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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

The United States Supreme Court decision in Brown v. Topeka Board of Education in 1954 declared unconstitutional the segregation by race of children in the public schools. Clearly the most important social decision of 20th century America, Brown vaulted the schools of the land into twenty years of desegregation efforts marked by love, hope, despair, violence, hatred, federal and state quota guidelines, further court decisions, Civil Rights legislation, biogenetic research — all of which has served to comply with, subvert, transmute, or get around the basic thrust of Brown, that "...in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."¹

Equality of Educational Opportunity

The Brown decision outlawed the legal maintenance of a dual school system based on race, sanctioned since the Plessy v. Ferguson decision of 1896. In its condemnation of such a system, the court appealed to evidence from the social sciences that the fact of separation placed in-

surmountable psychological obstacles in the way of achievement by blacks.2

In its decision to outlaw the dual system, the Supreme Court thought to accomplish two social goals, which have been referred to as the twin pillars of the "integration hypothesis"3: improved school achievement among blacks, and improved race relations between blacks and whites, provided that Allport's "equal status" characterized those relations.4

Solid evidence for these expectations did not exist in 1954.5 It has been sought post-factum and has been woefully lacking. The past twenty years have witnessed dramatic leaps forward for a select few blacks, mainly professional athletes and actors and actresses. But the comparative lot of the average black is not all that different twenty years later: in the summer of 1975, the unemployment rate among blacks on Chicago's south side reached almost 20 percent (nationally, in August of 1975, white unemployment was 7.6 percent: among blacks the rate of unemployment was 14 percent).6

6Monthly Labor Review, October 1975, p. 84.
James Coleman found some indications of slight improvement of blacks in desegregated settings, but not very much. Nancy St. John finds little evidence of gains for black children in desegregated situations and, indeed, some evidence of stress. There seems to be no question that black achievement gains through desegregation are minimal.

As far as the expectation of racial harmony is concerned, this appears, from the perspective of 1976, to be nothing but a sad joke. It may well be that a period of separation and alienation must precede a period of contact, as some theorists hold. Nonetheless, as America begins its third century, it must be admitted that racial harmony is certainly not one of our national characteristics.

**Future of Desegregation**

Efforts to desegregate the public schools will continue, notwithstanding the failure of Brown's augury. For one thing, there is no way of proving that the hopes of Brown would not have come true had we not had urban riots, wars, national disunity, and several difficult economic periods since 1954. Or, to say it another way, a radical social change such as that mandated by Brown may need at least two generations to take

---

its effect, and it may be unfair and premature to judge its results yet.

Some school systems in the South have desegregated effectively since Brown: but the large cities, particularly the large Northern industrial cities that house large concentrations of blacks, are more segregated now than in 1954, at least de facto (though not de jure, i.e., mandated by law). And plans to desegregate these systems seem to invite more "white flight" to the suburbs.10

There does not appear to be on the horizon a solution to this dilemma: that is, a large metropolitan desegregation plan that will be effective, will not drive one of the races out, will not attempt to force busing on the unwilling, will not lessen the quality of the educational program, and will not deny the parent the right to choose for his or her child the kind of school best suited to the child's needs. As far as present conditions can say, this is sheer Utopia.

Catholic School Desegregation

If the public school system finds problems with urban desegregation, the Catholic school system shares them since most of its schools are urban or metropolitan, and it adds a few dilemmas of its own.

The Catholic schools sprang up in the midst of the great Catholic

immigrations (Irish, Poles, Germans, Italians) of the 19th and early 20th centuries. The schools served the needs of the migrants to hold their community and faith-culture together, buffer their transition from European to American society, and make them socially mobile within the new world.\textsuperscript{11} The school was supported mainly by the parish church revenues.

As the exodus to suburbia unfolded in the third quarter of the 20th century, the Catholic urban schools found themselves without the children they were established to educate, and the parish church without the parishioners who used to support church and school. Blacks and other minorities who replaced the whites in the neighborhoods were interested in Catholic schools — mainly because the schools had succeeded in making their original denizens socially mobile enough to get out to the suburbs. However, the new ethnics did not support the parish church as the old parishioners had. For one thing, few blacks were Catholic; and for another, Latinos (even though they were mostly Catholic) did not particularly care to attend the "gringo" church, at least not at first.\textsuperscript{12}

The options for the Catholic urban school were either to close its doors and follow the congregation to the city fringe or the suburbs, or

to raise tuitions to much higher amounts and attempt to educate the new clientele without the subsidy from the parish. Many of the schools simply closed; and, of these, some re-opened in the suburbs. Others chose the latter course; of these, a few survived.

With Catholic schools the problem of integration was relevant only because it touched this issue: survival. Catholic schools had not generally excluded blacks per se, but until the 60's Catholic schools had not invited Protestants or other "non-Catholics" to attend. In the sixties, empty seats, spiraling costs, and a gentle ecumenical nudge from Pope John XXIII led Catholic schools to recruit non-Catholic pupils. Blacks responded to this option in large numbers, and the urban Catholic schools began to desegregate.

Desegregation did not last very long in most places. As the sixties progressed, there were fewer nuns, smaller collections at church, higher salaries for lay teachers, inflation — the whole spiral of financial problems that threatened the school's survival, destabilized the neighborhoods, and in general, contributed to white flight and the re-segregation of the urban Catholic schools.

Purpose

"Resegregation" is what this dissertation is about, or as one anonymous cynic put it, the process of change in school population from "the first black in to the last white out." We shall examine the major
literature on desegregation in the schools. We shall examine the pattern of desegregation and resegregation in the Catholic schools nationally, in the Archdiocese of Chicago, and in the Academy of Our Lady, a pattern of decline enrollment, increased minority attendance, and racial isolation. We hope to elucidate a pattern of resegregation that appears over and over again.

There is no contention that all the answers will be found here, because the desegregation — resegregation phenomenon is an enormously complicated problem with racial-ethnic, fiscal, demographic, and political aspects. We shall concentrate on the school-oriented facets of the problem.

The experience of the Academy of Our Lady, where the resegregation turnover was completed in less than ten years, may be of use to administrators and policy makers who face the prospect of racial change in the future. If financial crises and dwindling enrollments can be avoided in those future areas, and if the schools survive to serve their changing population, then this dissertation will have succeeded somewhat. Failing that, perhaps the experience detailed in this study will serve to point others around the pitfalls, and at least facilitate a somewhat orderly transition.
Segregation

Separation of black children and white children into different schools and school systems in America is not an historical accident. Nor is such segregation in schools merely a concomitant function of racial patterns in housing which are haphazard and voluntary. Gunnar Myrdal demonstrated that such segregation was no happenstance, but that both residential and educational segregation were part of the larger context of social and economic inequality between blacks and whites in America.¹³

With deep historic roots in the system of slavery, social inequality was legalized by the Jim Crow laws of the late 1800's. The Supreme Court in 1883 ruled the federal Civil Rights Act of 1875 unconstitutional, and this opened up the way for states and municipalities to separate the races in different schools, public facilities, parks, playgrounds, theaters, and means of transportation: in a word, to institutionalize racism. When this in turn was challenged, the United States Supreme Court in 1896 turned back the challenge and gave its blessing to social systems and public services that were "separate but equal."¹⁴

Until 1954, then, the public school districts of the South maintained dual systems: one for the white children, one for the blacks. The separation was mandated by state or local law and, according to the criteria of Plessy v. Ferguson, was allowable as long as the schools were "equal."

**Equality of Educational Opportunity**

The problem with the "separate but equal" doctrine lies in defining the criteria by which equality is established and opportunity is offered. Apparently in some districts this was interpreted to mean opportunity to fulfill one's inherited or designated role. And since a Negro's role in society was not one of leadership, scholarship or excellence, there was no reason to assume that equality of black opportunity was the same as equality of white opportunity. A Southern senator summed it up this way: "What the North is sending South is not money but dynamite; this education is ruining our Negroes. They're demanding equality."\(^\text{15}\)

Segregated schooling patterns, then, whether mandated by law in the solid South or simply de facto in the North or West, were part and parcel of a legally established or culturally implicit "color line." School segregation was the result of, and partial continuing cause of, a system of class and caste based on skin pigmentation that was headed

in Brown for a historic confrontation with the federal Constitution and the Equal Protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment. In fact, Supreme Court Justice Harlan, dissenter in the Plessy v. Ferguson decision, as much as predicted the clash:

Our Constitution is color blind, and neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens.... In my opinion, the judgement rendered this day will, in time, prove to be quite as pernicious as the decision made by this tribunal in the Dred Scott case.¹⁶

Gunnar Myrdal

Gunnar Myrdal's An American Dilemma was the major study that led to the dismantling of the segregated dual system in 1954. Myrdal studied not just school segregation, but the life of the Negro in America: his history, his demography, his economic and political stance, his social, educational, religious, and juridical status.¹⁷

Myrdal concluded that "separate but equal" was a hypocrisy, that the entire context of the Negro in America — the enormous social and economic disparity — could not be reconciled with the Constitution of the United States with its guaranteed rights for each citizen, or with the stated idealism of the American Creed of liberty and justice for all. The dilemma that Americans face, Myrdal maintained, is that the status of the Negro as the country's largest minority must improve quickly and dramatically, or America will stand exposed before the world and lose its

credibility as a champion of democracy. "America is free to choose whether the Negro shall remain her liability or become her opportunity."\textsuperscript{18}

Kenneth Clark

The Supreme Court, in its \textit{Brown} decision of 1954, called upon Kenneth B. Clark to give expert testimony. Clark presented a summary of current findings of psychological and sociological researchers on the effects of segregation. Based on Clark's statement, signed by 32 of his colleagues, the Court stated,

A sense of inferiority affects the motivation of a child to learn. Segregation with the sanction of law, therefore, has a tendency to retard the educational and mental development of Negro children and to deprive them of some of the benefits they would receive in a racially integrated school system. Whatever may have been the extent of psychological knowledge at the time of \textit{Plessy v. Ferguson}, this finding is amply supported by modern authority. Any language in \textit{Plessy v. Ferguson} contrary to this finding is rejected.\textsuperscript{19}

The Court's footnote 11 referred to Clark's summary, "The Effects of Segregation and the Consequences of Desegregation: A Social Science Statement," included as an appendix in the Appellant's Brief.\textsuperscript{20} In this work Clark and his confreres define segregation as the "restriction of opportunities for different types of association between the members of... (racial, religious, or linguistic) groups which results from or is supported by the action of any official body or agency representing some

\textsuperscript{18}Myrdal, \textit{An American Dilemma}, p. 1002. 
\textsuperscript{19}Brown \textit{v.} Board of Education, 345 U.S. 972 (1954), Footnote 11. 
branch of government." Clark then outlines his basic theory on the relation of segregation to low black achievement. Officially sanctioned segregation results in the perception of lower status by the minority child, accompanied by feelings of inferiority and humiliation. This produces a deficient self concept, low levels of aspiration; and this inbred defeatism becomes the immediate (but not only) cause of the minority child's failure to achieve.

For lower class minority children, the confusion and self-hatred connected with this condition are likely to lead to hostility or violence. For middle or upper class minority children, withdrawal, submission, or overcompensation may be the results. But for all segregated pupils, the universal result, Clark maintains, is a defeatist attitude and a lowered ambition that leads directly to failure.

Moreover, Clark adds, the devastating effects of official segregation are not limited to the minority. In such a system, the majority child may be allowed to view the minority with disdain or to vent their frustrations in anger toward them. Possible results from this (in majority children) are guilt reactions and defense mechanisms, possibly even cynicism and disrespect for law and authority.

21 Ibid., p. 167.  
22 Ibid., pp. 172-173.  
23 Ibid., p. 65.  
24 Ibid., p. 170.
Although "evidence suggests that minority children are unnecessarily encumbered by segregation and its concomitants,"\textsuperscript{25} the fact is that officially — sanctioned segregation can "potentially damage the personality of all children."\textsuperscript{26}

Clark goes on to point out that studies indicate other possible effects of segregation. It may, in some cases, impose a distorted sense of reality, block communication and engender hostility between races, and promote stereotypes and negative attitudes which precipitate violent outbreaks of racial tension. Clark maintains that desegregation will help avoid these harmful consequences. On the basis of studies examined thus far, Clark declares that desegregation will promote racial harmony.\textsuperscript{27}

In summing up his most powerful arguments for the Court, Clark reports that 80 percent of his colleagues agreed that segregation had ill effects on majority children; however, 90 percent agreed with his major conclusion, that "regardless of the facilities provided, enforced segregation is psychologically detrimental to the members of the segregated group."\textsuperscript{28}

The Supreme Court took Clark's report to mean that "this finding is amply supported by modern authority."\textsuperscript{29} In so doing the Court chose to ignore some of the weaknesses in the arguments. As a more recent critic states:

\textsuperscript{25}Ibid., p. 65. \hspace{2cm} \textsuperscript{26}Ibid., p. 63. \hspace{2cm} \textsuperscript{27}Ibid., p. 175. \hspace{2cm} \textsuperscript{28}Ibid., p. 173. \hspace{2cm} \textsuperscript{29}Brown v. Board of Education, 345 U.S. 972 (1954).
In no instance, precisely, were Clark and his colleagues able to pick out a study that tested the effects of segregation on the educational performance or disabilities of black children. Clark himself was probably vaguely aware of this problem, since he kept inserting qualifying phrases when making conclusions about "segregation," phrases like "enforced officially," and "segregation and its concomitants," that is, the whole context of environmental trauma occasioned by social inequality and the color line.

It should be pointed out, too, that because 90 percent of social scientists surveyed agree with a conclusion, such a statistic does not mean that the conclusion is demonstrated in 90 percent of the studies done by them. It simply means that, given a number of possible conclusions, they tend for one reason or another to agree with this one. As Clark himself so aptly put it in concluding his report: "The problem with which we have here attempted to deal is admittedly on the frontiers of scientific knowledge."

Gordon Allport

While Kenneth Clark pointed the Supreme Court toward the promised improved black achievement, the other half of the integration policy model was supplied by Gordon W. Allport: the equal status contact theory.

31Clark, Prejudice and Your Child, p. 65.
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Allport, among many other social scientists, looked upon the stance of the black man in America as being trapped in a "vicious circle." A later critic, David Armor, describes how this circle was viewed: white prejudice leads to unequal treatment of blacks; this discrimination induces feelings of inferiority in blacks and an inability to succeed; this failure in turn reinforces the original white prejudice. The only way to get the minority out of the circle was to diminish the prejudice against them, and this, is hoped, would be accomplished by mixing the races so that stereotypes could be destroyed.

Armor describes the policy model thus:

The key to breaking the vicious circle, then, was contact. By establishing integrated environments for black and white, white prejudice would be reduced, discrimination would decline, and damaging effects on the black child's feelings would be reduced.  

Allport formulated the contact theory in The Nature of Prejudice. He had taken the various steps in the development of relationships — contact, competition, accommodation, and assimilation — and examined the relationships of blacks and whites according to these steps. Using Stouffer's research on the American soldier (1949) and Deutsch and Collin's work on interracial housing (1951), Allport established that a lessening of hostility and a less prejudiced attitude on the part of whites was preceded and occasioned by an extended period of contact with blacks.


However, contact per se would not accomplish this objective. If, for instance, the relationship is a master-servant context or any of its variants, then this contact will not lead to competition or the other steps in human relationship. For this to ensue, the contact must be equal status contact. The positive effect of the contact can more easily occur if it is officially-sanctioned (as in the housing studies) and if it involves working toward common goals (as in the army).

Even if blacks and whites contact each other under ideal conditions, a lessening of prejudice may not result for all the participants. As Allport cautions, there are many individual, personal factors — background, upbringing, level of tension — that may defeat the purpose of integrated contact.35

However, aside from those unpredictable individual factors, with ordinary black and white people with normal amounts of prejudice, Allport states:

Prejudice (unless deeply rooted in the character structure of the individual) may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional supports (i.e., law, custom, or local atmosphere), and provided it is the sort that leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of the two groups.36

Gordon Allport's work was not cited directly by the Supreme Court in Brown. However, Allport was one of the signers of the Clark statement

to the Court, and the contact theory became almost national policy in Brown. Clark's research sought to demonstrate the devastating effect of segregation on black achievement. Allport showed that equal status contact could promote both achievement and harmony by reducing prejudice. Both pointed out the path to the Court, and it led to the elimination of the segregated school districts.

Fifties

It is interesting to note that, in the fifties, equality of educational opportunity meant offering the same to all: same schools (now integrated), same teachers, same laboratories, same libraries: all that could be classed as inputs. In the sixties, researchers would look for parity in outputs, e.g., test results. But the fifties in general, and the Brown decision in particular, concern themselves solely with making available the same opportunity to everyone.

Neither Clark nor Allport nor the Court argued that black children were taught in worse buildings, or by less qualified teachers, or with poorer textbooks, or in fewer libraries and laboratories — although these were undoubtedly true in many cases. They argued that the very fact that segregation was officially sanctioned did harm to the black child's psyche. So, on the one hand, the de facto separation of races in the North was not addressed: but the Supreme Court and the federal government turned their attention to the legally — established dual

systems of the South, commanding and cajoling them to get the black and white children into the same schools "with all due haste."

**Sixties**

The late fifties and early sixties were a time of preliminary evaluation of the results of the Brown decision. Social activists who had pushed for years to end official segregation now were frustrated on two scores. Many school systems were slow to desegregate (and in some locales private schools sprang up to render desegregation impossible); also, the early studies done on the newly-integrated school systems were not encouraging.

Besides the violence at Little Rock and other locations, there was a nagging suspicion that the whole brouhaha had been futile, because black pupils were not achieving on the level of white children, even though mixed in the same schools.

David Cohen states:

Evidence on the educational impact of desegregation (there had been none at the time of Brown) began to flow as schools integrated. Sometimes it showed modest gains and sometimes it showed no change over expectations, but it never showed that desegregated schools came close to eliminating achievement differences between blacks and whites.\(^{38}\)

At this time, the notion of equality was taking on the expectation that achievement of black children in desegregated schools ought to be on

somewhat of a par with white children, at least on average. The fact that this did not occur was a phenomenon that had to be looked into, and this was done by James Coleman and his associates.

The Coleman Report

The early sixties saw the executive and legislative branches of the federal government join the judiciary in the push for equality of educational and social rights. The Kennedy administration showed no hesitancy about using federal marshals to force desegregation. The Congress passed a strong Civil Rights Act in 1964; and the massive funds Congress provided in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 were to be withheld from districts which intentionally maintained segregated schools.39

The Civil Rights Act established a national Civil Rights Commission to promote its implementation, and one of the first steps the Commission took was to find out what was going on in the schools ten years after Brown, and why black pupils were not achieving as expected. The Commission directed James Coleman and his research team to "...conduct a survey and make a report to the President and the Congress, within two years of the enactment of this title, concerning the lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of race, color, religion, or national origin in public educational institutions at all levels in the United States, its territories and possessions, and the District of

Armed with this mandate from the Commission, Coleman set forth with his "Equality of Educational Opportunity Survey." The project did not get total support nation wide (for instance, Chicago, Los Angeles, and the state of Florida did not participate). Nonetheless, 72 percent of the districts in the country responded, and Coleman's team processed survey returns from 4,081 school principals, 66,826 teachers, and 568,743 pupils. As Mosteller and Moynihan remarked, the EEO Survey was "...almost certainly the most important effort of its kind undertaken by the United States government."41

The major conclusions of the Coleman project were summarized in his report to the President and the Congress on July 2, 1966:

The great majority of American children attend schools that are largely segregated — that is, where almost all of their fellow students are of the same racial background as they are. Among minority groups, Negroes are by far the most segregated. Taking all groups, however, white children are most segregated... In its desegregation decision of 1954, the Supreme Court held that separate schools for Negro and white children are inherently unequal. This survey finds that, when measured by that yardstick, American public education remains largely unequal in most regions of the country, including all those where Negroes form any significant proportion of the population.42

Thus Coleman confirmed for a skeptical Congress that the answer to the question "How integrated are the schools ten years after Brown?" was:

42Coleman et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity, p. iii.
not very. His further conclusion that the educational opportunity is unequal is derived from a comparison of inputs, i.e., characteristics of schools, and outputs, i.e., results of pupil achievement on objective tests.

Among inputs, Coleman identified as measurable school characteristics facilities, curricular programs, principals and teachers, and student body characteristics. Among the outputs, the Coleman survey used the results of 1st, 3rd, 6th, 9th, and 12th grade pupils on standardized tests of non-verbal vocabulary skills; association, classification, and analogy skills; and Reading, Mathematics, and General knowledge.43

Based on the correlations of these factors, Coleman's analysis attempts to describe what relationship the school's characteristics themselves (libraries, for example, and teachers and laboratories, and so on) seem to have to the achievement of majority and minority groups (separately for each group on a nation-wide basis, and also for Negro and white pupils in the North and South).44

The results of this analysis are: considering the inputs, the schools across the country are more alike than unlike, so much so that "When (socio-economic) factors are statistically controlled...differences between schools account for only a small fraction of differences in pupil achievement."45

Differences in facilities and curricula seem to account for little variation in pupil achievement, though minority children are more affected.

by such differences than whites. The same can be said for differences in teacher quality, which has a somewhat stronger correlation to pupil achievement generally.46

The one element in Coleman's analysis that shows a strong relation to pupil achievement is the educational background and aspirations of the other students in the school. This peer group factor, Coleman states, is most important to consider as it relates to equality of educational opportunity because, "...the principal way in which the school environments of Negroes and whites differ is in the composition of their student bodies, and it turns out that the composition of the student bodies has a strong relationship to the achievement of Negro and other minority pupils."47

All of these conclusions are general, and like all generalizations are subject to qualification. Despite clear cut differences in achievement between white and minority children nation-wide, the achievement differences between all children in one region of the country and all children in another region are as great as any differences between black and white, and usually greater.48 Moreover, the variations of pupil achievement within one school are four times as large as the variability between these schools.49

Nonetheless, even with these qualifications made, the facts of the

46Ibid.
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EEO survey still stand forth. American children were not much less segregated in 1964 than in 1954. And minority pupils average lower than whites on every level tested. The deficiency exists in the first grade and gets worse in the later years. Minority pupils start out school at a disadvantage, and schools — for whatever reason — do little to help overcome the deficiency.50

Although Coleman's report does not recommend policy, it does comment on the future of integration. Though admitting that test scores show small evidence of black improvement, and maintaining that there are other values in integration, "yet the analysis of school factors described earlier suggests that in the long run, integration should be expected to have a positive effect on Negro achievement as well."51

Coleman's report also presented a small number of case studies in desegregation. Although these studies are inconclusive, some of the trends indicated are worth citing because they relate to the Longwood case study in Chapter III.52

In the San Francisco area, the Coleman team had difficulty getting a racial head count which the Board originally thought improper or illegal. In "River City" a district wide, grade by grade desegregation plan had resulted in resegregation. In a district which changed Junior High

50Ibid., p. 21. 51Ibid., p. 29. 52Ibid., pp. 460-488. (Coleman's report also looked into Head Start and some college desegregation programs. These are not treated in this dissertation).
boundaries to achieve desegregation, the pupils "self-segregated" themselves in extra curriculars.

In Pasedena, possible resegregation impelled the NAACP local chairman to ask the Board to "...seek new ways to desegregate existing segregated schools, and maintain balance in those schools now integrated, but because of population movement becoming segregated."53

A Pasedena plan was presented which would combine an open enrollment policy with a racial quota system. The plan was entitled "Geographic and Controlled Open Districting." The County Counsel, however, disallowed the plan because, in his opinion, a quota based on race would violate the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment of the Constitution.54

Thus was formulated the dilemma for any school or district attempting to desegregate or preventing resegregation: equal protection or social justice prohibits such quotas, yet in some cases the quota or "Controlled Open" enrollment offers the only viable hope of alleviating racial imbalance. Parsons and Clark had maintained that for any desegregation plan to succeed, mutual acceptance by both minority group and whites is essential.55 In the case of quotas, this is doubly true because once the balancing ratio is achieved, the right of the later applicants is denied because of race, and, as a Pasedena board member stated, "What earthly right have we to say to a child, 'Because there are too many of your cer-

53Ibid., p. 480. 54Ibid., p. 484.
tain race you must go elsewhere.'"56

Coleman's report to the Congress, then, provided data to support liberal and/or black social activists who were claiming that the schools were not desegregating "with all due haste." As a matter of fact, they were correct. However, in positing that such separation was unequal according to the Brown criterion, Coleman actually goes beyond the scope of the Court. Brown had declared segregated schools unequal because of the psychological damage done by "segregation with the sanction of law."57 Coleman makes no such distinction in his conclusions. Indeed, in the sixties, with the push by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., and others to confront the de facto segregation of the North, the Court's qualification "with the sanction of law" was forgotten. Coleman and his associates seem to have been swept along in this tide.

Also, at the time of the issue of Coleman's report, so much attention was focused on the conclusion about segregation, that some of his most important findings were glossed over, for instance: that blacks had tested very badly on instruments designed to measure skills that open up job opportunities (and that this might be a significant fact in black unemployment);58 that peer group factors (background, social class, and aspirations of classmates) seem to have more influence on achievement than staff, program, or facilities — and that minorities are especially affected by

56 Coleman et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity, p. 482.
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peer group characteristics; and that though inequalities exist in the schools, the measurable academic inequality between black and white children exists prior to first grade; the factors that produce such pre-school inequality continue to be operative; the result is that a wide gap between the groups' respective achievements in first grade becomes a veritable chasm in senior year of high school.

These critical points of the Coleman survey may well have met the fate of findings of other presidential committees, that is, oblivion, were it not for the follow-up done in the Harvard Faculty seminar. And this may well not have happened except that Coleman's conclusions on peer group characteristics were of great interest to professor Daniel Patrick Moynihan.

Daniel P. Moynihan

Moynihan's interest in social inequality began prior to Coleman's study, when Moynihan was undersecretary of the Department of Labor in the Kennedy administration. In that position, Moynihan had addressed himself to the issue of inequality in black employment and social achievement generally. Such inequality persisted in areas long after the Jim Crow laws were abolished, and Moynihan, along with several other social scientists, began to be convinced that, "abolishing legal racism would not produce...equality." (The data later supplied by Coleman would seem to corroborate this.)

59Ibid., p. 302. 60Ibid., p. 21.
Moynihan maintained that any inquiry into the causes of inequality must go back beyond the schools and their influence to the heart of the black community itself: the family. He attempted to examine the axiom that "equal opportunity will produce equal results," and presented his findings in 1965 in The Negro Family: the Case for National Action.63

Moynihan studied governmental statistical reports that compared the rates of divorce, broken families, illegitimacy, and numbers of ADC families between blacks and whites. He was particularly struck by the figures on the black community of Harlem which a recent report had stated, was experiencing "massive deterioration of the fabric of society and its institutions."64 Moynihan concludes that the family life of the urban ghetto was crumbling.

Like Myrdal, Moynihan traced the origins of the problem to the institution of slavery and its heritage, the cycle of poverty. However, he argues (against Allport and Clark) that diminishing white prejudice or offering equal educational and job opportunities will not cure the damage that has already been done to the black family.

The black man, robbed of his role as provider and father figure, has faded into the background to such an extent that matriarchy has become a characteristic of the black family. The black woman, Moynihan

64Ibid., p. 4.
points out, faces the wellnigh impossible task of being mother, breadwinner, and authority figure. This fatal weakness in black family structure is what produces the aberrant, inadequate, and anti-social behavior of black youth and ultimately retards the progress of blacks as a group.65

Moynihan's report on the black family evoked a negative reaction among many blacks, who felt that the report reflected "a subtle racism."66 Stephen Cole maintains that Moynihan did not organize his material properly, so that he seemed to be connecting family instability to the factor of race, rather than highlighting the intervening variable of poverty.67 Be that as it may, there is a rather large speculative leap from the fact of matriarchy to juvenile delinquency and other youth problems. From the hindsight of 1976, there is no question that Moynihan was correct in pointing out the crumbling of family life; what he failed to see — but which is apparent now — is that the deterioration of "society and its institutions," particularly the family, is by no means restricted to the black community. Moynihan can not be blamed for not seeing what no one else saw in 1965; but, unfortunately, his call for national action to assist the institution of the family was rejected because of suspected racism. And the problems of the family — black, white, and others — have become intensely more critical in the last 11 years.

Moynihan, then, preoccupied with the family structure of blacks, was
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interested when Coleman's conclusions were published in 1966, especially those about family socioeconomic status and peer group influence on a child's achievement. However, he felt that the two year limit imposed by the Civil Rights Commission did not allow Coleman and his team enough time to analyze the data properly and refine their findings. Together with several other Harvard faculty members, Moynihan carried on further analyses of Coleman's report in a series of seminars during the 1966–67 school year.

The Harvard Seminars

The major contributions of the Harvard faculty seminars were reported in On Equality of Educational Opportunity, with Professors Moynihan and Frederick Mosteller editing. In their introductory chapter, Mosteller and Moynihan deal with the overall significance of the Coleman Report for national policy. As a first step in understanding the problems of American education, the EEO Report has broken the ground for future research and oriented the researchers of the future to look at educational "outputs" or results.

However, Moynihan and Mosteller assert, it is most difficult to formulate national policy from a one-time survey. They join practically all the critics of the Coleman report in citing the need for longitudinal studies, i.e., studies on the same groups of children in successive years. Besides, the EEO Report yields an ambiguous picture: rather equal inputs

---

69 Ibid., p. v.
nation-wide, but a great divergence of black and of white achievement, a full two standard deviations. Some national policy may perhaps alter the difference between groups, but how much will it help the individual child? Equality, Mosteller and Moynihan argue, is a relative concept: we could, if we wished, achieve equality by slowing down the smarter students, but would that serve the national need for leadership?

The ideal of equality in society, Mosteller and Moynihan maintain, must always be balanced with the ideal of liberty. We want equality for all groups, whites and minorities, but we also want freedom for each individual to excel to the limits of his capacity. These are not easy principles to balance, and the most valuable research would be that which can tell policy makers precisely what actions or policies will serve the two ideals fairly.

Mosteller and Moynihan call for national educational goals, to be researched and assessed at regular intervals. They call for experimentation with new classroom methods and new kinds of schools. They even suggest that direct income supplements to families might do more than projects like Head Start to increase achievement. What the Coleman report has told us, Mosteller and Moynihan state, is that we do not really know enough about human learning to say certainly what helps it and what hinders it. Integration may help, but not very much; we must experiment.
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Christopher Jencks presented a detailed statistical report to the Harvard seminar, concentrating on the Northern urban elementary schools. His re-analysis generally supports the conclusions of Coleman, especially the one challenged the most, namely that within regions black and white children have access to comparable school resources.\(^{76}\)

However, Jencks does question Coleman's conclusion that peer group factors affect achievement to a great extent. Jencks maintains that these variations may as easily be attributed to the individual family's socioeconomic status. Jencks generally wishes that family SES had been more clearly defined and explored in the EEO Report.\(^{77}\) And this leads Jencks to a conclusion which he later develops in later works:

> If and when we develop a comprehensive picture of inequality in American life, we will find that educational inequality is of marginal importance for either good or ill. Such things as control over capital, occupational specialization, and the traditions of American politics will turn out to be far more important than the schools.\(^{78}\)

Eric Hanushek and John Kain approached the EEO Report from an economist's point of view. They maintain that the survey attempted to do too much in a short period of time and failed to fulfill its basic mandate: to measure the degrees of inequality in the different schools. The EEO team, Hanushek and Kain stated, could not make up their mind whether inequality meant divergence of inputs or divergence of outputs. The result was that they failed to measure either adequately.\(^{79}\)

\(^{76}\)Ibid., pp. 93-94.
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As a consequence the EEO Report is of little use for national policy, Hanushek and Kain maintain. What is needed is a new brand of research that will measure students' progress longitudinally, and which could analyze the relative inputs of individual schools. Like Mosteller and Moynihan, these authors call for a period of intense experimentation and research in education.\textsuperscript{80}

James Coleman himself addressed the Harvard seminar and, in response to Hanushek and Kain, defended the design of the EEO study. He does admit that the definition of "equality" underwent changes in the course of the study, yet the researchers felt obliged to address both equality of inputs as well as equality of outputs.\textsuperscript{81}

What makes it difficult to assess the correlation of inputs and achievement, Coleman states, are the possible gaps between inputs disbursed by the school and received by the child. For instance, the school spends X amount per child, has facilities of Y degree of modernity, and has teachers of Z degree of excellence. All this leads to the expectation of A-plus achievement. However, diseconomies such as violence in the classroom, an unsafe neighborhood, or lack of discipline prevail. These factors intervene and prevent the child from achieving at the expected level.\textsuperscript{82}

In general, Coleman defends his EEO study while agreeing that further, and other kinds of research are needed for policy related questions.
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David Armor presented the seminar with still another statistical reanalysis of the Coleman data. He concentrated on the early grade-level findings. Armor's paper confirmed Coleman's conclusions that the average black is two standard deviations behind the average white pupil, and that the school can not possibly equalize results, not even in twelve years.83

As far as social policy goes, Armor suggests that these data provide strong arguments for programs of pre-school, early childhood and home-environment education. However, Armor warns, programs of this nature must be designed and implemented carefully because the home life-style of blacks and of whites differs greatly.84

Marshall Smith also reconsidered the basic findings of Coleman's Report. In his presentation to the Harvard seminar, Smith averred that the Coleman team had erred in over-estimating the effect of peer group factors on pupil achievement. Like Jencks, Smith thought that these variations in achievement should be attributed to individual family background, a factor whose influence Coleman had underestimated.85

Like other critics, Smith called for a modified kind of research: longitudinal studies and experimental models which would include control groups for comparison.86

David Cohen, Thomas Pettigrew, and Robert Riley addressed the seminar
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on what effect the Coleman data should have on desegregation plans. Since the 1954 Brown decision, the authors say, the center of the desegregation controversy has been the racial composition of the school or class. This factor must now be de-emphasized as a result of the EEO Report, because "assigning Negro students to mostly white classes would raise their verbal ability about 1.94 points....less than one sixth of the difference."87

Cohen, Pettigrew, and Riley do not advocate the abandonment of desegregation plans because of these data. The EEO Report, they maintain, did not distinguish adequately the effects of race and of social class. New research methods should address the relative impact of racial composition per se and social class and home background factors on pupils' achievement.88

In their presentation to the seminar, John Gilbert and Frederick Mosteller join Moynihan in calling for a period of intense experimentation in education. The Coleman Data, they maintain, have raised more questions than answers, and we need longitudinal studies on a large scale to find out what teaching methods best facilitate learning, and under which conditions.89

Henry Dyer, in his address to the seminar, turned specifically to thoughts of follow-up studies on the Coleman data. Three types of studies need to be done:
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Descriptive studies collect and organize information about the system; analytical studies use the information to generate hypotheses about it; experimental studies test the hypotheses by introducing new information.\textsuperscript{90}

Moreover, Dyer states, a lot of research going off in different directions would be wasteful. Some sort of officially-sanctioned authority must coordinate the efforts into a systematic body of knowledge. And even before this can be done, some research should be done on how to organize the researchers for better research, and how to persuade the taxpayers to finance it.\textsuperscript{91}

Edmund W. Gordon reviewed the literature for the Harvard seminar, attempting to define equality of educational opportunity as the notion had developed. He examines several definitions, each one of which leads to the problem cited earlier by Moynihan, the task of balancing the ideal of equality for all with the ideal of individual liberty.

Gordon says that freedom for the individual to excel must be maintained. Nonetheless, there is a basic set of skills which the school must impart to everyone. Gordon calls these "survival skills"; they are:

1. Basic communication
2. Problem-solving
3. Management of knowledge
4. Employment, leisure, and Continuing Education
5. Self Management: personal character development.\textsuperscript{92}

Equality of educational opportunity means that each pupil gets these basic skills in some similar degree. If pupils bring to school unequal
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capacities or backgrounds, then instruction must be individualized to compensate. These skills are the basics of equality in modern society. They form the base line for all to achieve, and beyond which the gifted are free to excel.93

**Sixties Summarized**

The Harvard seminar publicized the data of the Coleman report and analyzed it from several points of view. The questions raised by the EEO Report and the Harvard analyses challenged the very foundations of the Brown decision and the social and educational utility of desegregation. For the social scientist, this evoked a problem because, as Moynihan and Mosteller indicated,

Especially with respect to matters of race, the period of the EEO report, which is to say the mid 1960's, had been preceded by a half century, at very least, in which social science had been the unfailling ally of social change in this field. Not infrequently social scientists had been advocates as well as analysts....94

Now the social scientists had handed their erstwhile allies a set of data which suggested that school integration did not really make much difference: maybe even the schools did not make that much difference. Thus the sixties ground to a halt with federal judges still issuing desegregation and/or busing orders, as they had been since 1954. Now, however, they were opposed not only by conservatives and "hardhats" as they had always been, but they felt their traditional support from the groves of academe slipping away.
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The Coleman report and the Harvard seminar set the tone for future research on equality. Jencks would explore the thought that the schools' influence on societal inequality is marginal (1972).95 Nancy St. John (1975) would attempt to find effects of desegregation on individual children, not large average groups.96 Coleman himself (1975) would investigate demographic effects of desegregation plans, such as "white flight."97 But after the Coleman report of 1966 and the Harvard re-analyses of 1966-67, never again could it be blithely assumed that "racial balance" had very much to do with pupil achievement. Never again could the ancient myth be believed, that the public schools were the key to an egalitarian society.

