REPORT OF THE APPALACHIAN SCHOOL STUDY PROJECT

by

Thomas E. Wagner

WORKING PAPER NO. 4

June, 1974

Urban
Appalachian
Council

Room 514
1015 Vine Street
Cincinnati, Ohio 45202
513–421-2550 or 352-3291

P R E F A C E

This paper is one in a series to be published by the Research Committee of the Urban Appalachian Council as part of our effort to document the urban and rural realities of Appalachian life.

In 1972, the Urban Appalachian Council was organized to act as a regional resource and educational center for Appalachian affairs and to promote pride in cultural heritage among Appalachians in an urban setting

The Urban Appalachian Council functions as advocate and catalyst. It is a fundamental commitment to the concept of cultural pluralism which directs our work in research, advocacy, community organization, cultural affirmation and program development.

INTRODUCTION

The movement of rural people to urban industrial centers has continued to accelerate over the last several decades. The traditional port-of-entry neighborhoods in urban areas, which in years past received migrants of European ethnic origin, have become the receiving center for black and white rural to urban migrants. All of the problems usually associated with lower socio-economic groups living in the urban complex--poverty, inadequate health care, poor housing, crowded schools, and high crime rates--are often related to the in-migration of large numbers of disadvantaged individuals from the rural areas.

In Cincinnati, as in numerous other midwestern industrial cities, the greatest influx of rural to urban migrants is from the Appalachian region. Estimates are that over three million persons have migrated out of the southern Appalachian region alone since the beginning of World War II. A recently completed study by the Cincinnati Public Schools reveals that approximately 35 percent of the children attending schools in Cincinnati are of Appalachian heritage.

The general poverty, geographic isolation, and economic exploitation of the mountain region known as Appalachia is well documented. Over the last half-century a multitude of public and privately sponsored programs have been initiated to alleviate the social and economic problems of the region. Despite the almost regular rediscovery of Appalachia and its people, the problems persist.

Often, when one speaks of Appalachia, many Cincinnatians think of some far distant locale. Few realize that Appalachia is as close as Clermont County and that Southern Appalachia, the most depressed region, is just a two-hour drive down Interstate 75. Cincinnati is, in fact, a primary doorway into and out of Appalachia.

The mountaineer comes from a rural way of life which places emphasis on individualism, traditionalism, self-reliance, and strong loyalty to an extended family peer group. In the urban environment, the Appalachian finds himself in a culture that is time-oriented, organization conscious, and where peer groups develop from casual relationships. There has been, over the past two or three years, a growing awareness of the difference between the lifestyle and goals of the Appalachian and that of the middle class mainstream. However, a yet to be answered question is whether or not society's institutions will respond to these differences by providing new options. The purpose of this study is to provide one institution, the urban school system, with new information in anticipation that new methodologies and new approaches may be developed to provide for the educational needs of the Appalachian children who attend.

It should be noted, however, that the responsibility for providing for the needs, educational and otherwise, of urban Appalachians does not rest solely with the schools. All of society must work to provide for all of its citizens. To do otherwise can only lead to a lessening of the quality of life for all.

The members of the committee are grateful for the assistance and cooperation of the staffs of the Cincinnati Human Relations Commission and the Cincinnati Public Schools. A special acknowledgement is extended to Mrs. Grace Adick, principal of Oyler Elementary School; Mr. Harold Buxton, principal of Roberts Junior High School and Mr. Marvin Renshaw, principal of Western Hills High School, whose help and guidance was invaluable. We also wish to thank the teachers and administration staffs of the three schools for their willingness to share their time and ideas. And finally, I wish to express my appreciation to the committee members for their dedication, endurance and patience.

CONTENTS

CULTURE, DISADVANTAGEMENT, AND EDUCATION

Called by many names--inner-city, urban slum, ghetto--the schools of our metropolitan areas are a major educational concern. The flight of middle-class residents to the suburbs has often created urban schools that are populated primarily by students who are culturally outside of the American mainstream. Much has been written during the past decade about the students who attend urban schools. Often these different students are described as "culturally disadvantaged." and by other labels that seem to suggest inherent weaknesses in their subculture. A subculture that is in many respects alien to the society represented by the school and to the teacher who is a product of the society.

Cultural disadvantagement, according to Robert J. Havinghurst, is a relative term. A disadvantaged student is one "who is handicapped in the task of growing up to lead a competent and satisfying life" in our urban, industrial, and democratic society.[1] William E. Amos suggests that we should consider as disadvantaged those students who "have heavy liabilities which lessen their chances for competing successfully with their fellow citizens in all phases of life."[2] Francis P. Purcell defines disadvantagement in a different sense. In Purcell's terminology, the disadvantaged child is "one who in addition to poverty has been inculcated with the social learnings of a culture...to the extent that he is repudiated by the educational system, and he turns against the system in a desperate attempt to maintain what little self-esteem remains to him."[3] Purcell's description places the burden of fault on the institution and society rather than on the culturally different student.

Others see disadvantagement in terms of its visible factors. James Jacobs,[4] Lester D. Crow, et. al.[5] and Helen E. Rees[6] describe those who reside in substandard housing, have low income, are highly mobile, have little education, accept their low status and are without motivation to improve their way of life as being disadvantaged. Seldom are these persons exposed to "good" music or other forms of art, nor do they participate in the middle-class social activities of the supposedly "better" environment. The adjectives "good" and "better" imply that those subcultures which are outside of the middle-class mainstream have few attributes of value and that, if members are to improve themselves, they must adjust their way of life to middle-class expections. The Educational Policies Commission supports this disturbing concept in the assertion that, "some of their basic cultural institutions and attitudes not only fail to help but actually impede their adjustment. Adults in minority subcultures, continues the Commission,"...are not harmful, but merely fail to inspire emulation. Therefore, culturally different children must... seek their models outside of the home."[7]

