

Busing

ATTITUDES TOWARD BUSING AND INTEGRATION  
EXPRESSED BY BERKELEY MOTHERS, TEACHERS, AND CHILDREN:  
A SUMMARY OF 1966 SURVEY FINDINGS

By

Dr. Harold A. Jonsson  
Associate Professor  
Dept. of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education  
San Francisco State College

Submitted to the

BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

1414 Walnut Street  
Berkeley, California 94709

Dr. Neil V. Sullivan, Superintendent of Schools

Mr. John L. Cleveland, Project Coordinator, ESEA Title I

November, 1966

### INTRODUCTION

This Summary is a condensation of a survey report entitled "Maternal, Teacher, and Pupil Attitudes toward Busing, Integration, and Related Issues in Berkeley Elementary Schools" submitted in October, 1966, by the evaluation consultant for the local ESEA Title I project. Because of the favorable nature of the findings, there is a risk that a summary will appear to gloss over the few negative responses. For this reason, interested persons, and particularly those involved in formation of district policy, are urged to consult the full report.

In the long run, the ESEA Title I project is expected to reduce the achievement differential between target and non-target pupils by raising the achievement levels of pupils in the target area, and over a period of time project activities must largely be judged by their success in attaining this goal. However, the evaluation consultant and other concerned school district personnel assumed that achievement test data collected at the end of the initial four-month project period could not be expected to reflect the impact of project activities, not only because of the shortness of the project period but also because of the lack of comparable pre-test data.

As evidence of the initial educational disadvantage of target-area children, perhaps reduced to some small extent by the activities of the project period, we may cite the mean reading scores achieved by target and non-target first and second grade pupils in the May, 1966, testing. These tests were administered for the first time in May, 1966, so that no comparison data are available from earlier years. The contrasting mean grade-equivalent scores are presented in the table below. (At both grade levels, the non-target population includes bused pupils, 34 at grade one, 11 at grade two.)

Comparison of Stanford Achievement Test  
Total Reading Means on National Norms for Target and Non-Target Pupils,  
Grades 1 and 2, May, 1966

| <u>Primary I. Form W (first grade)</u> |                         | <u>Primary II. Form W (second grade)</u> |                         |
|--|-------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Target<br>(N = 436)                    | Non-Target<br>(N = 779) | Target<br>(N = 447)                      | Non-Target<br>(N = 760) |
| 1.6                                    | 2.2                     | 2.3                                      | 3.4                     |

Recognizing the limited immediate utility of achievement testing carried out at this stage of the project, project personnel decided to place major emphasis on assessment of attitudes. The innovative character of the busing program, and its potential implications, seemed to justify an extensive study of its impact upon attitudes, opinions, and values, as well as its perceived effects upon pupil achievement.

The initial assessment of attitudes funded under ESEA Title I consisted of the collection of individual interview data from 420 mothers of Berkeley elementary school children and questionnaire data from teachers. A supplementary allocation from district funds was arranged to complete the analysis of data already obtained, to conduct interviews of children, and to provide district personnel and Board members with a complete report of the findings. The additional funds permitted the following activities to be carried out:

- 1) Analysis of the "general values and opinions" responses of the mothers interviewed.
- 2) Analysis of non-coded comments throughout the maternal interviews and teacher questionnaires.
- 3) Preparation of two interview schedules for bused and receiving-class children.
- 4) Interviewing of 30 bused children and 29 receiving-class children.
- 5) Analysis of coded responses and comments of the 59 children interviewed.
- 6) Preparation of the comprehensive report of which this is a summary.

Interview schedules for mothers and children and a questionnaire for teachers were designed by an evaluation team headed by the Title I evaluation consultant to the district, who also directed the recruiting and training of interviewers and administration of interviews. In order to avoid placing excessive emphasis on questions related to the busing program and integration, the maternal interview schedule was designed to include a number of items regarding general attitudes toward the schools, but the present summary will necessarily focus on attitudes specifically related to project activities, with emphasis on busing and integration issues. The teacher questionnaire emphasizes project activities, busing and attitudes toward integration, and has several items permitting comparison of teachers' views with those of mothers. The interview schedule for bused children attempted to assess in detail the experiences and feelings of the children as measures of their academic and social adjustment to the receiving school. The schedule for receiving-school children attempts to determine attitudes toward the bused children, the degree to which the latter became active in the school's social life, and any perceived changes in the receiving-class children's academic and social well-being.

