#### GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

**RESEARCH PROJECT INITIATION** 

Date: June 10, 1971 pject Title: Civil Disorder: A Feasibility Study B-2109 pject No: incipal Investigator Dr. C. Michael York onsor: Georgia Department of Fublic Safety reement Period: From\_June 4, 1971 October 3, 1971 Until pe Agreement: Contract No. 94 \$6,290 Sponsor funding (B-2109) Fixed Price  $\frac{2,100}{$8,390}$  Ga. Tech Contribution (E-2101) nount: ports Required: Monthly Progress Reports due each month beginning July 3. Final Report - due October 3, 1971. Mr. Michael Hyde Planning Division consor Contact Person (s): Georgia Department of Public Safety 929 East Confederate Avenue, S.E. Atlanta, Georgia 30316 School of Psychology ssigned to: COPIES TO: Principal Investigator Library > School Director **Rich Electronic Computer Center** Dean of the College Photographic Laboratory Director, Research Administration Project File Deputy Controller (2) Security-Reports-Property Office Patent Coordinator Other A-3 (2-71)

#### **GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

OFFICE OF RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION

#### **RESEARCH PROJECT TERMINATION**

Date: January 17, 1972

Project Title Civil Disorder; A Feasibility Study

Project No: G-42-606

Principal Investigator: Dr. C. M. York

Sponsor: Georgia Department of Public Safety

Effective Termination Date: December 3, 1971

Clearance of Accounting Charges: Acceptable charges should have cleared by December 31, 1971.

Grant/Contract Closeout Actions Remaining:

All contractual obligations have been met.

٠,

Assigned to: School of Psychology

COPIES TO:

Principal Investigator

School Director Dean of the College

Director, Research Administration

Director, Financial Affairs (2)

Security-Reports-Property Office Patent and inventions Coordinator Library, Technical Reports Section Rich Electronic Computer Center Photographic Laboratory Project File Other

G-42. Gold Progress Report /

CIVIL DISORDER: A FEASIBILITY STUDY

Contract No. 94 with the Georgia Department of Public Safety 929 East Confederate Avenue, SE Atlanta, Georgia 30316 Colonel Ray Pope, Director

> Period Covered June 4 - July 3, 1971

> > Michael York and Jo Baker

School of Psychology Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, Georgia 30332

July 3, 1971

## CIVIL DISORDER: A FEASIBILITY STUDY

Problem familiarization and the establishment of a working relationship with the Civil Disorder staff within the Georgia Department of Public Safety consumed the Study Team at Georgia Tech during the initial month. Literature searches on civil strife and violence were begun, as were periodic visits and interviews with two State Patrol officers and a student intern who comprise the newly-formed Civil Disorder Unit.

The approach of this feasibility effort is exploratory. It is more epidemiological (attempting to isolate critical variables) than clinical (focusing on origin/history of rioters) or participative (accompanying the Civil Disorder Coordinators when they respond to requests from Mayors for assistance in opening up lines of communication among segments of a community). Just profiling the protest marchers and fire bombers or spending all the study team's time and energy in one event in one city did not seem wise for Summer '71. Serving as a sounding board to the men who face both stress and work-overload has already become a concurrent activity along with the usual start-up functions of a new project.

Plans were formulated to

- determine the objectives of the Civil Disorder Unit, as presently understood by staff members. Although the functions may be altered as circumstances change and staff allocations are increased, it is important that all parties are clear in the Unit's present definition and authority. For example, what is meant by "detect," "prevent," and "control" disturbances in Georgia?
- 2. actively search, review, and abstract the available literature and establish a preliminary library relating to Civil Disorder (namely, policecommunity relations, violence, riot, protest, racial attitudes). This kind of information will be useful later in a variety of training efforts among many law enforcement personnel in the State of Georgia.
- 3. attempt a monitoring of news accounts relating to civil unrest as it may occur in the State. Eventually, subscriptions of major newspapers should come into the Civil Disorder Unit for filing according to some category system.
- 4. reconstruct one or more case histories of actual disorder in Georgia (e.g., Milledgeville, Camilla).
- 5. develop a category system which would aid in the definition and classification of community "incidents." For example, by location (rural/ small town/ city/metro), kind of unrest (racial, labor, etc.), precipitating event and actual site of disturbances.
- 6. obtain and review the potential social indicators which may be in the 1970 Census Data for all counties, as available.
- 7. review the existing techniques for measuring citizen attitudes relating to civil strife, in anticipation of a larger study proposal in September.

6-42-606

## Progress Report 🖆

## CIVIL DISORDER: A FEASIBILITY STUDY

Contract No. 94 with the Georgia Department of Public Safety 929 East Confederate Avenue, SE Atlanta, Georgia 30316 Colonel Ray Pope, Director



Period Covered July 4 - August 3, 1971

## Michael York and Jo Baker

School of Psychology Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, Georgia 30332

August 3, 1971

As indicated in the June monthly report (dated July 3), a range of concurrent tasks have been undertaken: objectives of the Civil Disorder Unit, review of literature and establishment of library materials, monitoring of news accounts relating to civil unrest, case history attempts and search for "social indicator" information and techniques. Several days were also devoted to personnel action relating to the Civil Disorder Unit.

Progress is highlighted below.

#### 1. General Objectives of the Civil Disorder Unit

To advise, coordinate, and participate in the detection, prevention, and control of civil disturbance.

The function of <u>detection</u> is an information-gathering process, particularly in the monitoring of disturbances across the state (by telephone, newspaper clippings, GBI liaison, research assistance relating to public attitude and social indicators of tension and potential unrest).

The function of <u>prevention</u> is an ideal approach in various aspects of community life. Preventive strategies are preferred to corrective action, although often more remote, less tangible, less visible. Putting this function into practice involves Civil Disorder Unit coordinative efforts with the patrol and other police agencies, and eventually a public information program developed in conjunction with area planning commissions and local governments.

The <u>control</u> function has consisted mainly of the Civil Disorder Coordinator (trooper in plainclothes) responding to community requests for assistance from the Georgia Department of Public Safety. He departs immediately to the town or city, visits the requesting mayor, the chief of police, and the black leadership. The goal of opening up lines of communication is pursued in an effort to reduce existing conflict. In some instances, this activity would be categorized as "preventative," but to date most of the requests for police-community relations assistance are anxious pleas when the disturbance is imminent or already under way. During June and July, troopers in riot squads were dispatched to the cities of Chattanooga, Columbus, and Macon.

#### 2. Potential Social Indicators of Unrest from 1970 Census Data

The 1970 census statistics on the basic demographic characteristics of the inhabitants of Georgia have been reviewed in terms of towns of 10,000 or more population and by County and Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area. Data on age, sex, race, and relationship to head of household are now available. Delays have been encountered in the availability of more specific census information on each county and SMSA in Georgia. Easy reference can be made to the Bureau of Census tables, by County or SMSA, with respect to females-males by age category and race. This information is filed in the Civil Disorder Unit. Patterns of racial composition were translated onto a statewide county-oriented map by the CD Unit. Growth rate of each county is reflected in the Appendix through comparison of 1960 figures and the number of inhabitants enumerated in April, 1970. If time permits, a shaded map will be developed to highlight growth-loss during the decade.

#### 3. Monitoring of News Accounts Relating to Civil Unrest in Georgia

Description of civil disturbances by the local press provide one source of information (and tone) to the police-community relations function. Newspaper articles have been clipped and categorized by towns (e.g., Camilla, Milledgeville, Macon, Columbus) and type of event (racial, labor, etc.) and are being processed and shared with the Civil Disorder personnel.

Although a complete daily coverage has been prohibitive by the Study Team, it is anticipated that the major dailies of Georgia can be scanned by the Civil Disorder Unit secretary. An interim measure, until this procedure is functional, might be GBI mail-ins on a weekly basis.

#### 4. Specific Case Histories of Disorder Events

Periodic interviews are being held with the Civil Disorder staff in an attempt to reconstruct particularly the Camilla and Milledgeville cases, as originally planned by the Study Team. Attention will be given to major differences in the communication process and tension reduction encountered in the small town and small city--contexts not covered in the published studies of urban riots in Detroit, Los Angeles, and Newark.

#### 5. Preliminary Literature Review

A mammoth list of references on violence and civil strife has accrued during the decade of the Sixties. The Study Team is actively obtaining and abstracting many of the books and reports, although predictable delays have been encountered in receipt of numerous orders from national agencies or specific investigators. The appendixed references represent a master list for the proposed Civil Disorder library at Public Safety Headquarters. These resource materials have been tentatively categorized in terms of "descriptive studies," "theory and dynamics of violence," and "applications relating to civil disturbance." Abstracts will be typed onto cards for use by the Study Team and Public Safety members (in speeches, training, decision-making).

#### APPENDICES (separate)

- I. Selected Newspaper Clippings
- II. Reference List of Published Materials

A. Descriptive Comments and Books Relating to Studies of Violence

Etzkowitz, H., & Schaflander, G. M. <u>Ghetto crisis</u>. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969.

