An attitude study of high school students toward the Racial Imbalance Act of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Six District Plan of Springfield, Massachusetts: a case study.

Gregory Edward Johnson
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1

Recommended Citation
https://scholarworks.umass.edu/dissertations_1/2962

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations 1896 - February 2014 by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UMass Amherst. For more information, please contact scholarworks@library.umass.edu.
AN ATTITUDE STUDY OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS TOWARD THE RACIAL IMBALANCE ACT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS AND THE SIX DISTRICT PLAN OF SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS—A CASE STUDY

A Dissertation Presented

By

GREGORY EDWARD JOHNSON

Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

MAY, 1975

Major Subject: Urban Education
AN ATTITUDE STUDY OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS TOWARD THE RACIAL IMBALANCE ACT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS AND THE SIX DISTRICT PLAN OF SPRINGFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS--A CASE STUDY.

A Dissertation

By

Gregory Edward Johnson

Approved as to style and content by:

Norma Jean Anderson, Chairperson

Portia C. Elliott, Member

Frederic E. Finch, Member

Louis Fischer, Acting Dean
School of Education

MAY, 1975
I dedicate this treatise to my lovely wife, Judith Ann (Harris) Johnson, my parents, Johnnie and Theresa Johnson Brown, and my father and mother-in-law, James and Annie Harris, whose continued support through my young life has served to provide me with the educational, spiritual, humanistic and cultural tools to become a leader of men. Judy and I have been truly fortunate to have had loving and understanding parents. Please continue to share our lives as we will continue to yours.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my dissertation committee for working faithfully and patiently with me, especially toward the conclusion of my work. First to Dr. Fred Finch, who has been a true friend and professor, I will always be indebted; to Dr. Rudine Sims, who encouraged me to "hang in there; to Dr. Portia C. Elliott who through thick and thin remained a devoted teacher and scholar, but most important of all, a true friend; and last but not least, Dr. Norma Jean Anderson, who nourished me with her wisdom and friendship throughout my college years --your love and kindness will always be remembered.

In addition, I would like to thank Dr. Cleo Abraham for being a true friend, Brother and professor. For his sustained interest, assistance and guidance, I am extremely grateful and indebted.

For the long hours spent dialoguing, which helped me to think clearly, I am especially appreciative to Helen Wood Turner, Cynthia Elliot Brown, Frank Boulware, Willis Crosby, Marvin Haedall, Robert McCrail, and Vivian Wilgram.

To Carmencita Jones for providing me with records and documents on the desegregation process in Springfield. I am deeply indebted to her and the Quality Integrated Education Committee.

To Nancy Rudnicki, who typed the final draft, I owe a special note of thanks. To the faculty and students in the Center for Urban Education, I would like to say thanks for allowing me to be affiliated with
you. To Annette Stanback, who has been a true friend and "sister", I thank you.

Finally, to my five beautiful sisters whose encouragement, financial assistance, love and patience directed me toward this goal, I am extremely grateful. To Elaine Stowe, Bertha Rias, Darnell Smith, Joyce Reeves and Violet Ross, in the words of Sister Soul Aretha Franklin, "if ever you need me just call me--I'll be there."
An Attitude Study of High School Students Toward The Racial Imbalance Act of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the Six District Plan of Springfield, Massachusetts--A Case Study (May 1975)

Gregory E. Johnson, B.A., Southern Illinois University
M.A., Sangamon State University

Directed by: Dr. Norma Jean Anderson

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this dissertation is to provide a descriptive analysis of the events that happened during the racial balancing of schools in Springfield, Massachusetts in September of 1974. The Racial Imbalance Act of 1965 which prohibited imbalanced schools was not enforced in its early inception. The theory behind the Brown v. Board of Education ruling was very practical to many people in the United States. "Equal" could not be accomplished in "separate" schools.

The court rulings were not too concerned how the racial balancing of schools was carried out so long as the process was orderly. But as the case studies in Inglewood, Riverside, Richmond, and Boston point out, the process of racial balance was far from being orderly. To bring about racial balance requires the segregated school systems to be desegregated. Most desegregation processes require bussing because of the physical and geographical barriers between Black and white communities.
The process of desegregation is just that—a process, and until parents and educators realize that this process takes adequate planning, the failures of desegregation will outnumber the successes. A second but very important purpose of this investigation was to elicit the attitudes of Black and white high school students toward the Racial Imbalance Act and the Six District Plan.

The one-group pretest-posttest design was used to determine if Informatory Discussion Sessions on the RIA and the Six District Plan would produce any difference in the attitudes of Black or white students. This design had limited success basically because of the repeated measurement method without controls over history and maturation.

There were five hypotheses presented in the study—two major and three minor hypotheses. The first hypothesis questioned if the scores of Black students would be higher than white students toward the Racial Imbalance Act of 1965, after the Informatory Discussion Sessions. The t test for matched groups was used to test the significance level at the 0.05. An unqualified acceptance of the first hypothesis could not be made on the basis of the data provided.

The second hypothesis predicted that the scores of Black students would be more positive than those of white students toward the Six District Racial Balance Plan after the Informatory Discussion Sessions. Six questions were designed for the Racial Imbalance Inventory to test this hypothesis. Although the t test scores for selected questions were at the significance level, the category itself was not found to produce statistically significant difference between Black and white students.
The findings associated with the sample led to the conclusion that very weak relationships existed between the pre- and posttests but not at a statistically significant level. Exploratory findings for the sample indicated that these high school students, both Black and white, generally accepted the concept of desegregation but were usually "luke-warm" in their convictions toward desegregation--that is, they were neither strongly for nor strongly against the Racial Imbalance Act or the Six District Plan.

It was recommended that the process of desegregation be introduced and explained to children at the elementary grades to prepare them for the complicated process that their parents have given them. The process of desegregation has to be an understanding one if it is to work. It was further recommended that different research designs be used to measure the attitudes of elementary and high school students toward the desegregation process of racial balance schools. The "true experimental design" perhaps would produce the same or even entirely different results. The development of efficient and effective instruments to measure attitudes of students toward racial compatibility and acceptance should also be encouraged.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Few would argue the immutable fact that the primary vehicle for social mobility in America is education. Racial injustice and racial isolation, however, have enabled "white middle-class controlled" school systems to monopolize the distribution of educational opportunities rather than to equalize opportunities for all children.

The condition of unequal education, which has been imposed on Black and other minority students, has raised serious academic questions in education: What is quality education? What is meant by equal educational opportunities? A more immediate question, however, is the one asked by Robert Mayer in his book The Impact of School Desegregation in a Southern City. He has asked "... How can the distinct disadvantage of the inner-city child be overcome?"\(^1\)

Some educators and community leaders would offer decentralized community-controlled, "separate but equal" school systems as an answer to Mayer's question. Other educational groups have been in favor of introducing compensatory programs into the present system. Others would advocate integrating schools from administrators down to students. There are still others who are convinced that desegregated, racially balanced schools are at least a partial answer. There is, of course, merit to

\(^{1}\text{Robert Mayer et al. The Impact of School Desegregation in a Southern City. Toronto, Canada: D. C. Heath and Company, 1974, p. 8.}\)
each group's proposal, but this document will explore the fourth proposition—desegregation as it relates to the Racial Imbalance Act of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the implementation of the Six District Plan for the city of Springfield, Massachusetts.

Desegregation By Any Other Name?

Integration. In the years immediately following the 1954 Brown vs. Board of Education Supreme Court decision, liberal educators envisioned school systems that would be totally integrated. The Brown decision made segregation illegal but it did not require states to achieve desegregation. Robert Mayer stated, "The Constitution does not require integration; it merely forbids discrimination."\(^2\) Mayer further maintained a distinction between desegregation and integration. "Desegregation is reflected in the physical presence of sharing of the same environment by both races... Integration is reflected in attitudes of mutual respect... equality of access to resources and success in the system."\(^3\)

Racial Balance. Since 1967, the term desegregation has been used more consistently for court orders regarding racial balance. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) in setting forth guidelines for determining whether or not local school districts were segregated, determined acceptable percentages of students from both races to be in

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 8.

\(^3\)Ibid.
attendance at particular schools. Thus was born the principle of racial balance. 4

In summary, the following distinctions between desegregation, racial balance, and integration can be made: racially balancing schools is a means of desegregation and they are both preliminary steps to integration.

Desegregation--A Means to What End?

**Equality of Educational Opportunity versus Quality Education.**

Many Black parents, as Raymond W. Mack, has written in his book *Our Children's Burden*, "have defined equal-educational opportunities as the route to the achievement of a better life for their children. . . [and] equate desegregated education with improved education. . . ." 5 Many white parents, on the other hand, have seen desegregation as a threat to the quality of education for their children and equate high educational standards with the absence of Blacks. 6

No conclusive evidence has been found to support either group's contentions. There are those radical educators like Ivan Illich who would argue that neither equality of educational opportunities advocated by Blacks nor quality education advocated by both Blacks and whites can ever be achieved by Black or white students who are forced into obligatory schools designed to perpetuate the polarization of the "haves" and "have nots." Illich has written:


It should be obvious that even with schools of equal quality, a poor child can seldom catch up with a rich one. Even if they attend equal schools and begin at the same age, poor children lack most of the educational opportunities which are casually available to the middle-class child. . . . So the poorer student will generally fall behind so long as he depends on schools for advancement or learning. The poor need funds to enable them to learn, not to get certified for the treatment of their alleged disproportionate deficiencies.7

Illich does make some rather provocative points but within the confines of the present and the practical, the courts of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts have rejected the radicalism of Illich and tried to pass a Racial Balance Act which lives up to the moral commitment of a democratic society which aspires to "equal quality educational opportunity for all."

Statement of the Problem

The State of Massachusetts has not been firm in its commitment to racially balance its school systems. For nine years, the State has maintained legislation on the books at the State Capitol pertaining to racial balance of its schools. Each year legislators have made significant progress to weaken and water-down the efforts of the original bill. In April of 1974, the legislative body of the State of Massachusetts voted to repeal the Racial Imbalance Law. In May of 1974, Francis Sargent, Governor of the State, vetoed the legislators' action and presented his own version of a Racial Balance Plan for the State. What racial balance plan would be used in the State of Massachusetts, if any, became a yet

unresolved issue between January and August of 1974. What effect, if any, would desegregation have on the attitudes of students attending the Massachusetts public schools. This concern gave rise to the investigations undertaken in this dissertation.

The Study

In 1965, the Commonwealth passed the Racial Imbalance Act after a thorough study (the Kiernan Report) found schools in five cities imbalanced. After the Act was passed, three cities--Medford, Cambridge and New Bedford--made positive attempts to balance their schools. In the two cities where the problem of racial balance was much more complicated, Boston and Springfield, the school committees of both cities refused to accept the Kiernan Report findings and the Racial Imbalance Act of 1965.

After nine years of total resistance to the law, the state and federal courts forced Springfield and Boston to submit an acceptable racial balance plan and to implement those plans in September, 1974.

This study focused primarily on the first semester implementation of the Six District Plan (during the Fall semester, 1974-1975 academic year) and provided an analysis of the attitudes of high school students on attempts in the Commonwealth to desegregate public schools.

Purpose of the Investigation

The specific purposes of this investigation were: (1) to document the struggle for racial balance of schools in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; (2) to set forth a chronology of the events leading up
to the implementation of the Six District Plan; and (3) to ascertain whether there was any significant difference in the attitudes of high school students directly effected by the Racial Balance Act and indirectly effected by the implementation of the Six District Plan.

Definition of Terms

Governor Sargent's Plan (h. 6085) -- Amendments to the Racial Balance Act submitted to the Massachusetts legislature by the Governor. Under this plan, parents can send their children to the schools of their choice at the expense of the State.

Kiernan Commission Report -- A state-wide study on racial imbalance conducted by the Advisory Committee on Racial Imbalance and Education in 1964.

Racial Balance -- The condition of a public school in which more than thirty percent but not more than fifty percent of the pupils attending such school are non-white.

Racial Imbalance -- The condition of a public school which more than fifty percent of the pupils attending such school are non-white.

Racial Imbalance Act (RIA) -- Legislative act passed to end racial imbalance in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (1965).

Racial Isolation -- The condition of a public school in which not more than thirty percent of the pupils attending such school are non-white.

Racial Minority or Minority -- Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Latinos and American Indians are referred to as minorities. Racial minorities are those minorities with skin color or physical features that enable the majority population to easily identify.
The Six District Plan -- The racial balance plan for the city of Springfield. The plan is designed to racially balance the elementary grades one through six, with a limited amount of bussing. The Supreme Judicial Court has ordered Springfield to implement this plan effective September, 1974.

Statement of Hypotheses

In pursuance of the primary objective of this investigation, the major conceptual hypotheses will be presented as follows:

Hypothesis I -- The scores of Black students will be higher than white students toward the Racial Imbalance Act of 1965, after the Informatory Discussion Sessions.

Hypothesis II -- The scores of Black students will be more positive than those of white students toward the Six District Racial Balance Plan after the Informatory Discussion Sessions.

Hypothesis IIa -- There will be a significant gain in attitudes of students (Black and white) following Informatory Discussion Sessions.

The minor conceptual hypotheses are as follows:

Hypothesis III -- White students will perceive the quality of education in their schools superior to that of Black students, after the Informatory Discussion Sessions.
Hypothesis IV -- There will be a higher score difference for white students in the category of desegregation as it effects the quality of education for Black and Puerto Rican students, after the Informatory Discussion Sessions.

Hypothesis V -- Black students will respond more positively to racial compatibility than white students, after the Informatory Discussion Sessions.

Limitations of Study

The Racial Imbalance Act was suppose to provide fair and equitable education for Blacks. The Six District Racial Balance Plan was suppose to be the school balancing plan for Springfield. By September of 1973, neither the RIA nor the Six District Plan produced positive results to the satisfaction of the Black community.

Discontented with the lack of progress, the Quality Integrated Education Committee of Springfield conducted a strong campaign in the Black community in support of the Six District Plan. Many Black organizations and leaders also supported the plan. Based on this hard sales and promotion campaign, it was perceived that the Black students would look toward the RIA and the Six District Plan more positively than their white counterparts.

White students would probably feel that their (white) schools and education was better than that received by Blacks—based upon the publicity received by these students. White students were perceived as
having positive feelings toward their education and Black students were perceived as looking toward the desegregation process as the answer for better schools and education. The direction to which Black and white students would respond to the hypotheses was speculative, but it did seem that there was a possibility for a directional response.

This study is limited in that:

1. Participation in the study is limited to high school students in the Upward Bound program of Springfield, Massachusetts, a city of about 150,000 in New England. (The total minority population in Massachusetts is less than five percent.)

2. The racial balance of the Six District Plan did not involve the high school students directly. The Six District Plan is designed for the elementary grades only. The high school students have brothers and sisters who are in the elementary schools.

3. The Six District Plan will be evaluated only for the first semester of its implementation.

4. The attempts to establish a parent involvement or advisory group to help inform local people about the developments during the implementation of the Six District Plan was limited to primarily Black parents.

5. Data obtained reflect gross statistics about groups of students and little, if anything, about individual students.

6. Factors such as peer conversing, news media and parental influences would not be controlled.

7. Puerto Rican UBP students were not included in the study because the Massachusetts Racial Imbalance Act defines Puerto Rican students as "majority students."
Significances of the Study

It is hoped that this study will serve to:

1. Describe the implementation of the Racial Imbalance Act in the schools in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts;
2. Set forth a chronology of events leading up to the implementation of the Six District Plan in Springfield, Massachusetts;
3. Call attention to previous attempts at desegregation in the Western region of the United States; and
4. Represent a pioneer study upon which other researchers may build.

Overview

This dissertation will consist of six chapters. Chapter I explored the concept of desegregation as a means of achieving racial balance in the schools of Springfield, Massachusetts. For clarity, a list of definition of terms was introduced to distinguish between desegregation racial balance and integration. This chapter was designed to explain the purpose of the study, state the hypotheses and give the limitations and significance of this research.

Chapter II will explore the major court decisions affecting desegregation in the United States from 1896 to 1974. In addition, this chapter will identify the attitudes of parents toward the concept of desegregation. Selected case studies of "successful" desegregation attempts will be compared and contrasted to the desegregation attempts of Springfield, Massachusetts.
Chapter III will cover the historical perspective of the Racial Imbalance Act, and review the Six District Racial Balance Plan. This chapter will explore the past history of the Racial Imbalance Act (RIA) from 1965 to 1974. The Kiernan Commission Report was the catalyst for the RIA. The Report and the legislators who supported its findings, will be discussed briefly.

The major thrust of Chapter III will be to explore the Six District Plan and the struggle to implement the plan. The community efforts to support and oppose this plan are also presented. The personal notes of this researcher will be reported in this chapter under the category of Integration Congress. This researcher served as a Resource Person during the Integration Congress. A map of the Six District Plan is included in this chapter and the student composition of these districts are included in the appendix.

Chapter IV examines the research procedures used in this dissertation. The research design used was the one group pretest/posttest. The variables, pilot study, population instrument, field procedures and collection of data will also be reported in this chapter. The limitations of the research design will also be presented in this chapter.

Chapter V presents the findings and analysis of the data collected in Chapter IV. This chapter presents the five hypotheses in the null form, the significant level, and the implications of the findings. The major emphasis of this chapter is the level of significance of the attitudes of Black and white high school students.

Chapter VI is the summary, implications and recommendations of the dissertation. This concluding chapter will synthesize the substantive
material presented in the five previous chapters to serve the purposes of this study.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In Chapter I, attempts were made to differentiate between the terms integration, desegregation and racial balance. Also, attempts were made to point up the differences between "quality education" and "equality of educational opportunities." Chapter I also attempts to state the problem this investigator has tackled, define terms, give the purpose of the investigation, state hypotheses and give limitations and significance of this research.

In this chapter, attempts will be made to look at the progression of major court decisions affecting desegregation in the United States. An attempt will be made to identify the current attitudes and the progress or lack of progress made toward that end.

The major thrust of this chapter will be to review case studies of school desegregation which had similar problems to those of the city of Springfield, Massachusetts. The intent of this review is not to draw upon a random sample of case studies on desegregation, nor is this review intended to discuss all aspects of school desegregation, but rather to present studies which took the initiative to desegregate their schools but eventually were court ordered to desegregate.

Desegregation and the Courts

In the famous 1896 case of Plessy v. Ferguson, the Supreme Court upheld the validity of a Louisiana statute providing for "separate-but-
equal" accommodations for white and colored passengers on railroad trains. This ruling would maintain separate facilities for Blacks for an additional fifty-four years.

