective channels of communication within their schools and communities. An administrator cannot meet the challenges of the activist groups if his communication system is ineffective.

The leadership abilities of the secondary school principals are their most important asset in dealing with activist and dissident student leaders. The secondary school principal must establish communication and rapport with the dissident student. His
leadership ability should enable him to interact effectively with the dissident student and to channel the student's energies into desirable and meaningful activities and projects.
CHAPTER IV

IN DEPTH STUDY OF
FIVE SECONDARY SCHOOLS

The author conducted an in depth study of five secondary schools where student violence resulted in the temporary closing of each of these schools on one or more occasions.

To enable the author to obtain candid information, administrators were assured that their identities as well as the identities of the schools they represent would not be revealed in any portion of this study.

The five secondary schools that were selected for this study will be referred to as schools "A", "B", "C", "D", and "E".

Secondary school "A" is located in a residential setting and has a student enrollment in excess of 3000 students. The school and surrounding communities have experienced violent racial disorders for the past two years.

Twice during the 1968-69 school year the school was closed when sporadic fighting ensued between black and white students. In December, 1969, an incident with racial overtones that received local and national publicity occurred in the Chicago area and
triggered violence within this secondary school. Teenagers and local "toughs" who were not students at the school frequently entered the school cafeteria and precipitated fights among black and white students. This problem was also compounded by the fact that some students were cutting classes and going to the school cafeteria to participate in planned disruptions.

The school administrators in secondary school "A" are to be commended for the courage, originality, and leadership they have provided in restoring order and an appropriate school atmosphere to a school that was inundated with racial turmoil a few months ago.

At the present time, a closed circuit television system is being utilized to monitor corridors, the cafeteria, the entrances, and the outdoor areas surrounding the school. The principal has seven monitor screens in his office. He can also zoom the television lens in on corridors for close up views of any activity. This closed circuit television system is also augmented with a video tape recorder. If an administrator is monitoring the building and observes a disturbance in a corridor or elsewhere, he merely pushes a button and records the disturbance on video tape for further evidence and record.

It is remarkable how effective this television system has been as a method of surveillance. At one time, one hundred policemen were on duty at the school. Only eight police officers are currently on duty at the school each day.
To keep "outsiders" from entering the school, each student was issued an identification card bearing his photograph. Identification cards are checked each morning before a student can enter the school. These cards also specify the definite lunch period to which each student has been assigned, and all student identification cards are checked before students enter the cafeteria for each lunch period. One administrator commented, "The students do not mind having their identification cards checked; they realize it is for their own protection."

The cost of the closed circuit television system plus the expense of the weekly charges for security police will total approximately one hundred thousand dollars by the close of the 1969-70 school year.

Some secondary schools that encountered serious racial problems closed their school cafeterias immediately. The administrators of secondary school "A" are to be commended for maintaining cafeteria services for all students. As one administrator aptly stated, "We are not going to permit seventy students to interrupt the education of over 3000 students.

In summarizing the school's emergency plans the administrator commented as follows, "We are organized effectively now, and we do not plan to close school again if another student disruption occurs."

During the several instances of violence at this school, teachers were respected and were not attacked. Also, the school
has had practically no vandalism. The problems have been entirely racial.

The regulations in effect at this school have been clearly stated; students and parents have been informed that these regulations will be completely enforced. This enforcement has resulted in the expulsion from school of approximately fifty students since the school year began in September, 1969.

It appears that secondary school "A" will function smoothly from now on. Competent, dedicated administrators have formulated operational procedures that are effective in the local school setting. Excellent communications also appear to exist between school and community leaders. Many residents representing all races, and many former graduates of the school have contacted school officials to indicate their support of the school's procedures and to offer their assistance.

Secondary school "B" is a school with less than 1500 students located in a residential setting in close proximity to a suburban business district.

The school was closed in May of 1968 and again in November of 1969 because of student violence and student vandalism.

The physical appearance of the interior of the building is not very inviting or conducive to a learning atmosphere. The building is crowded, and it is badly in need of repairs. The interior lighting is extremely poor as little provision was made to take advantage of the natural light from outdoors. The principal has
made numerous requests for the building to be redecorated and re-
paired, but each year the building continues to deteriorate.

Several private security guards control the interior areas
of the school building, and they function with all exterior doors
locked and secured. The school spent over thirteen thousand dollars
for security guards from the opening of school in September until

The school has been disrupted frequently by youthful "toughs"
from the community who are drop outs and who no longer attend sch-
ool. Considerable damage has also resulted to the interior and ex-
terior of this building from students in attendance at the school
and from youth who do not attend the school.

Both occasions of school closings resulted from sit-ins by
black students. These sit-ins eventually led to the blocking of
corridors and stair ways. These tactics resulted in fights among
black and white students.

After the last sit-in, black students presented several de-
mands to the administration. Some of these demands were justifi-
able and logical. The principal initiated procedures to fulfill
the legitimate demands. Some demands were unreasonable and these
were not accepted. Student leaders were carefully advised in re-
gard to the unreasonable demands, and they were given specific
reasons why these demands could not be met.

The principal of secondary school "B" appears to be competent
and dedicated; however he feels very insecure in his position.
Communication with the central office staff is poorly established. The principal feels that the central office staff personnel are unaware and unconcerned about his school and the problems of this school.

Definite procedures and guidelines have not been established by the board of education to govern and regulate acceptable and unacceptable student dissent. This administrator feels that he is in a "no man's land" and not a part of a growing, ongoing organization. He is uncertain of the support he will receive in regard to the various situations he encounters with student dissent and disruption.

Every time a tense racial incident occurs on a state or national level, the tension spills over into the school setting. Community agitators continually keep the students in secondary school "B" on edge.

The principal is currently working with a student communications committee and it is beginning to be effective. He has worked diligently to keep all school organizations and activities open to students from minority groups. He has repeatedly refused to permit any organization to function on a purely racial basis. Any approved organization must permit participation by students of all races and creeds.