As Frank Riessman points out in his book The Culturally Deprived Child, an understanding of the psychology and culture of lower socioeconomic, underprivileged groups is essential for those persons who work in the agencies and institutions which deal directly with the subcultural minorities in our society.[8] But often there is a tendency to over generalize and simplify the problems of culture-conflict by emphasizing the similarities between subcultures and thereby neglect crucial differences. In schools where middle-class teachers are instructing children from one of society's minority subcultures, or perhaps from two different subcultures, a knowledge of the similarities and differences is essential in providing for the child's

standing the culture can result in institutional changes that do not alter the culture but, instead, provide stimuli that elicit responses that are expected and desirable. What Millard Black says, as below noted, about culturally different students is just as applicable to the Appalachian child in the urban school:

> He knows the fear of being over-powered by teachers who are ignorant of the culture and mores of his society, and who may not expect success of him. He fears lack of recognition and understanding from teachers whose backgrounds are totally dissimilar and who either misinterpret or fail to recognize many of his efforts to achieve and to accommodate himself to demands which are basically alien.[9]

It is with the problems of cultural difference that urban educators must come to grips if society is to provide equally for the educational needs of all of its citizens.

APPALACHIANS AND THE URBAN SETTING

It can be generalized that while Appalachians are not of a separate culture, they are a distinctive subculture which varies from the society at large. Those who are familiar with migrant Appalachians living in midwest urban centers are aware that Appalachians are culturally different people. The Appalachian life style, thought patterns, and personality are based upon an agrarian-frontier heritage rather than upon the requirements of an urban-industrial society. One needs only to compare the mountain subculture with that of the urban mainstream to realize that Appalachian migrant students are very different from other students who attend urban schools. The differences of heritage and culture may be subtle and unrecognized but because of their heritage and culture, Appalachians react differently to circumstances and situations than do other urban dwellers. It is for this reason that urban educators must become aware of the Appalachian migrant student.

Due to a number of economic factors, Appalachians have traditionally sought new economic opportunities in Detroit, Chicago, Cleveland, Indianapolis, Cincinnati, Dayton, and in all of the industrial towns between these cities, Because of its geographic location as well as its role as an industrial urban center, many migrants, particularly those from eastern Kentucky, pass through or settle in Cincinnati.

Throughout American history the central city has traditionally been the port-of-entry neighborhood for immigrants. Ghetto communities have historically served an important role in the acculturation process as numerous ethnic groups have moved through the inner-city of Cincinnati on their way to the suburbs. But the central business district is no longer the center of industrial growth and the inner-city port-of-entry neighborhoods now are a considerable distance from industry and the market place.

While today's migrants face greater difficulties in escaping the ghetto, many are able to do so. Schwarzweller, Brown and Mangalam describe those migrants who, after finding permanent employment, are able to escape

> As time went on, they became more skilled at their work and more familiar with the demands of the industrial job market. Their self-confidence increased and their desire for material improvement was markedly bolstered. The more skilled and ambitious among them sought out and found, with the direct help of the family and kin, better paying and higher status jobs.[10]

With better jobs comes the move to other, perhaps better neighborhoods. One such neighborhood is described by Ben Huelsman.

> The style of life of the assimilated mountaineer differ substantially from that of the southern mountain migrant in either the port-of-entry or in low cost housing projects. The assimilated mountaineer is drawn more directly into the middle-class mainstream of urban life than is true of the other two groups. Housekeeping standards, on the average, are higher than is generally observed in the decaying tenements of the port-of-entry. There is less juvenile delinquency and very little of the regimentation and hopelessness encountered so often in low cost housing projects. Except for the soft slurred accents of the southern mountains, the preference for Protestant fundamentalism and country music, the assimilated mountaineer has lost much of his distinctive culture.[11]

Essentially, what has happened to countless in-migrants before, also happens to the Appalachian; he melts into a mainstream of the suburban middle-class American society.

But those who do not make it become "ghettoized to the point that second and third generation children may easily have a worse lot than the original population," says Stuart Faber, past president of the Urban Appalachian Council. "The plight of ghettoized Appalachians can be summarized in a few short words; bad housing, unemployment and underemployment, poor health, alcoholism, juvenile delinquency, early school drop-out, and latent self-hatred due to lack of acceptance by the society of their cultural identity."[12]

The problems faced by poor persons living in ghettos--unemployment, poor housing, marginal health conditions, delinquency, etc.--are universal in nature. The migrant Appalachian living in inner-city neighborhoods face the same problems to the same degree as other ghetto dwellers. In many instances, they are the same problems which confronted the mountain in his mountain environment. The difference between the mountains and the city though is not in these problems, but in the new ones created by the neglect and insensitivity of urban dwellers, agencies, and institutions.

The focus of this study is upon the migrant and urban school, and Roscoe Giffin sees the school as a major cause of the Appalachian child's dissatisfaction with urban life.

> They are a part of an educational system that is at the same time more complex and richer in opportunity yet more demanding of achievement and continued regular attendance than was their lot either in a small one room school or in one of the newer consolidated schools. To complicate matters further, they are the pupils to teachers who are likely to be products of urban, middle-class society.[13]

The educational level of migrant adults averages around the eighth grade. And Appalachian parents, it is said, take little interest in their childrens' schooling. Communication between the school and the home is often poor. Few parents discuss academic problems related to their child's progress as is the mode in middle-class suburban schools. Appalachian attitudes about education and schools are only a part of the problem. Teachers who "seem to lack cross-cultural experience or for some reason are still acting like missionaries who want to change the morals and customs of the natives"[14] are just as much to blame for the migrant child's unfavorable impression of the modern urban school. The schools are institutions of middle-class society run for and by the middle-class.