Unfortunately, one of the major recommendations of the Harvard faculty has not been carried out. That is their unanimous call for a period of large scale and intense research on what constitutes learning, what helps it, and what hinders it. Moynihan and Mosteller felt that the lowered enrollment expected in the 70's would mean more dollars available for research.98 The sad fact is that whatever financial resources might have been available were eaten up by the inflation and recession of the 1970's. Thus the Coleman Report on Equality of Educational Opportunity, for all of its manifest faults, ambiguities and limitations, still stand

97Coleman's full study, Trends in School Desegregation, by Coleman, Kelly, and Moore, is not available as of this writing. The findings reported here were indicated in Coleman's summary of the data in Phi Delta Kappan, October 1975, p. 76-77.
98Mosteller and Moynihan, On Equality of Educational Opportunity, p. 46.
as one of the major educational studies in the history of America.

**Seventies**

In the 1970's, the mind of America became preoccupied with financial problems. The idealistic projects of desegregation, Civil Rights, Equal Job Opportunity, War on Poverty, all began to take a back seat in the late sixties as the Viet Nam war drained national resources and energy. Even the gradual winding down of the war did not ease the situation. Inflation and severe recession had become so serious that a conservative Republican president imposed Federal wage and price controls in August of 1971.

Against this background, the concept of equality of opportunity began to be spelled with a dollar sign. Equality of educational opportunity began to be viewed as access to those arts and skills which would lead to a job, guarantee fiscal security, and, thus promote social mobility.

Christopher Jencks and his associates examined equality from this viewpoint in *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*. 99

Jencks' title tells all: there is inequality in society, and schools can do little about it. "Eliminating differences between schools," Jencks states, "would do almost nothing to make adults more equal." 100

99 Jencks et al., *Inequality.*
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Jencks statistical reassessment of the Coleman data confirms the finding that the average white child scores about 15 points higher on standardized tests than the average black child.\textsuperscript{101} But for Jencks, this is only of symbolic importance, for even if the school outcome could somehow be equalized, the societal problem would still remain. The average white worker, Jencks states, is paid about 50 percent more than the average black worker. But the top one fifth of whites are paid 600 percent more than the bottom one fifth of whites. "From this point of view, racial inequality looks almost insignificant."\textsuperscript{102}

As far as the reform of schools is concerned, Jencks states, "None of the evidence we have reviewed suggests that school reform can be expected to bring about significant social change outside the school."\textsuperscript{103}

Instead of raising unreal expectations, Jencks continues, schools should concentrate on short range plans: make school more enjoyable for children, give parents options regarding desegregation. But the schools can never equalize the economic inequalities in society. Only the larger society, or the government, or the financial institutions working together can equalize income, purchasing power, equity, and security. Jencks suggests a government-guaranteed annual wage or insurance program to accomplish this.\textsuperscript{104} What the schools should do, Jencks cynically suggests, is to scale down their promises and try not to damage the child too much in his formative years. For this reason, he does not favor cutting school

\textsuperscript{101}Ibid., p. 81.  
\textsuperscript{102}Ibid., p. 14.  
\textsuperscript{103}Ibid., p. 255.  
\textsuperscript{104}Ibid., pp. 230-231.
expenditures — quite the contrary:

There is no evidence that building a school playground, for example, will affect the students' chances of learning to read, getting into college, or making $50,000 a year when they are 50. Building a playground may, however, have a considerable effect on the students' chances of having a good time during recess when they are 8.105

**Fiscal Equality**

The differences between the optimistic sixties and the cynical seventies is captured in comparing statements of Gunnar Myrdal and Christopher Jencks. In 1962 Myrdal, an economist, predicted that education would make for equality and social progress in America. In 1972 Jencks, an educator, states that economic equality must precede educational equality.

What we did not appreciate, Jencks argues, is the enormity of the inequality in society: "...the situation of the blacks has been like that of the poor in general, namely that their relative position has improved somewhat, but not fast enough to narrow the absolute gap between them and the rich."106

To achieve economic equality, "we think society should get on with the task of equalizing income rather than waiting for the day when everyone's earning power is equal."107 To achieve such equality, what is needed is reform of the economic, taxation, and financial institutions. When it comes to this kind of major societal reform, the influence of the school, Jencks concludes, is "marginal."108

---

105Ibid., p. 29.  
106Ibid., p. 217.  
107Ibid., p. 11.  
108Ibid., p. 25.
Individual Effects

If Jencks' economic arguments seem to run against desegregation, even more powerful arguments against forced desegregation by busing or other means can be found in the work of Nancy St. John.109

St. John has concentrated on the effects, especially psychological effects, of desegregation on individual children. In an earlier study of her own (1972), St. John had maintained that individual pupils and parents were at different stages of readiness for desegregation. She attempted to define the conditions that affect this readiness or lack of it. Besides intelligence and family SES, St. John identified age, sex, mental health, achievement, appearance, and previous experience of the other races as some of the factors that influence a child's propensity to succeed or fail in an integrated school setting.110 Based on these complexities, St. John argues strongly for pupil placement in segregated or desegregated settings on an individual basis, with the ultimate right of choice in the hands of the parents.111

St. John summarized her own and several other studies of effects of desegregation on individual children in School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children. Here are her findings:

109St. John, School Desegregation
111Ibid., p. 7 and p. 13.
...school desegregation per se has no unitary or invariable effect on children.\textsuperscript{112} ...there are identifiable characteristics for them... readiness for the stress or need for the challenge of desegregation appears to be a very individual matter.\textsuperscript{113}

Again St. John stresses the idea of individual children and the how of desegregation, not just the numbers involved: "in the years ahead, if children are to realize the promised benefits of desegregation, policy makers and educators must give less attention to balancing schools and more attention to conditions within biracial schools."\textsuperscript{114}

What about the higher self concept and aspiration predicted by Clark and the racial harmony promised by Allport? St. John summarized her findings:

Both the self-concept and aspiration of black children tend to be stronger in segregated schools... It seems as though desegregation must be dysfunctional in some ways for minority youth.\textsuperscript{115} ...desegregation sometimes reduces prejudice and promotes interracial friendship and sometimes promotes, instead, stereotyping and interracial cleavage and conflict.\textsuperscript{116}

Thus Nancy St. John brings us full circle back to the 1954 Brown decision. That decision was based on an expected heightening of black self concept and aspiration and an anticipated increase in racial harmony. St. John tells us that sometimes these effects are had in desegregated settings; sometimes the exact opposite occurs. What about the relation of desegregation to achievement?

St. John states:

\textsuperscript{112}St. John, School Desegregation, p. 121.
\textsuperscript{113}Ibid., pp. 112-113.
\textsuperscript{114}Ibid., p. 124.
\textsuperscript{115}Ibid., p. 59.
\textsuperscript{116}Ibid., p. 85.
In sum, adequate data have not yet been gathered to determine a causal relation between school racial composition and academic achievement. More than a decade of considerable research effort has produced no definitive positive findings.\textsuperscript{117}

**Coleman Revisited**

As if Jencks and St. John had not provided enough negative feedback on the effects of desegregation, James Coleman has returned to tell us that, in the big cities, desegregation has planted the seed of its own destruction. Coleman and his associates have attempted to analyze the phenomenon of "white flight" to the suburbs. In certain large cities, Coleman states, it appears certain that the fact of school desegregation plans actually contributed to "white flight." Instead of stabilizing the neighborhoods, desegregation contributed to instability.\textsuperscript{118}

Coleman shares the view of Nancy St. John that how desegregation is implemented is most important. One reason for increased white flight, Coleman argues, is that courts have denied parental rights by forcing busing plans on the cities. People are sometimes willing to surrender a right for some other tangible or demonstrable benefit. But the academic benefits of desegregation are not large (in many cases non-existent), and people thus are unwilling to surrender the right to choose a school for their child. So they move.

Coleman harks back to the point made by Parsons and Clark, that any

\textsuperscript{117}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 36.
\textsuperscript{118}\textit{Coleman et al.}, \textit{Trends in School Desegregation}, p. 76-77.
desegregation plan must have the support of all parties involved if it is to succeed.\textsuperscript{119} Moreover, plans must be designed that desegregate by expanding parents' rights, not reducing rights through forced busing.\textsuperscript{120} Long term social benefits, Coleman concludes, are not effectively achieved in a democracy by reduction but by expansion of individual rights.

**Summary**

We have attempted in this chapter to examine the works of the major authors on the subject of desegregation, and thus to analyze the patterns of thinking that have developed in the past 25 years. The optimistic predictions of Myrdal, Clark, and Allport helped the Supreme Court to take the desegregation plunge in 1954. In the sixties the Coleman team investigated the schools both on inputs and outcomes, and the Harvard seminars publicized and analyzed the Coleman findings.

Daniel P. Moynihan was the first to point out that the problems of social inequality preceded the school years and to suggest that help be given the family instead. Christopher Jencks took the thought one step further and said the schools were of only marginal importance — the real causes of inequality are financial and can only be changed by direct fiscal reform.

Nancy St. John has reminded us that the product of the educational process is not the "average black" or "average white" child. It is the

\textsuperscript{119}Parsons and Clark, Negro American, p. 492.
\textsuperscript{120}Coleman et al., Trends in School Desegregation, p. 78.
real individual pupil, and for the real children the outcomes of desegregation are not that good. Finally Coleman has told us that what started out as an expansion of rights (for blacks) has been implemented (in busing) by a reduction of rights, and that this can not provide a good solution.

As far as the future of public school desegregation is concerned, it is hoped that this study will call attention to the findings of St. John and Coleman. Otherwise the pattern of violence may continue.

Such a pattern seems inherently determined unless and until desegregation plans begin to be designed with (1) the individual child in mind; and (2) the cooperation of all involved. If numerical racial percentages and balances were significant for learning and for success, we would know it by now. The fact is, after all these years, that we know such ratios and balances are merely symbolic, and as such of political value only (if any).

Educators in public and private schools have to be careful not to abandon the ideals set forth in the Brown decision. The seventies are a cynical decade; it is very easy, on the basis of the negative research findings, to argue that integration has been a failure and therefore can be forgotten. But equality, liberty, and justice can not be forgotten. Those elusive and sometimes conflicting ideals still remain the obligation of the school to promote and instill. Notwithstanding the limited success of desegregation, the United States cannot go back to the color line. The country tried that for 60 years and is now aware that liberty and justice do not
flourish in such a system.

We said in the beginning of this essay that we are lacking an effective desegregation plan that will not drive one of the races out, will not attempt to force busing on the unwilling, will not lessen the quality of the educational program, and will not deny the parent the right to choose for his or her child the kind of school best suited to the child's needs. We are convinced, based on our review of the literature, that such an utopian-sounding solution is not only possible, but that without it the future of desegregation is hopeless.
CHAPTER II

DESEGREGATION IN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Having looked at the desegregation situation in the public schools, we may now attempt to develop a similar picture of the Catholic schools in the country, and in particular in the Archdiocese of Chicago in the decade between 1964 and 1974. This is going to be an extremely difficult task, for three reasons.

First, the "Catholic school system" is not a system at all. The National Catholic Education Association, our source for most Catholic school statistics, is a voluntary group to which a parochial school may belong or not belong as it wishes. State-wide Catholic Conferences and individual diocesan offices of Education attempt to bring some sort of bureaucratic organization for the supervision and advancement of Catholic schools. But as far as controlling authority over the individual parochial school is concerned, this properly belongs to the local pastor and his parish council or education commission. Regional diocesan high schools come more closely under systematic supervision by the diocesan director; but as often as not, the Catholic high school is owned and operated by a Religious order, e.g., the Jesuit Fathers, the Marist Brothers, the Notre Dame Sisters. The degree to which these "private Catholic schools" relate to diocesan policy depends on the good will of the Religious order and the political and diplomatic skills of the diocesan director of education.
Secondly, there are virtually no meaningful national statistics on Catholic schools prior to 1969.¹ One explanation for this is the "non-system" nature of Catholic schools outlined in the previous paragraph. Another reason is finance — research and the gathering of statistics from 155 dioceses cost money. The first national survey of Catholic schools (1969-70) was financed by a grant from the Carnegie Foundation.² A somewhat more cynical explanation for this phenomenon is that in the late sixties, Catholic schools began a political push to get federal and/or state financial aid, and in order to accomplish this objective, perforce had to document their claims.³ The fact is that until 1969-70, as Father Frank Bredeweg states, "a sector representing about 80 percent of non-public elementary and secondary education (had) almost complete lack of information...."⁴

Thirdly, considering the size, numbers, and the impact of the Catholic schools in the United States, the amount of research done on them is miniscule. The amount of research done on desegregation in Catholic schools is virtually non-existent. In 1970, Lawrence Deno of Notre Dame University surveyed the (then) 147 diocesan Superintendents by means of a self report form and follow-up phone calls. Deno used descriptive and

²Ibid.
³I must confess that I can find no Catholic writer who has yet put this explanation into print, as a rationale for the lack of statistics prior to 1969. As a working principal when the annual forms first came (all principals hate forms), I was told that the diocese and NCEA needed this information because the U.S. Office of Education was asking for it, as well as the Civil Rights Commission.
nonparametric inferential statistics to classify (anonymously) the 147 returns. His major finding was that as of 1970, only 33 dioceses (22.4 percent) had completed school research. Seven dioceses had studies done but unpublished; twenty-six had projects in the works. As of March 31, 1970, 82 dioceses had no educational research done, and none in progress.5

Andrew Greeley holds the thesis that the lack of research on things Catholic extends to more than the schools, to the whole Catholic American experience. Greeley states, "...theoretical reflection in the American context on the Catholic heritage or on the American Catholic experience itself is extremely rare."6

Father Greeley further maintains that the reason for this lack of research and reflection is the flawed nature of the communications process in the American Church. He states in another work, "American Catholicism is not structured in such a way that the attitudes of the laity are communicated upward or that periodic evaluation of institutional effectiveness can occur...."7 Greeley continues somewhat cynically, "Fifty million members, almost two hundred thousand religious professionals, hundreds of thousands of students — who needs data to make decisions?"8

5Lawrence Maxime Deno, A Study to Describe, Classify, and Evaluate Diocesan-Sponsored Catholic School Research (University of Notre Dame, 1970), p. 18.
6Andrew M. Greeley, "Catholicism in America: Two Hundred Years and Counting," The Critic, Summer 1976, p. 66.
8Ibid.
Whatever the causes of the situation may be, the fact is there: there is a paucity of research on Catholic schools, particularly in the area of desegregation. With these disclaimers made, let us now proceed to fill in as best we can the picture of desegregation in Catholic schools nationally, then review the few studies and cases available, then focus our attention on the Archdiocese of Chicago.

Catholic Schools in the United States, 1964-74

In the early and middle sixties, Catholic urban schools began to come under criticism from public school administrators and policy makers who were under the federal order to desegregate. Essentially, their complaint was: how can we design plans to desegregate our schools when a large private "system" is draining off our supply of whites? Thomas Gannon stated that, in some places at least, these criticisms seemed valid: in the 1964-65 school year, for example, out of 121,000 black pupils in Bronx and Manhattan, only 6,400 blacks (6 percent) were enrolled in Catholic schools. In the same year, only 14,646 Puerto Rican pupils (12 percent) were enrolled in the Bronx and Manhattan parochial schools.9

Stung by such criticisms, Catholic educators began to re-examine the role of the Catholic school in the inner city, and the stance of the Catholic dioceses regarding desegregation. At the 1967 convention of the National Catholic Educational Association, Monsignor Geno Baroni sounded

the call for Catholic schools to take the lead in desegregation efforts. Monsignor Baroni stated,

83 percent of the nation's white students are in predominantly white schools. (I believe the figure to be much higher for Catholic schools).... The day is soon at hand when those in charge of Catholic schools must find some way to regulate racially imbalanced schools.... Any approach must posit recognition of racial imbalance not as a core-city problem but as an opportunity for the larger metropolitan area to realize the extent to which all men are brethren.10

Baroni's statement is striking because it combines a classic "Catholic" approach, e.g., religious motivation (all men are brethren) with the worldly-wise intuition that a city desegregation plan could not work — the whole metropolitan area must participate. Not everyone agreed with Baroni's goal, or even conceded that it was in the realm of possibility. Gannon stated, "It may well be that for the Catholics to integrate a school to a ratio of 60 percent white to 40 percent Negro is concretely impossible even when it is believed desirable."11 Nonetheless, Baroni's leadership has had some effect on Catholic educators, especially those in policy-making positions. By 1975, the majority of Catholic dioceses — at least those in the industrial urban areas — have specific policies outlawing racial discrimination in Catholic school admission policies.12 What effect these policies have in practice depends, as mentioned previously, on the degree of cooperation the diocesan Superintendent can

elicit from the individual schools.

The response to the desegregation challenge by the ordinary urban white Catholic was clear. Father Koob, NCEA president, noted, "In the ghettos... vast numbers of Catholic whites have moved out."13 Brother Kyrin Powers, in 1974, investigated the causes of decline of Catholic High School enrollment in Brooklyn and Queens. Parents of six hundred pupils were polled, and the results classified in frequencies, percentages, Chi-squares, one way classification of analysis of variance. Powers found several factors at work — social class, tuition rates, perceptions of school effectiveness, as well as indications of white flight: "Further declines in Catholic secondary school enrollment would result if parents of Irish and Italian background continued to migrate from Brooklyn and Queens."

Thus, it would seem logical to conclude that although (at least some) Catholic leaders were addressing the task of desegregation, the mobile middle class Catholic parent was not responding. Let us now attempt to document this move by looking at the national statistics.

In 1969-1970, the National Catholic Education Association reported 4,089,615 pupils in Catholic elementary and secondary schools in the United States.15

14Kyrin Powers, Factors Affecting the Decline in Enrollment in the Catholic Secondary Schools of the Diocese of Brooklyn (Fordham University, 1974), p. 27.
The ethnic-racial breakdown is as follows:

Table 1

Catholic School Enrollment: Ethnic or Cultural Background, 1969-70.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ELEMENTARY</th>
<th></th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>163,134</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>34,646</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>180,149</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>34,806</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>9,194</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>2,591</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,815,904</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>849,234</td>
<td>92.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REPORTED</td>
<td>3,168,381</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>921,277</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 1 shows, in 1969-1970, blacks comprised approximately 5 percent of Catholic school enrollment nationally; all minorities (blacks, Spanish-surnamed, and Indian) equalled 11 percent of the Catholic school population; and "other," that is mainly whites, comprised 89 percent of the total.17

Table 2


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ELEMENTARY</th>
<th></th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>15,875</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1,842</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>150,557</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>33,287</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental American</td>
<td>15,798</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3,977</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-surname</td>
<td>154,376</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>31,530</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>2,613,580</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>820,447</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REPORTED</td>
<td>2,950,186</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>891,083</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16Ibid.
17Ibid.
In 1970-71, as table 2 shows, the reported national Catholic school enrollment was 3,841,269, a decline of 248,346 pupils, or 6 percent. Of the 1970-71 enrollment, blacks again comprised only 4 percent; all minorities (Blacks, Spanish, Indian, and Oriental) equalled only 10 percent; "all others," even with the Orientals moved to a separate category, still comprise 90 percent of the total enrollment.19

The editors of the 1970-71 NCEA report remark that even though black attendance has increased in Catholic schools, "...the statistically average Catholic school....most probably serves a predominantly white urban or non-urban neighborhood."20 They comment further that in Catholic schools nationally, 40 percent of minority pupils totally are in minority schools, i.e., between 80-100 percent minority. Among black pupils in Catholic schools, 45.1 percent are found in predominantly black (80-100 percent black) schools.21

Also, the editors point out the fiscal crisis that ensues when the traditional white Catholic population moves away: "....the minority group elementary schools had a substantially higher per pupil tuition and fee income and a smaller parish subsidy."22

The 1971-72 NCEA Data Bank report corrects some of the figures in the previous years' reports. It was discovered that not all the Catholic schools in the country reported to the NCEA previously, but that this has been adjusted. The corrected total of Catholic elementary and secondary

19Ibid.
20Ibid., p. 37
21Ibid., pp. 40-41
22Ibid., p. 49.
school pupils for 1971-72 is 4,022,508.\(^{23}\) However, the 1971-72 report does not give the breakdown of student population by racial or ethnic background. No reason is given for the omission.

In its 1972-73 report, the NCEA did not count all Catholic school pupils in the country by race. (Apparently, the task was getting too big.) The total number of pupils was counted from all the schools, 3,789,723 (a 6 percent decline from the previous year).\(^{24}\) But the racial-ethnic breakdown was counted only in a sample survey of 1,000 Catholic schools comprising 302,260 pupils.\(^{25}\) The percentages given in table 3 are projections from the sample, and no gross numbers are available.

Table 3\(^{26}\)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pupils</td>
<td>Pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriental American</td>
<td>.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish-surname</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>85.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basing our figures on the 1,000 schools sample, we may then conclude that in 1972-73, blacks comprised approximately 6.5 percent of the

\(^{25}\)Ibid.
\(^{26}\)Ibid.
Catholic school population nationally; all minorities listed (Blacks, Indians, Orientals, and Spanish) equalled 13.6 percent of the enrollment; and the whites (all others) comprised approximately 86.4 percent of the pupil population.27

The 1973-74 NCEA report does not give the racial-ethnic breakdown in detail. However, it does give highlights of the figures for the 1973-1974 school year, and concentrates much more space on the analysis of the data.

The total Catholic school enrollment for 1973-74 was 3,614,000 a loss of 175,723 pupils, or 4.6 percent decline from the previous year. 95 percent of the pupils are Catholic, and 13 percent are minority group pupils.28

This report notes the great decline in Catholic school enrollment between 1970-71 and 1973-74, and points out that the greatest decline has been in the urban area (382,000); and the least area of decline has been the inner city (10,000).29 The major losses to the Catholic school population have been from the white ethnic or city fringe areas. The editors state, "The large decline in urban school enrollments since 1970-71 is no doubt to a large extent the continuation of the shifting of the population to the suburbs."30

27This combined calculation was made on the basis of the total elementary population (231,387) and secondary population (70,873) in the sample. Ibid.
29Ibid.
30Ibid., p. 10.
The authors then delineate the dollars and cents implications of these demographic shifts:

As indicated earlier, in 1973-74 there are 1,401 inner city schools serving about 483,000 students, and another 3,517 urban schools which are often in a critically changing area between the inner city and the city limits. Generally, these are locations in which the Catholic population has declined. In many areas, some of the resulting circumstances are relatively vacant and old, but usable, buildings, a declining or nearly evaporated parish subsidy base which can less afford a school, the consolidation of several former schools into one regional school, and necessary rising tuitions which create an additional burden for parents who wish to send their children to these schools.31

Summary

It would seem from an analysis of the statistics supplied by the NCEA Data Bank, that the Catholic school record on desegregation has been just about comparable to that of the public schools. In the fall of 1972, of the approximately six and three-quarter million black pupils in the nation's public schools, 45.2 percent were in schools between 80 and 100 percent minority.32 In 1971, of blacks in Catholic schools, 45.1 percent were enrolled in schools between 80 and 100 percent black.33

The increase in black population in Catholic schools from 1969-70 to 1972-73 is a 24.6 percent leap, from 197,780 to 246,350. Thus, more blacks have availed themselves of a Catholic education, but on percentage, not many more have gone on to experience desegregated education.

31Ibid., p. 12.
From 1969 to 1974, the percentage of minority pupils in Catholic schools increased from 11 to 13 percent, and the white population decreased from 89 to 87 percent. But given the degree of racial isolation cited above, these figures cannot be construed to represent any sort of meaningful desegregation.

The plain truth is that, since Monsignor Baroni's call for Catholic leaders to "find some way to regulate racially imbalanced schools," blacks have been entering the Catholic schools at increasing but not startling rates, while the whites have been pouring out of the system by the thousands.

The most alarming statistic of all for the Catholic educator is that between 1969 and 1974, the enrollment in Catholic elementary and secondary schools in the United States declined by almost half a million pupils. And of the 475,615 who have left, almost all of them are whites.

Thus, the picture of desegregation in Catholic Schools nationally is not an inspiring one. But this does not mean that nothing has been done to attempt desegregation, or that some valiant efforts have not been made locally to desegregate Catholic schools. Before going on to the Chicago Archdiocese, let us examine some of the main studies done on Catholic schools, and review some of the serious local desegregation efforts.

Parochial School: A Sociological Study was the first serious effort to describe a "typical" Catholic school in terms of a social science framework. Father Joseph Fichter analyzed "St. Lukes" school as the educational arm of the Catholic parish. This work is a classic in Catholic literature, and should be perused by anyone who wishes a good picture of the pre-Vatican Council Catholic school. The study was conducted by interviewing 632 Pupils of St. Luke's school and 181 Catholic pupils in the public school, St. Luke's teachers as well as 496 parents and guardians. The interviews lasted approximately one hour and included poll-type and open ended questions. The researchers also spent several hours per week observing the workings of St. Lukes school.36

Although St. Luke's parish (anonymous) is thought by commentators to be in the South, a survey of the pupils revealed a surprisingly positive attitude toward blacks: "... [a] majority of parochial school pupils agreed that whites should try to have friendly relations with Negroes."37 However, Fichter cautions, "There is considerable difference, for example between what the children say about voting and about living next door to Negroes, and what the general practices in the community are in regard to these two items."38

Secondly, in the section on the financial structure of the school,

Fichter points out the relationship of the church collection, the Sisters, and the tuition rate to the operation of the school. Of the fourteen teachers in "St. Luke" school, eleven are Sisters who work for considerably less salary than the three lay teachers. The school is financed mainly through this contributed service of the Sisters, the support from the Sunday collection, and the fund-raising efforts of the active parents club and other parish organizations. The result is that the tuition charge to the parent is very low.39

As we have seen again and again, this fiscal base disappears in the sixties: there are fewer Sisters to contribute services; and, as the Catholic population shifts to the suburbs, the Sunday collection dwindles. In the typical Catholic school of the sixties, the parents subsume directly these costs, both in the higher tuition and fees and the extra fund-raising that the school asks of them.

A somewhat opposite viewpoint is adopted by John T. Shields in *The Goals and Expectations for Catholic Schools*.40 Shields, in a study on the Staten Island Catholic schools, attempted to show that philosophical differences were causing the decline in attendance, that is, people could not agree on what the schools were for. Surveying parents, teachers, and clergy, Shields discovered significant attitudinal differences: for instance, on the topic of teaching Religion, the teachers favored liberal methods, but the clergy wanted authoritaran methods; the parents were

39Ibid., p. 370.
divided. As another example, when asked to rank reasons for the importance of Catholic schools, most parents chose academic reasons first, but clergy and teachers chose religious reasons first.41

In view of the great changes begun in the Vatican Council (1962-66), it is certainly not surprising to find Catholics at cross purposes on occasion. Shields is correct in pointing out that polarity of opinion was affecting Catholic school attendance, as well as finance and personnel problems.

Kyrin Powers, as cited previously, pointed out the migration of Irish and Italian families from Brooklyn and Queens as causing the decline in Catholic school attendance.42 Powers adds that "since Catholic parents were more likely to choose Catholic secondary schools for their daughters rather than their sons, further decline in all-boys' schools seemed certain."43

Leo F. Fay, by means of a questionnaire, surveyed 4,618 parents on their reasons for sending their children to Catholic schools in Catholics, Parochial Schools, and Social Class: a Case Study.44 Fay's findings support the contention that social class is a crucial factor in parents' reasons for choosing a parochial school. He found that higher class Catho-

41Ibid.
42Powers, Factors Affecting the Decline in Enrollment in the Catholic Secondary Schools of the Diocese of Brooklyn, p. 27.
43Ibid. The pattern cited by Powers runs counter to that experienced in Chicago. There it was the Catholic girls' schools that suffered most from the population shift.
lies who chose a parochial school tended to do so for religious reasons; lower class Catholics who chose parochial schools tended to do so for social mobility reasons.45

How Fay's findings relate to desegregation is hard to say. It might be conjectured that lower class Catholics would resist desegregation on the grounds that "standards would be lowered" in the desegregated settings, and the social mobility motivation would disappear. However, this assumption is extremely difficult to prove. Fay's study does not pursue the question.46

Andrew Greeley and Paul B. Sheatsley reported in 1971 that attitudes toward desegregation among whites were becoming more positive. In their National Opinion Research Center study, they stated: "The integration of schools.... in the North... is now endorsed by eight of every ten respondents."47 This shift to more liberal attitudes was striking among Catholics, "...Irish Catholics and German Catholics have a higher average score on the integration scale than the typical white Protestant Northerner does."48

These surveys, of course, still leave unanswered the major question: if people generally, and Catholics in particular, are becoming more lib-

45Ibid.
46See, in a later section, the comments of Sister Eleanor Holland and Sister Jean Denomme on "lowering of standards."
48Ibid., p. 17.
eral on the issue of desegregation, why is it that the degree of racial isolation is so high in both public and Catholic schools?

The two recent major studies on Catholic schools have also been conducted by the National Opinion Research Center with Father Andrew Greeley as part of the team. The first NORC survey was taken in 1963 and its results published in 1966 as *The Education of Catholic Americans*.49 The Greeley-Rossi Report, as this became known, examined the traditional purposes of Catholic schools: academic excellence, social mobility, and religious values and loyalty to the Church. These three elements can be found in the authors' philosophy of parochial schools: "...religion must be taught in school, preferably a school which will train its graduates in the usual academic subjects, and prepare them for entry into American society, and in addition, develop in these graduates the proper value orientations and a strong sense of attachment to the Church."50

On the basis of their survey, Greeley and Rossi concluded that the parochial schools had maintained parity with the public schools and had helped the immigrant Catholics to rise into American society. They also found a positive correlation between attendance at Catholic schools and adult religious behavior.51 The authors suggested that these traditional purposes of the Catholic schools are still being served.

Desegregation does not appear as a factor examined by Greeley and Rossi.49

50Ibid., p. 6.
51Ibid., p. 219.
Rossi, except for one attitudinal finding. Their data suggest that a "full" Catholic education, that is, first grade through college, produces more tolerant and liberal attitudes toward minorities.\(^{52}\)

The second major National Opinion Research Center study was taken in 1974 and reported in *Catholic Schools in a Declining Church*.\(^{53}\) This report has touched off a controversy in the American Catholic Church that will go on for some time. The reason is that the authors attempted to update the 1963 NORC study of Catholic schools, and assess the impact of value-oriented schools in a time of shifting values. This report sampled 1,128 adult Catholics and got an 82 percent response, 903 persons. The attitudinal responses were analyzed according to a religious behavior model and a social change model developed by Professor James A. Davis.\(^{54}\)

In the course of their study, the authors documented what they take to be a decline in religious practice among Catholics over the past decade — a deterioration in Catholic attitude, prayer life, support for and loyalty to the Church. They maintain that their data has led them inexorably to the conclusion that the cause of the decline was not the changes introduced by the Vatican Council (as some had claimed) but rather the crisis of credibility precipitated in the Church by Pope Paul in his ban on artificial birth control in 1968. The authors state, "The primary factor in this downward trend seems to be the negative reaction of Catholics to the encyclical on the morality of family planning, *Humanae*

\(^{52}\)Ibid., p. 225.  
\(^{53}\)Greeley, McCready, and McCourt, *Catholic Schools in a Declining Church*.  
\(^{54}\)Ibid., pp. 16-18 and p. 327.
As may be seen from this charge, the study goes well beyond the re-
examination of the schools into areas of controversy in Papal authority,
theology, morality, and Church structure. These topics are most inter-
esting, and they do relate to the ultimate fate of parochial schools.
However, they are well beyond the scope of this dissertation. Therefore,
we shall report from the 1974 NORC study only those findings directly re-
lated to the Catholic schools and (the few) comments on desegregation.

The major conclusions of the 1974 NORC survey are three:

"1. Support for Catholic schools among the American Catholic popu-
lation is as strong as ever....
"2. Far from declining in effectiveness in the past decade, Catho-
lic schools seem to have increased their impact. ... The cor-
relation between Catholic school attendance and religiousness
is especially strong for those under thirty.
"3. In terms of the future of the organization, Catholic schools
seem more important for a Church in a time of traumatic tran-
sition than for one in a time of peaceful stability."56

If these findings are accurate, then the question must be asked:
why has attendance gone down so drastically in the decade, if the popu-
ularity and importance of the schools have increased? The two main re-
sponses given by those surveyed in the NORC study were that the paro-
chial school was "inaccessible financially" or "inaccessible geographi-
cally."57 This would seem to substantiate Father Bredeweg's comment
that "...the construction of Catholic schools in the suburbs did not

55Ibid., p. 260.  
56Ibid., p. 310.  
57Ibid., p. 242.
keep up with the movement of people in the 1960's."  

With regard to desegregation, the 1974 NORC study found that, "Ninety four percent of white Catholics say they would accept school integration for their children where a few of the other children are black, 70 percent would accept it where half of the children are black, and 34 percent would accept it where more than half the children were black."  

As far as housing and voting go, the study reports that 75 percent of the Catholic respondents have children in integrated schools, 35 percent live in integrated neighborhoods, and four fifths say they would vote for a qualified Jew or qualified black or qualified woman for president. The authors conclude, as did Greeley and Sheatsley in the earlier study, that "there has been a dramatic shift to the left in Catholic political and social attitudes over the last two decades."  

If these attitudinal changes toward desegregation are real, then we come again to the problem of the factual racial isolation in the schools. If indeed Catholics are favorable to desegregation but are not in fact desegregating their schools, then other factors — finance, geography, social class — are preventing it, or policy makers are not going about the task of planning desegregation in acceptable ways. Before focusing on the Archdiocese of Chicago, let us examine a few of these attempts.  

59Greeley, McCready, and McCourt, Catholic Schools in a Declining Church, p. 38.  
60Ibid., p. 29 and p. 38.
Catholic Desegregation Efforts

John Kleffner reports on a plan for desegregation of the Oklahoma City Catholic schools.61 The ambitious plan was defeated because busing proved to be too expensive and little cooperation was had between the Catholic and public schools. The result was resegregation. "It seems impossible," Kleffner concludes, "for one Catholic school system to follow a sound plan of integration when the local public school system does not work toward integration at the same time."62 Beyond this, Kleffner does not report the details of the plan.

In Philadelphia, a controversy erupted in 1973 when a parish in West Philadelphia was granted permission to send 9th and 10th graders to a suburban Catholic High school eight miles away.63 Parents who requested the permission insisted that "safety and not racism" were their motives. "They argue that the option will, in fact, help to keep whites in the city and reverse the white exodus to the suburbs."64

Not all agreed, especially the administrators and teachers of the city schools. Father John Buckley of St. Thomas More school (35 percent black, neighborhood changing) "...sees the option as a 'Pandora's Box' that could drain the already sagging enrollment and cause the school to

62Ibid.
64Ibid.
And the Association of Catholic Teachers accused the Archdiocese of "promoting segregation in its school system" and "giving in to the racial fears of white parents."

In the Philadelphia situation, as in others, the questions always are: how do you get people to cooperate in desegregation plans? To what degree do you tolerate segregation in order to preserve a school at all? How can a federal judge or Catholic bishop impose integration without causing white flight? How can you deal at all rationally or sanely in an area of human emotion that is characterized by irrational fear?

Surprisingly enough, Charleston, South Carolina, has the reputation among Catholic dioceses of making most strenuous efforts at desegregation. At the time the case study reported in Chapter III was being prepared, the NCEA Washington Office referred the committee to Father John Bond, Superintendent of Schools for the Charleston diocese. It seems fitting to give the last word in this section to him, since his statement pulls all the issues together:

...how much of principles (say social justice/integration) does one concede for the sake of the continued education service of an institution to, say, a predominantly all black student body? The last paragraph may sound "southern", or in contemporary language pluralistic, even separatist; but I assure you my record here has been atrociously desegregationalistic. It's just that I wonder after five years of efforts whether one can solve neighborhood problems by rearranging school attendance — or can an administrator do something substantially lasting, effective and good in desegregating schools? In a few cases we appear to have been successful; in others, a year after the fact, we have unintended racial isolation again.67

65Ibid., p. 2  
66Ibid., p. 1.  
67John Bond to Brother Pius Xavier, Associate Superintendent, Archdiocese of Chicago, 15 June 1972, p. 3.
Summary

Catholic schools in the United States have been through a decade of trauma. The system, to whatever degree it can be called such, has lost at least half a million pupils, and no one really knows why. One of the reasons for this perplexity is the lack of research. As Greeley, McCready, and McCourt state, "American Catholicism has traditionally refused to engage in systematic research on itself; so while theories as to the reasons for the decline abound, there is no evidence to support any of them."68

There is ample evidence, however, that the half million fewer pupils are mostly whites who have gone to the suburbs. Geno Baroni's call for Catholics to balance the schools racially has been followed by some leaders, but with little success. The cooperation of all involved is necessary for the success of a desegregation plan, as Parsons and Clark stated long ago. Isolating an individual school doesn't help — even isolating the city. Only a metropolitan plan will work, as Baroni and Coleman have stated, and suburbanites, Catholics and others, have displayed a distinct disinterest in proving to their urban neighbors that all men are brethren.

