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CHAPTER I

PROBLEM OF THE STUDY

Introduction

One of the most characteristic aspects of American life is its emphasis upon education. Education is seen as the means to sanctify traditions and to bring about progress. Education is viewed as the cementer of social harmony and the answer to every social ill. Even when scoffed at as "mere book learning," education in America almost universally is seen as the only answer to social and spiritual disharmony. For more than a century educators and observers, both foreign and American, have noted this phenomenon. As Cremin has written, this respect for the power of education is such a part of the American mind that it is a faith of religious proportion. He says,

As one reviews the American experience, nothing is more striking than the boundless faith of the citizenry in the power of popular education. . . . Education has commanded such widespread support that D. W. Brogan was once moved to refer to the public school as America's formally unestablished national church.¹

The roots of American faith in education reach to the very foundation of the American past. The first settlers brought with them a belief in their power to change their lives for the better in a new land. As the Puritans lost faith in their ability to bring about a spiritual regeneration, they turned to education in the hope that it might salvage their mission in the wilderness. Similarly, as American society began to become more stratified and as the unlimited opportunity for success began to lessen, as America began to become a nation of factory workers and clerks, the schools were looked to in order to keep opportunity for social mobility alive.

The realization of this change toward industrial life, replacing the farm of Jefferson's time, was captured in what historians have called the Jacksonian Movement. Beginning in the early 1820's the age of the "Common Man" was ushered in with the passage of universal male sufferage. One of the earliest manifestations of this new found political power were the Workingmen's Parties. Starting in Philadelphia and then spreading

---

throughout the country, the Workingmen's Parties attempted to improve the lot of workers through the power of the vote. They fought for a number of reforms: debt law reform, religious toleration, and unjust militia system, substandard housing, as well as shorter working hours, and higher pay for workers. Yet the highest concern was not for any of these things but for a common public education. The Workingmen's Parties believed deeply that the ills of the individual worker and of this economic and social inequality could be remedied by education. Francis Wright stated a belief shared by many other Workingmen's Party leaders when he wrote that, "until equality be planted in the mind, in the habits, in the manners, in the feelings, think not it can ever be in the condition." Similarly, Stephen Simpson, author of The Workingmen's Manual, argued that it was to education that the worker must look for redress of social grievances. "Knowledge is power," continued Simpson, "in respect to the procurement of equity to the great mass of the sons of labor."

The great faith in the power of education held by the Workingmen's Parties was, however, one based upon a necessary educational reform. Until this time, America

---

4 Ibid., p. 75.
5 Ibid., p. 77.
had a two-class school system: private schools for the wealthy and charity schools for the poor. Workingmen's Parties demanded that there be one common school attended by both rich and poor together. This, they argued, was the only way that the inequality of a two-track system of aristocratic privilege for some and inescapable poverty for others could be avoided.7

While the ideas espoused by the Workingmen's Parties passed to the Democratic Party with its constituents of poor farmers and workers, the real impetus for the common school came from the more prosperous middle class Whig Party. Though opposed on many issues, the Whigs and Democrats accepted the need for common education. One reason for Whig support may have been fear of "Jacksonian mobocracy."8 Another, however, was an equal fear of the excesses of wealthy interests. Reformers, such as, James Carter, Edward Everett, DeWitt Clinton, and most especially Horace Mann, fostered and reflected the belief that the answer to every ill of society was common education. Law, argued Mann, has the failing of stepping in only after the damage was done. Religion, on the other hand, is too divisive and its imposition would destroy civil liberty.9 Education was the only

7 Ibid., p. 83.
8 Ibid., p. 89.
viable option for it was both a positive force for good and compatible with a libertarian political creed. Mann preached the virtues of common education with religious fervor. For him the validity of common education was clear:

Individuals who without the aid of Knowledge, would have been condemned to perpetual inferiority of condition and subjected to all the evils of want and poverty, rise to competence and independence by the uplifting power of education.\[10\]

The idealism of education reformers like Mann and their belief in truly democratic education came to a real test with the great waves of immigrants which began to arrive after the great Irish Potato blight. Before 1840 most immigrants came to America from the Protestant Northern European Countries of England, Germany, Holland, and Scotland. This produced a fairly homogeneous society. Then the immigration patterns suddenly changed. Hundreds of thousands of Catholic Irish flooded America. The Irish encountered fear and hate signs reading "Irish and Dogs need not apply" were posted with ads for jobs. They were accused of being for monarchy and against democracy and even were characterized as shifty, drunken criminals who were inherently inferior and unredeemable. Still, as a nation of

\[10\] Ibid., p. 157.
immigrants, Americans were unable to sustain a fear of foreigners. Benjamin Labree, president of Middlebury College, reflected this aspect of American society when he stated his fear that the Irish were the modern Huns and Goths ready to destroy America. Yet he also argued, that if the school was to Americanize the immigrant, the native population must accept him.\textsuperscript{11}

Later immigrants following the Irish in the 1840's showed the same reluctance for Americans to truly welcome new groups into its shores. Each ethnic group in its turn found itself hated and distrusted. Following the Civil War, pseudo-scientific theories of racial inferiority were applied to Eastern and Southern Europeans. Warnings were sounded against the threat to the genetic health of the nation as fears were voiced about the moral and political consequences. Yet, the Irish and, after them, the Eastern Europeans were brought into the mainstream of American Culture. Each of these groups, no matter how different culturally, exhibited the same pattern of behavior. The more tested for being Irish, Hungarian, or Italian, the more intensely American they became. Every aspect of the Protestant Ethic was internalized as the ideal of life. The symbol and vehicle for that attempted gain of admittance to American way of life, to gain a

\textsuperscript{11}Binder, p. 64.
piece of the American dream, was the school. Whether school success was the means to or was a result of political and economical power, each of these groups found that success in school and acceptance by the larger society were inseparable.

What is the role of education today in the midst of all this? How do educators live with the ambiguities in the "educational system" and keep the faith in education? As social critics and serious scholars alike have agreed, minorities of color have not followed this same pattern of amalgamation. Certainly the faith in the possibility of appropriating the American dream has been there, from Frederick Douglass to Booker T. Washington and W. E. B. DuBois. The movement toward equality in the military, the schools, and employment show that the American faith in education is alive across every community.

For over 200 years after the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the ideas of education held by the New England Colonies still dominate the American educational system. The spirit of education for citizenship prevails and never seems to have completely died out. The idea that we can change our society if we change our schools, held by many modern educators, has its roots in the tradition which began in the New England Colonies.

At the same time, we seem to be at a crossroads in our educational system. For, if all the events of the
1960's and 1970's give evidence of a deep belief in the American schools, they also are examples of that faith being thwarted. History has not corrected the injustices and the wrongs of Western Civilization of changing the schools on one hand and dehumanizing non-whites on the other.

History can show us that the faith in education is possible; it can teach us respect, humility, trust, and love for mankind. There is the need for freedom of inquiry, so it will not be confined by standards or respect for a certain kind of inquiry. The hope is that the knowledge gained from experiences in life will create an honest picture in the urban community.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine whether useful data could be obtained from informants relative to education in an urban setting. The choice of informants implied a selection of key individuals who possessed knowledge and information regarding education in an urban community.

The problem of the study was stated in the form of two questions:

1. Are useful data available from selected informants regarding the priorities of education in an urban setting?
2. Is the Delphi technique a useful procedure for obtaining levels of consensus among different groups in an urban setting?

The major focus of this study, then, revolved around the ethnological interests of individuals and groups which influence education in an urban setting. Is the Delphi technique an appropriate procedure for reaching consensus from different groups in an urban community? Do selected informants provide useful data regarding education which reveal significant priorities for an urban setting?

**Assumptions**

1. The data obtained from selected informants can represent valuable information for future teachers in an urban school setting.

2. A knowledge of urban schools can be revealed by selected informants in an urban community.

3. The data can reflect the priorities that could influence education in an urban setting.

**Methodology**

A. Population

The area of Columbus bound by the Norfolk and Western Railroad on the East and the North and South Freeway on the West. The area contained approximately 24,000 dwelling units of which approximately 6,000 (25%)
were classified as substandard. The area contained one high school, one junior high school, and four elementary schools.

B. Research Procedure

The Delphi process was undertaken to solicit responses to a question concerning the future goals and outcomes for education in an urban setting. The researcher elicited a list of statements regarding urban educational issues from selected experts at The Ohio State University. After collecting the list of statements from the university experts, the researcher gathered all of the statements and organized them. These statements were given to informants through the Delphi procedure for further response.

C. Delphi Technique

The Delphi technique was originally developed by the Rand Corporation in the 1950's to assist the Defense Department in planning for future defense needs. It could be uniquely designed to serve as an effective method of gaining information from informants who could be identified as key individuals, possessing special knowledge and information. The original Delphi technique was modified for this study. But this study does reflect a generally accepted usage of the Delphi technique.
In the following chapters the value of the data obtained from informants and the usefulness of the Delphi procedure for this study will be analyzed.

**Definitions**

1. Opinion: a more or less clearly simulated idea or judgment held to be true.

2. Agreement: consensus as to the approach to be taken—a reconciling of differences.

3. Consensus: general opinion and/or general agreement.

4. Consensus point and/or consensus level: the median value or above, i.e., over 50% of the response. When there were four possible voted (response), three or more votes were necessary for an item response to reach consensus level; for 18 possible votes (responses) nine or more voted were required for an item response to reach consensus.

5. Urban Informants: reputation was the basis on which experts were selected for consultation. This process of selection broke down logically into two parts: (1) the determination of which categories of expertise were needed, and (2) the determination of who among the available persons was most expert in each such category.
6. IR (Item Response): the questionnaire item from which the questionnaire form was constructed; these numbers from one through 24.

7. PC (Priority Channel): the priority orders—first, second, third, or fourth established by a key for informants—on individual items.

8. EV (Expert Votes): the selected group which participated in the process.

9. RI (Round I): the first instrument carried to urban experts (informants) and the first formal instrument in the Delphi process.

10. RII (Round II): the second instrument carried to the experts (informants) and also the last formal instrument in the Delphi process.

Chapter II discusses briefly the historical forces and factors that influenced the American faith in education; the influences of social science which could open up new horizons for the understanding of the past; a look at American life which may be viewed as sociological manifestations of basic values and ideals of American life. Helmer points out an experimental attempt to predict the capabilities of computers in the future.  

Chapter III, Methods and Procedures, describes the design of the study and the procedures employed to gather and analyze the data.

Chapter IV, Analysis of the Data, provides a presentation and analysis of the data that were obtained for this study.

Finally, Chapter V, presents the summary, conclusions, and implications of this study.
HISTORICAL FORCES AND FACTORS: A LITERATURE SURVEY

Recent American historiography has been very much influenced by the conceptions, problems, and methods of the several social sciences. As Barzun and Graff have pointed out, social scientists keep urging historians to modernize their technique because social scientists are too busy to read history, and they do not recognize their own materials when presented in a different pattern.\textsuperscript{13} The effect of this has been a blurring of clear distinctions between history and social sciences. As a result, the historian is forced to widen the scope of his inquiry.

If the influence of social science has opened up new horizons for the understanding of the past, it also carries with it the knowledge that much of our research is doomed to reflect more of the researcher than the subject. The historian cannot avoid making a selection of facts though he may attempt to disclaim it by keeping his interpretations slim and circumspect. This creates a

necessary tension according to Becker, for it shows us that history finally is written, not by the academician, but by the man on the street. The meaning of history cannot be separated from the forces and events of the masses themselves. On the other hand, it does not take the imaginative projections of George Orwell to tell us how easily history may be distorted in the process of continual rewriting although his book 1984 made it dramatically clear.