This administrator appears to have a keen sensitivity to the needs and problems of his students. He is aware of student dissidents, of dissident leaders, and of students whose behavior can
trigger volatile disruptions. He cited examples of how he prevented two potentially serious incidents by working promptly with dissident student leaders. On two occasions this administrator utilized the assistance of a black parent to ease tensions with a group of black students. The black parent volunteered and was of considerable assistance to the building principal in preventing a third sit-in.

The principal stated that he is getting very little assistance from community leaders. Little community support is available since the school system of which he is a part, has not made an effort to establish lines of communication. The potential community support appears to be waiting in the wings. It has not been cultivated by this school system.

The students of secondary school "B" are fortunate that they have a principal with this man's courage, ability, dedication, and determination. He plans to leave school "B" and seek another position. This will be a significant loss for the students and staff members of this school.

This principal has vision and carefully formulated plans to use when an emergency situation develops at his school. It appears, however, that he is operating as a separate entity and not as a significant part of an organized school team and community.

Secondary school "C" is located in a residential setting and is in the student enrollment range of 2000 to 3000 students. The community in which secondary school "C" is located has been the
scene of considerable racial hostility. This racial hostility became evident about a year after the Watts riots occurred in Los Angeles.

During the 1968-1969 school year the school district was in an interim period as the superintendent departed from the school district to accept a similar position in another state.

Black students were organized by adults in the community and encouraged to stage a sit-in at the high school. Since the school district was operating without a superintendent a confrontation at this time necessitated decision-making by administrative personnel who would not ordinarily make decisions at the district level.

The principal seemed to be operating without specific plans for dealing with a student disruption such as a sit-in. Staff members apparently had not been orientated ahead of time and given specific assignments to fulfill during an emergency of this kind. School was disrupted by a sit-in during the 1968-1969 school year at secondary school "C". Several youths who were not students at the school also entered school corridors to participate in the disruption. The presence of youths from outside of the school served as further indication that this sit-in was planned ahead of time by students and community youth.

About a month after the sit-in occurred, fighting erupted in the school cafeteria among black and white students. This resulted in the closing of the school for a second time during the school year.
The school opened for the 1969-1970 school year with a new superintendent and a new principal. Also, this new administrative team formulated specific written plans for dealing with student disorders. Carefully developed plans were approved by the board of education and distributed to students and staff members. In short, students were informed that those who engage in physical violence or destruction of property will be expelled from school and prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

Shortly after school opened for the 1969-1970 school year, several black students refused to go to class and informed the new principal that they were going to stage a sit-in. The principal immediately asked the students to go into the auditorium so that he could talk with them. After a bit of persuading they agreed to do so. This gave the principal time to alert police to stand by and to arrange for bus transportation to get these students home. He also had custodians lock the auditorium doors to secure his dissident students within the auditorium.

The principal explained to the students that he would not permit a sit-in or any other demonstration that interferes with the orderly processes of the school. The students were told that they must either return to class or leave the building immediately and get on the busses provided. Students were informed that if they chose to leave the school they would receive unexcused re-admits for the time they are not in attendance at school. They were also informed that if they chose to leave school they would not be
readmitted to school until their parents accompanied them to school for a conference with the principal.

By this time the police had arrived and were standing by to assist school officials if assistance was needed. The principal directed the students to either return to class or leave the building immediately. Most students left the building at once and in orderly fashion. Three boys refused to leave the building, and stated that they were going to the cafeteria and cause some trouble. Two of these boys were involved in difficulty within minutes. One student attacked another student and one student resisted a police officer. Both boys were jailed and slated for court appearances.

This potentially volatile disruption became merely a routine matter of control. The principal’s specific emergency plans were effective in controlling this disruption.

Inconsistency in one procedure, however, caused the administration some problems before this entire situation was concluded. The black students who left school remained out of school as a form of boycott. About eighty per cent of these students remained out of school for a period of two weeks. During this period of time, some black parents phoned the school and indicated that their children wanted to return to school. They were reluctant to return to school, however, because of fear of physical attack from other black students who were still involved in the school boycott.

When the boycott ended and the students returned to school, some of the students whose parents had phoned the school received
excused absences for part of the time they were absent. The other students received unexcused admits to class. School officials were subjected to many telephone calls from angry parents, community organization leaders, and clergymen objecting to the inconsistency of the above stated procedure.

This inconsistency will not occur again, as specific school board procedures have been developed to prevent a situation of this kind from ever happening again.

Staff members had been carefully orientated and prepared for this kind of a student demonstration. Pictures taken of students who participated in the disruption are on file.

The principal stressed that staff members will help out during disturbances as long as they are assured that students who participate in the disruption are going to be punished for their actions.

Secondary school "C" is operating in orderly fashion at the present time, and no security officers are present at the school. Communication lines seem to be extremely well developed and maintained. The school board, administrative staff, and teaching staff are functioning as a team. Close communication seems to exist among school administrators and the community officials, especially law enforcement officers. The principal appears to be calm and confident, but he is also perceptive and realistic.

The principal in secondary school "C" offered the following caution to administrators who might be confronted with a volatile
school disruption:

If you are really prepared for violence, the critical communication devices will be protected and maintained. Secure the school public address system and the telephone switchboard immediately. Also, it is extremely important that skilled adults be prepared to utilize cameras and obtain pictures of students who are involved in violence or destruction of property.

Secondary school "D" is located in an industrial setting and enrolls a student body in excess of 3500 students. The school is extremely crowded, and students attend classes on a shift basis. Students who begin the school day at 8:00 A.M. are finished at 1:00 P.M. The second shift students begin school at 9:00 A.M. and their school day ends at 2:00 P.M.

The school community has experienced extensive amounts of racial hostility and unrest. The school was closed in the spring of the 1968-1969 school year when fights occurred among black and white students.