So far, to our knowledge, no district or diocese, public or Catholic, has put all the elements together and made a desegregation plan work.

68Creeley, McCready, and McCourt, Catholic Schools in a Declining Church, p. 10.
DESEGREGATION IN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS
IN THE ARCHDIOCESE OF CHICAGO: 1964-74

We have seen the pattern of Catholic school desegregation nationally: drastic declines in total enrollment, due mainly to white flight; increased enrollment of blacks and other minorities but not to more than 13 percent of the total; increased racial isolation generally, with a few desegregation plans working for a short while before resegregation sets in. Let us now turn our attention to the Archdiocese of Chicago and see if a similar pattern emerges.

The Archdiocese of Chicago is the largest Catholic ecclesiastical unit in the world, encompassing 1,411 square miles and serving 5,936,200 faithful in 460 parishes.69 The Archdiocese encompasses the city, all of suburban Cook County, and all of Lake County, Illinois. For this reason, a study of Chicago should not be taken as a study of a "typical" Catholic diocese. However, the sheer immensity of the Archdiocese makes it a ripe field of study. As native clergy are fond of saying: if good things are happening in the American Church, you will find them in the Chicago Archdiocese. By the same token, whatever problems or failures occur in the Catholic community will surely find echoes in the Archdiocese of Chicago. As far as the schools are concerned, if the Chicago Archdiocesan schools can be termed a "system," then it is the fourth largest school system in the country, after the public school districts of Los Angeles,

Our investigation of desegregation in the Chicago Catholic schools will be divided into three sections: a brief essay on the nature of the Archdiocese's commitment to desegregation; a review and analysis of the statistics over the last decade; and a look at the few studies on the problem and some examples of desegregation efforts locally.

**Commitment to Desegregation**

The Archdiocese of Chicago became involved in the quest for racial justice when Albert Cardinal Meyer became Archbishop of Chicago in the late nineteen fifties. Certainly, prior to that time, individual Catholics and inter-racial groups had worked for racial equality. But none of the prior leaders saw the cause of social justice with quite the urgency that Cardinal Meyer did. Meyer stated:

> The unresolved race question is indeed a pathological infection in our social and political economy. It is also an obstacle to right conscience before God. Our whole future as a nation and as a religious people may be determined by what we do about the race problem in the next few years.... It is the ultimate test of Christianity, as expressed in the words of the Divine Master, "By this will all men know that you are my disciples if you have love for one another." 70

John Cardinal Cody, who succeeded Meyer in 1965, came to Chicago from New Orleans with the reputation of a liberal advocate of civil rights. In New Orleans, he had gone so far as to excommunicate prominent Catholic lay leaders who refused to integrate their congregations.

Neither Meyer nor Cody, however, was able to get a Chicago integration plan organized in the Catholic school system until the public schools of Chicago gave some indication of a desire to desegregate. The indication came in 1967 when Superintendent James Redmond unfolded his plan for integrating the public schools. The "Redmond Plan" called for racial quotas, extensive busing, and a complex of 'magnet schools' and 'educational parks.' Part of the plan, too, was the "permissive transfer" system, whereby a pupil in the city was free to apply to any high school in the district if his own neighborhood school was classified as overcrowded.

Encouraged by this ambitious plan, the School Policies Commission of the city Catholic School Principals recommended to the Archdiocese School Board that a policy of "open enrollment" be adopted, in order to foster integration. Under this system a pupil in any area of the diocese could apply to any high school he or she chose, provided the parent or school provided adequate transportation. The hope of the commission was that blacks would begin to move out into the previously all white schools of the city's fringe. The Archdiocesan School Board adopted the "open enrollment" policy in 1967, and the desegregation effort began in earnest. A follow-up report of another School Study Commission in 1971 committed the Archdiocese even more deeply; one of its recommendations was:

Setting the following as school priorities developed for the Archdiocese of Chicago: Catholic schools serving neighborhoods with large numbers of low income families, such as those in public housing... Implementation of the Christian commitment to justice and equality, and enrichment of experience of all students, by honest integration of pupils in each school as to race, religion, mental ability, and economic background.73

Statistical Report

In the late sixties, then, both the Chicago Public Schools and the Archdiocesan Schools embarked on desegregation plans. Both plans wished to widen the educational opportunities for blacks, stabilize the racial makeup of individual schools, and hold some of the white population in the city. Both plans failed to achieve their goals.

As far as the public schools are concerned, Casey Banas remarked, "The Redmond Plan... 'ran into a buzz-saw in white neighborhoods,'"74 and the Districts annual report five years later showed that racial change in the neighborhoods had accelerated, and the schools were becoming more segregated each year. In fact, in 1972, in 61 percent of the schools, "enrollment is at least 95 percent black or 95 percent white."75

For a summary of the desegregation progress in the Catholic schools, we may now examine the statistics given in the Annual Reports of the Superintendent to the Archdiocesan School Board.

Table 476


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHICAGO (CITY)</th>
<th>TOTAL (ALL OF ARCHDIOCESE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1964-65</td>
<td>1965-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208,140</td>
<td>203,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>342,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>337,418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23,298</td>
<td>24,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231,438</td>
<td>227,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>366,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>362,996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As may be seen from table 4, the 1964-65 school year was a watershed for Catholic schools in Chicago. The decline in total enrollment begins in the 1965-66 year and continues steadily throughout the decade. Of the 366,171 children in the Catholic schools in 1964-65, sixty-three percent are located in the city. Of blacks in the diocesan system, ninety-seven percent are in the city proper — only 818 blacks are scattered in subur-

Table 577


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHICAGO (CITY)</th>
<th>TOTAL (ARCHDIOCESE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1966-67</td>
<td>1967-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195,604</td>
<td>187,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>328,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>315,991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,886</td>
<td>26,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221,490</td>
<td>213,935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>355,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>343,789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 gives the Chicago Archdiocese school population for the 1966-67 and 1967-68 school years. As was the case in the NCEA reports cited earlier, these early reports distinguished only whites and negroes. Spanish-surnamed, Orientals, and Indian Americans are (probably) included with whites. The trends begun in the 1964-65 figures continue: the total enrollment slipping badly now, both in the city and suburban area — a total decline of 6 percent since 1964; and a slow but steady increase of black pupils, of whom 96 percent are located in the city.\footnote{Ibid.}


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHICAGO (CITY)</th>
<th>TOTAL (ARCHDIOCESE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>171,736</td>
<td>159,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negro</td>
<td>28,186</td>
<td>26,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>199,922</td>
<td>186,625</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The enrollment figures for 1968 through 1970, as table 6 shows, does not continue the pattern of increased black enrollment. The black total drops by over a thousand pupils from 1968-69 to 1970; all of the decline is in the city. However, even though the black enrollment does not grow, the black percentage grows to 9 percent. This is because the
other trend, the total enrollment decline, continues unchecked. There are now, 1970, for the first time in the decade under study, fewer than 300,000 pupils in the Archdiocesan schools, representing a decline of 18 percent since 1964.81

Table 782


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ELEMENTARY</th>
<th>SECONDARY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>22,817</td>
<td>5,411</td>
<td>28,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Oriental</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish surnamed</td>
<td>11,835</td>
<td>2,927</td>
<td>14,762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>172,423</td>
<td>60,017</td>
<td>232,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>210,158</td>
<td>68,631</td>
<td>278,789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in table 7, the Chicago Archdiocese began in 1970 to report the other minorities separately, Spanish, Oriental, and Indian. Since the figure for blacks remains close to that for 1969-70, our previous contention seems to be supported, that is, that the other minorities were included with whites on the previous years' reports. Unfortunately, the Superintendent's 1970-71 report does not give the individual statistics for the city and the suburbs.

In 1970-71, the trends noted in the previous year continue. Again

81Ibid.
there is a small drop in the number of black pupils; blacks, however, now comprise 10 percent of the total because the total enrollment decline has continued, this time by over 20,000 pupils, almost a 7 percent loss from 1969-70. In 1970-71, the non-black minorities (accounted for the first time) Orientals, Spanish-surnamed, and Indians total 18,121 pupils, or 6.4 percent. All minorities together comprise 16.6 percent of the pupil population.83

Table 8


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHICAGO (CITY)</th>
<th>TOTAL (ARCHDIOCESE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Oriental</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>1,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish surnamed</td>
<td>13,217</td>
<td>14,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>27,607</td>
<td>29,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>122,141</td>
<td>217,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>164,549</strong></td>
<td><strong>262,775</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 begins to show the pattern of resegregation. The Archdiocesan total is again down by almost 6 percent, 16,000 pupils. But the "all others" figure in the city column tells the story. Here we find a decline of almost 38,000 pupils since 1970. The black enrollment has increased to 11 percent in the Archdiocese, but to 16.8 percent in the city proper. The total minority population, 46,675, now com-
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prises 17 percent of the Archdiocesan population. In the city proper, the total minority enrollment is now 25.8 percent.85

Table 986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHICAGO (CITY)</th>
<th>TOTAL (ARCHDIOCESE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Oriental</td>
<td>1,427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish surnamed</td>
<td>14,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>28,776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>111,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>156,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 1972-73 school year, as table 9 shows, the main trends and the pattern of resegregation continue. The total decline of whites in the system is 15,537, and more than 10,000 of them are losses within the city proper. Increases among minority groups keep the total pupil decline to 5 percent from the previous year. Blacks in 1972-73 comprise 12.2 percent of the enrollment (18.4 percent in the city). All minorities together equal 47,984, or 19.2 percent of the total. In the city, minorities comprise 28.4 percent of the city enrollment.87

In 1973-74, as table 10 indicates, the general decline of the total enrollment and the pattern of white flight from the city continue. The

Table 10


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHICAGO (CITY)</th>
<th>TOTAL (ARCHDIOCESE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Oriental</td>
<td>1,554</td>
<td>1,768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish surnamed</td>
<td>13,855</td>
<td>15,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>28,315</td>
<td>30,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>100,274</td>
<td>185,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>144,198</strong></td>
<td><strong>233,185</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

loss of whites to the system for the year is 15,892, of whom 11,699 are fewer white pupils in the city proper. Black and Spanish enrollment slips slightly in 1973-74, with the result that the overall enrollment decline is 6.5 percent (7.8 percent in the city). Blacks in 1973-74 comprise 12.9 percent (19.6 in the city). All minorities together equal 47,514, or just over 20 percent of the total Archdiocesan enrollment. However, as resegregation occurs in the city, minorities in 1973-74 comprise 30.5 percent of the Catholic school population within the city proper.89

Our final statistics on the Chicago Catholic schools, shown in table 11, indicate the dominant patterns of the past decade continuing unabated. The total diocesan enrollment declines by only 5 percent this year. The white enrollment declines by 14,000, of whom more than 8,000
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are from the city proper. Slight increases in all minority groups except Indian keeps the system from further total decline.

Table 1190

Archdiocese of Chicago: Enrollment by Race, 1974-75. Elementary and Secondary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CHICAGO (CITY)</th>
<th>TOTAL (ARCHDIOCESE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Oriental</td>
<td>1,804</td>
<td>2,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish surnamed</td>
<td>14,738</td>
<td>16,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Negro</td>
<td>29,409</td>
<td>31,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>92,041</td>
<td>171,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>138,159</strong></td>
<td><strong>221,586</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 1974-75, blacks have moved up to 14.2 percent of the Archdiocesan pupil enrollment; in the city, the black percentage is 21.3 percent. All minorities together equal 49,937 pupils, or 22.5 percent of the total diocesan enrollment. Again, in the city proper the minority percentage is significantly higher, almost 34 percent.91

Only one final figure needs to be cited on the Chicago Catholic schools, on the degree of racial isolation. This might seem to be apparent from the gradual population shift seen in the annual reports. But one memorandum is available from the Archdiocese School Board on racial balance in the high schools in 1968. At that time, there were 73,419 non-Negro pupils in the Catholic High schools. Of these, 15,008 were en-
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rolled in all-white schools; 49,335 were enrolled in schools between 1 and 10 percent black; 873 were found in schools between 30 and 99 percent black. Thus, the one official memorandum on the subject would seem to confirm the fact of racial isolation in the Chicago Archdiocesan Catholic schools.92

**Summary**

The decade of 1964-75 saw the Catholic school enrollment in the Archdiocese decline by almost 150,000 pupils, a loss of 40 percent from the 1964-65 totals. In the urban schools proper, the loss was 93,279, or 40.3 percent. Thus, the Archdiocese not only reflects the staggering loss of pupils to Catholic schools nationally (almost half a million children), but Chicago alone accounts for almost 14 percent of the decline nationally between 1969 and 1974.

Black enrollment and minority enrollment in Chicago run well ahead of the national percentages, with over 20 percent minority enrollment in 1973-74 compared to 13 percent nationally. In the urban Catholic schools of the city proper, black and minority enrollment more than doubles the national percentage — 34 percent minority enrollment compared to 13 percent nationally.

These figures bear out that the pattern of declining enrollment, increased minority attendance, and increased racial isolation seen in

Catholic schools nationally, can be verified in the Archdiocese of Chicago as well. If anything, the problems of white flight and racial isolation are more serious in Chicago than in other parts of the Catholic community. During the ten year period under study (even accounting for approximately 25,000 non-black minorities in the earlier reports) the attrition of white pupils from the system approaches 150,000, a loss of 44 percent of the non-minority pupils in one decade.

Chicago, we can conclude, has undergone an immense demographic change in the past ten years. The effect on the Catholic schools of the Archdiocese has been devastating. In Chapter III we will deal with the effects of this phenomenon on the Academy of Our Lady. Before doing so, however, let us examine the (few) studies related to the issue of desegregation, and peruse our inquiry in some individual areas, to see how the problems of ethnic and racial turnover affected individual schools.

Studies and Cases

Joseph J. McCarthy, in *History of Black Catholic Education in Chicago*, points out that the black Catholic percentage of the Archdiocese's population is 15 percent (somewhat higher than the black percentage of the national Catholic collectivity). McCarthy traces the roots of segregation in the Catholic community of Chicago to the policy of Cardinal Mundelein adopted in 1918. Rather than mingle black converts with the already established white congregations, Mundelein established a distinct

parish, St. Monica, for blacks only.94

Unfortunately for our purposes, McCarthy does not treat the contemporary issues of desegregation and resegregation. His dissertation concentrates on the historical problems of the fledging black Catholic parishes.

Judith McBride, in Integration in the Elementary Schools of the Chicago-DeKalb Province of the School Sisters of Notre Dame, surveys the dioceses in which the Sisters of this order are involved in Catholic parochial schools. Sister Judith polled the diocesan office to find out if diocesan admissions guidelines are non-discriminatory. She discovered that the Archdiocese of Chicago was operating under the "open enrollment" policy cited above. The dioceses of Peoria and Rockford, Sister Judith found, had no such policies. In the Notre Dame Sisters' schools, Sister Judith found that 105 out of 212 teachers, and 6 out of 19 principals "said they felt no obligation" and did not want their order "to assume responsibility in the area of school integration."95

Sister Judith does not present any empirical data on desegregation in SSND parochial schools. Her thesis is hortatory in nature, and she encourages the leadership of the Notre Dame order to adopt admissions policies regarding their schools based on social justice. Her work is

94Ibid., p. 33.
worth noting in that it lays the theoretical groundwork for the statement that the Sisters will make later in connection with the Academy of Our Lady.96

In 1973, the Chicago Tribune commissioned a task force to investigate the effect of the demographic shifts on the parochial schools in the city.97 Some of the findings of the Tribune researchers were:

St. Thomas Aquinas Church and school on Chicago's west side, was one of the largest and most thriving parishes in the Archdiocese. In 1965, the neighborhood of Austin was 86 percent Catholic, mostly Italian and Irish. St. Thomas' congregation numbered 5,000 souls.

After eight years of desegregation and resegregation (some called it block-busting), the Austin area was predominantly black and only 7 percent Catholic. Registered parishioners numbered 600 people.98

The Tribune task force also investigated a demographic phenomenon that could happen only in Chicago: two large Catholic schools, St. Barnabas and St. Margaret of Scotland, are neighbor parishes located just blocks away from each other. The difference between them is that St. Barnabas is "one of the city's largest, most successful, and most affluent Catholic elementary schools," while St. Margaret runs at a $100,000.00 a year deficit. The reason is that in less than four years, the white congregation of St. Margaret's has moved out, leaving the area

96Ibid., p. 2.
98Ibid., p. 6.
"predominantly black Protestant." 99

The task force continues:

The two neighboring parishes are symbolic of the malaise that has infected the Catholic school system in Chicago and across the country for the last 10 years — dramatic declines in enrollment and mounting economic woes... Tho it is dangerous to over-simplify, many Catholic educators believe one of the major causes of the malaise in the nation's urban areas has been the exodus of white Catholics to the suburbs...100

Loretto Academy was a Catholic girls' high school located in the Woodlawn area on Chicago's South side. During the 1950's the neighborhood changed from white to black, and by 1960 the Academy was all-black. In the 1960's the enrollment of the Academy went up to a peak of 400, then gradually dwindled to 250 girls in 1971-72. In June of 1972, Loretto closed its doors and merged with Mercy High School in the Chatham Area (81st and Prairie). The merged all-black girls' high school adopted the new title, "Unity High School."101

The Loretto Academy history is worth noting because enrollment and fiscal problems did not appear until well after resegregation had occurred and the school had become all-black. Sister Eleanor Holland, principal, pointed out that, after the racial changeover, recruiting pupils for Loretto became difficult, and the school would accept "referrals," that

99Ibid. (Since St. Margaret of Scotland is located just four blocks from the Academy of Our Lady, the demographic movement noted here will have a bearing on Chapter III as well).
100Ibid., p. 1.
101All information on Loretto High School is from an interview with Sister Eleanor Holland, principal of Loretto, then principal of Unity after the merger. The interview was granted to the author shortly after the merger, in Chicago, Illinois, 6 December 1972.
is, girls who had taken entrance exams at another school and not been accepted. Since the Academy accepted "referrals," it began to be assumed in the community that "standards had gone down." This caused many upwardly mobile blacks to look for a different school for their daughters. According to Sister Eleanor, then, white flight and resegregation alone did not bring on enrollment and fiscal problems. It was the public image of a "referral school," and the morale problems caused by this image among girls and parents, that led Loretto to decline in enrollment and eventually to merge with Mercy.102

Aquinas Dominican High School is another Catholic girls' school on Chicago's south side, located in the South Shore area at 2100 East 72nd Street. The desegregation and resegregation of the student body occurred during the years that South Shore turned from white to black, from about 1964-1972. In the fall of 1965, Aquinas enrolled 670 girls, of whom 18 percent were black. In the fall of 1972, the school had turned over to a 95 percent black percentage out of 616 girls.103

Although Aquinas seemed to be flourishing in 1972, Sister Jean referred to the problem of public relations now that the school has become predominantly black. Even though a North Central visiting team had given Aquinas a very favorable report (November, 1972), nonetheless some parents and alumnae persisted in believing that "standards had gone down," and

102Ibid.
103All information on Aquinas Dominican was provided in an interview with Sister Jean Denomme, principal of Aquinas, in Chicago, Illinois, 6 December 1972.
many thought that this had occurred to accommodate the influx of black pupils.

Sister Jean pointed out that this public relations problem existed among black parents as well. Upwardly mobile black parents cannot be persuaded that an all-black academy is as good educationally as the all-white or mixed school, and this may be another — even major — reason why resegregation leads to the demise of a Catholic school.\textsuperscript{104}

\textbf{Summary}

In this chapter we have attempted to elucidate the pattern of desegregation in Catholic schools, nationally and in the Chicago Archdiocese. We have examined the statistics and the few studies done on this topic, again nationally and in Chicago. We have gradually drawn the discussion into three identifying characteristics: Catholic high school, girls' academy, South side of Chicago. We believe that this focusing leaves us now ready for our case study in Chapter III, the Academy of Our Lady.

The pattern of desegregation that we have examined in Catholic schools nationally and in Chicago supports our original contention that desegregation does not last very long in a Catholic school. Most of the time resegregation occurs rather quickly, spurred on by white flight. Enrollment and fiscal problems follow soon: the issue then becomes one of survival.

There are, no doubt, many intervening variables in this process.\textsuperscript{104}Ibid.
The principals we interviewed in the previous section pointed out at least two: image or public relations problems, and the ambitions of middle class black parents.

Nonetheless, we believe that we have adequately documented the pattern: desegregation, whether forced or voluntary; followed inevitably by resegregation, caused by white flight (as well as other factors); then the enrollment decline, the financial problems, and the battle for survival.

Of course, no individual school replicates perfectly a national pattern. There is no such thing as an (average) school, and certainly no two schools undergo the experience of desegregation or racial turnover in the same manner. There are just too many individual characteristics at work.

Nonetheless, it is our contention that the recent history of the Academy of Our Lady reflects the national pattern in an extraordinarily clear manner, and thus the experience of the academy provides an apt study of the process of resegregation in Catholic schools. The rapid decline in enrollment of the student body, the serious financial problems, and the eventual total resegregation will be examined in detail. Moreover the astonishing rapidity of the process of resegregation will be noted as it unfolded at the Academy of Our Lady in the late nineteen sixties and the early nineteen seventies. It is hoped that this case study will be of assistance to administrators and board members of Catho-
ic schools in urban areas where racial turnover is, or soon will be, an important issue.
CHAPTER III

A CASE STUDY OF A CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL'S "DESEGREGATION" EFFORT

From what we have seen in Chapter II, it is apparent that there is a paucity of research devoted to Catholic schools which are in neighborhoods experiencing racial change, or which are attempting to desegregate. One reason for this is the lack of research on Catholic schools generally. Another reason is that racial turnover, integration, desegregation — whatever terms one wants to use — have involved trauma, conflict, crisis, and failure for Catholic schools. This chapter will attempt to describe the experience of relatively rapid racial change in one school, the Academy of Our Lady, Chicago, Illinois, and investigate some of the steps taken by the school in its attempt to survive, and their results. The Academy of Our Lady has been chosen because the racial turnover at the school represents an ideal case study situation which reflects the larger issue of Catholic school desegregation.1

The present chapter will be a difficult one to construct objectively. The writer was part of — indeed at the center of — the controversy surrounding the Academy's attempt to prevent resegregation, and has been called "a racist," or "hung up on race," or "unable to work in a bi-racial situation" more often than is pleasant to recall. For this reason the chapter will reflect a certain point of view, and events will be related

1Also, this writer was administrator of the Academy at the time.
from a certain perspective. The reader has a right to know what this point of view is in advance. So let us pause to explicate the position taken here.

As will be demonstrated shortly, the rapid growth of financial and enrollment problems at the Academy roughly parallels the rise in the black pupil percentage and the corresponding decline in white pupil percentage in the school's immediate neighborhood and in the Academy itself. At no time can we prove that the fact of racial turnover per se caused the other parts of the crisis. This writer has been told with "certitude" by teachers, parents, and alumnae, that the reason for the decline in the enrollment was: the discipline of the school declined; the school was too strict; the academic standards were lowered; the entrance requirements were too high; the neighborhood became dangerous when blacks moved in; the neighborhood was dangerous before blacks moved in; the tuition was too high for middle class whites; the tuition was low enough for incoming blacks; not enough recruiting was done to get more pupils; the school was overcrowded.

It is perfectly possible, of course, that some of the above assertions could have been true at one time or another — not, of course, all at the same time. It is our position that any one, or combination, of the above-mentioned factors could be at least as causative of crisis as the racial balance factor. Even other factors could be cited: the general state of the economy, the nation wide trends in Catholic school enrollment out-
lined in Chapter II, and the decline of religious practice among Catho-
lies in the sixties and their disenchantment with the schools. In an
ever extremely complex situation, we have adopted what we think is a cautious
position: at the Academy of Our Lady, racial change in the neighborhood
and the school was an integral part of the overall crisis of the school
and very probably contributed to the crisis.

With this viewpoint clarified, let us now proceed to focus our
attention on the Academy of Our Lady.

Longwood, AOL, the Academy

The Academy of Our Lady is located at 1309 West 95th Street on
Chicago's southwest side. The school was founded in 1874 by the School
Sisters of Notre Dame of the Milwaukee-Chicago Province with headquarters
in Mequon, Wisconsin, and later attached to the separate Chicago Province
with motherhouse in DeKalb, Illinois.\(^2\) In 1890 the Washington Heights
area was annexed to the city of Chicago, and around the turn of the cen-
tury the neighborhood began to be referred to as "Longwood Manor."\(^3\) This
name soon attached itself to the school, which is still referred to as
"Longwood Academy," and more recently simply as "AOL."\(^4\)

\(^2\)Margaret Carroll, "Longwood's Story, 1874-1974," Academy of Our
\(^3\)Ibid.
\(^4\)"Longwood Pep Song," ibid, p. 5. (The schizophrenia of names
for the school extended even to the Alma Mater song. A compromise was
struck when the more traditional "O Longwood, Fair Longwood," was design-
nated the school anthem and the more modern "pep song" was used for rallies
and games. See ibid., p. 5 and back cover).
The Academy developed as an independent private Catholic girls' high school which accepted boarding students until the 1930's. An elementary school was also run by the School Sisters on the same grounds, but this was discontinued in 1940. After World War II, the Academy evolved into its present form: a Catholic girls' day high school. The school, having built up alumnae since 1874, became immensely popular, its physical plant expanding in the nineteen-fifties to a full square block of seven buildings. Sending one's daughter to Longwood became a mark of status for the emerging middle class Irish and German Catholics of the South side. The reputation of the Academy was prestigious, as it held continuous North Central Association accreditation. Entrance requirements were high, academic standards rigid, and advancement to college was all but guaranteed to the girls who so applied. The Academy reached its zenith enrollment in 1967-68, almost 1,800 girls, with a faculty of 70 members. There were no debts, no operational deficits, and — aside from some student militancy endemic to the sixties — no signs of imminent trouble. Crisis would come, however, and come quickly.

In the nineteen sixties, two phenomena were beginning to develop which would profoundly affect the history of the Academy of Our Lady. First was the demographic change taking place on Chicago's south side, which would be characterized by Coleman ten years later as "white flight." Andrew Greeley, writing in 1959 about expected racial change in Beverly, the area just west of the Academy, predicted that the "invasion" of black

5Ibid., p. 9.
population would come from the east. The part of Washington Heights north of 95th Street began to change from white to black in the middle sixties. In April, 1968, the Real Estate Research Corporation submitted a report to the Chicago Board of Education, suggesting that Washington Heights, with a 13 percent non-white population in the 1960 census, would be 54 percent non-white by 1970 and 87 percent non-white by 1975. Actually racial turnover took place much more rapidly. Black families began moving into the area east of Ashland Avenue (the Washington Heights-Beverly "border") and south of 95th Street in the summer of 1970, and by the fall of 1970 most of the whites had moved out. By the 1972-73 school year, the Washington Heights area was almost 100 percent black.

The second movement was the gradual increase in black enrollment at the Academy of Our Lady. It will be noticed that we have not emphasized the term "desegregation" in this chapter. The Academy did not embark specifically on a desegregation program. However, under the open enrollment policy adopted by the Archdiocesan School Board in 1967, increasing numbers of blacks began to apply to the Academy for acceptance.

8Visual observation of the author, then a resident. (Someday, an urbanologist of more knowledge than this author should document in detail this classic "block-busting" operation. One realtor even petitioned the Chicago Zoning Board for a change of zoning that would permit the construction of a high-rise apartment across Loomis Avenue from the school! Strenuous efforts by school authorities, black homeowners, and alderman Wilson Frost finally prevented this).
At first this did not produce appreciable numbers of black pupils because, with the school at maximum enrollment, a prestigious school like Longwood could afford to accept only the top 60 or 70 percent of girls who took the entrance test. Unfortunately, many of the black girls from ghetto public elementary schools scored extremely low on AOL's entrance exam. Once the Academy's rooms were filled, the applicants below the cut-off point were referred to schools which did not test enough girls to fill up their seats.9

However, in the late sixties and early seventies, as Longwood's immediate neighborhood became increasingly black in character, the number of white applicants declined rapidly, with the result that the Academy began to reflect the trend we have examined in Catholic schools nationally, that is, a growing percentage of black pupils. The following two tables will illustrate this, along with the attendant financial problems.

Table 1210


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>1,353</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>952</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9See previous chapter for the effect of this procedure on "referral schools" such as Loretto Academy.

Before making any comment on these figures, some remarks are in order on the weakness of the statistics. As mentioned in Chapter II, the Archdiocese requested these figures for inclusion in the annual report to the National Catholic Education Association. However, recall that in the *Equality of Educational Opportunity Report*, James Coleman reported Boards which thought it illegal or improper to count the pupils by race.\(^{11}\) Some of this kind of difficulty was experienced each year at the Academy.

For example, homeroom teachers were often embarrassed to do the actual count and could be coerced only by emphasizing that this was mandated by the Archdiocese. There were, moreover, lingering suspicions that some teachers would deliberately list the black count low, so that the school could publicly claim a lower black percentage. Others would refuse to take the census seriously and would hastily scribble down a couple numbers which happened to add up to the homeroom total. A few were downright stubborn, and the assistant principal had to go to the homeroom herself and count heads.\(^{12}\)

The figures, then, are admittedly round estimates, and with these cautions, we may proceed to comment on the trends seen in table 12. Between the 1968-69 school year and the 1972-73 school year, the Academy

\(^{11}\)Coleman et al., *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, p. 480.
\(^{12}\)Cf. Sister Mary Bernadette and Sister Mary Camille, assistant principals. (If such recalcitrance was going on nation-wide, one shudders at the consequences for the validity of the NCEA Data Bank's national summaries).
declined in enrollment by 834 pupils, a loss of 51 percent from 1968-69 total. Among white girls only, the loss was 963, a staggering 71 percent attrition, from 1968 to the autumn of 1972. The black population increased by 129 pupils, or 49 percent in the five reported years. The black increase was not steady, however — in 1970-71 it even declined. In terms of percentages, the black ratio went up from 16 to 49 percent in just five years. But the black influx was not large except in the one year, 1969-70. Had the Academy retained its total enrollment level of 1968-69, 1,630 girls, the black percentage in 1972-73 would have been only 24 percent. But given the enormous attrition of white girls in the five year period, the black ratio approached 50 percent.

The "other" category at Longwood was never very high, and the percentage and number of non-black minorities remained stable. Actually, these represented just about the same four or five Oriental and Spanish families who lived in the Longwood area. No sizeable concentration of either minority was found near the Academy.

The analysis of Longwood's pupil population, then, over the five reported years, follows the pattern uncovered in the Catholic urban schools in Chapter II; the characteristics of the pattern are: a significant but not enormous increase in the number of black pupils; an extremely large decline in white pupils mainly due to white flight; a large decline in the total enrollment, which makes the black percentage leap larger even though the numerical black increase is not that great.

What was the influence of this enrollment pattern on the financial
well-being of the Academy? Table 13 illustrates the relation.

Table 13


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th>Racial Percentage</th>
<th>Ending Balance (deficit)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1968-69</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>16/83</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969-70</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>30/69</td>
<td>$11,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-71</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>39/60</td>
<td>($32,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-72</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>42/57</td>
<td>($65,000.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>49/49</td>
<td>($100,000.00+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Projected deficit.

As can be seen from table 13, the increase of fiscal problems of the Academy roughly parallels the decline in the total enrollment. This fact is not surprising, and may well be unrelated to racial turnover. In schools that depend on tuition for their operation, income is directly related to the number of pupils. Expense, however, is not related directly to precise numbers of pupils, but rather to programs that are maintained. The financial figures, it seems, bear out the fact that the Academy attempted to maintain quality programs even in the face of dwindling enrollment. Each year the dilemma had to be faced: at what point is the Art program, for example, phased out and the teacher dismissed? When 20 girls sign up for Art? Or 18? Or 14? And the further question had to be raised: when the school cuts out courses to save salary expense, does it then unwittingly contribute to the enrollment decline by tarnishing its image as a quality school?

Whatever may have been the case, it can be seen that as the 1971-72 school year ended, the Academy had reached the point where it was fighting for its life. It was emphasized in the introduction and in Chapter II that "desegregation" in Catholic schools was less a case of "equality of educational opportunity" than a question of survival, and the growing budget deficits at the Academy of Our Lady are an object lesson in this truth.

To take the three columns represented in table 13 and try to establish a cause and effect relationship among them is extremely difficult. To prove that racial change was causing the enrollment decline and its attendant fiscal problems is well-nigh impossible. The best we can say is that the factors do seem to be related, and each in its own way contributed to the crisis that confronted the school in 1972, when a $100,000.00 deficit was projected for the upcoming year.

As this crisis developed, several people involved in the Academy — administrators, teachers, alumnae, and parents white and black — began to be persuaded that a major reason for the decline in enrollment was the reluctance of white parents to send their girls to a school that was not "racially balanced." There is no way to demonstrate such an assertion; the point is that many people began to believe that such was the case. Efforts to alleviate the crisis, as will be pointed out in the next section, revolved around this assumption.
Survival Strategy

We have examined, in Chapter I, the decision of the Supreme Court in the Brown v. Topeka Board of Education which stated that, "separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."\textsuperscript{14} The assumption that has grown up around this decision is that schools that are all-black cannot be "equal" in quality to schools that are all-white or racially mixed. It was seen, too, in Chapter I, that this assumption has never been demonstrated conclusively. Indeed, the works of Coleman, Jencks, and St. John would seem to challenge the validity of the assumption on most serious grounds. Nonetheless, the belief persists that a school which becomes an all-black school must deteriorate in academic quality. Sister Eleanor Holland and Sister Jean Denomme reported, in Chapter II, that this belief was operative among both black and white parents at Loretto and Aquinas high schools when they resegregated.\textsuperscript{15}

Given this general climate of opinion, it is not surprising that the growth of the black student percentage at the Academy of Our Lady was viewed with alarm, nor that efforts to solve the school's problems by a plan for "racial balance" were met with some degree of acceptance.

What direction these efforts would take might be glimpsed from the following abstracts of correspondence from alumnae, parents, and administrator.

\textsuperscript{14}Brown v. Board of Education. 345 U.S. 972 (1954).
\textsuperscript{15}Holland and Denomme, 6 December 1972.
The Alumnae Board has been informed that the incoming freshmen about to be accepted will raise the Black-White ratio to 50-50. We feel that this ratio will automatically ensure that Longwood will then become an all-black school. And that this is not what our concerned parents and alumnae (both black and white) desire...

It would, we feel, be better to struggle with a small enrollment for a year while we build it up, than to allow the school to turn completely...16

Those of us who chose Longwood for our daughters deliberately chose a school with a substantial degree of integration. We are now observing a situation where resegregation is occurring, this time in the direction of an all-black school... As you well know, there are many white parents in our neighborhood who believe the white enrollment at Longwood is already too low, and therefore choose other schools... Here is my suggestion therefore: when the overall enrollment at a particular high school begins to approach 50 percent black, additional black applicants should be directed elsewhere, to schools with much lower black enrollment...17

We feel that the times and circumstances indicate immediate consideration of a racial quota policy at the Academy of Our Lady... This quota equity must be considered now if the Academy is going to remain in existence, since this is basically a problem of economics...18

There is quite an irony here: the policy of Archdiocesan schools, open enrollment, seems to achieve the objective of the archdiocese, integrated education, in the boys' high schools; in the girls' schools, on the other hand, the policy of open enrollment seems to militate against integrated education...some serious thinking needs to be done about the wisdom of open enrollment in all cases. The experience of Catholic girls' high schools on the South side would seem to indicate the wisdom of some sort of 'controlled experiment.'19

16Letter of Alumnae Board to Principal, February 22, 1971. (Note that the estimate of racial composition is one year ahead of the actuality). See Appendix I.
17Letter of Longwood Parent to Chairman of the Archdiocesan Catholic School Board, December 20, 1971. See Appendix I.
18Letter of Longwood Parent to Chairman of the Archdiocesan School Board, January 24, 1972. See Appendix I.
This correspondence among people interested in the Academy reflects the assumption that the school ought not be allowed to become all-black since the school would decline in quality, and perhaps close because of fiscal problems. Also, particularly the first two letters reflect the thesis investigated by Havighurst and Levine, namely that once the percentage of blacks in a given school passes a certain "tipping point," say 35 or 40 percent, then the school will inevitably become all-black because the whites will evacuate the neighborhood.20 Again, whether this belief about "tipping points" can be applied to Catholic schools with any certitude is difficult to prove. What is to be noted is that people believe it to be true.