The dangers and promise of history as a social science may be debated, but the one solid idea that it contains is that hidden social forces can no longer be ignored in assessing the meaning of historical events. Indeed, the very sociological theories used to explain these events are rooted in historically bound conceptualizations, as Mannheim's Ideology and Utopia shows.

Mills' example of the study of social science seems to be expressing the same thing, and his view might be applied:

Whether the point of interest is a great power state or a minor literary mood, a family, a prison, a creed, these are the kinds of questions the best social analysts have asked. They are the intellectual pivots of classic studies of man in society—and they are the

---

questions inevitably raised by any mind possessing the sociological imagination. For that imagination is the capacity to shift from one perspective to another—from the political to psychological; from the examination of a single family to comparative assessment of the national budgets of the world; from the theological school to the military establishment; from considerations of an oil industry to studies of contemporary poetry. It is the capacity to range from the most impersonal and remote transformations to the most intimate features of the human self—and to see the relations between the two. Back of its use there is always the urge to know the social and historical meaning of the individual in the society and in the period in which he has his quality and his being.16

Mills further states that when a man develops this self-consciousness in the sense of seeing himself and the "intersection of biography and history within society"17

... decisions that once appeared sound now seem to them products of a mind unaccountably dense. Their capacity for astonishment is made lively again. They acquire a new way of thinking, they experience a transvaluation of values: in a word, by their reflection and by their sensibility, they realize the cultural meaning of the social sciences.18

Mannheim presented his theory of false consciousness as another proponent:

Because of changes in history the individual's norms, modes of thought and theories may no longer be in accordance with the reality of a situation, and may even serve to keep him

17 Ibid., p. 21.
18 Ibid., p. 22.
from adjusting. In this case, these old patterns degenerate into an ideology whose function is to conceal the real meaning of the individual's conduct, even from himself. 19

One such basic conception is the effect of transition from rural to urban life. The classic works of Tonnies, Weber, Durkheim, and Cooley on this social event were all deeply rooted in history.

Sociologists like Cooley brought the new science of nature/nurture argument to a point of confusion:

How far is the present inferior condition of that race remediable by education and social improvement, how far is it a matter of germ plasm, alterable only by selection? This whole Negro-white problem hinges on this question which we cannot answer with assurance. 20

Cooley, revealingly, thought the problem analogous to the question of criminality and asked how much education should be tried and when other alternatives should begin.

The nature and effect of the protestant reformation, the quality of life in medieval feudal society, the distinction between organic life style versus mechanical in the 19th century, became the bases for sociological theory. No matter how generalized the use of these sociological ideas, they are fundamentally

19Mannheim, p. 96.
historical ideas, even when used by theorists who believe they are working only with empirical fact, free from the shifting support of historical interpretation.\textsuperscript{21}

This suggests that in Mills' phrase the "Sociological Imagination" is intimately tied to a historical perspective. This realization has led theorists, such as Morris Ginsberg, to the idea that totally different historical situations may be understood from a common sociological perspective without doing violence to the differences of cultures, epochs, and peoples.\textsuperscript{22} According to Ginsberg, tensions created by such events as the rise of urban life and the destruction of tradition can not be properly stated, much less adequately solved unless the events concerned are lifted from individual isolation and viewed from a generalized comparative position.

This historical sociological approach seems especially fitted for viewing the success of minorities in the schools. For, as suggested in the first chapter, minorities historically have traveled a common path of failure to success in the schools whether looking at the Irish experience, or that of the Eastern Europeans and Southern Europeans, or of the experience of the American Indian, Mexican American, Appalachians, or Afro American;

\textsuperscript{21}Mills, p. 25.

\textsuperscript{22}Ibid., p. 26.
obvious differences should not obscure the common pattern that emerged in their struggle for acceptance into the American mainstream. All faced common revilatiom from the more prosperous majority of their country-men. Their fitness as human beings was called into question. Pseudo-scientific evidence was brought to bear in order to show the innate inferiority of the out group. The poor showing of early migrants in the schools was used as proof of a basic inferiority, especially as researchers began to develop testing devices used at proving real physical and mental difference existed between ethnic groups. The rise of social Darwinism in the late 19th century is one example.

For the social Darwinist, the expert was the man who had proven himself the most fit by achieving financial and political power. The great industrialists, such as, Vanderbilt and Gould, Morgan and Rockefeller, represented the kinds of men the Darwinists held up as examples of the highest expression of the human species. It was these men who were the saviors of humanity. They were like mutants in the biological realm. By their innovative ability they increased industrial efficiency creating more jobs, benefiting the society as a whole.

23 Ibid., p. 27.
24 Ibid., p. 28.
Social Darwinism, with its catch phrase of the survival of the fittest and the struggle for existence, gave the forces of natural law to a laissez-faire competitive society. It provided a guiltless fatality to the disproportion of wealth by declaring that those who made it financially deserved to have succeeded on their own merit. Once more, it promised that in the end their success would lead to the improvement of the whole race of mankind. Compassion was, thus, shown to be counter-productive and acceptance of hard-headed reality became the highest virtue.\(^{26}\)

Hunter, like most other Americans who had their roots in the earlier migrations, saw these new Europeans as different and as such destructive to the America they knew. "Only the student of these ethnice changes wrought by great migratory movements, such as the one we witness in our day, can have any idea of the racial modifications which are likely to result from the coming of these strange people from all parts of the world,"\(^{27}\) he said. He warned that far-reaching change in America's national character would result, that the American type must change in response to the influences of new racial stocks. He catalogued the horrors inevitable in the wake of these new influences: stature would be decreased and the

\(^{26}\text{Ibid., pp. 6-7.}\)

\(^{27}\text{Robert Hunter, Poverty (New York, 1904), pp. 10-12.}\)
skull would become shorter and broader. Psychological changes would occur as well.

For Hunter the new forces and new languages were a threat to the American heritage:

The direct descendents of the peoples who fought for and founded the republic and who gave us a rich heritage of democratic institutions are being displaced by the slavic Balkan and Mediterranean peoples.\(^{28}\)

Hunter said it is a question of babies and birth rates. He was afraid not of a population explosion but of the genetic quality of the children being born. Greater immigration meant less pure native births. Intermingling of peoples would indefinately lower the standard of human existence he argued and, therefore, by allowing immigration, America was committing race suicide.\(^{29}\)

Despite such opposition as created signs saying "Dogs and Irish need not apply," the regulation of Irish, Southern and Eastern Europeans to sweat shops, and more recently Mexican Americans, Appalachians, and Blacks to the Ghetto, again a common pattern of response may be discerned. Instead of losing faith in America and its institutions, the opposite occurs. The Irishman, the Slav, the Black responds with a more intense belief in the institutions of American life than ever. It is just this response, made in the face of slavery, insults, hatred, and ostracism that creates the

\(^{28}\)Ibid., p. 27.
\(^{29}\)Ibid., p. 29.
characteristic faith in the public schools and of the beneficial effects of education.

Regardless of the reasons for migration, famine and unemployment in Ireland and Germany, forced slavery from Africa, the wish to escape class and caste by the ambitious not nobly born; once here, a common sociological principle welded all together. That is because caste, either physical or spiritual, is untenable in American society, eventual acceptance of minorities into the mainstream is inevitable. A nation of immigrants can not find a lasting basis for finding fault with new immigrants. Nor, on the other hand, can the immigrants, cut off from their traditions and clan, maintain a stance of alienation from the larger society. For as an American, a name which the newest immigrants off the boat may as easily claim as earlier immigrants off the Mayflower, the same values of freedom from tradition class restriction and prejudice are in operation.

Viewed from this perspective, the movement from out group status to in group acceptance can be approached as sociological law of progression within the American milieu.

Hollingshead's classic work, *Elmtown's Youth*, describes the cultural characteristics of five classes. The Elmtowners did deny the existence of class directly but acted as if classes exist. Even though Elmtowners
are inconsistent in their designations of a particular class, the systematic analysis of selected cultural traits associated with each of the five classes, based upon data collected from the families of the adolescents, supplemented by interviews and observations, reveal that the possession of a constellation of differentially evaluated social symbols—functional, pecuniary, religious, educational, reputational, power, lineage, proper associates, memberships in associations—are relied upon by Elmtowners to "hang people on the peg they belong on," to determine "their place in the community" or "their standing in life."  

Class I

Wealth and lineage are combined through the economic, legal, and family systems in such a manner that membership in class I is more or less stabilized from one generation to another. Consequently, the members of class I tend to have their position ascribed through inheritance. In view of this, very few of its members have achieved their position in the prestige structure through their own efforts. Because the station of the family is transferred to the children and because few persons achieve class I position

through their own efforts, only a few persons are able to enter its ranks in any one generation.\textsuperscript{31}

Class II

Almost one-half of the families in class II have achieved their position through their own efforts; the remainder have inherited them but a further rise is virtually impossible, as their origins are too well-known and not enough time has elapsed between the start of their ascent and the present to allow them to be accepted in the exclusive circles of class I. The typical class II family is aware of the social distance between itself and class I; nevertheless, it attempts to identify itself in every possible way with class I rather than with a lower class.\textsuperscript{32}

Class III

The pivotal position of class III, lying as it does between the two extremes of the prestige structure, was demonstrated by the attitudes its members revealed toward themselves as well as toward the other classes. As a rule, class III persons were superior to themselves because of their wealth, leisure, lineage, and way of life. They also knew that the class II persons occupied

\textsuperscript{31}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 84-89.
\textsuperscript{32}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 90-92.
a position superior to their own, but a position that rested on different bases: dignified occupations, income, higher education, leadership, and social activity-traits that they too possess but not in such generous amounts.\textsuperscript{33}

\textbf{Class IV}

Class IV persons, on the whole, are aware of the inferior prestige position they occupy in comparison with the higher classes; furthermore, they resent the attitudes most persons in these exhibit toward them. However, they take pride in the fact that they are not so badly off as the people in class V. They discriminate sharply between "people like us" and the socially ambitious higher classes and improvident "relievers," "loafers," and "criminal class" whom they despise.\textsuperscript{34}

\textbf{Class V}

Class V occupies the lowest-ranking stations in the prestige structure. It is looked upon as the scum of the city by the higher classes. It is believed generally that nothing beyond charity can be done for these people, and only a minimum of that is justified since they show little or no inclination to help themselves.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{33}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 93-94.
\textsuperscript{34}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 95-97.
\textsuperscript{35}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 98-100.
Similarly, the institutions of American life may be viewed as sociological manifestations of basic values and ideals of American life. Lubell in *The Future of Politics* values the important point that political power is a result of acceptance into the mainstream of American life and not a means to it.\(^{36}\) Similarly, institutions such as the school must be viewed not as a means to acceptance by the larger society, but accoutrements that accompany acceptance. That is, performance in the schools is a sociological phenomenon. The change in performance level by out groups joining the in groups may be seen historically and this basis may be expected to be repeated by other out groups. Failure to achieve success in the school, from this sociological viewpoint, suggests that for some reason movement into the mainstream of society is being blocked. The nature of the forces involved in this block have, of course, been argued by sociologist and social critics. DuBois, for example, saw the problem in terms of conflicting value systems. At one and the same time mutually exclusive values operated. This resulted in a kind of social schizophrenia where one value contradicts the next, making the resolution of social inequity a complex dilemma. DuBois illustrated

this idea by suggesting a comparative list of American values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Christian</th>
<th>Gentlemen</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>W.A.S.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Defense</td>
<td>War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Will</td>
<td>Manners</td>
<td>Caste</td>
<td>Hate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Rule</td>
<td>Exclusiveness</td>
<td>Propaganda</td>
<td>Suspicion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Patriotism</td>
<td>Exploitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>Wealth</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Empire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This scheme of value conflict creates not just a complicated dilemma but a quadra-dilemma. To make an even more confused picture, DuBois pointed out that the level of importance attached to particular values is not necessarily consistent. By way of example, he presented the following arrangement:

Peace
Manners
Propaganda
Goodwill
Exclusiveness
Exploitation
Patriotism
Empire

Whether one agrees with the scheme presented by DuBois or not, it illustrates the idea that differing concepts and values within as well as among individuals creates a complex web of hidden forces which may have varying amounts of influence on social realities. The

38 Ibid., p. 48.
39 Ibid., pp. 51-53.
subtlety and elusiveness of isolating the forces and factors involved in the social process was not lost sight of by DuBois. His disclaimer for the accuracy of sociological method in his own time may well serve to make us cautious against falling prey to our own subjective view of what is:

The best available methods of sociological research are at present so liable to inaccuracies that the careful student discloses the results of individual research with difference; he knows that they are liable to error from the seemingly ineradicable faults of the statistical method; to even greater error from the methods of general observation; and, above all, he must ever tremble lest some personal bias, some moral conviction training has to a degree distorted the picture in his view. Convictions on all great matters of human interest one must have a greater or less degree, and they will enter to some extent into the most cold-blooded scientific research as a disturbing factor.  