The survey sample consisted of 420 mothers, 150 teachers, and 59 children. The mothers were selected, in approximately equal proportions, from each of the following four groups:

1. Mothers of target-area children who were being bused to schools outside of the target area
2. Mothers of target-area children not being bused
3. Mothers of children in receiving schools who were attending classes with bused children
4. Mothers of children in receiving schools who were not in classes with bused children

From lists provided by the schools, names were picked on a random basis, and the number of mothers selected for each school was proportional to the size of pupil enrollment. Interviews were conducted in the last two weeks of the semester.

For the teachers, data were collected through a written questionnaire rather than personal interviews, and all teachers in the target and receiving schools were asked to respond. The proportion responding, 75%, is fairly large in view of the fact that the questionnaire was not available for distribution until the last week of the school year. It is probable that the non-respondents were, on the whole, neither strongly for or against the current program.

Teacher respondents were classified in four groups, analogous to those for the mothers. This enabled comparison not only among the four teacher groups but also in some respects with the corresponding groups of mothers.

Selection of the child samples involved decisions which place some limitation on the inferences to be made from the interview data. Considerations of maturity level and the desire for follow-up interviews in 1966-67 led to a decision to interview children who had been in the fifth grade during the project semester, and to supplement them with third graders if necessary (only 3 fourth graders were bused). The final sample consisted of 30 bused fifth-graders, and 29 receiving-class children of whom 26 were in the fifth and 3 in the third grade during the project semester. Each of the fifth graders shared a class with children from the other sample, permitting study of intergroup differences in perception of the events and conditions of the semester. Sample procedures for children were the same as for mothers except for the grade-level condition, so that the only reservations about the sample arise from the fact that the children interviewed were at only three of the seven receiving schools, and almost exclusively at a single grade level.

Some of the interpretations of data from the interviews and questionnaire to be discussed are conditional upon the school district criteria for selection of bused pupils and receiving classes. Children were selected who were predicted to adjust well emotionally and academically to the new school and parental consent was required. With these selection criteria, the bused children cannot be considered a cross-section of target-area pupils, nor can we assume that their parents are entirely typical of

target-area parents. We must probably assume some initial differences between mothers in groups 1 and 2. However, as there was no "self-selection" by mothers in groups 3 and 4 or by teachers in any groups, we may assume that obtained differences of statistically significant magnitude are related to the activities of the project semester.

## SURVEY FINDINGS

### Maternal Responses

The interviews of mothers revealed consistently positive attitudes toward the Berkeley schools and toward efforts to achieve integration, including specifically the busing of pupils. Impact of Title I project activities is reflected in responses to items asking the mothers to compare the project year with the previous year. These are shown in the table below. Almost half of all the mothers stated that their children liked school better this year, with no difference across groups. Comparisons for how well they thought the children were doing in their schoolwork revealed the same pattern. There was little difference in groups 1, 3 and 4 --nearly half saying "better"--but a significantly higher proportion in group 2 (60%) whose children received the direct benefits of project activities. In conjunction with many other data, the responses to items 21-23 can conservatively be interpreted to mean that satisfaction with the schools was not adversely affected by the busing.

Maternal Responses to Interview Items  
 Requiring Comparison of Project Year  
 With Previous Year

- Group 1: Target-area mothers of bused children
- Group 2: Target-area mothers of children not bused
- Group 3: Receiving-area mothers whose children were in classes with bused children
- Group 4: Receiving-area mothers whose children were not in classes with bused children