In 1950, the Supreme Court ruled that the "separate-but-equal" rule had no validity and ordered the University of Texas Law School to admit Herman Sweatt. Four years later, the court was ready to make another landmark decision in applying the Sweatt case to elementary and secondary schools. Cases were filed in four federal courts and one state court by Black parents with the help of the local and national branches of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. The four states involved were Kansas, South Carolina, Virginia, and Delaware.

In each of the four state cases, the "separate-but-equal" ruling was challenged. The Fourteenth Amendment at that time did not apply to the District of Columbia; however, the Fifth Amendment, like the Fourteenth, forbids denial of due process of law. Weinstein and Gottell state that there was more to this carefully stage-managed selection of cases for review than meets the naked eye.

The Kansas case concerned grade-school children in a northern state with a permissive segregation statute; the Virginia cases involved high-school students in a state having compulsory laws and located in the upper tier of southern states; South Carolina represented the Deep South, and Delaware the border states. The state cases all presented the issue of the application of the equal-protection-of-law clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, and the Court could have reached and decided that question in any one of them, but the wide geographical range gave the anticipated decision a national flavor and would blunt any claim that the South was being made a whipping boy. Moreover, the combination of cases included Kansas with its permissive statute, while other cases concerned state constitutional provisions as well as statutes with mandatory segregation requirements. Grade-school students were involved in the Kansas case; high-school students in the Virginia case, and all elementary and secondary students in the Delaware and South Carolina cases. The District of Columbia case drew due process of law into the cases as
an issue, in distinction to the equal-protection-of-law clause, and also presented an opportunity for inquiry into the congressional power to impose racial segregation. The NAACP had touched all bases.¹

Ultimately, the four state cases were grouped together and decided as Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, and the District of Columbia litigation was decided in a separate case, Bolling v. Sharpe. All were decided on May 17, 1954.² The Supreme Court held in Brown v. Board of Education that in the public schools, "separate" facilities could not be "equal". All nine judges agreed that "in approaching this problem, we cannot turn the clock back to 1868 when the (Fourteenth) Amendment was adopted, or even to 1896 when Plessy v. Ferguson was written."³

What the NAACP had attempted to do in the early 1950's was to make school segregation a national issue in hopes that the Supreme Court would hand down a favorable ruling. Thurgood Marshall (now a Supreme Court Justice) was the Chief Council for the NAACP during the 1954 decision. The major topic in the elementary and secondary schools in the 1950's was segregation only because of the inequalities that existed under the dual systems.

The Brown decision was interpreted initially to make illegal any state action to enforce segregation, but it did not require state action


²Ibid.

to achieve desegregation. De facto segregation, on the other hand, results more from indirect and unconscious causes, and is a process over which the court has no jurisdiction.

Attitudes Toward Desegregation

The attitudes toward school desegregation are as varied as the reasons for school desegregation. If parents, teachers, administrators and students are asked their opinion on desegregation, the odds are greatly in favor of four different types of responses. The major oppositions to segregation are: (1) racial isolation or polarization of the races is morally wrong; (2) the quality of education for minority students in a dual school system is inferior to that of majority students; (3) the gerrymandering of school districts has caused racial isolation and in order to correct de facto segregation which is against the law, desegregation must prevail; and (4) because of housing patterns, urban problems, and the exodus of whites to the outer-city, racial imbalance has resulted and can only be corrected by desegregation.

The oppositions to desegregation are: (1) Black students are usually the tool for desegregation in that most of the plans involve the transportation of Blacks only or the closing down of majority Black schools in majority Black neighborhoods; (2) white parents feel that the

---


quality of education in Black schools is inferior to that of white schools, and therefore, do not want their children to attend Black schools; (3) because of the increasing crime rates, the deterioration of the urban city and the inferior conditions of the inner-city schools, white parents do not want their children to attend Black schools; (4) white parents state that they favor integration but not "forced integration"; (5) some whites are in favor of Blacks attending white schools but not whites attending Black schools, especially if white students have to be bussed to Black schools; and (6) the threat of violence when Black and white students attend desegregated schools frightens both Black and white parents.

It can be seen that quality of education, the general acceptance of the concept of integration and the fears which integration might bring are of major concern to white and Black parents. There is no general agreement as to what process is most desirable or more convenient in accomplishing desegregation. Both proponents and opponents of desegregation generally agree that there exist many inequalities within our present educational system.

**Quality and Equality of Education.** When Thomas Jefferson wrote, "All men are created equal," he was not referring to Black people. His phrase was in reference to equal protection before the law for white free males. Charles A. Tesconi, Jr. and Emanuel Hurwitz, Jr. felt that men may be equal or unequal in different respects, possessing different abilities.⁶

---

Tesconi and Hurwitz further state that developments in America can not be expressed directly in terms of equality, but the inequalities which pervade American society. About forty percent of the U.S. population (some eighty-three million people) receive only about fifteen percent of the nation's income, while the richest five percent (about eleven million people) receives over twenty percent of the annual income. Thus, income and wealth or socioeconomic status plays a large part in the quest for equality. The authors further emphasize that the argument for equality should not attempt to include all men in all places.

It (Equality) rests in assumptions relating to the origins of inequalities. It assumes that social inequalities stand in the way of educational opportunity and, thus, constitute barriers to general equality of opportunity. The key word, then, is opportunity, the opportunity to get an education of whatever amount and kind one's capacities make possible. It is opportunity that must be equalized.

The opportunity to learn has not been an easy process for many children in the educational system. Studies have shown that the poor and minority group children do not receive the same results from their education as the wealthy and white children.

The Report on Racial Isolation in the Public Schools revealed that there are some general characteristics associated with poverty or affluence which are closely related to success or failure in school. These characteristics are expressed by the poor's inability to pay for necessary

---
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health care, food and clothing while the affluent take these services for granted.

**Academic Achievement.** The Report on Racial Isolation also conducted studies which revealed that the average grade level performance of students of lower social class have distinctly lower average verbal achievement than those from more privileged backgrounds. These findings are attributed to the gross inequalities that exist between social classes. James Coleman, in releasing the report on *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, warns his readers that these inequalities are included in the statistical findings that he presents.

In reading these statistics on education, one must picture the child whose school has every conceivable facility that is believed to enhance the educational process, whose teachers may be particularly gifted and well educated, and whose home and total neighborhood are themselves powerful contributors to his education and growth. And one must picture the child in a dismal tenement area who may come hungry to an ancient, dirty building that is badly ventilated, poorly lighted, over-crowded, understaffed, and without sufficient textbooks. 

Coleman proceeded by providing findings which he said did not "significantly" show any gross difference between the school inputs (libraries, teachers, textbooks, laboratories) when comparing white and Black schools. He did find gross differences between the school output (achievement). At the grade level six, Blacks were 1.6 years behind whites in achievement; at grade nine, 2.4 years; and at grade twelve,
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3.3 years. Coleman reported that the academic achievement of Black students increased slightly when they attended desegregated schools.

Gloria J. Powell supports the above finding. She says:

Consequently, the effects of desegregation on the achievement of Black students is not consistent, in many instances is minimal, and indicates that the number of Blacks in the desegregated school may be as important or more important than the number of white students.

It is certainly true that the quality of a school's curriculum, the character of its facilities, and the attitudes and qualifications of its teaching and administrative staff can affect the attitudes, morale and performance of students. The Report on Racial Isolation found that there is a pronounced relationship between the qualifications of teachers and the performance of students. This relationship remained constant for Black students of all social classes in schools of different social class compositions.

Case Studies

Inglewood. Edna Bonacich and Robert F. Goodman discuss the events that occurred in Inglewood, California, a city located adjacent to Los Angeles. During the period between 1965 and 1969, a substantial
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number of Black students came into the school district (Inglewood) but were concentrated in about one-third of the schools. 16

This study of school desegregation in Inglewood, California had two distinct characteristics which on the surface would appear to aid the cause of school desegregation. First, the Black population in Inglewood was middle-class. Bonacich and Goodman point out that the typical strong association between race and class was not a factor in this study. 17 Second, the scale size of Inglewood—thirty-four percent Black—should have also served in the best interest of desegregation.

The process of school desegregation is far from being an easy task, as the residents of Inglewood found out. The decision to desegregate have been vested in the local school boards which have chosen to ignore the law to racially balance their school systems. Bonacich and Goodman point out that studies conducted in the past by Robert Crain, Morton Inger and Robert Stout have found that school boards have open the desegregation decision to public debate provoke community conflict. These studies have found that people who are usually indifferent are forced to choose sides. The community becomes polarized. 18

Bonacich and Goodman point out that successful school desegregation need not require the active consent of the public. Quite the


17 Ibid., p. 4.

18 Ibid., p. 5.
opposite—public consent is only likely to follow a firm move to desegregate. The study of the Inglewood school system presented some interesting findings. The authors state that there is a "ceiling" on the proportion of the city that can reasonably become Black and when that ceiling is surpassed, the white flight or exodus begins. This white exodus is rationalized by the fears that white parents possess. People are unwilling to tolerate the negative consequences of social change when their children are affected. Parents who feel that their children are being hurt by changes in the school system may move out of a community, even in the face of economic loss, a break with old friends and great inconvenience.  

The authors divide the study into three major parts: the demography of the city, the schools within the system, and the politics of the community. The Black families moving into Morningside (East Inglewood) overwhelmingly middle class, perhaps they are a little less well off than most of Inglewood's whites. The Eastside of Inglewood which is predominantly Black and middle class wanted to integrate with the school system of West Inglewood. Most of the Black residents of the Eastside wanted a "quality integrated education" for their children.

The schools in Inglewood were resegregated faster than the neighborhoods in which they were located. On the Eastside... the elementary schools were becoming all Black, with increases of over twenty percent
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in proportion of each school's Black population in the three-year period. This resulted from white parents withdrawing their children out of the public schools.

A major issue discussed by Bonacich and Goodman is the effects of integrated education on the quality of education of white children. Proponents of integrated education believe that it can have a number of academic and social benefits; but perhaps the single most significant outcome that they project is improvement in the academic performance of Black children. According to the authors, however, this generalization has not been proven conclusively. White parents who are in opposition to desegregation feel that the academic standards in their schools will decline. Again, such evidence has not been proven. Whether lower average achievement scores have any impact on the quality of education for white or Black students is an open question.

Every school system has some type of school committee or governing board. These individuals are usually elected by popular vote. The school committee in the Inglewood study was very similar to school committee members in most white controlled communities—racist. The desegregation controversy began in December of 1965 when the superintendent of schools organized a Human Relations Committee. The Eastside of the city had become increasingly Black. In January of 1967, on the recommendation

22 Ibid., p. 29.
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of the Human Relations Committee, the board decided to invite the State Bureau of Intergroup Relations (BIR), an agency of the Department of Education, to conduct a study in Inglewood.25

The study conducted by BIR forced the superintendent of schools to admit that segregation did exist and that a plan to correct the situation should be developed. Although the BIR report was accepted by the school board, little was accomplished. In February of 1969, the Citizens Advisory Committee filed suit in court after the board refused to implement a racial balance plan called the 6-3-3 Plan. This plan was essentially a paring plan for the secondary schools. One junior-senior high school complex would be turned into a junior high school facility. In that way, all senior high school students would attend one school, as would all junior high school students. The elementary schools would not be changed.26

On May 28, 1969, the superior court judge hearing the desegregation suit against the Inglewood School District dismissed the case.27 He did warn the school board that he would reverse his decision if they did not balance their schools by September of 1970. In December, the school board rejected a second desegregation plan by a vote of four to one. Again, a group of parents filed a suit against the district. The court hearing was held in May and in July of 1970; a superior court judge ordered the district to produce a desegregation plan to be put in operation

25 Ibid., p. 69.

26 Ibid., p. 76.

27 Ibid., p. 79.
with the opening of schools in September. On September 3, 1970, the court accepted the board's plan, but one week later the board voted to appeal the court order. In October, the board changes its decision and proceeded with the court ordered plan. In concluding, the authors state:

Seven years after the issue first surfaced, the Inglewood school leadership begins a new search for programs that are responsive to the real needs of Inglewood's students and parents. Perhaps after all these years, there is, at least, a recognition that this, in fact, is what must be done.

Riverside. Irving G. Hendrick discussed the history and perspective of a school integration plan in Riverside, California. Hendricks points out that Riverside was the first school system with a population over one hundred thousand and with a kindergarten through twelfth grade enrollment in excess of twenty thousand to develop and implement a full-scale racial balance plan. He adds that the racial balance plan did not become a reality until three years later when minority parents petitioned the school board. When meaningful programs have been initiated, they have usually followed minority requests, sometimes vigorously waged and taking the form of concentrated protests.

28 Ibid., p. 95.

29 Ibid., p. 96.
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Hendrick reported that most school systems do not act on desegregation plans or racial balance plans until some group or organization protest. He adds that while the immediate responsibility for carrying out desegregation rests with local school administrators and board of education, the chief societal sanctioning body for action has been the courts and to a lesser extent legislative bodies and state school officials.\(^{33}\) Faced with the threat of court order, the school board of Riverside voted to racially balance their schools.

Like most cities which attempt to racially balance their schools, the Riverside plan involved closing schools, three in this case, and some extensive pupil transportation.\(^{34}\) Similar plans were implemented in White Plains, New York; Evanston, Illinois; and Springfield, Massachusetts. The closing of Black schools have caused major concern only on the part of Black parents, but the use of transportation (bussing) has created an atmosphere of unrest by both Blacks and whites.

The push for desegregation plans by Black and minority parents came as a result of the inferior education they felt their children were receiving. Hendrick reports that the compensatory programs in Riverside were inadequate and not meeting the expectations of Black parents. He further adds that the relative rankings of the three segregated Black schools on standardized achievement tests had not improved in comparison to the other schools of the district.\(^{35}\) Token attempts were made toward

\(^{33}\)Ibid., p. 11.

\(^{34}\)Ibid., p. 9.

\(^{35}\)Ibid., p. 86.
open enrollment policies. The transfer of Black and minority youth to white schools was encouraged by the school board on a "space available" basis.

Hendrick reports a series of events in Riverside which lead to a showdown between the Black community and the school board. On Friday, September 3, 1965, a group of Black parents and members of the NAACP met to discuss a strategy to desegregate the city's schools. It was at this Friday meeting that the decision was reached to circulate a petition calling for the closing of Lowell and Irving Schools, and to push rapidly for the complete integration of the school system. On Monday, September 6th, the petitions were circulated. On Tuesday, September 7th, the day of the school board meeting in which the petitions would have been handed to the board, a fire broke out at Lowell School causing considerable damage. Fear of "another Watts," coupled with the fact that no link could be drawn between the fire, the petition proved a stimulant to action.

Coming three and a half weeks after the devasting killing, burning, rioting, and looting in the Watts area of Los Angeles, and coinciding with the Negro petition drive in Riverside, the fire made a great impression on the school board. . . . There is no question but that this unsolved cases of arson worked for the benefit of the school integration campaign materially, psychologically, and politically.

As a result of the fire, the school board voted to have double sessions at Lowell. Threatened with a boycott of schools organized by
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Black parents and leaders, the school board voted to transport 239 Lowell students in Kindergarten through third grade to seven other elementary schools. The entire facility would be closed in three years. The board also voted to have the superintendent prepare a comprehensive plan to desegregate the city's school system. Black parents were not completely satisfied, but they did end their boycott. Hendrick felt that the fire at Lowell School was a major event to the road of integration in Riverside. He felt that turn-of-events enabled the school board to become more civic-minded.

The Riverside Board of Education did not commit itself to a comprehensive integration plan because it was intimidated into doing so, but rather because it believed strongly that integration was the right approach. The petition-fire-boycott sequence, however, helped immeasurably to make them believers. From here on, the superintendent and board would have to lead. Pressure rarely remains the tool of only one segment in the population.

In late October of 1965, the school board accepted a Proposed Master Plan for School Integration. The school board was very conscious of racial balance in the pattern of school segregation. Most of the junior and senior high schools in Riverside were integrated by 1966, but by 1967, the five junior high schools were becoming increasingly imbalanced... the plan adopted on May 6, 1968 promised to narrow the range to between twelve and twenty-five percent minority registration in any one junior high.
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Richmond. Lillian B. Rubin's study of the Richmond, California School District's desegregation was devoted to the issues surrounding bussing. Bussing should be understood only as a means of transportation; a means of getting children from home to school and back. On December 18, 1968, the school board voted three to two to adopt an integration plan that included two-way bussing. Prior to the Richmond school board's decision to use two-way bussing, the Berkeley school board voted to bus both white and Black students. Under the direction of Superintendent Neil V. Sullivan, the city of Berkeley became the nation's first major city (population of over one hundred thousand) to racially balance its schools.

Opponents to bussing argue that they are not opposed to integration, but only to bussing to achieve that integration. Rubin points out that "given the reality of housing segregation, to oppose bussing is, for all practical purposes, to oppose integration." Bussing has been used to transport Black students miles away from their homes and past several white schools to attend schools comprised of Blacks only. In 1972, when bussing was placed on the Republican ticket and the Democrats were forced to take a pro-integration stand, the Nixon administration came out in favor of the neighborhood school. What the administration was saying was that it was opposed to bussing to achieve that integration.

---


Bonacich and Goodman support this conclusion. They reported that in the summer of 1972, the Inglewood school board fired their superintendent and in an August meeting, voted to rescind bussing and ordered the district administration to find ways to return to the concept of the neighborhood schools. The ousted superintendent commented: "This all started with the Nixon declarations on bussing. They really warmed things up in Inglewood. It reflects the tempo of the nation to try to stop bussing."^45

Rubin's study showed how racist a community can become when using two-way bussing to desegregate their community. Racism in America has foiled many attempts to desegregate school communities. School board members have been labelled as a result of their positions on desegregation. If they are in favor, they are liberals; if they are opposed, they are conservatives. In the studies conducted in Inglewood, Riverside and Richmond, California, the conservatives were elected in the majority over the liberal, particularly after desegregation plans had been implemented (Boston, Riverside, Inglewood, and White Plains).

Despite the controversies surrounding bussing and the opposition expressed, bussing does have its positive elements. A panel of experts who worked together not long ago at the Syracuse University Research Corporation (S.U.R.C.) conducted a study of literature to determine those indications of the progress or lack of progress—that bussing for racial integration has made toward improving the main components of racial tension associated with most school bussing controversies, their findings were:

--Bussing affects student performance in a cumulative way (Blacks gain in scores; if whites don't gain, they remain the same).

--Bussing probably benefits younger pupils more than it does older ones. (It is fairly safe, therefore, to generalize and say that the academic effects of school segregation set in hard and early upon youngsters.)