Orwell reasoned that words like democracy, socialism, freedom, patriotic, realistic, justice, all have several different meanings which can not be reconciled with one another. In the case of a word like democracy, not only is there no agreed definition, but the attempt to make one is resisted from all sides. Words of this kind are often used in a consciously dishonest way.  

Orwell also concludes:

Objective consideration of contemporary phenomena compels the conclusion that success

40 Ibid., p. 59.
41 George Orwell, Ten Contemporary Thinkers, Politics and the English Language (Toronto, Canada, 1966), p. 57.
or failure in competitive activities exhibits no tendency to be commensurate with innate capacity, but that a considerable element of the unpredictable must invariably be taken into account. \(^42\)

Democracy was founded on self-evident or natural rights, the conservatives argued, and chief among these rights was liberty of a man to acquire and keep property without the interference of government, and the liberty of a workingman to deal directly with his employer without the interference of a union.

Professor John W. Burgess of Columbia University declared, "An Anglo-Saxon is a person who instinctively knows that liberty cannot survive trade unions and other socialistic schemes from Eastern and Southern Europe." \(^43\)

Immigrants from Southern or Eastern Europe, after the prevailing theories continued, have had to debate the notion of "instinct for liberty" which blocked their movement into the American mainstream. \(^44\)

Hutchins prescribed that democracy was the answer to everything, including the ills of democracy. He said, Democracy means self-government, and self-government means primarily participation by the individual, at least through the selection of his representatives, in decisions

\(^{42}\) Ibid., p. 58.


\(^{44}\) Ibid., p. 70.
affecting his life and happiness.\textsuperscript{45} Since decisions affecting the citizen's life and happiness were taken not merely by his government, but also by many other institutions, corporations, trade unions, and political parties, for example, the thing to do was to democratize them, as well as the government.

The democratic faith is faith in man, faith in every man, faith that man, if he is well enough educated and well enough informed, can solve the problems raised by his own aggregation.

Hutchins further states,

One advantage of this faith is that it is practically shock-proof. Education can be made trivial beyond belief. The media of communication can be turned into media of entertainment. The dialogue can almost stop because people have nothing to say, or, if they have something to say, no place to say it. Still it is possible to believe that if democracy and the dialogue can continue, if they can be expanded, if they can be improved, freedom, justice, equality, and peace will ultimately be achieved.\textsuperscript{46}

His shock-proofs were:

(1) Some of the unions in which democratic forms were most conspicuous were the most anti-social.

(2) The citizens could actually participate in decisions upon which their lives depended.

(3) 'Vote as you please, but please Vote.'\textsuperscript{47}


\textsuperscript{46}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 34.

\textsuperscript{47}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 36-38.
It is still our responsibility, now more than ever, to see to it that government of the people, by the people, and for the people does not perish.  

Parsons' "Western Society" is another very complex entity with many different variations on national, regional, cultural, class, and other bases. There are, nevertheless, a small number of structurally distinctive features of it which, though unevenly distributed in different parts, are of such strategic significance for the whole that they can be singled out as presenting in the most accentuated form the problems which are crucial to the whole. These are, above all, those features associated with the development of the modern type of urban and industrial society, which is far more highly developed in the modern Western world than anywhere else or at any other period.  

Parson analyzed the genesis and the channeling of Western society from four different aspects or structural functional contexts; they are:  

(1) the kinship system in its context in the larger society, since this is the environment in which the principal patterns in the individual personality become crystallized.  
(2) the occupational system, since this is the arena of the most important competitive process in which the individual must achieve his status.  

---  

48 Ibid., p. 39.  
(3) the fundamental process of dynamic change by which traditional values and sentiments are exposed to a far more drastic and continuing disintegrating influence than in most societies.

(4) the kinship system in its larger setting involves a variety of influences on the child which favor high levels of insecurity structured in relatively definite and uniform ways and correspondingly a good deal of aggression.  

While the more famous founders of sociology, such as, Auguste Comte, Karl Marx, and Herbert Spencer, were predominantly armchair theorists in their approach to understanding the causes and consequences of the industrial and urban revolutions, the rise of capitalism and the problems of labor, it was the more empirical and pragmatic tradition of Charles Booth in England and the Hull House work in this country. This kind of work inspired DuBois to study the facts, and all the facts, concerning the American Negro and his plight. He was determined to put science into sociology through a study of the condition and problems of his own group.  

Nevertheless, DuBois continued, there are some social problems whose urgency demand careful study. Essential questions that affect our lives in intimate ways must be investigated and conclusions made, despite the possibility of error inherent in the sociological

---

50 Ibid., pp. 255-256.
method itself. It is with consciousness of this danger that the present study is approached.

**Delphi**

The Delphi technique, originally developed by the Rand Corporation in the 1950's to assist the Defense Department planning for future defense needs, is uniquely designed to serve as an effective method of gaining information from informants in an urban school setting. Delphi avoids the dangers of specious persuasion that group confrontations for decision-making often produce. Delphi allows for an anonymous response to questions and reception of anonymous feedback as to how others in the group have responded.\(^{52}\)

Olaf Helmer presented an experiment that attempted to use Delphi to predict the capabilities of computers in the future. A panel of computer experts was asked to estimate the year when a computer would be able to score 150 on a standard IQ instrument. He used four rounds of responses that gave each expert the chance to change his opinion to the majority or minority opinion. Helmer concluded that the median of round four represented group consensus.\(^{53}\)

\(^{52}\)Alvin Lipsetz, "Delphi as an Intervention Technique in Developing a Plan of Change for the Student Affairs Office at The Ohio State University" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1972), p. 49.  
\(^{53}\)Ibid., p. 50.
The Delphi technique completely eliminates committee activity and replaces it with a carefully designed program of sequential interrogations, interspersed with information and opinion feedback. The questioning usually is conducted best by a series of questionnaires.\textsuperscript{54}

The Delphi technique was used by the United States Air Force for developing consensus among a group of experts concerning a forecast of the international situation between the years of 1966 and 2015. Although there was no way of validating the specific forecasts, the results were considered to be of interest to those concerned about future developments in the field of international relations.

Helmer discusses, in his Social Technology, three important processes: (1) the Delphi process of selecting experts, (2) the performance of experts, and (3) the utilizing of expert groups in the decision-making process. He states: "While model building is an extremely systematic expedient to promote the understanding and control of our environment, reliance on expert judgment, though often unsystematic, is more than expedient." Helmer continues to argue that, if a particular decision can not be based on theory, experts will be consulted. "In the social services, we are

\textsuperscript{54}Ibid., p. 51.
able to call on a vast reservoir of expertise of many kinds.\textsuperscript{55}

According to Helmer, there is a growing recognition that it is necessary to do something about our ability to predict the future, and that we should form methodological devices for a more effective approach to forecasting the future. From the viewpoint of Helmer, the social sciences are on the point of evolution. Traditional methods, he says, are proving inadequate to the task of dealing effectively with the growing complexity of forecasting. The degree of complexity increases the need for decision-creating devices in the private and public sector, using techniques that have not been used before. One of these devices is the Delphi technique, a technique which attempts to make effective use of informed, intuitive judgment.

Whittier states, "The realignment of power is a painful process without guarantee of improvement."\textsuperscript{56} Yet, changes must be made to better serve all citizens and particularly those who find the present system inadequate. It seems, however, that plans to utilize the strengths of the professionals and lay citizens

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{55}Ibid., p. 54.
\end{flushright}
together hold more promise for bringing about improvement and maintaining it than plans to allow either group to have exclusive decision-making power.

Helmer projected that the qualitative improvement of societal studies depends upon our acceptance of operation research technique. The Delphi process generates its importance from well established theory. Helmer, in "The Future of Science," stated that the programmed use of informed opinion may lack the elegance and the cohesiveness of the scientific theory, but effective use of devices for exploring the future are thereby aiding the planning and the decision-making process.

Some proponents of the Futurist theory argue, that by utilizing the Delphi technique, the overall goal of a conference is, thus, facilitated in combining opinions of the various members into convergent thinking on a single position. The traditional and simplest way of achieving consensus has been a round table discussion where experts arrive at an agreed position. According to some theorists, this way has great limitations. In particular, the outcome is apt to be a forced, contaminated, therefore, artificial compromise among divergent groups. Helmer believes, also, that the Delphi technique in its simplest form eliminates a discussion group around a table and replaces it with a carefully designed program.
of sequential, individual interrogation which flows from questionnaires interspersed with information on opinions of the feedback of other groups as well as individuals.

The Institute of Government and Public Affairs at the University of California in Los Angeles used the Delphi technique in an attempt to generate some helpful perspectives on changes in American education. Some of the experts decided on the values as follows:

(1) the behavioral results of the procedure are very instructive.
(2) to make the required choices to forego 'desirables.'
(3) people familiar enough with the decision process in one setting or another that one might have thought them comfortable with the need to decide.
(4) there was much soul searching and argument.
(5) the procedure was looked on by almost all of the participants as potentially very useful in educational planning at all levels.57

In "The Delphi Technique: A Tool for Collecting Opinions in Teacher Education," Cyphert and Gant felt it best if they did not notify any of the participants of the classification that that was the basis of his inclusion nor of the groups and other individuals involved in their survey. They included seven categories.

A. Faculty from the School of Education and selected student leaders from the graduate and undergraduate populations, University of Virginia campus.

B. Persons in positions of leadership in the University—deans, the president's cabinet, and elected members of the University faculty senate.

C. Off-campus elements: educators, i.e., elementary and secondary schoolteachers and administrators holding elective office in state-wide professional organizations.

D. Organizational leaders, not necessarily professional educators, such as the officers of the Virginia School Boards Association, the Virginia PTA, the State Council of Higher Education.

E. Persons of paramount influence in political circles, e.g., the education committees of the Virginia House and Senate, U.S. senators and representatives, the governor.

F. Leading newspaper editors and persons dealing with education in such groups as the Virginia AFL-CIO, NAACP, Virginia Farm Bureau, and the Virginia Chamber of Commerce.

G. Selected teacher educators of national reputation from across the nation.58

Donald Anderson developed a project using the Delphi technique for an intermediate school in Ohio. The participants were asked to respond to an open-ended questionnaire using the following question stem:

In the decade ahead, the County School District should concentrate its energies and resources.59

Participants were asked to give up to 10 responses. The responses were reviewed independently by the four members of the research team. They developed items independently that proved to match each other quite closely. After

58 Ibid., p. 425.
59 Lipsetz, p. 52.
four Delphi rounds, Anderson reports success in identifying high priority, organizational objectives, and in influencing decisions on the basis of this data.