At the beginning of the 1969-1970 school year numerous incidents were reported to the administration of "hit and run" tactics. Then students were in groups and in crowded areas, someone would get hit in the back or on the back of the head. The attacker would run through the corridors and his identity would not be determined. Tension and fighting among black and white students eventually led to the closing of the school cafeteria.
A major fight took place among black and white students in October, 1969, and definite racial overtones were present. The black students were not pleased with the manner in which the white students were disciplined; however administrators indicated that the situation was handled with fairness to all students.

Police were summoned to the school to quell fighting among students. They responded and contained the situation rapidly and in as effective a manner as possible. No demands or requests were presented to the administration prior to this confrontation in October. Administrators feel that the disruption was initiated entirely from within the school and was not caused by outside forces. They also do not believe that the students had any valid reason for this confrontation.

After a two day cooling off period school resumed with security guards in abundance. A definite number of black and white parents have been invited to visit the school each day as observers. They wear a visitor's badge, and they also write a report at the close of the day to comment upon their experiences during the day. This technique of utilizing parents as observers has been quite effective, and administrators are to be commended for initiating this technique.

Rest rooms and locker rooms are kept under close surveillance by security guards. Matrons are present in girls rest rooms and locker rooms. With the school cafeteria closed, the close surveillance of rest rooms and locker rooms completes the containment
and security of the most likely areas for disruptions to occur. The administration of secondary school "D" feel that they are extremely well organized now, and they do not plan to close school again if a student disruption should happen to occur.

Open forum type meetings were conducted for parents after the disturbances resulted in the temporary closing of the school. These meetings were not effective, and in many instances the meetings were not in the best interests of the school district. These meetings resulted in additional tensions and strained relations in the black and white communities. Many racist statements were made by parents of both races, and the meetings accomplished very little.

If future meetings of this nature become necessary, the administration will conduct closed meetings and invite leaders of recognized community groups and organizations. All facets of the community have a right to be represented, but any meeting for adults that is conducted during periods of extreme tension should be by invitation only. The meeting should be a closed one and should not be conducted as a public meeting. Also, if an adult meeting is held a committee of staff members and community leaders should be present to respond to questions from the group. This committee should appoint a chairman and all questions from the floor should be directed to the chairman. It is the chairman's responsibility to direct the question to a member of the committee. This procedure is extremely important if an orderly meeting is to result during times of extreme emotional stress. School administrators
and school board members should not be placed in front of disorderly, angry groups to be torn apart verbally. On one occasion a competent school board member was provoked into making some careless statements after being repeatedly insulted and verbally attacked by angry parents. Meetings should be structured so this kind of a situation cannot occur.

The administrators of secondary school "D" are to be commended. They worked courageously and diligently to establish order within a school that was beset with racial strife. They are also to be commended for not yielding their position to unreasonable demands by either black or white students.

It appears that these administrators have solved a difficult problem by establishing effective communication lines, by utilizing the assistance of parents and community leaders, and by developing emergency plans that are effective for their local school setting.

The members of the teaching staff are to be commended for their excellent cooperation in identifying students who were guilty of misconduct during the disruptions, and for serving as a calming influence upon all students of the school.

The enrollment of school "E" is in the range from 1500 to 2000 students. The school is situated in an industrial setting that includes six villages and nine feeder elementary schools. This high school has been an integrated school for many years. Relationships have always been good among black and white students at this school.
Racial unrest that flared on a national scale, and instances of racial unrest in the local communities produced immediate tensions in the school.

At the very beginning of the student unrest movement, it appeared that the administration of secondary school "E" had not adequately prepared the students, staff members, and community adults to face the new challenges of this unrest movement. It seems that the administration was not able to establish and maintain effective channels of communication with the black students and the black community.

This school began to experience student unrest in April of 1968. Considerable agitation of a purely racial nature was generated in the adult community. Youthful gang members and young adults from the inner city of Chicago frequently came to the community to agitate the local youths and to encourage them to engage in various forms of rebellious behavior.

During the first week of the 1968-1969 school year school "E" was inundated with racial hostility, student distrust of the administration, a break-down in communications among administrators, students, parents, and community leaders, and fear and frustration on the part of the teaching staff.

When school opened on September 4, 1968, black students presented three demands to the administration. One of their demands was very justifiable as they had been promised a specific curricular offering and this promise had not been fulfilled. Students
and parents used this issue to display their hostility and distrust toward the administration.

The other two demands were not justifiable, and the administration's first reaction was to take a stand and deny these two demands. Gradually they made concessions and eventually traditional procedures for choosing selection committees were completely altered. The changes reduced tensions among black students and parents, but increased tension and anger among white students.

By Friday, September 6, fighting had erupted among white and black students. School was dismissed early on this day as fighting ensued in school corridors.

The administration sent selected staff members out to confer with community groups on Saturday and Sunday. While these staff members possessed some degree of skill in communication and in group dynamics, they had not previously been utilized in situations where they had an opportunity to communicate with the adult community. These staff members worked day and night to try to establish some peace and tranquility in the community.

While staff members were at work in the community, the administrative staff was meeting with two student groups. These groups were the black youth council and the white youth council. Administrators met with these two groups separately, and then they conferred with the groups jointly. A black educator from outside the community was also obtained to attempt to restore communication with the black community.
On Monday, September 9, the school situation was extremely tense. As the press and television camera men arrived on the scene about 150 white students walked out of school and marched across the street from the school carrying picket signs. It was reported to school officials that the television camera men felt that there were not enough students walking out of school. He allegedly sent some students back into the building to encourage more students to walk out.

The black youth council and the white youth council met on Monday afternoon. There was good dialogue and much agreement on how to pull the school back together. The councils issued statements to be cleared through the administration and given to the press and television media. Both councils wanted an all school assembly for Tuesday morning to stop rumors, clear the air, and seek the cooperation of white and black students. The leaders of the black youth council and those of the white youth council reassured the administration that they could control their respective groups and that no incidents would occur in the assembly.

The administration was faced with a big decision. Should they show their trust and confidence in the students and conduct this requested assembly?