--Scarce is the way to characterize the amount of research available dealing with the effects bussing has upon college aspirations among children.

--Neither the academic performance nor the aspirations of white students are altered when they are bussed to achieve racial integration.

--At the root of the entire matter is a fundamental assessment of the presence or absence of high quality school services at the end of the bus ride. (If the caliber is poor, then surely the children will suffer as a result; and this single factor far outweighs the question of who goes where in determining the educational impact of a bussing program.)

One anxiety frequently expressed about bussing children is whether it is a good idea to separate youngsters from the good things usually associated with a neighborhood school--familiar surroundings, close parental proximity, racial and social identity.

Another apprehension over bussing pinpoints potential dangers to children when they attend schools with youngsters from different racial, social and economic backgrounds.
Summary and Parallels

City Population and Minority Percentage. The population of the cities examined in this study range from eighty thousand for Richmond, California to one hundred thousand for Inglewood and Riverside. Springfield has a population of about one hundred fifty thousand. All of the cities had a minority school population of thirty-five percent or less. There were at least twenty thousand children in the school systems and the minority enrollment on the average was about seven thousand. This minority enrollment was usually concentrated in one section of the city. At least three schools in the Black community were sixty-five to ninety-five percent Black.

Court Action. In the four cities discussed in this chapter (Inglewood, Riverside and Richmond, California; and Springfield, Massachusetts), the process of desegregation was long and tedious. Court action was necessary to bring about school desegregation. In Inglewood, after the school board refused to address the problems of racial imbalance, Black parents filed suit in superior court against the school system. Eventually, the court ruled that Inglewood must submit an acceptable desegregation plan.

Similar case suits were filed in Richmond, Riverside and Springfield. In each case, Black and minority parents, with the help of civil rights groups, filed suit in state and federal courts to desegregate the cities' school systems. As will be reported in the next chapter, the desegregation process in Springfield took nine years of legal proceedings after the state passed legislation in favor of racial
balance. The desegregation process took seven years in Riverside, seven years in Inglewood, and four years in Richmond.

Desegregation Process. The process used to bring about school desegregation in the cities of this study was very similar to that used in most northern cities. In all four cities, the policy of one-way bussing prevailed until court orders prohibited such action. Black students were bussed into white communities on a space-available basis only. The city of Springfield tried to pass-off its Black students to its surrounding suburbs, by encouraging the METCO Program. Inglewood and Richmond's decision to buss students, white and Black, to different schools outside of their neighborhoods, created much controversy. In all four cities of this study, opponents to desegregation stated that they were in favor of school integration, but opposed to bussing to bring about that integration.

Grade Level Desegregation. In Inglewood, Riverside and Richmond, the desegregation process involved transporting junior and senior high school students. Few attempts were made in these cities to desegregate the elementary school system. The first attempt to desegregate the elementary schools was undertaken by the Riverside study. A fire which did considerable damage forced the school board to transport elementary children to additional schools. In Springfield, the desegregation process involved the elementary grade levels. Springfield's high schools were all located in a central area downtown. The one junior high school that was located in the Black community was closed in 1969, and Black junior high students have been bussed out ever since that time.

Desegregation Plans. All of the proposed desegregation plans were developed by the school superintendents and their staffs. In
Springfield, the plan involved establishing administrative units throughout the school district. Kindergarten through fourth grade, and kindergarten, fifth and sixth grades were the two approaches. In Inglewood, the 6-3-3 Plan was used. All elementary school children would attend their neighborhood schools and a junior high school and high school complex was built to accommodate all junior and senior high students.

In two cities, outside agencies and organizations conducted studies and developed strategies for the school systems to use. In Inglewood, the Bureau of Intergroup Relations (BIR) conducted the study and in Springfield, Clinchy Associates prepared the plan. Both cities refused to adopt the proposed plans and eventually the courts ordered the school boards to adopt established workable plans.

**Student Involvement.** The major disadvantage of the school desegregation process utilized in each of the previously mentioned cities was that student involvement was not solicited. Student violence and protest erupted in the schools and classrooms primarily because adequate planning was not conducted before hand and with student input. A significant number of adults had decided that desegregation was best for both Black and white students; little explanation, if any, was given to the students.

**Community Involvement.** Parent involvement, both Black and white, had a sounding affect on the school desegregation process in Springfield as well as the case studies listed above. In Inglewood and Riverside, Black parents were concerned about the increasing number of Black students attending Black schools in Black neighborhoods. These parents also felt that the quality of education in their schools were inferior to
that received in white schools. Thus, it would seem that these parents equated quality education with desegregated schools.

Tactics used by community groups to bring about school desegregation ranged from peaceful demonstrations and sit-ins to violent disputes and heated boycotts of classes. In most cases, parents either boycotted schools or threatened to do so. In the city of Springfield, Black students were bussed out of their community to attend junior high school. No high schools or junior high schools existed in the Black community of Springfield. Five predominantly Black elementary schools existed in the city until September of 1974.

The NAACP, the Urban League, the Quality Integrated Education Committee, and the League of Women Voters worked hard to bring about desegregation in Springfield. In Inglewood, the NAACP and a young Black political group helped to bring about desegregation.

In conclusion, these four cities all were front-runners in developing plans to desegregate or passing legislation to end racial imbalance. In the end, all would be forced by groups and organizations, and eventually the courts, to desegregate their schools. In all four cities, the conditions for desegregation was at worst, ideal; for the minority composition was not drastically large enough to prevent an orderly influx of Black and white students into white and Black schools.
In Chapter II attempts were made to explore the major court decisions affecting school desegregation. Also, attempts were made to identify the major concerns of parents toward desegregation attempts. This chapter also explores selected case studies of school desegregation in the United States.

This chapter will address itself to explaining the historical implications of the Racial Imbalance Act, the Six District Plan, the Kiernan Commission Report, and the City-wide Congress for Peaceful Integration. Listed in this chapter are the major events that took place in the process to bring about desegregation in Springfield, Massachusetts.

Massachusetts has been among the numerous states conducting studies on the racial composition of its schools. These studies have revealed that many school systems are imbalanced racially. These conditions will continue to exist unless state and federal legislation is passed to prohibit such imbalance.

In 1964, the State Board of Education of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts assembled a very popular advisory committee of twenty-one leaders throughout the state. These individuals represented public and private sectors from business and industry, religious groups and ethnic groups. Two task force teams of distinguished educators assisted the advisory committee in compiling its final report.
The published document of this one year survey became known as the Kiernan Commission Report (named after Own B. Kiernan, the Commissioner of Education). The report of the Advisory Committee on Racial Imbalance and Education stated in April, 1965 that "imbalance does exist in some of our communities and that its effects are harmful."¹

The Kiernan Commission Report reported that in 1964 forty-five public schools in Boston, eight in Springfield, one in Cambridge and Medford, and an undetermined number in New Bedford were predominantly Black schools. The report further concluded that racial imbalance is harmful to Black children, that its existence in the public school system deprives Black children of equal educational opportunity, and that it is also harmful to white children to isolate them from healthy interracial contact.²

The report demanded the elimination of racial imbalance in the public schools and the achievement of integrated education by practical, reasonable and educationally sound methods. In order to accomplish this task the Kiernan Commission Report proposed that legislation be passed to ensure equal protection and equal access to education in the Commonwealth.

Racial Imbalance Act. In 1964, legislation was introduced in the House to eliminate racial imbalance. A total of six racial imbalance measures were introduced: five by the three Black representatives


²Ibid.
from Boston; and one by Senator Beryl Cohen. Cohen's bill was a proposal for a special commission of three Senators, five House members and two members appointed by the Governor to study and investigate the question of racial imbalance in the Boston public schools.3

Hearings were held by the Joint Committee on Education on February 19 and 25, 1964. Because most of the proposals introduced to the House were poorly and hurriedly constructed, the majority of them were soundly defeated. The authors of the early racial imbalance amendments were not specific in their language and definition of terms. Few legislators would endorse the new bills.

Commissioner Kiernan wasted no time in campaigning for the new racial imbalance law. The Kiernan Report appeared on April 15 and Kiernan immediately assumed responsibility for carrying out recommendations concerning state legislation aimed at forcing the school committee to address the problem of racial imbalance.4 The Commissioner presented early drafts to the legislature aimed at correcting the racial imbalance of schools. Senator Cohen worked closely with the Commissioner and together with a group of concerned civil rights workers, a workable draft was formulated. During the month of June, the Lieutenant Governor, Elliot Richardson, became familiar with the Kiernan-Cohen group's work. The Governor and Lieutenant Governor showed genuine interest in the legislation, and although the management of the bill was largely taken over by Democrats, Richardson "kept the Republicans in

3Civil Rights In the Political Process: An Analysis of the Massachusetts Racial Imbalance Law of 1965, p. 42.

4Ibid., p. 49.
line;" his position was made easier by the fact that the Governor had made racial balance a major issue.\(^5\) On June 9, 1965, Governor Volpe announced his support of the Kiernan-Cohen bill.

For two months the Democrats and Republicans battled with different bills and amendments. On July 22, Senator James F. Burke introduced a new draft of the racial imbalance bill. Under Senator Burke's bill, the local school committees would be given a grace period of five years before funds would be withheld for non-compliance with the law. The wording "five years" was later changed to "a reasonable time."

One final amendment was "tacked on" to the Kiernan-Cohen bill, by Representative Craven of Boston. The amendment would bar Communists or persons "listed in any state or federal document as being a member of a Communist-front organization" from serving on the advisory council created by the proposed legislation.\(^6\) The House approved the bill and its amendments on a roll call vote of 125 to 91. On August 5, the Senate voted 31 to 16 in favor of the House amendments. On August 18, Governor Volpe signed into law the Racial Imbalance Act (RIA) of 1965.

**General Laws—Chapter 71.** The Commonwealth of Massachusetts was one of the first states to take the initial task and burden upon itself to racially balance its public school systems. Passage of the RIA was designed to comply with the equal educational opportunity requirements of the United States Constitution by its own action, and without the necessity of federal intervention.

\(^5\)Ibid., p. 51.

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 56.
Prior to the passage of the RIA, the State Board of Education had little power to demand local school boards to racially balance their schools. Under the RIA, state officials had the power to withhold funds if local boards refused to comply with the law. State officials, also, had power to provide financial incentives to assist local boards in their endeavors to end racial imbalance.

Chapter 71, Section 37D. Determination, Elimination, etc. of Racial Imbalance by School Committees read in part as follows:

The school committee of each city, town and district shall, annually (first of school year), at such time and in such form as the commissioner shall determine, submit statistics sufficient to enable a determination to be made of the percent of non-white pupils in all public schools and in each school under the jurisdiction of each such committee. Whenever the state board of education finds that racial imbalance exists in a public school it shall notify in writing the school committee or regional school district committee having jurisdiction over such school that such finding has been made. The school committee shall thereupon prepare a plan to eliminate such racial imbalance and file a copy of such plan with the board. The term "racial imbalance" refers to a ratio between non-white and other students in public schools which is sharply out of balance with the racial composition of the society in which non-white children study, serve and work. For the purpose of this section, racial imbalance shall be deemed to exist when the per cent of non-white students in any public school is in excess of fifty per cent of the total number of students in such schools.

Said plan shall detail the changes in existing school attendance districts, the location of proposed school sites, the proposed additions to existing school buildings, and other methods for the elimination of racial imbalance. Said plan shall also include projections of the expected racial composition of all public schools. Any plan to detail changes in existing school attendance districts, the locations of proposed new school sites and proposed additions to existing school buildings with the intention of reducing or eliminating racial imbalance, must take into consideration on an equal basis with the above-mentioned intention, the safety of the children involved in travelling from home to school and school to home. Said plan may provide for voluntary co-operation by other cities and towns in rendering assistance and in making available facilities to effectuate said plan.

\[7\text{Massachusetts, General Laws - Chapter 71 s 37C.}\]
The Board of Education shall provide technical and other assistance in the formulation and execution of plans to eliminate racial imbalance, made pursuant to section thirty-seven of chapter seventy-one. Whenever the board determines that a school committee... has failed to file a plan in compliance with the provisions of said section, it shall consult with and make specific recommendations for a plan by such school committee...8

Section 1-1 concludes that if after determining that racial imbalance does exist and the school committee does not show progress "within a reasonable time in eliminating racial imbalance, the commissioner of education shall not certify the amount of state aid for such city or town." However, upon receipt of a plan acceptable to the board of education, the commissioner may notify the commissioner of corporations and taxation and the comptroller to pay any such withheld funds, if that be the case.

Springfield is the city we will be scrutinizing as to racial balance patterns. The city of Springfield is the third largest city in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and has a population of about 150,000 people. Springfield was second to Boston in the total number of imbalanced schools. A historical analysis of the pass endeavors of the city reveal a somewhat lukewarm commitment to the concept of an equal education for all.

Springfield Schools--A Chronology. Schooling in Springfield began early, with a succession of "dame schools" in which children were taught their ABC's for a small weekly fee in what was probably a dimly lighted room of some crude pioneer cabin. The first schoolhouse of

8Massachusetts, General Laws - Chapter 15 s 11.
only one room was erected in 1679. The first high school in Springfield was established in 1828, the first adult evening school in 1851, and the first kindergarten in 1894. Springfield has sought to take seriously the education of its youth.

As early as 1939, Dr. John Granrud, superintendent of schools, named a committee to study the whole program of intergroup and citizenship education because of his concern about the growing racial, religious, economic and political tensions in American life.

About a year after the program had been initiated, the new program of democratic living and classroom study was introduced into the schools. Springfield followed this program for about five years. The Springfield Plan which had its greatest impact from 1939 to 1945 attempted to immunize its children against racial and religious antagonisms by means of an integrated education free from fear and mistrust. Whether it was successful or not is debatable. However, the Springfield Program like the American democratic way, can be seen as unfinished business.

Springfield like many other cities in Massachusetts and other states in the U.S. continued to operate and ignore the issues of desegregation and racial imbalance of their schools even though in 1954 the

---

10 Ibid., p. 4.
11 Ibid., p. 152.
12 Ibid., p. 148.
Brown vs. Board of Education decision was rendered prohibiting segregated education. For an additional ten years, the question of desegregation was avoided with all deliberate speed until on September 19, 1963, the Springfield School Committee, by formal resolution, found that "racial concentration" did exist in some of its schools and that "integrated education (was) desirable." The committee resolved to "take whatever action was necessary to the fullest extent possible, to end racial concentration in the schools within the framework of effective educational procedures." Dissatisfied with the existing situation, in January, 1964, Black parents filed a law suit in U.S. District Court to require the school committee to take steps to eliminate racial imbalance. At that time, apparently, the school authorities discontinued their plans, if any, to implement the September 19th Resolution.

On January 11, 1965, the U.S. District Court ruled that racial imbalance existing in "some of the schools" in Springfield constituted unlawful racial segregation under the United States Constitution and was to be eliminated "to the fullest extent possible - within the framework of effective education procedures." The court held that in the light of the ratio of white and non-whites in the total Springfield population (approximately ten to one) "a non-white attendance of appreciably more than 50 per cent in any one school is tantamount to segregation."\(^\text{(13)}\)

On April 1, 1965, the Kiernan Commission Report on Racial Imbalance was released. Included in the report was a complete breakdown of

\(^{13}\)Report of the Advisory Committee, *Racial Imbalance to Education*, p. 46.
the imbalanced schools that existed in Springfield. The committee report listed eight schools as imbalanced. They were Buckingham Junior High, Hooker, Carew, Eastern Avenue, Tapley, Brookings, Ells, and De-Berry elementary schools. Of the eight schools, six of them are located inside the Model Neighborhood Area (MNA) or the Model Cities Area. The Model Cities Area is eighty-five per cent Black and the neighborhood schools reflect similar statistics.

Within the Model Cities Area school construction has been a slow process. Two schools have been built in the past fourteen years, they are Ells (1960) and DeBerry (1961). Tapley was constructed in 1887, with additions in 1910 and 1954; Buckingham Junior High was built in 1890 with additions in 1915 and 1927; Eastern Avenue was constructed in 1898 and Brookings constructed in 1926.

Eight months after the Kiernan Commission Report was released, Springfield School Committee members submitted its first plan to racially balance its schools. In December, 1965, Springfield submitted a brief three and a half page plan to the state board. The plan was entitled "Springfield Plan for the Promotion of Racial Balance and the Correction of Existing Racial Imbalance in the Public Schools." Outlined in the plan included the closing of Hooker School and construction of a new Brightwood School. No firm commitment of any substance was made. The state board did not accept the plan and Springfield submitted a revised plan in February, 1966.

\[14\] "Springfield Plan for the Promotion of Racial Balance and the Correction of Existing Racial Imbalance in the Public Schools."

The revised plan had not improved to an acceptable degree and
the state board again returned the plan to Springfield. On April 1,
1966, Springfield submitted yet another revision to the first plan.
The revised plan submitted in April contained (1) changes in existing
school attendance districts; (2) the location of proposed school sites;
(3) the proposed additions to existing school buildings; and (4) other
methods for the elimination of racial imbalance.\(^\text{16}\)

On April 12, 1966, the state board approved the third submission as a preliminary first step plan.\(^\text{17}\) The board asked that further steps be incorporated into plans to be submitted the following October. The school committee of Springfield had seemed to be making positive steps toward racially balancing its schools. The first years progress was very respectable.

During the school year 1966-67, Springfield failed to submit a
racial balance plan. On December 27, 1966, the state board voted to
withhold approximately six million dollars in state aid.\(^\text{18}\) On July 8,
1967, the school committee presented to the state board its second plan.
This plan called for modest redistricting of Homer and Buckingham. The second plan also called for additions to Van Sickle Junior High and the closing of Buckingham Junior High in October, 1969. No strong commitment in terms of long range construction was made with exception of the

\(^{16}\)"Revised Springfield Plan for the Promotion of Racial Balance and the Correction of Existing Racial Imbalance in the Public Schools," April 1, 1966.

\(^{17}\)Springfield Union, April 18, 1966.

\(^{18}\)State Board Minutes, December 27, 1966.
Brightwood-North End Complex slated to be completed by September, 1970. The state board rejected the second plan.

In September, 1968, the school committee submitted an acceptable long-range plan to the state. The September Plan contained a construction schedule. The Plan proposed to convert Homer and Tapley to K-4 schools in September, 1968, transferring 387 (71 per cent non-white) fifth and sixth graders to balanced schools. Buckingham would close in September, 1968 and the Brightwood Community School would be opened. By September, 1971, the new North Branch School would be open, and by September, 1973, a new Pottenger School would be completed. The plan also projected an "experimental" school at Ells with the cooperation of local colleges and the development of a metropolitan transfer program called METCO (Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity). 19

Convinced that the Springfield School Committee was acting in good faith and working toward irradicating racial imbalance in its schools, the state board approved the second plan and released the six million dollars in frozen funds.