Timothy Weaver, *in Delphi, A Critical Review*, suggests that using the Delphi to develop goals and priorities is a normative exercise since the focus is on what is desirable rather than on speculation of probable dates of events. Feedback represents normative choices on the part of the other participants. Rankings and consensus in this type of Delphi can be a function of many different things for the participants and, therefore, are, by themselves, spurious. He offered possible modifications of Delphi that would help to make it a more effective tool in educational forecasting. One of these offers to avoid the criticism of the spurious nature of Delphi data. Also, Weaver cited a comprehensive compilation of literature dealing with Delphi. He questioned some of the fundamental assumptions of naive interpretations of Delphi data.⁶⁰

Weaver is quoted as saying about the value of the data:

> Convergence of divergence which occurs after feedback ought to be taken as an indicator of the force of arguments and clarifying of points of view; in this view it is assumed to have nothing to do with the accuracy of events in question.⁶¹

---

⁶⁰Ibid., p. 54.
⁶¹Ibid., p. 56.
With some of these strategies in mind, this investigator used the Delphi technique for a study of the value of data obtained from selected informants who were key individuals in an urban community. The purpose was to uncover useful data regarding education which might reveal the appropriate priorities for schooling in an urban setting.
CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This study attempted to determine whether useful data could be obtained from using the Delphi technique as a data gathering process. The Delphi is a recently developed methodology for creating data from selected experts. In this study the Delphi approach was modified for a different purpose. It was not intended as the agent for change itself although this aspect does relate to the second question in this study. This section describes the methods and procedures employed in the study as well as the specifics of the usefulness of the Delphi technique.

The Delphi technique was originally developed by Rand Corporation in the 1950's to assist the Defense Department in planning for future defense needs. It can be uniquely designed to serve as an effective method of gaining information from informants in an urban setting.

The Delphi technique was used by the United States Air Force for developing consensus among a group of experts concerning a forecast of the international situation between the years of 1966 and 2015. Although
there was no way of validating the specific forecasts, the results were considered to be of interest to those concerned about future developments in the field of international relations.

The overall strategy in this study called for informants in an urban setting to reveal their priorities regarding schooling and education. The researcher gathered information from selected informants in an urban setting which related to values relative to school policy, classroom performance, and educational outcomes.

The original Delphi procedure was modified for this study. This study does reflect a generally accepted usage of the Delphi process. In order to fully develop appropriate items for later use in the Delphi technique, a focused interview with university experts at The Ohio State University was conducted. This process was undertaken to solicit responses to a question concerning the future goals and outcomes for education in an urban setting. A list of items was devised from their responses. These steps were followed by the researcher:

1. The researcher elicited a list of statements regarding urban educational issues from selected experts at The Ohio State University.

2. After collecting the list of statements from the university experts, the researcher gathered all of
the statements and organized them in a complete list of 80 items.

3. The university experts sorted these statements by means of a Q-sort procedure.

4. These 20 items were then ranked from one to 20 according to their priority.

5. Four additional items were included from the research and literature reviewed for this study to make a total list of 24 statements.

6. In Round I the list of 24 statements were presented to selected informants in an urban setting, and they were asked to rate or evaluate each item according to its priority; i.e., their view of its importance or success.

7. Round II included a list of priority ratings to the informants which indicated their consensus. This step required the informants to revise their judgments or to specify their reason for remaining outside the consensus. This round provided a final chance for their revision of judgment.

This process enabled the researcher to examine the appropriateness of the modified Delphi technique. The original Delphi question (Appendix B) was distributed to select experts at The Ohio State University. These experts were selected on the basis of their recognized
experiences at the university and in urban areas. The experts at the university responded with 80 separate suggestions and comments to the major question for the Delphi. From those responses, three general categories were developed: goals, functions, and roles. The result of the sorting and categorizing process was 20 phrases or key words that represented objectives, roles, and goals of an ideal urban school program. As mentioned above, four additional statements were added to the final list later. A sample of actual comments received from the experts is presented here to illustrate the divergent nature of the responses.

1. Parental concerns should be dealt with on an on-going basis.

2. Conflicts between students and faculty should be resolved quietly with compromise.

3. Communicate within student life-style.

4. Emphasis on basic skill—not experimental approaches.


6. Tenure of urban school district be awarded by the urban school community.

7. Decision-making within the community school leading to a better school built around community needs.

8. The school should change with the times.
9. Governance: Student, parents, teachers, and community resident involvement in decision-making.

10. Incorporation of ethnic cultural element into the curriculum and teacher preparation.

Finally, 24 items were selected to comprise the Delphi questionnaire. These items represented significant educational issues, questions, and points-of-view. The items and questions are presented below with the question stem:

An ideal Urban School Program in an urban setting should:

1. have teachers who have a strong identification with the urban school in which they are a part.

2. have decision-making within the community school leading to a better school built around community needs. (Throughout these statements "community" refers to the Columbus, Ohio, inter urban area.)

3. have student representation in faculty meetings and any other meetings which involve decisions concerning students.

4. reconstruct the arrangements for school governance.

5. not desegregate by busing. Make all schools equally educational regardless of the location.

6. have funds available for an urban school ombudsman to deal with parental concerns.
7. provide tenure for urban schools by selection from the urban community.

8. design programs for teachers and parents working together to focus on a curriculum which speaks to the life-style and identification of an urban community.

9. delegate decision-making as well as community responsibility.

10. have schools a little more "liberated;" when people are forced to do something, they tend to not want to do it.

11. deal with conflicts between students and teachers and, hopefully, gain a common ground for compromise.

12. be designed to give children the opportunity to find out how they feel about themselves, and whether they have any worth and value.

13. create the aura for the development and compromise between parents, teachers, students, and administrators in an urban school setting.

14. develop an equitable distribution of school finance.

15. design cultural elements into the curriculum and teacher preparation.

16. develop orientation to educate teachers to deal with the realities of minorities and poor people.

17. elect school board members to directly represent the educational interest of the disadvantaged and the gifted students.
18. develop parent training programs for school development and community control.

19. emphasize basic skill and not "experimental" approaches.

20. have "preventive" decision-making/planning before crises arise.

21. encourage teachers in urban schools to live in the urban community.

22. have a humanness approach and teach a sense of justice, and respect the right for differences.

23. have someone outside of schools who can explain the role and dynamics of the urban school community.

24. offer counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving.

The Delphi technique operates on a feedback mechanism. The results of Round I represented feedback to the participants in the final Round II. For feedback, the group modal response was used. The modal response was selected for several reasons. Use of the modal response avoided the confusion that the use of means might have created. The intent was to encourage choices of "1" or "2" or "3" or "4." A mean score of "1.4," for reference, would have not been as strong an encouragement as a modal response of "1." The instructions were to assign a 1-4 priority to each item. It is easily understood and makes few assumptions about the statistical sophistication of
the participants. This is an ordinal measurement which was more appropriate to the small size of the group.

In Round I each respondent was required to choose six items for each of the four priorities, meaning the result was six items for priorities "1," "2," "3," and "4." In Round II there were no restrictions on distributing the ratings. For example, a respondent could choose more "1's" in this round than was permissible in Round I. If the informant did not agree with the modal response and rated a Round II item differently than the modal response for that item, the informant was asked to provide a written comment, in the margin, as to the nature of this disagreement.

The Informant as an Expert

The investigator followed Helmer in the identification and selection of community informants to receive the Delphi questionnaire. Helmer explained the rationale for expertise as follows: "While in some cases the expert judgment that is available may be highly intuitive in character and based on insights that, although no less reliable, may have thus far defied articulation within a theoretical framework."^62 This expertise could be of great value in practical policy considerations, i.e., the teasing-out of criteria for the selection of useful

^62 Lipsetz, p. 53.
data. It is believed that decision-makers have always used the opinion of experts to aid in the decision-making process, a procedure which was followed for the thesis of this study.

Helmer holds that,

Once a rough overall pattern of the future educational needs of our society has been established one would have to turn to the question of devising appropriate educational innovations to meet the new needs. These innovations might be of many kinds. They might be in the nature of administrative modification of goals. . . . Here again, the Delphi approach may prove expedient; it can be used, first to solicit ideas for suitable educational innovations and, second, to appraise the efficacy of any such proposals that do not lend themselves easily to direct experimental evaluation.63

If the Delphi technique can help to answer some of the questions for school administrators and for community experts, then as an innovation, the technique might be successful as another assist to the administrative process.

Community dwellers in the urban setting are becoming more concerned about the schools within their community. This concern is being revealed consistently through their activities in the urban community. The urban leaders are asking for a voice in the decision-making process. The urban school, with its close ties to the ethnological, sociological, and political concerns

63 Ibid., p. 54.
of the community have to recognize a new role that this voice can play in the future.

The community feels that it trusted the "established order" and was failed; persons in the network of the "established order" felt that it tried and was misinterpreted.

It should be emphasized here that decisions test a person's value system consciously as well as subconsciously. The confrontation process facilitates a decision process when it is remembered that the "value system" of the other decision-maker was significant in determining the nature and extent of action to be taken.

If the "value system" is dynamic and a kind of "bargaining process," then decision-making could well be a process to pacify the diverse elements in an urban setting. The Delphi technique is seen as one method of telescoping the "value system" of decision-making which incorporates the above thinking with special emphasis on a bargaining process.65

**Characteristics of the Informants**

In the selection of informants in an urban school, it is generally accepted that many persons and groups are

---

65 Ibid., p. 30.
influential in making decisions. It has been observed further that these key groups exist because they are influential in the decision itself and the acceptability of it. In the setting for the present study these groups were identified as: Urban Setting Individuals, Community Training Personnel, and Urban Technical Force. These key groups represent, in part, the individuals in the urban society which influences urban public education. Some scholars believe that because the institution of urban public education is so highly dependent on the greater society, pressure for change within the urban area has to be accepted by the greater society irrespective of how the change is based. Educators must have the consent of the voters to implement change. It is the voters rather than the professionals who have control of the urban schools. Emmons states that the success of the process of educational decision-making depends upon the acceptance by the actors of the internal and external groups which control the process.\textsuperscript{66} Therefore, the selection of the urban expert group was designed to reflect this characteristic of decision-making in the urban area.

Urban setting individuals

These persons were generalists whose decision area was away from the actual operation of the urban

\textsuperscript{66} \textit{Ibid.}, p. 93.
community school. They usually have minimal contact with teachers but some contact with students and community people. The group included individuals in business, labor, and community organizations. The group will be identified by the symbol USI.

Community training personnel

These persons were generalists also, but their decision area was close to or at the level of general operation of the urban school. They have contacts through agencies like employment, housing, and community social services. This group will be identified by the symbol CTP.

Urban technical force

These persons can be defined as community personnel who have taken an active part in the formulation of urban setting concerns and who developed that concern through the leadership thrust that formal organization can provide. They included elected and ex-appointed officers, ex-policy makers, and individuals influential in their urban community. They often became the voice of the urban community. This group will be identified by the symbol UTF.
Qualifications of Community Experts

The method of determining available persons was done through assessing the persons' qualifications against an unconventional background. The qualifications or unconventional background included:

1. Training in other urban disciplines
2. Interest in the urban problems
3. Experience in an urban-setting type community
4. Involvement in urban education
5. Traditional or non-traditional education

Selection of Informants

The informants (experts) were selected by definition from the urban setting area. They were:

1. Urban Setting Individuals (USI)
   - One Minister
   - Two Urban Merchants
   - Three Urban Consultants (varied contacts with urban people)

2. Community Training Personnel (CTP)
   - One Urban Executive
   - One Training Coordinator
   - Three Ex-Urban Public School Teachers
   - One Physical Education Director (Urban Recreation Center)
3. Urban Technical Force (UTF)
   
   Two Presidents of urban community organizations
   Two Ex-State employees
   One Ex-Urban appointed officer
   One Ex-Black Studies Chairman

Initiating the Process

Eighteen, six in each subsection, were asked to follow through on the Delphi process. First, they were contacted and informed of the process of the Delphi technique. At that personal interview a detailed explanation was made of:

1. Their commitment to the project if the research was to have value.

2. The design of the Delphi questionnaire that would be used in the research project.

3. The purpose and procedure of the research project.

It was necessary to be explicit, because the Delphi technique depended upon the recycling of questionnaires to the same people in the urban community. Therefore, it was necessary that these urban people not only agree to participate but agree, also, to continue the participation throughout the extent of the project. Because if, during the process, some of the informants decided to withdraw
from the process, then the validity of the Delphi technique becomes questionable.