The problems most often cited by school personnel appear to be directly related to the contrast between the values and attitudes of the Appalachian subculture and those of the middle-class mainstream. They include:

1. Poor preparation for city schools.
2. Lack of interest in regular school attendance.
3. Lack of health protection.
4. Communication between the school and the parent.
5. Poor attendance and performance record.
6. A high drop-out rate.

Even though the problem headings may be applied to most minority groups attending Cincinnati Public Schools, the solutions to these problems are not universally applicable to all groups.

This project is not concerned with placing the blame for these problems but with providing information and knowledge about Appalachian migrants in Cincinnati Public Schools. It is the committee's sincere wish that the information and knowledge will be used to arrive at policy decisions which will improve each school and teacher's effectiveness in preparing Appalachian children for life in an increasingly complex society.

STUDY METHODOLOGY AND PROCESS

In January, 1973, Louise Spiegel, the chairperson of the Appalachian Council Research Task Group, asked Dr. Thomas E. Wagner to assume the direction of a project to study Appalachian migrants in Cincinnati Public Schools. A general lack of knowledge regarding Appalachian migrant students attending Cincinnati Public Schools as well as a desire to develop a comprehensive data base upon which to make future recommendations regarding migrants living in the greater Cincinnati community prompted the need for such a study. Through the cooperation

including several graduate and undergraduate students from the University of Cincinnati.

It was quickly realized that the study, because of its heavy reliance upon volunteer laymen and the absence of quantifiable data, would require an approach which would be subject to question regarding its validity. While a whole range of procedures appear to be available, the circumstances and limitations of the situation dictated a less than pure approach. In such a research project, the point made by Eugene J. Webb, Donald T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz, and Lee Sechrest regarding research methodology is extremely important. "The most persuasive evidence comes through a triangulation of measurement processes. If a proposition can survive the onslaught of a series of imperfect measures, with all of their irrelevant error, confidence should be placed in it."[15] Thus, what was called for in this study project was the selection of a tested research model generally accepted for its validity.

Such a model was to be found in the Cincinnati School Foundation's program of School Visitation Committees. For over twenty-one years the Cincinnati School Foundation has sought to "inform the public in a unbiased and impartial manner about the schools and their administrative and educational problems."[16] Since 1967 the Foundation has sponsored visiting committees which have studied and reported on individual Cincinnati Public Schools. The success and respectibility of the School Foundation's approach to studying Cincinnati Schools is generally recognized. Confidence in the study methodology was strengthened by the reception the Appalachian School Project Committee received when school administrators were told the same study format was to be used in this project.

Five planning, orientation, and training meetings were held in preparation for the study. Resource personnel from the Cincinnati Board of Education, the University of Cincinnati, and CHRC provided information about Cincinnati Public School programs and educational philosophy, Appalachian migrants living in the City of Cincinnati, and training in observation and interview techniques. Factual information regarding the schools to be visited was compiled and presented by a representative of the Department of Research, Information and Statistics of the Cincinnati Public Schools.

An extensive orientation meeting was held with the principal and selected staff members of each of the three schools visited. In these sessions the school administrators and faculty were extremely cooperative and open in their discussion of the school situation.

The visiting teams were subdivided into pairs and asked to spend several days in each school building. They were instructed to cover all aspects of the school including the library, lunchroom, gym, faculty lounge or workroom, administrative offices, and PTA meetings as well as regular classes. The visitors were encouraged to seek informal conversation with students, administrators, teachers, and parents so as to gain an impression of the school atmosphere, communications, discipline,

The selection of the schools to visit was accomplished in the following manner. Migrants of Appalachian origin were concentrated in at least seven neighborhood areas of Cincinnati and the surrounding metropolitan community. Representatives of community agencies and others concerned about the urban Appalachian generally agree on the location of the areas. Regretably, there is little quantifiable data to verify what is believed. However, it is a simple matter to superimpose a map of the agreed upon migrant enclaves onto a map of the school sttendance areas to determine which elementary, junior high, and senior high schools have a high percentage of Appalachian students enrolled. Three schools, Western Hills High School, Roberts Junior High School, and Oyler Elementary School were chosen for study. All three schools draw students from Lower Price Hill, a recognized Appalachian neighborhood. The Western Hills attendance district was chosen because there was no evidence of a crisis situation relative to Appalachians and because committee members were aware of faculty and administrators in each school who were sensitive to the plight of Appalachian migrant students.[17]

It was decided to follow a student's progress through the grade levels and, accordingly, Oyler Elementary School was visited during the month of March, 1973; Roberts Junior High School was visited during the month of April, 1973, and Western Hill High School during the month of May, 1973.

Before one can evaluate the effectiveness of a school to meet the needs of its students, one must recognize two important factors. First, for those who attend, the school is the single most influential institution in the lives of urban children. Secondly, the school has contact with students only for one segment of each day. The family and community environment also have a significant influence upon a child's development.

As a guide for measuring a school's effectiveness, the committee used the question, "Does the educational program of the school meet the needs of the Appalachian children living in the attendance district?" It is assumed that the primary goal and mission of each school is to provide the basic skills and information required to adequately function and achieve self-fulfillment in our society. These skills include the ability to communicate (read and write), mathematical skills, certain social skills, and the ability to think and make wise decisions. Schools which provide the above skills are presumed to meet their role and mission and therefore satisfy the needs of the children who live within the attendance district.

The committee's evaluation of the three schools and each school's environment for Appalachians is based entirely upon participant observation during visits; interviews with students, teachers, administrators, and parents; and analysis of school documents (attendance reports, surveys, school information systems material, etc.) It should be kept in mind that the committee members were not trained observers and were limited by time in their school visits. Admittedly, in some instances the committee's

THE COMMUNITY AND SCHOOLS

Lower Price Hill is a relatively isolated community, both socially and geographically. The Mill Creek and Ohio River border on the east and south sides. To the west is a high steep hill that spearates the community from Upper Price Hill. On the north, the community tapers out as State Avenue is squeezed by the Mill Creek on the one side and the hill on the other.