The potential danger of placing large numbers of students together during periods of tension and stress was also of considerable concern to the administration.

Some members of the administrative staff advised against
having this assembly. The black educational advisor also advised against having the assembly.

The assembly was conducted and was almost a success. Shortly before the assembly was to conclude, a white dissident student acted in bad faith and made some remarks of a racist nature over the microphone. Within seconds fights broke out and students were dismissed immediately by classes. It was too late; the fuse was ignited and a long period of fear and frustration was in store for this community and its residents.

This situation at secondary school "E" was a difficult one for the administration and teaching staff. Experienced, competent and dedicated administrators and staff members worked diligently and fearlessly to restore order to the school and community. All of these educators are to be commended for their sincere and valiant efforts that eventually reduced chaos and led to the establishment of order and decorum.

The administrators adopted several operational procedures to maintain school decorum during the remainder of the 1968-1969 school year. Private security guards, locked exterior doors, curtailment of many evening activities, and closing of the school cafeteria were procedures that restored order to this troubled school.

The assistance of village officials and community leaders was not as widespread and effective as it should have been during the period of crisis. It appears that communication lines had not been
established and maintained in a state of readiness with community leaders.

At the close of the 1968-1969 school year, approximately forty per cent of the staff members resigned to accept positions in other school systems. A change also occurred in the administration of the school. The transition from the former administrative staff to the new staff was not accomplished as smoothly as it could have been.

Problems arose quickly for the new administration as the 1969-1970 school year began. Many student activities and student organizations have been discontinued at the school. The school is operating fairly smoothly at present with students on shifts of approximately five and one-half hours duration each day.

It will take time for the new administration and the many new staff members to gain rapport with the students and to reestablish mutual trust and understanding among students and community leaders.

Conclusions of In-Depth Study:

As a result of the in-depth study of five secondary schools where violence occurred, several conclusions have been established by the author:

1. More student disruptions occur in racially integrated schools.
2. Racial unrest in a school or community increases the possibility of a sudden and volatile student disruption.

3. Student conflict and disorder in secondary schools is frequently caused by agitators from outside the school.

4. Specific emergency plans that are supported by established lines of communication are effective when principals must react to disruptions.

5. An interracial council that includes both black students and white students is the most effective organization to develop communication among students in integrated schools.

6. Violence is most likely to occur in the school cafeteria. The next most likely areas for violence to occur is in rest rooms or locker rooms.

7. Teenagers and young adults from outside the secondary schools have caused considerable trouble by entering school corridors during the school day.

8. Security guards can be extremely effective at a school if all students are given an identification card bearing their photograph.

9. Principals who have been prepared with specific emergency plans have functioned effectively during periods of conflict and have tended to resist unreasonable demands of dissident students.

10. Administrators who were not prepared for student disruptions have tended to "give in" and yield their position...
to attempt to pacify dissident students.

11. Student identification cards bearing the student's photograph are being utilized effectively to keep outsiders out of schools and school cafeterias.

12. When police are called to a secondary school to quell student violence they should be placed in complete control immediately upon their arrival.

13. When student unrest is at a high pitch it is unwise to conduct all-school assemblies or crowd large numbers of students together.

14. Integrated schools should include some black administrators, counselors, and teachers on their staffs.

15. If police officers or private security guards are used is a school on a permanent basis both black officers and white officers should be included on the security staff.

16. Principals who have the ability to establish close communication and rapport with dissident student leaders can often prevent potential violent disruptions.

17. Student organizations that include students from only one race should not be permitted.

18. A school board policy manual that specifically outlines the boards policy in regulating student dissent is invaluable to the secondary school principal.

19. Administrators who organize adult meetings to reduce tensions following school disruptions should invite parents
who represent various community organizations. Meetings of this nature should not be open to the public.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The secondary school principal is presently the target of pressure from many individuals and groups. He is confronted by the student activist movement, by militant teachers groups, and by community organizations that favor the "new left" or the far right.

In this rapidly changing social order the secondary school principal is expected to be the instructional leader of the staff, and he is expected to possess the managerial and logistical techniques to accomplish the many non-educational functions that must be completed.

It is especially important that the secondary school principal be an individual in good health, and a person who possesses the vitality and endurance that will enable him to fulfill the many responsibilities that are expected of him. Many high school principals who are past middle age are finding the demands and responsibilities of the principalship more than they can handle in today's educational scene. The secondary school principal in the schools of the future will undoubtedly by young, and he will probably find the position especially demanding of his time, talents, and energy.
The secondary school principal must be a very mature individual who has developed the ability to control his emotions during times of crisis. The student activist and the dissident student leaders will challenge the patience and leadership ability of the most able and experienced principals. It is extremely essential that the principal be a very perceptive individual who can distinguish all forces that are affecting any given situation.

Probably the most critical area for principals in today's fast moving society is the ability to communicate with individuals and groups. The principal who cannot establish effective lines of communication within his school and community cannot function as an effective leader.

In interacting with dissident student leaders and in negotiating with pressure groups the principal must possess leadership skills which will permit him to channel destructive activism into positive educational reform and into constructive projects and activities for students. A knowledge of group dynamics is extremely essential for the secondary school principal.

The in-depth study of five secondary schools that experienced student violence indicates that the secondary school principal is the man on the spot. He is the person who must have some ideas, alternatives, techniques, and tactics that will reduce tensions when potential conflict occurs within the secondary school.
Hypothesis I

Principals, in dealing with student activism, should think more in terms of positive educational change than in terms of repression and control.

In the light of the accumulated data, this hypothesis can be accepted. Principals generally agree that a considerable amount of positive reform can result if the student activist movement is approached from a positive aspect.

Many procedures and policies that are being followed in secondary schools today have been in effect for several years. While educational change should not be initiated just for the sake of change, it is about time that educators take a careful look at many of the things they are doing in their schools. The student activist movement has accomplished one definite constructive aspect. It has motivated educators to take a careful look at the total operation of their schools.