Summary

The Delphi process

The development of the Delphi questionnaire began with the selection of experts from the university. As stated before, the group included experts from The Ohio State University with a background in an urban area or urban studies. First, they were contacted by the researcher and informed of the purpose of the study. Then, a personal interview was conducted with each expert informing that person of the overall procedure of the study. The Delphi process developed from the Q-sort of items (Appendix A) was designed as an approach to help the university experts in organizing their priorities. A 100% return was received by the researcher on the initial questionnaire from the experts. After the receipt of the first questionnaire from all respondents, a process of accounting and tabulating was undertaken. Statements were listed and identified. The statements became the Round I questionnaire (Urban Setting Interview), and was hand-carried to the Delphi informants in the urban setting.
Round I

Round I was initiated by giving a letter (Appendix D) to the informants; they were asked to participate in this Delphi urban study and to respond to the Round I questionnaire. Eighteen questionnaires were completed by the informants for a 100% return. After the conclusion of Round I, all participants in the urban community were presented letters (Appendix E) of acknowledgment thanking them for their participation. They were also informed that Round II would be the final round in this Delphi process.

Round II

The questionnaire for Round II displayed the results of Round I and the model responses for each item. This round requested that each informant look at his previous response and the model response for each item and decide if he wanted to change his response. A comment was required from a respondent if a change was made in this initial response. In this round there was no restriction to the number of times any priority level was used.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of this chapter was to present and analyze the data from the Delphi technique undertaken in this study. These data were pertinent to the questions of the study.

Two questions framed the purpose of the study:

1. Are useful data available from selected informants regarding the priorities of education in an urban setting?

2. Is the Delphi technique a useful procedure for obtaining levels of consensus among different groups in an urban setting?

The purpose of the Delphi technique was to test the usefulness of the data obtained from the urban setting. The open-ended questionnaire was the first step to generate sufficient comments for the item building process. The items developed from responses to the initial Delphi question, created 80 individual comments from university experts. These items appear in Appendix A. The university experts were asked to sort the 20
items from highest to lowest priority as they perceived them in their awareness of the urban community. They were asked to rank the items as they preferred them in an ideal program in an urban setting.

These university experts generated a large number of statements which they thought were crucial to the task of selecting priorities for an urban setting. Examples of these statements are listed as original quotations. They are listed to assist in perceiving what the university experts thought was crucial to an urban setting. These items represent examples from which the original statements were developed.

Examples of original statements from university experts were:

- "development of a program that would facilitate student-teacher-parent interaction." "Not a PTA!" "Someway to have parents in school activities."

- "have student representation in faculty meetings and any other meeting which involves decision concerning students."

- "have schools a little more 'liberated,' where people are forced to do something, they tend to not want to do it." "Do away with Security Guards."

- "Do not Bus!" "Make all schools equal educationally regardless of the location!"

- "Governance," "student, parent, teacher and community residents involvement in decision-making."

- "Recruitment" "retention of qualified teachers, teaching-aides, and more specialists of every category."
pre- and in-service education for teachers and administrative staff-communication."

"strong identification with urban school and ability to communicate within the student's life-style."

"the ability to resolve conflict by having the community specialist and agent for change and understanding."

"responsive to parental concerns"

"de-centralized decision-making"

"we must reconstruct the arrangements for school governance."

"tenure of urban school district be awarded by the urban school community."

"teachers and parents working together to focus on a curricula which speaks to the life-style and identification of particular community."

"an economic resource center to create jobs that can relate to parent, teachers and the schools."

"development of an equitable distribution of school finance."

"incorporation of ethnic cultural elements into the curriculum and teacher preparation."

"development of orientation to educate teachers to deal with the realities of the Black and the poor."

"election of school board members to directly represent the educational interests of the Black and the poor."

"teachers should have strong identification with the urban school in which they are a part."

"preventive decision-making/planning before crises arise."
Distinct differences in priorities became apparent when the experts at The Ohio State University were asked to rank the 20 items in order of importance in an "ideal" urban school program in the urban community (see Table 1).

Item 1, "provide buffer between students," reflects the possibility of problems in the urban schools. On the actual sort, opinion seemed evenly divided as to how important this time was perceived. However, the ideal sort shows a great deal of diversity, which seemed to show signs of distaste for the "buffer" role.

Item 4, "individual development for students," remained essentially the same between the sorts. The university experts felt that the development of individual students was most important. However, it was most important to note that the university experts felt that the development started at home. The item dealing with compromise (6) lost importance when viewed ideally.

An item dealing with a role similar to that of the change agent is Item 9, "community change agent." Again, there seems to be a clear distinction in the importance university experts perceived this role to be in an urban setting. Items 18 and 19 may be considered
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Provide buffer between students and teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No rule enforcement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Humanness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Individual development for students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Higher salaries for teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Willingness to compromise</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. React quickly to crises in the schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Centralized decision-making</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Community change agent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Strong identification with urban school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Communicate within student life-style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Urban school Ombudsman</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Responsive to parental concerns</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Resolving conflicts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Teach moral leadership and responsibility</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Community specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teaching new students</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Provide traditional services in the urban school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Facilitate change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Decision-making based on research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to represent risky roles and the actual sort reflected in this inference.

For this study, three groups of informants were created for the Delphi procedure:

1. **Urban Setting Individuals.** These persons were generalists whose decision area was away from the actual operation of the urban community school. \( N = 6 \).

2. **Community Training Personnel.** These persons were generalists also, but their decision area was close to or at the level of the general operation of the urban school. \( N = 6 \).

3. **Urban Technical Force.** These persons can be defined as community personnel who have taken an active part in the formulation of urban setting concerns and who developed that concern through the leadership thrust that a formal organization can provide. \( N = 6 \).

Stated below are some of the written comments made by the urban informants when they responded to the Delphi instrument. These reactions represent supplementary explanations for their judgments in response to the items of the Delphi instrument. In other words, these statements reflect their difference of opinion with the value of an item for an educational priority.

USI - (1) "the school is part of the community." (2) "the school system should provide enough money for all the schools to function on a sound fiscal basis,"
regardless of the location." (3) "children need basic skills to function in society, not experimental approaches." (4) "do not see the need for an urban school ombudsman."

CTP - (1) "compromise, interpreted as basis for cooperation and/or respect, as a major key to teacher-student communications." (2) "an ounce of prevention is worth several pounds of cure." (3) "humanness approaches should be utilized in all human relationships." (4) "schools should be responsible to the community for decision-making processes." (5) "can not relate to ombudsman, for parental concerns, should be more direct." (6) "conflicts must be avoided comprises viva student-teacher is imperative.

UTF - (1) "children must know their value and worth, but it must first come from the home." (2) "do not discourage teachers from living in the urban community, near the urban school." (3) "board members should be concerned about all students." (4) "schools should not be like a prison—freedom should exist." (5) "feels that system is not arranged wrong—it is not functioning as was designed."

The purpose of this study was to discover if the groups of selected informants could move toward consensus, i.e., reach general agreement on their item responses. Therefore, it is necessary to ascertain the nature and extent of consensus achieved in total group reaction and subgroup differences to item responses in Round I and Round II. Such a gross comparison should indicate whether the investigation utilizing the Delphi technique (Round I, II) did, indeed promote consensus within the group of 18 informants.
To facilitate an investigation for analyzing the distribution of ratings by the informants, Table 2 presents the responses of the informants in Round I. The researcher tabulated the item responses across the round, and then totaled them to find the mode for each item. Table 2 provides information all 18 informants without requiring any contact with them as a group. This was one of the advantages for employing the Delphi technique for this study.

Are useful data available from selected informants regarding the priorities of education in an urban setting?

The purpose of this question was to investigate if the priority modal rating of the informants changed between rounds. If changes occurred, then the purpose of this question was to describe those changes.

The data relating to this question are contained in Table 3. Table 3 was constructed to assist the researcher in the observation of the change in distribution of ratings across different rounds. It was important to ascertain how the informants moved toward subgroup and total group consensus. The researcher postulated that changes in the informants' patterns illustrated the following:

1. Movement from an established priority rating on a given round to a higher priority rating on a succeeding round.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,3,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS FOR EACH ITEM
DELPHI ROUND II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Movement from an established priority rating on a given round to a lower priority rating on a succeeding round.

A change may be one of two possible types:

1. +: A change toward the priority rating on the round being evaluated.

2. -: A change away from the priority rating on the round being evaluated.

The investigative procedure explored changes found in Round I and Round II especially during interviews between both rounds. The researcher looked for the most active informant and least active informant; the most active positive informant and the least active informant; the most active negative informant and the least active negative informant; and the most active informant in a subgroup across both rounds.

How did the groups move toward consensus? How did the groups change?

The purpose of this section of the analysis is to examine the consensus level to telescope if that consensus could characterize subgroups and total groups. The researcher posited that the consensus level of any group, total or subtotal, could be identified, and, also, that such identification could be helpful in analyzing the process of consensus building in the determination of data obtained from selected informants in an urban setting.
An inspection of Table 4 for the Urban Setting Individuals (USI) group reveals that five Consensus Item Responses (CIRs) were found between rounds I and II, and 30 were found for the total subgroup. The USI subgroup consensus compared to the total consensus across the rounds showed variation between the rounds. In the same rounds, three Item Responses (IRs) carried USI subgroup consensus and no total group consensus.

The USI subgroup generated 30 CIRs of a possible 48 changes (24 IRs times two rounds). Two of these IRs moved from USI subgroup consensus on Round I to consensus on Round II (IR numbers 11 and 16). No evidence was found of movement from one level of consensus to another or movement from consensus to no consensus. The two items that changed moved in a positive direction, i.e., toward the total subgroup consensus.

It was important to ascertain how the USI subgroup moved toward total group consensus. Changes in the consensus patterns illustrated this point. In Table 4 column NC indicated the number of changes by the subgroups USI, CTF, and UTF.

Is the Delphi technique a useful procedure for obtaining levels of consensus among different groups in an urban setting?

To facilitate the investigation of consensus promotion, this researcher referred to Tables 4, 5, and 6.
TABLE 4
URBAN SETTING INDIVIDUALS
CONSENSUS ACROSS ROUNDS I, II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR</th>
<th>Rounds</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>Total CIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Denotes item response for USI subgroup consensus.
I, II: Denotes priority ranking (modal) of subgroup.
Table 4 was the beginning subgroup table which showed the choices of the informants (USI) by IR across rounds; items 4 and 5 showed IRs gathered in both rounds. The researcher tabulated the CIRs, and then totaled those CIRs. Following the identification of the concerns, the researcher compared the changes of the CIRs between the rounds. In Table 5 the researcher compared the behavior of those IRs that reached consensus by priority channels and, thus, identified those IRs that not only reached consensus but also changed consensus levels.

The Community Training Personnel (CTP) is located in Table 5. It shows similar values for the USI subgroup in Table 4. The CTP subgroup generated 29 CIRs. Six of these moved from no CTP subgroup consensus on Round I to consensus on Round II (IR eight, nine, 11, 16, 20, 22, 23). Also, there was evidence that of movement from one level of consensus to another level of consensus (15). This happened when there was a tie vote on item 15 in Round I, and the informants decided to change their position for consensus in Round II.