The general strategy that was evolving among the Longwood people was: stabilize the racial composition of the school by limiting black enrollment at some point below or at 50 percent; in order to guarantee this, adopt a racial quota system of acceptance of pupils; with the "racial balance" thus guaranteed, build up white patronage through extensive recruitment and busing programs. The hoped-for result would be to build the total enrollment back up to survive financially.

The assumption behind the strategy was that large numbers of potential white pupils from the Beverly and other white areas to the west of the Academy did not enroll because the percentage of black pupils was too high (and under the "tipping point" hypothesis would inevitably grow).

20Robert J. Havighurst and Daniel V. Levine, Education in Metropolitan Areas, 2nd ed. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971).
The key, then, to the recruitment of these white pupils was the stabilization of the percentages of black and white in the school. The only way this could be done effectively was by a simple quota system.

The major obstacle, or so it seemed, to the implementation of a quota strategy by the Academy was the Open Enrollment policy of the Archdiocesan School Board, described in Chapter II. The parents and administration of the Academy were hopeful of gaining an exemption from this policy. The objective of the quota plan was to prevent resegregation, and this was consonant with the purpose of the open enrollment policy, though not with its letter. Besides, the "permissive transfer" policy of the Chicago School Board, which also had the purpose of desegregation, had been waived by the Board in cases where resegregation was threatening. The Academy's neighbor, Morgan Park High School, had obtained just such an exemption, and this fact was well known to AOL's parents and alumnae.

A delegation of the Academy Parents' Association appeared with the Principal before the Archdiocesan School Board to present the quota plan on June 5, 1972. But the Board was hesitant to grant an exemption to the open enrollment policy, mainly because people might not understand the reasons for the exemption. How, indeed, could the Board grant an exception to its stated policy without seeming to abandon its stated objectives of desegregation? Besides, the objection was raised, was it clear that such a policy was acceptable to all the parents of Longwood's pupils?
On the basis of these questions, the Board deferred its decision until the fall and appointed a committee to explore the questions raised. The committee was to poll the parents on the quota question and test the climate of public opinion by consulting other schools, local pastors and teachers in the feeder schools, and community organizations. The Board set a hearing for October 2, at which time the committee would report the results of its research and make its recommendation. The report made by the committee to the Board is the substance of the research findings reported in the next section.

Brother Pius Xavier, associate Archdiocesan Superintendent, was named chairman of the committee, which included Father Walter Wilczek, President of the Archdiocesan High School Principals' Association; Father James Moses and Sister Pauline Zoch, administrators of Longwood; other secondary school principals: Sister Eleanor Holland, Unity; Sister Mary Helen, Queen of Peace; Brother N. B. Hueller, Rice; Brother John Shanahan, Marist; Sister Mary Brian, McCauley; Father Edward LaMonte and Father John Gavin, Mendel; Sister Alice Pierce, principal of St. Clotilde elementary school and chairperson of Council 13 of the Archdiocesan Elementary School Principal's Association; and Father Mark Dennehy, member of the Archdiocesan School Board.21

The committee worked over the summer and into September, hearing from pastors, principals, community groups, and in particular polling the parents of current and incoming freshman pupils by means of a ques-

21Minutes of the Academy of Our Lady Quota Study Committee (September 12, 1972).
tionnaire.

**The Quota Committee**

The major research findings of the committee are the results of the parent questionnaire. Before going into the survey results, let us briefly examine the inputs from groups other than parents.

Groups that were approached by the committee, and their responses are the following: The Academy Alumnae Association, Fathers' Club Board, Mothers' Club Board, Advisory Board (faculty, students, and parents), the Ridge Ministerial Association, the Beverly Area Planning Association, and the Beverly-Mount Greenwood area Catholic pastors went on record in favor of the quota plan.22

The Washington Heights-Brainerd area Catholic pastors opposed the quota plan. Many were concerned that the exemption to open enrollment would not be understood in the black parishes. One associate pastor stated bluntly, "There is no way you could convince the people of my parish that this is not a racist move."23

The elementary School Principals' Association Council 25 (white area) favored the quota plan. And — somewhat surprisingly — the Association's Council 13 (black parishes) came out in favor of the quota plan.

22See Appendix I.
23Reverend Marvin Offut, Associate Pastor, St. Leo Church. (Clergy Conference, St. Margaret of Scotland Church, September 27, 1972).
The most glaring failure of the committee was in the area of internal communications in the Academy itself. The summer vacation was not a good time for faculty communications, and the Provincial Chapter of the School Sisters of Notre Dame (the Academy's governing body) was not due to meet until September. When the Sister's Chapter did meet (well after the parent survey had been completed) they rejected the notion of quota:

The School Sisters of Notre Dame of the DeKalb Province affirm and support the statement of the Bishops of the Catholic Church concerning the principles of Christian Social Justice.

Therefore, we declare ourselves in favor of an enrollment policy at the Academy of Our Lady placing no limits of race, creed, or residence, nor any restrictions of quota or balance upon those who apply for admission to the school.24

More comment will be made on the public opinion results, and in particular the extraordinary statement of the Sisters, in the next chapter. Suffice it to observe here, that even if the Archdiocesan School Board had granted an exemption to the open enrollment policy, the Academy of Our Lady would not have put a quota plan into practice since the Sisters' Chapter would in any case have forbidden it. Nonetheless, the Archdiocesan School Board had commissioned the research on the question, and the results of the parent attitude survey are herewith presented.

Parameters of the Population

As the parent survey was being gathered in the summer of 1972, an analysis was made of the student population, to set up the parameters of the group and enable the writer to determine whether the responses to the survey constituted a representative sampling of the parent population. A task force of parents, alumnae, and students volunteered to assist in the analysis.

For the older students (1972-73 seniors, juniors, and sophomores) the current file cards in the school office were used. For incoming (1972-73) freshmen, the registration cards filled out in February were used. These were quite reliable indices of who would appear in September, since a non-refundable fee of $55.00 was assessed at registration time.

Neither of these sets of cards yielded parameters for all the demographic questions on the survey. For instance, at registration time the parents were not asked how many years they lived at their current address. They were, however, asked their religious affiliation. This was not included on the survey, since the overwhelming majority (85 percent) were Catholic.

Herewith are presented the actual parent population characteristics taken from the analysis of the cards. The figures do not all add
up to the same total for two reasons: not all the cards were completely filled out; and in some cases people were not readily identifiable by area or occupation — in this case the task force member made a list on a separate sheet, and these are given separately after the respective table.

Table 14


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brainerd</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Park</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Heights</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Greenwood</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Chicago)</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>823</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty four cards were listed as non-classifiable by area; they represented twenty-four widely scattered parishes which the volunteer analysts had never heard of. These were added to the "Other (Chicago)" category and this yields a total of 823 pupil cards analyzed by area.

The research team found only one surprise in this data, that is, the large number in "Other (Chicago)." The neighborhoods listed covered the area around the Academy to a considerable distance. The conclusion to be drawn is that a significant number of girls had to travel a good distance to school each day.

The task force (and the survey respondents) were asked to classify area according to the 1972 telephone directory map.
Table 15


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The racial makeup of the various classes shows the process of re-segregation in operation. If we analyze the top three classes (seniors, juniors, and sophomores), we find 309 white and 280 blacks. The incoming freshmen class shows 63 whites and 140 blacks, which tips the majority of total population to blacks, 52.2 percent, for the first time in the school's history.

This was a surprise to the researchers. Even the cover letter sent with the survey (Appendix II) projected a 49 percent black population in 1972-73. Resegregation was gaining momentum, and the percentage of blacks leaped from 42 percent in 1971-72 to (projected) 52.2 percent in 1972-73. In keeping with the pattern already elucidated, the total enrollment also drops. Just how far the enrollment would drop, was impossible to tell accurately because the discrepancy in totals of tables 14 and 15. Apparently, at least eighteen students had not identified themselves by race (a problem we referred to earlier in trying to get the racial head count by homeroom).
Table 16


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELIGION</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>85.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>812</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religion was not asked of the parents on the survey. As can be seen from table 16, the school population remains heavily Catholic even though black enrollment is higher. Also, as can be seen from comparing the totals of table 14 and table 16, some did not identify themselves as to religious affiliation.

Table 17


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trade</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>699</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides the fathers listed above, the task force volunteers listed twenty men as non-classifiable, mostly self-employed entrepreneurs, entertainers, and the Auditor of State Accounts, Michael J. Howlett. Adding these in, we have a total of 719 men. The remaining cards yielded no
information on this criterion, and perhaps these represent unemployed, disabled, or deceased fathers. At any rate, they are not indicated on the cards.

Looking at just the listed occupations in table 17, we find the skilled trades the highest percentage (25), with civil service (18.2) and professional (15.2) the next highest. Sales and Other come in around 12 percent, and both Office and Factory under 10 percent.

Table 18 gives the breakdown of Mothers' occupations. In this criterion, housewife is by far the largest majority. Office workers (20.8) and Professional (17.1) make up the bulk of the rest. All the other classifications come in under 5 percent. There were no Mothers who were listed as unclassifiable by the task force.

Table 18

Academy of Our Lady. Occupations of Mother, 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trade</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>767</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, we have again, as in the Fathers' occupation, a large
number of cards which simply give no answer at all to occupation of Mother.

Besides occupation, race, residence, and religion, only one other criterion was available from the student cards. This was the number of brothers and sisters. The number of brothers of Longwood students is listed in table 19.

Table 19

Academy of Our Lady. Number of Brothers of Students, 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF BROTHERS</th>
<th>AOL FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>773</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Since the numbers of younger sisters might be useful information for future recruiting, the sisters of current students were divided into older and younger. Table 20 gives the breakdown of students with older sisters.

Table 20


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF OLDER SISTERS</th>
<th>AOL FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>691</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The number of current pupils with younger sisters, possible future students of the Academy is given in table 21.

Table 21


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF YOUNGER SISTERS</th>
<th>AOL FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking into account the variables of residence, race, religion, occupation, and family composition, we may draw the following brief sketch of the Academy's parent population. The population is widely scattered on Chicago's South side and suburbs. Beverly (white area) and Washington Heights (black area) are the two largest identifiable residential areas. However, the nebulous Other (Chicago) is the largest listed area, indicating some lengthy travel to school for a large number of the girls.

The racial makeup of the school will be majority blacks (52.2 percent) for the first time in 1972-73. Caucasians are well represented, however, at 46.2 percent. The parents' stated religious affiliation is heavily Catholic (85.1 percent). The families may be characterized generally as middle class leaning to upper-middle, with Skilled Trade,
Civil Service, Professional, and Sales the major father's occupations, and with 44.5 percent of the mothers not working outside the home. Those who do work outside the home fall principally into the Professional and Office categories.

The families may be characterized as medium to large sized, with 40.5 percent reporting at least one brother, 32.3 percent listing at least one older sister, and 30.1 percent listing at least one younger sister. One discouraging fact for the task force was the high percentage (46 percent) listing no younger sisters at all. This figure did not bode well for recruitment of future students from current families.

It was this population of parents who were polled on their views regarding desegregation at the Academy, with a view to assessing the degree of support for the racial quota strategy. The results of the survey are presented here.
SURVEY RESULTS

Respondents

Three hundred and forty-five valid questionnaires were returned and calculated. Of the 345, 217 or 62.9 percent were from current pupils' parents; 128 or 37.1 percent were from parents of incoming freshmen. 209 surveys were filled out and sent in by the Mother; 80 were filled out and returned by the Father; and 56 returns indicated that both parents had filled the questionnaire out together.

Table 22


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brainerd</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Park</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Heights</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Chicago)</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the actual respondents with the pre-calculated parameters of the population, we find that Beverly is the leading identified

---

26Questionnaires returned by students, faculty members, or alumnae were invalidated. Parents only were allowed.
area of respondents with 37.7 percent; Chicago (Other) is the next largest with 32.2 percent. This corresponds rather closely with the original parameters shown in table 14. Only one identified area is significantly different from the population parameter, and that is Washington Heights. 148 parents had been classified in Washington Heights, but only 24 questionnaires, or 7 percent, were returned.

On the criterion of race, we find that the actual respondents to the questionnaire come close to the pre-calculated parameters shown in table 15, in fact within 5.5 percent among whites, and within six percentage points among blacks. Two interesting points are revealed in table 23: five families identified themselves as racially mixed, and all 345 respondents answered the question of identity by race.

Table 23

Academy of Our Lady. Respondents to Parent Survey by Race, 1972–73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>46.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially Mixed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analyzing the respondents according to Father's Occupation, we find that Skilled Trade (20.6 percent) is again the leading category. However, Professional is the second highest with 19.7 percent; Civil Service drops to third with 15.9 percent; Sales again is fourth with
13.3 percent. All the other categories are under 10 percent as in the total population. All the actual respondent categories are within 5 percentage points of the pre-analysis of the total population, as shown by comparing table 17 and table 24.

Table 24

Academy of Our Lady. Respondents to Parent Survey by Occupation of Father, 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trade</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Looking at the actual respondents by Mother's Occupation, we find a remarkable similarity to the total population parameter shown.

Table 25

Academy of Our Lady. Respondents to Parent Survey by Mothers' Occupation, 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trade</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in table 18, in that 43.2 percent are housewives, within two percentage points of the card analysis. However, Professional and Office drop considerably to 13.9 percent and 11 percent respectively. Even so, they are still the second and third highest categories. The Civil Service category jumps from 2.5 percent in the total population to 10.1 among the actual respondents.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF SONS</th>
<th>FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analyzing the number of sons on the returned questionnaires, we find the results come close to the population analysis shown in table 19. 34.8 percent of the parents report one son, compared to 40.5 in the total population; 18 percent indicate two sons compared to 20.7 percent in the total. All the categories are within seven percentage points of the total population parameter, as shown in table 26.

Below are presented the answers of the respondents to the number of daughters, daughters who previously attended Longwood, daughters
currently attending and on what level, and daughters not old enough for high school. We shall not present a direct comparison to the total population parameter of younger or older sisters, because the information is not the same. (The student registration card, for example, did not ask the pupil to state whether her older sisters were alumnae of the Academy, enrolled at the Academy, or enrolled in another school.)

Table 27

Academy of Our Lady. Respondents to Parent Survey by Number of Daughters, 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF DAUGHTERS</th>
<th>FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonetheless, this information will help us to discover whether the respondents do represent a comparable sub-group of the total population with regard to family composition, loyalty to the school, and possible future recruits from current families.

Tables 26 and 27 tend to confirm our projection from the total parent analysis that the families represented at the school are medium to large sized. Of the respondents, 34.8 percent report at least one son; and 30.4 percent report at least two daughters. Another 33 percent
report three or four daughters in the family.

Table 28


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF ALUMNAE</th>
<th>FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28 illustrates the changing population of the Academy. 112 families report daughter(s) who previously attended, but 133 report no alumnae daughters. Considering that the Academy was almost one

Table 29

Academy of Our Lady. Respondents to Parent Survey by Level of Students, 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL OF PUPILS</th>
<th>FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Attending</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Attending</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Attending in Some Level</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
hundred years old with a strong Alumnae Association, these figures be-
token a shift in the school's population to a new clientele.

Table 29 indicates that the 345 families who answered the survey account for approximately 390 pupils. 101 are families of incoming freshmen with no older sisters at the school. It would seem that this is another indication of a change in the school's clientele, since we know that the incoming class was projected at approximately 69 percent black. Blacks also, as shown in table 23, proportionally took more interest in the subject of the school's desegregation problem.

Table 30

Academy of Our Lady. Respondents to Parent Survey by Daughters Too Young to Attend, 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUMBER OF YOUNGER DAUGHTERS</th>
<th>FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 30 reveals the same discouraging fact uncovered in the analysis of the total population, that is, a significant number of families (43.2 percent) of current pupils show no daughters coming up the ranks as possible future recruits for the Academy. Eliminating the
41 "no reply", a cumulative percentage of 77 percent show either zero or one younger daughter. And if a large proportion of the "no reply" category on this table actually means zero, then the recruitment picture is even more bleak.

On the basis of these analyses of the respondents by residence, race, occupation, and composition of the families, we believe that our respondents constitute a representative sample of the total parent population of the Academy. The residential distribution is similar, and the racial character is approximately half-black and half-white. The families are medium to large sized, middle-class socially mobile. Tables 31 (Income) and 32 (Home-owners) will corroborate this.

Table 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME LEVEL ANNUAL</th>
<th>FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $4,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000 - $8,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,000 - $12,000</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 - $16,000</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,000 - $20,000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $20,000</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>345</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The middle class to upper middle character of the families who answered the survey is indicated in table 31. Fewer than 10 percent of respondents show a family income of less than $8,000 per year.
percent make between $8,000 and $20,000 per year, and almost one fourth are in the over $20,000 per year category.

Table 32

Academy of Our Lady. Respondents to Parent Survey by Homeowner or Renters, 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESIDENCE STATUS</th>
<th>FAMILIES</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>90.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32 indicates that the overwhelming majority of the respondents own their own home. Added to the results of the responses by income in table 31, we may then corroborate the composite of our respondents as medium to large sized families, middle to upper middle class.

Based on the analyses of the respondents by area, race, occupation, family size and composition and the two indications of socioeconomic status (income and housing), our contention seems to be supported that our 345 respondents represent a fair and valid sample of the Academy's parent population at large.

**Responses to Major Questions**

The Academy's parents expressed in their questionnaire a strong desire to maintain an integrated school population, as shown in table 33.
Table 33


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTEGRATION</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>89.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parents expressed approval of a busing program to maintain integration by a 2 to 1 margin, and general but not unanimous approval of extensive recruiting to maintain integration, as shown in table 34.

Table 34


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSING PERCENT</th>
<th>BUSING PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>206 59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>104 30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>35 10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECRUITING PERCENT</th>
<th>RECRUITING PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>250 72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54 15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>41 11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the topic of degree of support for a racial quota system, the response was more positive than the busing proposal, but not as strong as the response to recruiting. Though there are more yesses than nos to the quota question, almost one quarter of the respondents said no, and as table 35 shows, fully one eighth of the respondents did not reply to this question at all. At best, this could be called a reserved ap-
Table 35

Academy of Our Lady. Responses to "To maintain integration, would you approve of the Academy applying a quota system, i.e., admitting one black student for each white student and vice versa?" 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>QUOTA PROPOSAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the replies to the question about integration must be understood in the light of the respondents definition of integration and beliefs about its utility. These are illustrated in tables 36 and 37.

Table 36

Academy of Our Lady. Responses to "What do you consider the ideal racial composition of a school?" 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDEAL COMPOSITION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% Black</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30% Black</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40% Black</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% Black</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>36.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51% - 70% Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71% - 90% Black</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91% - 100% Black</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from table 36, the majority of respondents (77 per-
cent) cluster between 30 and 50 percent black, with a significant
minority (11.3 percent) at 20 percent black.

Table 37

Academy of Our Lady. Responses to "Did your beliefs about
integration influence your decision to choose Longwood for
your daughter?" 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFLUENCE DECISION</th>
<th>NUMBER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern of responses in the last five figures reveals a mixed
line of reasoning. Overwhelming approval was stated for maintaining an
integrated school, but this apparently was not decisive in choosing the
school. Ideal racial balance was indicated between 30 and 50 percent
black, and the parents gave positive but not unanimous approval to the
plans for maintaining racial balance. Deciphering the meaning of these
ambivalent responses requires further and more sophisticated analysis of
the responses. In the following section we shall attempt to relate the
pattern of responses to the demographic variables. First, the statistical
tools used in this analysis will be explained.

Methodology

The data gathered in the Longwood parent survey was coded and pro-
cessed through the Loyola University terminal.\textsuperscript{27} The Statistical Package

\textsuperscript{27}See Appendix II. Code numbers are on right side of each page.
for the Social Sciences was utilized to process the data.28

The SPSS program first provided the demographic characteristics of the respondents so that we might more clearly describe the responding population. Second, it provided the gross results of the attitudinal questions.

Once this was completed, the data seemed to lend itself to a further, more sophisticated analysis. A factor analysis was conducted on the data, ultimately gathering three major factors among the attitudinal variables. Factor analysis was chosen as a method of examining the data because the factor method cut down considerably the number of calculations that would have to be made in order to report the questionnaire results adequately.29

In the factor analysis of the responses to the Longwood parent survey, a Scree test30 indicated three major factors among the attitudinal variables where missing data (that is, no reply) did not exceed 25 percent. The three factors shown by the Scree test as appropriate were extracted and submitted to a Varimax rotation.

Once these three underlying factors were identified, one further analytical step was taken, in order to discover which (if any) of the

demographic variables (such as sex, age, occupation, or income, for instance) could account for the different patterns of responses uncovered in the factor analysis. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted on the three factors and the demographic variables, and correlation coefficients where appropriate.

Two final notes on methodology. Questions 18 through 24, Fathers' Education, and questions 25 through 31, Mothers' Education, proved too complex to handle as fourteen separate responses. To simplify analysis of this section, the variables were reduced to two and expressed in ordinal terms on a second set of data cards. If, for instance, the respondent indicated that the mother graduated from high school, the card simply indicated that Mothers' Educational level equals twelve years. If the respondent indicated the father had graduated from college but did not possess an advanced degree, the card showed Fathers' Educational level equals sixteen years. Educational data was then correlated with scores derived from the factor analysis. Also, it simplified the task by rounding off the (few) parents who graduated from high school in 3½ years and those who were in the process of getting an advanced degree were assigned a score of 18, even though more than two chronological years are needed for an advanced degree as often as not. The reasoning is that, had the person gone to school full time, he or she would probably

31 The survey set up the response pattern badly to begin with. For example, the respondent may have answered yes to Question 23, "Did father graduate from college?" but no reply at all to the prior questions about elementary or high school years. The gross responses, then, to these fourteen questions are meaningless and not reported.
have spent the better part of two years in acquiring the advanced degree.

Finally, the various printouts in the factor analysis and analysis of variance kept pointing to a trend (but not a significant correlation) in question 5, who filled out the survey, Mother, Father, or both parents together. A separate analysis gave correlations between factor scores and the responses answered by the Mother, those answered by the Father, and those filled out jointly. These results will be given at the end of the chapter, together with the educational level results.

With these notes on methodology in mind, we may now proceed to report our analysis and interpretation.

**Report of Survey Responses**

Besides the responses reported in the first part of this chapter, the survey returns which were processed indicated the following gross responses. The responses to the Parents' Age questions indicate that the Mothers are, on average, younger than the Fathers. Both groups cluster in the 36-55 range, as might be expected for parents of high school age children. Mothers' largest category, however, is 36-44 years old; the Fathers' largest group is 45-55 years old.

Responses to question 33 show that the respondents are a fairly stable population. 73.1 percent of the parents have been at their current address for at least five years; 40.9 have been at the current address for more than ten years. Only 7.3 percent indicate a move within
the past two years, as shown in table 39.

### Table 38

Academy of Our Lady. Respondents to Parent Survey by Parents' Age, 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-44</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-55</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 39

Academy of Our Lady. Responses to Parent Survey. "How long have you lived at your current address?" 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two to four years</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five to ten years</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than ten years</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 40 indicates a good degree of involvement in community affairs by the respondents to question 36. 212 parents, or 61.4 percent belong to a Block Club or civic group. This question is similar to the question on identification by Race, in the sense that almost 100 percent of the survey respondents answered it.
Table 40


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 41 reveals a high level of aspiration for their daughters on the part of the respondents. Fully 81.7 percent want their daughter to go on to college. Only a small percentage choose Business School, Junior College, or Work.

Table 41


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before asking the parents to compare the Academy to other high schools, the survey asked them to rank the various aspects of the work of the school (any school) on a scale of 1 to 5. They were asked to
assign levels of importance to the areas of Teaching Academic Subjects, Maintaining Discipline, Inculcating Moral Values, Offering Extracurricular Activities, and Social Interaction. The results are given in tables 42 and 42a.

Table 42


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACADEMIC</th>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>MORAL VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 42a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXTRACURRICULAR</th>
<th>INTERACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parents' responses to these questions indicate a heavy emphasis on
Academics as the most important task of the school. Only one person out of 345 ranked Academics below third place. Inculcation of Moral Values was ranked second by the majority, and Discipline third, although these were very close. Social Interaction and Extracurriculars follow way behind — these are close, also, with Interaction just a bit ahead in the parents' estimation. These questions prompted many additional comments from the respondents. The most interesting of these reveals that some parents ranked Discipline and Values low not because of lack of regard, but because they felt these areas to lie in the province of the family, not the school.32

Table 43

Academy of Our Lady. Responses to Parent Survey. "How would you rate Longwood compared to other high schools in the metropolitan area. 1 = Much poorer than other schools; 2 = Poorer than; 3 = As good as; 4 = Better than; 5 = Much better; 6 = No opinion." 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ACADEMIC</th>
<th></th>
<th>DISCIPLINE</th>
<th></th>
<th>MORAL VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td>No. Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 1.4</td>
<td>7 2.0</td>
<td>6 1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7 2.0</td>
<td>11 3.2</td>
<td>13 3.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>81 23.5</td>
<td>82 23.8</td>
<td>76 22.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>115 33.3</td>
<td>92 26.7</td>
<td>105 30.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>78 22.6</td>
<td>85 24.6</td>
<td>69 20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>17 4.9</td>
<td>25 7.2</td>
<td>28 8.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>42 12.2</td>
<td>43 12.5</td>
<td>48 13.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345 100.0</td>
<td>345 100.0</td>
<td>345 100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next two series of questions ask the respondents to give a rating to the Academy (Question 43-47) compared to other high schools

32See Appendix III.
on the same five criteria: Teaching Academic Subjects, Maintaining Discipline, Inculcating Moral Values, Offering Extracurriculars, and Social Interaction; and (Question 48-52) to assess the impact of integration on their daughter in these areas. The following four tables give the parents responses:

**Table 43a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>EXTRACURRICULAR</th>
<th>SOCIAL INTERACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from tables 43 and 43a, the parents who responded to the survey generally had a good opinion of the Academy on Teaching Academic Subjects, Maintaining Discipline, and Inculcating Moral Values. On all three criteria, "Better than other schools" was the leading response, and the replies clustered in the three middle categories: "as good as," "better than," and "much better than." Longwood's Extracurricular programs and Social Interaction are not rated as highly. These questions, too, prompted much additional comment (See Appendix III). As may be seen both in the figures and the comments, many freshman parents preferred to defer judgment — thus the large numbers of "No Reply" in this series of questions.33

33Ibid.
Table 44

Academy of Our Lady Responses to Parent Survey. "Do you think that attending a racially integrated school has benefited your daughter in terms of:" 1972-73.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT</th>
<th>FAMILY DISCIPLINE</th>
<th>MORAL VALUES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 44a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOCIAL INTERACTION</th>
<th>WIDENING OF INTERESTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This series of responses shows an opposite attitude from tables 43 and 43a. Parents generally do not ascribe a positive value to integration on Academics, Discipline and Moral Values. But they are more pleased with the effects of integration in Widening of Interests and in Social Interaction. The contrast of these response patterns will be examined in more detail, in the factor analysis given below.

This concludes the reporting of the responses in gross numbers. We shall now proceed to further examination of the data through the factor analysis, and the analysis of variance.
Factor Analysis

The factor loadings on the attitudinal variables are shown in table 45. Questions 43 through 47 ask the respondents to rank the Academy on Teaching Academic Subjects, Maintaining Discipline, Inculcating Moral Values, Extracurricular Activities, and Social Interaction. Questions 48 through 52 ask for an evaluation of integration on the criteria. Question 53 asked, "Did your beliefs about integration influence your decision to send your daughter to Longwood?" Question 54 asked, "What do you consider the ideal racial composition of a school?"

Table 45


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>FACTOR 1</th>
<th>FACTOR 2</th>
<th>FACTOR 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.74944*</td>
<td>0.20395</td>
<td>0.04249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.75702*</td>
<td>0.22947</td>
<td>-0.01481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.77286*</td>
<td>0.26526</td>
<td>-0.01400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.66248*</td>
<td>0.03705</td>
<td>0.06389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.59956*</td>
<td>-0.06796</td>
<td>-0.02982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0.29562</td>
<td>0.58733*</td>
<td>0.18882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.02626</td>
<td>0.67802*</td>
<td>0.00546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.00773</td>
<td>0.76533*</td>
<td>0.02219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>0.15164</td>
<td>0.63788*</td>
<td>0.13229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.12587</td>
<td>0.69060*</td>
<td>0.15882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.12089</td>
<td>0.33680</td>
<td>0.32665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.22361</td>
<td>0.30997</td>
<td>0.41255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.02535</td>
<td>0.14591</td>
<td>0.59048*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.03276</td>
<td>0.05572</td>
<td>0.58252*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0.03534</td>
<td>0.04882</td>
<td>0.51063*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>-0.09185</td>
<td>-0.00475</td>
<td>0.53102*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 55 through 58 asked for support for integration generally and
the proposed strategies: busing, quota system, extensive recruiting.

As seen in table 45, a clear cut factor pattern emerged. Loadings above the .50 level were utilized for the purpose of interpreting the Factors.

Factor I exhibits high loadings on questions 43-47 which asked the respondent to rank the Academy on Teaching Academic Subjects, Maintaining Discipline, Inculcating Moral Values, Offering Extracurricular Activities, and Social Interaction. Factor I may be characterized as a general Esteem for the Academy.

Factor II exhibits high loadings on questions 48-52, which asked the respondent to evaluate the impact of integration on the child in the same five areas (Academics, Discipline, Values, Extracurriculars, and Interaction). Factor II may be described as a general Evaluation of Integration.

Factor III exhibits high loadings on questions 55-58 in which the respondent was asked to indicate support for integration and the proposed strategies (busing, quota, and recruitment) for preventing resegregation at the Academy. Factor III may be described generally as Support for the Strategies for integration.

Question 53 "Did your beliefs about integration influence your decision to send your daughter to Longwood?" and Question 54, "What do you consider the ideal racial composition of a school?" both have moderate
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loadings on Factor II and Factor III, indicating a positive relation to satisfaction with the impact of integration and commitment to the strategies. However, only variables with factor loadings above the .50 level are used for analysis and interpretation.

Based on the factor loadings shown in table 45, our analysis indicates in Factor I, that respondents who had esteem for the Academy in Academic Subjects tended also to esteem the school's work in Maintaining Discipline, Inculcating Moral Values, Offering Extracurriculars, and Social Interaction. Factor II shows that respondents who value the impact of integration on the pupil in Academics also tend to value its impact on Discipline and the other criteria. Factor III shows that respondents who support integration also tend to support the proposed strategies for preventing resegregation.

With the three major factors identified, we may now proceed to compare the factors to the identifying variables, and begin to answer the questions raised earlier. If Factor I indicates a general favorable or unfavorable attitude toward the Academy, can we discover which demographic variables are responsible for the trend. Do blacks, for instance, favor the school more than whites? Mothers more than Fathers? The highly educated more than the less educated? Do the older parents generally have a higher esteem of the school than the younger ones, or the professional people more than the factory workers?

To provide answers to these questions, factor scores were calculated for each factor and an analysis of variance was conducted for each
of the three factors and each of the demographic variables. The results are given in the following section.

As the analysis of variance measures the differences in response to the three factors, it should be kept in mind that the esteem for Longwood is generally high among the parents. In table 43, the median response to all five questions lies in 4, "better than other schools." Tables 44 and 44a indicate a positive evaluation of the effects of integration in the areas of Social Interaction and Widening of Interests, a negative evaluation on integration in Discipline and Moral Values — in Academics the parents were evenly divided.

Also, it should be recalled that support for integration and the strategies to prevent resegregation was generally high. Tables 33, 34, and 35 showed 89 percent of respondents wanted the school to remain integrated; 59.7 percent approved busing, 72.5 percent approved recruiting, and 62.9 percent of respondents approved the quota proposal.

**Analysis of Variance**

In this section, each of the individual demographic variables will be examined to assess its influence on the pattern of responses discovered in the three factors. In the several tables which follow, number of respondents will be reported for each category and for the total. Mean scores will be reported for each category and for the total. Standard deviations will be reported (in parentheses) for each category and for the total. F ratios (F = ) and levels of significance (P < ) will be reported. Correlation coefficients (r = ) will be reported where appropriate,
and a second significance level (P <) will be shown for the correlation.

As shown in table 46, a significant difference exists, at the .01 level, between the new parents and the parents of sophomores, juniors, and seniors on Factors I and II. Recalling that Factor I defines general estimation of the Academy, we may conclude that the incoming freshman parents have a higher opinion of the Academy than the parents of upper-classmen. The parents of older pupils are less pleased with the school than the new parents.

Recall, however, from tables 43 and 43a, that the gross response to this factor showed a general high estimate of the Academy. Recall, too, that many new parents declined to answer these questions (Appendix III). Our analysis of variance has shown that those who evaluate the school lower, were generally the parents of the older pupils, and that the difference between their attitude and that of the new parents is significant.

As shown also in table 46, a significant difference exists, at the .05 level, between the new parents and the parents of sophomores, juniors, and seniors on Factor II. We may conclude that incoming freshman parents have a higher regard for the effects of integration than the parents of older students. Recall from table 44 that parents generally did not ascribe a high value to the effects of integration. Recall too, from table 15, that the incoming class will be majority black for the first time, and this finding does not seem surprising. Blacks, and whites who are deliber-
Table 46

Analysis of Variance by Freshman and Upperclass Parents on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARENTS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.867)</td>
<td>(0.915)</td>
<td>(0.748)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperclass</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>-0.178</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.789)</td>
<td>(0.815)</td>
<td>(0.800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.823)</td>
<td>(0.851)</td>
<td>(0.784)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.8680</td>
<td>5.0347</td>
<td>0.4689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ately choosing an integrated school, tend to ascribe more value to the desegregated setting.

No significant difference was found between the newer and older parents on Factor III, support for integration strategies. Our analysis of variance by new and old parents has shown us that the parents of incoming pupils tend to regard the Academy more highly, and to evaluate the impact of integration on their daughters more highly.

As shown in table 47, a significant difference exists, at the .01 level, between the responses of the Fathers by age bracket and Factor I. The 36-44 group has a generally higher opinion of the Academy. The trend in this variable is for the younger Fathers to be more favorable toward the school. The trend is not a statistically significant total pattern,
however, because those under 35 look less favorably on the school than the 36-44 group.

Table 47
Analysis of Variance by Fathers' Age on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.139</td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>0.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.198)</td>
<td>(0.821)</td>
<td>(0.344)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-44</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.192</td>
<td>0.101</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.703)</td>
<td>(0.787)</td>
<td>(0.572)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-55</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-0.227</td>
<td>-0.064</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.784)</td>
<td>(0.779)</td>
<td>(0.903)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-0.163</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>-0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.786)</td>
<td>(0.860)</td>
<td>(0.820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>250</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.795)</td>
<td>(0.790)</td>
<td>(0.784)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 5.3314 \]
\[ P < .01 \]
\[ r = -0.1739 \]
\[ P < .01 \]

No significant correlation was found between Father's age and Factor II, impact of integration. But, as table 47 also indicates, a significant correlation exists, at the .01 level, among the responses to Factor III and Father's age. The younger the Father, the more supportive the respondent is of integration and the strategies for maintaining integration. The older the Father, the less supportive the re-
spondent was of the strategies.

Our analysis of variance by father's age has shown that generally the younger the Father is, the more highly the respondent regards the Academy, and a higher degree of support is registered for integration and the plans for preventing resegregation.

As shown in table 48, a strong correlation was discovered between Mother's age and estimation of the Academy. The older the Mother, the less satisfied with the school is the respondent. This correlation is significant at the .001 level.

No significance was seen in the analysis of Factor II and Mother's age, but, as shown in table 48, significant differences appear, at the .001 level, in the pattern of responses to Factor III, among the different age brackets of the Mother. The younger the Mother, the more supportive the respondent is of integration generally, and the more supportive the respondent is of the strategies for maintaining a desegregated setting. This correlation is significant at the .001 level.