- Fogelson, R. M. White on black: A critique of the McCone Commission report on the Los Angeles riots. <u>Political Science Quarterly</u>, 1967, 82(3), 337-367.
- Gilbert, B. W., & the staff of the Washington Post. <u>Ten blocks from</u> <u>the White House: Anatomy of the Washington riots of 1968.</u> New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968.
- Hayden, Tom. <u>Rebellion and repression</u>. New York: World Publishing Company, 1969.
- Hayden, Tom. Trial. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.
- Jacobs, Paul. <u>Prelude to riot, a view of urban America from the</u> bottom. New York: Random House, 1968.
- Kapsis, R.; Smith, J.; Saunders, B.; Takaji, P.; & Williams, O. <u>The reconstruction of a riot: A case study of community tensions</u> <u>and civil disorder</u>. Waltham, Massachusetts: Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, Brandeis University, 1970.
- Locke, H. G. <u>The Detroit riot of 1967</u>. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1969.
- .McCord, W. M. Burn, baby, burn! The Los Angeles riots. <u>The New</u> Leader, 1965, 48(17), 3-5.
- Masotti, L. H., and Corsi, J. R. <u>Shoot-out in Cleveland</u>. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1969.
- Momboisse, R. <u>Riots</u>, revolts, and insurrections. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1967.
- Nation Magazine. Violence: New York, Los Angeles, Newark, East Harlem, Detroit. The Nation, 1967, 205(4), 101-107, 126.
- Oberschall, Anthony. The Los Angeles riot of August, 1965. <u>Social</u> <u>Problems</u>, 1968, <u>15(3)</u>, 322-342.
- Paletz, D., & Dunn, R. Press coverage of civil disorders: A case study of Winston-Salem, 1967. <u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>, 1969 <u>33(3)</u>, 328-344.
- Parmentor, Tom. Breakdown of law and order: A firsthand account in the words of Detroit ghetto dwellers. <u>Trans-action</u>, 1967, <u>4(9)</u>, 13-22.

- Rubenstein, R. E. <u>Rebels in eden: Mass political violence in the</u> <u>United States</u>. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970.
- Rudwick, E. M., & Meier, August. Negro retaliatory violence in the twentieth century. New Politics, 1966, 5, 41-51.
- Sauter, Van Gordon, & Hines, Burleigh. <u>Nightmare in Detroit: A</u> rebellion and its victims. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1968.
- Willhelm, S. M., & Powell, E. H. Who needs the Negro? In Hadden, J. K., Masotti, L. H., & Larson, C. J. (eds). <u>Metropolis in crisis</u>: <u>Social and political perspectives</u>. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1967.
- Wright, Nathan. <u>Black power and urban unrest</u>. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1967.
- Wright, Nathan. <u>Ready to riot</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.

#### B. Theory and Dynamics of Violence and Disruption

- Astin, A. W. Campus disruption, 1968-69: An analysis of causal factors. In Karten, F. F., Cook, S. W., & Lacey, J. I. (Eds.). <u>Psychology</u> and the problems of society. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, 1970, 377-387.
- Berg, K. R., & Turner, J. L. Cultural differences in psychosocial distress: northern-born Negroes and southern-born Negroes. <u>Proceedings of the 76th Annual Convention of the American Psychological</u> Association, 1968, 3, 547-548.
- Berkowitz, Leonard. Aggressive cues in aggressive behavior and hostility catharsis. Psychological Review, 1964, 71(2), 104-122.
- Berkowitz, L., Corwin, R., & Heironimus, M. Film violence and subsequent aggressive tendencies. <u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>, 1963, <u>27</u>, 217-229.
- Berkowitz, L., & LePage, Anthony. Weapons as aggression-eliciting stimuli. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7(2), 202-207.
- Caplan, N. S., & Paige, J. M. A study of ghetto rioters. <u>Scientific</u> American, 1968, <u>219(2)</u>, 15-21.
- Davies, J. C. Toward a theory of revolution. <u>American Sociological</u> Review, 1962, 27(1), 6-19.
- Dynes, Russell, & Quarantelli, E. L. What looting in civil disturbances really means. Trans-action, 1968, 5(6), 9-14.
- Feshbach, Seymour. <u>The function of aggression and the regulation of</u> <u>aggressive drive</u>.
- Fogelson, R. M. From resentment to confrontation: the police, the Negroes, and the outbreak of the nineteen-sixties riots. <u>Political</u> Science Quarterly, 1968, 83(2), 217-247.

- Grimshaw, A. D. Urban racial violence in the United States: Changing ecological considerations. <u>The American Journal of Sociology</u>, 1960, 66, 109-119.
- Grimshaw, A. D. Changing patterns of racial violence in the United States. Notre Dame Lawyer, 1965, 40, 534-548.
- Gurr, T. R. <u>Why men rebel</u>. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1970.
- Hundley, J. R., Jr. The dynamics of recent ghetto riots. Journal of Urban Law, 1968, 45(3,4), 627-639.
- Le Grande, J. L. Nonviolent civil disobedience and police enforcement policy. <u>The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police</u> Science, 1967, 58, 393-404.
- Locke, H. G. Riot response: the police and the courts. Journal of Urban Law, 1968, 45(3,4), 805-813.
- Mallick, S. K., & McCandless, B. R. A study of catharsis of aggression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4(6), 591-596.
- Nelson, Bryce. Brandeis center for violence study: Exploring the causes of urban riots. Science, 1968, 161, 246-249.
- Spiegel, J. P. Psychosocial factors in riots old and new. <u>The Amer-ican Journal of Psychiatry</u>, 1968, 125(3), 37-41.

#### C. Applications Relating to Civil Disturbance

- Chamberlain, G. M. Part I. What cities have done to stop riots, once they have started. <u>American City</u>, 1967, 87-89.
- Chamberlain, G. M. Part II. What can be done to prevent riot situations from arising. American City, 1967, 107-109.
- DeLong, Hal. Detroit remembers July, 1967 prepares to avoid another. Police, 1968, 12(5), 6-12.
- Fox, H. G. Demonstrations demand specialists. Police, 1968, 12(4), 33-35.
- Lahman, Joseph. Law enforcement and the police. In Masotti, L. H., & Bowen, D. R., <u>Riots and Rebellion</u>. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1968.
- Lee, A. M., & Humphrey, N. D. <u>Race riot</u>. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1968.
- Levy, Burton. Cops in the ghetto: A problem of the police system. In Masotti, L. H., & Bowen, D. R. <u>Riots and Rebellion</u>. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1968.

Moenssens, A. A. A riot that didn't happen. Police, 1967, 12(2), 47-50.

Momboisse, R. M. Demonstrations and civil disobedience. <u>Police</u>, 1967, <u>12(2)</u>, 76-82.

Niederhoffer, Arthur. <u>Behind the shield: The police in urban society</u>. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1967.

Sikes, M. P., & Cleveland, S. E. Human relations training for police and community. <u>American Psychologist</u>, 1968, 23(10), 766-769.

Wilson, O. W. Civil disturbances and the rule of law. <u>The Journal</u> of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1967, <u>58(2)</u>, 155-159.

606

Progress Report 3

## CIVIL DISORDER: A FEASIBILITY STUDY

Contract No. 94 with the Georgia Department of Public Safety 929 East Confederate Avenue, SE Atlanta, Georgia 30316 Colonel Ray Pope, Director



Period Covered August 4 - September 3, 1971

> Michael York and Jo Baker

School of Psychology Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, Georgia 30332

September 3, 1971

#### CIVIL DISORDER: A FEASIBILITY STUDY

#### Table of Contents

Symptoms of the Riot Virus

Stages within the Riot Process

Predicting Civil Disorder

The Nature and Measurement of Attitudes

#### Appendices

- A. Program Strategy for Preventing Race Riots (Things-To-Do Advice from Detroit Investigators)
- B. Abstracted Notes on Selected Reference Materials (5 by 8 card file format)
- C. The Phenomenon of Prejudice (Working Notes)
- D. Preliminary Community Relations Questionnaire (And Tryout Data)

## Symptoms of the Riot Virus

Greater awareness of the symptoms and resulting social and economic costs has occurred through the large number of post-riot investigations (1940's to late 1960's). Such post-audits are useful in the categorization of symptom areas and, if training is effective, in spotting symptoms-a preventive activity. The descriptive literature suggests the following general symptom areas.

#### 1. Opinions and Sentiments (Beliefs, Attitudes, Values)

Opinions are the surface-reactions or "what people are saying" about current events, persons, issues. Sentiments are the more established "feelings" people have toward another person, group, idea, or issue. A sudden upsurge in open statements against an issue or other persons would be a definite symptom of interpersonal relations within a community. A more systematic barometer of the underlying public sentiment would be the periodic use of attitude measures (interview or mail surveys).

#### 2. Racial Frictions

Race riots are set in motion by a vast number of rumors, personal irritations, and situations adversely affecting the lives of far more people than those who take part in the violence. Symptoms of probable disturbances are not specifically catalogued, but the general fever chart includes the struggle between white and black boys, soldiers, workers, community citizenry, and to a lesser extent, neighbors.

#### 3. Rumors--the Verbal Milling Process

If tension is prevalent in a community, the rumors that circulate take on a more purposive character. They cease being merely idle gossip; they become more biting and direct. Rumors symptomatic of race riots have generally gone through three stages: (1) tales of insults and discriminations, frequently traceable to subversive groups, (2) then stories of imminent violence, and finally (3) the crisis rumors, the inflammatory accounts of beatings.

#### 4. Demagogic Groups

Groups of emotional anti-Negroes and of emotional anti-whites flourish and die out in many metropolitan American communities. These anti-democratic organizations can generate a climate of intolerance, giving organizational sanction for aggressive activities. In addition to breeding and sanctioning an "atmosphere" of intolerance, they also serve as rumor mills out of which the more intolerant get their ready-made prejudices. Such organizations also provide leadership, and possibly rank-and-filers to jump into any riot situation.

## 5. Police Behavior

This symptom area may be reflected in "ground swells" such as (1) increased distrustfulness of the police by specific segments of the community and (2) increased number of arrests among these kinds of people. An example of these symptoms would be the urgent demands by Negroes for adequate representation on the police force, for equal treatment of prisoners, and for other implementations of constitutional rights. More and more headlines relating to this issue may be actual storm warnings.

One sociologist advances the notion that Army behavior in peacetime presents a rough parallel to police work. Both are deadly routines that bring slurs, few commendations, and many other frustrating experiences. These mounting frustrations must find outlets. Thus, war would be to the Army what civilian outbreaks are to the police. Both offer socially acceptable outlets for the residuum of aggressiveness characteristic of each.