In November, 1968, Deputy Commissioner Curtin, chairman of the Task Force, requested a progress report from Superintendent John Deady. The report cited a delay in the construction of Brightwood Community School of at least three years. It was further reported to Deputy Commissioner Curtin that the METCO program had only attracted forty-four students and that Buckingham School had been closed, one year ahead of time.

In March, 1969, Dr. Deady informed the state board that the proposed Pottenger School would be replaced with a South End Complex. The new school would connect two major sections of the city—the South End and the Maple-Central Street areas—and would encompass the School Street, Howard Street, Achushnet Avenue school districts and parts of the Sumner Avenue and Brookings districts. Opening was expected in 1972. In anticipation of the completion of North Branch in 1972, the school committee proposed for September 1, 1969, the assignment of 160 kindergarten pupils from the imbalanced schools to the schools they would be attending when North Branch opened.20

On January 2, 1970, the state requested an updated version of the third plan to be accompanied by information on success of previous plans. By now the state was beginning to loose patience with Springfield. In five years there still existed five imbalanced schools in Springfield. Dr. Deady reported to the state that architects had not been hired and that some portions of the current plan would be cancelled.

Convinced that Springfield was "dragging its feet" in efforts to balance its schools, the state board began to apply pressure at a special meeting on June 4, 1970. Unanimously, the board passed the following motion submitted by Mrs. Dorothy Robinson:

Voted: That the School Committee and Mayor of Springfield be put on notice immediately that their failure to comply with the racial imbalance law will result in notification to the Comptroller and the State Tax Commissioner under Chapter 70, Section 5, to withhold Springfield's share of Chapter 70 aid.21

20 Letter from Dr. John E. Deady to Dr. Thomas J. Curtin, March 17, 1969.

21 State Board Minutes, June 4, 1970.
In December, 1970, a group of Black parents and concerned citizens voiced complaints to the state charging that the long-range plans would burden only the Black children. The group complained that their local schools were being closed in their communities and their children were being bused out to white schools and almost no white children were being bused in. The Commissioner of Education responded to the Mayor and school committee of Springfield with a letter containing the following paragraph:

...(It) is increasingly clear to me that in the development of its long-range racial imbalance plan your School Committee must operate fairly and equally, to the extent, possible, on all segments of the affected community. That is, any inconvenience to pupils and parents that may result from the closing, the selection of sites for new schools, or the transportation of children should be shared equally by the entire community.22

In January, 1971, the Commissioner of Education notified Springfield that construction of North Branch and South End Schools be abandoned pending further study of a more equitable plan. The state also withheld school aid from Springfield for failure to submit a short term plan to eliminate racial imbalance.

The school committee, on January 14, 1971, filed suit against the Board of Education. The suit charged that the state board acted "arbitrarily and capriciously." The case went before the Superior Court, but before the court ruling, attempts were made to exempt Springfield from the RIA. On April 13, 1971, Representative Anthony M. Scibelli (d-Springfield), Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, filed a bill which would exempt Springfield from the RIA pending

outcome of the city's court case against the state. On May 11, the House passed the bill by a 29 vote margin and sent it to the Senate. On June 22, the Senate barely passed the measure 15 to 13, and sent it to Governor Sargent. The Governor vetoed the bill stating that the State must keep its commitment to guarantee equal educational opportunity.

The school committee hired Clinchy Associate to prepare a long-range building plan. The plan was abandoned before its completion and cost the city $22,500. The school committee rejected the findings and recommendations of the Clinchy Associates report. The report projected the building needs of the city through 1980.

In 1972, the State Supreme Judicial Court handed down its decision that Springfield School Committee comply with the state board and balance its schools by September, 1973. The court also ordered the release of the frozen funds held by the state board.

In November, 1972, Dr. John Deady prepared a Six District Racial Balance Plan. This plan originally called the Task Force Plan, was developed by Dr. Deady and his staff, with the assistance of the Task Force personnel. The Six District Plan proposed to divide the elementary schools in Springfield into six (6) districts: five (5) of the six districts would have one of the five imbalanced schools within its district.

---

Each new district (contains one imbalanced school) would be re-organized into new administrative units consisting of kindergarten through fourth grade schools and schools with kindergarten, grade five and grade six. Under the Six District Plan some children would be transported to different schools. The distribution of children to different schools would be shared by both Blacks and whites. This new plan unlike the past ones, included two-way busing instead of one-way busing of only Black children.

On July 11, 1973, the State Board of Education ordered that a hearing be held in Springfield in fifteen days on two plans to bring the public schools into racial balance. White and Black parents, community leaders and concerned citizens groups gave testimony for and against the proposed plans. On October 12, 1973, the state board ordered Springfield to implement the Six District Plan in September, 1974. The School Committee of Springfield met and voted to have the City Solicitor file an appeal on behalf of the School Committee.

On May 1, 1974, the Supreme Judicial Court upheld the State Board of Education's order that Springfield implement the Six District Plan. The Court said:

the school committee's...objections...are without merit. The cases are to be remanded to the jurisdiction of the single justice of this court who shall require timely compliance with the board's order so as to ensure the implementation of the Task Force plan by September, 1974. Once before we set a dead-


line by which the board and school committee were to have acted to eliminate racial imbalance in Springfield's schools, School Committee of Springfield v. Board of Education, Mass. Adv. Sh. (1972) 1543, but that date came and went with no results having been achieved. In order to ensure that a similar fate does not befall our new deadline, the single justice will retain continuing supervisory jurisdiction of this case. We repeat our admonishment, directed at different parties but in a similar context, that 'the time for testing the meaning of the statute has long since passed and...the time for prompt action to implement it is at hand.'

Also in May, the legislature voted to repeal the Racial Imbalance Act. When the bill reached Governor Francis Sargent's desk, he vetoed the action and presented additional amendments calling for voluntary busing plans.

In July, the legislature voted into law Chapter 636, the Racial Imbalance Amendments that were proposed by the Governor. The following month the school committee voted to obey the new law (Chapter 636) and instructed the City Solicitor to appeal to the Supreme Judicial Court to vacate the order to implement the Six District Plan. With school scheduled to open within thirty days, the parents of school children in Springfield were confused as to which schools their children would attend in September.

Under the Six District Plan many of the school children would be transferred to different schools. Chapter 636 which was signed into law in July appeared to override the previous court order. But on August 22, 1974, the State Supreme Judicial Court denied the school committee's request that the Six District Plan be vacated. In denying the committee's request, the state court cited several reasons:

---


Since Chapter 636 is invalid in the foregoing respects under the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, it also violates Articles 1 and 10 of the Massachusetts Declaration of Rights.

Chapter 636 is unconstitutional as applied to the Springfield School System in the circumstances of this case.

The Springfield School System has in the past utilized the one desegregation method which the Commissioner and board can mandate under the revised law, open enrollment, and this method had no appreciable desegregative effect on the five imbalanced schools... open enrollment alone cannot achieve school integration.

In the school construction area, the School Committee has been so reluctant to build schools because of the lack of resolution of the racial balance issues, that only one new school has been started in thirteen years.

The various alternatives advanced by Chapter 636 are not new, albeit enhanced by increased funding. They are methods which have not worked in the past and will be difficult to implement in the future even with the full cooperation of the School Committee.

The action of the Springfield School Committee on August 1, 1974, in its series of motions designed to reinstate racial imbalance is an act of de jure segregation.

The main thrust of Chapter 636 was to halt the state boards efforts in Boston and Springfield. This is not constitutionally permissible.

We submit that the motion should be denied on the merits because it would be inequitable to vacate the decree. Equity requires that it be continued in effect.30

The attempt to void the RIA by the State Legislature, the Governor and the school committee of both Boston and Springfield fell short of its mark. The state court found the amendments to the RIA (Chapter 636) unconstitutional. The only additional alternative for the School Committee of Springfield was to appeal to the federal court.

30 School Committee of the City of Springfield vs. Board of Education, August, 1974, pp. 32-46.
With school scheduled to start September 16, 1974, the school committee voted to comply with the state court order.

**Integration Congress.** The proponents of the Six District Plan, confident that the court would not vacate the order, proceeded with a "City-wide Peaceful Integration Congress" on August 18, 1974. Sponsoring members of the coalition were the Board of World Service, Foster Memorial Church, Hope Church, League of Women Voters (Springfield area), Greater Springfield Council of Churches, Model Cities, the Springfield Chapter of the NAACP, the Quality Integrated Education Committee, and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

The Congress was held on Sunday, at Springfield Technical Community College. The planners of the Congress anticipated an audience of three hundred people to be in attendance, but only about one hundred-fifty persons were present. Poor attendance was primarily due to the Springfield School Committee's refusal to allow the Superintendent of Schools, Dr. John Deady and his staff to participate in the planning process. At a school committee meeting, attended by this researcher, the school committee voted four to one not to allow any school personnel to proceed with any task involving the Six District Plan.

Faced with the real possibility that the Six District Plan would be implemented in September, the Congress proceeded to inform the community about the plan and its implications. This researcher was asked to participate as a resource person. The proceedings of the Congress are listed in the following section. The participants speeches are presented as interpreted by this researcher.
Proceedings of City-wide Congress. The Congress opened with a series of short testimonies and resolutions. The narrator, Reverend E. McKinnon White, representative from the Springfield Council of Churches said "Religious movements have become increasingly concerned about liberal movements. The Christian Gospel has never stood for segregation of any kind. We are one people of one blood under one God. We must operate with more concerns at the broadest concept."

He went on to say "To continue to delay a system that will balance the schools of this city will be to continue to divide the residents of this city. If we continue to delay the racial balance process on a fair and impartial plan, we cannot claim equal education for all. We do have a program that offers a degree of fairness. We should not have to wait on a court order to achieve integration."

Emmit Thompson, representing the Urban League said, "Racial harmony cannot be achieved in separate conditions. The task of achieving racial balance is not an easy one but working together, it can be achieved. The city fathers and leaders of the community, citizens groups, parents, voters, and interested parties should take the initiative to try to get the job done."

Mrs. Rebekah Crampton, of the League of Women Voters described the situation as an "atmosphere of approaching climax." Those of us who have fought for and against the Six District Plan are hoping that the issue is met head on. Education can bring freedom and comfort in the society in which we live. Our children can say in years to come, that our parents, helped us live in a world of which we are truly proud.
Edith L. Ray, the President of the Springfield Chapter of the NAACP, said, "The policy of the NAACP has always been for total integration. It is our duty as concerned individuals to help bring about quality integrated education. It is the intention of the Springfield Chapter of the NAACP to back the Congress in its efforts today, in helping to bring about that integration."

Reverend Keith Raid, Wesleyan Methodist Church said, "Peaceful integration can be achieved in Springfield, within the last twenty-five years all churches have moved within the belief of racial inclusion. I hope that this Congress will not be the end of such efforts for obtaining quality integrated education for all."

Dr. Jessie Parks, a member of the Congress Panel and an unsuccessful candidate for the School Committee in 1964, recapped the history of the Racial Imbalance Act. Dr. Parks commented, "If you are in a responsible position, you should do things in a positive rather than a negative way. If the officials in our city do not meet the issues in a responsible way, the city residents will likewise follow in sequence."

Attorney Gerald Hegarty, Esquire of Hampden County Civil Liberties Union, was scheduled to speak on Chapter 636 and its possible affects, but he was unable to attend. Attorney Leonard Polletta, of Hegarty's staff was sent to replace him on the program. Mr. Polletta reported to the Congress participants that "Since May 1, one judge has been supervising the proceedings of the Six District Plan. Very little has been done. The City Attorney, William Flanagan, has argued before the judge that since the Governor had signed the amendment to the Racial Imbalance Act of 1965 (Chapter 636), the current order to proceed with the Six District Plan should be vacated."
State Attorney General Robert Quinn, felt that the new law (Chapter 636) should be upheld and refused to represent the State Board of Education before the judge. He did allow the board to hire its own attorney. Five parents from Springfield filed a motion to intervene in the case asking that the Six District Plan be allowed to being in September, 1974. The court was to make its ruling on Thursday, August 22, 1974.

Chapter 636 takes away the power of the State Board to require a local school committee to bus students to achieve racial balance. It does not deny the right of the local school committee to require busing. A racially balanced school under the RIA of 1965 and under Chapter 636 is defined as any school with more than fifty (50) per cent non-whites (Blacks). A racially isolated school is one in which less than thirty (30) per cent of the students are non-white (Black).

Also under Chapter 636, a voluntary program or freedom of choice system would exist. Any Black student who attends a racially imbalanced school can elect to attend any racially isolated school; and any white student who attends an isolated school can elect to attend an imbalanced school. The State would pay for one hundred (100) per cent of the transportation cost.

Mrs. Elaine Rucks, Education Planner for Model Cities, described the Six District Plan. She stated that "On May 1, 1974, the state board ordered Springfield schools integrated." More than half of the Black students in Springfield Public Schools attended racially imbalanced schools last year. The Six District Plan was designed by Dr. John Deady and his staff. The plan proposes to divide the city into six (6) separ-
ate districts with one racial imbalanced school in each district. All kindergarten children will remain in their neighborhood schools. If their parents want them to be bused with their older brothers and/or sisters, they may do so. The maximum distance to be travelled by any student is five (5) miles. The plan will distribute the burden of integration on the white as well as the Black populace; two-way busing will be implemented.

Most children will attend their neighborhood elementary schools for at least three (3) years of their elementary careers. As of October 1, 1973, 3,046 public school children were transferred for reasons of overcrowdedness, safety, or some other reason. The Six District Plan will redirect the route of busing. Approximately twenty (20) per cent of the elementary school population will be transported by busing. The advantages of the Six District Plan are as follows:

1. Elementary schools will be divided into different administrative units. Middle-school concept can concentrate manpower, and finances at the fifth and sixth grade levels. Presently, approximately thirty-six (36) schools have fifth and sixth grade students.

2. Team teaching could be utilized to a greater extent. Many classrooms have thirty (30) to thirty-five (35) students. Under this new plan, the classrooms will be equalized more and approximately twenty-three (23) to twenty-five (25) students per classroom will exist. This will also help the teacher meet the demands and needs of more students.

3. Students of varying backgrounds and cultures will come together at an age when they are better able to accept each other rather than waiting until the junior high school level. Children are more reluctant to accept change as they grow older.

4. All of the schools within the city will be integrated. Not more than thirty per cent of the children in most of the schools will be Black.
5. Children will be going to school with their friends and neighbors. The plan is divided into local blocks and streets.

6. Teachers and counselors will be oriented to help with the smooth transition. Parent involvement is also encouraged.

The Reverend Ronald G. Whitney, Associate Director of the Greater Springfield Council of Churches, reported to the Congress the facts and myths of the Six District Plan. They are as follows:

1. It has been reported by unreliable sources that 5,800 children will be transported out of their local neighborhood schools. The fact is less than 4,200 children will be transported.

2. The transportation cost will result in higher taxes. Under the Racial Imbalance Act, transportation will be reimbursed by the State one hundred percent.

3. Because of transporting of children, it has been rumored that safety of children will be in danger. The facts show that children will be safer on buses according to statistics from past studies on desegregation.

4. Children will be separated from their friends by attending different schools. The facts are that children will be attending schools with their friends and neighbors.

5. It has been rumored that the achievement of white children will decline during desegregation. The fact is that no evidence to this statement has been reported.

6. It has been reported that all parents have to participate in the transportation plan. The fact is that parents do not have to participate in the transportation plan but they must see to it that their children attend the designated school.

7. It has been reported that violence will occur if this plan is implemented. The fact is that violence occurs only when community leadership is lacking.

By providing a sense of direction for the community, the City-wide Congress for Peaceful Integration had been a major catalyst in
accomplishing this purpose. The school committee had not met its responsibilities and the mayor has continued to speak out against the Six District Plan.

A motion was made to ask Mayor Neil Sullivan through a resolution to provide leadership for a peaceful integration of the schools in September. The members present felt that the Congress should be more specific to the mayor. The narrator of the Congress stated that the proposed resolution "could mean anything from nuts to soup." The motion was revised to read, "that the Congress pass a resolution to call upon the mayor to implement a plan of integration, specifically the Six District Plan, this September." The motion passed and was sent to the Resolution Committee to be prepared and sent to the mayor.31 The resolution read as follows:

---

31 Minutes taken from City-wide Congress for Peaceful Integration by this researcher, August 18, 1974.
RESOLUTION

Whereas, the Racial Imbalance Act of 1965 mandated that no school in the Commonwealth may have an enrollment of more than fifty per cent (50%) non-white.

Whereas, in accordance with that Law, the State Board of Education has determined and notified the School Committee annually that racial imbalance exists in the Springfield Public Schools.

Whereas, in further accordance with that Law, the School Committee has exhausted its judicial remedies.

Whereas, subsequent to Public Hearings held in the City of Springfield, the State Board of Education has specifically recommended that the Springfield School Committee implement the Six District Plan to eliminate the racial imbalance that exists in the public schools.

Whereas, on May 1, 1974, the Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts upheld the Board's Opinion and Order, and the Court further Ordered Springfield to implement the Six District Plan by September, 1974.

Whereas, Chapter 636 became Law two months following that Order, and violates the spirit and intent of the 14th Amendment as interpreted by the 1954 Landmark Decision, Brown Vs Topeka, Kansas, outlawing the "separate but equal" doctrine and further it violates the aforementioned state statute.

Be it therefore resolved that the Congress for Peaceful Integration urges the Mayor of the City of Springfield, in his capacity as Chairman of the School Committee, to advocate the implementation of the Six District Plan forthwith in order that the schools may open integrated in September, 1974.

Be it further resolved that copies of this Resolution be sent to:

Honorable Francis Sargent, Governor of the Commonwealth
Robert H. Quinn, Esq. Attorney General
Dr. Gregory Anrig, Commissioner of Education-Agent for the State Board of Education
William Flanagan, Esq., City Solicitor
Gerald Hegarty, Esq., Attorney for the Intervenors
All members of the Springfield School Committee
All news media

On Wednesday, September 4, 1974, the day schools were scheduled to open in Springfield, only the city's high schools, junior high schools and six elementary schools not involved in the Six District Plan, began classes. Thirty additional elementary schools did not start classes until September 16, 1974. Superintendent John Deady appealed to the 1500 staff members for their aid and support in instituting the busing plan. "The past is the past and as we look ahead, the welfare of our children should be our only concern."^33

Teachers began to map out strategies to ensure that the opening of school would go smoothly. Civic groups and organizations asked that parents, teachers, and all interested parties cooperate with the court order and ensure the safety of the children. A series of public service broadcasts were released on radio and television appealing to the public to accept the busing plan. On Friday, September 13, 1974, Mayor William C. Sullivan issued the following statement concerning the implementation of the Six District Racial Balance Plan:

I would like to address myself to the citizens of Springfield regarding the racial balance plan which will go into effect with the opening of our public elementary schools Monday morning, September 16.