Percentages of  
 Mothers by Groups

| Item No. | Item   |             | Percentages of Mothers by Groups |    |                     |    |
|----------|--|-------------|----------------------------------|----|---------------------|----|
|          |  |             | Target Area<br>1                 | 2  | Receiving Area<br>3 | 4  |
| 20       | "How well does (study child) like school this year compared to last year?"             | Better      | 45                               | 45 | 45                  | 48 |
|          |  | Same        | 35                               | 40 | 32                  | 41 |
|          |  | Not as well | 7                                | 8  | 12                  | 7  |
|          |  | Don't know  | 13                               | 7  | 11                  | 4  |
| 21       | "How well is (study child) doing in his schoolwork this year compared to last year?"   | Better      | 42                               | 60 | 47                  | 48 |
|          |  | Same        | 35                               | 27 | 37                  | 44 |
|          |  | Not as well | 7                                | 7  | 5                   | 2  |
|          |  | Don't know  | 16                               | 6  | 11                  | 6  |
| 22       | "How hard is it for (study child) to get good grades this year compared to last year?" | Easier      | 19                               | 31 | 22                  | 20 |
|          |  | Same        | 45                               | 42 | 49                  | 60 |
|          |  | Harder      | 17                               | 19 | 11                  | 10 |
|          |  | Don't know  | 19                               | 8  | 18                  | 10 |
| 23       | "How is (study child) getting along with other children at school this year?"          | Better      | 32                               | 27 | 27                  | 28 |
|          |  | Same        | 50                               | 58 | 58                  | 66 |
|          |  | Not as well | 3                                | 8  | 5                   | 2  |
|          |  | Don't know  | 15                               | 7  | 10                  | 4  |

In response to a question about the value of the busing to their own participating children, 91% of the mothers of bused children (Group 1) said that the contact with children of other neighborhoods had been "good" and only one of the 116 said that it had been "bad," while 65% of the mothers of children in the receiving classes (Group 3) said that the contact had been "good" for their children and none said that it had been bad. (The remainder saw "no difference" except for about 5% who "don't know.")

Two items asked only of mothers of bused children (Group 1) produced very positive responses. To the question, "In general, do you think the busing has been good for your child?" (Item 38), 91% replied "yes," and when asked if the busing had created problems for the child or the family (Item 39), 84% said "no problem," 13% "slight problem" and only 3% "big problem."

Some of the other interview items were designed to assess general support for the objectives of the ESEA Title I program, especially as these involve integration. These are listed below with the proportions of favorable responses.

| <u>Item No.</u> | <u>Item</u>  | <u>Maternal Groups<br/>Asked</u> | <u>Proportion<br/>In Favor</u> |
|-----------------|--|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 30              | "Are you for or against having children from other neighborhoods bused into your school to relieve overcrowding in other schools?"   | 3 and 4                          | 90%                            |
| 32              | "Do you believe that children from poorer neighborhoods ("poorer" = "People have less money") such as parts of West Berkeley, would be able to learn more if they were in classes with children from other neighborhoods?" | All                              | 78%                            |
| 33              | "If we found that this was true (that they would learn more), would you approve of busing children to schools in better neighborhoods to improve learning?"  | All                              | 91%                            |

In conjunction with the interviews, all receiving-area mothers were presented with two ten-item checklists in the following order:

- a) "Some reasons people give why they believe middle-class children should go to school with children from poorer neighborhoods."
- b) "Some reasons people give why they believe middle-class children should not go to school with children from poorer neighborhoods."

Analysis carried out on the check-list responses revealed no significant differences in the ranking of the "should" statements by mothers in groups 3 and 4. The three statements most often rated as among the most important by both groups seem very closely related to each other. They are the following:

| <u>Item No.</u> | <u>Item</u>  |
|-----------------|--|
| 1               | "Children and parents have a better opportunity to understand people of different backgrounds."                  |
| 10              | "If children of different backgrounds associate early, their attitudes toward each other remain more accepting." |
| 4               | "Prejudice and stereotyping are reduced through closer contact."   |

The only "should not" statements considered important by as many as 20% of the receiving-area mothers were the following:

| <u>Item No.</u> | <u>Item</u>   |
|-----------------|---|
| 2               | "Young children need the security of their own neighborhood and friends."                                   |
| 5               | "It is inconvenient for parents and children to have the children bused to schools in other neighborhoods." |

Analysis of the importance ranking of the "should not" items revealed some differences between groups 3 and 4. Significantly more of the group 4 mothers (whose children had not been in classes with children bused in from the target area) ascribed importance to the following reasons against social integration:

| <u>Item No.</u> | <u>Item</u>   | <u>Percentages<br/>Group 4 versus 3</u> |
|-----------------|---|---|
| 2               | "Young children need the security of their own neighborhood and friends."                                     | 43 vs. 29                               |
| 3               | "Academic standards are lowered."   | 17 vs. 8                                |
| 4               | "Lower-class children are more aggressive and may frighten or abuse children who are not accustomed to this." | 19 vs. 9                                |

On the other hand, significantly more, though not many, of the group 3 mothers (10% vs. 5% of group 4) considered the following reason important: "There is too much emphasis on remedial education and not enough emphasis on enrichment." (No. 10 of the list.)