## 6. Employment

"Keeping people in their place," in addition to the sheer fact of high unemployment, is an ancient theory of social control used by authoritarians worldwide. This symptom was prevalent in the June, 1943, Packard strike and related Detroit race riots. The issue was upgrading of three skilled Negro employees, an upgrading to which union contracts had entitled them. Things to watch for in this context are limited channels of collective bargaining, previously destitute individuals getting "big money" that can be spent only in a few limited but public areas, and abrupt Negro and white employment contact with one another without adequate preparation for working together sensibly and democratically.

## 7. Overcrowding

Subgroups who feel the pressure and competition of each other's "living space" begin to experience movements such as "white restriction" and "Negro expansion." In addition to housing facilities, city overcrowding refers to recreation and transportation facilities. If these people resort to the futile tactic of blaming one another (for a situation for which neither may be to blame), this mutual abuse is a grave symptom.

### 8. Juvenile Delinquency

Although the youth have not been adequately studied in post-audits of riots in the North, symptoms which deserve watching include: soaring arrests, emergence of teen gangs, reports from social workers of more children left to fend for themselves while their parents work.

#### Stages within the Riot Process

Not all local civil disturbances go through all four stages. The majority do not reach stage three. It is still not certain at what point in the process it is appropriate to use the word 'riot' to describe the event. In fact, more information is needed about the process and better reporting of the phrase structure itself.

... Conant of the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, 1968.

#### Phase I. The Precipitating Incident

- ... an inflammatory gesture, act, or event viewed by the aggrieved community as evidence of injustice
- ... draws together a large number of people

#### Phase II. Confrontation

- ... local people swarm to the scene; potential riot promoters articulate the crowd's rage--a keynoting process
- ... law enforcement arrives
- ... response of civil authorities
- ... news media identify the precipitating incident

#### Phase III. Roman Holiday

... older persons drop out; young people take over the action, displaying angry intoxication (throw things, taunt police, swap rumors)

#### Phase IV. Siege

- ... polarization; limited, if any, communication
- ... curfew declared; patrol or guard assistance summoned; fire bombing, sniping
- ... both sides tire of this fruitless, devastating way of resolving conflict

#### Predicting Civil Disorder

Only recently have specialists who have considered the phenomena of civil disorder, riot, or rebellion begun to formulate and test research models which incorporate specific measurable variables (potential predictors pitted against behavioral indices such as riot endorsement or actual participation. Empirical attention to two riots<sup>a</sup> in the 1940's (Harlem and Detroit) went beyond description, but the resulting books provide no predictive model.

From the literature reviews by the present study team, one largescale, cross-cultural study of strife<sup>and</sup>wo recent attempts at prediction of general violence (riot) within prescribed communities will be highlighted to illustrate both the difficulty and promise of prediction models in the process of explaining and understanding civil disturbance.

> A theoretical model of the causes of civil strife tested among 114 countries over 5-year period. Kinds of variables are:

deprivation	
economic	magnitude of civil strife
political	conspiracy
coercive potential	internal war
(retribution)	turmoil
popular compliance	
(legitimacy)	

Eight summary indicators proved to account for two-thirds of the variance among nations in relative magnitude of civil strife.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Clark, K. B. Group violence: A preliminary study of the attitudinal pattern of its acceptance and rejection; the 1943 Harlem riot. <u>Journal</u> <u>Social Psychology</u>, 1944, <u>XIX</u>, 319-377; Lee, A. M., & Humphrey, N. D. <u>Race riot</u>. New York: Dryden Press, 1943.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Gurr, T. A causal model of civil strife: A comparative analysis using new indices. <u>American Political Science Review</u>, 1968, <u>62(4)</u>, 1104-1124.

Testing the hypothesis that isolated, powerless, dissatisfied individuals are more prone to extremism among 312 Negro males in Los Angeles. The socio-psychological design included the following predictor and criterion variables:

degree of white contact ... willingness perceived powerlessness to use perceived racial dissatisfaction violence

The combined effects of the three predictive variables produced an important profile of the most violence-prone males.<sup>c</sup>

Interviews among 500 (78% Negro) Cleveland residents above age-20 provided data in the Gawiser model for prediction of riot behavior. The concepts measured in this study were:

aggressive potential (degree of frustration person feels) (measured by Cantril self-anchoring ... riot behavior striving scale) Cleveland system effect June, 1966 (general attitude toward "the system") perceived results of violent action (viewing the forces of retribution) perceived cultural norms on violence (a protest approval attitude)

Statistical analyses (factor analysis) found three of the four predictor variables to be stable. Attempts at prediction through multiple regression analysis revealed high relationships (R of .80) with riot involvement. Degree of dissatisfaction was the most important predictor.<sup>d</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>C</sup>Ransford, H. E. Isolation, powerlessness and violence: A study of attitudes and participation in the Watts riot. <u>American Journal of Sociology</u>, 1968, <u>73(5)</u>, 581-591.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>d</sup>Gawiser, S. R. <u>Towards a simulation model of urban civil disorder</u>. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, June, 1969.

## The Nature and Measurement of Attitudes

The attitudes held by individuals represent "predispositions to respond" to some class of stimuli with certain classes of responses. A general conception of attitude is given in the schematic below (the three major components of attitude are itemized in the middle column).

STIMULI individuals situations social issues social groups other "attitude objects"	Cognition	<ul> <li>physiological responses verbal statements of feelings</li> <li>perceptual responses verbal statements of beliefs</li> <li>overt actions verbal statements concerning own behavior</li> </ul>
(measurable independent variables)	(intervening variables)	•

As an illustration, an individual's "affective" or emotional response toward another person or group may be inferred from verbal statements of how much he or she likes or dislikes that "attitude object." The "cognitive" component of attitudes in the context of police-community relations, might be understood in part by obtaining the favorable-unfavorable qualities attributed to specified groups of people and beliefs of the persons sampled about appropriate and inappropriate ways of responding to the object being studied. The "action tendency" component--all the behavioral readiness associated with the attitude--is presumed to show up in daily behavior, including verbal statements if asked about one's attitude.

Attitudes are correlated with behavior. If an individual holds a negative attitude toward a given object, he or she will be disposed to harm or punish or destroy the object. In the area of prejudice, you may have a tendency to avoid designated groups of people, to reject them as friends, to withhold help, to treat them as inferior persons. This is an assumption until documented with data gathered in a particular context.

## The Measurement of Attitudes

Reliable and valid measures are needed if the concept of attitude is to be used in understanding and predicting action. As with all psychological determinants, the measurement of attitudes is necessarily indirect. Inferences are drawn from the responses of individuals toward the object. The methodology is available within the behavioral sciences-particularly among social psychologists. The technology ranges from onepage, self-administered attitude scales to extensive face-to-face interviews. Many specific references are in libraries; a useful set of resource books might include:

Bogardus, 1928	Remmers, 1950	
Edwards, A. L., 1957	Selltiz, et al., 1965	
Hyman, 1954	Shaw & Wright, 1967	
Osgood & Snider, 1969	Warren, et al., 1964	

However, the existing techniques must almost always be adapted to the subject under study and the local situation. There is no ready-made scale, questionnaire, or interview format (purchasable from a publishing house) which is amenable to immediate use in Georgia towns on the matter of community tension and endorsement of civil disturbance. Yet, specialists are available within the state to develop, administer, and report the findings generated by an appropriate attitudinal measure.

Appendixed to this monthly progress report is a preliminary version of a questionnaire relating to citizen views on selected aspects of race relations. The initial focus on this issue stems from the fact that racial tension did underlie almost all civil disturbance in Georgia during Summer, 1971 (and several preceding years). The tryout data, obtained from an available college student sample, may not be generalizable to all Georgians, but some of the preliminary findings have grave implications for governmental planning. For example, the views of these white males on the following issues are:

Negroes are d	iscriminated agai	nst		
yes		98%		
no		0%		
not sure		2%		
Sympathy with	civil rights demo	onstrators		
personal	participation	7%		
sympathy		73%		
not sympa	athetic	20%		
Justification o	f protest against	discriminat	tion	
	In Employment	In Educat	ion In Hous	ing
yes	86%	. 89%	5 86ª	%
no	7%	5%	5 70	%
not sure	7%	7%	70	%
Posture of ins	stitutions with res	pect to Neg	roes	
	Supreme Court	Congress	State Gov't.	Atlanta
helped	86%	80%	34%	61%
kept down	n 2%	7%	39%	20%
not sure	11%	14%	27%	18%
Believe police	e brutality exists	against Neg	roes	
true	39%			
not true	32%			
not sure	29%			

3- 92-10018

## CIVIL DISORDER: A FEASIBILITY STUDY

A Report to

The Georgia Department of Public Safety

Colonel Ray Pope, Director

C. Michael York, Ph.D.

E. Jo Baker, Ph.D.

with the assistance of

John Humphrey, student

Alan Martin, student

School of Psychology Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, Georgia 30332

November, 1971

## CIVIL DISORDER: A FEASIBILITY STUDY

A Report to

The Georgia Department of Public Safety

Colonel Ray Pope, Director

C. Michael York, Ph.D. E. Jo Baker, Ph.D. with the assistance of

John Humphrey, student

Alan Martin, student

School of Psychology Georgia Institute of Technology Atlanta, Georgia 30332

November, 1971

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

General acknowledgment is made to Colonel Ray Pope, Director, Georgia Department of Public Safety, who recognized the appropriateness of obtaining technical assistance through a university-based series of studies relating to civil disorder. Members of his immediate staff provided continuing support to the Georgia Tech Study Team throughout this feasibility study. Appreciation is extended particularly to Mr. Michael Hyde and to Lieutenant Carlton Fisher's planning division within the Department.