To summarize table 47 and 48: age seems to have been a significant influence on the responses in Factor I and Factor III. The younger parents tend to have a higher regard for the school than the older parents, and also tend to support desegregation and the strategies for preventing re-segregation than the older parents. No significant differences, however, were found among the age brackets on Factor II, the evaluation of the impact of integration on the pupil's development.
Table 48
Analysis of Variance by Mother's Age on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.562 (0.740)</td>
<td>0.345 (0.743)</td>
<td>0.328 (0.376)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-44</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.023 (0.693)</td>
<td>0.034 (0.765)</td>
<td>0.161 (0.567)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-55</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-0.308 (0.786)</td>
<td>-0.060 (0.776)</td>
<td>-0.168 (0.917)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 56</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-0.141 (0.072)</td>
<td>0.227 (1.982)</td>
<td>-0.702 (0.898)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>-0.049 (0.783)</td>
<td>0.041 (0.854)</td>
<td>0.021 (0.750)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
F = 9.9485 
\]

\[
P \ll 0.01 
\]

\[
r = -0.2931 
\]

\[
P \ll 0.001 
\]

In the analysis of variance by occupation, several significant differences were found. Occupation of Father was related to Factor I, and Mother's occupation revealed significant differences on all three factors.

As may be seen in table 49, significant differences, at the .01 level, are found in the Fathers' occupations and Factor I. The Skilled Trade and Factory categories find the respondent most favorable toward the Academy; the Civil Service and Sales brackets are close to the mean.
The Professional and Office categories reveal much less satisfaction with the Academy on the part of the respondent.

Table 49

Analysis of Variance by Father's Occupation on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-0.460 (0.857)</td>
<td>0.036 (0.750)</td>
<td>0.190 (0.684)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.215 (0.882)</td>
<td>-0.361 (0.707)</td>
<td>-0.228 (0.891)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.254 (0.583)</td>
<td>0.250 (0.612)</td>
<td>0.358 (0.387)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trade</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.189 (0.726)</td>
<td>-0.123 (0.813)</td>
<td>-0.107 (0.763)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-0.207 (0.769)</td>
<td>0.086 (0.846)</td>
<td>-0.025 (0.894)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-0.026 (0.827)</td>
<td>0.047 (0.765)</td>
<td>0.033 (0.725)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.135 (0.652)</td>
<td>0.141 (0.763)</td>
<td>-0.267 (0.873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>-0.031 (0.811)</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.778)</td>
<td>-0.017 (0.783)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F =</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1020</td>
<td>1.4148</td>
<td>2.0747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P &lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 50 shows significant differences, at the .01 level, among Mother Occupations by all three Factors. On Factor I, ignoring the small groups of Factory and Sales, the Skilled Trade and Civil Service categories indicate a greater esteem for the school. The Office group is
more negative, and the Professional and Housewife groups express a strong negative assessment of the school.

Table 50

Analysis of Variance by Occupation of Mother on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>-0.215</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>-0.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.512</td>
<td>1.129</td>
<td>-0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled Trade</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>0.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.590</td>
<td>-0.065</td>
<td>0.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Service</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>-0.242</td>
<td>-0.179</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>-0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 4.1691  2.8246  4.5072

P < .05

On Factor II, the Housewives are again the most negative in their
evaluation of the impact of integration. Almost all the women who work outside the home are positive in their evaluation of integration, especially the Professional and Skilled Trade groups.

On Factor III, the Professional, Sales, Skilled Trade, and Civil Service women are most supportive of integration strategies. Housewives and Office women register less support for integration strategies.

To summarize tables 49 and 50: Occupation made a significant difference in the responses to the three Factors, especially among the Mothers. The most striking finding is the consistent negativism of the largest group, the Housewives. They were the most negative in their esteem for the Academy, again the most negative in their evaluation of the impact of integration, and certainly not enthusiastic in their support for the strategies for maintaining integration.

Question 10, identity by race, revealed significant differences on all three Factors under analysis. Blacks generally were more favorable toward the school, evaluated the effects of integration higher, and were more supportive of the strategies than whites.

As seen in table 51, significant differences are found, at the .001 level, on Factor I analyzed by Race. Blacks, racially mixed families, and Other are much more pleased with the Academy than whites. This finding corresponds to the analysis of Factor I and incoming parents (table 46); we know that the incoming 1972-73 class will be majority black. Also as shown in table 51, significant differences, at the .001 level,
Table 51

Analysis of Variance by Race on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>0.237 (0.758)</td>
<td>0.404 (0.816)</td>
<td>0.174 (0.261)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>-0.373 (0.784)</td>
<td>-0.274 (0.764)</td>
<td>-0.181 (0.873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.230 (0.253)</td>
<td>-0.578 (0.488)</td>
<td>0.083 (0.959)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racially Mixed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.284 (0.491)</td>
<td>0.405 (0.532)</td>
<td>0.321 (0.540)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.088 (0.823)</td>
<td>0.034 (0.851)</td>
<td>-0.015 (0.784)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>268</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.0897</td>
<td>16.8260</td>
<td>4.9193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

exist between the respondents to Factor II by Race. Blacks and Racially mixed are more favorable in their estimation of the impact of integration on their daughters. Whites and Others are generally less pleased with the effect of integration on their daughter's education.

As shown in table 51, significant differences also appear, at the .01 level, in response to Factor III. Although parents generally favored integration and the strategies to maintain integration (tables 33, 34, and 35), the analysis of variations in responses by Race shows Blacks, Others, and Racially mixed respondents as more supportive of integration and plans to maintain it than whites.
To sum up table 51, Race of the respondent was influential at significant levels on all three Factors. Blacks tended to have a higher opinion of the Academy than whites. Blacks attached a greater value than whites to the effects of integration on their daughters. And Blacks were generally more favorable than whites to integration and the proposed strategies for preventing resegregation.

Numbers of children seems to have had some effect on the pattern of responses. The number of sons correlated negatively to both Factor I and Factor II. Number of daughters correlated negatively to Factor I. And number of daughters who previously attended correlated negatively to Factor I.

As may be seen from table 52, a significant correlation exists, at the .005 level, in the pattern of responses to Factor I by number of sons. Although the pattern is not consistently progressive, the trend is for the people with more sons to have a lower estimation of the Academy; those with fewer sons favor the school more.

As may be seen also in table 52, a significant correlation appears, at the .05 level in the responses to Factor II by number of sons. Again, the pattern is not consistent, but the trend is for the parents with more sons to evaluate the impact of integration lower than the parents with fewer sons. No significance is found in responses to Factor III by number of sons.

As table 53 indicates, a significant correlation is found, at the
Table 52

Analysis of Variance by Number of Sons of Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF SONS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.173 (0.500)</td>
<td>0.154 (0.724)</td>
<td>0.120 (0.553)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.002 (0.759)</td>
<td>0.192 (0.927)</td>
<td>-0.064 (0.776)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-0.239 (0.852)</td>
<td>0.014 (0.821)</td>
<td>-0.069 (0.822)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>-0.222 (0.841)</td>
<td>-0.069 (0.845)</td>
<td>0.132 (0.560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-0.090 (0.873)</td>
<td>-0.494 (0.626)</td>
<td>-0.200 (0.998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-0.649 (0.806)</td>
<td>0.065 (0.763)</td>
<td>0.183 (0.400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.047 (0.634)</td>
<td>-0.364 (0.821)</td>
<td>0.185 (0.605)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.049 (0.000)</td>
<td>1.090 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.491 (0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.978 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.310 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.761 (0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>0.047 (0.000)</td>
<td>1.090 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.491 (0.000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = \begin{align*}
1.9422 & \\
1.9613 & \\
0.8862 & 
\end{align*} \]

\[ p < \begin{align*}
- & \\
- & \\
- & 
\end{align*} \]

\[ r = \begin{align*}
-0.1800 & \\
-0.1574 & \\
0.0112 & 
\end{align*} \]

\[ p < \begin{align*}
.005 & \\
.05 & \\
- & 
\end{align*} \]
.001 level, in the responses to Factor I by number of daughters. The definite trend is for parents with more daughters to assess the Academy more negatively, and for those with fewer daughters to have a more favorable attitude toward the school. No significance was found in the analysis of Factors II or III by number of daughters.

To summarize tables 52 and 53, parents with larger families tended to esteem the Academy lower and to have more negative evaluation of the impact of integration. This pattern corresponds to the trend for older parents to have a more negative attitude toward the school (tables 47 and 48). No significant correlations were found, however, between number of children and Factor III, degree of support for integration and the strategies to maintain integration.

Looking at the next series of questions, we find a negative correlation between Factor I and number of alumnae daughters, (Question 13) and significant differences, but no correlation, between number of alumnae daughters and Factor III. There are no significant correlations between number of daughters currently attending (Question 14) and any of the factors. Significant differences are found between both Question 15, level of current pupils, and Question 16, number of daughters too young, on Factor I and Factor III.

As shown in table 54, significant differences exist, at the .01 level, in the responses to Factor I by daughters who previously attended. The strong trend, especially among the larger groups with more alumnae
Table 53

Analysis of Variance by Number of Daughters on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF DAUGHTERS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.199 0.782</td>
<td>0.175 1.023</td>
<td>-0.067 0.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0.045 0.737</td>
<td>0.102 0.787</td>
<td>0.047 0.852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-0.221 0.698</td>
<td>0.003 0.798</td>
<td>-0.084 0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-0.372 0.924</td>
<td>-0.278 0.782</td>
<td>-0.104 0.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.258 0.539</td>
<td>-0.084 0.732</td>
<td>0.202 0.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.807 1.320</td>
<td>0.048 0.792</td>
<td>-0.076 0.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.518 0.539</td>
<td>0.116 0.930</td>
<td>0.078 0.409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.476 0.836</td>
<td>-0.142 1.153</td>
<td>0.396 0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>(0.823)</td>
<td>(0.854)</td>
<td>(0.787)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 4.1617 1.0661 0.5241
P < .01 — —
r = -0.2956 -0.1088 0.0305
P < .001 — —

daughters to have a lower esteem for the Academy. The same trend is found in Factor III. Respondents with more alumnae daughters tend to be less
Table 54

Analysis of Variance by Number of Daughters Who Previously Attended on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF ALUMNAE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.096 (0.710)</td>
<td>0.083 (0.778)</td>
<td>0.033 (0.724)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-0.354 (0.933)</td>
<td>-0.029 (0.706)</td>
<td>-0.222 (0.983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-0.420 (0.710)</td>
<td>-0.169 (0.808)</td>
<td>-0.001 (0.659)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.896 (0.928)</td>
<td>-0.523 (0.651)</td>
<td>-0.943 (1.326)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.661)</td>
<td>0.586 (0.949)</td>
<td>0.091 (0.229)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-1.329 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.385 (0.000)</td>
<td>0.501 (0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>(0.842)</td>
<td>(0.764)</td>
<td>(0.863)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 5.3273  1.8489  2.7844
P < .01  —  .05
r = -0.2988 -0.1277 -0.1322
P < .001  —  —

supportive of the strategies for maintaining integration.

As shown in table 55, significant differences exist, at the .05 level, in the responses to Factors I and III by level of pupils. Examining the mean scores, we find the parents at Freshman, Sophomore, and
### Table 55

**Analysis of Variance by Level of Students on Three Factors.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-0.219 (0.808)</td>
<td>-0.020 (0.768)</td>
<td>-0.344 (1.047)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>-0.230 (0.698)</td>
<td>0.103 (0.760)</td>
<td>0.102 (0.604)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-0.037 (0.811)</td>
<td>-0.139 (0.893)</td>
<td>0.116 (0.653)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.239 (0.961)</td>
<td>0.329 (0.955)</td>
<td>0.033 (0.806)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Attending</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-0.255 (0.708)</td>
<td>-0.102 (0.795)</td>
<td>0.071 (0.588)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Attending</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.250 (0.667)</td>
<td>-0.159 (0.710)</td>
<td>-0.025 (0.358)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Attending on Same Level</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.233 (0.000)</td>
<td>0.537 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.885 (0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>-0.088 (0.823)</td>
<td>0.034 (0.851)</td>
<td>-0.015 (0.784)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F** = 2.3128  
**P <** .05

Junior levels generally supportive of the Academy of the strategies to maintain integration. Senior parents, however, have a lower esteem for the school and are the most strongly opposed to integration. This corresponds somewhat to the negative response among older parents (tables 47 and 48), and might reflect a backlash attitude of parents who started
Table 56

Analysis of Variance by Number of Daughters Too Young to Attend on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO. OF DAUGHTERS TOO YOUNG</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>-0.124 (0.846)</td>
<td>0.028 (0.779)</td>
<td>-0.230 (0.931)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.012 (0.680)</td>
<td>0.014 (0.792)</td>
<td>0.267 (0.567)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-0.241 (0.857)</td>
<td>-0.090 (0.776)</td>
<td>0.106 (0.457)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.314 (0.498)</td>
<td>0.161 (0.871)</td>
<td>0.271 (0.403)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.095 (0.898)</td>
<td>0.104 (0.652)</td>
<td>-0.250 (0.533)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3.309 (0.000)</td>
<td>1.272 (0.000)</td>
<td>0.250 (0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.443 (0.000)</td>
<td>-1.155 (0.000)</td>
<td>0.341 (0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>(0.817) (0.783)</td>
<td>(0.009) (0.780)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 3.2513 \quad 0.9681 \quad 3.7745 \]
\[ P < 0.05 \quad 0.01 \quad 0.1804 \]
\[ r = -0.1032 \quad -0.0264 \quad 0.1804 \]
\[ P < 0.05 \]

their daughters out in a majority white school, now finding the Academy majority black. The opposite attitude appears in the next table, which compares responses of parents by number of daughters too young to attend high school.
As seen in table 56, significant differences appear in the responses to Factors I and III by number of daughters too young. Parents with one and four younger daughters have more esteem for the Academy than those with zero, two, and three. On Factor III, parents with zero and four younger girls tend to be negative toward plans for integration. Those with one, two, three, five, and seven younger daughters tend to be more positive on Factor III. The correlation, at the .05 level, indicates that the greater the number of younger daughters, the more positive the respondent is toward integration and the plans to maintain it.

To summarize tables 54, 55, and 56, older parents (of senior and alumnae daughters) tend to esteem the Academy less and be less supportive of integration strategies. Younger parents (those with fewer alumnae and more younger daughters) tend to have a higher opinion of the Academy and to be more supportive of desegregation and the plans to prevent re-segregation.

Looking at the demographic variable of income, we find no definite pattern of responses to Factor II. The respondents in the $8,000 to $12,000 and $12,000 to $16,000 income ranges tend to esteem the school more highly and evaluate the impact of integration more positively. A positive correlation was found in the Factor III responses by income.

As can be seen in table 57, significant differences exist, at the .05 level, in the responses to Factor I by income level of the respondent. The trend is for parents in the higher income brackets to have a lower es-
Table 57
Analysis of Variance by Income Brackets on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOME BRACKET</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AQL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $4,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.024 (0.000)</td>
<td>0.157 (0.000)</td>
<td>-0.660 (0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000 to $8,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-0.330 (0.821)</td>
<td>0.656 (1.683)</td>
<td>-0.208 (1.139)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$8,000 to $12,000</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.190 (0.704)</td>
<td>0.098 (0.816)</td>
<td>-0.138 (0.893)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$12,000 to $16,000</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-0.162 (0.886)</td>
<td>-0.108 (0.793)</td>
<td>-0.047 (0.855)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$16,000 to $20,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>-0.054 (0.899)</td>
<td>0.086 (0.714)</td>
<td>-0.036 (0.725)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over $20,000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-0.227 (0.789)</td>
<td>-0.040 (0.779)</td>
<td>0.189 (0.517)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>(0.832)</td>
<td>(0.036)</td>
<td>(0.852)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 2.3922
P < .05

r = -0.0920
P < .05

reem of the Academy. On Factor III, the correlation shows a clear pattern of greater support for integration and the strategies for maintaining integration, as the income of the respondent is greater. The lower the in-
come, the less support is registered for integration and the strategies for preventing resegregation.

The analysis of variance on the variable of residence location uncovered differences in Factors I and II.

Table 58
Analysis of Variance by Residence Location on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brainerd</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.307 (0.666)</td>
<td>0.470 (0.810)</td>
<td>-0.078 (0.531)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverly</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>-0.386 (0.848)</td>
<td>-0.169 (0.949)</td>
<td>-0.182 (0.923)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgan Park</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-0.107 (0.877)</td>
<td>-0.171 (0.879)</td>
<td>-0.099 (1.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.307 (0.603)</td>
<td>0.334 (0.641)</td>
<td>0.190 (0.475)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Greenwood</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.531 (0.760)</td>
<td>-0.079 (0.865)</td>
<td>0.209 (0.875)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Chicago</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0.164 (0.728)</td>
<td>0.225 (0.708)</td>
<td>0.171 (0.544)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburb</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.057 (0.719)</td>
<td>-0.395 (0.854)</td>
<td>0.124 (0.560)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F =</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4424</td>
<td>3.4768</td>
<td>1.9349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P &lt;</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As table 58 shows, significant differences are seen, at the .01 level, between responses to Factor I by residence location. Among identifiable neighborhoods, Brainerd and Washington Heights (black areas) register the highest opinion of the Academy. Beverly and Mount Greenwood (white areas) registered the lower estimation of the Academy. This analysis of Factor I by neighborhoods corresponds with our finding (table 51) that blacks generally tend to have a higher opinion of the school than whites.

Table 58 also illustrates significant differences, at the .01 level, to responses by residence location to Factor II. A higher estimate of the value of integration for their daughters is registered by parents from Brainerd and Washington Heights (black areas) and Other Chicago. A lesser evaluation of the impact of integration is registered by parents from Morgan Park, Beverly (white), Mount Greenwood (white); and a strong negative evaluation is indicated by the Suburbanites. This corresponds to our earlier finding (table 51), in which blacks tended to attach a more positive evaluation to the effects of integration than whites.

In Factor III, table 58 does not show significant differences in the pattern of responses by location. A weak trend is discernable, however, as the identifiable white neighborhoods indicate less commitment to strategies for integration than the black areas. Again, this tends to corroborate our earlier finding (table 51), that even though all parents were generally in favor of integration and the proposed strategies for preventing resegregation, blacks were more supportive than whites of this Factor.
To summarize table 58, Residence location seemed to be influential in the responses. As a general trend, respondents from identifiable black neighborhoods tend to have a higher esteem of the school, impute a higher value to the effects of integration on the pupil, and be more supportive of strategies for integration than the respondents from identifiable white neighborhoods.

To finish the series of questions on residence: no significant differences were found between any of the three Factors and Question 33, "How long have you been at your current address?" The analysis of variance on Questions 34 ("Do you own your own home?"") and 35 ("Do you rent?") showed the renters somewhat more positive toward the Academy than home owners and more supportive of integration strategies. But the numbers are so disproportional (almost 91 percent of respondents are homeowners), that the results are well nigh insignificant.

Table 59 illustrates a significant difference, at the .05 level, between Factor II and the responses to "Do you belong to a community organization?" Those who respond positively to the question regarding community involvement tend to ascribe a higher value to the impact of integration on their daughters. Those who are not involved in community affairs place less value on the effects of integration on their daughters. No significance was found in the analysis of this question on Factor I or Factor III. It would appear that people who are committed to civic or neighborhood activities value the effects of integration more.
Table 59

Analysis of Variance by Community Involvement on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INVOLVED</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
<td>-0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.841)</td>
<td>(0.814)</td>
<td>(0.931)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>-0.152</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.809)</td>
<td>(0.859)</td>
<td>(0.677)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>267</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.824)</td>
<td>(0.850)</td>
<td>(0.784)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F =</td>
<td>2.5603</td>
<td>5.4557</td>
<td>3.4119</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P &lt;</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 60 indicates, a significant difference was found, at the .01 level, between the responses to Question 37, "What are your plans for your daughter after graduation from the Academy?" and Factor II and III. Parents whose plans for their daughter include college value integration higher and are more supportive of integration and the strategies. Those who indicate Junior College, Work, or Business School are less supportive of the effects of integration and the strategies for preventing resegregation. No significant differences appeared on this question and Factor I.

Questions 38 through 42 are rank questions, in which the respondent was asked to rate the importance of Teaching Academic Subjects, Maintaining Discipline, Teaching Moral Values, Extracurriculars, and Social Interaction.
Table 60

Analysis of Variance by Future Aspirations on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPIRATIONS</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>-0.392</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.830)</td>
<td>(0.735)</td>
<td>(0.919)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.802)</td>
<td>(0.839)</td>
<td>(0.703)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>-0.203</td>
<td>-1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.274)</td>
<td>(0.771)</td>
<td>(1.187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td>-0.635</td>
<td>-0.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.944)</td>
<td>(0.628)</td>
<td>(1.082)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.814)</td>
<td>(0.975)</td>
<td>(1.098)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.830)</td>
<td>(0.846)</td>
<td>(0.788)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = \]
\[ P < \]
\[ .01 \]
\[ .01 \]

In the ranking of the various aspects of a school's effort: no significant relationship was found between any of the factors and Question 38, Teaching Academic Subjects. Significance was found, however, on Maintaining Discipline (Question 39) on Factor II and Factor III.

Table 61 shows significant correlation, at the .05 level, to the Ranking of Discipline analyzed by Factor II. The trend indicates that parents who ranked Maintaining Discipline highly, tend to be less pleased with the effect of integration on their daughters. Those who were most
Table 61

Analysis of Variance on Rank Maintaining Discipline by Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DISCIPLINE RANKED</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.127 (0.804)</td>
<td>0.049 (0.875)</td>
<td>-0.397 (1.078)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-0.056 (0.885)</td>
<td>-0.040 (0.858)</td>
<td>-0.231 (0.869)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-0.200 (0.756)</td>
<td>-0.153 (0.760)</td>
<td>0.107 (0.628)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-0.073 (0.877)</td>
<td>0.375 (0.601)</td>
<td>0.138 (0.756)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-0.050 (0.863)</td>
<td>0.320 (0.606)</td>
<td>0.290 (0.358)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>-0.073 (0.831)</td>
<td>0.013 (0.794)</td>
<td>-0.034 (0.790)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 1.1527 3.7808 5.004  
P< .01 .01 .01  
r = -.0248 0.1300 0.2545  
P< .05 .001 .001

pleased with the effect of integration on their daughters tended to rank the Maintaining of Discipline lower.

Table 61 also reveals a high correlation, significant at the .001 level, between the Ranking of Discipline and Factor III. A consistent progression is seen in the mean scores from 1 to 5. Those parents who rank discipline high tend to be less supportive of integration and the
plans to maintain it. Respondents who ranked Maintaining Discipline lower tend to be more supportive of integration and the strategies for preventing resegregation. It appears that those who value integration and are committed to maintaining it do not do so for reasons of Discipline, but rather for other reasons, for instance, academics.

No significant correlation was found between Question 40, Rank Inculcating Moral Values, with any of the three Factors. Significance was found, however, between Question 41, Rank Offering Extracurricular Activities, and all three Factors. And negative correlation was found between Question 42, Rank Social Interaction, and Factor II and Factor III.

Table 62 reveals significant differences, at the .01 level, to the Ranking of Extracurricular Offerings and all three Factors. On Factor I, the trend is for those who rank Extracurriculars lower to have a lower esteem of the Academy. On Factor II, a mixed response emerges and no clear pattern can be discerned. On Factor III, a clearer pattern can be seen: the higher the respondents rank Extracurriculars, the less they tend to support integration and strategies for preventing resegregation. This would appear to support our previous comment on table 61, that parents who value integration do so primarily for academic reasons.

Table 63 reveals significant differences, at the .001 level, in the responses to Rank Social Interaction by Factor II. Ignoring the small groups at the top, the mean scores show a discernable trend. Respondents who rank Social Interaction lowest in the school's work, tend
Table 62

Analysis of Variance by Rank Offering Extracurricular Activities on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXTRACURRICULARS RANKED</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.923</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td>-3.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.066)</td>
<td>(0.553)</td>
<td>(1.177)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.769)</td>
<td>(0.726)</td>
<td>(0.688)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>-0.263</td>
<td>-0.215</td>
<td>-0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.808)</td>
<td>(0.826)</td>
<td>(0.838)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.736)</td>
<td>(0.692)</td>
<td>(0.588)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>-0.066</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.812)</td>
<td>(0.786)</td>
<td>(0.786)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 4.8675 5.5704 6.9449
P < .01 .01 .01
r = 0.0039 0.1186 0.1975
P < .05

Table 63 also indicates a significant correlation, at the .001 level, between responses to Rank Social Interaction and Factor III. Parents who
to assess negatively the effect of integration on their daughters. Those who rank Social Interaction higher, tend to ascribe a greater value to the effect of integration.
Table 63

Analysis of Variance by Rank Social Interaction on Three Factors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK SOCIAL INTERACTION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Interaction)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.210</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
<td>(0.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.780)</td>
<td>(0.721)</td>
<td>(0.478)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>0.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.855)</td>
<td>(0.568)</td>
<td>(0.637)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.216</td>
<td>0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.746)</td>
<td>(0.688)</td>
<td>(0.622)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>-0.154</td>
<td>-0.271</td>
<td>-0.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.785)</td>
<td>(0.828)</td>
<td>(0.873)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.791)</td>
<td>(0.783)</td>
<td>(0.766)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F = 1.5470 \]

\[ P < .001 \]

\[ r = -0.0235 \]

\[ P < .001 \]

rank Social Interaction lowest are the least supportive of integration and the strategies. Respondents who grade Social Interaction higher in the order of the school's responsibility, tend to be more supportive of integration and the plans proposed to prevent resegregation.

The ambivalent responses shown in table 63 would seem again to corroborate our earlier comments, that those who value integration and
are committed to the plans for preventing resegregation, are mainly interested in the Academic benefits of desegregation.

This completes our analysis of variance of each of the demographic and ranking variables, except for Fathers' and Mothers' educational level and sex of the respondent, Question 5. As mentioned previously, the questions on the parents' education presented special problems that had to be handled in a separate program. The following charts will present the gross results of the educational data and the mean (average) educational level of the parents. A second chart will then indicate the in-

Table 64

Educational Level of Mother and Father.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOTHER</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>FATHER</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEARS OF SCHOOLING</td>
<td></td>
<td>YEARS OF SCHOOLING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(No Reply 81)*</td>
<td>(No Reply 87)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*omitted in calculation of mean

Mean educational level reported: 13.3 years

Mean educational level reported: 13.4 years
fluence of parental educational level on the three Factors, broken down by the respondent: Mother alone, Father alone, and both parents together.

As table 64 indicated, the mean educational levels of Mothers and Fathers are very close. In the factor analysis, Mothers' education correlated negatively \((r = -0.1756)\) to Factor I, at the .05 level of significance. The greater the Mothers' education, the less the respondent thought of the Academy. Mothers' education correlated highly \((r = 0.2362)\) with Factor III, at the .001 level of significance. The more highly educated Mothers supported the strategies for integration more strongly. No significance was found in Mothers' educational level in Factor II.

Fathers' education followed the same pattern in the factor analysis, correlating negatively \((r = -0.2337)\) to Factor I at the .001 level, and correlating positively \((r = 0.1309)\) to Factor III, at the .05 level of significance. As Fathers' education went up, the less the respondent thought of the Academy and the more the respondent supported integration strategies. No significance was indicated between Fathers' education and Factor II.

It would appear, from the analysis of table 64, that the parents of higher educational levels have greater expectations of the school, which the Academy is not meeting. Also it would seem that the better educated parents are desirous of preventing resegregation, so that the Academic level would not deteriorate further.

As table 65 indicates, in the Mother only field, the educational
Table 65

Correlations With Parental Educational Level Broken Down by Sex of the Respondent. (r scores).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENT EDUCATION</th>
<th>FACTOR ONE (Esteem AOL)</th>
<th>FACTOR TWO (Evaluate Integration)</th>
<th>FACTOR THREE (Support Strategies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOTHER (n = 167)</td>
<td>FE -0.30***</td>
<td>ME -0.19**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FATHER (n = 62)</td>
<td>FE -0.15</td>
<td>ME -0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTH (n = 39)</td>
<td>FE 0.01</td>
<td>ME 0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL (n = 268)</td>
<td>FE -0.23***</td>
<td>ME -0.17**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p .05
** p .01
*** p .001

level of both parents is operative, correlating negatively with Factor I and positively with Factor III. In the joint field, Mothers' education correlates positively with Factor III. No correlations are found with either parents' educational level in the Father only field. The Mother only field is the dominant sex and most closely determines the correlations in the general population, as might be expected since Mothers returned more than twice the number of surveys as Fathers alone and the joint fields combined.

**Interpretation and Conclusion**

In our reporting of the results of the Academy of Our Lady parent
survey, we first established that the 345 respondents represented a valid sampling of the total parent population. Next it was shown, in the gross replies to the major questions, that the parents indicated positive support for integration and the proposed strategies for maintaining integration.

The gross replies also revealed a high level of educational aspiration, with the majority of parents wanting a college education for their daughters, and placing heavy emphasis on Teaching Academic Subjects as the most important aspect of school. Moral Values and Discipline ranked second and third in the parents' estimation, and Extracurriculars and Social Interaction much lower.

The parents registered a high estimate of the Academy on Academics, Moral Values, and Discipline, but a lower estimate of the Academy on Extracurriculars and Social Interaction. On the other hand, parents did not express a positive assessment of the effects of integration on their children in Academics, Discipline, or Moral Values, but were more positive toward the effect of integration in Extracurriculars and Social Interaction.

In the factor analysis, we discovered three underlying factors in the attitudinal responses: Factor I, the parents' assessment of the Academy (Questions 43-47); Factor II, the evaluation of the effect of integration on the daughter (Questions 48-52); and Factor III, support for integration and the strategies to prevent resegregation (Questions 55-58).

An examination of the correlates of Factor I indicated that the
younger respondents tended to view the Academy more highly than the older parents. This was indicated by the fact that freshman parents, parents with fewer alumnae daughters, and parents with more younger daughters correlated positively with Factor I. In the Fathers' occupation variable, the Professional and Office respondents showed less satisfaction with the Academy. In the educational variable, the higher the education level of both Mother and Father, the less pleased the respondent is with the school. Race was influential in the responses to Factor I: blacks tended to evaluate the Academy higher than whites, and this finding was corroborated by the residence location variable. The black areas corresponded more positively with a high opinion of the Academy than the identifiable white neighborhoods.

An examination of the correlates of Factor II showed that again the newer parents tended to evaluate the effects of integration higher. Blacks estimated the benefits of integration higher than whites. Those involved in community organizations, and those who ranked Social Interaction higher were more pleased with integration. Those respondents who ranked Discipline higher tended to be less pleased with the effects of integration. Valuation of the effects of integration seemed to revolve around the issue of academic achievement.

An examination of the correlates of Factor III indicated that again younger parents were more supportive of integration and plans to maintain integration than older parents. The Race and Residence variables again indicated blacks as more supportive of integration and the proposed stra-
tategies than whites. In the Occupation of Mother variable, the Professional, Sales, Skilled Trade, and Civil Service categories indicated more support than the Housewives, Office, and Factory groups. The education variable revealed an opposite pattern to Factor I: the higher the educational level of both Mother and Father, the greater support was registered for the integration plans. Parents who desire a college education for their daughters were more supportive of integration strategies. Those who ranked Discipline higher tended to be less supportive of the integration strategies, while those who ranked Social Interaction higher tend to be more supportive of integration and plans for preventing re-segregation, but those who ranked Extracurriculars higher were less supportive of the strategies. Again, Academics seemed to be the most crucial issue for the parents.

In the separate examination of factor scores by sex of respondent, the relationship of factor scores and educational level showed that the "Mother only" field had the least variation from the general respondent analysis. Mother alone seemed to be more influenced by the major variables of Race, Age, Occupation, Residence, and Income level than the Father only and joint fields. Mothers' education retains significant influence, as well as Mothers' occupation, in the Mother only field, and we may conclude that the Mother was the dominant element among the respondents.

The reporting and analysis of the Academy of Our Lady survey has shown a general high regard for the school, especially among the younger, the newer, and the black parents. As the indices of social class get
higher — education and income — the lower is the opinion of the Academy. This would seem to indicate greater expectations by the parents not being met by the school.

The parents generally did not ascribe a high value to the effect of integration on their child, but again, the younger, newer, and black parents were more positive in their attitude toward the benefits of integration.

The parents responses on these first two Factors exhibit a pattern of variance that betokens a whole different clientele coming into the Academy, one that reflects the pattern of resegregation that was explained in Chapter II. Blacks, with a higher regard for integration and a greater esteem for the Academy, will be the majority race in the school in the future. Whites, with a lower estimate of the Academy and less esteem for the effects of integration, are gradually becoming disillusioned with the once prestigious — and all white — Longwood Academy.

A strong degree of support was registered by the parents for the proposed strategies — busing, recruitment, and quota policy — to prevent re-segregation. Blacks, again, are more supportive of these strategies than whites. Even on the controversial quota proposal, blacks are more in favor of the strategy than whites, in order to preserve a desegregated situation at the Academy.

The results of this parent survey (in less sophisticated form) were presented to the Archdiocese of Chicago School Board on October 2, 1972. The results of that hearing, and the analysis of the various inputs which determined the Board's decision, will provide the starting point for the next chapter.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF MAJOR FINDINGS:

IMPLICATIONS FOR POLICY DECISIONS

IN CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Policy Results

On October 2, 1972, the results of the parent survey analyzed in Chapter III were reported to the Chicago Archdiocesan School Board. Of course, the Board did not receive the results of the factor analysis and analysis of variance indicated in the Case study section of this dissertation. Under ideal conditions these techniques would have taken much longer than the three month time limit imposed. As a matter of fact, it has taken years to apply these techniques and compose the dissertation.

The Board did receive, however, a summary of the data-processed report on the gross responses of the survey questions. They had before them information on the survey results up to table 44a inclusive in Chapter III.

The policy decision of the Archdiocesan School Board was to deny the Academy an exemption from the Open Enrollment policy and to forbid the use of a quota system in the acceptance of pupils.

How was this decision arrived at by the Board? The Case Study of the Longwood parent survey indicated a substantial degree of support
for the proposal. And as we have seen in Chapter III, our major finding was that the reputation of the Academy, valuation of integration, and support for the proposed strategies were strongest among the school's new clientele: the younger parents, the incoming parents, the black parents. To what degree were these survey results influential in the Board's decision?

The answer to this question lies in an understanding of the relationship of policy making and research. The Board had mandated the survey of the Academy parents and the public opinion inquiry in order to determine whether or not the quota strategy was acceptable to the people involved. The case study was designed to find this out, and in fact the study revealed that the majority of the parents and the community did support the proposed strategies, even the quota system, for preventing resegregation at Longwood Academy.

However, a brief perusal of the minutes of the quota committee and of the Board in its October 2 session (See Appendix I), indicates that the issues on which the ultimate decision rested were not the acceptability of the strategies, but rather the feasibility of the plans working successfully, the "social justice" issue raised by the leadership of the School Sisters of Notre Dame, and the public relations problem of the School Board in the black community.

The committee, in fact, had voted 8-1 against recommending the exemption, and, as the minutes indicate, "Those opposed to it did not see
it as a viable solution."¹ Practicality was the issue.

The Chapter of the School Sisters of Notre Dame issued their statement on Social Justice shortly after the committee completed its work and Sister Arliss read it to the Board at its October meeting:

The School Sisters of Notre Dame of the DeKalb Province affirm and support the statement of the Bishops of the Catholic Church concerning the principles of Christian Social Justice.

Therefore, we declare ourselves in favor of an enrollment policy at the Academy of Our Lady placing no limits of race, creed, or residence, nor any restrictions of quota or balance upon those who apply for admission to the school.²

There are several problems raised by the statement of the Sisters. For one, the Sisters did not explain which statement of the Catholic Bishops they were referring to, nor which principles of Social Justice were operative in their decision. For another, the Sisters did not indicate precisely how the principles of Social Justice were being applied to the case at hand. Neither the parents, the Academy administrators, the committee members, nor the Board members had thought that the quota proposal per se was in violation of Christian Social Justice. Some thought the proposal inane; some thought it not feasible; but all concerned seemed to think that it was worth debating given the alternative of resegregation since resegregation did not seem to serve social justice.

¹Minutes of the Committee Meeting, (Academy of Our Lady, September 19, 1972). (See Appendix I).
The effect of the Sisters' statement on the Board meeting was stunning. When Sister Arliss sat down, Board members were anxious for the vote that would quash the Academy proposal and get on to less troublesome agenda items. Everyone in the Board room stood condemned, contaminated for even considering the evident violation of social justice. All were anxious for the meeting to be over.

One further input, however, was to be given, and that was the opinion of the counsel on the legality of the proposal:

The Board had been advised by its attorneys that while it might be legal for a private school to operate on a quota system of integration, such action might give the appearance of sanctioning a change in policy as a discriminatory reaction to the change in the neighborhood.\(^3\)

The Archdiocesan attorneys did not give just a legal opinion, but also a public relations analysis. They said, if effect, it may be legal to operate a quota system of selection of pupils, but it is very bad public relations in the community, because it would look as if the Board were hedging on its commitment to integration expressed in the Open Enrollment policy.