Many secondary school principals readily admit that they have initiated several changes in their schools as the result of pressure from students. They hasten to add, however, that these changes are really in the best interests of the students and the school.

It is also apparent that principals have received pressure from students to initiate some changes that would decrease the quality of the educational program. The capable principal is using his leadership abilities to resist undesirable change and to channel this undesirable change into acceptable projects and activities
for students.

The majority of principals feel that the student activist or the dissident student should have an opportunity to be heard and to express his opinion. Most principals attempt to establish communication and rapport with individual dissident student leaders. While these students are challenging for any principal, most principals realize the importance of maintaining close contact with these students.

**Hypothesis II**

Principals have experienced the need to open new channels of communication to develop better understanding among students, staff, and parents.

The data strongly support this hypothesis, and principals are aware of the importance of communication in coping with the student unrest movement.

The pressures of the student activist movement call for effective and more adequate systems of communication. It is especially vital that the communication between the school and the adult community be firmly established.

The perceptive secondary school principal realizes the importance of open lines of communication with community leaders and officials. These lines of communication must not only be established but they must be maintained in a state of readiness.

Several secondary school principals did not get the maximum
assistance from community leaders during school disturbances because they were careless and did not do their part in maintaining communication with community leaders. Principals were in strong agreement that it is the principal's direct responsibility to establish open lines of communication. While this is not always an easy task, it is so vital that the administrator must give it as much time and attention as it takes to accomplish the task. Communication is a word that is often misunderstood. It does not necessarily mean that two people agree on all issues, but it does imply that two persons listened to each other's point of view.

Some principals found that their carefully formulated emergency plans were not effective in times of crises because they did not have an adequate communication system to back up the emergency plan. Communication is the heart and pulse of a school.

Hypothesis III-

Principals have recognized the need for student involvement in the planning and implementation of student extracurricular activities.

This hypothesis involves the importance of student participation in the planning and implementing of extra-curricular activities. On the basis of the data of this hypothesis, it is being accepted.

Principals feel that students often give "lip service" to expressing a desire to get involved in the planning and implementation of student activities; however principals find that students rarely sustain a concerted effort to follow through and work on
these activities. If an element of fun or recreation is present, students will sometimes get involved with these activities. Several principals remarked that student involvement in activities rarely happens just by chance. This student involvement is preceded by leadership on the part of dedicated teachers, counselors, or administrators.

Because of the rapidly changing society of which we are a part, a reevaluation is needed of the extra-curricular activities programs in the nation's secondary schools. Student participation in extra-curricular activities is on the decline. This is really not surprising when one stops to think that little change has been made in these programs for many years.

Leadership on the part of dedicated staff members seems to hold the key to the future of extra-curricular activities. Some principals feel that extra-curricular activities are on the way out unless they provide audience approval or unless some award is given following the activity.

While students profess a desire to get involved in the planning of student activities, they still look to the administration to provide organization and clarity to the activities. The data clearly indicate that students expect administrators to maintain a degree of control over student activities.

The prosperous economy has enabled many high school students to obtain part time employment. Many students work to earn spending money and to save money for college attendance. This also is
a factor in the decline of student participation in student activities.

**Hypothesis IV**

Principals have the direct responsibility to provide alternatives and solutions that will prevent conflict and confrontation by student activist groups.

The results of the data strongly support Hypothesis IV. The high school principal has the direct responsibility to provide alternatives and solutions that will prevent conflict and reduce tensions in the school.

The trend in recent months is for pressure groups to exert as much force as possible upon the secondary school principal. Individuals have learned by watching recent events in this country that people who organize into groups can exert much more pressure on an administrator than one individual can exert.

The principal must utilize every bit of leadership skill that he possesses to initiate positive change and to resist change that is not in the best interests of the high school program.

A real challenge exists for the secondary school principal when dissident students are pushing for change that is in reality undesirable change for the overall quality of the school. The competent principal will be successful, however, in diverting a considerable amount of this undesirable pressure into positive projects and activities for the students who originally initiated the change.
It is extremely important for the secondary school principal to keep the many demands he faces in proper perspective. Most principals have learned to live with pressure, and they accept it as a part of the responsibility they must bear.

Hypothesis V

Principals must rely less on authority and more on leadership ability to develop rapport with dissident student groups.

This hypothesis is clearly supported and upheld by the data compiled. The activist or dissident student presents a challenge to the leadership abilities of the principal. The principal's success or failure as an administrator is directly related to his ability or inability to establish communication and rapport with dissident student leaders. Principals use a variety of techniques to interact with these students. Most principals make themselves very accessible to dissident students, as they realize that these students are involved in challenging many of the traditional procedures that have been standard operating criteria for many years. Because a very small percentage of students are making their minority feelings a significant part of the educational scene, the competent principal must not yield or compromise his position to these dissident students. Many principals will be quick to yield on the little things, but they realize the importance of holding their ground on the big issues. Principals have found that the more concessions they make the more demands the students have
waiting for them. Principals are getting a lot of experience in negotiating with student groups. Most experienced principals have become rather sophisticated at this technique of negotiation.

Some principals do not like the word, "negotiate." They feel that the word implies that they are "giving in" and yielding their position. The experienced principal looks on negotiating as "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." In short, these principals will yield a point to gain a point in another area.

Hypothesis VI

High school principals, in responding to the potential threat of student activism, have developed specific plans to maintain school decorum.

All six of the hypothesis in this study were supported by the data; however hypothesis VI was supported the most strongly of all hypotheses. Principals in the suburban area where this study was conducted have formulated specific emergency plans. Unfortunately, many of these principals have encountered disorders that have necessitated the use of these plans. Some principals had specific plans that would have been effective if communication lines had been established. Their plans were not effective, however, for a variety of reasons. An excellent plan that is retained in the principal's desk is of little help in a violent disruption if the school staff has not been orientated to the plan. Also, the local police department cannot be of maximum assistance if they have not seen the principal's plan before an emergency occurs.
While no school administrator enjoys setting up a "police state" at his local school, some administrators found that it was necessary if the safety and well being of all students was to be maintained. Some schools who found it necessary to create a "police state" were able to return to normal operating conditions by a gradual reduction of security personnel.