The original members of the Civil Disorder Technical Assistance Unit must be credited with the day-to-day liaison with the Study Team. As is true for any new project, some Departmental personnel time was required to familiarize the Study Team with the organizational structure of the Department. Lieutenants Ray Stephenson and Roy Womack shared this burden along with the tedium of submitting to interviews and in other ways providing necessary information to the Study Team. That they accomplished the task of making the new Unit functional in spite of a series of community crises and a lack of backup personnel warrants commendation. Their new role required that they deal with a complex phenomenon without the comfort of specific guidelines. A well-defined operations manual is not available for the emerging field of law enforcement which is beginning to be known as police-community relations.

At the Georgia Institute of Technology, several individuals contributed to the progress and effectiveness of this matching-funds contract between the Institute and the Georgia Department of Public Safety. Dr. Edward H. Loveland, as Director of the School of Psychology, actively supported the cooperative relationship between the two state agencies. As our colleagues, Dr. Loveland and Dr. Richard Davenport assited in the early planning of project activities. It should be stated that the two students, both Georgia natives, became deeply involved in a scholarly search for knowledge relating to violence and civil disorder. Finally, Mrs. Shirley Isbell was highly effective in accomplishing the myriad of details relating to her role as project secretary. TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ACKNO	DWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST C	OF TABLES	v
SUMM	ARY OF ACTIVITIES OF THE STUDY TEAM	vi
CHAPT	TER	
I.	PERSPECTIVE ON RIOTS	1
	Civil Disorder in Georgia General Symptoms of the Civil Disturbance Virus Specific Attempts by Others to Predict Riot Behavior	
IJ.	CITIZEN ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS	11
	Techniques for Assessing Attitudes Preliminary Data Collected by the Georgia Tech Study Team	
m.	AN INNOVATIVE APPROACH • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	16
	The Civil Disorder Technical Assistance Unit Two Case Studies: Milledgeville and Louisville Behaviors of CDTA Unit Representatives	
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	34
	Specific Recommendations Relating to the CDTA Unit A General Recommendation Research Proposal Ideas	
REFEF	RENCES IN THE REPORT NARRATIVE	41
APPEN	NDIX	
Α.	Stages within the Riot Process	43
в.	Bibliography Relating to Violence and Law Enforcement	44
с.	Preliminary Data Relating to Community Relations	49
D.	1970 Census Data by County and Race	63
E.	Summary Form for Reporting Civil Disorder	66
F.	Selected References Relating to a Potential Performance Effectiveness Study	68

## LIST OF TABLES

1.	Selected Data from an Opinion Questionnaire Administered to a College Sample	15
In A	ppendix C:	
2.	Public Perception and Attitude Relating to Civil Disorder and Law Enforcement (illustrative research design)	52
3.	Response Percentages Relating to Perceptions of the State Patrol	53
4.	Response Percentages Relating to Perceptions of the National Guard and Local Police	54
5.	Tentative Relationships among Two Personality Measures and Attitude toward Blacks	55
6.	Tentative Relationships among Selected Indices of Protest Sympathy, Contact with and Attitude toward Blacks and Authoritarian Personality	56
In A	Appendix D	
7.	Population Data by County and Race	63

## SUMMARY OF ACTIVITIES OF THE GEORGIA TECH STUDY TEAM TOWARD OBTAINING THE OBJECTIVES OF THE FEASIBILITY STUDY

# OBJECTIVE A: To become familiar with the organization and objectives of the CDTA Unit.

#### Activities:

- 1. Conferred with members of the Unit.
- 2. Held specific interviews.
- 3. Reviewed written material.

# OBJECTIVE B: To determine the kind of information that is available relative to the causes and the handling of civil disorders.

#### Activities:

- 1. Searched through various types of libraries and other collections of written material.
- 2. Attended symposia conducted at the national level relative to the study of violence, public attitudes, training of police officers, changing roles of law enforcement.
- 3. Conferred with individuals across the nation who had been or who are currently engaged in the study of various aspects of police-community relations, civil disorders, personnel selection.
- 4. Established a working relationship with specialists and provided for a mutual exchange of technical information.
- 5. Developed an annotated bibliography which has been provided to the CDTA Unit.

OBJECTIVE C: To explore techniques for assessing some of the indicants of social unrest and potential civil disorder and the perceived role of law enforcement agencies.

#### Activities:

- 1. Evaluated available techniques.
- 2. Developed and pretested an instrument which provided data relative to selected citizen attitudes toward the conditions which evoke violent activity, the violence itself, and the role of law enforcement.
- 3. Summarized an analysis of the pretest data which appears as a part of this report.
- 4. Obtained relevant 1970 census data and provided brief summary of population composition for all counties within the state.

# OBJECTIVE D: To analyze specific instances of recent civil disorders within the state.

#### Activities:

- 1. Monitored ongoing activities of CDTA Unit representative during assignment to specific areas of unrest.
- 2. Established a procedure for monitoring newspaper accounts of civil disorder.
- 3. Evaluated several approaches to case description that previously had been used.
- 4. Developed an analysis which includes a description of the precipitating conditions, initiating events, and critical behaviors.
- 5. Provided analyses of two instances of civil disorder.
- 6. Developed tentative guidelines for intervention activities of CDTA Unit representative assigned to a community crisis.

OBJECTIVE E: To provide the Department with specific recommendations that evolved through activities of the Study Team during the feasibility study.

#### Activity:

1. Developed recommendations directly related to maintaining and increasing the effective functioning of the CDTA Unit which are incorporated into this report.

OBJECTIVE F: To provide a suggested plan for future research.

#### Activity:

1. Formulated a plan of research based upon information obtained through conducting the feasibility study.

In addition to the above-stated objectives, the Study Team responded to requests for professional assistance from the Department, one of which involved providing psychological evaluations of candidates for a position in the CDTA Unit.

#### I. PERSPECTIVE ON RIOTS

1

Violence in the form of race riots and protest riots is not a new phenomenon in America. Observers have noted that riots tend to occur during periods of national stress. In the 1860's the fear of whites that the emancipation of slaves would cause a depression of wages and employment led to riots involving white and black laborers in the cities of Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, and New York.

After World War I, heightened tensions were associated with the prospect of large-scale unemployment which awaited servicemen returning from Europe. The nation's capital experienced confrontations between returning military people and blacks who had migrated to Washington looking for jobs. In the early 1940's, major riots occurred in Detroit and in Harlem within New York City.

The 1960's evidenced new factors relating to riots. No longer was the fear of unemployment the major cause of riots. The new civil disturbances were protest riots. They were precipitated by the actions of a people, poor and forced to live in slums, rising up against an affluent and indifferent society. This protest fever was further enhanced by the unrealized hopes of blacks that the civil rights legislation and the war on poverty would improve human relations within communities. One theorist (Wright, 1967) believes that current riots are the product of the historical stunting and distortion of the Negro self-image to the extent that they have come to think of themselves as adolescent, halfgrown individuals.

Three riots occurring during the Sixties illustrate the loss of many lives and extensive property damage. In 1960 the Harlem riot left 1 dead with 141 seriously injured (including 48 policemen). There were 519 arrests, and property losses from breakage, looting, and arson amounted to hundreds of thousands of dollars. In 1965 the sixday Watts riot recorded 34 persons killed, 1,032 injured, and 3,952 arrested. In 1967 the bloodiest and most damaging riot took place in Detroit where 40 persons were killed, 2,250 were injured, 4,000 were arrested, and property damage amounted to over 250-million dollars.

After the Watts riot Governor Brown of California created a commission charged with the responsibility of investigating the causes of violence and developing remedies against further outbreaks. The McCone Commission was one of five investigative bodies that were appointed following major outbreaks of violence from 1965 to 1968.

The Kerner Commission (1968) reported that the riots did not result from single precipitating incidents. Instead, eruptions of violent activity were generated out of an increasingly disturbed social atmosphere in which a series of tension-heightening incidents which took place over a period of weeks or months became linked in the minds of many in the black community with more underlying grievances. A relatively minor incident often was sufficient to trigger a display of violence. In approximately 50 per cent of the cases, the focal event related to police actions, usually a claim of police brutality.

Post-riot audits have revealed that only a small percentage of residents in the areas actually participated in the violence. In Detroit, for example, survey data (Kerner, 1968) indicated that only 11 per cent of the total population in the riot areas admitted participation in riot activity. Further, 16 per cent of the residents claimed that they acted as "counterrioters" and urged rioters to "cool it."

It should be noted that the recent outbreaks of urban violence did not appear without warning. A commission on civil rights appointed by President Truman in 1948 reported eleven years later that racial discrimination was seriously undermining the social fabric of the nation. These spokesmen specifically warned against the division of society into "two cities" (Baskin, 1969). Nine years later the Kerner Commission (1968) reached the same conclusion: "... our nation is moving toward two societies, one black and one white--separate and unequal."

#### <u>Civil</u> Disorder in Georgia

The State of Georgia was not immune to the significant increase in civil rights demonstrations and confrontations which occurred on the national level during the past decade. The City of Atlanta, in 1964, experienced almost daily racial trouble over the desegregation of public accommodations. National publicity was given to these events, including the mayor's street barrier associated with the famous Peyton Road blockbusting incident. State troopers were summoned to the college community of Athens when disturbances arose over the integration issue at the university. In other parts of the state during the 1960's community tension surfaced in Americus, Albany, and Savannah. Perhaps the most conspicuous and costly civil disturbance/riot situation was in Augusta which experienced a major racial confrontation in 1970.

If the local disturbance receives attention in the national newspapers, an abstracting team at Brandeis University's Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence excerpts the information into a standardized format. These descriptive briefs provide a nationwide archive of riots including those in Georgia--if the event received national publicity. One local confrontation received the following abstract:

Location: Social Circle, Georgia Date: February 14-15, 1968

CHARACTERISTICS: On February 14, state troopers drag fifty kicking biting demonstrators out of the path of school buses as blacks lie down to protest "deplorable conditions" at the all-black Social Circle Training School. The next day, 44 protestors arrested in a demonstration involving 100 blacks. After the arrests, a group of about 20 blacks unsuccessfully attempts to enroll several black students in the Social Circle Public School. On February 16, state troopers escort the buses to school via a back route, avoiding confrontation with 50 demonstrators, including 7 white University of Georgia students.