On the whole, it appears that group 3 mothers have learned that some anticipated harmful effects of integration have not materialized in their own child's experience.



Teacher Responses

Like the mothers in the interview samples, teacher respondents evidenced optimism and positive attitudes toward project activities and the district's efforts toward equal educational opportunity and educational integration, including favorable views toward the busing program.

Responses to the following items relevant to integration did not differentiate among the four groups of teacher respondents.

| <u>Item No.</u> | <u>Question</u>  | <u>Overall Proportions</u>   |
|-----------------|--|--|
| 6               | "In general, do you think it is advantageous or disadvantageous for children to be in contact with children of other socio-economic groups?" | 6% omitted<br>85% advantageous<br>5% makes no difference<br>0% disadvantageous<br>4% mixed advantageous and disadvantageous (write in) |
| 7               | "Do you think the children of the less privileged groups can benefit from going to school with middle-class children?"                       | 18% omitted<br>79% yes<br>3% no  |
| 11              | "Are you in favor of having children bused from overcrowded schools into schools in other neighborhoods?"                                    | 3% omitted<br>91% yes (three positive categories combined)<br>5% no  |
| 13              | "Aside from problems of overcrowding, do you favor attempts to achieve greater racial and socio-economic balance in the schools?"            | 6% omitted<br>89% yes<br>5% no   |

Two items were designed to assess the degree to which children of different races associate with each other in the target and receiving schools. To the question, "Do the Negro and white children in your class associate with each other informally?" a majority of those of whom the question was asked responded "yes, a good deal" (66% group 1, 75% group 2, 57% group 3, 70% group 4). The proportions choosing either this response or the one reading "yes, some" were 84% group 1, 91% group 2, 97% group 3, and 93% group 4. Interpretation of these proportions is complicated by the fact that the target-area and receiving-area classes differ greatly in racial composition, and that the two receiving-area groups differ. Many target classes have few, if any, white children, and group 4 classes, even if racially mixed, usually do not contain Negro children of socio-economic backgrounds widely differing from the white majority. By contrast, all of the group 3 classes received Negro children of a lower socio-economic stratum, and began receiving them in the middle of the school year. This

undoubtedly required considerable accommodation. In view of these considerations, the fact that 97% of group 3 teachers responded "yes, a good deal" or "yes, some" suggests exceedingly successful adaptation to the new situation and much good will on the part of all concerned.

The items where teachers were asked to compare children's progress in the project semester with the previous semester revealed several differences across groups. The items are the following, with response categories "better," "same," and "not as well":

| <u>Item No.</u> | <u>Question</u>  |
|-----------------|--|
| 1               | "How well do the children in your class seem to like school this semester compared to last semester?"  |
| 2               | "How well are your pupils doing in their schoolwork this semester as compared to last semester?"   |
| 3               | "How well do the pupils in your class seem to get along together during regular instructional time this semester compared to last semester?" |
| 4               | "How well do your pupils get along together in play situations and during non-instructional time this semester compared to last semester?"   |

To all of these comparison items, the proportion of target-school teachers responding "better" was larger than the proportion of receiving-school teachers selecting the same response and their comments emphasized the improved learning conditions and morale brought about by reduction in class size.

The area of largest improvement reported by all groups was that of pupil achievement (No. 2, "How well are your pupils doing in their schoolwork this semester, as compared to last semester?"). To this item, 56% of target-school teachers (62% in group 1, 52% in group 2) reported that their pupils were doing better and only 1 of the 75 target-school teachers checked "not as well."