According to the 1970 census, 53% of the housing in the Lower Price Hill area (Census Tract 91) is considered substandard. Since that time, however, the community has been included in a federal rehabilitation program and there are now a considerable number of buildings being remodeled. The 1970 census shows a population of 3,187 persons (0.1% black).

There are several indicators of the community's poverty level. The median home value for Lower Price Hill is $7,000, the median family income is $5,856, and 32.9% of the residents have incomes that are below the 1970 poverty level. Less than 10% of the available work force is employed in some form of professional or managerial occupational, and fewer that 12% of the adults are high school graduates.

There are very few recreational or entertainment facilities available to the residents. Two agencies, the Santa Maria Neighborhood House and the Boys Club of America, serve as centers for community activity. As might be expected, the level of parental involvement in school or community activities is low.

Oyler Elementary School

Oyler Elementary School is located near the center of the Lower Price Hill community. The present school building was opened 43 years ago and until recently housed grades one through eight. The school became an elementary school when Roberts Junior High was opened in 1966. The principal has been an administrator at the school for over nine years

The building looks its years. Set tightly in among the neighboring buildings, it appears empty except just before and after school. However, inside the halls and rooms are spacious and clean and the atmosphere is relaxed and friendly.

The school is not typical of most in the city in that it is a nongraded elementary school. There are five teams or groups of teachers who instruct children in age ranges (e.g., 6,7,8 years old, 9,10 years old, etc.). Because of crowded conditions at Roberts Junior High, there are five classes of seventh graders assigned to the Oyler building. Many of the seventh graders are from Riverside-Harrison, a community along the river west of Lower Price Hill. There are also three kindergarten, two headstart, and a non-profit Montessori class in the building.

During the 1971-72 school year, there were approximately 1000 students at Oyler. None of the students were black. Oyler's absence rate with 11.6% of the students absent daily, is well above the city-wide average. The mobility rate, at 50%, is at least 20% above the city-wide average. Student sixth grade

Though seeming to be shy and withdrawn at times, the students are noticeably courteous, and friendly toward visitors and teachers. There appeared to be better than average teacher involvement and rapport among the faculty. The atmosphere was that of a community school. Many of the faculty and administrators have been at Oyler for several years and personally know the families of many children who attend. One noticeable phenomena was the exceptionally large number of parents who wait on the playground for their children at the end of each school day. The local, almost isolated, flavor of the school is reflected in the small PTA which is active locally but not in city-wide PTA activities. Few parents or community citizens are actively involved at the school beyond the PTA.[20]

Roberts Junior High School

Roberts Junior High School has had the same principal since 1966, the year the school opened. The school, situated on a hill overlooking the Millcreek Valley, is located in the northwest section of its attendance district. With the exception of the ubiquitous blue plastic used to replace broken windows, the school building is attractive and in reasonably good condition.

The school's curriculum is typical of that in Cincinnati junior high schools. There are three special educational classes, three industrial education classes, and a broad range of courses for all grade and ability levels. Approximately 40% of the student body is classified at the basic level. In 1971-72, school enrollment was 1,136 students. Less than 1% of the students are black. Approximately 20.4% of the students are absent daily, a figure that is above the city-wide school district average. The dropout rate, at 4.2%, is also above the city-wide percentage for dropouts.

While most students at Roberts have I.Q's that are average and above, they generally must be considered both economically and educationally deprived. Teachers report that the students are relatively unsophisticated and naive about the world beyond their own community. The students are friendly, however, open toward strangers, and respond well to persons who take the time to talk with them.

The school attendance district for Roberts Junior High School consists of several distinct community areas. They include Lower Price Hill, East Price Hill, the Riverside area, and Sedamsville. The residents of East Price Hill, or Upper Price Hill as it is sometimes called, have moderate incomes and generally should be considered low middle-class or blue-collar workers. The Sedamsville, Riverside, and Lower Price Hill communities have little in common with Upper Price Hill. The majority of the Appalachian white students who attend Roberts Junior High live in Lower Price Hill.

Western Hills High School

Western Hills High School, located near the western border of the attendance district, is approximately 45 years old. The school's design is typical of schools built during the late nineteen twenties. It is attractive and in reasonably good condition. Despite being designed for 2,300 students, the school building houses nearly 3,100 students. A new vocational education wing should alleviate

The curriculum is typical of most Cincinnati area high schools. The school has a "track" system whereby the students are divided into four academic levels, basic, general, academic, and advanced students. There are some vocational and business education courses. Approximately one-third of the students enroll in a post-secondary educational program upon graduation.

Only 28 of Western's 3,122 students are black. Administrators estimate that 25 to 30 percent of the student body are first or second generation Appalachians. There is a definite socioeconomic and cultural split in the school's student body. While the split cannot be defined along cultural lines (as is between the "long hairs and the straights"), there appears to be a definite difference between the Covedale-Westwood and the Price Hill-Fairmount-Lower Price Hill students. It is estimated that at least one-fourth of the student body is Catholic.

Just over 10% of the students are absent daily, a figure well below the city-wide school district average for high schools.[22]

Estimates are that over one-half of Western's faculty live within the school district (the majority in the Covedale and Westwood communities). The PTA is reasonably active for a senior high and there are active alumni and booster groups. However, few Appalachian parents are involved in these organizations. There appeared to be a sense of renewed spirit throughout the school and community. Several administrators and teachers remarked that students from the Appalachian neighborhoods were being assimilated to a greater degree that in previous years. This is largely attributed to a lessening of past elitisism or cliquishness on the part of many student groups.

OBSERVATIONS

1. On the whole the committee was impressed with the competence, dedication and sincerity of the administration and faculties at Oyler Elementary School, Roberts Junior High School, and Western Hills High School.