STATISTICS	S: Arrests:	46	Killed:	0
	Injured:	7	Property da	mage:
SOURCE:	The Washing Ann Arbor (N	ton Post, F lich.) News	ebruary 15-17, 19 ebruary 15-17, 196 , February 16, 17 oruary 16, 1968	68

4

#### General Symptoms of the Civil Disturbance Virus

Greater awareness of the symptoms and resulting social and economic costs of violence has been brought about through the large number of post-riot investigations. In the absence of prior research reports on crises in Georgia, these post-audits of riots in the North provided guidance in the categorization of general symptom areas. Before focusing specifically on events in Georgia, perhaps it would be helpful to the reader to outline several of these symptoms which have been digested from the urban-focused civil disturbance/race riot literature.

<u>Opinions and Attitudes</u>. Opinions are the surface evaluations or "what people are saying" about current events, persons, issues. Attitudes constitute the more established "feelings" people have toward another person, group, idea, or issue. A sudden upsurge in open statements against an issue or group or class of persons would be a signal of the opinion climate within a community. A more systematic barometer of the underlying public sentiment would be periodic use of attitude measures accomplished by means of interviews or mail surveys. Methodological considerations relating to this symptom area are discussed and illustrated more specifically in the next chapter.

<u>Racial Frictions</u>. Race riots are set in motion by a vast number of rumors, personal irritations, and situations adversely affecting the lives of far more people than those who take part in the violence. Symptoms of probable disturbances have not been catalogued specifically, but the general fever chart for racial disturbances includes the following: large numbers of black residents, high unemployment or "underemployment," presence of functioning civil rights groups, and spokesmen against discriminatory practices.

<u>Police Behavior</u>. This symptom area may be reflected in "ground swells," such as (1) increased distrust of the police by specific segments of the community and (2) increased number of arrests among certain kinds of people. An example of these kinds of symptoms would be the urgent demands by blacks for adequate representation on the police force, for equal treatment of prisoners, and for other implementation of constitutional rights. More and more headlines relating to these issues may be actual storm warnings.

Employment. "Keeping people in their place," in addition to the sheer fact of high unemployment, is an ancient strategy of social control used by authoritarians worldwide. This symptom was prevalent in the June, 1943, Packard strike and the related Detroit race riots. The issue in that community crisis involved the upgrading of three skilled black employees, an upgrading to which union contracts had entitled them. Things to watch for in this context are limited channels of collective bargaining, previously destitute individuals getting "big money" that can be spent in only a few limited but public areas, and abrupt black and white contact with one another without adequate preparation for working together sensibly and democratically.

Overcrowding. Subgroups who feel the pressure and competition for each other's "living space" begin to experience movements such as "white restriction" and "black expansion." In addition to housing facilities, city overcrowding can refer to services such as recreation and transportation. If these people resort to the futile tactic of blaming one another (for a situation for which neither may be to blame), this mutual abuse itself is a grave symptom.

<u>Juvenile Delinquency</u>. Although the youth have not been studied adequately in post-audits of riots, symptoms which deserve watching include: soaring arrests, emergence of teen gangs, reports from social workers of more children left to fend for themselves while their parents work.

<u>Demagogic Groups</u>. Groups of emotional anti-blacks and of emotional anti-whites flourish and die in many metropolitan American communities. These anti-democratic organizations can generate a climate of intolerance, giving organizational sanction for aggressive activities. In addition to breeding and sanctioning an "atmosphere" of intolerance, they also serve as rumor mills out of which the more intolerant get their ready-made prejudices. Such organizations also provide leadership, and possibly arouse rank-and-filers to jump into any riot situation.

<u>Rumors--the Verbal Milling Process.</u> If tension is prevalent in a community, the rumors that circulate take on a more purposive character. They cease being merely idle gossip; they become more biting and direct. Rumors symptomatic of race riots have generally gone through three stages: (1) tales of insults and discriminations, frequently traceable to subversive groups, then (2) stories of imminent violence, and finally (3) the crisis rumors, the inflammatory accounts of beatings.

7

## Specific Attempts by Others to Predict Riot Behavior

What are the major factors which would help in the prediction of future riots? Only recently have specialists who have considered the phenomena of civil disorder, riot, <sup>1</sup> or rebellion begun to formulate and test research models which incorporate specific variables (potential predictors pitted against behavioral indices such as riot endorsement or actual participation). The studies and reports of riot behavior which erupted in the 1940's (viz., Harlem and Detroit) went beyond mere description of the events; however, the resulting reports provide no explicit predictive model (Clark, 1944; Lee & Humphrey, 1943).

From the literature searches by the Georgia Tech Study Team, two recent attempts at prediction of general violence (riot) within prescribed communities serve to illustrate both the difficulty and promise of prediction models in the process of explaining and understanding civil disturbance.

The hypothesis that <u>isolated</u>, <u>powerless</u>, <u>dissatisfied individuals</u> are more prone to extremism was tested recently by Ransford (1968). The design for this study in California included three predictor variables (degree of white contact, perceived powerlessness in society, and perceived racial dissatisfaction) against the criterion of willingness to use violence. These variables, in combination, revealed the highest violenceproneness among a sample of 312 black males in Los Angeles.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Staff members at the Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence (Conant, 1968) have identified four major stages in the riot process. A summary of the riot stages is provided in Appendix A.

The variables included in a promising simulation model (Gawiser, 1969) of urban civil disorder were the degree of frustration or dissatisfaction, general attitude toward "the system," perceived results of violent action, and the perceived cultural norms on violence. The criterion was self-reported riot behavior in Cleveland. Three of the four predictor variables were found to be stable. These attempts at prediction at the Case Western Reserve University revealed high relationships with self-reported riot involvement. <u>Degree of dissatisfaction</u> was the most important predictor of riot involvement among a sample of 500 Cleveland residents, 78 per cent of whom were black.

Additional Literature Resources. A bibliography of resource materials which were uncovered and read by the Georgia Tech Study Team is given in Appendix B. The categorization of this wealth of information has been a difficult task. One approach, as more publications become available in the ensuing years, might be in terms of the miscellaneous <u>descriptive writings</u> (viz., books, speeches, journal articles), selected <u>theoretical</u> and predictive considerations relating to violence, and references which deal more specifically with <u>applications</u> by law enforcement agencies. Much of this information has been abstracted into a set of 5 by 8 cards for joint use by the present investigators and the Georgia Department of Public Safety. This library of reference literature will be useful in a range of training activities, in subsequent research studies, and in the development of a state-wide public information program relating to the prevention of civil disorder. For example, informal communication

9

with national law enforcement agencies such as the International Association of Chiefs of Police has revealed that only preliminary guidelines have been outlined with respect to the essential elements of a policecommunity relations program. Perhaps the present and future program of research studies in the State of Georgia will contribute to the translation of the various hypotheses and tested findings into effective "things to do."

## II. CITIZEN ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS

# Techniques for Assessing Attitudes

This section of the feasibility study report is in response to the Department's request for guidance relating to the measurement of public attitude. The general objective would be progress toward understanding the factors contributing to civil disorder in the state. The first summary statement should be that the methodology for appropriate studies is available as a result of knowledge and research experience among the behavioral and social scientists. As a review, the attitude measurement strategies can be categorized as observational methods (such as trained participant observers living in communities) and the self-report method which involves asking individuals their attitudinal position on specific issues or social objects. An innovative approach in recent years is the search for unobtrusive measures which might reflect the direction and intensity of attitude bearing on the issue in question. Some spokesmen say that 95 per cent of prior attitude research has relied on the second approach--self-reported expression of attitude. The particular techniques for data collection by the self-report method range from the extensive interview or lengthy questionnaire to an abbreviated poll-type questioning or brief paper-and-pencil instruments such as attitude scales. The medium for transmission of the responses might be the face-to-face interview, the telephone, or the public mail service.

Scarcity of Measures Predictive of Violence. It has become apparent to the Study Team that no ready-made measure of community tension and prediction of civil disorder is available for immediate application in the State of Georgia. The scholars who have focused most extensively on community violence admit to difficulties both in conceptualizing the problem and in making operational a search for causative factors (Conant & Levin, 1969). As in the study of other complex behavioral phenomena, promising variables have been identified and measured against limited criteria and among selected samples of individuals. Examples of these kinds of studies were given at the beginning of this chapter and continue-with respect to attitudes--in the next section.

<u>Measuring Selected Views of Race Relations and Law Enforcement</u>. The format and kind of information elicited by more than one of the attitude measurement approaches will be illustrated through the mention of several recent studies. An item from a nationwide Gallup poll conducted in July, 1967, had the following format and resulting data.

, .	In your opinion, how well do you think Negroes are treated in this communitythe same as whites are, not very well, or badly?							
-	Same as <u>Whites</u>	Not Very Well	<u>Bad</u>	<u>Don't Know</u>				
Men	72%	18%	2%	8%				
Women	72%	13%	2%	13%				

To understand better how Americans feel about violence, a University of Michigan team (Blumenthal, Kahn, & Andrews, 1971) conducted interviews in the summer of 1969 among 1,374 men across the country. Unemployment, discrimination, and lack of education were viewed as causes

#### of violence, and

65 per cent mentioned some form of violence when asked about worries they had about America;

only 30 per cent saw prevention through police force; a solid consensus among these men wanted the use of police force in a threatening situation kept to a minimum.