On the items comparing the project semester with the preceding semester, receiving-school teachers in group 3 responded somewhat differently from those in group 4. The only area where a difference reached statistical significance was in response to item 1 (How well children like school) where 27% of group 3 teachers and only 7% of those in group 4 reported that their pupils seemed to like school better in the project semester than in the previous semester and none of the group 3 teachers reported that their pupils liked school less well than before.

In connection with the questionnaire, the teachers were asked to study two ten-item lists of reasons why middle-class children should and should not "go to school with children from poorer neighborhoods." (These were

the same as the items rated in the maternal interviews.) There were some interesting differences between groups 3 and 4 of the receiving schools in their responses to the checklist items. Encouragingly, group 3 teachers (those receiving bused children) agreed with a larger number of the "should" arguments than did teachers in group 4 (6.5 as against 5.5), and also marked somewhat fewer arguments in the "should not" list. This would suggest that the attitudes of group 3 teachers toward integration have at least not been adversely affected by the project semester and may have improved.

In addition to checking the items with which they "agreed" or "tended to agree," teachers were asked to indicate which 3 (or fewer) they considered the most important in each list. Analysis of the proportions of teachers in the four groups who rated each item as among the most important revealed a few differences worthy of analysis. The "should" arguments most often rated important were the following:

| <u>Statement No.</u> | <u>Item</u>  | <u>Overall Proportion</u> |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------|
| 10                   | "If children of different backgrounds associate early, their attitudes toward each other remain more accepting." | 36%                       |
| 4                    | "Prejudice and stereotyping are reduced through closer contact."   | 35%                       |
| 5                    | "Children will be better prepared to meet the realities of our larger society."                                  | 28%                       |

For this list, the most provocative difference across groups is the rating of statement No. 4 (above) as among the three most important by 60% of group 3 teachers. This is significantly higher than the proportions for the other three groups, and over twice as large as the group 4 proportion. We might be justified in inferring from this that group 3 teachers have tended to observe reduction in prejudice and stereotyping as a result of the socio-economic and racial mixing brought about in their classes during the project semester.

Another difference between group 3 and group 4 responses supports the inference that group 3 teachers are basing their judgments in part upon the experiences of the project semester. Statement No. 8, "Association with middle-class children helps socially disadvantaged children adopt more widely accepted behavior and goals," was rated as among the three most important by 30% of the group 3 teachers, while only 13% of the group 4 teachers gave it this rating.

Groups 3 and 4 differed somewhat in the importance ratings given to the should not arguments. While group 3 teachers have in general no more tendency to agree with these (in fact, show slightly less agreement), there are some items which they rank as higher in importance than do group 4 teachers. Of teachers in group 3, 20% ascribed relative importance to the following two items, as against 4% and 2%, respectively, of the group 4 respondents:

| <u>Statement No.</u> | <u>Statement</u>  |
|----------------------|---|
| 1                    | "Contact with lower-class values, manners and speech would have a negative influence on middle-class children." |
| 4                    | "Lower-class children are more aggressive and may frighten or abuse children who are not accustomed to this."   |

In line with other inferences made about the possible influence of group 3 teachers' experiences in the project semester, we must admit the possibility that some group 3 teachers observed some negative effects of lower-class manners, etc., upon their middle-class pupils. The fact that any such observations resulted in no overall negative reaction (as evidenced by the low response of group 3 teachers to the "should not" items in general and to the rest of the interview items) is highly reassuring.

In no case was a particular problem or adverse aspect of the busing brought out by more than a small proportion of group 3 teachers. The main criticism was by four (out of 30) teachers in this group who indicated that arguing, fighting, and/or discipline problems had increased as a result of the addition of bused children. There were also two instances of group 3 teachers saying that their classes had been held back by the addition of pupils at mid-year, and some target-area teachers (group 1) said that some of their former pupils reported back that they felt uprooted or unhappy because of the transfer. However, these statements do not receive support from the interviews of mothers and children.