I am well aware that many parents have opposed this plan. However, the Supreme Judicial Court of the commonwealth has spoken. As mayor of Springfield, I must uphold the laws of this commonwealth. I will not neglect that responsibility. I remain confident that if we are courageous and persevering, this court order will be carried out in an atmosphere of good feeling.^34


On Tuesday morning, September 17, 1974, the day after schools opened under the busing plan, The Springfield Union reported:

Without disruptions, with normal attendance and with only a handful of minor problems, Springfield's elementary schools opened under a court-ordered integration plan Monday. Aside from some confusion and a few cases of missed buses, the Six District Racial Balance Plan took effect smoothly. There was only one instance of open, though peaceful, resistance to the busing plan.35

Desegregation had at last arrived in the city of Springfield. Since 1963, the school committee had acknowledged segregation of its elementary schools. Twelve years later under a court-ordered busing plan, five imbalanced predominantly Black schools merged with twenty-five predominantly white schools to satisfy the states Racial Imbalance Act. The process of desegregation was long and painful for proponents and opponents alike.

Countless numbers of plans, petitions, appeals, suits, and court orders were handed down during the process. State and federal funds were withheld from the city and politicians were elected and defeated on the issue of racial balance. The process which appears to be over for some, has only just begun for others.

The major limitation of the Six District Plan was that it did not include the Sixth District, where many Puerto Rican and Spanish-speaking children live. The schools in the Sixth District were Brightwood, Lincoln, Jefferson, Carew, School and Howard Street. In a news release on October 12, 1973, the Commissioner of Education, Gregory R. Anrig, on behalf of the State Board of Education expressed his concern

about the minority isolation of the Sixth District. His comments were as follows:

Of some concern to the Board is the fact that the Sixth District of the Task Force Plan, which contains most of the Spanish-speaking population, is left isolated from the other five districts. The Sixth District is now racially balanced under the state racial imbalance law but is, to use the Examiner's phrase, minority isolated. This minority isolation may be in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution... If so, the Committee and the City of Springfield are under a continuing obligation to remedy that situation...this Board has no power to refuse to approve a plan when it has constitutional concerns about that plan, but may only seek a judicial declaration on the constitutional issue.36

One year later on October 3, 1974, Commissioner Gregory R. Anrig, asked Springfield to take steps to end the concentration of Puerto Rican children in the city's North End elementary schools (the Sixth District). Commissioner Anrig stated: "Whenever possible, one should not by plan create a school district in which the majority of the children are from minority groups."37

The Commissioner's request was not enforceable because by state law, Puerto Rican children are considered whites under the Racial Imbalance Law. If the city of Springfield failed to take heed to such warnings, the federal agency of Health, Education and Welfare could enforce the request.

The "minority isolation" of the Sixth District has the potential of creating additional problems concerning racial balance. The Sixth District currently consists of one-third Blacks, one-third whites, and

36 Opinion and Order of the Board of Massachusetts Department of Education Bureau of Educational Information Services, p. 14.
one-third Spanish-speaking children. Desegregating Spanish-speaking children into schools and classrooms which are not prepared to address the problems of language barriers and cultural differences can prove to be dangerous and damaging. The Sixth District must be closely monitored within the upcoming years.
Elementary School Districts
Under the Six District Plan
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CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The previous chapter provided an historical overview of the events leading up to the passage of the Racial Imbalance Act and the process by which the Six District Racial Balance Plan was implemented. Additionally, the chapter discussed the general philosophy and attitudes of the State Legislature, the Governor and the School Committee of Springfield toward the process of desegregation and racial balance.

The first part of this chapter will describe the research methodology, the methodological assumptions, the research design, the pilot study, the method of selection of subjects, the instrumentation and field procedures. The second part of this chapter will discuss the data collection and recording, the data processing and analysis and the limitations of the research design.

Research Methodology

This descriptive Research Study attempts to determine if the attitudes of Black and white students are significantly different on issues involving the Racial Imbalance Act, the implementation of the Six District Plan, quality education, desegregation and racial compatibility. This model was chosen because it seemed the most suitable vehicle to facilitate the fact finding and the systematic data gathering on attitudes of student toward the problem surrounding desegregation of Springfield schools.
Methodological Assumptions

By employing this methodology two major assumptions were made. The first assumption was that "truer" attitudinal responses would come from the population chosen because they were not so intricately involved in the implementation of the Six District Plan. These "truer" responses could be gained in a selective environment. This project provided a non-hostile environment for the students to express their attitudes. The second assumption asserted in this methodology was that attitudes can be changed within the proper instructional environment.

Research Design

This study was a one-group pre-test--post-test design. This design was chosen because in working with social problems, like desegregation, control groups and manipulation of variables was not always feasible. Advantages of this design are that the design provides a control for selection and mortality of variables. The major disadvantage of the design was that there was no assurance that the treatment was the only or even the major factor in the difference between the pre- and post-test. History, maturation, and testing were left uncontrollable. In addition, there may be plausible rival hypotheses effecting changes in attitudes.
Pilot Study

In order to test the reliability of the instrument, a sample of twenty Black students was taken from a summer program at Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts. These students were participating in the Springfield Amherst Summer Activities Program (SASA). The SASA program consisted of sixty Black students and twenty counselors and teachers. Twenty students were selected randomly by choosing every third student listed in the program. A pre-test (RII inventory) was administered to students on Friday, June 21, 1974. On Tuesday, June 25, these same twenty students were given a short history of the Racial Imbalance Act in Massachusetts, an explanation of the Six District Plan and the definitions and meanings of seven terms: Racial Imbalance Act, integration, Six District Plan, desegregation, METCO, quality education and segregation. The discussion and question period lasted about one hour. After the discussion period, the students were administered a post-test (RII inventory).

The results of the findings were that the students average score on the pre-test was 61.650 and their average score on the post-test was 68.450 a gain of almost seven (7) points. It would seem that the Informatory Discussion Session was responsible for the seven point gain in that a forum was created for the students for discussion and interaction to the process of desegregation.

Selection of Subjects

The sample used in this study consisted of sixty-four high school
students enrolled in the Upward Bound Summer Program. Of the sixty-four students, forty-four (44) were Black and twenty (20) were white. The Upward Bound Summer Program was sponsored by the University of Massachusetts, located in Amherst.

The students in the sample were selected because (1) they were from Springfield and the surrounding areas (Springfield is located in the western part of the state with a minority school enrollment of twenty-eight (28) per cent). (2) They were all in elementary school when the original decision to balance the elementary schools was made. (3) According to past history of the educational process, they were candidates for failure. (4) They all knew very little, if anything, about the Six District Plan but were knowledgeable about the Racial Imbalance Act. (5) The students in this study were not directly involved in the desegregation process.

Instrumentation

The Racial Imbalance Inventory (RII) was designed in an attempt to determine how students of different races felt about the Racial Imbalance Act and the Six District Racial Balance Plan. The Racial Imbalance Inventory consisted of twenty questions arranged on a five-point Likert Scale.

The RII was divided into five different categories: 1) the Racial Imbalance Act, 2) the Six District Plan, 3) Racial Compatability, 4) Desegregation, and 5) Quality Education. The students were to pro-
vide a response that reflected their own personal opinions to each question. The responses ranged from (1) Strongly Agree, (2) Agree, (3) Undecided, (4) Disagree, to (5) Strongly Disagree. All non-responses were scored under (3) Undecided.

**Content Validity.** The instrument used for this project was constructed by this researcher with the aid and assistance from a "panel of experts." Fifty questions were constructed and divided into the five categories mentioned above. The questions were rated on the basis of their relationship to each category. These questions were presented to a panel of six people, all experts in urban education. The panel consisted of two professors of education, both of whom had conducted past research on desegregation; two community leaders, working for desegregation; and two graduate students working in programs involving desegregation. The list was screened down from fifty to twenty questions.

**Reliability.** To test the attitudes of students on the Racial Imbalance Act and the Six District Plan, an instrument would have to be constructed utilizing the local racial balance plan. No pretested instrument was available. The instrument constructed from the RII Inventory had to be tested for its reliability.

Table 1 (Appendix G) shows the pre- and posttest scores, squared scores, and standard scores which were used to the coefficient of stability. The formulas used in determining the coefficient of stability was the same as the formula for determining the correlation coefficient.
The coefficient of Stability (also called the test-retest method) is the correlation between a test and itself. There were two disadvantages in using this method. The first was that the obtained reliability coefficient will not reflect any of the error due to the sampling of content. The second disadvantage was that the student's memory of his answers on the pre-test quite likely influenced the answers on the post-test. The major reason for using this test-retest method was that an alternate form did not have to be constructed.

Table 2 (Appendix G) shows the pre- and post-test standard scores and the product of the pre- and post-test scores. These product scores represent the estimated correlation coefficient score. The correlation of Stability using test-retest method for the RII is reported to be .65.

Field Procedures

Objectives. One of the task of this study was to find a populace that would be indirectly affected by the Six District Racial Balance Plan and knew very little about the plan. Since the school committee in Springfield refused to endorse the proposed plan, the majority of the residents of the city knew very little about the plan, even though the Superintendent of Schools for Springfield designed the plan. The school committee refused to allow Dr. John Deady to promote the Six District Plan. Because the school committee was under court order, they did allow Dr. Deady to make the bare minimum input in order to open the schools for September, 1974.
Fifty-four per cent of the students in the sample had brothers and sisters who were in elementary school. These same high school students had attended the imbalanced elementary schools themselves. As far as can be determined, no one had ever asked these students their opinion about racial balance, integration, or segregation.

Procedure. Students were given Informatory Discussion Sessions on three separate occasions during the summer program. The discussion sessions were conducted with the permission of the Director of the Upward Bound Program, Mr. Donald Brown. On Tuesday, June 25, 1974, at the first group meeting of all the students in the Upward Bound Program, a fact finding sheet was handed out to each of the one hundred and forty students present.

It was found that of the one hundred and forty students who participated in the initial fact finding sheet, seventy per cent of the students were either familiar with or had heard of the seven terms. Only thirty per cent of the students were unfamiliar with the terms. But when the terms were evaluated individually, the results in Table 4.1 were found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms</th>
<th>Familiar With</th>
<th>Have Heard Of</th>
<th>Unfamiliar With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Racial Imbalance Act</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six District Plan</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desegregation</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METCO*</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Education</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Segregation</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 140

*Metropolitan Council for Educational Opportunity
On Thursday, June 27, 1974, seventy (70) students were randomly selected to participate in the study. Controls were used to ensure that a significant number of white students would be included in the sample (there was a ratio of approximately 2:1 of Black students to white). Of the seventy students approached to participate in the study, sixty-four agreed to be tested and attend all the discussion sessions. They were given a pre-test which lasted about thirty minutes and were told that the discussion sessions would begin on Tuesday, July 2, 1974.

An additional concern was to determine to what extent, if any, would the Informatory Discussion Sessions affect the high school students attitudes toward the Racial Imbalance Act and the Six District Plan. There were four Informatory Discussion Sessions--each lasted about one hour and were designed to explain the purpose of the Six District Plan, the significance of that plan and the possible alternatives if this plan did not go into effect.

The amendment to the Racial Imbalance Act of 1965, Chapter 636, which would make it illegal for the State Board of Education to require a local school district to bus students to achieve racial balance, was also discussed in detail. It was necessary to define the seven terms and the relationship they have with one another before the groups could proceed.

The design of this study was structured so as to determine whether or not the attitudes of Upward Bound Students would change if they were educated about the pros and cons of desegregation. A test was run to show if there was any significant gain in scores between pre- and post-tests.
On Tuesday, July 2, 1974, the sixty-four students participated in the first discussion session on the seven (7) terms defined by this researcher. Students were asked what they thought was the definition of each term. The discussion took place in an atmosphere of cooperation and self-initiation (no student was forced to participate in the discussions).

The second discussion session was held on Tuesday, July 9, 1974. The topic of discussion was the Racial Imbalance Act. A history of the RIA was given to the students from the period of 1965 to 1974. Major passages in the Act were also discussed. The session lasted one hour.

The third discussion session was held on Tuesday, July 16, 1974. The topic of discussion was the Six District Racial Balance Plan. The pros and cons of the plan were discussed as they related to the process of desegregation. This session lasted forty-five minutes. The fourth and final discussion session held on July 23, dealt with the implications of the Racial Imbalance Act and the Six District Plan, the effects of desegregation on the Commonwealth and the country, and the issue of busing. After one hour of discussion, the students were given the post-test (the same instrument used for the pre-test). The entire process including the testing and discussion lasted one hour and forty minutes. There was a five week period between the pre- and post-test.

Data Collection

Three counselors from the Upward Bound Program volunteered to assist with the organization of the discussion groups. The counselors
each accompanied the researcher in each discussion session. They were familiar with the students and served to set the students at ease and aided in facilitating the discussions.

The counselors also helped to distribute and collect the data from the students. The results from the Fact Finding Sheet were hand tabulated by the researcher on June 26, 1974. The data collected from the pre-test on June 27, 1974, was programmed to utilize the computer. This data was coded and stored to secure it from damage or loss. The data collected from the post-test was handled similarly to that of the pre-test. The material was collected, coded, and keypunched for a computer program.

Data Processing and Analysis

Data was analyzed using a two-tailed t-tests with an alpha at the 0.05 level of significance to avoid the Type I error of incorrectly rejecting the null hypothesis. By allowing for the attitudes of white and Black students to be either positive or negative, the two-tailed t-tests would report any significance in different responses.

Restatement of Conceptual Hypotheses

In restating the conceptual hypotheses of this investigation, Hypotheses I and II are treated as the major hypotheses in that they directly address the purpose of the investigation. Hypotheses III, IV,
and V are considered the minor hypotheses. These hypotheses are closely related to the purpose of the investigation but do not satisfy the specific requirements of the investigation. The major and minor hypotheses conceptually appear as follows:

Hypothesis I -- The scores of Black students will be higher than white students toward the Racial Imbalance Act of 1965, after the Informatory Discussion Sessions.

Hypothesis II -- The scores of Black students will be more positive than those of white students toward the Six District Racial Balance Plan after the Informatory Discussion Sessions.

Hypothesis IIa -- There will be a significant gain in attitudes of students (Black and white) following Informatory Discussion Sessions.

Hypothesis III -- White students will perceive the quality of education in their schools superior to that of Black students, after the Informatory Discussion Sessions.

Hypothesis IV -- There will be a higher score difference for white students in the category of desegregation as it effects the quality of education for Black and Puerto Rican students, after the Informatory Discussion Sessions.

Hypothesis V -- Black students will respond more positively to racial compatibility than white students, after the Informatory Discussion Sessions.
Chapter IV was mainly concerned with discussing the hypotheses and the procedures used to test the hypotheses. The validity and reliability of the instrument was also discussed. The previous chapter explained the problems encountered by this researcher in relation to the one group pretest/posttest design.

The first section of this chapter was concerned with the presentation and analysis of the findings. The level of significance and the types of test used to measure the level of significance were also presented. The hypotheses presented in this chapter was stated in the null form. The second section reviewed the implications of the findings.

The results from the Racial Imbalance Inventory pretest revealed that the responses of Black and white students were quite similar. The mean score for Black students was 61.35 and the mean score for white students was 60.69. The deviation scores on the pretest were not large enough to produce a significant difference between Black and white students on the pretest.

The first hypothesis was stated as follows:

Hypothesis I -- There will be no significant difference between the scores of Black or white students toward the Racial Imbalance Act of 1965 after the Informatory Discussion Sessions.
The two-tailed t-test was employed on mean of posttests of RII on questions in category dealing with the Racial Imbalance Act. The level of significance was 0.05. As reported in Chapter IV, data was collected on sixty-four students: forty-four Black and twenty white students.

In evaluating Hypothesis I, three questions on the RII were developed to evaluate the student's attitudes toward the Racial Imbalance Act of 1965. (See Appendix E for questionnaire in its entirety.) Two of the three questions had to be of significant difference before the category could be determined significant. Questions one, six and nineteen were included under the category "Racial Imbalance Act." Only question six, which reads "Massachusetts should be ordered by state and federal courts to balance its schools" was significant. Sixteen percent of the Black students agreed and sixty-six percent of them disagreed with question six. Of white students, twenty-five percent agreed and thirty-five percent disagreed with question six (see Appendix C). When the t-test was employed, the level of significance was .008. The level of significance for questions one and nineteen were .198 and .209, respectively (Table 5.1). The t test results for the total category, however, did reveal that there was a significant difference in responses of Black and white students.

On the basis of the data provided in the Racial Imbalance category, Hypothesis I must be rejected as stated:

--There will be no significant difference between the attitudes of Black or white high school students toward the Racial Imbalance Act of 1965.
TABLE 5.1

Mean Score, Standard Deviation and Significance Level on the RII by Category for Black and White Students

Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Imbalance</th>
<th>Black N = 44</th>
<th>White N = 20</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The Racial Imbalance Act of Massachusetts should be explored.</td>
<td>3.470</td>
<td>1.285</td>
<td>3.050</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Massachusetts should be ordered by state and federal courts to balance schools.</td>
<td>3.909</td>
<td>1.158</td>
<td>3.100</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Blacks, whites and Puerto Ricans should attend schools of choice.</td>
<td>4.023</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>3.700</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>.209</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>11.410</strong></td>
<td><strong>9.850</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.405</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.872</strong></td>
<td><strong>.013</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second hypothesis was stated as follows:

Hypothesis II -- There will be no significant differences between the scores of Black or white students toward the Six District Racial Balance Plan after the Informatory Discussion Sessions.

The two-tailed t-test was employed on mean of posttest of RII on questions dealing with the Six District Plan. The level of significance
was 0.05. In evaluating Hypothesis II, four questions were designed to solicit the attitudes of the students regarding the Six District Racial Balance Plan adopted by Springfield, Massachusetts. In order to accept Hypothesis II, two questions (numbers thirteen and fourteen) would have to be at the 0.05 significant level.