Numerous post-riot surveys have been conducted and reported. The following two studies illustrate the measurement approaches usually taken. A questionnaire was mailed to 500 white people in 20 different neighborhoods in Rochester two weeks after the July, 1964, riots (Harper, 1968). No age or sex differences were found in the opinion data, but greater hostility was expressed by individuals living a few blocks distant from Negro families than by residents in the "one block away" and "suburban" categories. Reynolds (1968) reports the findings from interviews held among Omaha riot participants. Of the 163 participants interviewed, 147 had been arrested--all were Negro and only 6 were women. Unemployment, or the inability to hold a job, was given as a major reason for rioting. They indicated that a George Wallace speech set off the demonstrations.

An analysis of causal factors in college disruption was accomplished by Astin (1970) through mailed questionnaires to more than 400 campuses in America. Indicators of protest proneness (regardless of issue) included little student-faculty interaction, students not verbally aggressive in class, incohesiveness, and permissive policies relating to drinking. The absolute number of blacks was directly related to the probability of protest over racial policies.

# Preliminary Data Collected by the Georgia Tech Study Team

The Georgia Tech Study Team constructed a preliminary questionnaire relating to citizen views on selected aspects of race relations. Initial data were obtained from a white college sample, thus the findings are not generalizable to all Georgians. Yet, some of the results have grave implications for governmental planning over the ensuing years. These descriptive data are given in Appendix C along with a selected bibliography of other studies and resource materials relating to attitude measurement, in the context of civil disorder. A sampling of these findings is highlighted in Table 1 to illustrate the views of these young, white males.

In summary, it is very clear that this sample of individuals believes the statement by the Kerner Commission relating to "separate and unequal" societies in America. They overwhelmingly feel that protest against discrimination is justifiable--in employment, in education, in housing. About three out of four express sympathy with the aims of civil rights demonstrations. In terms of institutional progress in reducing these inequities, they rate the Supreme Court and Congress very high, whereas only 34 per cent feel that the State Government has helped the Negro (39 per cent felt it has "kept down" the Negro). The city of Atlanta received a more favorable rating. Approximately 4 in 10 of these young, white males believe that police brutality exists against Negroes. The overall perception of the State Patrol was relatively favorable on dimensions such as fairness and effectiveness.

# Table 1

# Selected Data from An Opinion Questionnaire Administered to a College Sample (white males)

Negroes are disci	imina	ted again	nst:								
yes		-	98%								
no	no					0%					
not sure		2%	2%								
Justification of protest against discrimination											
in	in employment: in education: in housing:										
yes	860	70	89	%		86%					
no	79	%	5	%	7%						
not sure	79	%	-	7%		7%					
Posture of institutions with respect to Negroes:											
S	upren	ne Court	Congres	ss Sta	ite Go	v't. A	.tlanta				
helped	869	76	80%		34%		61%				
kept down	20	76	7%		39% 20		20%				
not sure	119	76	14%		27%		18%				
Believe police brutality exists against Negroes:											
true			39%								
not true			32%								
Sympathy with the aims of civil rights demonstrations:											
yes, and I have personally participated 10%											
yes, but I hav	ated	ed 68%									
no, not sympathetic 23%											
Worked with blacks on an equal basis:											
	yes					85%					
no	15%	15%									
Have belonged to	a soci	al club o	r attende	d a so	cial g	gatheri	ng with				
blacks:						-	-				
yes	yes					63%					
no			37%								
Perceptions of the State Patrol (rated on 1-7 scales between the											
paired adjectives	-perc	entage d	ata)								
unfair	0 3	3 4 2	2 28	39	41	fair					
bad	0 1	. 1 <b>1</b>	2 24	52	11	good					
undisciplined	1 4	0 1	0 25	45	14	discipl	lined				
unfriendly	26	6 2	4 32	16	7	friend	ly				
ineffective	0 2	2 3 1	5 26	47	6	effecti	ve				

.

## III. AN INNOVATIVE APPROACH

It is not the purpose of this report to develop a treatise on the problems confronting society. The following statements are included to point out some aspects of the prevailing social climate which is fostering outbursts of violent activity.

The passage and the attempted enforcement of civil rights legislation have jolted lifelong attitudes and life styles of both blacks and whites. Particularly in the South, many previously unchallenged modes of behavior and forms of interpersonal relationships are no longer tenable. However healthy it may be for long-term development, an unstable social structure tends to produce friction and to generate anxiety and tension. In their struggle to gain and/or maintain social and economic power, groups and individuals become increasingly sensitive to any perceived threat to their former position or to their newly acquired or anticipated status.

It is within this climate that incidences of friction are occurring which threaten to exceed the tolerances of citizens as well as law enforcement agencies. There are instances when individuals in positions of authority or agencies charged with the responsibility of maintaining order and enforcing the law have been either unwilling or unable to overcome personal prejudices and to adjust to changes in the social order

16

that have been impressed upon them. In many cases, their actions have tended to "fan the flames" of smoldering resentment on the part of one group and fear of encroachment on the part of the other, thus increasing the probability of an eruption of violent activity. For example, reports of brutal treatment of blacks by members of law enforcement agencies have often triggered outbursts of violent activity.

It is worthy of note that in the State of Georgia where various forms of law enforcement have been caricatured on the national scene by newspaper and magazine articles, by motion pictures, and by television skits and commercials, an innovative approach to coping with civil violence has been developed.

#### The Civil Disorder Technical Assistance Unit

The Civil Disorder Technical Assistance Unit was developed primarily to offer firsthand evaluation, advice, and other forms of assistance to requesting communities. A major activity was to foster communication between polarized groups by means of nonuniformed men who would serve as listeners and catalysts for improved policecommunity relations.

Broader departmental objectives relating to civil disorder are encompassed in the following goal-statement:

... to advise, coordinate, and participate in the detection, prevention, and control of civil disturbance.

The function of <u>detection</u> is an information-gathering process, particularly in the monitoring of disturbance symptoms across the

17

state (by telephone, newspaper clippings, liaison with numerous organizations, and research assistance relating to public attitude and other social indicators of tension and potential unrest).

The function of <u>prevention</u> is an ideal approach in various aspects of community life. Preventive strategies are preferable to corrective action, although the activities often appear more remote, less tangible, and less visible in the eyes of the public and even among the program participants. The implementation of this function has involved coordinative efforts with the office of the Governor, the State Patrol, and other police agencies in the direction of improved community relations. The increased emphasis placed on police-community relations by the Governor and the Georgia Department of Public Safety supports the preventative function.

The <u>control</u> function has consisted mainly of responding to community requests for assistance made to the Governor or to the Georgia Department of Public Safety. A member of the CDTA Unit (in plain clothes) departs immediately to the town or city, visits the requesting mayor, the chief of police, and the leadership of the dissident group. The goal of developing lines of communication is pursued in an effort to reduce existing conflict. In some instances, this activity would be categorized as "preventative," but to date most of the requests for policecommunity relations assistance have been anxious pleas made to the Department after the disturbance is imminent or already is under way. The more traditional and costly control procedure of "sending in troopers" under the direction of the Governor continues to be available. During the summer of 1971, the public in Georgia and the nation was very much aware of the dispatch of riot squads to the cities of Chattanooga, Columbus, and Macon.

A focal activity of the Civil Disorder Technical Assistance Unit is that of making an evaluation of specific community crises. Factors in the evaluation should include but not be limited to an estimate of the causative factors, the level of intensity, the number of dissidents involved in relation to the population affected, the prevailing community attitude, and the communication ability among the potentially polarized groups. If personnel of the State Patrol are summoned to the crisis area, the CDTA Unit has the additional responsibility of advising the Director of the Georgia Department of Public Safety on the observed command performance and adherance to operational procedures.

## Two Case Studies: Milledgeville and Louisville

Two civil disturbances in Georgia, one in Milledgeville and the other in Louisville, in which the CDTA Unit intervened during the time phase of the present study, have been selected for analysis. On-sight observations of ongoing events were precluded by delays in obtaining formal approval of the contract which necessitated reallocation of the investigators' time. The following statements are based upon information obtained through personal interviews with two representatives of the CDTA Unit and with an intern assigned to the Unit during the summer months. Additional data were obtained from written accounts of the events provided by the CDTA Unit.

Within the constraints of available information, an effort has been made to identify the precipitating conditions and the initiating events which seemed to trigger overt expressions of protest in these two areas. Those behaviors or conditions that appear to be primarily attributable to the CDTA Unit are indicated by asterisks. Although exhaustive compilations and analyses of events are beyond the scope of the present study, particular attention has been given to salient conditions and explicit behaviors that either directly affected or, if carried out, could have affected the intensity and/or duration of the conflict.

Ideally, observations would have been made on two similar conflict situations, with CDTA Unit intervention involved in only one. Obviously, such niceties are reserved to laboratory situations. Lacking such direct comparison, the following summaries should enable some evaluation to be made of the effect of CDTA Unit intervention in these two incidents of civil disturbance.

20

# Louisville (Jefferson County) May - July, 1971

As is true in many areas in the South where cultural mores are undergoing drastic changes, formal, overt expressions of dissatisfaction appear, then subside, only to reappear. The CDTA Unit usually becomes involved only when violent eruptions occur or threaten to occur. In Louisville the blacks had tried unsuccessfully for a long period of time to obtain redress for long-existing grievances. At the time the schools were integrated, they negotiated an agreement with the white leaders to maintain an equal ratio of black-to-white school principals, although the ratio of black-to-white citizens was about sixty to forty. <sup>1</sup> A breakdown of this agreement represented to the blacks not only a step backward in their arduous struggle for recognition but, more importantly, a loss of confidence in any black-white agreement. The following statements relate to the intervention of the CDTA Unit at different times over a three-month interval.

- I. May, 1971
  - A. Precipitating conditions:
    - Long-standing grievances, e.g., poor roads, unsanitary living conditions, etc., by black citizens against local power structure.
    - 2. Alleged history of unequal treatment of blacks by local law enforcement agencies.
    - 3. Unequal representation of blacks on school board.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>The 1970 census data for Jefferson County indicate the population to be 3, 783 white males and 4, 086 white females and 4, 363 black males and 4, 942 black females.