#### Bused and Receiving-Class Pupils' Responses

Interviews of bused children and receiving-class children also produced predominantly favorable findings in every connection. Almost all of the bused children reported having valuable experiences both academically and socially, and the other children in their receiving classes showed good attitudes toward the bused children and perceived no loss to themselves accruing from the busing program. Asked how they felt about having been transferred, 25 of the 30 bused children interviewed said they were "glad," four "sorry," and one expressed "mixed" feelings. Two of the four who were sorry were the two who had not wanted to go at the outset, but whose mothers decided for them. Of the receiving-class children, 22 of the 29 in the sample said that they were glad that the bused children had come into their classes, while five said they were neutral or indifferent, one had "mixed" feelings and one was "sorry." In interpreting responses of receiving-class children it is important to note that many of them had had their classes split and had changed teachers at mid-year. Comments by several children indicated that any dissatisfaction that they felt with the project semester was due to the mid-year change of class and teacher.

Items asking children to compare their impressions of the project semester with previous semesters, though substantially parallel, were worded slightly differently in the two interview schedules, since the bused children were comparing schools as well as semesters. The following are the principal comparison items, with the approximate wording and the response proportions for the two groups of children.

| Item No.<br><u>Bused/Receiving</u> | Item (Paraphrased)   | Bused Children's<br>Responses<br><u>N=30</u> | Receiving-Class<br>Children's<br>Responses<br><u>N=29</u> |
|------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| 35/41                              | How well did you like school last semester...?                       | 19 "better"<br>4 "same"<br>7 "not as well"   | 13 "better"<br>11 "same"<br>5 "not as well"               |
| 36/42                              | How well did you do in your schoolwork...?                           | 13 "better"<br>3 "same"<br>9 "not as well"   | 14 "better"<br>12 "same"<br>3 "not as well"               |
| 37/43                              | How hard was it for you to get good grades...?                       | 6 "easier"<br>3 "same"<br>21 "harder"        | 7 "easier"<br>17 "same"<br>5 "harder"                     |
| 38/44                              | How would you compare the amount of classwork you were given...?     | 22 "more"<br>4 "same"<br>4 "less"            | 17 "more"<br>7 "same"<br>5 "less"                         |
| 39/45                              | How hard was the classwork...?                                       | 22 "harder"<br>6 "same"<br>2 "easier"        | 11 "harder"<br>13 "same"<br>5 "easier"                    |
| 44/50                              | On the average, did you have more or less homework last semester...? | 17 "more"<br>12 "less"<br>1 "same"           | 17 "more"<br>6 "less"<br>6 "same"                         |

There are other items where comparison of the two groups is difficult to report because of the different points of view and differences in response codes. The most important of these is probably the one asking how much teacher help the bused children received. On item 40 of the bused children's schedule, these children were asked if their new teacher had given them as much time as they needed in explaining problems or assignments. The related items for receiving-class children were two: No. 46, asking the same question as it applied to them, and No. 48, asking how much help the teacher gave to the bused children. These are shown below. (following page)

| <u>Item No.</u><br><u>Bused/Receiving</u> | <u>Item</u>  | <u>Responses</u>            | <u>Bused</u> | <u>Receiving</u> |
|---|--|-----------------------------|--------------|------------------|
| 40/46                                     | Did the teacher give you as much of her time as you needed to explain problems or assignments? | "yes, always"               | 8            | 1                |
|   |  | "yes, most of the time"     | 7            | 17               |
|   |  | "yes, some of the time"     | 10           | 8                |
|   |  | "no, seldom or hardly ever" | 4            | 2                |

| <u>Item No.</u> | <u>Item</u>  | <u>Responses of Receiving-Class Children</u>   |
|-----------------|--|--|
| 48              | Did you feel that the teacher gave (the bused children) as much of her time as they needed to get along, too much of her time, or not enough...? | 3 "too much of her time"<br>23 "as much as needed"<br>3 "not as much as they needed" |

Receiving-class children were also asked to compare the amount of teacher help they received during the project semester with the previous semester. The results:

| <u>Item No.</u> | <u>Item</u>  | <u>Responses of Receiving-Class Children</u> |
|-----------------|--|--|
| 47              | Did you feel that the teacher gave you more or less time... than the semester before? (In general) | 5 "more time"<br>14 "same"<br>10 "less time" |

Of all of findings from the items listed above, the only one that seems suggestive of an unfortunate state of affairs is that for item 47, where 10 (1/3) of the receiving-class pupils said that they were given less teacher time than the previous semester. However, six of these volunteered the information that they had changed teachers at mid-year and that their new teacher was generally less generous with time and help than the previous teacher.