Question thirteen, "The Six District Plan should not be enforced in September," was accepted at 0.035 (Table 5.2); question fifteen, "I approve of the Six District Plan for racial balance," was not at the significant level. Twenty-three percent of the Black students agreed with question thirteen whereas seventy-five percent of the white students agree with this question (see Appendix C). There seemed to be mixed reactions to whether or not the students approved of the Six District Plan. On the basis of the data provided in the Six District Category, Hypothesis II must be accepted as stated:

--There will be no significant differences between the attitudes of Black or white students toward the Six District Racial Balance Plan.

Hypothesis IIIa was stated as follows:

--There will be no significant gain in attitudes of students (Black and white) following Informatory Discussion Sessions.

A gain in scores on the RII was reported as a gain in attitudes. The mean scores for white students on the RII were 60.69 and 66.65 respectively. The mean scores for Black students were 61.35 and 67.69 respectively. The gain in scores for white students was 5.96 points and for Black students, 6.34 points. The gain in scores within the groups was not significant, but the gain between the group scores (pre-test and posttest) was significant (Table 5.3).
### TABLE 5.2

Mean Score, Standard Deviation and Significance Level on the RII by Category for Black and White Students

**Posttest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIX DISTRICT PLAN</th>
<th>Black ( N = 44 )</th>
<th>White ( N = 20 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Brothers and sisters will attend school under Six District Plan.</td>
<td>3.227</td>
<td>1.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Six District Plan should not be enforced in September.</td>
<td>3.181</td>
<td>1.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I am aware that the Six District Plan has been accepted for my city.</td>
<td>3.318</td>
<td>1.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I approve of the Six District Plan for racial balance.</td>
<td>3.295</td>
<td>1.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My community should have had more input in the Six District Plan.</td>
<td>3.863</td>
<td>0.702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL** | 16.886 | 2.148 | 16.300 | 2.658 | .352 |
TABLE 5.3

Gain Scores of Black and White Students on Racial Imbalance Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>61.35</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>60.69</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STUDENTS</th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>VARIANCE</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>SIGNIFICANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>67.69</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>66.65</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of the data provided, Hypothesis IIa must be rejected as stated:

—There will be no significant gain in attitudes of students (Black and white) following Informatory Discussion Sessions.

Hypothesis III was stated as follows:

Hypothesis III — There will be no significant differences in how Black and white students perceive the quality
of education in their schools after Informatory Discussion Sessions.

Four questions were included in the Quality Education category. In order for the third hypothesis to be accepted, three of the four questions must have been accepted at the 0.05 significant level. Only question two which read, "Black and Puerto Rican schools are inferior to white schools," approached a level of significance. Forty-six percent of the Black students agreed with and thirty-seven percent disagreed with question two, as compared to fifteen and forty percent respectively for white students.

The mean and Standard Deviation sides were very similar for Black and white students as well as the percentage of agreement or disagreement for each question within this category (Table 5.4). Thirty-six percent of the Black students agreed that "Quality education can only be achieved for Black and Puerto Ricans through desegregation," as compared to twenty-five percent of white students agreeing to this statement. On the basis of the data provided in this category, Quality Education, Hypothesis III must be accepted as stated:

--There will be no significant difference in how Black and white students perceive the quality of education in their schools.

The fourth hypothesis was stated as follows:

Hypothesis IV -- There will be no significant difference between the attitudes of Black and white students that desegregation will improve the quality of education for Black and Puerto Rican students after Informatory Discussion Sessions.
TABLE 5.4

Mean Score, Standard Deviation and Significance Level on the RII by Category for Black and White Students

Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUALITY EDUCATION</th>
<th>Black N = 44</th>
<th>White N = 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
<td>Mean  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Black and Puerto Rican schools are inferior to white schools.</td>
<td>2.886 1.351</td>
<td>3.400 1.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Desegregation will improve the quality of education for Black and Puerto Rican students.</td>
<td>3.227 1.327</td>
<td>3.400 0.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Black and Puerto Rican students can receive quality education in their own schools.</td>
<td>3.522 1.023</td>
<td>3.450 1.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Quality education can only be achieved for Blacks and Puerto Ricans through desegregation.</td>
<td>3.068 1.371</td>
<td>3.450 1.317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12.227 2.718</td>
<td>13.700 2.515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four questions were used to measure the fourth hypothesis. Three of the four questions had to be at the significant level to accept the hypothesis. In reviewing the data, it was found that there were no significant difference in Black and white responses. The mean and Standard Deviation scores are almost identical for Black and white students (Table 5.5). The percentage of agreement or disagreement was very similar. On the basis of this data, Hypothesis IV must be accepted as stated:

--There will be no significant difference between the attitudes of Black and white students that desegregation will improve the quality of education for Black and Puerto Rican students.

The fifth hypothesis was stated as follows:

Hypothesis V -- There will be no significant difference in responses of Black and white students as to racial compatibility after Informatory Discussion Sessions.

Four questions were designed to solicit the students' attitudes toward race relations. Students were asked questions about racial violence, compatibility and basic attitudes towards desegregation. In order for Hypothesis V to be significant, questions twelve and eighteen must report out at the 0.05 level.

Sixteen percent of the Black students agreed that "Desegregation will enable the races to get along better," while fifty-two percent of the Black students disagreed with this statement. In response to the same questions, five percent of the white students agreed and sixty-five percent disagreed (see Appendix C). The significant level for question twelve reported out at .242 (Table 5.6).
### TABLE 5.5

Mean Score, Standard Deviation and Significance Level on the RII by Category for Black and White Students

**Posttest**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Desegregation is okay if it does not involve bussing.</td>
<td>2.613</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My parents probably would not support desegregation plans for elementary schools.</td>
<td>3.227</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Bussing is acceptable for desegregation only for short trips.</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>3.150</td>
<td>.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Under desegregation, white administrators and teachers would be less sensitive to the needs of Black and Puerto Rican students.</td>
<td>3.477</td>
<td>3.350</td>
<td>.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>12.818</td>
<td>12.450</td>
<td>.561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**TABLE 5.6**

Mean Score, Standard Deviation and Significance Level on the RII by Category for Black and White Students

Posttest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACIAL COMPATIBILITY</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 44</td>
<td>N = 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Blacks and Puerto Ricans are against desegregation just as much as whites.</td>
<td>3.204</td>
<td>0.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If bussing is used to desegregate two-way bussing should be imposed.</td>
<td>3.909</td>
<td>1.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Desegregation will enable the races to get along better.</td>
<td>3.523</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. If the Six District Plan is implemented, there will be racial violence.</td>
<td>3.181</td>
<td>0.922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.818</td>
<td>1.920</td>
<td>14.350</td>
<td>2.207</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In response to question eighteen, "If the Six District Plan is implemented, there will be racial violence," twenty percent of the Black students agreed and thirty-nine percent disagreed with this statement. White students in response to the same questions, agreed fifteen percent and disagreed thirty-five percent. The t test for this question was not significant. On the basis of this data, Hypothesis V must be accepted as stated:

--There will be no significant difference in responses of Black and white students as to racial compatibility.

Discussion of Findings

As reported earlier in this chapter, the pretest showed no significant difference in the responses of Black and white students. Their responses could be said to have been similar on the pretest. The first hypothesis reported after the Informatory Discussion Sessions revealed that there was a significant difference in how white and Black students responded to the Racial Imbalance Act. White students were much more apprehensive to the RIA as interpreted by their responses. The mean scores of the white students were much lower than the mean scores of Black students.

Hypothesis II reported no significant difference in the responses of Black and white students. Hypothesis II also reported that although there was significant difference between the responses of Black and white students, there was, however, a difference in gain scores for both Black and white students. The gain itself was not significant between Black and white students.
Hypotheses III, IV and V were accepted as stated. There was no significant difference between the responses of the Black and white students after the Informatory Discussion Sessions. One major reason no significant difference was found had to do with the "population". These high school students were "disadvantaged" lower-class students enrolled in a compensatory program (Upward Bound).

The change of attitudes in the area of ethnic relationships, in general, depends upon experience of personal contacts.\(^1\) Little, if any, major difference was reported between the attitudes of these high school students because they have had past experiences with one another. Darshan Sachdeva reported a change in attitudes of junior high school Black and white students toward school desegregation.\(^2\) This change came about when Black and white students attended desegregated schools. Sachdeva reported that the school integration had a positive effect on student feelings and attitudes toward school.\(^3\)

The Report on Racial Isolation also reports data which suggest that school desegregation has its greatest impact upon student attitudes and preferences through the mediating influence of friendship with students of the other race.

Black and white students who attend school with each other, but have no friends of the other race, are less likely to prefer desegregated situations than students in desegregated schools who have such friends.

---


Having attended schools with students of the other race and having friends of the other race contribute to preferences for desegregation. The effect is strongest for students who have had both experiences.\(^4\)

The Black and white students in this Upward Bound Program did attend schools with each other. Their social circles were racially isolated—whites associated with whites and Blacks associated with Blacks. By attending classes together, living together, playing and competing together; these Black and white Upward Bound students have come to accept each other. In some aspect, they have begun to accept desegregation.

The attitudes of these students toward desegregation was very similar. Black and white students did not always agree, but there were no significant differences in attitudes between the two groups. Because of the adverse publicity of the desegregation attempts in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, it is impossible to infer from this data to what extent these students accept the desegregation plan.

There was a large percentage of responses in the "undecided" category or alternative three (3). The students seemed somewhat reluctant to take a positive or negative stand. This was possibly due to questions being worded to give the "model" or expected answers. Renis Likert, in discussing criteria for constructing a Likert Scale, says:

To avoid any space error or any tendency to a stereotyped response, it seems desirable to have the different statements so worded that about one-half of them have one end of the attitude continuum corresponding to the left or upper part of the reaction alternatives

and the other half have the same end of the attitude continuum corresponding to the right or lower part of the reaction alternatives.  

It is reasonable to expect the results found in this study to reflect only the sample population. The instrument designed for this study (RII) was designed for the sample population. The instrument included questions in reference to the laws of one state and the balance plan of one city within that state. At best, Black and white students accept and reject desegregation and attempts to desegregate, at about the same degree, especially when they attend classes together and play or work in the same programs with one another.

---

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Chapter V was mainly concerned with the analysis of the findings. The implications of the findings as perceived by this researcher were also discussed.

This chapter concerned itself with the summation of the previous five chapters, the re-examination of the findings as hypothesized and the recommendations for future research this study might have.

In Chapter I, the problem of racial isolation and racial injustice was presented for review. Questions were posed as to how to effectively deal with the condition of unequal education—a problem that most minority groups face in America. Of the possible solutions mentioned were community-control, compensatory programs, and desegregation.

The primary purpose of this investigation was to explore the process of desegregation as it related to the Racial Imbalance Act and the Six District Plan. The purpose was not to advocate the process of desegregation over other viable alternatives, but merely to explore the possible advantages the desegregation would have upon a city.

Desegregation could be viewed as the by-product or "first child" of integration. Since the Brown vs. Board of Education decision, the state and federal courts have tried hard to force desegregation upon many school systems. The policy of "separate but equal" prevailed for over fifty years before the Brown decision was rendered.
Attempts were made in the first chapter to differentiate between the terms integrated and desegregation. Integration is a goal of many people in America who feel that it is morally right. Desegregation is a process to achieve that integration. In order for society in general to become integrated, the institutions that make up "society" must first become integrated through the process of desegregation.

The problem with the process of desegregation is that while many people are for it, there are just as many against it. The "concept" of desegregation is fine, but the actuality of desegregation presents problems. The case in point was the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. For nine years, the Commonwealth laws prohibited racial isolation within its schools and for nine years racial isolation existed.

The problem of this investigation focused around the students in Springfield, Massachusetts. What effect, if any, would desegregation have on the attitudes of the students? The specific purpose of the investigation was to document this descriptive study of Springfield. Chapter I concludes with the definition of terms, the statement of hypotheses and the significance of the investigation.

To evaluate the process of desegregation in Springfield in a clear and unbiased manner, a review of the laws surrounding desegregation and a review of the literature had to be undertaken. Chapter II was a discussion of the court decisions, cases and case studies.

In 1954 when the Supreme Court decision ruled that "separate" could not be "equal", a direct confrontation existed between the courts and the liberals in the North, and the Southern segregationist. During the "sixties", the focus of desegregation switched from South to North.
The South has maintained the "concept" of segregation because of its history and principles. In the North, a much more complicated form of racial isolation existed.

De Facto segregation or segregation that results not out of direct intention or defiance of the law, but because of housing patterns, or employment practices. Northern cities during the prosperous sixties saw a "vast influx" of minorities and a "great exodus" of the majority or white populace. Urban schools became increasingly predominantly Black and minority and suburbs became almost totally white.

The general excuse for the white exodus was the fear that minorities would lessen the quality of education within the urban schools. Those who could afford new homes in the suburbs and the expenses of commuting to work were able to escape the urban crunch.

The review of the case studies as reported in Chapter II reveal that Black schools were closed when they became almost totally Black, and those Blacks who attended such schools were bussed to other Black schools or to white schools. Until the early seventies, the emergence of two-way bussing of both Black and white students for the purpose of desegregation appeared.

The pressure exerted by Black groups helped bring about effective desegregation plans. The tactics used by these groups were: (1) the boycotting of schools, (2) the protesting and demonstrations at school board meetings, (3) court action suits, and (4) violence. The latter was not a common tactic and when violence was used, the process for desegregation was stymied.
Chapter III addressed the historical implications of the Racial Imbalance Act and the Six District Racial Balance Plan. This chapter presented the underlying theme for desegregation—"Because it is Morally Right." In 1964, the Kiernan Commission reported that racial imbalance did exist in some communities of the Commonwealth: Boston and Springfield were two of those cities. The report demanded the elimination of racial imbalance in the schools and the achievement of integrated education by practical, reasonable and educationally sound methods.

The legislature held hearings on the problems of racial imbalance and in 1965 passed the Act into law. Under the Racial Imbalance Act, state officials had the power to withhold funds if local school boards refused to comply with the law. The law left the responsibility of providing an effective racial balance plan with the local school boards and vested the power of enforcement with the State Board of Education.

The city of Springfield developed the Six District Plan. The plan called for the transferring of some five thousand children to different schools. Only two thousand would be transported by bus. The additional three thousand students lived close enough to the transfer schools. The Six District Plan was presented to the School Committee of Springfield in 1972. The state court ordered the plan implemented in September of 1973; that date passed and the court re-issued its order for September of 1974. After much protest and legal action, the plan went into effect on September 16, 1974.

Chapter IV presented the research methodology, the research design, pilot study, method of selection, instrumentation and field procedures.
In addition, this chapter discussed process of data collection, processing and analysis and the limitations of the research design.

The research design used in this study was the one group pretest/posttest design. The disadvantages of this design appear at first to outweigh the advantages. The research design does not lend itself to "true experimentation." The major disadvantage of the design is that there is no assurance that the treatment is the only or even the major factor in the difference between the pre- and posttest.

An attempt to conduct a pilot study to determine the reliability of the instrument was conducted. The population of the pilot study was entirely Black; thus, not truly addressing itself to the hypotheses as stated in Chapter I.

The population of this chapter presented the forum for soliciting attitudes toward desegregation. Two basic assumptions were made in utilizing this model. The first assumption was that truer attitudinal responses would come from these students since they were not so intricately involved in the implementation process. The second assumption was that attitudes can be changed within the proper instructional environment.

The major hypotheses as reported in the conceptual form state that Black students scores will be higher than white students toward the Racial Imbalance Act and the Six District Plan. The analysis of the data in Chapter V revealed a statistical difference between the attitudes of Black and white students toward the Racial Imbalance Act, but not the Six District Plan.

The data did show that both Black and white students' scores increased significantly on the posttest but no significant difference between
the races existed. The organization of each subject into different categories made it difficult for either of the two hypotheses to be accepted. In the category "Racial Imbalance," the total statistics for the category had to report significant before the researcher could reject the null hypotheses.

A t test between all the scores on the pretest and all the scores on the posttest revealed no significant difference between the groups (pre- and posttest). There are slight differences within groups (race or Black and white). The one group pretest/posttest design implies that the attitudes (dependent variable) will change when an independent variable treatment (Informatory Discussion Sessions) is introduced. Such was the case for the major hypotheses.

The null hypothesis was accepted for Hypotheses III, IV and V. The t test showed no significant difference between the responses of Black and white students toward desegregation, quality education and racial compatibility. The attitudes of these students appeared to be very cohesive, possibly due to the success of the Upward Bound Program. The program created a climate for cooperation and mutual understanding of both races.

Implications of the Findings

Although the data generated from the sample of this study does not permit generalizations to the total population, it would seem, to this researcher, that speculative discussion is appropriate.

The speculative implications of the findings of this research study are threefold:
1. When Black and white students live, work, play and study in the same environment, their attitudes toward one another are very similar. Their acceptance or rejection of each other was not based on race.

2. The future desegregation process in cities in the North will become increasingly violent toward Black and minority groups if desegregation is not made part of the elementary and secondary curriculum.

3. Elected "majority" school boards will not be responsive to the needs and demands of minority groups toward the status of minority groups' schools and curriculum. In such cases, the more school boards neglect the minority communities the more federal and state court rulings will be in support of the desegregation process.

Recommendation for Future Research

It is recommended that desegregation inventory used to measure attitudes be designed to elicit student opinions. The process of desegregation must be developed into a curriculum if society is to move toward integration. It is further recommended that discussion sessions on desegregation and racial balance be developed and implemented into the elementary and secondary school systems. When children of different races and ethnic groups do not interact in common environments, it is important that they understand one another.
Conclusions

The findings of this study must be limited to the sample population. The one group pretest/posttest design has many limitations. There was no way to control for the effects of history, maturation, testing and instrumentation. The contribution that similar research designs have made to the scientific process is questionable, but the possible implications for the field of education are present. The controlled random selection of the subjects to participate in the study would not have been possible under different designs. The mortality rate of the sample could have been adversely affected in utilizing another design.

Public school systems are becoming increasingly difficult to infiltrate in order to conduct research. The conditions placed upon the graduate students by the school system in many instances bias the results. Laboratory conditions do not exist in most cases in the field of education unless grant money is provided. True experimental designs are not without their handicaps.
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APPENDIX A

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE RACIAL IMBALANCE ACT
AND THE SIX DISTRICT PLAN
RACIAL IMBALANCE - A CHRONOLOGY

September 19, 1963 -- School Committee resolved: to end racial imbalance in Springfield schools.

January 1964 -- Black parents filed lawsuit (Barksdale vs. Springfield).


April 1965 -- Recommendations to Springfield from the State Committee on Racial Imbalance.