Once these inputs were in: the negative recommendation of the committee, the Sisters' statement, and the "legal" advice, the Board quickly took its vote. It voted unanimously to deny the Academy an exemption

\(^3\)Chicago Tribune, October 8, 1972, Metro., p. 2. (See Appendix I for full statement of counsel).
from Open Enrollment.

The lessons learned about research and policy in the Academy proposal are these: the structure of the Longwood parent survey was determined by the mandate of the Board — to ask the parents their thoughts and to test the climate of public opinion. The results of this structure were twofold: first, the Board by its mandate cast the parent survey in a political, not educational, mold; second, the research design was therefore inappropriate to address the ethical questions about the quota system raised by the Sisters, or even educational policy questions raised by some Board members, such as, how are the black and white pupils getting along? or how are they achieving?

Worse than this, the design of the survey placed the researchers and parents in the awkward position of seeming to concentrate solely on the racial balance issue; they thus were vulnerable to charges of racism.4 As it became clearer exactly which inputs would determine the decision, it also became clearer that a more appropriate study would have been to examine the likelihood of such a proposal working — feasibility — or even better, to address the study to the observable effects of desegregation in the Academy and thus argue for their preservation. Unfortunately, this could not have been done over summer vacation, and resegregation occurred so quickly at the Academy that a golden opportunity was lost to do longitudinal studies on the same pupils in different stages of racial balance.

4"School Board Votes Wisely," The New World, October 13, 1972, Section 2, p. 10. (See Appendix I).
This is all hindsight, however, which always contains more wisdom than foresight. The fact is the case study did what it did, rather well, under the circumstances. The study was operative in the final decision of the Board, but not decisive. In the last analysis it was outweighed by the issues of feasibility, moral-ethical considerations, and public relations problems.

Just a brief denouement before we go on to the next section. Precisely when the last white girl left Longwood is not known, but, as of 1976, the Academy is an all-black school. Also, as of 1976, the Chicago Public Board of Education, in an effort to comply with a State mandate to racially balance the schools, has adopted a racial quota system in Gage Park High School and Morgan Park High School.\(^5\) Racial quotas are also in effect, and apparently working, at the Disney Magnet and Robert Black Magnet Elementary Schools. Plans for the new Whitney Young High School include racial balancing by a quota system.\(^6\)

**Research and Policy**

It seems, on reflection, that the experience of the Longwood parents and the Chicago Archdiocesan School Board is not an isolated case, but that to some degree, at least, emotional and political factors provide stronger input into policy-making decisions than social science research. Miller and Ornstein state, "...while we depend on research findings to provide guidelines for complex questions, we do not have a clear picture

\(^5\)Chicago Tribune, March 17, 1976, Section 2, p. 1.
\(^6\)Chicago Tribune, May 18, 1975, Section 1, p. 43.
of the process of policy making.""7

Even in so called "pure research" itself, emotional factors can not be ignored. Young and Bress, among others, make a case that social scientists can be unconsciously swayed by their own personal ideals and goals, and their work subtly reflect not just empirical findings, but "advocacy."8

Thus, problems arise in research intended for policy making because first, we do not know in advance precisely how the findings will relate to the decision making process; and second, researchers may subconsciously skew the findings to their own biases. Also, as in the Longwood survey, research may be designed on the assumption that a certain factor (say the parents' opinion) will decide the issue, and at a later date it turns out that other factors outweighed the study's findings. As Miller and Kavanagh state:

...the use of empirical findings for the making of policy is subject to many dangers...empirical research findings do provide one alternative to understanding complex social problems, but their utilization is many times not practical because of the problem of design, sampling, and instrumentation.9

These problems of research and policy making seem to be exacerbated when racial issues are at stake, no doubt because of the high emotional

and political overtones, and especially when the issue gets into the courts. Eleanor Wolf documents a Detroit desegregation case of 1971, in which the Board was ordered to "...adopt and implement practices and policies that compensate for and avoid incorporation into the school system the effects of residential racial segregation."\(^{10}\)

In her analysis, Wolf remarks that the nature of the case dictated that all empirical testimony came from one point of view, that is, to show that housing opportunities are restricted for blacks. The Detroit Board, as defendant, took the position that the housing issue was irrelevant and thus presented no testimony. The result was that, "legal advantage, rather than sociological relevance, governed the choice of materials to be presented."\(^{11}\)

The Court, in effect, held the Detroit schools responsible for segregated housing patterns and mandated the well-nigh impossible task of "integrating" the city schools whose white population was 25 percent. Wolf concludes her analysis with the understatement, "Social science testimony is being used in these school cases, and it should be of better quality than much that was offered in the Detroit case."\(^{12}\)

Even in areas where racial problems generally are not great, school desegregation seems to bring out conflict. Robert L. Crain and his as-

\(^{11}\)Eleanor Wolf, "Social Science and the Courts, the Detroit School Case," Public Interest, Winter 1976, p. 104.
\(^{12}\)Ibid., p. 352.
sociates did case studies on eight cities in *The Politics of School Desegregation*. They discovered that in the majority of cities under study, racial issues were handled routinely and usually resolved quickly. However, school desegregation plans did cause disruptions and conflicts. Why should this be so?

Crain maintains that this happens for two reasons: (1) the relative autonomy of the School Board, and (2) the Board is a policy-making body: hence it can adopt a desegregation policy and leave it to the administrators to work out the details.

Crain's first point cannot be accepted. School Boards are either elected or appointed; in any case, they are accountable to someone, and in no case can be termed "autonomous." His second point is much stronger: the politics of school boardsmanship would seem to dictate that the board adopt a fine sounding desegregation plan — to placate civil rights groups, if for no other reason; then leave the details of the plan to the superintendent. If the plan fails, the board can blame the superintendent. In any case, Crain's point is well taken that board structure may breed irresponsibility.

We already noted in Chapter I that in two celebrated cases, political and/or ideological factors seemed to prevail over research. In the *Brown v. Board of Education* case of 1954, the Supreme Court rather blithe-

14Ibid., p. 352.
ly assumed that Kenneth Clark's report "amply supported" the claim that enforced segregation did psychological damage to black pupils. But Miller and Kavanagh point out that the study used by Clark merely surveyed psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, and social psychologists regarding the effects of segregation with or without equal facilities. "With the information given, "Miller and Kavanagh continue, "there is no direct evidence that the social scientists conducted research dealing with these two specific issues."16

As we also indicated in Chapter I, the volatile reaction and charges of racism to Daniel P. Moynihan's The Negro Family: the Case for National Action is another example of research shunted aside because its findings are politically and emotionally ill-timed. Moynihan's liberal credentials are well established by now, and even in this 1965 report he did not object to "matriarchy" in the black communities per se but only insofar as it seemed to give blacks a disadvantage compared to the rest of society: "It is clearly a disadvantage for a minority group to be operating on one principle while the great majority of the population, and the one with the most advantages to begin with, is operating on another."18

Stephen Cole has remarked that Moynihan could have organized his

18 Ibid., p. 75.
data more coherently to emphasize poverty and discrimination as intervening variables, and that one can raise serious methodological challenges to Moynihan's conclusions. But at the time, it was not these scientific questions that put The Negro Family on the back burner, but the tense racial atmosphere of the middle nineteen-sixties.

A classic case of research findings touching off a furor was the report by Arthur Jensen in 1969 on reasons for the great differences in average IQ scores between black pupils and white pupils. Jensen infers that compensatory educational programs can not close the gap in these average scores because such programs can repair or re-supply lacunae in environmental influences, but they can not affect genetic differences. "There seems to be little question," Jensen states, "that racial differences (exist) in genetically-conditioned behavioral characteristics, such as mental abilities, just as physical differences."

Whether Jensen actually meant to imply that blacks were just genetically inferior mentally that whites, is beside the point. Blacks understood him that way, and the brouhaha was on. The attacks on Jensen began immediately, and it became abundantly clear that it had been extremely impolitic of Jensen to publish such opinions. Everyone was so outraged that very few, apparently, took up Jensen's challenge on scien-

22Ibid., p. 80.
tific grounds. As Jensen himself stated:

The idea that the lower average intelligence and scholastic performance of Negroes could involve, not only environmental, but also genetic factors, has indeed been strongly denounced. But it has been neither contradicted nor discredited by evidence.23

Of course, the largest research project specifically designed to provide data for educational policy decisions is James Coleman's Equality of Educational Opportunity Report.24 Yet even though this study was commissioned by the Congress and surveyed a vast number of schools across the country, it too might have been sent to the back burner were it not for Moynihan's interest in the results, and the Harvard seminars on the report.25

The problem with Coleman's EEO Report was that it did not supply the data which a liberal congress wanted. Even when the findings were noted, not all agreed precisely what policies ought to flow from the data. One critic stated:

For a piece of large-scale research, there are big portions of data that are worthwhile and salvagable. But there is absolutely nothing in the report to support policy decisions. It's social value is zero.26

Moynihan and Mosteller, on the other hand, argued that the Coleman

23 Ibid., p. 82.
study had broken ground in new areas, and was useful, especially to point out the way for future longitudinal studies. "Public policy," Moynihan and Mosteller state, "is almost invariably based on inadequate information if for no other reason than that institutions informing day-to-day policy decisions scarcely exist, certainly not for school systems." 27

To summarize the section on research and its relationship to policy making: a great many problems exist in attempting to define specifically how research fits into the decision-making process. Emotional factors on the part of the researchers themselves, political factors in the decision makers, public pressure factors on Boards and commissions — all these are part of the process. But we do not know how and to what degree they relate to research itself.

These problems inherent in social policy making are compounded if litigation is involved, if the issue of race is involved, and particularly if desegregation of schools is involved. What sort of research design is appropriate for these situations? We do not know. As James Coleman himself stated, reflecting on the massive EEO study which he had directed, "It is equally clear...that policy research in social areas is only beginning, and that social scientists have much to learn about how to answer policy-related research questions." 28

28 Ibid., p. 167.
Catholic Schools

All of the problems regarding the relationship of research to policy decisions generally, seem to be magnified when the issue involves Catholic schools. It has already been noted, in Chapter II, that both the quantity and the quality of Catholic school research is extremely low, considering the size, the numbers, and the impact of Catholic educational institutions.

Also in Chapter II, we examined the two major studies done on Catholic schools by the National Opinion Research Center, under the direction of Andrew M. Greeley. On the basis of these studies, Father Greeley states that, "theoretical reflection in the American context on the Catholic heritage or on the American Catholic experience itself is extremely rare." 30

Greeley maintains that the great loss of pupils to the Catholic schools in the last decade, which was noted in Chapter II, is part of the penalty the Church is paying for not doing research on its schools, and thus basing policy decisions on ignorance. For instance, a popular opinion in Catholic circles is that the maintenance of Catholic schools

30 Andrew M. Greeley, "Catholicism in America: Two Hundred Years and Counting," The Critic, Summer 1976, p. 66.
31 Greeley, McCready, and McCourt, Catholic Schools in a Declining Church, p. 326.
has become too expensive, that donations have not kept up with the rising costs. But research shows that,

It is not that the people are unable to give money to the Church; they are able to and they do not want to... there is more money available for Church contributions than many had previously thought. This money would be especially available if it were made clear that it was to be spent on the parochial schools of the country...32

Another axiom of current Catholic opinion is that the decrease in the parochial school enrollments merely reflects the drop in the birth rate. But a recent study indicates that this may not be the case at all. Andrew Thompson, Che-fu-Lee, and Wilfrid H. Paradis make an important distinction between "reproduction rate" and "population growth rate":

The two population projections made in the present study predict a decline in the Catholic reproduction rate. This suggests that Catholic families will be having fewer children per family. But, because of the growth in the number of Catholics of child-bearing age, and as a consequence of previously high levels of fertility, the number of Catholic families will increase at some point. Hence, elementary age Catholic population could increase, even in the presence of a decreasing reproduction rate.33

The question then returns to the issue of research and policy making. The glib explanations offered for the nagging enrollment declines in Catholic schools do not stand up under the scrutiny of serious social science research. But to what degree will these studies be operative in determin-

32Ibid., p. 260-262.
ing the future of the Catholic schools?

On the basis of our study, we think, unfortunately, minimally. The "causes" of the problems in Catholic schools in the last decade are no doubt many and complex. The studies just cited have taken finance and population out of the realm of the "major causes." What then are the major causes? The essence of the quandary seems to lie in the decision making process itself. And, if this is the case, how can a decision be arrived at which will offer guidance to cure the situation?

The future of Catholic schools is closely tied to the future of the American Church and the hoped-for evolution of democratic and open decision making procedures within the Church. Greeley and his associates suggest that,

The first step in answering such a policy-related question, however, would be to give the laity some kind of choice in the matter.... (data) indicate that many of them would choose to keep the parish school open even at the cost of increasing their own financial burden...(data) also indicate that decisions reached and implemented at the highest bureaucratic levels, as was the case with Humanae Vitae, sometimes have pernicious and expensive effects among the faithful.34

The sharing and the clarifying of decision making power within the Church would then seem to be a priority if Catholic schools are to flourish. But such sharing and such clarification must go far beyond the so called "board movement" that has taken place within the Church since the Vatican Council ended in 1965. Although parish councils, area boards, and educa-

34Greeley, McCready, and McCourt, Catholic Schools in a Declining Church, p. 262.
tion commissions have proliferated, "American Catholicism is not structured in such a way that the attitudes of the laity are communicated upward or that periodic evaluation of institutional effectiveness can occur."35

The plain fact is that the power of the new lay boards, councils, and commissions is mostly symbolic. Although the modern Church has established and encouraged such boards, their role is a questionable one because the Church has never abrogated the 1918 Code of Canon Law or any prior Ecumenical Councils which give to the pastor alone peremptory rights over everything that goes on in the parish.

Even should the pastor and his local board be in agreement, can it be reasonably expected that their views will penetrate the upper bureaucratic levels of the Church where the big money, personnel, and resource policy decisions are made? Father Greeley states:

...there are no giants anymore. Never in the whole history of the Catholic Church in America has religious leadership so effectively and so completely isolated itself from the ordinary Catholic Laity.36

Can the Catholic school "system" survive without sensitive, open, and informed leadership? There are, no doubt, individual charismatic leaders like black pastor Father George Clements, whose prestigious Holy Angels School thrives in the midst of the ghetto, and who long ago, "quit waiting for direction, leadership, or even much financial aid from 'down-

town," and whose parish's motto is, "We got it together by ourselves."\(^{37}\)

But such parishes are exceptions, and 'downtown,' like it or not, is where the major policy decisions are made on which the future of the Catholic schools rests. There is no way of predicting the future behavior of the very human people who inhabit the Church's upper echelons. Nor is there any way of restricting the pervasive action of the Spirit of God. For the Catholic schools, unlike their secular counterparts, explicitly depend on that Spirit for their life and sustenance.

But, barring such divine intervention, and relying on recent history, the best prediction that can be made is that the future of Catholic schools is clouded by the muddled communications process by which information is gathered (or not gathered) and by which policy decisions are formulated.

As Greeley and his associates remark:

American Catholicism has traditionally refused to engage in systematic research on itself; so while theories as to the reason for the decline abound, there is no evidence to support any of them.\(^{38}\)

Summary

Chapter IV has taken us far afield. We began by describing the policy results of the case study on the Academy of Our Lady parents. It


\(^{38}\)Greeley, McCready, and McCourt, Catholic Schools in a Declining Church, p. 10.
was seen that the survey findings were outweighed, in the Archdiocesan School Board's decision, by issues of practicality, ethics, and public relations.

Our brief inquiry into the relationship of research and policy making indicated that the Longwood experience was not an isolated case. Research for policy decisions is fraught with many dangers: emotional factors, political factors, and public pressure factors. The problems are compounded if litigation is involved, if race is an issue, and particularly if desegregation of schools is contemplated. Fundamental to the problem is that the best researchers in the country are not sure which research designs are best fitted to provide data for policy making questions. We do not know enough about the process of decision making in social problem areas.

In Catholic school research and policy making, these problems are again compounded by the nature of parochial schools and their intimate link with the institutional Church itself. The reluctance of the hierarchy to underwrite research on the Catholic schools is part of a crisis of leadership and credibility within the Church that leaves the future of Catholic schools in serious jeopardy. In Catholic affairs, we know even less about the relationship of research to policy making, and this does not betoken a bright future for the parochial schools of the nation.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

This dissertation has attempted to investigate the issue of desegregation as it relates to Catholic schools. In particular, an inquiry was made into policy making decisions in Catholic urban schools which attempt to avoid the phenomenon of resegregation.

In Chapter I, the circumstances and studies were reviewed which led to the Supreme Court decision of 1954, and the assumptions about desegreated schooling that were involved in that decision. The Coleman EEO Survey, the Harvard seminars, and the works of Moynihan, Jencks, and St. John led to the conclusions that the presumed benefits of integration have not lived up to their promise, and that much work needs yet to be done if "equality of educational opportunity" is to become a social reality in America.

In Chapter II, the investigation turned to Catholic schools, where a dangerous lack of serious research was noted, particularly in the area of desegregation. The study uncovered a pattern found in the Catholic schools nationally and in the Archdiocese of Chicago: a pattern of declining enrollment, increased minority attendance, and racial isolation. The fiscal problems attendant to white flight and resegregation led to
the conclusions that desegregation does not last very long in Catholic schools and that the result is often a struggle for the school's survival. For a variety of complex reasons, the Catholic school record on maintaining desegregation is about as poor as that of the public schools.

In Chapter III, the Case study revealed that a population of Academy of Our Lady parents reflected the assumptions of the Brown case in their desire to maintain desegregation and prevent resegregation. The analysis indicated that a high level of educational aspiration and a heavy emphasis on Academics were operative in the parents' minds, and that they gave the Academy high marks on Academics, Moral Values, and Discipline. Parents, however, were not enthusiastic about the effect of integration on their children in terms of Academics, Moral Values, and Discipline.

A factor analysis uncovered three underlying factors in the parent survey responses. Factor I was the parents' general esteem for the Academy. Factor II was the evaluation of the effects of desegregation on the pupil. Factor III was support for integration and the proposed strategies for preventing resegregation.

An analysis of variance on the three factors revealed: on Factor I, as the indices of social class (education and occupation) rose, the lower esteem was registered for the school. Higher esteem for the Academy was found among the incoming parents, the younger parents, and the black parents.

On Factor II, analysis of variance showed again that the newer par-
ents, the younger parents, and the black parents expressed a higher evaluation of the effects of integrated schooling on their daughters. Those who were involved in community organizations and those who valued Social Interaction tended to be more pleased with integration. Parents who ranked Discipline higher tended to be less pleased with integration. Valuation of the effect of integration seemed to concentrate on the issue of academic excellence.

The analysis of variance on Factor III showed that greater support for the proposed strategies came from the younger and the black parents. Parents of higher educational levels and parents who desired college education for their girls tended to be supportive of the strategies for preventing resegregation. Parents who ranked Discipline high tended to support the strategies less, while those who valued Social Interaction were positive in support of the strategies to maintain integration. Again, academic achievement seemed to be the main motive of those who favored the strategies for preventing resegregation.

In the analysis by the variables of sex and education, the Mother emerged as the dominant element in the pattern of responses. The "Mother only" field reflected most closely the general response pattern to the three Factors.

In general, the factor analysis and analysis of variance led to the conclusion that a whole new clientele was emerging into the Academy. The newer, the younger, and the black parents indicated greater esteem for the
school, a greater evaluation of the effects of desegregation, and stronger support for the proposed plans — even the controversial quota strategy — for preventing resegregation at the Academy of Our Lady.

In Chapter IV the policy results of the Academy of Our Lady Case Study were reported. It was shown that the findings of the study were outweighed — at the policy making level — by issues of feasibility, moral-ethical considerations, and public relations difficulties.

It was noted that designing research for policy decisions in social areas is by no means a clear-cut task. The nation's leading researchers quite frankly admit that such research is hazardous because of the lack of insight into the process of decision making in social problem areas.

In research on Catholic schools, this problem is magnified because the institutional Church has not yet taken the proper steps to endorse serious research on itself or its agencies; nor has the Church decreed for itself effective procedures of communication, information gathering, and shared decision making.

Recommendations

The conclusions noted above do not augur a bright future for the Catholic schools of the nation. Most pointedly, they do not betoken a flourishing time ahead for Catholic schools in urban areas where racial shifts have begun or can be expected in the next few years. However, pessimism is not the intended result of this study. The Catholic school
"system" has been through crises before and has exhibited a tough resiliency. And the National Opinion Research Center studies, which were cited in Chapter II, indicate that Catholic parents still value their schools highly and are willing to make sacrifices to maintain them. Such esteem and such commitment can be translated into active support if (at least some of) the following recommendations are implemented.

**The schools:** like every researcher before us, we conclude that more research is needed. This is not because research is a self-perpetuating system, but because good research inevitably raises more questions than it answers. It is urged that the Church engage in serious and long-range processes of evaluation of its educational institutions. This will not be an easy task because teachers, administrators, and Religious are by nature more pragmatic than reflective. That is to say, these professions by temperament and preparation tend to find fulfillment in the doing of the daily task and are less comfortable in assessing the effects of their work. But unless regularized evaluation becomes a priority in Catholic schools, there will be no rational basis for planning changes and improvements, and the result will be that the programs grow stale.

**Desegregation:** studies must be undertaken on the nature and the effects of desegregation specifically in Catholic schools. It is hoped that this dissertation is part of the beginning of such a movement. However, let us not inflate its value — this study is a one-time survey in a particular school. Someone at higher bureaucratic levels in the Diocese must organize the studies to be made; otherwise the quest for "racial balance" in Catho-
lic schools will continue as it has for the past ten years — at a snail's pace. And individual schools will continue to replicate the experience of the Academy of Our Lady — desegregation, then rapid resegregation.

Realistically, this second recommendation may not find sympathetic ears among Catholic school administrators. For one thing, there is less social pressure now for integration than there was ten years ago, and even many black parishes have decided to "get it together by themselves." For another, Catholic school administrators are preoccupied currently with financial and personnel problems. Finding means to stay afloat fiscally and to stay out of the clutches of the National Labor Relations Board will be major tasks for Catholic education for some time to come.

Nonetheless, as noted in our Case Study, a substantial number of people are in favor of desegregation in the Catholic schools, and some believe that Christian Social Justice is involved in the issue. If these desires and ideals are to be achieved, Diocesan and national Catholic authorities will have to address the problem of desegregation with courage and gusto, and bring an organized approach to bear on the problem.

The Church: as noted in Chapter IV, there are authors who feel that the decision making mechanisms of the American Church are faulty and out of date. The difficulties of formulating social and educational policy are immense in any case, and particularly if the leadership of an institution is experiencing problems of credibility among its members.

Since the Catholic schools are so intimately tied to the institutional
Church, the key to their future lies in the Church's subjecting itself and its agencies to research and evaluation. This will involve setting up procedures for communication, information gathering, and open and forthright investigation into the question of how policy decisions are reached in the ecclesial community.

For some, this will be a threat. Vested interests are at stake, and decisions debated and decided in the open are much more vulnerable to criticism. But if the Church, with its spiritual tradition, its sacramental instruments of reconciliation, and its explicit reliance on the Spirit of God, can not accomplish this task, then no one can.

If such a project is undertaken by the American Church, a great deal of preliminary work will need to be done. The pioneer studies will suffer from the same limitations of the current study, that is, lack of previous studies to refer to and difficulties in gathering data. Researchers will need to experiment with alternative sampling techniques in order to design large scale studies.

Should the Church underwrite such a long term project for self-assessment of its agencies and institutions, it would not only take a significant step in its own development, it would also make an important contribution to the field of social science research and policy making in society at large.
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APPENDIX I

PERTINENT CORRESPONDENCE AND DOCUMENTS
February 22, 1971

Father James Moses  
Academy of Our Lady  
1309 West 95th Street  
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Father Moses:

The Alumnae Board has been informed that the incoming Freshmen about to be accepted will raise the Black-White ratio to 50-50.

We feel that this ratio will automatically ensure that Longwood will then become an all-black school; and that this is not what our concerned parents and alumnae (both black and white) desire.

We can understand what the economic difficulties of limiting the enrollment would be but, it is hoped, that a fixed-expense chart could be compiled and the enrollment adjusted as to the acceptable minimum. Even the Chicago Board of Education admits that 35% is the break-off point for integration — after that, the school goes completely black.

It would, we feel, be better to struggle with a small enrollment for a year while we try to build it up; than to allow the school to turn completely.

We hope that a decision of these far-reaching consequences would be discussed with the Alumnae and Advisory Boards before sending out the Freshmen acceptance letters.

Sincerely yours,

THE ALUMNAE BOARD OFFICERS

Marge Carroll  
Lyn Quinlan  
Betty Devine  
Marie Kinsella  
Flo Lorance  
Peggy Hanlon
Mr. Lawrence Klinger, Chairman  
Catholic School Board  
430 N. Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois  

Dear Larry:

Two years ago I wrote to Mr. Martin Lowery, then Chairman of the Archdiocesan School Board about my concern over the marked increase in Negro enrollment at the Academy of Our Lady High School, where John and I currently have two daughters in attendance. Copies of my letter were sent to Father Robert Clark and Cardinal Cody.

Mr. Lowery replied that this increase merely reflected the racial changeover of Southwest neighborhoods, and that nothing could be done by the School Board.

Thaddeus O'Brien replied for Father Clark, sending me a copy of School Board policy pertaining to open enrollment, and stated that the Board felt that open enrollment acted to facilitate the integration of all Archdiocesan high schools.

Those of us who chose Longwood for our daughters deliberately chose a school with a substantial degree of integration. We are now observing a situation where re-segregation is occurring, this time in the direction of an all-black school.

As you well know, there are many white parents in our neighborhood, who believe the white enrollment at Longwood is already too low, and therefore choose other schools for their daughters. Although I, myself, have been generally well pleased with Longwood, I doubt very much that I will choose this school for our next daughter coming up, unless the racial picture improves.

Some of us have gone to great efforts, physically and financially, to recruit more white students for the Academy of Our Lady. We have met with only limited success.

I think we parents deserve some help from the School Board in at least preserving the overall racial percentages we have now.

My letter to Mr. Lowery also contained a suggestion for quota enrollment, at least as a working goal, for whites and blacks in all high schools of the Archdiocese. He replied that Negroes would be
offended by such an idea. However, if the quota (goal) would be 50% white, and 50% black, and I as a white parent am not offended, why should a black parent be?

Here is my suggestion, therefore: When the overall enrollment at a particular high school begins to approach 50% black, additional Negro applicants should be directed elsewhere, to schools with a much lower black enrollment. This will partly solve the problem of which high school the white student will select, while we continue our efforts in the recruiting program.

I firmly believe it is in the best interests of ourselves, our children, the School Sisters of Notre Dame, and the Archdiocese itself, that Longwood should not be added to the list of schools which has become all-black.

I would ask you to bring this subject up for discussion and, hopefully, action, by the entire School Board. At a time when racial quotas are being openly discussed for the building trades, (St. Louis) for housing in certain communities, and for the public schools in Illinois, I believe such a discussion is entirely proper.

I shall look for your early reply.

Sincerely,

Marcella V. Meyer
(Mrs. John E. Meyer)

MVM:ms
ccs: Father Robert Clark
Brother Pius
John Cardinal Cody
Father James Moses
Brother Pius Xavier, Catholic School Office  
430 North Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Brother Pius:

By now you or Cardinal Cody — perhaps both — are receiving letters from concerned parents and alumnae of Longwood, asking that steps be taken to assure that Longwood remains an integrated school. The people concerned have had the courtesy to inform me that they are writing to you, so that I would know, if matters are referred back to me.

Actually, since our meeting of ten days ago at Loretto high school, I have been doing quite a bit of thinking on the subject of integration in Catholic high schools; also I have brought the subject up to our school Advisory Board, to seek their views and recommendations. Let me share with you my own thoughts, and the ideas of the Longwood Advisory Board. (That board, you may recall, is composed of lay and religious faculty, parent club, alumnae, and student representatives.)

My own thoughts on the subject are the result of talks with you, other school principals, and several public high school principals who have observed the pattern of racial change in schools and neighborhoods on the south side. That pattern of change seems to follow this course: as black families move into a neighborhood and white families begin to move out, the black population of the school grows and the white population decreases. Public school officials generally agree that a stable school population can be maintained if the black population increase is gradual up to about 35%. That is referred to as the "tipping point". That is, if the ingress of black students goes over 35-40% too quickly, the school is assumed to be going "all black." This signals a swift and complete evacuation of the neighborhood by white people.

Not all the sociological patterns that pertain to public schools apply necessarily to Catholic schools. For one thing, Catholic schools do not depend on a set geographical area for enrollment. So a number of Catholic boys' high schools, through extensive recruiting and busing programs, have remained integrated even though their immediate neighborhoods have changed completely.

However, this has not been the case with Catholic girls' high schools. Despite great efforts at recruiting and busing, the girls' high schools seem to have fallen in to the public school pattern. Only, one more step takes place; once the girls' school goes all black, the black people begin to look elsewhere for a school that is integrated. The results for the original school are declining enrollment, financial crises, and eventually, the threat of extinction.

There is quite an irony here: the policy of the archdiocesan schools, open enrollment, seems to achieve the objective of the arch-
diocese, integrated education, in the boys' high schools; in the girls' schools, on the other hand, the policy of open enrollment seems to militate against integrated education.

Assuming that the above is a valid analysis of the situation, then some serious thinking needs to be done about the wisdom of open enrollment in all cases. The experience of Catholic girls' high schools on the South side would seem to indicate the wisdom of some sort of "controlled enrollment."

This is undoubtedly a difficult situation. How do you have open enrollment in some schools, but not in others? Besides that, the archdiocese adopted open enrollment as the best means to achieve integrated education. If it were now to adopt a different — indeed, opposite — policy, how does the archdiocese convince people it has not abandoned its objective of integration? The PR aspects of the problem are too enormous to be discounted.

With all this in mind, let me now relate the ideas of our school Advisory Board. I introduced the subject to our Board members, explaining my views as indicated above. I also indicated that Longwood is now at the crossroads, a 40% black student population; and that preliminary indications are that the incoming freshman class will be at least 50% black; if we follow our usual criteria of accepting all girls who score at the 40th percentile or above on the entrance test.

The Longwood Advisory Board expressed a unanimous desire that the school remain an integrated school. This wish is based on the conviction that integrated education has some values not found in all white or all black schools. The Board discussed various ways that this might be preserved: an expansion of our already large recruiting program, busing, imposing a quota system of the school population totally, seeking the cooperation of other schools in giving large numbers of referrals. While not endorsing any one of these means, the Board did not reject any of them either. The substance of the Board's recommendation to me is: explore various means of preserving Longwood as an integrated school. Seek the help of other schools and the archdiocese.

The reason for the cautious note in the Board's recommendation is that they are aware of the possible negative reactions in the public at large, and particularly in the black community. They do not want any embarrassment to come to the archdiocese because of our situation, but they very definitely want Longwood kept integrated.

Our Board members are aware that the archdiocesan school policies will soon be under review. Perhaps new policies will soon be under review. Perhaps new policies or ways of maintaining integration will be approved. In the meantime, we wish to express our gratitude for the interest and understanding you have shown our school. Any assistance you can give us is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Father James C. Moses, M.S.C. Principal
Office of the Chairman

January 5, 1972

Mrs. John E. Meyer
9822 S. Longwood Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60643

Dear Marcella:

Your letter of December 20, 1971 was discussed in open session by the Archdiocese of Chicago School Board at its recent meeting on Monday, January 3, 1972.

Following discussion of this subject, I was instructed by the members of the Board to respond to you that at this time, we are not in favor of establishing racial quotas for our secondary schools. It was interesting that some of the strongest comment against establishment of such quotas, came from two of the members of our Board who are black and both of whom have children in the Archdiocesan Secondary School system.

Our present Admissions Policy No. 5110 is as follows:

"Every Catholic child whether his parents are Catholic or not, has a right to attend his parish school. Neither race, national origin nor the ability of the family to pay tuition are to prevent a child from being accepted in the school. The Archdiocese of Chicago School Board is firmly committed to high quality integrated education. Integration remains a priority objective of the schools in order to prepare children to live, work and develop in a nation and world which are multi-racial. Furthermore, since the parochial schools of the Archdiocese are an integral part of the larger society of metropolitan Chicago and since de facto segregation weakens the fabric of society, the parochial schools will make their proper contribution toward eliminating a dual system of schools based on racial differences."
The Superintendent's office, over the past several years, has been providing considerable assistance to the Academy of Our Lady from several standpoints, one of which was working with pastors and principals in the community which could supply AOL with students. I do not feel that we are in any position to force people to send their children to any school -- the only way this could be accomplished would be to create geographic districts for all of our high schools, a situation which would not be possible and which is not practical, inasmuch as virtually all of the schools are owned by their religious orders and are, therefore, not the real property of the Archdiocese of Chicago.

I appreciate your concern and the amount of time and effort which you and many others have devoted to this situation for a considerable number of years. Outside of the assistance which is being provided by the Superintendent's office as described above, I do not feel that there is anything more which can be done by the Board especially in the area of establishing racial quotas.

Sincerely,

(Signed Larry Klinger)

Lawrence E. Klinger

cc: His Eminence, John Cardinal Cody
Reverend H. Robert Clark
Mr. Lawrence Klinger, Chairman
Catholic School Board
430 N. Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Larry:


I must admit I was sorely disappointed that the school board apparently is unwilling or unable to be more helpful to us parents who would want Longwood to remain an integrated school.

You quoted Catholic School Admissions Policy to the effect that "integration remains a priority objective of the schools". It seems to me that the other side of that coin is an effort by all concerned to prevent resegregation once integration has occurred.

I am sorry that some of the school board members were so opposed to the idea of quota enrollment. Certainly this idea was offered as the lesser of two evils (i.e. to prevent resegregation) rather than as a goal in itself. We have numerous black parents at Longwood who would also like to keep the school integrated. Furthermore, if such a broad goal was adopted, even informally, I myself, as a white parent, might not be able to get my daughter into a school like Mother McAuley or Queen of Peace. Quota enrollment is not entirely satisfactory from any viewpoint, therefore.

It is a matter of considerable interest to me that two of my children in Sutherland public elementary school, in an all-white neighborhood have black teachers this year, mainly because of a directive from federal government to the Chicago Public School Board, specifying that the faculty of each school may not be more that 75% of any one race. About six years ago I wrote to the Superintendent of Catholic Schools in Chicago suggesting that an effort be made to integrate the faculties of all Catholic schools, rather than face the much more difficult "busing" task. Father Clark replied that since there were so few Negro teachers, and they preferred to work near their homes, this idea was quite impractical.

By now, you probably know what the ratio of black/white girls was at Longwood on testing day.
Because the future of Longwood is so important to the stability of the neighborhood where you and I live, I hope that you and the Board will make every effort to help us.

Very truly yours,

Marcella V. Meyer
(Mrs. John E. Meyer)

c.c.
His Eminence John Cardinal Cody
Rev. H. Robert Clark
Brother Pius
Father James Moses
January 24, 1972

Mr. Lawrence E. Klinger
Chairman
Archdiocese of Chicago School Board
430 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Mr. Klinger:

As:

1. an alumna of the Academy of Our Lady, Class of 1943
2. As the mother of a 1971 graduate of the Academy of Our Lady
3. As the mother of a member of the class of 1976 of the Academy of Our Lady
4. As the mother of two potential graduates, 1980 and 1987, of the Academy of Our Lady,

and inasmuch as we are not a unique family in this area, we feel that the times and circumstances indicate immediate consideration of a racial quota system at the Academy of Our Lady.

This quota equity must be considered NOW if the Academy of Our Lady is going to remain in existence, since this is basically a problem of economics.

We should appreciate your views on this matter.

Sincerely,

Mrs. William A. Boyd
(Patricia Kelly, '42)

10324 Longwood Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60643
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Lawrence Klinger
President, Archdiocesan School Board
430 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

We, the Ridge Ministerial Fellowship, an ecumenical association of 40 religious congregations of the Beverly Hills-Morgan Park area, strongly support the idea and goal of integrated education. We feel the Academy of Our Lady is a significant institution in our community because it has achieved integration, and we definitely support the efforts of the Academy of Our Lady Parent's Club (as reported in the June 6th edition of the Chicago Tribune) to maintain a racial balance in their integrated school.

Sincerely,

(Signed Jonathan Brown)

Rabbi Jonathan Brown, Pres.
Office of the Chairman

Reverend Walter Wilczek, C,R.
President
Archdiocesan Secondary School Principals Association
Gordon Technical High School
3635 N. California Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60618

Dear Reverend Father:

I appreciated the opportunity to meet with you, Father Moses and Brother Pius last Friday and discuss the proposal which had been presented at our June 5, 1972 meeting by the Parents Club from the Academy of Our Lady.