- B. Initiating events:
  - 1. School board's decision to replace retiring black principal with white man although qualified blacks were available.
  - 2. Assistance of national black organization.
- C. Factors that tended (or might have tended) to <u>increase</u> tension or to prolong conflict:
  - 1. Overreaction to rumors by local law enforcement official.
  - 2. Provocative actions by local law enforcement official, e.g., comments made to citizens, request for troopers, taking pictures of participants.
  - 3. Control of situation assumed by national black organization.
- D. Factors that tended (or might have tended) to <u>decrease</u> tension or to resolve conflict:
  - 1. Refusal by leader of local unit of the Department of Public Safety to respond to emotional request for outside assistance.
  - \*2. Communication with city officials and with leaders of protesters to separate rumor from fact about proposed activities of protesters.
  - \*3. Persuasion of local law enforcement official to modify arbitrary decision about legal protest activity.
  - \*4. Initiation of personal contact with black leaders in their own area, often at their homes.
  - \*5. Development of working relationship with some of the black leaders.
  - \*6. Ascertainment from black leaders of the real bases of the blacks' dissatisfaction.

Behavior attributable to CDTA Unit.

- II. June, 1971
  - A. Precipitating conditions:
    - 1, 2, 3 same as for I.
  - B. Initiating events:
    - 1, 2 same as for I.
    - 3. Failure of school board to renew contracts of outspoken black teachers.
    - 4. Unsatisfactory explanation of events surrounding black prisoner found hanged in jail.
  - C. Factors that tended (or might have tended) to <u>increase</u> tension or to prolong conflict:
    - 1, 2, 3 same as for I.
    - 4. Inability of black leaders to arrange meeting with representatives of local power structure.
    - 5. Emotional intervention by leader of national organization.
    - 6. Excessive anxiety on part of local law enforcement official which fostered his tendency to overreact to rumors.
    - 7. Request by local law enforcement official for presence of troopers.
    - 8. Overreaction by individual member of law enforcement agency.
    - 9. Multiple provocative actions on part of local law enforcement official which tended to increase fear of white citizens and to widen schism between blacks and whites.
    - 10. Refusal of local official to set bond for arrestees.
    - 11. Reluctance of city officials to meet with nonresident black leaders.
    - 12. Expressed intent of city official to communicate to black leaders by mail the city's response to their demands.

- D. Factors that tended (or might have tended) to <u>decrease</u> tension or to resolve conflict:
  - \*1. Immediate appraisal of situation through communication with law enforcement officials, representatives of local power structure, and black leaders (working relationship previously established).
  - \*2. Meeting arranged between black leaders and representative of local power structure.
  - \*3. Relaxation of minor requirement regarding protest activities.
  - \*4. Agreement of law enforcement official to withdraw request for troopers.
  - \*5. Open communication with interested individuals outside immediate area, e.g., representative of U. S. Department of Justice, Community Relations Division.
  - 6. Peaceful disbursement of antagonistic groups of blacks and whites.
  - \*7. Bargain with blacks: set bond for black arrestees upon promise of no violence.
  - \*8. Agreement by city official to call meeting of black leaders, both resident and nonresident, and to communicate personally the city's response to their demands.
  - \*9. Projection of future potential forms of protest.
- III. June-July, 1971
  - A. Precipitating conditions:
    - 1, 2, 3 same as for I and II.
  - B. Initiating events:
    - 1, 2, 3, 4 same as for I and II.
  - C. Factors that tended (or might have tended) to <u>increase</u> tension or to prolong conflict
    - 1. City officials vote to deny blacks a permit to picket local stores in order to grant local merchants a permit to parade for special sales day.

- 2. Picketing by blacks prior to time their permit became effective (requested extension of time had been denied).
- 3. Arrest of pickets.
- 4. Open meeting of blacks to protest arrest of pickets.
- 5. Refusal of city official to set bond for arrestees.
- 6. Alleged brutality toward arrestees by law enforcement representatives.
- 7. Provocative acts by white citizens; alleged threats, etc.
- 8. Development of white "vigilante" group.
- D. Factors that tended (or might have tended) to <u>decrease</u> tension or to resolve conflict:
  - \*1. Agreement of city officials and local merchants to grant picketing permit.
  - \*2. Agreement of blacks to disburse upon promise of CDTA Unit representative to try to arrange for bond for arrestees.
  - \*3. Contact and open communication maintained with black leaders; unfounded rumors stopped.
  - \*4. Release of female juvenile arrestees.
  - \*5. Physician and black ministers escorted to public works camp to meet with arrestees.
  - \*6. Effect of above-mentioned visit (#5) determined by discussing with blacks.
  - \*7. Assistance from GBI agent obtained at request of black citizens and city officials.
  - 8. Reasonable bond set for arrestees conditioned upon promise of no violence.
  - \*9. Assessment of situation and projection of probable further activities.
  - \*10. Biracial committee established to work on resolving long-standing problems.

Milledgeville (Baldwin County)<sup>1</sup> February - May 1971

Tension that had been building up in the Milledgeville area for some time was accentuated by orders to integrate the local schools. A representative of the U. S. Department of Justice, Community Relations Division, had been involved in the resolution of some problems encountered in the integration of school buses.

The following statements relate to two separate incidents in Milledgeville in which a representative of the CDTA Unit was involved. The first was a relatively minor incident in which the CDTA Unit representative's activity was restricted primarily to appraisal of the situation. The second incident was of longer duration and involved a complex interaction of many variables.

I. February, 1971

- A. Precipitating condition:
  - 1. Unsatisfactory conditions at a high school.
- B. Initiating event:
  - 1. Walkout of approximately 100 students.
- C. Factors that tended (or might have tended) to <u>increase</u> tension or to prolong conflict:
  - 1. Request from school official that police chief communicate threat of suspension to students.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Summary census data for Baldwin County are provided in Appendix D. The 1970 data are: 10,047 white males and 11,217 white females and 6,113 black males 6,863 black females. Within the City of Milledgeville, however, the racial comparison is 2,773 white males and 3,594 white females and 2,392 black males and 2,842 black females.

- D. Factors that tended (or might have tended) to <u>decrease</u> tension or resolve conflict:
  - 1. Refusal by police chief to become involved in school disciplinary action.
- **II.** March-May, 1971
  - A. Precipitating conditions:
    - 1. History of paternalism toward black citizens by local power structure.
    - 2. Alleged history of unequal treatment of black and white by law enforcement officers.
    - 3. Return to Milledgeville of young activist college students.
    - 4. Pressures exerted by law enforcement officials against local drug traffic.
    - 5. Publicity regarding alleged severe beating of black prisoner by law enforcement officials.
    - 6. Resentment built up in law enforcement officials as result of many clashes with blacks.
  - B. Initiating events:
    - 1. Walkout of approximately fifty students.
    - 2. Picketing of local stores by students.
  - C. Factors that tended (or might have tended) to <u>increase</u> tension or to prolong conflict:
    - 1. Harrassment of shoppers by pickets.
    - 2. Pressure on conservative blacks to boycott local merchants and shop outside city.
    - 3. Refusal of black leaders to meet with representatives of local power structure.
    - 4. Mayor's refusal to "go" to blacks for discussion of issues.
    - 5. Mass arrest of pickets.

- 7. Setting of excessive bonds for arrestees.
- \*8. Change of CDTA Unit representative assigned to problem area.
- 9. Arrest of black man and wife which resulted in treatment at hospital for wife.
- 10. Inability of black citizens to agree upon selection of representatives to biracial committee.
- 11. Conflict among blacks regarding value of assistance from national black organization.
- 12. Walkout of approximately 200 high school students who then disrupted classes at other schools.
- 13. Divisiveness among black leaders; distrust of one another.
- 14. Complaint of police brutality toward black arrestee.
- D. Factors that tended (or might have tended) to <u>decrease</u> tension or to resolve conflict:
  - \*1. Contact initiated with black leaders.
  - \*2. Agreement of local power structure representative to meet with blacks upon brief notice.
  - \*3. Decision made (with police chief) not to call in troopers.
  - \*4. Pickets being photographed as they harrassed shoppers and interfered with traffic.
  - \*5. Discussion with black leaders regarding the probable undesirable consequences (e.g., prison records) of their contemplated action and possible alternative methods (e.g., meeting with power structure).
  - 6. Assistance of representative of U. S. Justice Department, Community Relations Division, in persuading black leaders to meet with city officials.
  - \*7. Meetings between black leaders and city officials.

<sup>\*</sup>Behavior attributable to CDTA Unit.

- \*8. Mayor's agreeing to confer with black leaders before publicizing response of city officials to demands of black citizens.
- \*9. Visit made to arrestees in prison in order to listen to their complaints.
- \*10. Mayor's agreement to "go" to black area and talk with leaders.
- \*11. Black leaders escorted to prison in order to talk with arrestees.
- \*12. Conservative black leaders perceived by other blacks as being responsible for reduction in bonds.
  - 13. Mayor's agreement to permit representatives of blacks to observe activities at prison.
- \*14. Transfer of confidence by black leaders from one CDTA Unit representative to another.
- \*15. Agreement by city officials to grant special permit to picket.
- \*16. Communication maintained with individual black leaders.
- \*17. Meeting between black citizens, white citizens, and city officials.
- \*18. Agreement involving mutual trust between black leaders and city officials, e.g., remove troopers on promise of no violence.
- \*19. Efforts made to establish a biracial committee.
- \*20. Integration of police cars on 11 to 7 shift.
- \*21. Compromise between black petitioners and city officials regarding time limit of rally permit.
- \*22. Hearing arranged by police chief about latest charge of police brutality.
- 23. Breakdown in organization among blacks and general dissipation of energy over prolonged struggle.