2. In all three of the schools, administrators were open to the development of new and innovative programs. The nongraded approach at Oyler and the individualized reading program at Roberts, as well as the special interest courses (including an Appalachian course) at Roberts and Western Hills are examples of this commendable attitude.

3. That individual administrators and teachers are aware of and sensitive to the educational needs of Appalachian students was apparent. However, the fact that the central administration of the Cincinnati Public Schools does not provide special programs directed at meeting the special educational needs of Appalachians who live in Cincinnati was just as apparent. Those programs which serve Appalachians are more the result of individual initiative and not a result of conscious efforts by the central administration or Board of Education.

4. The number of teachers in each school who recognize the cultural differences of Appalachian children, while growing, remains small. Far too many teachers expressed a "so what" attitude toward Appalachian children and, thus, tend to ignore or deny the existence of a different cultural group in their classroom.

5. A few counselors and administrators, and only a sprinkling of teachers, seemed to be aware of the home conditions of the children attending each school. Also, many seemed to lack the knowledge or expertise to deal effectively with Appalachian parents. There is a tendency to place all of the blame for educational failure upon the student and the home.

6. Students attending each school expressed their own and parental fear and apprehension about moving on to the next school--from Oyler to Roberts to Western hills--or on to the post secondary experience, whether work, college or nothing.

7. Despite some special emphasis courses (black or Appalachian), teachers and students generally were unaware of cultural groups other than their own.

8. Appalachian students at Oyler and Roberts were unaware of, or ashamed of, their rich cultural heritage. Furthermore, there was little evidence to indicate the Board of Education was planning to develop or implement programs that would serve to instill in Appalachian children a positive self and cultural image.

9. The physical plant of each school, although worn, and despite some crowding, was adequate. Buildings seem to be the least among priorities since it was repeatedly noted that good teachers created their own learning atmosphere in even the drabbest of rooms.

In general, the committee was left with the impression that the Cincinnati

regarding the heritage and background of their students; estimates by counselors and administrators are that between fifty and seventy percent of the Appalachian children beginning elementary school would not complete high school; the overall anxiety on the part of the students to attend the next level of school; and the lack of concrete evidence to indicate that the Cincinnati Public Schools are aware of and concerned with the needs of Appalachian students, strongly supports the conclusion.

Comments and Recommendations

Comment: There is a need for the training of educators, in the various cultural backgrounds and characteristics of their students. In the schools visited there is a particular need to acquaint teachers, counselors, and administrators with the cultural heritage of Appalachians.

Recommendation: That the Cincinnati Public Schools continue to support in-service programs which emphasize the development of an awareness on the part of teachers of the background and heritage of the students who daily attend their classes.

Comment: An effective program of cultural education is necessary for Appalachian children trying to achieve some personal and group identity. This education must be a continuing process begun in the elementary grades so that students can develop a personal awareness, group cohesiveness, and indigenous leadership which will enable them to encounter successfully the cultural conflicts they will experience at junior and senior high school levels. Educational programs which stress cultural heritage can serve to increase an understanding of oneself and to develop a sense of belonging to an historical tradition, thereby, helping to create a positive self-image.

Recommendation: That the Cincinnati Public Schools encourage the development of special "mini" courses and curriculum units at several grade levels which emphasize the unique heritage of the urban Appalachian student.

Comment: There is a serious need for information and data on the Appalachian students attending Cincinnati Public Schools. Very little is known about where Appalachians attend school, about dropout rates, absenteeism, mobility, comparative test results, attitudes, etc.

Recommendation: That the Cincinnati Public Schools continue to cooperate with legitimate groups and individuals who are seeking to gather information about urban Appalachians.

Comment: Those programs which currently benefit Appalachian students are largely the result of individual teacher, administrator, or parent and community volunteer efforts.

Recommendation: That the Cincinnati Public Schools provide ways to encourage innovative teaching methods, parent-community involvement, and curriculum modifications which will benefit not only Appalachians, but all students. Furthermore, the central administration should initiate research efforts to aid in the overall development or modification of programs and curriculum so as to meet the pressing needs of Appalachian

Recommendation: That the administration of each school, with the active support of the central administration, begin at once to develop articulation programs designed to ease the transition of Appalachian students from Oyler to Roberts and Roberts to Western Hills.

Comment: The recognition that vocational and technical education is valid alternative to the traditional college oriented curriculum is to be commended. The new vocational additions to many of the high schools should provide new educational and career opportunities to all students, including Appalachians. However, no one form of education is proper for every student.

Recommendation: That the Cincinnati Public Schools not assume that vocationa education is the only solution to the varying needs of Appalachian students. To do so will deny many Appalachians children equal access to the multiple opportunities availabl within our society. Appalachian students should be counseled into all educational opportunities best fitting their individual needs.

Comment: The cultural and individual responses from home and parent regarding child-school relationships, progress and purpose differ sharply from those expressed by school personnel. Parental feelings of inadequacy, anger, confusion, fear, disillusionment, and apathy--all of which impede potential educational progress--are characteristics commonly seen in parents from one of the subcultures which society has denigrated. It is important that the school not use these attitudes as an excuse for its own failure. While it is necessary to stress the values which have promoted success in American mainstream, it is just as important to build an appreciation for the values and life-styles of those subcultures which make up our society. Our schools must deal realistically with those attitudes and life situations upon which parental influence has strong effect.

Recommendation: That academic and counseling programs be revised to reflect a stronger awareness of differing teacher/parental attitudes and to provide more special assistance in education where such attitudes might impede educational programs. There should be more emphasis placed on establish and maintaining sensitive contact between teacher, child, counselor and the home.