I am also happy that you will chair a Committee consisting of representatives from the Archdiocesan Secondary School Principals Association, the Academy of Our Lady and the Archdiocesan Board, to study this situation and report back to us with a recommendation at our meeting on October 2, 1972.

I feel that the work of your Committee will need to address itself, at least, to the following four points:

1. The reaction of parents as a group at the Academy of Our Lady to the proposal which was presented to us at our June 5 meeting -- as indicated, Father Moses will handle this subject.

2. Reaction of representatives from the Archdiocesan Secondary School Principals Association to our Board granting the Academy of Our Lady an exception to our current Policy on integration allowing them to establish a racial quota.
3. Legal implications which could develop from allowing the Academy of Our Lady to have a racial quota -- Brother Pius has already contacted Kirkland and Ellis and they will submit an opinion on this subject.

4. What are the long term possibilities of the Academy of Our Lady remaining an integrated school? -- by long term, I am really referring only to the next five years. In investigating this subject, I would presume you would want to discuss the matter with at least principals and pastors from schools who either are or could be sending eighth grade graduates to the Academy of Our Lady in the next five-year period.

I have asked Reverend Mark Dennehy from our Board to serve as the Board representative on your Committee. Father Dennehy, as you know, has just returned from an extensive visit in South Africa and indicated to me that he will give me an answer on possible service on this Committee within a week.

If you have any further questions, please feel free to call upon me or other members of the Board.

Sincerely,

(Signed Lawrence E. Klinger)

Lawrence E. Klinger

cc: Reverend H. Robert Clark
    Reverend James Moses, M.S.C.
    Brother Pius Xavier, F.M.S.
    Mr. John Lydon
July 10, 1972

Brother Pius
Chicago School Board
430 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Re: Institution of Quota System

Dear Brother Pius:

This is in response to your request for our opinion concerning the legality of the proposed institution of a racial quota system by the Academy Of Our Lady School. The following are the facts as I understand them:

In approximately 1967 the Catholic School Board determined that the enrollment in its schools was predominantly white. In order to amend this situation, the School Board adopted an open enrollment policy. Under this policy anyone who applied for admission to a Chicago area Catholic School was admitted regardless of race or church affiliation. Since the adoption of this policy the percentage of blacks and other minority groups in the Chicago area Catholic Schools has substantially increased to the point that there is now approximately a one-to-one ratio of black to white students. This increase in the number of black students has corresponded with an increase in the number of black families in the neighborhood about the Academy Of Our Lady Parish. The school officials at the Academy Of Our Lady are concerned that a continued increase in the number of black pupils will drive out of the school children of white families in the area. Accordingly, the school officials have applied to the Catholic School Board for permission to drop the open enrollment policy. In its place they would institute a quota system. Under the quota system the school would attempt to maintain an approximately equal ratio of black and white students.
We have reviewed the United States and Illinois Constitutions as well as the applicable case law in this area. As a result of our research, we are convinced that a public school would have a great deal of difficulty establishing a racial quota; although a reasonable argument can be made that such a quota would be appropriate where the purpose is to prevent an integrated school from becoming a segregated school.

With respect to private schools, however, there is nothing in either of the Constitutions or in the cases to indicate that it would be unlawful to establish the proposed quota system. Accordingly, it can be stated that, based on the present status of the case law, the imposition of such a racial quota would be lawful.

I recognize that you have asked me to provide you with a legal opinion and have not sought my counsel with regard to public relations matters. Nevertheless, I feel I should take the liberty of expressing to you my views concerning this latter aspect. Should the Catholic School Board decide that its open enrollment policy has been successful in producing appropriate integration in those schools where integration is feasible, it would be understandable and acceptable, in my view, for the School Board to then establish a one-for-one quota, system-wide, in order to prevent already integrated schools from becoming all black schools. This could be construed as an extremely worthwhile change on a system-wide basis. However, should the School Board permit one school to adopt such a quota system, where that school is located in a neighborhood that is changing from white to black, it may well give the appearance that the School Board is sanctioning such a change in policy as a discriminatory reaction to the change in the neighborhood. Permitting such a change on a school-by-school basis would appear to be fraught with public relations problems whereas such a change on a system-wide basis might well be regarded as commendable.

If you have further questions please call.

Sincerely,

Joseph B. Wollenberger (Signed)

Joseph B. Wollenberger

JBW:mr
FATHERS' CLUB
1309 West 95th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60613

July 27, 1972

Rev. James C. Moses
Academy of Our Lady
1309 West 95th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60643

Dear Father Moses:

The Executive Committee of the Fathers' Club is aware of your recent appeal to the Catholic School Board to consider the racial balance of the Student Body at the Academy.

The Committee would like to see a reasonable balance maintained. If this is done, the students, both black and white, will have an opportunity to study together, eat together, socialize together, complain together, sing together, pray together, and perform together all the other activities that belong to the High School years.

In our segregated City very few young people have this opportunity. Certainly the members of this Committee did not have such an opportunity at the High School level.

For the girls at Longwood this may be their only chance to get to know persons of a different race as individuals.

The Committee supports your position in this matter and wishes you every success.

Sincerely,

(Signed Thomas Lyons)

Thomas Lyons
President
Father James Moses  
Academy of Our Lady  
(Longwood High School)  
1309 West 95th Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60643

Dear Father Moses:

The AOL Alumnae Board has been informed that the incoming freshman class will raise the black-white ratio in the school to 50-50.

We feel that this ratio will endanger Longwood's policy of integration, and may ensure its becoming an all-black school. This is not what our concerned parents and alumnae (both black and white) desire.

We can understand the economic difficulties of limiting enrollment but, it is hoped, that a fixed-expense chart could be compiled and the enrollment adjusted as to the acceptable minimum. Even the Chicago Board of Education admits that 35 per cent is the break-off point for integration -- after that, the student population becomes entirely black.

With an integrated population, Longwood has an opportunity to present its students with an exercise in human relations unavailable to students in schools of all-white or all-black populations. We believe that the Catholic School Board should be urged to assist in every way possible to permit Longwood to continue presenting this opportunity, and perhaps to devise a plan whereby other schools in the area would be permitted the same opportunity. The faculties of Longwood and these other schools should receive some special training in teaching in an integrated situation, too, so that the sensitivities of the groups involved should not be offended, and so that the educational opportunities inherent in an integrated situation are enhanced.

The Alumnae Board offers its services to Longwood now as it has in the past. But we believe that groups such as ours cannot do the entire job in promoting integrated education for AOL. We believe it is time for the officials who devise and administer policy on an archdiocesan basis to accept their share of responsibility in helping Longwood's faculty to achieve the broadest possible educational experience for the girls entrusted to its care.

Sincerely,

Signed Marge Carroll  
AOL Alumnae Board  
Marge Carroll, President
August 14, 1972

Mr. Lawrence E. Klinger  
Chairman, Archdiocese of Chicago School Board  
430 N. Michigan Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60611

Dear Mr. Klinger:

The Beverly Area Planning Association is most interested in a decision the Catholic School Board will be making soon. We have been informed that you are considering steps to be taken to preserve Longwood Academy as an integrated school.

We are convinced that maintaining racial balance at Longwood is of the utmost importance to the stability of the Beverly community. Therefore, we urge the Catholic School Board to take positive action to assure that Longwood does not become an all-black school. And, all other means failing, we would urge that a racial quota system be imposed on the enrollment procedure at Longwood.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Yours sincerely,

(Signed G. Phillip Dolan)

G. Phillip Dolan  
Executive Director, B.A.P.A.

GPD/ak
Dear Father Moses,

The Mother's Club strongly supports your request to the Archdiocese School Board to designate The Academy of Our Lady as a Model School.

We desire this because we want to maintain and upgrade the quality education which has always been ours, in addition, we recognize we have a realistic environment that would be conducive for a model school.

Our ultimate goal would be to prepare each girl who comes to us for the complex world she must face.

We feel that a model school can be accomplished if we have the following:

1. A strong academic program

2. Innovative procedures in education to challenge the most academic student as well as being flexible enough to adapt to the slower student

3. Long range programs to give security to students as they move through the four (4) years of study

4. Extended bus service to students who live at a distance and want to take advantage of the offerings of A.O.L.

5. A serious attempt to maintain a well integrated student body and faculty

6. Maintain a stable administration and faculty

CONTINUED............
7. Recruiting of families who have left the community and found their new schools of less quality than A.O.L. and who would want their children to finish here.

We also know this community is one which has people who want to work for the betterment of the school, the community, and above all, has a Christian Spirit regarding the total situation.

The request in this letter and the possible means of attaining it came for The Mother's Club Board members which represent more than nine hundred (900) people in addition to the hundreds of neighborhood families.

We are waiting for and anticipating a positive reply from you and The Archdiocese School Board.

Sincerely,

Signed Rita Scheurich

Mrs. Gregory Scheurich,
A.O.L. Mother's Club
President

Signed Mae N. Hunter

Mrs. Henderson Hunter
Correspondance Secretary
Fr. Jim Moses presented to the committee a series of typewritten reports concerning

A. The original proposal for a racial quota system at Longwood.

B. A series of recommendations based on the meetings and remarks of previous meetings and his cluster meetings.

C. A report on his meetings with the parish clusters.

D. Proposal as to how we may proceed concerning the problem at The Academy of Our Lady.

These reports are included in the minutes of this meeting.

Sr. Alice, Chairman of Council 13, reported that her Council would be in favor of the quota if it provided for the acceptance of students across the board, bright through slow.

Sr. Eleanor researched the previous week's discussions with individuals who had been in charge of changing schools and reported their reaction. They were very pessimistic about the possible success of the proposed quota system. Their overall conclusion was that parents will not send girls into the area, and this seems to be the same pattern in all parts of the Archdiocese where the change had been taking place.

Br. Pius again raised the question concerning faculty conviction that the school would close if it went all black, despite the evidence that black schools do and can exist. His impression was that people were against the quota system because it was a quota of exclusion rather than in-
clusion and hence a negative quota.

In the discussion that followed, the opinion was ventured that it would be very difficult to say whether the school would close or continue as a black school if the quota did not succeed. The point here is important. It seems that the religious community would have to have some assurance that the quota system would work. The opinion was that if the quota system did not work, it could destroy the school. Hence, it might be preferable for the sisters to allow the school to become an all black school and to remain in existence.

In response to the black communities' acceptance of the quota system, we refer to the response of the parish clusters as submitted by Fr. Jim Moses and the response of Council 13 as presented to us by Sr. Alice. To test the general assumption of the quota system, it was suggested that we survey the white elementary schools now to see if they know just about how many girls would be coming to the Academy for the following school year. The proposal was to ask Council 25 to support a survey of this kind so that we would be better able to assess the thinking of the girls and their parents on the elementary level in the white areas concerning their reaction to traveling to the Academy of Our Lady. Fr. Mark Dennehy was pessimistic about the parents sending their children through the black area, and postulated the principle that the wider the black belt, the more reticent the parents are to send their children through that belt to get to the school.

We have no idea what the effect would be on the white parents if we said
no to a quota system. Presently there are quite a few requests by blacks for enrollment at the Academy, but the Academy is holding the line on admissions until this issue is settled. It was felt generally that if the quota dooms you to a low number of enrollees, it is almost impossible to pull yourself out of the problem of a dwindling enrollment unless you can do something to re-do the image of the school. It was the consensus that this does not seem to be a likely possibility. The schools' sisters of Notre Dame are worried about the move and the public relations that are involved. They are most interested in what this Board will recommend and are looking to present these recommendations to their Provincial Chapter.

Br. Pius did stress the fact that it is necessary to do something in this matter. Presently, looking to Council 25 for further input seems to be logical course of action. We are still awaiting the survey information gathered by Fr. Jim Moses and consequently can afford to delay an extra week because of the importance of this matter.

The problem of bussing was also discussed at length. Some boys' schools today are surviving because of their bussing procedures. It seems that the girls schools do not fare quite as well. Experience shows that Mercy tried the bussing program for three years but did not succeed. If a bussing program is to be instituted at the Academy, how extensive of a bussing program should it be? There is presently a partial bussing program in conjunction with Mount Carmel and Leo High Schools.

Granting the bussing program and its success, we should also consider
the possibility of the Academy turning into a black school. Hence, the question must be brought up as to whether we have room for two "Unity" schools. This must be considered, given the high level of the black community and the poor condition of the public high schools. It was agreed that if we talk in terms of an integrated school, we must talk more than just black and white students. This constitutes another complex problem for the school.

It was generally agreed after today's discussion that it would be profitable for us to ask the elementary school principals of Council 25 to cooperate with a simple and yet direct survey which would assess the thinking of the girls in the white elementary schools. This might be a better indicator of the potential of a quota system than the express preference of the survey of the students presently at the Academy of Our Lady. Because of the fact that any solution we may arrive at can be so complex as to threaten the existence of the Academy, we should proceed with extreme caution and assure ourselves that we have received as much information as possible to make a valid recommendation to the School Sisters of Notre Dame and to the Archdiocese of Chicago School Board. As a result of this meeting, it was decided that the survey should be given to the schools of Council 25. Br. Pius will supervise the mechanics of the survey. This group then will reconvene on Tuesday, September 26 to discuss the information that we hope to have compiled by that time.
Fr. Jim Moses presented his report on the results of the parents survey at Longwood Academy and the results of the survey taken from the Council of the elementary schools and Council 25. The tabulated results are attached to these minutes.

There were 700 survey inquiries sent to the parents of students at the Academy of Our Lady and of these we received 351 responses. The respondents in the Longwood survey wanted the Academy to remain an integrated school, would be in favor of a quota system, a bussing program, and extensive recruitment to achieve this end.

The survey of the schools in Council 25 is also attached to these minutes. The respondents to question 3: "Would you be willing to send your daughter to the Academy of Our Lady via private bus service?" were high for St. Walter and St. Cajetan, they were down for St. Barnabas and Christ The King. From the results of the survey even an optimistic estimate would indicate another drop in white enrollment and hence a drop in all enrollment if the quota system were employed. Generally, this would be most detrimental to the survival of the Academy of Our Lady.

After a long discussion, the committee had voted 8 to 1 against recommending the quota system.
Fr. Jim Moses voted in favor of the quota system in order to have his vote express the parental preference as revealed in the Longwood survey. Other opinions expressed in the discussion were reflected in these news quotations:

1. In favor of a quota only if this is applied uniformly to the entire Archdiocese .... it is not workable in only one school.

2. All for integrated education, but doubtful about quota system as the means to achieve it.

3. Would like to know the position of the School Sisters of Notre Dame .... it's their school.

Generally, those opposed to the quota did not see it as a viable solution to either the short or long range problems at the Academy. Intense recruiting with a well-planned bussing program were partible alternatives in that the alternatives would allow the sisters more realistic flexibility in working in the community in which the school is located, should they choose to do so. If anyone of the committee would like to think through the details of the problem and make a further statement, they may submit it in writing or call Brother Pius' secretary and dictate the statement to her. It will then be included in the report to the School Board.
To: Committee of Archdiocesan Secondary School Principal's Association

From: Father James Moses

REPORT

Talk to local parish clusters re Longwood's request to Catholic School Board on integration/quotas.

On September 19, two local parish clusters heard a presentation by Father James Moses, explaining the background and current status of Longwood's request before the Catholic School Board regarding integration and quota system.

The Beverly - Mount Greenwood - Evergreen Park Cluster heard the presentation at 4:00 p.m. Present were priests and Sisters from the following parishes: Christ the King, St. Barnabas, Little Flower, St. Ethelreda, St. Cajetan, St. Walter, Holy Redeemer, Queen of Martyrs, St. Bernadette, St. Denis, St. Thomas More and St. John Fisher.

After the presentation a few questions were asked to clarify Longwood's request. A great deal of discussion was not possible since the group was in formal session and had a large agenda to face.

Father Don Cahill, cluster chairman, presented a letter of support for Longwood's request and passed it around for signing by any members of the cluster who wished to endorse it. The letter was addressed to the School Board Chairman, Mr. Klinger.

The 6th Senatorial District Cluster of parishes heard the presentation at 5:00 p.m. Present were priests from St. Margaret of Scotland, St. Kilian, St. Sabina, St. Leo and St. Thaddeus, including Father Thomas Raftery, Senator from the district.

This was a short presentation, and informal discussion continued through social hour, dinner and beyond. This cluster is composed of predominantly black parishes. The priests were sympathetic to Longwood's position but hesitant to endorse any imposed "quota" system.

One priest stated that a quota system was certain to be interpreted as a racist move in the black community. Another suggested that Longwood drop its request before the Board. Others urged that a greater good might be accomplished for society by preserving integration, even though the method of preserving it was hard to swallow.

To sum up: no one in this cluster was enchanted by the notion of quota. Some thought it was worth trying as better than re-segregation. No motion was made to communicate to the Board. Individuals might do so on their own.
Of great concern to all present were the practical aspects of putting across a quota system, should the Board allow it. To say it shortly: Should we encourage our 8th grade girls to take the test at the Academy, or not?

Submitted by
James Moses

PROPOSAL

October 2, 1972

Report of Committee on Academy of Our Lady High School to the Archdiocesan School Board of Chicago.

Members of the Committee:

Brother Pius Xavier
Reverend Walter Wilczek
Reverend Mark Dennehy
Reverend James Moses

Statement of the question

In its June 5, 1972 meeting, the Board heard a request from the parents of Longwood students, that the Board take steps to preserve Longwood as an integrated school. To achieve this goal, an exemption was requested from the Board's policy of Open Enrollment, so that Longwood might impose a 50-50 black-white quota system on its enrollment procedure.

The Board appointed the above-named Committee to study the Longwood situation and submit a recommendation for decision by the Board in this (October 2) session.

The Board Chairman's instructions to the Committee indicated four areas of investigation - the desire of Academy Parents regarding the issue; the reaction of the Archdiocesan Secondary School Principals Association; legal implications of a quota system; the opinion of the pastors and principals of schools which are sending girls to Longwood, or might be in the next five years. This report is divided into four sections indicated.
RECOMMENDATION

The Committee recommends that The Academy of Our Lady be given an exemption from the diocesan open enrollment policy in the registration of freshman students for the fall semester, 1973; that Longwood be permitted to use a racial quota system of 50% white, 50% black in the admitting of new students.

In making this recommendation, the Committee in no way implies that racial quotas are the ideal way of integrating Catholic high schools in the Archdiocese. We make the recommendation on the possibility that a quota system might work to maintain integration in one school, the Academy of Our Lady.

The Committee calls upon the Board:

(1) To observe carefully the effects of a quota system on Longwood Academy this year;

(2) In the spring and summer of 1973, appoint another ad hoc committee to evaluate those effects, with the purpose of extending Longwood's exemption for another year, or terminating it.

(3) To address itself to the whole question of racial integration in Catholic High Schools, including a review of the effectiveness of the open enrollment policy and an exploration of other means that might be adopted.

(4) To call upon the Catholic Secondary School Principals Association to participate in the project described in #3.

Of particular concern to the Committee is the placing in Catholic High Schools of girls who might not be able to enter the Academy of Our Lady because of the quota system.

The Committee, requests the Associate Superintendent's office to design and supervise a system of referral and acceptance for these girls in a way that is fair and equitable to the Academy and neighboring girls schools that might be affected.
Given a racial quota system at Longwood, how are girls to be accepted or directed to other schools?

Possible ways:

(1) Assuming more of one race apply for Longwood; place the names of all in the larger group in a hat, pull out names until the number is equal to the other group, direct the remainder to other schools.

(2) Again assuming that one race outnumbers the other in applicants for Longwood:

Accept and refer across the board of percentile ranks on a quota system: for example, of the race with the larger number, only enough to equal the smaller group are taken, 25% from the 75th percentile up, 50% from the 25th to the 75th percentile, and 25% from the 1st to 25th percentile. The remainder are directed to other schools.

(3) Other variations of the above perhaps with adjusted percentile figures. E.G., there may not be enough girls in the larger racial group above the 75th, so that none would be directed elsewhere. This would seem to be unfair to other schools involved and other percentile ranks would have to be adopted for the divisions.
REPORT TO: The Archdiocese of Chicago School Board

FROM: Rev. Walter M. Wilczek, C.R.,
Chairman of the Special Committee to Study the Request
For a Quota System made by the Academy of Our Lady

DATE: October 2, 1972

On June 5, 1972, the Parents Club from The Academy of Our Lady, presented a request to the Archdiocese of Chicago School Board requesting an exception to the policy of open enrollment. They petitioned that The Academy of Our Lady be able to install a quota system for 1973-74 school year. The matter had to be taken up at this early date because of recruitment and admissions in January of 1973. This problem was referred to the Archdiocese of Chicago High School Principals Association by Mr. Larry Klinger.

On June 26, 1972, Mr. Larry Klinger, Fr. Walter Wilczek, President of The High School Principals Association; Br. Bius Xavier, Associate Superintendent for The Archdiocese of Chicago, and Fr. James Moses, representing The Academy of Our Lady, met to discuss this matter. At that time it was decided that they, together with Fr. Mark Dennehy, representing The Archdiocese of Chicago School Board, would formulate the committee to investigate the problem and report to The Board for its October 2, 1972 meeting. It was the expectation that this committee would have a positive recommendation for The Board to follow.

In order to assess the reaction of the parents, at the Academy of Our Lady, to the proposal which was presented at the meeting, Fr. Jim Moses would conduct a survey of the parents. This he did and a copy of the results of that survey is attached to these minutes. It was further decided that a legal opinion concerning the implications of a quota system at The Academy of Our Lady would be procured. Br. Pius Xavier contacted
Kirkland and Ellis to submit an opinion on this subject. Their correspondence is also included in this report.

It was also the desire of the committee to get a wide range of expertise and input into the deliberations of this problem. To help with this we had correspondence from Fr. John M. Bond, Superintendent of Schools of The Diocese of Charleston, South Carolina, who has an extensive background in the problem of school integration. A copy of Fr. Bond's analysis is attached to this report. We also asked various Principals serving in the Archdiocese of Chicago to help in the consultations.

Those who had devoted their time and energy to this project were:

Sr. Eleanor, Trinity High School  
Sr. Pauline, The Academy of Our Lady  
Fr. John Gavin, presently Principal of Mendel High School  
Fr. Edward LaMorte, immediate past Principal of Mendel High School  
Sr. Mary Brian, Principal of the McAuley High School  
Sr. Mary Helen of Queen of Peace  
Br. N. B. Hueller, Brother Rice High School  
Sr. Alice Foley  
Fr. Mark Dennedy  
Fr. Jim Moses  
Br. Pius  
Fr. Walter Wilczek

These individuals met three times - once on Tuesday, September 12, September 19 and September 26, 1972. It was pointed out to the group that they should try to involve themselves in the problem of The Academy of Our Lady as if they themselves were Principal of that particular school.

The problem facing the Academy of Our Lady was outlined as everyone's problem and the importance for an insightful recommendation by this group was absolutely necessary. The only way that this would be possible is through a total involvement on the part of each individual in the deliberations. The Chairman of the committee feels that the participants did enter into the deliberations with a personally concerned frame of mind.
The committee looked over all of the material presented including the correspondence presented by Fr. Moses from the interested community surrounding The Academy of Our Lady, and minutes of his meeting with parish clusters, Fr. Bond's insights, and the surveys taken of the parents of the girls of the Academy and of the elementary schools which are considered feeder schools to the Academy.

The thinking of the Principals is reflected in the minutes of their meetings. These minutes are attached to this report. At the last meeting on Tuesday, September 26, 1972, the group felt that it had enough input by way of surveys, opinions and the reflections of individuals who have gone through changing schools, to vote 8 to 1 against recommending the quota system to The School Board.

Generally, the group felt that integrated education is a good to be sought. It also felt that it is necessary to create an awareness among the people of the good of an integrated education. However, it was not convinced that the quota system is the way to achieve this end. It was felt that heavy recruitment and bussing, where necessary, should be the means employed to achieve an integrated student body. The consequences of that reflection mean that schools who are going black would recruit heavily in white areas to encourage white students to continue to come to that school in order to maintain a rational balance. It will also mean that schools that are overwhelmingly white also make the black community feel welcome at their schools. This would probably necessitate the schools to take steps to assure the black community that they are, indeed, welcome. The group also felt that it did not believe that integrated education consisted solely in the presence of white and black
students at the school. It consisted of a total program of teachers, programs of studies for the school population as it evolves from year to year. The underlying principle would be to meet needs of the current student body.

It was also felt that the School Sisters of Notre Dame should adopt a community posture in this matter. Recognizing the Financial difficulties that they are facing at The Academy of Our Lady at the present time, realizing the possible consequences of a quota system, and examining the alternatives that are available to them in this area of the Archdiocese, the School Sisters of Notre Dame should examine their situation in the light of their apostolic commitment to secondary education, Community resources, and financial viability. The group felt that its recommendation and the action of the Archdiocese of Chicago School Board would be meaningless without the complete support and understanding of the School Sisters of Notre Dame. It realizes, moreover, that their decision is uniquely theirs.

The one vote in favor of the quota system was cast by Fr. Jim Moses in order to express the parental preferences as revealed in the Longwood survey. It is significant to note that the parents of the girls presently in school are in favor of a quota system. However, it was felt that their fears for the disruption of the racial balance that exists in the school at the present time can be allayed with an intensified recruiting and a possible bussing program. Hopefully, such a program would assure all of an integrated school community, work to an integrated educational program, and maintain the racial balance desired.
The School Sisters of Notre Dame of the DeKalb Province affirm and support the statement of the Bishops of the Catholic Church concerning the principles of Christian Social Justice.

Therefore, we declare ourselves in favor of an enrollment policy at the Academy of Our Lady placing no limits of race, creed, or residence, nor any restrictions of quota or balance upon those who apply for admission to the school.

(Signed Sister James Marie, S.S.N.D.)
Provincial Leader

(Signed Sister Arliss Sheeley, S.S.N.D.)
Councilor for the Apostolate

(Signed Sister Mary Margred Ulmer, S.S.N.D.)
Councilor for Personal Development

September 27, 1972
The Board then received a report from Rev. Walter M. Wilczek, Chairman of the Special Committee to Study the Request for a Quota System Made by the Academy of Our Lady High School. This committee consisted of representatives from the Archdiocesan Secondary School Principals Association, the School Board and the School Board staff. Father Wilczek indicated in his report that by a vote of 8-1 this Committee is against recommending a quota system to the Archdiocesan School Board for the Academy of Our Lady. The School Sisters of Notre Dame, who own the school, also indicated that they were in favor of an open enrollment policy at the Academy.

Upon motion made, duly seconded and unanimously carried, the Board accepted this report and the recommendation of the Special Committee. The Chairman indicated to the parents and community representatives present at this meeting the Board's concern for the total subject and informed them that he would appoint a Committee whose objective will be to search for creative ways for achieving integration in our schools.
Mr. Lawrence Klinger
Catholic School Board
Archdiocese of Chicago
430 North Michigan Avenue
Chicago, Illinois

Dear Larry,

Since I initially brought up the subject of racial balance at the Academy of Our Lady in correspondence with the School Board three years ago, I would like to thank you and the other board members for hearing us parents, and also to make a few observations about the meeting on October 2.

In my opinion, it is unfortunate that there were restrictions on the dialogue with the parents beyond the allotted ten minutes; otherwise it might have come to light that the probable reason for the decline in the number of black students was not "internal problems" within the school, as Mr. Lowery tried to suggest, but rather that there are relatively fewer black families who can afford the increasing tuition costs.

Secondly, while offering the services of a School Board Committee to help us white parents recruit white students for Longwood, it would also seem reasonable for your Board to appoint a committee to assist black parents, and school administrators, to recruit black students for those high schools which have a low black enrollment.

Finally, no one could disagree with the statement of principle of the School Sisters of Notre Dame regarding service to all, regardless of race; however, when the alternative is closing the school and serving no one, as appears to be likely in the near future from the enrollment figures, it does seem that some policy change is only good common sense, especially in view of the supporting sentiment of the majority of parents, black and white.

Very truly yours,

Marcella V. Meyer (Mrs. John E.)

cc: Rev. H. Robert Clark, Brother Pius,
Catholic School Board, Chicago, Illinois
Father James Moses, Sister Pauline, S.S.N.D.
Academy of Our Lady, Chicago, Illinois
Sister James Marie, S.S.N.D., Sister M. Arliss, S.S.N.D.
DeKalb, Illinois
The Archdiocesan School Board wisely voted against any kind of racial quota system being imposed at the Academy of Our Lady, Longwood, on the Southwest Side of Chicago.

The suggestion had been made to the board last June, the board referred the matter to a special committee of the High School Principals Association, and the committee in turn rejected the proposal.

Despite all the anxieties over declining enrollment at Longwood, which now finds itself located in an all black community, and despite the good will of the parents' association, which wants to maintain a stabilized, integrated education program at Longwood, a racial quota system is not the long term solution to the problem, if indeed it is even a short term solution. The simple fact is that the quota, as proposed, was aimed at excluding black students from the school, in an effort to recruit more white students.

Granted the problems of racial change now confronting the Beverly community, schools cannot be used as mechanisms to stabilize neighborhoods, because our youth are involved, and they should not be used as tools in social change.

An exception to the open enrollment policy of the Archdiocese cannot be made. If a quota system is to be imposed on one school, it must be extended to all schools in the Archdiocese, and maybe it should be so considered.

Until that time, the Academy of Our Lady will have to deal with its own problem through more aggressive recruitment and busing, and, as several board members pointed out, get its own internal house in order as to a better balance of white and black on the faculty and to insure that the problems of black students are being dealt with at Longwood. A racial balance between black and white students in itself will not guarantee meaningful integration.

EDITOR:

This is to comment on your editorial, "School Board Votes Wisely," in your October 13 issue. These comments come from one who has been closely associated with the Academy of Our Lady for the past few years, who followed the quota proposal from the beginning, and who, as a member of the School Board subcommittee which studied the question, cast the lone vote in favor of the quota system.

Actually, I had no intention of making a public statement on this issue. The board has made its decision and we must abide by it; and, as things turned out, the leadership of the School Sisters of Notre Dame was not in favor of the notion of quota. I see no point in resurrecting the issue — yet your editorial makes certain implications which cannot go unanswered.

First, and most important of all, the quota system was not, as you state, "aimed at excluding black students from the school, in an effort to recruit more white students."

THE THEORY behind the quota proposal was this: if a school in a changing neighborhood can guarantee its constituency a stable racial balance for a number of years, then perhaps more white parents would send their children to the school, on a 50-50 basis more black students could be accepted; and enrollment would go up generally.

Two objectives would be achieved: racial balance and increased enrollment. (As a kind of side bonus, the stabilized school population might help stabilize the neighborhood.)

This theory may be described as untried and unproved. There are certainly some great risks involved; for example, the risk of becoming an exclusion quota as you describe, and the financial risk if the system limited enrollment instead of building it up.

THE THEORY remains unproved now since by board decree it may not be tried. We don't know if the system would have worked, or if the possible risks would have become realities. Be that as it may, the proponents of the quota system were not racists trying to exclude black students from the school.

Tenuous though the quota theory may seem you must surely see the contradictions in your own position. While telling us that a racial balance of students "will not guarantee meaningful integration," you urge
us to get a "better balance of white and black on the faculty."

One might argue for or against racial balance as a good thing in a school. There are various opinions on the matter. But if you see the concept as a value, and if you urge such a balance on the faculty, how can you condemn an effort to maintain such balance among the student body?

ALSO, YOU state that "an exception to the open enrollment policy of the Archdiocese cannot be made"; yet you feature in the same issue of The New World an article about a Catholic high school in Chicago whose admission policy "processes students through an admissions grid which gives a percentage of students to each parish," with the result that the school's student body is 33% black, 25% Spanish, and 40% white. Please, who is kidding whom?

Assuredly, I have no desire to pick a fight with the people who run the school referred to above. I have no argument with them or their admissions policies.

I do take issue with your double standard. Because we at Longwood are striving to maintain racial balance, your editorial tells us to get our "internal house in order...to insure that the problems of the black students are being dealt with at Longwood."

LET US assume that high school students have problems: some because they are black, some because they are white, most because they are teenagers growing up, all because they are human.

Your editorial implies something further, namely that black students at our school have special problems that other students do not have, and that the school is not dealing with them. You offer that accusation without a shred of evidence to support it.

The community of Longwood, students, teachers, parents, and alumnae — black and white — deeply resent that unfounded accusation. On their behalf, may I request that you publish this categorical denial of it. May we request, too, that should you in the future ever editorialize about our school again, you take the time and effort to find out the real facts of the situation. Perhaps that way you will save yourselves from falling victim to statements that are so totally ignorant and uninformed they border on the libelous.

FR. JAMES MOSES
Principal,
Academy of Our Lady

Chicago
APPENDIX II

LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE TO LONGWOOD PARENTS

ACADEMY OF OUR LADY
1309 West 95th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60643

July 24, 1972

To: Parents of Longwood Students

From: Father James Moses

Re: Integrated Education

Dear Parents:

On June 5 a group of parents of Longwood students appeared before the Archdiocesan School Board asking the Board to take steps to preserve Longwood as an integrated school. You might have read about this meeting in one of the daily newspapers on June 6. This letter proposes to inform you of the background and motivation for the appearance, and the results of it.

Sociological background: the school in the past few years has experienced a decline in enrollment generally, but an increase in black student population. This has resulted from the great change in the neighborhoods immediately around the school.

The AOL graduating class of 1972 was composed of roughly 62 percent white girls and 37 percent black. The class entering Longwood in the fall of 1972 will be composed of roughly 58 percent black students and 42 percent white. The total school population is projected like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motivation: the AOL parents who went to speak before the Board were concerned that, if the enrollment pattern continues as it has in the past few years, Longwood will soon become an all-black school. Their request was that the School Board take steps to make sure Longwood remains integrated. The Board agreed to name an ad hoc commission to study the situation.

The point at issue is whether we, the students, teachers, parents, and alumnae of Longwood, value the experience of integrated education for our girls. If we do prefer to keep an integrated school, then we probably will have to impose a quota system or some other control on our enrollment process.

The Archdiocesan School Board will make a decision in its October 2 meeting on what steps Longwood should take to preserve its integrated character. Prior to that meeting, a special committee will study the situation and make recommendations to the Board. That committee is composed of:

Father Walter Wilczek, Principal of Gordon High School and President of the Catholic Secondary Schools Principals' Association: Father Wilczek, as chairman of the committee, may appoint other members of the Principals' Association to serve on the committee;

Father Mark Dennehy, of the Archdiocesan School Board;

Brother Pius Xavier, Associate Superintendent of Catholic High Schools;

Father James Moses, representing Longwood.

My function on this committee is to present as accurately as I possibly can the opinions and desire of the people of Longwood regarding integrated education and steps needed to preserve it. In order to help me to do this quickly and fairly, will you please fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me. Don't fill out the questionnaire hastily or carelessly — give it some thought. Just do it soon!

We hope to begin tabulating your responses on or about August 7. Your prompt cooperation will be appreciated.

May I add, too, that I shall be glad to hear from any of you over the phone or in person. Since I am currently taking a morning class at Loyola, the best time to reach me at the school office is between 1:00 p.m. and 4:00 p.m. Let me add also that you should feel free, if you wish, to express your views to the other members of the committee, but, by all means, fill out and return the questionnaire.

Finally, let me emphasize the anonymous character of the questionnaire.
Questions about your family's financial status, for instance, are not being asked to determine whether to raise tuition. This information is asked solely to help determine whether the responses we get back on the survey come from a truly representative portion of our parent population.

Thanks for your cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Father James C. Moses
QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Person answering survey: (Put an X in the appropriate box.)

☐ Student
☐ Mother
☐ Father
☐ Alumna
☐ Both Mother and Alumna
☐ AOL Faculty Member
☐ Both Faculty Member and Alumna

2. Age: (Answer for both Father and Mother.)

Father: ☐ Under 35 ☐ 36-44 ☐ 45-55 ☐ Over 56
Mother: ☐ Under 35 ☐ 36-44 ☐ 45-55 ☐ Over 56

3. Occupation: (Answer for both Father and Mother.)

Father: ☐ Professional ☐ Office ☐ Factory ☐ Skilled Trade
Mother: ☐ Professional ☐ Office ☐ Factory ☐ Skilled Trade
3. Occupation Cont'd.