April 1, 1966 -- First Plan submitted based on recommendations of the State Committee on Racial Imbalance.

September 1967 -- Second Plan presented (approved by State).

March 1969 -- Revised Plan presented and approved.

1970 -- State requests updated version of third plan to be accompanied by information on success of previous plan.

December 1970 -- State approves construction plan and further orders short term balance to be submitted by April 1, 1971.

-- Black citizens group objects to the construction portion of revised plan.

January 26, 1971 -- Commissioner halts building plans pending further study of a more equitable plan.

1971 -- State withholds school aid from Springfield for failure to submit a short term plan to eliminate racial imbalance.

-- School Committee files suit in Superior Court charging state acted arbitrarily and capriciously.
--- Case goes to Supreme Judicial Court.

--- Clinchy Associates contracted to prepare a plan (Clinchy Plan abandoned - cost approximately $30,000).

1972 --- School Committee rejects Clinchy Report.

--- Supreme Judicial Court renders decision - funds released - orders Springfield to balance by September, 1973.

--- Six District Plan prepared.


November 12, 1973 --- City Solicitor files appeal on behalf of School Committee.

May 1, 1974 --- Supreme Judicial Court upholds State Board's order to implement the Six District Plan.

May 1974 --- Francis Sargent, Governor, vetoes bill to repeal Racial Imbalance Act - submits amendments - voluntary busing plans.

July 1974 --- Legislature enacts Chapter 636.

August 1974 --- School Committee votes to obey new law and to ask the court to vacate and amend its order.

August 22, 1974 --- State Supreme Judicial Court unanimously agreed that the Springfield School Committee comply with the previous court order and implement the Six District Plan in September, 1974.

September 16, 1974 --- Six District Plan implemented.

--- Racial Balance of elementary schools.
APPENDIX B

THE SIX DISTRICT PLAN
RECOMMENDATION FOR ELIMINATING RACIAL IMBALANCE
IN THE SPRINGFIELD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

November 30, 1972
Balancing Elementary Schools

Three weeks ago, the School Department was instructed by the School Committee to prepare a plan to eliminate racial imbalance in the elementary schools of Springfield. During this period, a careful review has been made of possible ways to accomplish this most difficult and complicated task, keeping in mind the Law of the Commonwealth, and the recent decision of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court.

In recent years, this subject has been explored thoroughly by an ad hoc committee appointed by the Springfield School Committee by various community groups and by the School Department staff, with assistance from state and federal specialists. Three plans were submitted to the School Committee a year and a half ago. The basic data which must be used in the development of any plan has not changed significantly nor has the law changed at all during the intervening months. In the final analysis, any plan will be composed of essentially the same ingredients.

This evening, we shall present to you the outline of another plan to racially balance the elementary schools in Springfield. The final plan selection was made after several attempts to establish reasonable, fair and practical districts, and after a review of twelve different school organizational patterns within each possible school district.

We have attempted to keep the plan simple and have avoided options at this time, for they tend to confuse the basic issues which are involved. We recognize that there may be legal or judicial questions involved—but these can only be answered by the courts. Throughout our deliberations,
we have attempted to keep in mind the needs and safety of children and the educational programs which they should receive.

**Basic Considerations**

Prior to reviewing the plan itself, these are several points which should be kept in mind:

1. Chapter 641, Acts of 1965, states that all schools will be racially balanced.

2. The Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth has ordered that the elementary schools in Springfield be balanced by September of 1973.

3. A Superior Court judge has directed that a plan be submitted to the Massachusetts Board of Education by the Springfield School Committee at the earliest possible date.

4. There is no plan which can be devised that does not involve the bussing of children.

5. Some children are going to have to be moved from their present schools.

6. In any acceptable plan, the burden of implementation must be shared by all segments of the community.

7. It is the contention of the School Department that desirable educational programs for children are developed when administrators, supervisors, children, and parents work cooperatively in an atmosphere of mutual trust and respect. Such a state can best be achieved when turmoil and upheaval are held to a minimum. Within the proposed districts, the desired continuity of attendance
and refinement of programs to meet the needs of children are possible.

8. Research shows that Black and white children do at least as well academically in a racially balanced situation as they did in imbalanced schools.

9. It is apparent in this city that young children from different backgrounds attending school together do learn to get along together. Tensions decrease in direct proportion to the mutual respect which grows through daily association at an early age.

10. Bussing can be a matter of personal convenience, but it has no effect on the education of a child.

11. Under the proposed plan, educational opportunities for children in each school in each district will be approximately the same.

The proposed plan does not include the precise assignment of students to schools, as this is a long and difficult task. However, it will be done if the basic plan is acceptable. Prior to any action, it is my recommendation that a careful study of the plan be made and that representatives of interested community groups be invited to appear before the School Committee to offer their suggestions for improvement. This action is desirable prior to holding meetings in the various schools throughout the city whose district lines are to be changed as a result of the implementation of the plan.

Adjustments Needed

In subsequent months, it will be necessary to make adjustments in the following areas:
A. Transportation  
B. Cafeterias  
C. Staff transfers  
D. Supply and equipment adjustments  
E. Inservice meetings for teachers, principals and supervisors  
F. Establishment of parent-school groups in the new school districts  
G. Orientation of children to new assignments  

All of the above adjustments are to take place with maximum communication among the schools, parents and such community and city governmental agencies as may relate to the successful and smooth implementation of the plan.

Some Financial Estimates

People are naturally concerned about the cost of this proposal. At this point, amounts are rough but read as follows:

- 4 portable rooms at Clickman)  
  --4 portable rooms at Balliet  
  --Transportation  
  --Noon supervision  
  --School lunch equipment  
  --Bus monitors  
  --School and community in-service training

- $280,000  
- $966,865  
- $48,746  
- $107,984  
- $50,000  
- $300,000

(request special legislation to give city regular state aid for this construction)  
(100% reimbursement from state)  
(regular state aid, Chapter 70)  
(75% reimbursement)  
(100% reimbursement)  
(available under new Federal Emergency School Aid Act)
Significant Items for Ready Reference

This plan:

1. Establishes six enlarged elementary school districts, five of which include one of the presently racially imbalanced elementary schools. (Each of these districts will have a non-white population of approximately twenty-eight percent.)

2. Eliminates racial imbalance in the elementary schools of Springfield in grades one through six.

3. Allows kindergarten pupils to remain in their neighborhood schools.

4. Permits pupils presently participating in the open enrollment plan or reassigned to improve racial balance to remain in the schools which they are presently attending.

5. Transfers a total of 5,791 pupils, including 3,689 white pupils and 2,102 black pupils.

6. Involves white and black pupils in thirty to thirty-six elementary schools.

7. Maintains reasonable commuting distances for all transported children with the greatest distance being approximately three miles. (Most transportation distances will be considerably less.)

8. Requires the construction of four-room portable additions at Balliet and Glickman Schools.

9. Reorganizes the elementary schools into new administrative units consisting of kindergarten through fourth grade schools and schools with kindergarten and grades five and six in each of the newly enlarged school districts.
10. Permits most elementary school children to attend their neighborhood school for part of their elementary school experience.

**Proposed New School Districts**

Various feasibility studies for eliminating racial imbalance in the Springfield public schools were carefully analyzed. Such factors as distribution of number of white and black pupils, school capacities, distance, safety, and equality of educational opportunity were considered. Fair and equitable treatment for all school districts was a prime consideration underlying the selection of the attached proposal.

To correct racial imbalance in the five elementary schools which are imbalanced at present, the thirty-six elementary schools will be grouped into six districts, five of which may be formed for achieving racial balance. The schools in the sixth district not involved in this plan include Brightwood, Carew Street, Howard Street, Jefferson Avenue, Lincoln and School Street Schools where there are many non-English speaking pupils. Schools within each district to be included in the racial balance plan are listed below:

**District One:**
- Brookings School
- Acushnet Avenue School
- Kensington Avenue School
- Summer Avenue School
- White Street School

**District Two:**
- DeBerry School
- Harris School
- Memorial School
- Tiffany School
- Washington School
District Three: Homer Street School
Brunton School
Clickman School
Greenaway Drive School
Sixteen Acres School
Talmadge School

District Four: Ells School
Balliet School
Dorman School
Indian Orchard School
Lynch School
Morris School
Myrtle Street School
Warner School

District Five: Tapley School
Armory Street School
Bowles School
Glenwood School
Liberty School
Pottenger School
APPENDIX C

THE RACIAL IMBALANCE ACT OF 1965
§ 37C. Declaration of Policy for Promotion of Racial Balance in Schools.

It is hereby declared to be the policy of the commonwealth to encourage all school committees to adopt as educational objectives the promotion of racial balance and the correction of existing racial imbalance in the public schools. The prevention or elimination of racial imbalance shall be an objective in all decisions involving the drawing or altering of school attendance lines and the selection of new school sites. (1965, 641, § 1.)

References --


CASE NOTES

School committee had standing within discretion of court, to be permitted to attack constitutionally of Racial Imbalance Law by proceeding for declaratory relief. See School Committee of Boston v Board of Education, 352 Mass 693. 227 NH2d 729, app dismd 389 US 572, 19 L Ed 2d 778, 88 S Ct 692.

The purpose of the Racial Imbalance Law is the achievement of equal educational opportunity, the statute having its foundation in a legislative finding that the Commonwealth is faced with an emergency because of racial imbalance in the public schools, and the purpose of the statute is within the constitutional powers of a State Legislature, School Committee of Boston v Board of Education, 352 Mass 693, 227 NE2d 729, app dismd 389 US 572, 19 L Ed 2d 778, 88 S Ct 692.

Federal court will not grant relief while administrative efforts to cure racial imbalance are being made.--In a case in a Federal Court in which it was alleged that the school committee of a city was applying §§ 37C and 37D of the instant chapter in such manner that certain parents and children were being denied equal protection of the laws as a result of alleged racial imbalance in a public school, and where it appeared that the school committee, well prior to the bringing of the action, had taken steps designed to, and was actively seeking to, correct whatever racial imbalance existed in the school, it was decided
that the Federal Court would not, at that time, interfere, by way of
injunction, with the pre-lagitation administrative attempts of the
school committee to correct the imbalance, but it was also pointed
out that unless the school committee acted swiftly, Federal Court
action would become appropriate and mandatory. Parris v School Com-
mittee of Medford, 305 F Supp 356.

37D. Determination, Elimination, etc. of Racial Imbalance by School
Committees.

The school committee of each city, town and district shall, 
annually, at such time and in such form as the commissioner shall
determine, submit statistics sufficient to enable a determination to
be made of the per cent of non-white pupils in all public schools and
in each school under the jurisdiction of each such committee. When-
ever the state board of education finds that racial imbalance exists
in a public school, it shall notify in writing the school committee
or regional school district committee having jurisdiction over such
school that such finding has been made. The school committee shall
thereupon prepare a plan to eliminate such racial imbalance and file
a copy of such plan with the board. The term "racial imbalance" re-
fers to a ratio between non-white and other students in public schools
which is sharply out of balance with the racial composition of the
society in which non-white children study, serve and work. For the
purpose of this section, racial imbalance shall be deemed to exist
when the per cent of non-white students in any public school is in
excess of fifty per cent of the total number of students in such
school.

Said plan shall detail the changes in existing school attend-
ance districts, the location of proposed school sites, the proposed
additions to existing school buildings, and other methods for the
elimination of racial imbalance. Said plan shall also include pro-
jections of the expected racial composition of all public schools.
Any plan to detail changes in existing school attendance districts,
the locations of proposed new school sites and proposed additions to
existing school sites and proposed additions to existing school build-
ings with the intention of reducing or eliminating racial imbalance,
must take into consideration on an equal basis with the above-mentioned
intention, the safety of the children involved in travelling from home
to school and school to home. Said plan may provide for voluntary co-
operation by other cities and towns in rendering assistance and in
making available facilities to effectuate said plan.

A school committee shall not alter or change a school district
or districts under such a plan without holding a public hearing. Said
school committee shall cause the notice of the time and place of such
hearing and of the subject matter, sufficient for identification, to
be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the city or town once in each of two successive weeks, the first publication to be not less than fourteen days before the day of the hearing or if there is no such newspaper in such city or town then by posting such notice in a conspicuous place in the city or town hall for a period of not less than fourteen days before the day of such hearing, and also send notice by mail, postage prepaid, to each parent affected by the proposed change. At the hearing any person, whether entitled to notice thereof or not, may appear in person or be represented by an agent who need not be an attorney.

No school committee or regional school district committee shall be required as part of its plan to transport any pupil to any school outside its jurisdiction or to any school outside the school district established for his neighborhood, if the parent or guardian of such pupil files written objection thereto with such school committee.

Whenever a city, town or regional school district provides transportation for children who live more than one and one half miles from the schools to which they are assigned for the purpose of eliminating or reducing racial imbalance, the state treasurer shall annually on or before November twentieth pay to such city, town and member towns of a regional school district, subject to appropriation, one hundred per cent of said cost as approved by the commissioner.

Said board may, from time to time, require each school committee to submit to said board a report on the progress of the plan and its implementation.

The supreme judicial and the superior court shall have jurisdiction in equity upon petition of the board of education to enforce the provisions of this section. (1965, 641, §1; 1969, 644, approved August 7, 1969, effective 90 days thereafter.)

Editorial Note --

The 1969 amendment added a paragraph to provide for reimbursement by the state of the cost of transportation of certain pupils.

References --

Racial Imbalance Law not unconstitutional for vagueness.—The Racial Imbalance Law inserted by St. 1965 c. 641, is not unconstitutional as being in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution and Articles 1, 10, 11 and 30 of the Declaration of Rights of the Massachusetts Constitution because of vagueness either because it furnishes no criteria to aid in classifying students as white and nonwhite, nor because of vagueness in the definition of "racial imbalance" inasmuch as the instant section lays down a definitive test that racial imbalance should be deemed to exist when the percentage of non-white students in a public school exceed 50 percent of the total, and inasmuch as statute should be construed, if possible, to avoid doubts as to constitutionality. School Committee of Boston v Board of Education, 352 Mass 693, 227 NE2d 729, app dismd 389 US 572, 19 L Ed 2d 788, 88 S Ct 692.

Racial Imbalance Law not unconstitutional as denial of equal protection.—The Racial Imbalance Law is not unconstitutional as being in violation of the equal protection clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution and of Article 1 of the Declaration of Rights of the Massachusetts Constitution because the purpose of the statute of achieving equal educational opportunity is within the constitutional powers of a State Legislature, because every presumption should be made in favor of the validity of legislative enactments, and because until a pupil has in fact been excluded from a public school on account of race, the argument that the statute works a denial of equal protection is unimpressive, a school committee, as appears from the instant section, not being required to transport a pupil outside his neighborhood school district if his parent or guardian files a written objection, School Committee of Boston v Board of Education, 352 Mass 693, 227 NE2d 729, app dismd 389 US 572, 19 I. Ed 2d 778, 88 S Ct 692.

Racial Imbalance Law not unconstitutional as violative of due process.—The Racial Imbalance Law is not unconstitutional as being in violation of the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution and Articles 1, 10 and 12 of the Declaration of Rights of the Massachusetts Constitution for failure to grant to a school committee a hearing on its proposed plans and the board's action thereon, a sufficient reason being that the school committee has no personal or property rights involved. School Committee of Boston v Board of Education, 352 Mass 693, 227 NE2d 729, app dismd 389 US 572, 19 L. Ed 2d 778, 88 S Ct 692.
Transportation of pupils as means of reducing racial imbalance. — The education department may, under appropriate circumstances, recommend the transportation of pupils as a means of eliminating or reducing racial imbalance in the public schools, and assuming that no written protests have been lodged with the school committee under § 37D, such transportation may lawfully be provided without violating any of the provision of § 68, 1965-1966 Op AG 230.

Summary of provisions of instant section.--For a summary of the provisions of the instant section, including the requirement that school committees submit statistics showing the percentage of non-white students, the notice to a school committee when racial imbalance is found, the submission of a plan by the school committee to eliminate racial imbalance, the definition of "racial imbalance," and the contents of the plan which the school committee is required to submit, see School Committee of Boston v Board of Education, 352 Mass 693, 227 NE2d 729, app dismd 389 US 572, 19 I. Ed 2d 778, 88 S Ct 692.

Federal court will not grant relief while administrative efforts to cure racial imbalance are being made.--See case not to § 37C, supra, under this caption.
§ 11. Duties and Authority of Board of Education to Eliminate Racial Imbalance in Schools.

The board of education shall provide technical and other assistance in the formulation and execution of plans to eliminate racial imbalance, made pursuant to section thirty-seven D of chapter seventy-one. Whenever the board determines that a school committee or regional school district committee has failed to file a plan in compliance with the provisions of said section, it shall consult with and make specific recommendations for a plan by such school committee or regional school district committee.

If, following the receipt of notification from the board of education that racial imbalance, as defined in section thirty-seven D of chapter seventy-one, exists, a school committee or regional school district committee does not show progress within a reasonable time in eliminating racial imbalance in its schools the commissioner of education shall not certify the amount of state aid for such city or town or for such towns which are members of such regional school districts, as required by section five of chapter seventy, and the school building assistance commission upon receipt of notice from said board that racial imbalance exists shall not approve any project for school construction for such city, town or regional school district under chapter six hundred and forty-five of the acts of nineteen hundred and forty-eight, as amended, and the commissioner of education may notify the commissioner of corporations and taxation and the comptroller to hold such funds as have been so certified under said section five but have not been disbursed. The commissioner of education may thereafter upon receipt of a plan acceptable to the board of education notify the commissioner of corporations and taxation and the comptroller to pay any such withheld funds to such city or town in such amounts and at such times as he may designate, and the school building assistance commission upon receipt of notice from said board that a plan acceptable to it has been received may approve such projects. (Amended by 1966, 14, § 41, approved March 2, 1966, effective, by act of Governor, March 3, 1966, and by § 79 effective as of Jan. 1, 1966.)

The school building assistance commission shall, notwithstanding any contrary provision of chapter six hundred and forty-five of the acts of nineteen hundred and forty-eight, as amended, increase the amount of grants for schoolhouse construction to sixty-five per cent of the approved cost, whenever the board of education is satisfied that the construction or enlargement of a schoolhouse is for the purpose of reducing or eliminating racial imbalance in the school system and so notifies the school building assistance commission. (1965, 641, s 2, approved, with emergency preamble, August 18, 1965.)
Editorial Note --

The 1966 amendment changed references to § 9 of chapter 70 to references to § 5 of such chapter.