CONCLUSION

American schools have served throughout our history to preserve and transmit the dominant value system in society. As thousands of immigrants passed through Ellis Island into American Life, the schools served to acculturate their youth. The members of each new ethnic group on their arrival in the city have looked collectively to education, or more specifically, to the public schools, to provide the skills needed to take advantage of the opportunities offered by our society. Even today, the minorities who are moving into the inner-city--Blacks, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Appalachians--all native Americans--look to the schools to provide assistance in coping with contemporary American society.

The unresolved, serious problems of neglected Appalachians attending urban public schools have existed for over three decades. Even so, very little is being done to provide better educational opportunities for what may be the second largest group of minority students attending midwestern urban schools. Unless urban school systems face the challenge soon, the problems associated with Appalachians will be with American society well into the 1980's and even into the final years of this century.

Psychiatrist Robert Coles has said: "Somehow we all must learn to know one another". The Cincinnati Public Schools (or any other agency serving citizens of Cincinnati) cannot continue to ignore the urban Appalachian. Unless the citizens of Cincinnati learn to live together, to accept each other's background and way of life--Black or white, Appalachian or other ethnic heritage, lower-class, middle-class or upper-class--we will be unable to cope with our rapidly changing society. All segments of the urban community must be considered; otherwise, the force of what we have helped to build will suffocate us.

Footnotes:

[1]Robert J. Havighurst, "Who Are the Socially Disadvantaged?" in The Disadvantaged Child, ed. by Joseph Frost and Glenn R. Hawkes. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1966), p. 16.

[2]William E. Amos, "Disadvantaged Youth: Recognizing the Problem," in The Disadvantaged and Potential Dropout: Contemporary Education Programs, A Book of Readings, ed. by John Curtiss Gowan and George D. Demos (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1966), p. 9.

[3]Francis P. Purcell, "The Disadvantaged Child and the Culture of Poverty" in Education and the Urban Community; Schools and the Crisis of the Cities, ed. by Maurie Milson, Francesco Cordasco and Francis P. Purcell, (New York: The American Book Company, 1969), p. 140.

[4]James N. Jacobs, "A Summary of Activities and Future Plans for Compensatory Education in the Cincinnati Public Schools" in Educating the Culturally Disadvantaged Child, ed. by Lester D. Crow, Walter I. Murray and Hugh H. Smythe (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1966) p. 168.

[5]Lester D. Crow, Walter I. Murray, and Hugh H. Smythe, ed., Educating the Culturally Disadvantaged Child, (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1966), p.1.

[6]Helen E. Rees, Deprivation and Compensatory Education: A Consideration, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968).

[7]Education Policies Commission, Education and the Disadvantaged American, (1962), p. 7.

[8]Frank Riessman, The Culturally Deprived Child, (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1962).

[9]Millard H. Black, "Characteristics of the Culturally Disadvantaged Child," in The Disadvantaged Child, ed. by Frost and Hawkes, pp. 45-46.

[10]Harry J. Schwarzweller, James S. Brown, and J.J. Mangalam, Mountain Families in Transition. (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1971), p. 219.

[11]Ben R. Huelsman, "Urban Anthropology and the Southern Mountaineer," Proceedings of the Indiana Academy of Science, (Vol. 78, 1969), p. 103.

[12]James Adams, A Series on Appalachians in Cincinnati, Ohio. (Cincinnati: The Cincinnati Post Times-Star, 1971), p. 3

[13]Roscoe Giffin, "From Cinder Hollow to Cincinnati," (Article Reprint), Mountain Life and Work, (Fall, 1956) pp. 11-20.

[14]James Adams, A Series on Appalachians in Cincinnati, Ohio, (Cincinnati:

[15]Eugene J. Webb, Donalt T. Campbell, Richard D. Schwartz, and Lee Sechrest, Unobtrusive Measures: Non-reactive Research in the Social Sciences, (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company), 1966, p. 3.

[16]Cincinnati School Foundation, Purpose and Functions of the Cincinnati Foundation, (Cincinnati, 1972).

[17]The Cincinnati Public Schools, in response to a request by the Urban Appalachian Council, recently revised their student information cards to include the county of birth for all pupils and their parents. A preliminary review of the data resulting from this new system support the selection of Oyler, Roberts and Western Hills.

[18]United States, 1970 Census of Population and Housing: Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. (Washington Department of Commerce), 1972. (Census Tract 91, Lower Price Hill).

[19]Cincinnati Public Schools, School Information System Report: Oyler Elementary School, (Cincinnati: Cincinnati Public Schools), 1972.

[20]A number of changes have occurred at Oyler since the committee's visit in the Spring of 1973, the changes include:

*Complete electrical rewiring and florescent lighting throughout the building.

*Inauguration of state funded Home Economics Impact Program; teacher spends one-half time counseling seventh grade girls, visiting homes and attempting to involve parents in the school.

*Santa Maria Community Services employed a part time Welfare Rights Worker in the Spring of 1972. In May of 1973, Oyler was informed that the economic level of the community now qualified the school for an ESEA Title I program.

The ESEA program concentrates on reading improvement. There are six new teachers funded by this program. Each teacher has an instructional assistant, all of whom are community residents.

[21]Cincinnati Public Schools, Schools Information System Report: Roberts Junior High School, (Cincinnati: Cincinnati Public Schools), 1972.

[22]Cincinnati Public Schools, Schools Information System Report: Western Hills High School, (Cincinnati: Cincinnati Public Schools), 1972.

A P P E N D I X

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Ms. Doris Bartsch
Ms. Ann Bunis
Ms. Nancy R. Claggett
Ms. Adele Cornelius
Ms. Toni D'Angelo
Ms. Carol Davidow
Ms. Anna Marie Evans
Ms. Judith Green
Ms. Sara Hale
Mr. Michael Maloney
Ms. Nancy Rueger
Mr. Barry Schwartz
Ms. Alice Sexton
Ms. Peggy Sigler
Ms. Louise Spiegel
Ms. Yvonne Watson

Dr. Thomas Wagner, Chairman

APPALACHIAN SCHOOL STUDY PROJECT

BASIC STUDY QUESTION:

Does the educational program of the school meet the needs of the Appalachian children.