The presence of racial unrest in a school necessitates a tighter control or the need for increased awareness on the part of the principal. A volatile situation can develop in seconds without warning. Most administrators who experience student racial unrest are totally prepared for action. One principal summed up the feelings of many principals as follows: "When racial unrest develops we call the police immediately; we would rather have police present and not need them than to need the police and not have them here."

Effects of student activism

The student activist movement has had definite effects upon the leadership roles of secondary school principals. The principals who participated in this study have changed in the manner in which they exercise their leadership roles in one or more of the following ways:

1. Principals serving in racially integrated schools have become more perceptive, and they have developed leadership techniques that assist in preventing volatile student disorders.
2. Principals are making expedient and more extensive use of police and private security guards in coping with student activism.

3. Parents are being called upon more frequently by principals to become involved as observers in schools that are beset with racial turmoil.

4. The student activist movement has caused principals to spend much less time on instructional leadership, curriculum development, and staff evaluation. The time and energies principals formerly devoted to these functions are now being spent identifying student leaders and in interaction with dissident students.

5. Since the student activist movement has placed excessive demands upon secondary school principals' time, administrators have been forced to delegate many important leadership functions for which they must bear the final responsibility. Frequently these functions are delegated to assistants who lack experience in fulfilling the specific functions.

6. Principals have been forced to consider students opinions and feelings on such issues as school dress codes and traditional school policies. They have also found it imperative to develop an organizational structure that provides students the opportunity to express their ideas, opinions, and gripes.
7. The current trend of student involvement has placed pressure upon principals to provide opportunities for students to assume leadership functions in the planning and implementation of school activities. Principals have found it necessary to support student leadership and to develop a spirit of trust in students' leadership abilities. This support and trust must also be developed with the realization that some students will fail at leadership attempts.

8. Most of the principals in this study improved their lines of communication and their communication techniques. The threat of student violence necessitates open lines of communication, and principals especially improved their communication with community leaders.

9. The activist movement caused principals to develop and sharpen techniques of group dynamics and leadership skills needed in the negotiation process. Activism has motivated many principals to continually seek a higher level of development of these dynamics and skills.

10. Pressure from black leaders for Afro-American history courses and pressure from many students for more meaningful studies has resulted in curriculum revision in many social studies courses. Principals have initiated curriculum revisions which provide for instruction in the vital issues of our day—race relations, the Viet Nam war, pollution, and crime and poverty.
In closing, this summary of the effects of student activism upon the leadership role of secondary school principals indicates that student activism is a changing and highly complex process.

One of the secondary schools that the author studied in his in-depth probe has been closed several times because of student violence. The administrators in this school have had considerable experience in coping with student disruptions, and they have developed several safe guards and leadership techniques to prevent any further student violence. This school was recently closed again because of student violence.

It may be concluded that while emergency plans are often effective, it is impossible to prevent all student confrontations. An administrator who has made careful emergency plans, regardless of how extensive, has no guarantee that student violence will not erupt in his school.

Recommendations

1. Every secondary school principal should have a specific emergency plan to guide him in the event of a disruption in his school.

2. Principals must develop effective lines of communication within their schools and communities, and these lines of communication must be maintained in a state of readiness.

3. The principal must possess techniques of group dynamics and leadership abilities that will enable him to interact with individuals and groups.
4. Written school board policies to govern student dissent should be formulated by the administration and adopted by the members of the board of education.

5. Student identification cards bearing the student's photograph should be provided for all students in secondary schools. This will facilitate security within the school and will enable administrators to admit the only authorized students of the school.

6. Police officers or private security guards should be utilized to prevent student violence, to quell violence after it occurs, and to restore an orderly atmosphere to a school after violence occurs.

7. During periods of student unrest, the secondary school principal must give special care to maintain the security of the school cafeteria, student rest rooms, and locker room areas.

8. Principals must maintain communication with dissident student leaders and develop rapport with them.

9. The secondary school principal must be prepared to provide alternatives and solutions as conflict situations begin to develop within the school.

10. The secondary school principal must make it clear to students that he is responsible for the safety and protection of all students and that he will take whatever steps are necessary to fulfill this responsibility.
11. Principals serving in integrated secondary schools must maintain a greater state of readiness to prevent conflict as racial unrest increases the possibility of a volatile disruption.

12. Principals serving schools that have large student enrollments may benefit from the use of closed-circuit television in maintaining school surveillance and security.

13. Principals should refrain from conducting all-school assembly programs during periods of tension and unrest.

14. Secondary school administrators who have successfully coped with student disorders and violent confrontations should be utilized as resource persons to conduct seminars for other high school principals. State Departments of Education could provide valuable orientation for principals if they would sponsor such seminars.

15. Principals need to take an active part in their professional organizations, and avail themselves of the excellent materials that have been prepared by these organizations.

Suggestions for Further Study

The secondary school principal is presently the target of considerable pressure from many different sources. The demands upon his time do not permit him the opportunity to engage in many research studies. Most principals have ideas and some areas of special interest that they would investigate if time permitted. As the student activist movement gains additional momentum, the
secondary school principal will continue to seek assistance from any professional source available.

As a result of this study, the author suggests the following areas as significant ones for additional study:

1. How can the National Association of Secondary School Principals be of more assistance to principals in coping with student activism?

2. What can local boards of education do to instill a feeling of security for the secondary school principal in this era of student unrest?

3. Can technological equipment such as closed-circuit television be made available to secondary schools at a cost that is within their local budgets?

4. What is the most expedient and most effective method to train secondary school principals in "group dynamics"?

5. Should teachers colleges and graduate schools include course work in the area of professional negotiation for prospective administrators. How effectively can these skills be taught to educators who intend to serve as secondary school principals?