CASE NOTES

Duties of Board of Education.--Under the instant section, the Board is required to provide technical and other assistance in the formulation and execution of plans submitted by a school committee, and if the committee does not show progress in a reasonable time in eliminating imbalance, the Commissioner of Education may order State aid funds withheld until an acceptable plan has been received. School Committee of Boston v Board of Education, 352 Mass 693, 227 NE2d 729, app dismd 389 US 572, 191 Ed 2d 778, 88 S Ct 692.

For a case where at a school committee's request, the board pursuant to the instant section provided technical and other assistance in the form of a "Task Force" of educators to aid in the formulation and execution of plans to eliminate racial imbalance, see School Committee of Boston v Board of Education, 352 Mass 693, 227 NE2d 729 app dismd 389 US 372, 191 Ed 778, 88 S Ct 692.

Racial Imbalance Law not unconstitutional for vagueness.--See Case Note to c. 71. § 37D under this caption.

1J. Same Subject: Judicial Review of Board's Actions.

Within thirty days after (1) a school committee or regional school district committee declines to accept the recommendations submitted to it by the board, or (2) the board disapproves a revised plan submitted to it by a school committee or regional school district committee, said committee may file a petition for judicial review in the superior court for the county in which it is located or in the supreme judicial court for Suffolk county. The court may affirm the board's determination of the recommendations submitted by it or its determination of disapproval of a revised plan submitted to it, and order compliance with the recommendations of the board by appropriate decree, or if it finds and rules that the determination by the board is (a) in excess of the statutory authority or jurisdiction of the board, or (b) based upon an error of law, or (c) arbitrary or capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law, then it may set aside such determination by the board and remand the matter to it for further action.
The supreme judicial and the superior court shall have jurisdiction in equity upon petition of the board of education to order funds withheld as provided in section one I for such period of time as the court may determine. (1965, 641, 2, approved, with emergency preamble, August 18, 1965.)

CASE NOTES

School Committee's right to review.--Under the instant section, if a school committee declines to accept recommendations submitted by the board, or if the board disapproves a revised plan, the committee may seek judicial review pursuant to which the court may affirm the board's determination and order compliance, or it may find that the board's determination exceeded its authority, has based on an error of law or constituted an abuse of discretion. School Committee of Boston v Board of Education, 352 Mass 693, 227 NE2d 729, app dismd 389 US 572, 19 l. Ed 2d 778, 88 S Ct 692.

School committee had standing, within discretion of court, to be permitted to attack constitutionality of racial imbalance law by proceeding for declaratory relief.--See School Committee of Boston v Board of Education, 352 Mass 693, 227 NE2d 729, app dismd 389 US 572, 19 l. Ed 2d 778, 88 S Ct 692.

1K. Advisory Committee on Racial Imbalance.

The board of education, with the advice of the commissioner, shall appoint an advisory committee on racial imbalance and no individual shall be appointed to this advisory committee on racial imbalance who has been listed in any state or federal document as being a member of a communist front organization. The members of the committee shall serve without compensation except that they may be reimbursed for the necessary expenses actually incurred in the performance of their duties. (1965, 641, 2, approved, with emergency preamble, August 18, 1965.)
§ 12A. Adoption of Plan for Attendance of Children Residing in Other Towns in which Racial Imbalance Exists, etc.; Financial Assistance, etc.

The school committee of any town may adopt a plan for attendance in the public schools in such town of a limited number of children residing in other towns in which racial imbalance, as defined in section thirty-seven D of chapter seventy-one, exists in a public school. Such plan shall tend to eliminate said racial imbalance, shall be consistent with the objectives of said section thirty-seven D, and shall include an estimate of the expenses necessary to put such plan in operation. The school committee shall file a copy of such plan and the vote by which it was adopted with the state board of education. The state board of education shall approve or disapprove such plan within ninety days after the date of such filing. If it disapproves such plan, it shall state the reasons therefor; if it approves such plan, it shall inform the town of the amount of financial assistance which the commonwealth shall provide, as hereinafter provided. The town shall not be required to proceed with such plan unless and until the school committee agrees with the state board of education, through the commissioner of education, on the amount of such financial assistance and the terms upon which such financial assistance shall be provided. A school committee and board of education may accept, for the purpose of carrying out such plan, gifts, grants, or contributions from any source, whether public or private.

Any child residing in any town and attending therein a public school in which racial imbalance, as defined in said section thirty-seven D, exists, may attend a public school of a town in which he does not reside, providing the school committee of such town has adopted, and the state board of education has approved, a plan for the attendance of nonresident children in such towns, as set forth in this section.

The state board of education, from funds appropriated for the purpose, shall provide financial assistance to any town which adopts a plan for the elimination of racial imbalance in other towns, which plan meets the approval of the state board of education. Such financial assistance may include payments of part or all of the tuition required for any child, payment for part or all of the transportation costs for such child and payment for all of the salaries of teachers and others who may be required under such plan. The state board of education shall provide technical and other assistance to any town in the formulation and execution of any such plan.
Any amounts received by the school community of any town from the federal government, from the commonwealth or from a charitable foundation or private institution for the purposes of this section shall be deposited with the treasurer of such town and held as a separate account, and may be expended by said school committee without further appropriation, notwithstanding the provisions of section fifty-three of chapter forty-four. (1966, 506; 1968, 622. § 1, approved July 16, 1968, effective 90 days thereafter.)

Editorial Note --

The 1958 amendment added the last paragraph relating to the expenditure without further appropriation of amounts received by school committees from the federal government, from the commonwealth, etc.

§ 12B. Same Subject; School Committee May Fix Terms of Attendance of Nonresidents; Acceptance and Disbursement of Federal Funds.

Notwithstanding the provisions of section twelve, any child may attend the public school of a town where he does not reside upon such terms as the school committee of such town where he does not reside shall fix; provided said school committee shall set and be paid a tuition rate which rate shall not exceed the average expense per student for such school for the period the child shall attend; provided, however, that in the case of a regional school district, the sum set by the school committee as such tuition rate shall require the acceptance of the member of the regional district school committee who represents the town in which such school is located.

The commonwealth and the school committee of any town may accept funds from the federal government for the purposes of this section. Any amounts received by the school committee of any town from the federal government, from the commonwealth or from a charitable foundation or private institution shall be deposited with the treasurer of such town and held as a separate account and may be expended by said school committee without further appropriation, notwithstanding the provisions of section fifty-three of chapter forty-four.

Whenever such funds are received after the submission of the annual school budget, all or any portion thereof may be expended by the school committee without further appropriation, but shall be accounted for in the next annual school budget. (1966, 506; 1968, 622, § 2, approved July 20, 1968, effective 90 days thereafter.)

Editorial Note --

The first 1968 amendment struck out, in the first sentence of the second paragraph, the words "pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89-10 of the Eighty-ninth Congress."
The second 1968 amendment affected only the first paragraph, substituting the words "set and be paid a tuition rate which rate shall not exceed" for the words "be paid a sum equal to" formerly appearing in line 4, and adding at the end of the paragraph a provision relating to the acceptance of the sum set as tuition rate in a regional school district.
APPENDIX D

ENROLLMENTS OF THE SIX DISTRICTS

AND SCHOOL COMPOSITION
### Enrollments of District I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>1 - 6</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acushnet Ave.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookings</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Ave.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner Ave.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>370</strong></td>
<td><strong>2089</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>2461</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enrollments of District II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>1 - 6</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DeBerry</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>737</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>364</strong></td>
<td><strong>2153</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>2517</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Enrollments of District III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>1 - 6</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunton</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedman</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glickman</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteen Acres</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>621</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talmadge</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>518</strong></td>
<td><strong>2965</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3483</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Enrollments of District IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District IV Schools</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>1 - 6</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balliet</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ells</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Orchard</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>435</strong></td>
<td><strong>2489</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>3015</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Enrollments of District V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District V Schools</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>1 - 6</th>
<th>Special</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armory</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowles</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenwood</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottenger</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapley</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>385</strong></td>
<td><strong>2264</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>2673</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** These enrollment figures reflect the Springfield five district enrollment for September 16, 1974.
### Pupil Composition of District I by Grade and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District I Schools</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Grades K - 3</th>
<th>Grades 4 - 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W N-W Total</td>
<td>W N-W Total</td>
<td>W N-W Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookings*</td>
<td>32 75 107</td>
<td>130 371 501</td>
<td>64 147 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acushnet Ave.</td>
<td>39 8 47</td>
<td>143 35 178</td>
<td>66 19 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Ave.</td>
<td>75 0 75</td>
<td>290 6 296</td>
<td>127 1 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumner Ave.</td>
<td>46 0 46</td>
<td>168 1 169</td>
<td>100 1 101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White St.</td>
<td>88 2 90</td>
<td>262 6 268</td>
<td>123 29 152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>280 85 365</td>
<td>993 419 1412</td>
<td>480 197 677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pupil Composition of District II by Grade and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District II Schools</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Grades K - 3</th>
<th>Grades 4 - 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W N-W Total</td>
<td>W N-W Total</td>
<td>W N-W Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeBerry</td>
<td>7 65 72</td>
<td>32 257 289</td>
<td>14 124 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>83 1 84</td>
<td>263 7 270</td>
<td>135 5 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial</td>
<td>45 18 63</td>
<td>114 19 133</td>
<td>66 14 80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiffany</td>
<td>41 0 41</td>
<td>143 7 150</td>
<td>79 14 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington*</td>
<td>102 2 104</td>
<td>360 14 374</td>
<td>188 9 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>278 86 364</td>
<td>912 304 1216</td>
<td>482 166 648</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pupil Composition of District III by Grade and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District III Schools</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Grades K - 3</th>
<th>Grades 4 - 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W N-W Total</td>
<td>W N-W Total</td>
<td>W N-W Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunton</td>
<td>63 1 64</td>
<td>197 5 202</td>
<td>95 14 109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedman*</td>
<td>23 20 43</td>
<td>141 87 228</td>
<td>97 39 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glickman*</td>
<td>30 2 32</td>
<td>149 14 163</td>
<td>72 7 79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>14 104 118</td>
<td>34 389 423</td>
<td>8 128 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sixteen Acres</td>
<td>116 8 124</td>
<td>451 35 486</td>
<td>182 17 199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talmadge</td>
<td>64 3 67</td>
<td>411 15 426</td>
<td>132 8 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>310 138 1448</td>
<td>1684 545 2028</td>
<td>586 213 799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Selected as Grade 5 - 6 school for the districts
### Pupil Composition of District IV by Grade and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District IV Schools</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Grades K - 3</th>
<th>Grades 4 - 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W  N-W Total</td>
<td>W  N-W Total</td>
<td>W  N-W Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balliet</td>
<td>19  6  25</td>
<td>71  17  88</td>
<td>71  17  88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorman</td>
<td>28 18 46</td>
<td>143 92 235</td>
<td>83 43 126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ells</td>
<td>4  41 45</td>
<td>12 175 187</td>
<td>5  62  67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Orchard</td>
<td>99 14 113</td>
<td>322 69 391</td>
<td>134 33 167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynch</td>
<td>53  5  58</td>
<td>197 27 224</td>
<td>118 41 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>16  9  25</td>
<td>82 27 109</td>
<td>56 18 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myrtle*</td>
<td>44  1  45</td>
<td>92  5  97</td>
<td>45  3  48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warner*</td>
<td>61  6  67</td>
<td>214 31 245</td>
<td>116 35 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>324 100 424</td>
<td>841 435 1276</td>
<td>628 252 880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Selected as Grade 5 - 6 schools for the District

### Pupil Composition of District V by Grade and Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District V Schools</th>
<th>Kindergarten</th>
<th>Grades K - 3</th>
<th>Grades 4 - 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>W  N-W Total</td>
<td>W  N-W Total</td>
<td>W  N-W Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armory*</td>
<td>59  24  83</td>
<td>262 21  283</td>
<td>136 9  145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowles</td>
<td>60  9  69</td>
<td>214 8  222</td>
<td>107 17  124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenwood</td>
<td>40  2  42</td>
<td>117 2  119</td>
<td>80  55  135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>33  0  33</td>
<td>148 2  150</td>
<td>91  27  118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pottenger</td>
<td>58  4  62</td>
<td>202 6  208</td>
<td>148 27  175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapley*</td>
<td>12  47  59</td>
<td>49 270 319</td>
<td>12  79  91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>262 86 348</td>
<td>992 309 1301</td>
<td>574 214 788</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX E

QUESTIONNAIRE: THE RACIAL IMBALANCE INVENTORY
The Racial Imbalance Act of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts: A Case Study of Upward Bound Student's Attitudes Toward the Racial Balance Act and the Six District Plan of Springfield, Massachusetts

Submitted By:

Gregory Edward Johnson
The purpose of this study is to solicit your responses on educational issues that affect all of our lives today. The results of this study will be used to help determine how students such as you feel about educational issues. Please read the instructions carefully and answer the questions honestly and as quickly as possible. The first section of this instrument is intended to provide us with some background information about you. The second section is the Racial Balance Inventory.

What is your age?

(1) 13  (4) 16  (7) 19 or older
(2) 14  (5) 17
(3) 15  (6) 18

What is your sex?

(1) Male  (2) Female

What is your educational status?

(1) Freshman  (3) Junior
(2) Sophomore  (4) Senior

What school do you attend?

__________________________________________

How long have you been in the Upward Bound Program?

__________________________________________ years

To what ethnic group do you belong?

(1) American Indian
(2) Asian
(3) Black
(4) Chicano
(5) Puerto Rican
(6) White
RACIAL IMBALANCE INVENTORY

The following pages contain a number of statements about which there is no general agreement. Please read each statement carefully and circle the selection that best expresses your feelings. Remember there are no right or wrong answers.

CHOICES: (1) Strongly agree
        (2) Agree
        (3) Undecided
        (4) Disagree
        (5) Strongly disagree

1. The racial imbalance act in Massachusetts should be enforced even if it means that I have to be bused to another school.
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree

2. Black and Puerto Rican schools are inferior to white schools.
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree

3. Desegregation will make the quality of education better for Black and Puerto Rican students.
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree

4. Desegregation is okay if it does not involve busing.
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree

5. My parents probably would not support desegregation plans for local elementary schools.
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree
6. Massachusetts should be ordered by the State and Federal courts to balance their schools' racial composition even if it means busing.
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree

7. Busing is an acceptable mechanism for desegregation only for short trips.
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree

8. My brother(s) and/or sister(s) will be required to attend another school under the Six-District Plan.
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree

9. Blacks and Puerto Ricans are against desegregation just as much as whites.
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree

10. If busing is to be used as a tool for desegregation, then white students should be bused into Black and Puerto Rican schools, if Blacks and Puerto Ricans are bused into white schools.
    (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree

11. Black and Puerto Rican students can receive a quality education in their own schools.
    (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree

12. Desegregation will enable the races to get along better.
    (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree

13. I feel the Six-District Plan should not be enforced this September.
    (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree (5) Strongly disagree
14. I am aware of the Six-District Plan that has been accepted and selected for implementation in my city.  
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree  
   (5) Strongly disagree  

15. I approve of the Six-District Plan for racial balance in my city.  
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree  
   (5) Strongly disagree  

16. My local community should have had more input into the planning of the Six-District Plan.  
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree  
   (5) Strongly disagree  

17. If the schools were desegregated, white school administrators and teachers would be less sensitive to the needs of Black and Puerto Rican students.  
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree  
   (5) Strongly disagree  

18. If the Six-District Plan is implemented, there will be racial violence.  
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree  
   (5) Strongly disagree  

19. Blacks, whites, and Puerto Ricans should attend the school of their choice regardless of location as stated under the Governor's plan.  
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree  
   (5) Strongly disagree  

20. Quality education can only be achieved for Blacks and Puerto Ricans through desegregation.  
   (1) Strongly agree (2) Agree (3) Undecided (4) Disagree  
   (5) Strongly disagree
APPENDIX F

FACT FINDING SHEET
What is your name? ____________________________________________

What school do you attend? ____________________________________

In what city do you live? ______________________________________

Listed below are a group of terms which you may or may not be familiar with. Please place a check in the space that best describes your knowledge of that term.

Racial Imbalance Act 1 2 3
Integration 1 2 3
Six District Plan 1 2 3
Desegregation 1 2 3
METCO 1 2 3
Quality Education 1 2 3
Segregation 1 2 3

Would you be interested in participating in a research project involving balanced education in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts?

Yes ____________________________ No __________________________
APPENDIX G

MEAN, SQUARE AND STANDARD SCORES ON RII;
PRODUCT OF PRETEST AND POSTTEST:
AND STANDARD SCORES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pre-test Score</th>
<th>Squared Score</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
<th>Post-test Score</th>
<th>Squared Score</th>
<th>Standard Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4489</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6084</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3721</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4761</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5184</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6241</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5329</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5929</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6400</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5476</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5329</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3721</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>-.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3844</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3969</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5329</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4624</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>6241</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4356</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5329</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4900</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5929</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4624</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5329</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6561</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>7396</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4761</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5776</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5184</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5776</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5776</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5625</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5776</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5184</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5184</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7396</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3364</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3481</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5476</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6084</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4225</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4761</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4225</td>
<td>-.59</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>4489</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5929</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3969</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3721</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>3969</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>-.79</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>5041</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Product of Pre-test Standard Scores and Post-test Standard Scores on the RII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Pre-test</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Product of Pre/Post-test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-2.21</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>5.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>-2.38</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H

STUDENT RESPONSES IN PERCENTAGE ON RII BY CATEGORY
Percentage of Agreement or Disagreement of High School Students on RII by Category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Imbalance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **White**        |
| **N = 20**       |
| **Questions**    | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** |
| 1                | 35.0      | 24.7          | 40.3         |
| 6                | 25.0      | 40.0          | 35.0         |
| 19               | 75.0      | 00.0          | 25.0         |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Six District Plan</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 44</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **White**            |
| **N = 20**           |
| **Questions**        | **Agree** | **Undecided** | **Disagree** |
| 8                    | 15.0      | 50.0          | 35.0         |
| 13                   | 75.0      | 5.0           | 20.0         |
| 14                   | 40.0      | 5.0           | 55.0         |
| 15                   | 10.0      | 45.0          | 45.0         |
| 16                   | 45.0      | 45.0          | 10.0         |
Percentage of Agreement or Disagreement of High School Students on RII by Category

### Desegregation

**Black**  
*N = 44*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>N = 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Quality Education

**Black**  
*N = 44*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>White</th>
<th>N = 20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Percentage of Agreement or Disagreement of High School Students on RII by Category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial Compatibility</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Black</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>White</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>00.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>