STUDY METHODOLOGY:

The study will include various research techniques including interviews with students, teachers, administrators, parents and members of the school's attendance district community; participant observation; and content analysis of school documents (attendance reports, surveys, School Information Systems material, etc.).

STUDY TIME TABLE:

Planning Sessions - (3) January 18.

Orientation and Training meetings - (2) February 9.

Fact Book Preparation - (Oyler and Roberts) March 1.
(West. Hi.) April 1

School Visits - (Oyler) March 15.
(Roberts) April 1.
(West. Hi.) April 15.

Working Paper Completed - May 15.

ORIENTATION AND TRAINING MEETINGS:

First meeting-Resource personnel to discuss elementary and secondary educational programs, child and adolescent behavior, interviewing and observation techniques, reporting procedures and information systems.

Second meeting-Building principals, orientation to the school and community.

FACT BOOK:

May include:

A. Physical aspects of the school - i.e. age, capacity, location, brief history, extent of crowding.

B. Enrollments and Class Size.

C. Population of School: Socio-economic makeup, ethnic composition.

D. Staff of School: Administrators, number of teachers, counselors, librarians, pupil/teacher load, pupil/counselor load.

E. Educational Program: Courses offered, levels of instruction, scheduling of classes.

F. Extra-curricular activities.

G. Parent Organizations

H. Facilities: Lunchroom, library, gymnasium, outside grounds, science labs, special rooms.

SCHOOL VISITS: Visiting team will be subdivided into pairs. Plan to spend several days in each school building. Try to cover all aspects of the school. Arrangements will be made to visit classrooms, library, lunchroom, faculty lounge and workroom, administrative offices, PTA meetings, etc. Seek informal conversations with students, administrators, teachers and parents to get impressions of school atmosphere, communications, discipline, relationships, problems, attitudes, etc.

THE REPORT: The basic process for writing the report will be determined in special meetings after the data is collected.

VISITING TEAM GUIDELINES

A. Visiting

1. Two committee members should observe the same activity or class at the same time.
2. Try to cover several aspects of the school (visit classrooms, playground, gym. lunchroom, teacher's workroom, office, etc.).
3. Allow for informal conversation with teachers and students on such subjects as communications, relationships, texts, etc.
4. Keep an up-to-date record of your observations, thoughts and impressions during your visit.
5. Meet with your team partner to set up your visiting schedule. You should plan to spend at least three hours in the building each visit. A minimum of three visits should be scheduled. If you find it necessary to change your schedule, please notify the team coordinator.

B. Questions you may wish to ask:

1. School personnel
   a. To what extent do Appalachian students participate in school activities?
   b. Do Appalachian parents participate in school activities?
   c. Describe the self-image of Appalachian students?
   d. What are the aspiration levels of Appalachian students?
   e. Are they as motivated to learn as other students?
   f. Does their achievement level compare with that of the other students in your school?
   g. Do Appalachian students follow school rules and regulations?
   h. How do they get along with other students in the school?
   i. What do you believe are the strengths and weaknesses of Appalachian students?

2. Students
   a. Do you enjoy school? Why?
   b. Which subjects are your favorite? Why?
   c. How do you feel about your teachers?
   d. What type of person do you feel makes the best teacher?
   e. Are there any subjects you don't enjoy? Why?
   f. How are your treated in this school?
   g. What is the biggest problem in this school? What should be done about the problem?
   h. Do you go to school every day? If not, why?
   i. Do you belong to any clubs, teams or groups in school?
   j. Are your friends in school?

3. Parents and Community Residents
   a. What is your impression of the school?
   b. Do your children enjoy the school?
   c. How are your children treated by the school?
   d. How are you treated by the school personnel?
   e. Are your children learning?

School Information System (SIS):
List of Data by Category

The following provides a rather thorough list of the data in SIS. In general, the reader can assume that all "specific data" includes school designations and absolute numbers for academic years 65-66 through 70-71. Moreover, when percentiles are indicated, it includes the 10th, 25th, 50th, 75th and 90th.

General Categories	Specific Data
1. PUPILS	
A. Absence & Attendance (average daily rates)	by total, sex, grades - ind. and sub-group, special ed.
B. Attitude (based on Student Survey)	by factors & questions (since 1967-68)
C. Membership	by total, sex, grades - ind. and sub-groups, special ed.
D. Mobility	same as above, except by sex as well as by new enrollment, transfers-in, transfers-out, external transfers, dropouts - with percent for each.
E. Promotion	by percent (if not included)
F. Pupil-Teacher Ratio	by total, grades (1-3, 4-6)
G. Referrals	by percent for attend. & psych.
H. Tests - Achievement	all with grade equivalent percentil
1. Iowa Basic Skills (Grade 4)	by total and subtests (vocab, reading compos., lang., skills, and ari
2. Metropolitan - Advanced English (gr. 8)	by subtests (lang., word knowl., reading, spelling)
3. Metropolitan - Advanced Math (gr. 8)	by subtests (prob. solving, computation, concepts)
4. Metropolitan - Intermediate (gr. 9)	by subtests (lang., word knowl., reading, spelling, arith, comput. & concepts & prob. solving)
5. Metropolitan - Primary (grade 3)	by subtests (reading, work knowl., word anal., arith. comput. & concep & prob. solving)

7. SAT - Secondary	by grade (8, 10-12) and subtests (lang. paragraph meaning, arith comp
I. Tests - Aptitude	
1. Kuhlman-Anderson	by percentile
2. Lorge-Thorndike	by percentile
3. School & College	by total & subtest (verbal, math) with percentile
J. Tutoring	by fund source, tutors & tutees
II. SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AREA	
A. Delinquency	by glass breakage, contract & work orders - all with pct, lights broken juvenile arrests
B. Land and density	by general acreage, residential acreage, persons per acre, dwelling
C. PTA membership	by percent
D. Population	by over 5 yrs. of age, employed, in
E. Voting	by resignation - with pct. voting on schl. issues, voters for schl. issue with pct.
F. Wealth	by cars per dwell. unit & total, lun for needy child., child. on welfare, with pct.
III. SCHOOL PLANT	by age of bldg. & play area (in 1,00 Sq. Ft.)
IV. STAFF - CERTIFICATED	
A. Absence & Attendance	by total and reasons for absence
B. Attitude (based on Teacher Survey)	by respondents, response per questio (on 7-pt. scale) & per factor - with
C. Experience	by av. age, av. yrs. teaching in Dis av. yrs. total teaching, various con tracts - with pct., no degree, BA or with pct.