As a check on the satisfaction indices for receiving-class children as they relate to the busing, a correlation was sought between the "how well you liked schools" item (No. 41), and responses to item 115 "As you look back on it, are you glad or sorry that these children have come to your school?" No relationship was found between "not as well" responses to No. 41 and "sorry" or "mixed feelings" responses to No. 115.

Among all of the items permitting direct comparison of bused and receiving-class children's perceptions of the project semester, the major differences pertain to difficulty of classwork, with almost twice as large a proportion of bused children perceiving the work as harder. However, the fact that all of the 29 receiving-class children also reported increased difficulty of classwork suggests that some of the increased difficulty perceived by bused children may be independent of differences between the

sending and receiving schools and even of the mid-year adjustment problems of the bused children. (It seems possible that the second half of the fifth-grade curriculum is harder than the first.) There is, in any case, no indication that the instructional program was "softened up" as a result of the assimilation of bused children.

The items revealing the greatest difference between the experience of the two groups of children is the one regarding relative difficulty of "getting good grades" this semester. The figures are as follows:

| <u>Bused Children</u> |           | <u>Receiving-Class Children</u> |          |
|-----------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|----------|
| Item 37               | 7 Easier  | Item 43                         | 7 Easier |
|                       | 3 Same    |                                 | 17 Same  |
|                       | 21 Harder |                                 | 5 Harder |

It is clear that the bused children believed they had been up against different competition and grading standards than previously. The protocols suggest, not that these children actually got lower grades, but that they had to work harder.

The most general finding with regard to the bused children is that, while they perceived the receiving-school work to be harder, the quantity of work to be greater, and the school rules more strict, the strong relationship between these responses and the satisfaction indices shows that they liked adapting to all of these increased demands. They also expressed a sense of adequacy to meet the demands, as evidenced by the fact that over two-thirds said that the increased work and harder work was seldom or never more than they could handle (item 41). There is every indication that the majority of the bused children sought more challenge, better opportunity to achieve, and a quieter, more peaceful learning environment than they had previously had.

Interview items regarding formation of friendships among bused and receiving-class children revealed that all of the 30 bused children in the sample and 26 of the 29 receiving-class children formed friendships among children of the other group, in most cases "several" or "many," "within - week," and "on their own." There was also every indication that the bused children participated in student activities to a very great degree, particularly in view of the mid-year transfer and difficulties connected with taking the bus home after school.

There were several reports of fighting and arguing between bused and receiving-class children, but few of the respondents saw these as having racial implications. Several children reported some name-calling referring to skin-color or race; however, on the part of children of both groups, and some of the receiving-class children reported name-calling "behind the backs" of the bused children. None of the children expressed any distress over these incidents, only one bused child hinted that she had been discriminated against because of her race, and only one receiving-class child expressed a negative opinion of "most" of the bused children.

The general tenor of the interview protocols of bused children, supported by inferences from all of the other data analyzed, indicates the appropriateness of the procedures used to date for selection of children to be bused. These apparently resulted in the selection of children who were quick to adjust to the academic requirements of the receiving school and to become a part of its social life. With few exceptions, these children evidenced the achievement motivation and behavioral standards considered characteristic of middle-class and upward-mobile persons. These qualities appear to have contributed, perhaps in large part, to the generally excellent adjustment of the children bused and to the highly favorable reaction to the busing program on the part of receiving-class mothers, teachers, and children.

#### Attitudes Toward "Reverse Busing"

All of the survey instruments included items assessing attitudes toward "reverse busing" or the busing of white, middle-class children into schools in less privileged neighborhoods. These were included partly for their own sake, and partly as a check on the veracity or sincerity of other pro-integration opinions. Many mothers and teachers of the receiving area (and far more in the target area) are receptive to the reverse busing concept. Approximately 27% of the receiving-area mothers and 41% of the receiving-area teachers stated that they thought such a program would be beneficial to their children or pupils, provided that participation were voluntary. The idea was favored by significantly more mothers of children already in classes with children bused from the target-area than mothers of receiving-school children who were not sharing classes with bused children. The proportions were 35% to 20%, respectively, of group 3 and 4 mothers who answered with an unqualified "yes" or "yes, provided that he is already achieving well," and there were also fewer group 3 mothers who said it would "definitely not" be beneficial (33% as against 44%). Many mothers and teachers qualified their negative responses in various ways tantamount to freeing them of racial or other prejudicial implications.