The inspection of Table 6 for the UTF group reveals that 27 CIRs of a possible 48 changes (24 IRs times two rounds) were made between Rounds I and Rounds II. Eight of these IRs moved Urban Training Force (UTF) group to no consensus on Round I to consensus Round II (IR numbers 3, 4, 7, 8, 13, 18, 19, 20). There
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR</th>
<th>Rounds</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>Total CIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>+11-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes item response for CTP subgroup consensus. I, II: Denotes priority ranking (modal) of subgroup.
**TABLE 6**

**URBAN TRAINING FORCE CONSENSUS ACROSS ROUNDS I, II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR</th>
<th>Rounds</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>Total CIR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>3*</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>3*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>4*</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>2*</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>+14-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Denotes item response for UTF subgroup consensus.
I, II: Denotes priority ranking (modal) of subgroup.
also were evidences of movement from one level of consensus to another level of consensus (change of priority rating). This happened in items 12 and 24 based on a positive change to join the consensus of the subgroup.

To arrive at the level of subgroup CIR, the researcher counted the individual informant votes at each IR level and determined if four or more informants voted the IR at a given priority level. Therefore, on Table 6 the IR for this subgroup moved toward consensus at a rapid rate. The movement from an established priority rating on Round I, to a higher priority rating, did happen in this subgroup, especially in Round II.

The informants in UTF subgroup generated the type criteria and substantiated their commitment by fulfilling the several designed tasks of the Delphi process. It was concluded that priority choices could be generated by selected informants in an urban setting by using the Delphi process.

It was important to ascertain how the different subgroups moved toward total group consensus. Changes in consensus patterns illustrated this. In Tables 4, 5, and 6 column NC indicates the number of changes made by the subgroups (USI, CTP, UTF). A change was defined as:

1. Movement from one level of consensus to another level of consensus (change of priority ranking)
2. Movement from no consensus to consensus
3. Movement from consensus to no consensus

Table 7 shows the IR by informant groups priority across Rounds I and II. The movement of votes on a given IR toward convergence of thinking between the informants could be a measure of movement toward consensus. On Round I this is precisely what happened. On Round II the CIRs of Round I retained their vote and held consensus level. The new acquisition of votes at Round II by the IRs which enabled them to become CIRs is indeed evidence of the promotion of consensus.

The examination of the data presented in Table 7 provides an analysis of the three informant subgroups. For each subgroup (USI, CTP, UTF) all IRs were analyzed to discover those choices which reached consensus, subgroups total, those which reached consensus, subgroup matching.

Table 7 shows the total votes across Rounds I and II after the questionnaires. The subgroups may not equal total group votes because of variance in definitional responses from subgroups. Additional IRs received sufficient votes to reach consensus level. There was evidence of voting toward certain convergence of IRs. This voting in Round II became heavy enough to move the IRs. This movement, again, indicates the promotion of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR</th>
<th>USI Informants</th>
<th>CTP Informants</th>
<th>UTF Informants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consensus. These findings did indicate that Round II promoted consensus.

A better understanding of the movement toward consensus promotion can be found in Table 8. The researcher enumerated in this table the IRs that reached CIRs on Rounds I and II, and then totaled those CIRs. Following the identification of the concern areas, the researcher compared the changes of the CIRs between the two questionnaires. In Table 8 the researcher compared the choices of those IRs that reached consensus by priority selection and, thus, identified those IRs that not only reached consensus but also changed consensus levels.

This comparison of consensus shows variation between the subgroups and the total consensus across questionnaires. In Round I there were nine IRs carrying subgroup consensus and total group consensus. In the same questionnaire there were five IRs carrying "1" rating and not carrying subgroup consensus; yet, there were six IRs carrying less than top ratings for IRs in Round I. In Round II seven IRs carried the top rating in the subgroup and consensus in the total group. There were two IRs in Round II which carried the maximum amount of the IRs in the same questionnaire.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR</th>
<th>R I</th>
<th>Priority Rating</th>
<th>R II</th>
<th>Priority Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9*</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11*</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>10*</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Consensus equals 9 (more than 50%).
This is the summary table for this analysis in Chapter IV; it shows the comparison of consensus across Rounds I and II. It shows that change moved in a positive direction, i.e., toward subgroup and total group consensus.

It is important to not only determine the degree of change between the informant groups in the priority rating, but also the nature or direction of change. One can ask whether changes moved toward consensus or away from consensus. Table 9 summarizes this.

**TABLE 9**

TOTAL CHANGES BY SUBGROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>No. Changes</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USI</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTP</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTF</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows all groups changed; all groups changed toward the positive; one member of each subgroup changed negatively as well as positively, and this change was not consistent among the subgroups. The USI did not change at all, and the CTP and UTF changed only once. The USI subgroup was the most firm in its original direction of its conviction and the CTP and UTF were the least firm in their original direction of convictions.
The purpose of this sector of the analysis was to examine the contribution level of useful data from the subgroup to the total group contribution to the study. The total group reached various consensus levels across rounds. The researcher assumed that the subgroups would show contribution in a definable way to the total consensus.

Comparison of subgroup to total group

Table 10 shows the total CIRs for subgroup against total group by rounds. Subgroup CIRs may not equal total group CIRs because of variance in definitional consensus (a majority in the subgroups, 9 of 18 in the total group). This table shows the amount of agreement within the group by rounds and how that agreement relates to the total of three informant groups combined. Again, the sum of the parts does not have to equal the sum of the whole in this case.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>R I Sub-Group</th>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>R II Sub-Group</th>
<th>Total Group</th>
<th>Across Rounds Sub-Group</th>
<th>Total Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>USI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTP</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTF</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The USI subgroup had the highest generation of CIRs for each round, the UTF subgroup had the lowest. On R II the UTF subgroup generated the most CIRs and the USI subgroup generated the fewest. The UTF was stable at the highest ground level; the USI was stable at the lowest level. All groups increased or matched consensus on each successive round.

Final urban priorities

The original promise of the study was to look at the possible value of data obtained from selected informants in an urban setting and to determine whether or not they could be helpful at telescoping outcomes in decision-making and policy in urban schools. The final priorities of both rounds are shown in Table 11.

The highest priority items, by virtue of number of "1" ratings, were 12 and 4. The thrust of these two items reflects the direction the urban community may be moving: programs designed to give children the opportunity to find out how they feel about themselves, and whether they have any worth and value, gives promise for a potential educational orientation for the urban child. To offer counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving, can also go a long way to create positive changes in the urban setting. Item 8 moved into the top priority rating by a close vote.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Top Priority</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have teachers who have a strong identification with urban schools in which they are a part.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reconstruct the arrangements for school governance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not desegregate by busing! Make all schools equally educational regardless of the location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be designed to give children the opportunity to find out how they feel about themselves, and whether they have any worth and value.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop an equitable distribution of school finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design ethnic cultural elements into the curriculum and teacher preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design programs for teachers and parents working together to focus on a curriculum which speaks to the life-style and identification of an urban community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Second Priority</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have decision-making within the community school leading to a better school built around community needs. (Throughout these statements &quot;community&quot; refers to the Columbus, Ohio, inter urban area.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deal with conflicts between students and teachers, and hopefully gain a common ground for compromise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop orientation to educate teachers to deal with the realities of minorities and poor people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have student representation in faculty meetings and any other meetings which involve decisions concerning students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide tenure for urban schools by selection from the urban community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delegate decision-making as well as community responsibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create the aura for the development and compromise between parents, teachers, students, and administrators in the urban school setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elect school board members to directly represent the educational interest of the disadvantaged and the gifted students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have &quot;preventive&quot; decision-making/planning before crises arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasize basic skills and not &quot;experimental&quot; approaches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fourth Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have funds available for an urban school ombudsman to deal with parental concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have schools a little more &quot;liberated&quot; when people are forced to do something, they tend to not want to do it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop parent training programs for school development and community control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage teachers in urban schools to live in the urban community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a humanness approach and teach a sense of justice, and respect the right for differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have someone outside of schools who can explain the role and dynamics of the urban community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Design programs for teachers and parents working together to focus on a curriculum which speaks to the life-style and identification of an urban community," can be looked at as a change in heart by the informants after Round I. Items 6 and 10 stayed at the fourth priority throughout both rounds; the consensus seemed to be of little concern for an urban ombudsman or more "liberated" children in the urban setting. Both emotional items, 5 and 15, received strong top priority support continuously through the two Delphi rounds. Table 8 shows strong top priority ratings in both rounds of these emotional items in the urban setting.

Summary and conclusions

The informants changed 42 items over two change rounds. The changes in Round I were considerably less than the changes in Round II. This held true for all types of changes. For overall change activity, USI was the leader with 15 changes across two change rounds. The USI, as singular persons and as a group, was the most active. The UTF was the least active for group average, but the CTP group contained the least active informants.
TABLE 12
THE MOVEMENT OF INFORMANT CHOICES
TOTALS OF MOVEMENT BY GROUPS
ALL ROUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>USI</th>
<th></th>
<th>CTP</th>
<th></th>
<th>UTF</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All informants except two changed; most of the changes were positive (toward modal response); none were neutral. The informants contributed to consensus and from their changes, they behaved more as individual informants than as a group or subgroup.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine whether useful data could be obtained from informants relative to education in an urban setting. The choice of informants implied a selection of key individuals who possessed knowledge and information regarding education in an urban community.

The problem of the study was stated in the form of two questions:

1. Are useful data available from selected informants regarding the priorities of education in an urban setting?

2. Is the Delphi technique a useful procedure for obtaining levels of consensus among different groups in an urban setting?

The major focus of this study, then, revolved around the ethnological interests of individuals and groups which influence education in the urban setting. Is the Delphi technique an appropriate procedure for reading consensus from different groups in an urban
community? Do selected informants provide useful data regarding education which reveal significant priorities for the urban setting?

This study has developed a possible role for dwellers in an urban setting. The Delphi technique was used to discover data from selected informants. An examination of the differences of opinion within an urban community was used as a positive mode for drawing attention to conflict situations. The researcher examined the Delphi process as a technique for gaining a positive consensus.

Certain conclusions can be drawn as a result of the data analysis, but the findings of this study are limited to this urban area. The informants whose identity within the group is unknown, submitted priorities concerning a given educational issue.

This study attempted to determine whether useful data could be obtained from using the Delphi technique as a data gathering process. The Delphi is a recently developed methodology for obtaining information from selected experts. It was not intended as the agent for change itself although this aspect does relate to the second question in this study.

The original Delphi procedure was modified for this study. This study does reflect a generally
accepted usage of the Delphi process. In order to fully develop appropriate items for later use in the Delphi technique, a focused interview with university experts at The Ohio State University was conducted.

The overall strategy in this study called for informants in an urban setting to reveal their priorities regarding schooling and education. The researcher gathered information from selected informants in an urban setting, which related to values relative to school policy, classroom performance, and educational outcomes.

These steps were followed by the researcher:

1. The researcher elicited a list of statements regarding urban educational issues from selected experts at The Ohio State University.

2. After collecting the list of statements from the university experts, the researcher gathered all of the statements and organized them in a complete list of 80 items.

3. The university experts rated these statements by means of a Q-sort procedure into 20 high priority statements.

4. These 20 items were then ranked from one to 20 according to their priority.

5. Four additional items were included from the research and literature reviewed for this study to make a total list of 24 statements.
6. In Round I the list of 24 statements was presented to selected informants in an urban setting, and they were asked to rate or evaluate each time according to its priority, i.e., their view of its importance or chance for success.

7. Round II included a list of priority ratings to the informants which indicated their consensus. This step required the informants to revise their judgments or to specify their reasons for remaining outside the consensus. This round provided a final chance for their revision of judgment.