**Father:**

- [ ] Sales
- [ ] Civil Service
- [ ] Housewife
- [ ] Other

**Mother:**

- [ ] Sales
- [ ] Civil Service
- [ ] Housewife
- [ ] Other

Please use the following space to explain your occupation if the above categories do not apply to you:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

4. Race:

- [ ] Black
- [ ] White
- [ ] Other (10)

5. Children:

- Number of Sons
  - [ ] (11)
- Number of Daughters
  - [ ] (12)
- Number of Daughters Who Previously Attended Longwood
  - [ ] (13)
- Daughters Currently Attending Longwood
  - [ ] (14)

**Present ('72-'73) Level of Daughters at Longwood:**

- [ ] Senior
- [ ] Junior
- [ ] Sophomore
- [ ] Freshman (15)

**Number of Daughters Too Young to Attend Longwood**

- [ ] (16)
6. Income: (of family)

☐ Less Than $4,000.00 per year
☐ $4,000.00 — $8,000.00 per year
☐ $8,100.00 — $12,000.00 per year
☐ $12,100.00 — $16,000.00 per year
☐ $16,100.00 — $20,000.00 per year
☐ More than $20,000.00 per year

7. Educational Background: (Please answer for both Father and Mother)

Father:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years Elementary School</th>
<th>Did You Graduate?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mother:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years Elementary School</th>
<th>Did You Graduate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Residence
8. Residence Cont'd.

(Please specify Chicago location according to the map in the 1972 telephone directory.)

☐ Brainerd
☐ Beverly
☐ Morgan Park
☐ Washington Heights
☐ Mount Greenwood
☐ Other (Chicago)
☐ Suburb

Number of Years at Your Present Address:

☐ Less than 1
☐ 1 Year
☐ 2 - 4 Years
☐ 5 - 10 Years
☐ More than 10 Years

Do You Own Your Own Home?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Do You Rent?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Do You Belong to a Community Organization, for example, a Block Club, Brainerd Community Organization, Beverly Area Planning Association, and the like?

☐ Yes ☐ No

9. Education:
9. Education Cont'd.

What Plans Do You Have For Your Daughter Upon Graduation From Longwood? (37)

☐ Junior College
☐ College
☐ Work
☐ Business School
☐ Other: Specify:__________________________

Please rank the following aspects of the school's effort in the order of importance as you see them (Write in 1 for the most important, 2 for the next, 3 for the third, etc., so that each is marked.)

☐ Teaching Academic Subjects (38)
☐ Maintaining Discipline (39)
☐ Inculcating Moral Values (40)
☐ Offering Extra-curricular Activities (41)
☐ Promoting Social Interaction (42)

In terms of the above, how would you rate Longwood, compared to other high schools in the metropolitan area? (Please circle the appropriate number in each category.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Academic Subjects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining Discipline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inculcating Moral Values</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Education Cont'd.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offering Extra-Curricular Activities</th>
<th>Much Poorer Than Other Schools</th>
<th>Poorer Than Other Schools</th>
<th>As Good As Other Schools</th>
<th>Better Than Other Schools</th>
<th>Much Better Than Other Schools</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(46)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promoting Social Interaction</th>
<th>Much Poorer Than Other Schools</th>
<th>Poorer Than Other Schools</th>
<th>As Good As Other Schools</th>
<th>Better Than Other Schools</th>
<th>Much Better Than Other Schools</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think that attending a racially integrated school has benefitted your daughter in terms of:

- **Academic Achievement**
  - Yes
  - No

- **Family Discipline**
  - Yes
  - No

- **Moral Values**
  - Yes
  - No

- **Social Interaction**
  - Yes
  - No

- **Widening of Interests**
  - Yes
  - No

Did your beliefs about integrated education influence your decision to send your daughter to Longwood?

- Yes
- No

What do you consider the ideal racial composition of a school?

- 20 percent Black, 80 percent White
- 30 percent Black, 70 percent White
- 40 percent Black, 60 percent White
- 50 percent Black, 50 percent White
- Other. Specify: ________________________________
Do you want Longwood to remain an integrated school?  

☐ Yes  ☐ No  

To maintain an integrated school, would you approve of Longwood's:  

Adopting a busing program?  

☐ Yes  ☐ No  

Applying a quota system to the enrollment procedure (i.e., accepting one white student for each black student accepted, and vice versa)?  

☐ Yes  ☐ No  

Recruiting extensively?  

☐ Yes  ☐ No  

☐ Other. Specify: ____________________________  

________________________________________________________________________  

________________________________________________________________________  

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this survey. Please use the enclosed envelopeto return the questionnaire to the school.
**APPENDIX III**

**COMMENTS ON PARENT SURVEY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTIONNAIRE</th>
<th>QUESTION #</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>#59</td>
<td>&quot;I never cared for busing of any kind, but to survive, Longwood must remain integrated!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>#51</td>
<td>&quot;Because mos of the girls stick to own race&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>#54</td>
<td>&quot;Any as long as it is integrated and Academic Standards are not lowered to keep school enrollment up.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>#56</td>
<td>&quot;Yes, only if children wish to leave their neighborhoods, to attend Longwood.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>#49-52</td>
<td>&quot;Has not effected her one way or another.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>#43 pf</td>
<td>&quot;We are losing ground Maintaining Discipline. From what I gather both Faculty (Nuns) and Lay Teachers are afraid to lay down the law to the colored students. When I went to Longwood, the teachers word was law. You didn't talk back to a teacher. We need a firmer hand with our students.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>#8</td>
<td>&quot;General Foreman, Machine Shop and Assembly Dept.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>#8</td>
<td>&quot;Truck Driver&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>#8</td>
<td>&quot;Father deceased&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>#43-47</td>
<td>&quot;Have been extremely disappointed in the lack of discipline in the past few years — manner of dress — language — I realize this is universal and would rather have my daughter at Longwood than a public school.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>#56</td>
<td>&quot;to bring white girls into Longwood&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>#57</td>
<td>&quot;But not 1 to 1. I do not think it possible to keep enrollment on a 50-50 basis.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>#59</td>
<td>&quot;It is important not to show favoritism to the colored girls they should be treated alike — I have seen this happen before and white people paying tuition resent it...&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"She has never been to an integrated school before."

"My daughter is just beginning her freshman year at Longwood. I do not know about any of the high schools in the area. Consequently I cannot answer upper section on page 6."

"I insist on pay as you go tuition payments."

"Encourage" ("Offering" crossed out)

"Depends on her intentions and aptitude"

"She will be a freshman so no opinion yet"

"Mother: I wok in Securities at Northern Trust"  
"Father Been at Western Electric for 18 years"

"This is what I am looking for for my daughter"

"I do not have any ideas but what ever it will take for the school to stay integrated."

"Father: Traveling Auditor for Continental Bank"

"Englewood (I believe)"

"Daughter's first year at Longwood so we would be unable to answer this question."

"Prefer 40 percent Black, but no more than 50 percent Black."

"For now"  "Freshman"

"Mother woks part time: currently enrolled in college on full time basis."

"I feel an ideal composition of a school should be an equal percentage of Blacks, Whites, and Other (Indians, Chinese, Mexican, etc.) races."

"Deceased."

"Do not know as yet."

"Have McCauley, Mother of Sorrows, and Longwood as a District."
"Foreman (Commonwealth Edison)" "Secretary."

"Mother does Market Research on phone and person to person basis."

"Quigley 5"

"Art Institute School of Fashion Design."

"Our daughter will be a Freshman. We have a large family, and if we didn't think Longwood was superior academically to other high schools we wouldn't be sending her there. We couldn't afford to provide her with the education at Longwood, if she wasn't going to benefit greatly from the experience."

"We hope all this will be true."

"Kathleen is just starting Longwood. Your academic reputation and accessibility and even the smaller size (or lower enrollment) were important factors."

"Academic achievement and compatibility of the students are more important that 'ideal' racial numbers. However, at the present (in time) it is a social fact of life that if whites are not in the majority and academic achievement and discipline drop, segregation in reverse is the result."

"Longwood Manor."

"at present"

"Divorced"

"Deceased"

"If this means meeting and getting along with all kinds of people."

"I find this tenuous and unable to assess"

"Who knows?"

"Both daughters chose Longwood. Not my decision."
"Take measures to insure physical well-being of all students — increase security."

"On a volunteer basis!"

"Surg. Tech II (Operating Room)"

"I am a packer at the National Biscuit Company."

"?"

"Hopefully"

"My daughter is an incoming freshman. I do not feel qualified to rate Longwood to compare it to other high schools."

"On the basis of her grade school education."

"Well not very much."

"Other: a school community where students are respected as human beings, where they are taught to respect each other, and where the staff will honestly attempt to rid themselves of the prejudices they have learned."

"a busing exchange program with a school where there is a majority of non-black students.

"Euclid Park Improvement Association"

"To Father James Moses. We could not give an honest opinion in comparing Longwood with other High Schools in the Metropolitan Area because our daughter will be attending Longwood her first semester this fall. Sincerely, (signed by parents.)"

"Other 33 1/3 for all races"

"(Const) Laborer"

"I don't know — depends on her interests and capabilities in school"

"Quota should be 3 or 4 white to 1 black. 1 to 1 quota will not work — look across the south
side — the archdiocese should take a hand and strongly support extensive recruiting. If it's not done this year, if the ratio is not made 3 or 4 to 1, the school will become all black in 1974 except for the Senior class. (Comment: this lady was prophetic. J.M.) Please don't let this happen. Longwood at one time was the top south side girls school academically. Don't close another Catholic school to white pupils."

059 #8 "Father - accountant"

059 #59 "To maintain the quality education and values that has made Longwood, it has to be kept predominantly white."

060 #9 "Part time office work"

062 #37 "Work or college - it's up to them."

062 #59 "As long as it can't be all white, a 50/50 would be fine — not 80/20 in favor of black"

064 #55-59 "To answer the above I would have to know the Board's definition of integration. Likewise for all succeeding questions."

066 #8 "Office Machine Sales and Service (Used)"

067 #9 "Group Chief Operator - Telephone Company"

069 #48-52 "Enrolled for Sept '72. Unable to answer."

070 #37 "She is free to pursue her own plans for the future."

070 #43 "I cannot answer this question because, as indicated, this is my first daughter to attend longwood."

070 #48 ff "Same as above"

070 #59 "Signed by parent (father)"

071 #8 "Retired"

071 #53 "Also being a member of the Catholic Church."

071 #58 "Longwood's record speaks for itself. Recruiting is not necessary."
"I have no knowledge as my child is a freshman."

"Each child which takes public transportation to school, in the broad sense is being bused now."

"We as black people have found if whites are not in the majority they do not remain. If the equal quota was set up the whites would leave and down would go the academic level and the school. Personally, I could not care what race comprises the student body as long as the academic level is held high to insure my children and all children a quality education."

"Roseland"

"Father: teaching is the role of the school. Moral Values and Extracurriculars are the parents' roles."

"Longwood seems to offer good academic subjects along with an atmosphere where the student can grow and realize her potential"

"Not applicable"

"Ideally, the racial composition of a school should consist of the racial breakdown in the state of Illinois."

"10% Black 10% Irish 10% German 10% Polish 10% Italian etc."

"End load operator"

"unknown"

"Daughter's choice against my better judgement"

"Prefer all white"

"For white only!"

"Postal inspection"

"Enrollment should be on a first come first served basis without regard to races."
"Deceased"

"???

"Lawyer - CPA"

"?"

"Father Contractor - Mother Teacher"

"I cannot answer because my daughter is a transfer student."

"Director of Program involved with minority economic development."

"Historically schools have had to maintain a much larger percentage of white to black in order to sustain an integrated situation. Realistically there is no ideal racial composition of a school."

"Self-employed"

"Oak Lawn"

"still attending"

"Unable to honestly answer, but base on what I've heard and seen."

"will"

"If that's the only way to keep it integrated."

"Nursing school"

"Since my daughter is an incoming freshman I do not feel qualified to answer the next two questions."

"I think the diocese should assume the responsibility of keeping Longwood an integrated girls' high school."

"None - for daughter to decide when the time comes."

"Too soon to judge"
"None"

"I have no comment on these questions."

"No comment"

"She is on her own"

"I don't think the other three are important."

"All is will say is that Longwood use to be a good school. You let the blacks in now live with them."

"I took her out because of it."

"No blacks at all I go only by past and present."

"I don't care"

"Mgr Advertising Whse"

"(1) Have lower standards and it's increasingly evident. (2) Discipline is fair in school but outside of building its obviously nil. (3) Fair"

"Deceased"

"Medical School"

"In my mind there is no ideal racial composition. As the question stands, why did you not offer as an ideal: 80% black, 20% white, 60% black, 40% white, 70% black, 30% white"

"does not matter"

"not interested"

"what about faculty"

"If inculcating moral values is important to Longwood, I would like to see more select recruiting of both black and white students."

"70% white 30% black"

"extensively"
"She plans to go into pre-Med. I'd like for her to get the best of the school. I am with the school. She is not to disobey the rules."

"?"

"It's a shame color should be an issue"

"Since the school is becoming overcrowded, why not 1 black, 1 white, 1 others"

"all white"

"I am the only support of my children — my tuition is more than my mortgage or food! I believe something should be done for mothers thru mothers club regarding paid up tuition if something happens to us — as the fathers club does."

"partially"

"I believe that A.O.L.'s business courses should be stressed — and her old fashion virtues which other schools do not have"

"Maintenance Lady"

"No opinion"

"No frame of reference"

"100% White"

"I don't think Longwood should be maintained any longer as an integrated school"

"Private all white exclusive boarding school, taking in only socially and academically well off girls from the area (Bev. Morgan Park)."

"& classes"

"V.P. Steel Heat Treating Co."

"25% black 75% white"

"Special Policeman"

"Father black Mother other"
"Nursing School/Medical School"

"This always assumes the minority of excellent education."

"40% black, 40% white, 20% others"

"all of the above systems would be helpful"

"banker"

"not necessarily"

"School bus driver"

"It has made them both less liberal-minded, more prejudiced, less open to integration as such. We think it good for them if only for the social education they receive."

"As an added comment: Our girls attended Longwood with open minds and hearts. Due to contact with blacks on a closer basis in school they have formed their own opinions and I feel that tho their father and I would like to see them in an integrated school, they would prefer not to, based on their past experience. This is especially true of the girl who has just graduated as she watched the downgrading of many of the school's values with regard to morals and discipline from her first year to her last. She went into Longwood with a strong feeling for her faith and an open mind. She came out no longer a practising Catholic and with a feeling of equality for those who can hold the upper hand by threats and violence."

"I received this form on August 10, 1972"

"Masters in Social Work"

"Masters in Social Work"

"All my daughters decided on attendance at Longwood themselves."

"It's difficult for me to specify a percentage. Actually I think the percentage is an indifferent matter. The important aspect to the students is that all factions receive a hearing
and fair treatment. Father Moses has done well in this area. There are a few teachers, however, either thru fear or inadequacy have been either partial to blacks, or have been unable to maintain discipline in a primarily black room. The only reason I would withdraw our girls from Longwood is if the standards of education or behavior were lowered. I see no reason why this should happen to accomodate any ethnic group, be it white, black, or yellow. The education I received at Longwood not only gave me a good academic foundation, but also instilled in me a regard and respect both for myself and others, regardless for their station in life, their race or religion. If in order to achieve integration, such standards were minimized, then and then only, would I believe my girls could no longer profit from the inter-racial experience at Longwood."

"In general, I do not favor the quota system. However, in a situation such as this, it is obvious that, unless something is done along these lines, Longwood would lose, rather soon, the advantage it now has in being an integrated school, where members of all races can have an opportunity to know and learn from each other."

"We consider these all three to be of equal importance"

"We have no other children in high school, so we have no comparison"

"equal to the racial composition of Chicago."

"What do you mean by a busing program?"

"After attending Longwood for one year, our daughter has developed prejudices that she did not have before, because of the leeway of preferential treatment given blacks over whites in matter of discipline by the teaching staff of Longwood. If other girls have had similar experience, this might possibly account for the present problem of racial proportion."

"Father deceased"

"According to the church I don't see how you
could ask a prejudice question, or are you prejudice?"

137  #59  "Your questions all answer themselves saying your going on a 50%-50% basis. That means you are going to accept a percentage of children from each gramer school - thus maintaining your quota."

139  #24  "1 year Law"

139  #59  "Must have only 20 to 25% black enrollment or no school!"

140  #54  "I wonder if this question was ever considered when A.O.L. was 99 44/100 white?"

140  #56  "Ironic, but interesting"

140  #57  "Why not the old 10 percent?"

140  #58  "Who?"

140  #59  "Do you really believe that white students can be recruited? It is not my intention to make the task facing the special committee more difficult than it is. But your whole approach seems to blame the lack of student enrollment on the rising black enrollment. On the surface of the thing it would seem that the enrollment would be up, but of course we know that the white parents are no longer interested in the well being of A.O.L. It is this pulling out by the white students that give the new balance to the black minority." (Signed by father and address given.)

141  #57  "1 black to 2 white - "

141  #59  "Recruit more white so as not to loose it altogether to a totally black system!"

143  #37  "?"

145  #54  "We should forget about color."

148  #9  "Mother - Elementary School Teacher"

149  #48-52  "Does not start until September 1972. Have no opinion as yet."
"nursing"
"South Shore"
"Daughter is incoming freshman. Unable to answer"
"Keep it white. The only reason I am sending her, is that Morgan Park has more niggers"
"Teacher"
"Father: Owner and President. Mother: Secretary and Customer Liaison"
"No opinion"
"Teaching our daughter is our prime interest. Black vs. White does not and should not be an issue. Both my husband and I attended (so-called) integrated schools all our lives and feel very upset because the issue should be a problem. We are disappointed this survey is necessary" (signed by parent)
"Ticket agent"
"It really doesn't matter as long as the teaching is up to standard. I'm more interested in subjects, morals and discipline than the racial composition of the school. If the discipline and standards remain the same the school won't make a turn from mixed to all black."
"Father - Real Estate Broker. Mother - Student about to graduate from college and subsequently teach."
"My daughters have not yet begun. We'll see."
"If the racial balance is tipped any further toward Black Majority I will transfer my daughters. I feel that the classroom environment and potential are automatically lowered to include the majority and the whole achievement rate is lowered for all. I have seen it happen before."
"Roseland Area"

"D.D.S. for Father, Office Manager for Mother"

_/graduated. /would be a junior if she returned. /would be a freshman but will not be attending Longwood."

"Prefer all white but in today's society feel that educational background (elementary) should determine acceptance of students of all races and that school requirements should be upheld so students work to reach those heights - and not to have the school eliminate courses because "not enough girls want them" and to substitute courses that would get girls through four years of college - I believe standards (academic) have been greatly reduced along with discipline since I was a student at A.O.L. and since my oldest daughter attended and graduated from A.O.L.

"Since my second and third daughters will not return to the Academy in September, I don't believe I have a right to answer the above questions."

"Insufficient opportunity to observe and judge."

"Maintain high standards which will appear attractive to retreating white applicants"

"Recruit at nearby white parochial schools. To keep the school from becoming another Mercy Hi."

"If standards are set for accepting the bussed children, i.e., not just any pupil for race sake."

"She has not yet attended a racially integrated school."

"Our daughter made the decision to attend Longwood herself. Integration was not an important factor, since there are other integrated schools available in the community."

"We think the archdiocese should adopt a quota system throughout the archdiocese (city and suburbs) in all schools (grammar and High Schools)
We believe any attempts at integration on a school by school basis is doomed to failure in the parochial schools just as it has failed in the public schools and in neighborhood composition. We have tried unsuccessfully to get the archdiocese to come to grips with this problem for the past 10 years. I hope you have better luck. Sincerely yours" (signed by parents)

169 "previously 11 years in Maple park"

169 "Yes and No. I am more concerned with Academic Value and Moral Values."

170 "Nursery School Teacher"

172 "Rosemoor"

173 "Freshman"

173 "Freshman"

175 "Custodial"

175 "Bellevue-Roseland"

177 "Get support from Archdiocese in maintaining integration."

179 "Example our training and teaching at home has been of such. School has not changed either way."

179 "Selection of (%) only because it seem this is the only way our children get equal Education teaching and with higher white. No, less black, this keep the level of teaching up. Integration matters less to me when speaking of Education. Equal academic standard of teaching in ever school is the importants and not a racial percentage."

179 "integration is good for social aspects. If a school maintains its standars and teaching level, it doesn't matter one way or another."

180 "Corporation President"
"But over 10 years in neighborhood"

"1 to Nursing School"

"stationary engineer"

"Clerial office"

"Benefits both races"

"Question out of context"

"Its been found that the one checked is the only one that works reasonably well, because when it becomes half & half, white people have a tendency to run."

"It should remain so!"

"It's fine as long as whoever is being bused pays for it and not me..

"Would accept any system that would maintain a 60-40 balance. Absolutely necessary!"

"Father bus driver"

"At 50% Black - 50% White this school will gradually go all black - and Longwood will be no more."

"100% white or 100% black in their respective schools in their respective neighborhoods."

"Don't care"

"The white students are in the minority and are not allowed an opinion. So why bother."

"My daughter has spent only one semester so I have not had a chance to analyze these aspects of the school."

"Father is Director of Miles Square Health Center, St. Likes Pres Hosp. Mother is teacher for eight years at St. Prendans."
"Michelle wants to go next year."

"Our daughter wants to go to Med. School."

"We don't believe you need busing to achieve integration because students are bused in."

"Field Representative Ill. State Fair Employment Practices Commission"

"Chatham"

"Due to my 3 heart attacks, our income will amount to about $6,000 per year. I will no longer be able to work."

"For who, whites or blacks?"

"Ground maintainence on Aircraft fueling & oiling"

(signed by parents)

"Security Univ. of Chicago"

"Beauty Culture"

"Roseland"

"If the recruiting is applied to black students as well as to white students. We believe that Longwood should attempt to remain integrated because black children will not go into a black society, but must enter and face whites as well as blacks. Also I question whether or not Longwood would maintain its academic standards if the school was to become all black."

"Don't understand what you mean by busing."

"1. Improve library - open more hours, new books, etc. 2. Continue elective courses, as many as possible, also AP courses, so the bright student will be interested in attending. 3. Provide more clubs, such as Science, using faculty advisers who are interested and who really want to encourage students to use some initiative."
"Undecided"

"For Longwood"

"No quotas"

"This should be No! However, there is some doubt as to the school's method of teaching, or its ideas of moral values."

"Personal business"

"Field Service Trade"

"I don't believe blacks are interested in integration. Just out and out take over."

"But not on a 50%-50% basis"

"Mother - Registered nurse"

"Greenvue 94th & Emerald"

"Whatever procedure is necessary to maintain the educational standard of the school."

"Nursing School Graduated"

"You already have a busing program. Most of the children use some transportation to get there."

"Father Architect Dept of HUD, Mother teacher - Harlan H.S."

"With excellent discipline and good academic subjects you will have a good school. Also assure safe transportation to & from school. The neighborhood is very bad."

"Deceased"

"35% black, 65% white. statistically this seems to be the point at which a stable situation can be maintained. If the black population exceeds this, the tendency is for the school to go all black."
"In order to maintain 35-65 or 33 1/3-66 2/3, it would have to be 2 whites for 1 black. How does black Catholic population versus white Catholic population of female high school age students work out? Then how many spots are available in South side girls' high schools: Mother McCauley, Queen of Peace, Mother of Sorrows, Mercy → Unity, Aquinas, Longwood, etc. If there are a percentage of black Catholics accomodated in Catholic High schools in relation to their percentage, then I think a 2-1 ratio would be justified. I can see where the black parents might have a complaint if they were not getting their share in enrollment overall."

"Father maint. mechanic. Mother - beauty culturist"

"I do not think any racial quota is "ideal" per se. The quality of the school, the desire for education, the willingness to work, etc. are important to me. Also, the desire of students, black and white, to get along with girls of the other race. My daughter believes that some present students - black & white - do not accept integration as a goal and this can cause tension. The "buried" prejudices of whites surface when a separatist black is encountered. Although this can have some therapeutic effect, it can also generate unnecessary tensions. Also, my daughter thinks some teachers do not impose the same standards on some black students out of a "feeling of sympathy." If this is so, it is not good for either race. All other things being equal, I would prefer a ratio of 60% white to 40% black - 2nd choice 70% to 30%; 3rd choice 50% - 50%.

"I think the Catholic School Board should work actively with other Catholic schools to bring about a controlled racial mix in some schools. We should have all-white and all-black schools (equally "good") for those who desire them. Others should be designated as integrated, the ratio made public, and that ratio should be controlled by a quota, free busing (paid by the Archdiocese), etc. I would prefer integrated
schools but realistically true integration is not going to work today in every situation. The Church should actively support the integrated schools to prove that quality education can be afforded under integration. The separatists of each race, the fearful, etc. should be given "exclusive" schools at tuition rates sufficient to pay costs with required courses in social problems, student exchanges for special lectures or courses, and other programs to give an "integrated experience". In short, Catholic schools, to justify their existence, must offer quality education, accepting people as they are, but work actively to further the goal of racial understanding and acceptance."

228 #6 "Deceased"

229 #37 "Undecided"

229 #54 "Ideally, 50% would be the ans. but C $500.00 per yr. I believe I have a right to expect my daughter to attend the same high class "Longwood" that my sisters, nieces, and countless friends knew in yesteryear & Let's face it, man, "You ain't gonna do it," even with 30% Black - 70% white composition."

232 #6 "Deceased"

232 #8 "Father was a claim statement man for the C.T.A."

233 #57 & #58 "No opinion at all"

233 #59 (signed by parent and address given"

234 #42-47 "Assumed as the reason for enrollment - got all knowledge of standards from niece."

234 #54 "At least 40% either Black or White"

234 #55 "?"

234 #56 "Voluntary"

234 #57 "Provided that the white enrollment does not drop below 40%"
"Maintain standards that encourages white enrollment. Multi-racial rather than integrated, with mutual respect and interchange of knowledge and understanding of each ethnic difference."

"Supervisor: Bureau of Streets & Sanitation, Chgo. Ill."

"We cannot sincerely accurately answer this question in its entire concept. But we feel that this is a highly rated school in all aspects but this fall, experience shall better enable us to understand."

"It helps slightly, we feel life should be lived in a complete society, school-work, etc."

"Not necessarily"

"consider scholastic average"

"After survey consider committee decision"

"Deceased"

"This was taught at home."

"Real Estate Broker"

"Roseland"

"Nursing Career of Airline Stewardess"

"Even"

"Not here Girls are stealing Returning to school after children"

"Is there a choice?"

"Poor example"

"!!!"

"This quota is great — but you had better also think in terms of economics — you can be racial as hell and still be bankrupt!"
"Auburn Park"

"Office work for wife"

"Deceased"

"Scholarships if possible"

"Roseland"

"If the parents and students think it is necessary for the safety of the children, I would approve of the busing program."

"I think this would be necessary for the white parents, because of the fear they may have for their children, which busing if necessary could solve."

"I have no knowledge of other high schools."

"Academic quota 1st, Race 2nd."

"Father Ambulance driver"

"if she desires to go"

"Housing executive" "social worker"

"w/relatives"

"The academic standing of Longwood was a prime factor in our joint selection. We hope the excellence in this area will not change."

"Recruit with specific criteria for basis of selection and never lower your standards... perhaps one day it will not matter whether the girls are black, white, pink, or otherwise but simply good clean well adjusted American girls — intent upon attaining a good education."

"Question is too biased. Really, who can say? Underpinning this question, the professional attributes of the faculty and administration, their readiness to interact and serve as models for the girls, and above all the expanding dyna-
mic of their leadership, will prove crucial to those who attend, rather than a certain percentage of this or the other group being a solution."

262 #57 "?"

263 #8 "Father disabled and not working permanently"

263 #37 "At present she would like to join the Navy"

265 #32 "Park Manor"

265 #59 (signed by Mother)

266 #37 "Nurse"

266 #59 "I believe let your child go where they are (?) this will make them a good student and lady"

267 #55 "If rather than go all black 'Yes' If possible to make 95% 'other than' Black 'Yes'"

267 #56 "If to keep from becoming all black"

267 #57 "Prefer accepting 5 whites to 1 Black, etc."

267 #59 "Dear Father, I'm serious about the above answers if I lived in a nice white suburb the answers would be more extreme to the point you wouldn't even take time to read them. (if thats possible) However, I've seen my son, when he was about 12 years old, "rolled" for his money by blacks. I've seen my daughter, when she was in about 6th grade, challenged to a fist fight by a black girl. We, as a family, have been exposed to "them" for the last 10 years. I as a fireman have been exposed to "them" for 17 years. With reference to the moral & discipline questions on page 5 & 6, I don't think Longwood or any other school does the job it's suppose to along these lines. The use of 4 letter words and especially the "12 letter word" common among blacks is not my cup of tea, and I don't think Longwood or many of the other schools do anything to discourage it. Probably because of "free speech" and "academic freedom". This is the trend today. I will con-
continue to try and get away from it. I feel the same concern should be held for both the physical and mental well being of a person. Therefore, I am against the use of the language mentioned above, as I am against yelling "FIRE" in a crowded theatre. I wish you luck, but I think "we" got a loser when it comes to dealing with the undisciplined black race. Sincerely yours,

"one white student for each black student..."

"Where there is more predominate white, there is better education offered. Therefore keeping black enrollment limited" (Signed by parent.)

"Deceased"

"Father is accountant"

"I'm not blaming this on the school. I think it is the times in which we are living."

"I definitely think would stabilize the school and would benefit everybody."

"Indefinite"

"Do you mean which I rank as important or as the school is handling them?"

"Don't carry enough subjects. Too many study periods."

"Maybe - in fact she is even more prejudiced"

"not particularly"

"useless now"

"might help hold line"

"Is it worth it?"

"Any percentage of any race or creed is acceptable, provided the students accepted are morally and academically qualified."

"Medical technician"
"50% white, 40% black, 10% Latino & others"
"Chicago policeman"
"Providing the bus system maintains discipline"
"?
"1. Teaching academic subjects (a) maintaining discipline & (b) inculcating moral values should be unnecessary — these should come from the home"
"?
"I cannot give an opinion"
"Do not understand"
"It would seem that over the past few years Longwood has made no serious attempt to make its name known to areas where predominantly white girls live. In the years since 1963 when my first daughter attended Longwood, no one made an attempt to provide information to Seven Holy Founders (Fr. Dennehy's parish) about Longwood nor made a serious attempt to provide transportation. The lack of transportation, and we were never close to the CTA, has made it difficult to get our two girls to Longwood. Catholic boy's schools will survive with or without transportation, but Catholic girls' schools will not. I've broached this subject before at Fathers' Club meetings, but it was never seriously pursued. This is why I have my third daughter at Seton and my fourth will probably go there or Marian."
"No opinion on any of these"
"Gresham"
"Engr. VP"
"Because of"
"?
"Ridiculous question"
Get aid in holding tuition down. Why not send girl to school that is safer etc. for same cost — all of which is too high. With regrets you have lost me. The sixteenth member of my family (sisters and their daughters and my first two girls) will not enter AOL this fall. One daughter soon will finish. The neighborhood is too dangerous and having just left do not wish to return. A.O.L. having business courses puts it above all other girls schools nearby. The N.D. nuns are tops. But the girls do side against each other (race) as shows at elections, dances, etc. Most all the girls I know had great attitudes graduating from St. Margarets but changed these at AOL. After seeing their childhood groups split by the neighborhood change and being harrassed by blacks from Vanderpod and grouped by blacks as Honkey's most of these girls have learned first hand why their grandparents were bigots. All I hear is how everyone bends backwards for the blacks. Would you allow a club for white only as the black girls have and how about a white Unity Mass? How about some Irish History incorporated into Religion class. There is only one class in Religion at A.O.L. where you can escape Black History. Who cares. Now is now. I don't know my family tribe name either. I know Juniors that can't wait to get out. I really hate to see it go, wouldn't have believed it could happen, but the people you are losing are mostly the ones from the nearby changing parishes and have been given such a hard time and financial set back they have lost interest in any bold new ideals, they are not glad to be out and hurt badly. Longwood's biggest fan just bit the dust but I will continue to pray for you and wish you all the luck you'll need."

"I have had no experience with other high schools so how can I compare it"

"Vice president General Manager Pre-school teacher (mother)"

"Not clear; do you mean between races or just other girls."
"Longwood has not made sufficient effort to keep a higher percentage of white girls."

"Preserve the school; preserve the community!!"

"With higher white percentage"

"to attract more whites"

"If we want the school and community to survive the percentage of white must be higher. The white attitude is that a school suffers from too high a black percentage; (1) lower academic standards (2) increased discipline problems. We must work like "hell" to survive!"

"Retailer - owner of small chain of stores"

"The 4 aspects I numbered presuppose discipline. A climate of discipline is necessary before anything else can take place."

"Regardless to percentage attending to white or black, I feel the school should maintain the same rating academically, morally, socially and all the other factors involved."

"Accept students on qualifications academic (?); time of applying, not on basis of black or white attending — what happens if no white students apply according to quota systems?"

"Decision was made long before Longwood was integrated"

"Limited"

"Buyer"

"Mother registered nurse"

"I don't feel integration should be an issue. My concern is that no matter what the racial composition of the school, under no circumstances should Longwood compriemise its ideals or lower its standards of academic excellence."
So often schools in black areas deteriorate into filthy holes - no standards. Maintain the pride and competence of your staff and be twice as tough in what is expected of your students. I truly don't see any value to a racially-balanced 50-50 etc. student body - "the white skin or black skin has no right to be an issue."

"Housekeeping dept for Nursing home"

"Security guard"

"Times control changes - the percentage factor does not affect my consideration."

"Junior college or business school"

"For white students"

"Too soon to tell"

"Father is Physician. Mother part time nurse"

"I feel that any of the above may be of assistance, but there may be 2 vital problems that need attack (1) the attitude of the faculty (many of them) is that of being under siege - now there may be some truth in this, but basically there seems to be a very deep and possibly subcourious racist attitude - a real lack of openness and this applies also to their attitude to worry of the white girls also (2) a real lack of talent in too much of the faculty - although I feel that the teaching is as good or a little better than some schools some really inadequate teachers are doing a good deal of damage - better to raise the tuition and at least have scholarship - I guess I'm really looking for a St. Iguetius for girls - maybe it's a dream - but if it were a reality the Academy couldn't fail. It just isn't that good. Also if girls are treated less like infants (washroom passes etc.) they might act better and if they didn't then crack down."

"South Shore"
"Father traffic clerk. Mother nurse"

"Accepting students according to academic performance"

"Supervisor: lingerie factory"

"Father's, Mother's, & students names given"

"Mortician"

"?"

"After two weeks I do not feel qualified to answer"

"Mother teacher"

"Any race"


"Cannot answer because our child just started 9/72 Semester. We have nothing so far to compare. However, the school was recommended very highly."

"Junior college yes"

"I really don't know"

"Ideally 50-50, but don't know if it will work"

"Skilled electrician"

"Attended technical school"

"Attended Bus. college"

"Art Institute of Chicago"

"Comment: if people would work together and care for their community, schools, etc., integration could work. Today, in our "cold society, a neighbor does not care for his neighbor; he only cares for himself. This is what makes a community change from one color to another. A neighborhood or school will only
"go" if people go. How far can one run? There is no place to run anymore! Can't people see and realize this?! The pendulum must begin to swing the other way. I hope I can help. I think A.O.L. is a terrific school"
education and the experience obtained from such, can be accomplished with blacks in the majority also." (signed by father)

338

#54 "100% American Catholic Should accept only those who will adhere to the discipline and moral values - Should serve the girls in the area who qualify to the above."

338

#55 "Not if you continue the two standards of discipline with the white getting the short end of the stick"

338

#56 "Why bus more blacks in?"

338

#57 "Standards should be considered - not color"

338

#58 "Is the only way the school will survive."

342

#8 "Paving contractor"

342

#51-52 "?"

342

#55-56 "?"

343

#8 "Credit manager"

243

#59 "Voluntary applicants who are willing to make sacrifices to pay their way, are the answer to your survival"

345

#8 "Bus driver"
demographic variables (such as sex, age, occupation, or income, for instance) could account for the different patterns of responses uncovered in the factor analysis. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted on the three factors and the demographic variables, and correlation coefficients where appropriate.

Two final notes on methodology. Questions 18 through 24, Fathers' Education, and questions 25 through 31, Mothers' Education, proved too complex to handle as fourteen separate responses. To simplify analysis of this section, the variables were reduced to two and expressed in ordinal terms on a second set of data cards. If, for instance, the respondent indicated that the mother graduated from high school, the card simply indicated that Mothers' Educational level equals twelve years. If the respondent indicated the father had graduated from college but did not possess an advanced degree, the card showed Fathers' Educational level equals sixteen years. Educational data was then correlated with scores derived from the factor analysis. Also, it simplified the task by rounding off the (few) parents who graduated from high school in $3\frac{1}{2}$ years and those who were in the process of getting an advanced degree were assigned a score of 18, even though more than two chronological years are needed for an advanced degree as often as not. The reasoning is that, had the person gone to school full time, he or she would probably

31The survey set up the response pattern badly to begin with. For example, the respondent may have answered yes to Question 23, "Did father graduate from college?" but no reply at all to the prior questions about elementary or high school years. The gross responses, then, to these fourteen questions are meaningless and not reported.
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