6. How can school counselors, school social workers, and deans be utilized most effectively to reduce tensions and unrest?
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MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 11, 1969

TO: All District Superintendents

FROM: Robert P. Hanrahan

SUBJECT: STUDENT UNREST CONFERENCE

On May 21, 1969, five suburban high school superintendents and I met with Sheriff Joseph I. Woods and his staff in our conference room to discuss measures to be taken in suburban Cook County to prevent student disruptions before they reach the violent and confrontation stage. Discussion also was centered on what to do once violence erupts.

I feel that the conference was a productive one, and I would like to share with you some of the important points discussed at that conference. I will summarize briefly the highlights of the conference, but I have enclosed a full transcript of the proceedings taken at this historic conference for your use in the future.

Suggested Procedures to Follow to Help Prevent Student Unrest and Violence

1. To orient faculty members, administrative staff, as well as custodial, cafeteria, and clerical staffs with policy, in the event there is a student walkout, sit-down strike, or violence. This should be done NOW.

2. To have you and your administrative staff meet with local police chief to define roles of police and school officials during a confrontation.

3. To contact your local police early, in order to alert them of possible trouble.

4. To develop an open door policy (if you don't have such a policy already) for your students. Listen to the student problems.

5. To develop a more relevant and meaningful student council so that all groups are truly represented.

6. To have on hand a list of security agencies you can call on when the local or county police leave your school.
7. To develop specific guidelines for your security officers to follow in their job descriptions.

8. To investigate universities or foundations such as the Mott Foundation in Flint, Michigan, which could provide inservice training workshops for your present security personnel. In addition, these institutions could provide you with security personnel.

Your comments and reactions to these procedures, the transcript, and the conference itself would be welcomed.

Enclosure
Dear Superintendent:

The Committee on Internal Security, of which the undersigned are Chairman and ranking minority member, respectively, recently released a special report on the activities of the militant Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) in seeking to disrupt our nation's high schools and recruit high school students in their organization.

As Members of Congress vitally concerned with this issue, we are enclosing a copy of this report for the use of high school administrators.

The report is not intended to reflect the final results of a study of SDS but it does provide hopefully useful background information so far obtained which may be of benefit to you and your colleagues.

We do ask that you read the report and let us have any reactions or comments with respect to the subject that may be of help to us in our future examinations and deliberations. If your own school has had any confrontations or experiences with SDS, we would be pleased to receive information from you concerning the circumstances. We would also be interested in hearing about any use you make of this report.

We solicit your cooperation in this regard as we seek to assist you in meeting the challenge which SDS may pose to the stability of our nation's high schools, which stand as such an important bulwark in our free society.

Richard H. Ichord (D.-Missouri)  
Member of Congress

John M. Ashbrook (R.-Ohio)  
Member of Congress
SUGGESTED BOARD POLICY

SCHOOL DISRUPTIONS

-It shall be the policy of the Board of Education to recognize legitimate student grievances and to provide an orderly method of communication and redress to all pupils and parents of the District. Dissent should properly be directed through established grievance procedures. School disruption or disregard for lawful authority shall not be permitted.

-Disruptive dissent in the form of civil disobedience such as sit-ins, boycotts, take-over of buildings, or other disruptions of the normal operation of the school shall be dealt with as follows:

1. All persons involved in disruptions on school property shall be directed to desist and to resume scheduled activities or to leave the premises.
   a. Students who return to class promptly and orderly will be readmitted with "no credit" for all time missed.
   b. Those who leave the premises promptly and orderly will not be permitted to return that day and all time missed shall be treated as "no credit" absence.
   c. Individuals responsible for actions causing personal injury or property damage will be subject to prosecution in accordance with school and civil regulations.
   d. Individuals responsible for organizing, inciting and perpetuating disruptive acts shall be similarly subject to disciplinary action.

2. Disruptive persons who are insubordinate to instructions by school officials shall be subject to removal by civil authority.

3. Unlawful dissent in the form of truancy or boycotting shall result in loss of credit for time missed and participants shall be subject to provisions of the attendance laws of the State of Illinois.
Safety and Security of Building and Pupils During Disturbances

Four levels of building security are planned for possible use in response to emergencies resulting from disturbances.

Condition One - Surveillance

This plan will be implemented upon receipt of verified reports of potential trouble. It is designed to provide observation and control over entry of unauthorized persons. The following individuals will take posts as indicated.

- Main Office for Communication
- East Auditorium Corridor
- West Corridor to Fine Arts Building
- P.E. Area
- East Cafeteria Corridor
- Maintenance and Cafeteria Exits - Put all doors on Panic Bar Control

Unauthorized individuals should be refused admission and difficult situations reported immediately to the Principal, Phone 33, 34, 37. Keep students out of halls.

Condition Two - Minimum Security

This plan will be utilized on receipt of verified reports that a demonstration or disturbance is planned, or if situation warrants additional security. It is designed to provide observation and security on every floor or area of the building. The following individuals will take the posts as indicated. Department Chairmen will arrange for suitable classroom supervision. Faculty are not to issue passes on the direction of the department chairman.

- East Auditorium
- West Corridor to Fine Arts Building
- P.E. Area
- West Cafeteria Corridor
- West Cafeteria Corridor
- Second Floor - Main Building
- Second Floor - Main Building

Supervisors keep students out of halls. Fire drills will be announced on P.A. Ignore all alarms until confirmed.

Lavatories, classrooms, offices, and entry ways should be kept under surveillance. Report difficult situations to the Principal, Phone 33, 34, or 37.
Condition Three - Intermediate Security

This plan provides immediate coverage on all outside entrances in addition to minimum hall security throughout the building.

1. Purpose:
   a. Calming influence until police arrive
   b. Break up any attacks until police arrive
   c. Keep students out of halls.