It was necessary to be explicit because the Delphi technique depended upon the recycling of questionnaires to the same people in the urban community. Therefore, it was necessary that these urban people not only agree to participate but agree, also, to continue their participation throughout the extent of the project. Because, if during the process some of the informants decided to withdraw from the process, then the validity of the Delphi technique becomes questionable.

The original promise of the study was to look at the possible value of data obtained from selected informants in an urban setting and to determine whether or not they could be helpful at telescoping outcomes in decision-making and policy in urban schools. The final
priorities of both rounds are shown in Table 11 in Chapter IV.

The highest priority items, by virtue of number of "1" ratings, were 12 and 4. The thrust of these two items reflected the direction of the urban community may be moving: "Programs designed to give children the opportunity to find out how they feel about themselves, and whether they have any worth and value," gives promise of future development of the total child in the urban community. "To offer counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving," can also go a long way to create positive changes in the urban setting. Item 8 moved into the top priority rating by a close vote: "Design programs for teachers and parents working together to focus on a curriculum which speaks to the life-style and identification of an urban community," can also be looked at as a change in heart by the informants after Round I, when the informants had a chance to adjust their choices. Items 6 and 10 stayed at the fourth priority throughout both rounds; the consensus revealed little concern for an urban ombudsman or more "liberated" children in an urban setting. Both emotional items, 5 and 15, received strong top priority support continuously through the two Delphi rounds.
Conclusions

The initial question of this study addressed the usefulness of data supplied by selected informants. The data relating to this question were presented and analyzed in Chapter IV. Whether the data from informants can be concluded as useful was related to several considerations: Did the Delphi question generate sufficient interest and response from informants? Were levels of consensus achieved by the informants during the Delphi rounds? Did specific items on the Delphi instrument achieve a significantly high priority by the respondents? As reported in Chapter IV, these criteria in the form of questions were satisfied in the affirmative. Eight high priority statements (items) were identified at a level of consensus by the informants, thereby, reflecting that certain statements demonstrate a priority consideration for urban informants. If, for example, no levels of consensus had been achieved and the respondents had chosen to vary their choices away from consensus, then the question of usefulness would have been determined in the negative. In this sense, as reported in this study, consensus was the major criterion for determining usefulness, and this approach was consistent with the usual test applied when a Delphi procedure was employed.

Whether the Delphi technique could move the selected informants toward consensus, i.e., to reach
agreement through a feedback process, represents the primary purpose of this study. The Delphi Rounds I and II were analyzed for clues to the recorded choices of the urban informants through their voting priorities for the selection of item responses. The investigation revealed evidence of changes in the recorded voting priorities among the urban informants. The evidence of movement was generally toward the priority modal rating of the selected item responses contained in the Delphi document. The continued movement of the item responses into consensus leads to the conclusion that a Delphi procedure can achieve consensual results and create useful data from urban informants.

The entire group of informants were composed of three subgroups, identified as Urban Setting Individuals (USI), Community Training Personnel (CTP), and Urban Technical Force (UTF). The subgroups generated consensual item responses (CIRs) from Round I through Round II. These subgroups (CIRs) generated matching change in item responses, i.e., those CIRs which were the same as those of the total group. The matching CIRs grew in number across rounds, i.e., at each round more subgroup (CIRs) became congruent with total group (CIRs). The Urban Selected Individuals changed the most, the Urban Technical Force changed the least. Most of the changes were positive, no changes were neutral. The evidence
leads to the conclusion that each informant and each subgroup tended to exhibit a unique pattern of movement toward consensus.

With respect to the second question of the study regarding the usefulness of the Delphi technique itself for achieving levels of consensus, the data supports a positive claim of usefulness. The Delphi technique was an appropriate means for determining whether consensus existed. Without the evidence of such an approach, it might be hypothesized that agreement fails to exist and that discordant views dominate the educational priorities of key urban residents.

Selected urban informants revealed these items as top priority for the urban setting:

Have teachers who have a strong identification with the urban school in which they are apart.

Reconstruct the arrangements for school governance.

Be designed to give children the opportunity to find out how they feel about themselves, and whether they have any worth and value.

Not desegregate by busing! Make all schools equally educational regardless of the location.

Develop an equitable distribution of school finance.

Design ethnic cultural elements into the curriculum and teacher preparation.

Offer counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving.
Design programs for teachers and parents working together to focus on a curriculum which speaks to the life-style and identification of an urban community.

The heart of education in an urban setting is the dialogue which must be carried on with the urban learner through all the institutions serving the community: the urban school, the urban church, the urban family, and all community organizations. This means that educators and urban community leaders must know how people perceive their situation and what each party views as high priorities. The new educator in the urban setting must be willing and able to identify the goals and processes that are most widely shared.

In the past the urban community rarely spoke as one voice in matters relating to educational priority and policy. This study has demonstrated that urban informants can achieve consensus among themselves regarding educational priorities when a procedure similar to the Delphi technique is employed.

Implications

The conclusions of this study lead toward several warranted assertions which have implications for urban education. In a day when normative values, that are widely shared, appear to be missing from the educational scene, it may be assumed that urban communities do not agree on educational priorities, especially from those
influential urban leaders who appear to speak in many voices. In other words, the urban community does not know what it wants educationally as evidenced by some disagreements that exist among urban leaders themselves. This study has demonstrated that levels of consensus can be achieved under the negotiating conditions which the Delphi technique provides.

The clearest implications of this study are two-fold: 1) Levels of consensus among influential urban leaders in matters of educational policy and priority can be achieved, and 2) A procedure similar to the Delphi technique promotes a dialogue which otherwise might be missing. The clear advantage of the Delphi technique provides an absence of face-to-face confrontation among participants and permits a studied consideration of the worth and value of an idea which should be directly examined in the marketplace of educational decision-making.

But even if American schools do provide the kind of educational diversity that is needed, it will still not be enough to fulfill the American promise of equality of opportunity. The urban schools, contrary to traditional American ideals, cannot do everything. Regardless of how good schools are or how many different kinds of schools exist, they can never be an adequate substitute for direct action for curing social ills. An overstate belief that education is the gateway to social and
economic development leads Americans—white and black—toward a belief that formal schooling serves as a panacea and that merely schooling a child insures keeping him out of the unemployment line and jail. The chances of achieving worthwhile goals through schooling are drastically reduced without the presence of prior conditions: decent housing, clothing, food, family stability, and an equal chance to get a good job once schooling has been completed.

The last of the 20th century has made it clear that urban schools cannot accomplish everything Americans have expected them to. Our time is best spent neither reaffirming our past faith in the urban schools nor bemoaning their inadequacies, but working to see that the best job possible of developing man's intelligence and moral sensibilities is given top priority. Neither the schools nor any other human institution can protect man from himself. Whatever the limitations of an urban school, the good will and intelligence of all the members of the community must be put to work. The results of this study demonstrates a means for approaching this task. The final implication of this study suggests the need to focus on those priorities and goals most widely shared by urban residents.
Recommendations

It is recommended that continued research be constructed to:

1. acknowledge the value of data from an urban setting utilizing the Delphi process,
2. determine the validity and reliability of the information obtained from urban experts,
3. include teachers and administrators as informants in the identification of educational priorities for an urban setting,
4. broaden the base of fact-finding information before you introduce research like the Delphi technique to an urban setting, and
5. include in the methodology of the Delphi process a means of developing deviant modal questions to test contrasting views from the university to the urban setting.
APPENDIX A

ITEMS ON Q-SORT TO STUDY THE VALUE OF DATA FROM AN URBAN SCHOOL SETTING
1. Provide buffer between students and teachers
2. No rule enforcement
3. Humanness
4. Individual development for students
5. Higher salaries for teachers
6. Willingness to compromise
7. React quickly to crises in the schools
8. Centralized decision-making
9. Community change agent
10. Strong identification with urban school
11. Communicate within student life-styles
12. Urban school Ombudsman
13. Responsive to parental concerns.
14. Resolving conflict
15. Teach moral leadership and responsibility
16. Community specialist
17. Teaching new students
18. Provide traditional services in the urban school
19. Facilitate change
20. Decision-making based on research
APPENDIX B

WORK SHEET FOR UNIVERSITY EXPERTS
Name: ____________________________

If you had the opportunity and the funds to create the ideal Urban School program in Columbus, Ohio———Please describe the goals and objectives upon which you would concentrate your energies and resources.

A.
B.
C.
D.
E.
F.
G.
H.
I.
J.

Please return to: Wallace Chandler - Graduate Student
60 Neil Gables, 2096 Neil Avenue
APPENDIX C

VALUE OF DATA FROM AN URBAN SETTING
To: Informants in an Urban Setting

From: Chairman and Graduate Committee
    Professor Charles Galloway, Professor Bernard Mehl, Professor Paul Klohr

Re: Value of Data from an Urban Setting

A new methodology, the Delphi Technique, has been used recently for obtaining information that is otherwise unavailable. The Delphi Technique was developed by Olaf Helmer and his colleagues at the Rand Corporation in the early 1950's to obtain group opinions about urgent defense problems.

The Delphi Technique is intended to get informed opinion—your opinion—without involving a face to face confrontation. This contact is made by suing a focused questionnaire schedule, to gain feedback from community experts and hopefully to produce more carefully considered group judgments.

1. The first effort elicited a list of opinions regarding urban educational issues from selected experts at O.S.U.

2. In Round I this list of expert opinions is presented to informants in an urban setting, and they are asked to rate or evaluate each item according to its priority; i.e., their view or its importance, chance for success, etc.

3. Round II will include a list of priority rankings which will indicate a consensus, if any, and in effect will required the informants to revise their opinions or to specify their reasons for remaining outside the consensus. This round provides a final chance for the revision of opinions.

We are asking you to participate in this unique process. Your responses throughout the Rounds will be anonymous. We ask for your name on the focused questionnaire schedule only as a way to keep track of which questionnaire we have received.

Since the Delphi Technique—focused questionnaire schedule—is sent to a limited number of people, your response is very important.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Prof. Charles M. Galloway
Chairman
Student Graduate Committee
APPENDIX D

A LETTER FOR FOCUSED INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
We are soliciting information in order to assist us in finding useful data from informants in an urban setting. This focused interview schedule is being used to reflect some of the hidden and influential forces which may exist in an urban setting. Your help will be appreciated, as we continue to uncover useful data from this urban setting.

We asked that you include your name on the focused interview schedule for record keeping purposes only. All data will be kept anonymous.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Wallace Chandler
Graduate Student
APPENDIX E

LETTER OF APPRECIATION FOR DELPHI PROJECT ON URBAN COMMUNITY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
Memorandum

TO: Participants in the Urban Setting Research Project
FROM: Wallace Chandler
RE: Delphi Project on Urban Community Goals and Objectives

The results of the first round of our Delphi project have given us an excellent list of statements and results. The researcher have tallied and interpreted your responses to our first round of questions.

To complete the project we will need a second round, so there will be another questionnaire and interview. I will deliver to you personally the first round results and questions. I sincerely appreciate your willingness to take time from your busy schedule to participate in our study.

Again, thanks for your help.

Wallace Chandler
Graduate Student
APPENDIX F

EXPERT STATEMENTS
THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN URBAN STUDY
The Urban School should:

1. Involve the school community in every phase of community life.
2. Respect the student as an individual human being.
3. Understand the needs of the urban school community.
4. Respect the urban community as a viable societal entity.
5. Understand the needs of the urban students.
6. Solicit the respect of the teachers for the urban school.
7. Establish two-way communication with the urban community.
8. Understand the needs of the urban school teachers.
9. Emphasize basic skills in the urban school.
10. Develop a learning climate that has relevance for all students.
11. Elect school board members who support the development of an urban school.
12. Identify objectives and goals to meet the needs of a developing urban setting.
APPENDIX G

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS ON ROUND II
There were a vast number of comments made to the items in Round II. The comments below are representative of the total statements received.