OYLER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

School Year 1971-72

	School Value	City Average (All Junior Highs)
Average Daily Absence	76 11.65%	8.35%
Average Daily Attendance	596 88.69%	91.52%
Average Daily Membership ($)	672 1.48%	1.35%
Gross Membership ($)	846 1.57%	1.35%
Mobility	50%	30%
Achievement - Grade 3 - Norm 3.2		
Reading 50% at	2.3 gr eq	2.6 gr eq
Math Computation 50% at	2.80 gr eq	2.7 gr eq
I.Q. 50% at	89 I.Q.	96 I.Q.
Achievement - Grade 6 - Norm 6.3		
Reading 50% at	4.5 gr eq	5.1 gr eq
Math Computation 50% at	4.8 gr eq	5.1 gr eq
I.Q. 50% at	89 I.Q.	94 I.Q.
Attitude toward School	57%	53.12%
Academic Confidence	22%	24.87%
Parent Attitude Toward Program	78.60%	73.91%
Juvenile Arrests	9 2.49%	1.35%
P.T.A. Membership	26%	32.54%
Registrants Voting Out of Those Registered 11/70	54%	64.09%
Students Above Low Income ($)	622 1%	
Free Lunches	59.97% 403	32.39%
Age of Building		

OYLER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, continued

	School Value	City Average (All Junior Highs)
Staff Total Days Absence Per Employee	7.44 days	10.31 days
Staff Morale	4.56	4.58
Number on Staff ($)	1.96% 36	1.35%
Staff Turnover	21%	24.66%
Average Years of Teaching - Total	11.0 years	12.03 years
B.A. Degree	44%	49.54%
M.A. Degree	56%	50.27%

GOALS	Percent Selecting Goals
Students:	
Good Health	56%
Job Training	52%
Teachers:	
Improvement of Basic Skills	79%
Understanding Other People	58%
Parents:	
Improvement of Basic Skills	65%
Citizenship	55%

ROBERTS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

School Year 1971-72

	School Value	City Average (All Junior Highs)
Average Daily Absence	202 17.78%	 14.36%
Average Daily Attendance	933 82.13%	 84.08%
Average Daily Membership ($)	1,136 6,19%	 5.00%
Gross Membership ($)	1,360 6.37%	 5.00%
Mobility	33%	29%
Achievement - 8th Grade Norm 8.1		
Reading 50% at	6.10 gr eq	6.20 gr eq
Math Computation 50% at	6.70 gr eq	6.90 gr eq
I.Q. 50% at	92 I.Q.	92 I.Q.
Attitude Toward School	38%	37%
Academic Confidence	29%	28%
Parent Attitude Toward Program	77%	63%
Juvenile Arrests ($)	96 7.6%	 5.88%
PTA Membership	11%	13.76%
Registrants Voting Out of Those Registered 11/70	64%	65.53%
Students Above Low Income ($)	1,078 11%	
Free Lunches	158 13.91%	 24.21%
Age of Building	5 years	21 years
Absence/Employee	11.54 days	9.89 days
Staff Morale	4.57%	4.10%

ROBERTS JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL, continued

	School Value	City Average (All Junior Highs)
Staff Turnover	23%	29%
Average Years of Teaching - Total	12 years	9.82 years
B.A. Degree	37%	37.06%
M.A. Degree	63%	62.12%

GOALS	Percent Selecting Goals
Students:	
Job Training	65%
Understanding Other People	41%
Teachers:	
Improvement of Basic Skills	78%
Self Development	50%
Parents:	
Job Training	73%
Citizenship	54%

WESTERN HILLS SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

School Year 1971-72

	School Value	City Average (All Senior Highs)
Average Daily Absence	309 10.7%	16.1%
Average Daily Attendance	2,579 89.3%	83.9%
Average Daily Membership ($)	2,888 20,77%	14,400+ (Total) 12.5%
Mobility - In-Out-Leaving School	14%	16%
Reading Subtest 50% of kids Norm - 50%	40% tile	32%
Attitude Toward School	41%	42%
Academic Confidence	35%	33%
Parent Attitude Toward Program	71%	64%
PTA Membership	17%	17%
Registrants Voting Out of Those Registered 11/70	72%	66%
Students, Above Low Income ($)	3,249 20.52%	15,000 (Total) 12.5%
Juvenile Arrests ($)	90 16.67%	600 (Total) 12.5%
Students Receiving Free Lunches	18 .6%	7%
Age of Building	43.00	32.00
Staff Absence/Employee	6.86 days	11.30 days
Staff Morale	4.7	4.0
Number on Staff ($)	109 15.20%	600+ 12.5%
Staff Turnover	19%	25.88%

WESTERN HILLS SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, continued

	School Value	City Average (All Senior Highs)
M.A. Degree	78.00%	70.88%

GOALS	Percent Selecting Goals
Students:	
Job Training	65%
Understanding Other People	52%
Parents:	
Job Training	63%
Citizenship	58%
Teachers:	
Job Training	53%
Citizenship	49%