2. Duties and Stations:
   
   Main Office - Communications (both ways)
   a. Call police to be available immediately
   b. Advise faculty and students re:

   1) Class movement
   2) Students remaining in class

3. Stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P.E. Area</th>
<th>West Cross Corridors to Auditorium Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cafeteria Area</th>
<th>East Cross Corridors to Auditorium Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECOND FLOOR AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Near Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Condition Four - Maximum Security

This plan requires the employment of police. It is designed to provide security in every hall and possible trouble point. This force will be located in the Principal's office.

Police will inform school who is in charge of police details.

1. Announce students must disband and return to class immediately.

2. If group is not disbanded:
   a. Police isolate gathering area. Deans and Faculty will identify pupils.
   b. Hold bells so there is no hall movement.
   c. Teachers separate non-participating students and direct to an area away from the gathering.
   d. Police to remove students from the building and grounds who have refused to return to class. Police will use own judgment regarding arrest.
   e. All students removed will not be readmitted that day.
   f. Classes resume on regular schedule.

NON-TEACHING PERSONNEL - CLERKS, CUSTODIANS, AND CAFETERIA

The responsibility of this group in respect to control over students is none. They must not be placed in a position of responsibility. All non-certified personnel should refrain from involving themselves in a chaotic situation.

TEACHERS

The responsibility of the teaching staff at and during a disturbance is tremendous. They must exercise judgement in matters when all social and school rules are "out the window." They should protect any and all students from being harmed in any way. The use of physical force is forbidden except in case of self protection and then force should be only to subdue the violator. The courts will not be sympathetic to an over aggressive reaction to an action.

As a general rule to follow -- do whatever is reasonable.

Also, in regard to the situation, try to control the students immediately under your jurisdiction. A teacher with 27 students can do a great deal in helping the total situation by asserting their rule with a smaller group.

NOTES:

1. Security Control will be located in the Principal's Office, Main Office, Telephone 33, 34, or 37.

2. Department Chairmen will arrange substitutes. Classes may be combined in certain instances to reduce the number of substitutes needed. Individuals who are leaving classroom for supervision will notify the department chairman.
APPENDIX D

HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

I. Principals, in dealing with student activism, should think more in terms of positive educational change than in terms of repression and control.

II. Principals have experienced the need to open new channels of communication to develop better understanding among students, staff, and parents.

III. Principals have recognized the need for student involvement in the planning and implementation of student extracurricular activities.

IV. Principals have the direct responsibility to provide alternatives and solutions that will prevent conflict and confrontation by student activist groups.

V. Principals must rely less on authority and more on leadership to develop rapport with dissident student groups.

VI. Principals, in responding to the potential threat of student activism, have developed specific plans to maintain school decorum.
APPENDIX E

Questions to test hypotheses

Select one of the five alternatives and indicate the reason for your choice.

1. The perceptive high school principal will distinguish between constructive and destructive student activism.
   - Strongly Agree
   - Agree
   - Undecided
   - Disagree
   - Strongly Disagree

2. The high school principal must anticipate the possibility of a student disruption and be prepared to exercise immediate leadership that will stop violence.
   - SA
   - A
   - U
   - D
   - SD

3. High school principals need to establish an atmosphere of trust and understanding that will facilitate continuous two-way communication between the staff and student body.
   - SA
   - A
   - U
   - D
   - SD

4. High school students rebel against administrators who maintain autocratic control over student activities.
   - SA
   - A
   - U
   - D
   - SD

5. The high school principal must analyze and keep in perspective the conflicting demands that he faces.
   - SA
   - A
   - U
   - D
   - SD

6. Dissident students respect the high school principal who is willing to listen and discuss topics that he considers non-negotiable.
   - SA
   - A
   - U
   - D
   - SD
7. Student participation in school activities increases as administrative controls are decreased.

8. When confronted with activism, the high school principal must know when to make a decision and when to wait and investigate.

9. High school principals' leadership goals should focus priority on student involvement in the school program.

10. Initial pressure from students is often the impetus for desirable educational change within the high school.

11. The potential threat of student disruptions has caused principals to exercise greater care in planning crowd control procedures for after school and evening events.

12. A knowledge of the power structure of the student body is important to the high school principal when immediate communication is essential.

13. Students participate more enthusiastically in after school and evening activities when they have had the major part in planning these activities.
14. The high school principal must learn to feel secure when faced with student activist groups.

SA A U D SD

15. The principals' ability to negotiate with student groups is imperative when conflict situations occur.

SA A U D SD

16. When student activism is ignored or "put down" it may result in disruptive activity.

SA A U D SD

17. The high school principal must develop a close relationship with community leaders as he may need their support in emergency situations.

SA A U D SD

18. High school principals may prevent many potential problems if they maintain an "open door" policy to students.

SA A U D SD

19. High School students generally support an activity that they have had a part in formulating even though they may not be in accord with all aspects of the activity.

SA A U D SD

20. The high school principal must be in control of his emotions at all times when reacting to student activism.

SA A U D SD

21. Principals must be ready at a moments notice to negotiate calmly with student leaders who may be emotionally involved.

SA A U D SD
22. High school principals have found that repression of a problem resulting from student activism is not an effective administrative technique.

SA A U D SD

23. In today's fast moving society, high school principals may encounter problems if rumors and untruths are not refuted immediately.

SA A U D SD

24. Since each faculty and student body is unique, the high school principal must develop a specific emergency plan adapted to his local situation.

SA A U D SD

25. Deliberate confrontation that has been planned to disrupt the orderly processes of the school must be stopped immediately.

SA A U D SD

26. High school principals are finding many opportunities for school improvement inherent in student activism.

SA A U D SD

27. Principals have found that prolonged periods of conflict generates tensions and reduces the principal's intellectual resources for coping with conflict.

SA A U D SD

28. A student communications committee that meets regularly with the high school principal can provide significant "feedback" regarding needed school reforms.

SA A U D SD
29. Principals have found that procedures used effectively in controlling one student confrontation may not be effective in controlling a second confrontation.

SA A U D SD
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