1. Have teachers who have a strong identification with the urban school in which they are a part.

"Over the years, I have known and related to several teachers living outside the urban area who are very good teachers."

"Teachers need to identify, but not with just urban schools, but with all schools."

"Assume that only Black can teach Blacks or vice versa sets dangerous pattern."

"Teachers must identify with environment in which they are teaching in or community."

2. Have decision-making within the community school leading to a better school built around community needs. (Throughout these statements "community" refers to the Columbus, Ohio, inter urban area.)

"The school is part of the community, therefore, the residents of the community should have a part in the decision-making process."

"There should be educational development happening which teachers and students have better understanding."

"Decision-making is the thrust for controlling education and development of a political base in the urban area."

3. Have student representation in faculty meetings and other meetings which involve decisions concerning students.

"Student input is a necessary force in any school meeting."

"Because of the way society is going, liberal forces, responsible students should be involved in policy and decision-making."
4. Reconstruct the arrangements for school governance.

"School governance is important, but not with educational background."

"The governance of schools is top priority in terms of importance."

"Feel that system is not arranged wrong--it is not functioning as it was designed."

5. Not desegregate by busing! Make all schools equally educational regardless of the location.

"We should live in an integrated society, and I am not necessarily for busing, but our society is polarized enough and there should be some type of change."

"Change! School Board position needs to be brought out of the 50's and into the 70's before it is too late."

"The School System should provide enough money for all the schools to function on a sound fiscal basis regardless of the location."

6. Have funds available for an urban school ombudsman to deal with parental concerns.

"Believe some structure should be established to provide for parental concerns other than thru PTA or principal."

"I don't see the need for an urban school ombudsman."

"Can not relate to Ombudsman for parental concerns."

"Should be more direct i.e., teacher-parent."

7. Provide tenure for urban schools by selection from the urban community.

"No response."

"It is an advantage to the urban school if some of the selection of teachers is provided by the leadership in the urban community."
8. Design programs for teachers and parents working together to focus on a curriculum which speaks to the life-style and identification of an urban community.

"Such programs should include previous data from parent-student workshops; so that practical agendas can be established."

9. Delegate decision-making as well as community responsibility.

"School should be responsible to the community for decision-making processes."

"I continue to believe that a community must be responsible for its share of the decision-making."

10. Have schools a little more "liberated," when people are forced to do something, they tend to not want to do it.

"We as an urban community need to be more liberated, but not from ourselves but from our enemies around us, in other communities who have historically controlled us."

"Don't understand a word like liberated."

"Schools should not be a prison--freedom should exist."

11. Deal with conflicts between students and teachers, and hopefully gain a common ground for compromise.

"Compromise, interpreted as basis for cooperation and/or respect, is a major key to teacher-student communication."

"Conflicts must be avoided, compromise viva student-teacher is imperative."

"Should deal with conflicts, if schools are not run like prisons, conflicts should subside."

"Should have policies and guidelines pertaining to conflicts between students and teachers."
12. Be designed to give children the opportunity to find out how they feel about themselves, and whether they have any worth and value.

"Children must know their value and worth, but it must first come from the home."

"Children need as many opportunities as possible to survive in our world today."

13. Create the aura for the development and compromise between parents, teachers, students, and administrators in an urban school setting.

"I don't understand this point."

"I view this as almost an impossibility." "The need is there, no doubt, but I feel it would be very difficult to achieve such an interrelationship suitable to all concerns."

"Has a lot to do with manner in which schools are operated."


"If schools are to be equal, they also should be guaranteed equal funding."

"I feel that all schools should be financed the same."

"Will be unnecessary, if and when all schools become educationally equal."

"School finances should be stressed and controlled for a most equitable distribution, which is often not the case in the urban community today."

15. Design ethnic cultural elements into the curriculum and teacher preparation.

"I feel that ethnic cultural elements have systematically been removed from our schools, and this is very unfortunate."

"Morals and ethnic background have to be the highest priority, the need is so great for our leaders of tomorrow."
"We have passed the point of trying to identify differences, skills are what we need in the urban community to be prepared for the future."

16. Develop orientation to educate teachers to deal with the realities of minorities and poor people.

"In many cases teachers have not experienced the realities of minorities and poor people." "Education and developmental orientation in these matters is imperative."

17. Elect school board members to directly represent the educational interest of the disadvantaged and the gifted students.

"School board members most important to urban community."

"Election of school board members is top priority, as we saw in the last election the paramount importance is there."

"Election of school board members in crisis period becomes so important as schools go through change."

"Such school board members are necessary to effect board responsibilities."

18. Develop parent training programs for school development and community control.

"Training and re-training must go on all through the urban setting."

"Parent preparations and coordination is a major pitfall to community and education objectives."

"Parents must be trained to educate their children, and make education purposeful in the urban community."

"This program should happen through PTA."

"Please don't put all the blame on the parents."

19. Emphasize basic skills, and not "experimental" approaches.

"Children need basic skills to function in society, not experimental approaches."
"No time for experimentation."

20. Have "preventive" decision-making/planning before crises arise.

"Always be prepared."

"An ounce of prevention is worth several pounds of cure."

"Happens in successful business why shouldn't it happen in schools."

"Don't wait for crises, but you never can be prepared."

21. Encourage teachers in urban schools to live in the urban community.

"I would like to see teachers relate more to the community in which they teach, one way would be if they lived in the urban community."

"I want to know where they live, and how my taxes are being used."

"Where the money comes from is where it should stay."

"In order to plan for control of your community, teachers must be a part of that urban setting."

"Do not discourage teachers from living in the urban community near urban schools."

"Not all teachers should live in urban areas, if so you will have only one type of teacher."

22. Have a humanness approach, and teach a sense of justice, and respect the right for differences.

"The approach should be used in relating to teachers in dealing with Black youth."

"Not enough justice and respect exist within the urban schools."

"Always respect the rights of others."

"Humanness approaches should be utilized in all human relationships."
"Relate to response on operating schools like prisons."

23. Have someone outside of schools who can explain the role and dynamics of the urban school community.

"Individuals outside the schools can provide an additional role and dynamics other than the expertise of the educators."

"Everything that is educable does not go on inside of schools, more information and explanation can be made available in the urban school community."

24. Offer counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving.

"Family counseling is first, but some assistance from the urban school is necessary."
APPENDIX H

URBAN SETTING INTERVIEW
ROUND I
Round I

Using the following key, indicate the priority you would attach to the statements listed below:

Priority Key
1. = Top Priority
2. = Second Priority
3. = Third Priority
4. = Fourth Priority

In order to discriminate among the items, distribute priorities in such a manner that no level of priority will be used more than six times (in other words, you will give 6 "1's," 6 "2's," 6 "3's," 6 "4's").

As mentioned before, your response will continue to be anonymous.

An idea Urban School Program in an urban setting should:

1. have teachers who have a strong identifications with the urban school in which they have a part.

2. have decision-making within the community school leading to a better school built around community needs. (Throughout these statements "Community" refer to the Columbus, Ohio, inter urban areas.)

3. have student representation in faculty meetings and any other meetings which involves decisions concerning students.

4. reconstruct the arrangements for school governance.

5. not desegregate by busing! Make all schools equally educational regardless of the location.
6. have funds available for an urban school ombudsman to deal with parental concerns.

7. provide tenure for urban schools by selection from the urban school community.

8. design programs for teachers and parents working together to focus on a curriculum which speaks to the life-style and identification of an urban community.

9. delegate decision-making as well as community responsibility.

10. have schools a little more "liberated," when people are forced to do something, they tend to not want to do it.

11. deal with conflicts between students and teachers, and hopefully gain a common ground for compromise.

12. be designed to give children the opportunity to find out how they feel about themselves, and whether they have any worth and value.

13. create the aura for the development and compromise between parents, teachers, students, and administrators in an urban school setting.

14. develop an equitable distribution of school finance.

15. design ethnic cultural elements into the curriculum and teacher preparation.

16. develop orientation to educate teachers to deal with the realities of minorities and other people.

17. elect school board members to directly represent the educational interest of the disadvantaged and the gifted students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>18. develop parent training programs for school development and community control.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>19. emphasize basic skills, and not &quot;experimental&quot; approaches.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>20. have &quot;preventive&quot; decision-making/planning before crises arise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>21. encourage teachers in urban schools to live in the urban community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>22. have a humanness approach, and teach a sense of justice, and respect the right for differences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>23. have someone outside of schools who can explain the role and dynamics of the urban school community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority</td>
<td>24. offer counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I

URBAN SETTING INTERVIEW
ROUND II
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Accompanying each statement is the modal response (Column b). The modal response represents the priority level most frequently selected for each item. Your previous (Round I) response is located in Column c. After considering the group modal response, place your new response (see key) in Column d. If your new response does not agree with the group’s modal response, place your reason for differing in Column c. In this round there is no restriction to the number of times any priority level may be used. Enter only one number in Column d.

This questionnaire will be the last chance to change your response, also, the researcher will interview each informant in Round II. Thank you again for your continuing participation.

1. = Top priority  
2. = Second priority  
3. = Third priority  
4. = Fourth priority

An ideal Urban School Program in an urban setting should:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Modal Response</th>
<th>Your Previous Response</th>
<th>Your New Response</th>
<th>Reason for Variance Between (b) and (d)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. have teachers who have a strong identification with the urban school in which they are a part</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Modal Response</td>
<td>Your Previous Response</td>
<td>Your New Response</td>
<td>Reason for Variance Between (b) and (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. have decision-making within the community school leading to a better school built around community needs. (Throughout these statements &quot;community&quot; refers to the Columbus, Ohio, inter urban area.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. have student representation in faculty meetings and any other meetings which involves decisions concerning students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. reconstruct the arrangements for school governance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. not desegregate by busing! Make all schools equally educational regardless of the location.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. have funds available for an urban school ombudsman to deal with parental concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Modal Response</td>
<td>Your Previous Response</td>
<td>Your New Response</td>
<td>Reason for Variance Between (b) and (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 7. provide tenure for urban schools by selection from the urban community.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. design programs for teachers and parents working together to focus on a curriculum which speaks to the life-style and identification of an urban community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. delegate decision-making as well as community responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. have schools a little more &quot;liberated,&quot; when people are forced to do something, they tend to not want to do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. deal with conflicts between students and teachers, and hopefully gain a common ground for compromise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Modal Response</td>
<td>Your Previous Response</td>
<td>Your New Response</td>
<td>Reason for Variance Between (b) and (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 12. be designed to give children the opportunity to find out how they feel about themselves, and whether they have any worth and value.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. create the aura for the development and compromise between parents, teachers, students, and administrators in an urban school setting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. develop an equitable distribution of school finance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. design ethnic cultural elements into the curriculum and teacher preparation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. develop orientation to educate teachers to deal with the realities of minorities and poor people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Modal Response</td>
<td>Your Previous Response</td>
<td>Your New Response</td>
<td>Reason for Variance Between (b) and (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) 17. elect school board members to directly represent the educational interest of the disadvantaged and the gifted students.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. develop parent training programs for school development and community control.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. emphasize basic skills, and not &quot;experimental approaches.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. have &quot;preventive&quot; decision-making/planning before crises arise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. encourage teachers in urban schools to live in the urban community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. have a humanness approach, and teach a sense of justice, and respect the right for differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Modal Response</td>
<td>Your Previous Response</td>
<td>Your New Response</td>
<td>Reason for Variance Between (b) and (d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) have someone outside of schools who can explain the role and dynamics of the urban school community.</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. have someone outside of schools who can explain the role and dynamics of the urban school community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. offer counseling to assist each student in his personal development and problem solving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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