Of the twenty-nine receiving-class children asked whether they would like to attend one of the schools the bused children came from, only four indicated that they would "like to go." Most of those who would "prefer to stay" stated that their reservations pertained to leaving their friends behind, and several said that they would be willing if they were accompanied by a group of friends. Six gave reasons pertaining to fears of the environment in the target-area schools, centering around expectations of fighting and "meanness" among the children there.

#### Areas for Improvement

While the busing program as a whole appears to have been very successful in the eyes of the persons affected by it, it was not without some inevitable deficiencies. These are revealed by responses to some of the relatively objective items of the children's interview schedules, rather



than by attitudinal data. The busing service seems to have been subject to irregularities (at least that of the three schools attended by the children in the survey sample) which may have contributed to morning tardiness of bused children and hampered their participation in after-school activities. Unfortunately, teachers were not asked specifically about these matters and apparently did not think to comment on them when asked to criticize the busing program, so that the extent to which this was a problem, especially in the other four receiving schools, is not determinable with present data. The bused children in the survey sample, while reporting that the buses were often late, did not complain about it, and their mothers, judging from the strong tendency to report that the busing created no problem (item 39 of the maternal interview) seem to have been unaware of scheduling problems. Lack of criticism by teachers also suggests that the problems were not severe. However, morning tardiness and inability to stay after school probably increased a sense of the "differentness" of the bused children from the rest of the children, which is certainly antithetical to meaningful integration. Insofar as these problems are aggravated by busing irregularities, they can be ameliorated by a firming-up of the busing schedule in the coming semesters of the project.

The fact that a larger proportion of the bused children interviewed preferred the late bus than actually took it (22 versus 15, or 73% versus 50%) cannot necessarily be attributed to anxieties about the bus schedule. Some children were apparently under standing instructions to come straight home. The non-coded comments in this vein have to do with having to get home to do homework. Perhaps many of the mothers, and maybe even some of the children, do not fully understand that the children are foregoing some valuable social experiences by leaving immediately after school.

A somewhat related problem is revealed in the reporting by children of lack of contact between bused and receiving-class friends after school, on weekends, and in the summer. For this lack of social continuity, both groups of children tend to blame distance between their residences rather than disinclination to get together. Perhaps maintenance of informal contact across socio-economic and racial lines requires some creative planning and enlistment of the good will and cooperative spirit evidenced by mothers, teachers and children in this attitude survey.

## CONCLUSIONS

The criteria for selection of children to be bused seem valid for the present time, although an additional requirement should be that the children themselves are desirous of the transfer. The two children interviewed who were transferred against their will (on their mother's decision) reported that they were unhappy at the receiving school.

If the number of children bused is not to be increased, the major needs revealed by this survey are for increased reliability of the busing schedule and the creation of opportunities for increased structured and unstructured social contact between bused and receiving-class children. In addition, the few bused children who have not made a happy and productive adjustment to the new school should probably be given the opportunity to return to their former school if they wish to do so. Although the original agreement contained the proviso that the children should expect to stay until the completion of the sixth grade, it hardly seems desirable from any point of view to require their continuation in the program if it is not meeting their needs and purposes.

As one studies the over-all results of this attitude survey, one might be tempted to emit a sigh of satisfaction. It is true that a great majority of the mothers, teachers, and pupils whose attitudes were sampled evidence a high degree of approval of the schools in general and of project activities in particular and that the atmosphere for continued educational and social progress in Berkeley is very favorable. We cannot, however, overlook those relatively few problems and dissatisfactions that were reported, nor can we assume that all respondents were completely candid in expressing their views. In such a sensitive area as that of social integration in the schools, which may involve some sacrifices in well-being, real or imagined, temporary or permanent, we can expect some people to be hesitant in voicing their views. We can also anticipate that attitudes will fluctuate with conditions in the community, the neighboring communities, the State, and the nation. Perhaps the wisest reaction to the findings of this study would be an attitude of thankfulness that efforts to date have been well received, and a determination to continue to earn the confidence and support of the community.