## Effective Behaviors of CDTA Unit Representatives

From an analysis of the events in Louisville and Milledgeville, the following summaries or outlines have been developed. The first outline describes the typical pattern of behavior followed by CDTA Unit representatives after being assigned to a situation involving actual or potential civil disorder. It should be emphasized that the "pattern" is a typical one, open to modification for specific situations.

The second summary lists some of the behaviors that the CDTA Unit representatives have utilized effectively to develop and facilitate communication between protesters and representatives of local power structures and to reduce the level of tension within a specific area. By no means should it be construed as a comprehensive catalogue of behaviors.

- 1. Report of civil disturbance or potential disturbance in a community made to Department of Public Safety usually by
  - a. representative of local power structure, e.g., mayor, city councilman, or
  - b. representative of local law enforcement agency, e.g., chief of police, sheriff, commander of Department of Public Safety unit, or
  - c. concerned citizen.
- 2. CDTA Unit representative assigned to problem.
- 3. CDTA Unit representative goes to area and contacts
  - a. representative of local power structure, e.g., mayor, and
  - b. representative of local law enforcement agencies, e.g., chief of police, sheriff, commander of local Department of Public Safety unit,

for the purposes of

- (1) assessing current situation, and
- (2) obtaining names and other information about leaders of disturbing or potentially disturbing group.

## He then contacts

c. the leaders of the disturbing or potentially disturbing group, including representatives of national organizations if involved,

#### for the purposes of

- laying groundwork for working relationship, e.g., gaining confidence, developing good communication,
- (2) determining bases for current dissatisfaction,
- (3) determining underlying problems, e.g., previous unsatisfactory relationships with law enforcement agencies, political intrigue, etc.,
- (4) determining immediate plans (if any) of protesting group for manifesting dissatisfaction,
- (5) pointing out to them the probable results of contemplated action (e.g., for illegal behavior--arrest and prison record), and
- (6) suggesting alternative approaches to gain redress, e.g., petitions, meeting with representatives of power structure, etc.
- 4. CDTA Unit representative again contacts representatives of power structure and law enforcement agencies and suggests action to attenuate friction, e.g., meetings, or development of biracial committees.
- 5. CDTA Unit representative also contacts the appropriate representative of the U. S. Department of Justice, Community Relations Division. This contact may take place immediately upon the CDTA Unit's involvement in the problem or at any time thereafter.

- 6. The number and types of individuals contacted thereafter vary depending upon the degree of constancy in
  - a. leadership of aggrieved groups,
  - b. involvement of national organizations in local problem,
  - c. kinds of problems involved, e.g., bases for the dissatisfaction, and
  - d. level of tension and potential for spread of violent activity.
- 7. As quickly as possible, the CDTA Unit representative transfers back to local officials the responsibility for following through in the resolution of conflict.

Behaviors of CDTA Unit representative found to be effective toward attaining goal of conflict resolution.

- A. Objective: To establish communication with leaders of dissident group.
  - 1. Dress casually (sport clothes, not too flashy).
  - 2. Initiate contact with leaders of dissident group by going to their environment (popular cafe, lodge, street corner, home).
  - 3. Utilize "spacer," if available, to gain more rapid acceptance (a moderate, respected leader or a representative of the U. S. Department of Justice, Community Relations Division, especially if he has previously established rapport with them).
  - 4. Clearly delineate own position and role in current situation.
  - 5. Develop some degree of empathy with dissidents if they have valid reasons for protesting, but maintain own identity as liaison.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Based upon two case studies.

- 1. Lay foundation for personal contact by transferring to each group some information about the probable stance of the other.
- 2. Arrange meeting between leaders of both groups.
- 3. If possible, include in the meeting some moderate leaders along with the more radical leaders.
- 4. During the meeting, try to maintain both an objective position and a focus upon the overall objectives of the meeting.
- 5. Try to restate issues, demands, or responses to clarify ambiguities.
- 6. When made an issue, publicly acknowledge commitments made to either group.
- C. Objective: To decrease the level of tension and/or decrease the probability of violent outbursts.
  - 1. Clearly communicate to the leaders of the dissident group the probable undesirable consequences of any anticipated violent activity (violate the law--arrest, criminal record, etc.)
  - 2. Clearly communicate to the appropriate representatives of the power structure the probable consequences of any anticipated action that appears to be undesirable relative to conflict resolution (setting excessive bonds for riot participants, refusing to grant a reasonable request for demonstrations).
  - 3. In both of the above-stated situations, suggest more acceptable alternatives toward attaining the desired objectives.
  - 4. Whenever possible, reinforce the leadership position of the more moderate leaders.
  - 5. Capitalize upon opportunities to negotiate, particularly if they involve an element of trust for either the dissidents or the power structure.
  - 6. Promise no more than can reasonably expect to deliver.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

That the CDTA Unit has attained such notable achievements within the short period of its existence is due primarily to the individual personalities and capabilities of the members of the Unit. The acceptance of an assignment for which they had not been trained specifically and for which the appropriate behaviors were not known engendered in them some degree of anxiety. Their anxiety and feelings of insecurity were intensified by the fact that the nature of the assignment removed from them the highly valued accoutrements with which they had closely identified over the span of their service with the Department--the trooper uniform, the holster, the gun. The perception of their activities by their peers reduced the moral support that usually accompanies common activities. The nature of the activities required to attain the objectives of the Unit was perceived by many members of the Department as "consorting with the enemy." Even the local officials in a strife-ridden area who benefitted by activities of the Unit managed to get in a few gibes, such as referring to them as "our experts in Negro-ology." For these men who were reared in the South with its traditions of separation of the races to have overcome their own personal feelings, in addition to coping with the situations mentioned above, and still to have accomplished their objectives is worthy of high commendation. Specific Recommendations Relating to the CDTA Unit

Selection of Personnel. Careful consideration should be given to each

new assignment to the Unit, with particular attention being focused upon the individual's attitudinal system and personality characteristics. From the observations and analyses of the Georgia Tech Study Team, it appears that an individual assigned to this Unit, in addition to having attained the good judgment and other complex capabilities required of a trooper, must also possess a high degree of flexibility, tolerance, and sensitivity. In addition, the effective functioning of a Unit member depends to some extent upon his insight into his own attitudes and prejudices and his awareness regarding the biasing effect of those attitudes. In this connection, the Study Team assembled a battery of psychological tests and personal interview techniques.

Expansion of Unit. Additional personnel are needed to implement stated objectives of the Unit other than those which are directly related to emergencies. Even if assigned to the Unit on a temporary basis, the carefully selected personnel should be oriented with respect to the Department's philosophy concerning the Unit and its mission, and they should undergo training in the basic techniques so as to be skill-ready in time of crisis.

With adequate personnel, appropriately selected and well-trained Unit representatives could interact with various law enforcement agencies and with members of the power structure in small towns to establish rapport and to familiarize them with the objectives and functions of the Unit. From these kinds of interactions additional information could be obtained relating to the areas and causes of potential outbreaks of violence in the state. The representatives also could interact with various civic, religious, and governmental organizations, including the administrators, faculties, and students at educational institutions, to increase their awareness of the complex, changing role of law enforcement officials. Hopefully, existing negative perceptions of law enforcement would be reduced through these personal interactions in selected communities in the state.

<u>Training</u>. To prepare them for their new roles, newly assigned personnel should be given intensive training relative to the emerging field of police-community relations. An important part of their function relates to group activity, such as the development and/or improvement of goaloriented communication between dissidents and local authorities. The provision of training in specific techniques relative to coping with these types of group situations should increase their level of confidence and their efficiency.

<u>Systematic Modifications</u>. The composition of the CDTA Unit and the procedures followed should be varied systematically in an effort to develop the most effective task force. For example, the substitution of one representative for another in an ongoing situation in 1971 was found to delay progress for a few days. Fortunately, no loss other than delay occurred. The use of pairs of representatives might be tried, either both white or one white and one black. Another modification might involve the explicit utilization of a "spacer" (e.g., a black moderate). The individuals directly involved in crisis situations could suggest other meaningful modifications which, if feasible, could be made operative. Precise data must be recorded so that some objective evaluation can be made of each modification.

<u>Standardized Reporting.</u> In addition to the narrative reports now being written, a standard form should be completed by the Unit representative assigned to a crisis situation. Standardized data reporting is necessary not only for evaluative efforts but to provide other useful information to the Department regarding the types of behaviors that tend to increase or to decrease tension and polarization. A preliminary version of a summary form developed by the Study Team is reproduced in Appendix E.

<u>Statement of Objectives</u>. A clear statement should be made of both the general and the specific objectives of the Department relating to civil disorders. If detection, prevention, and control remain as the general objectives, then specific statements should accompany each goal for clarification. Behaviorally-defined objectives are not only prerequisites for evaluative studies; they are also necessary for effective internal and external communication.

#### A General Recommendation

By establishing the CDTA Unit, the Department of Public Safety has again demonstrated its progressive approach to law enforcement. So that a larger audience might benefit from its experience and progressive thinking, it is recommended that the Department consider undertaking an active program of instruction relating to the general topic of police-community relations. The overall objective of such a program would be to increase the sensitivity of law enforcement agencies and other relevant individuals to the major variables involved in community tension, particularly those involving race relations. The methods of instruction might vary from briefings to lecture-discussion classes and training workshops with some sessions involving role playing.

One specific type of material that could be distributed to the participants is the 29-page public service booklet which provides summary statements of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. Copies of this summary are available (at \$10 a hundred) from the numerous sponsoring agencies, such as the Atlanta-based Southern Regional Council.

#### Research Proposal Ideas

The feasibility study by the Georgia Tech Study Team identified several areas of research need within the Department of Public Safety. Although the focus during the summer of 1971 was on the Department's innovative response to civil disorder in the state, it became obvious to the Study Team that a specific function such as the CDTA Unit is not isolated from other departmental activities relating to the protection of life and property in Georgia. The civil disorder experience illustrated vividly the changing role of police work in general, the lack of consensus about what effective performance entails, and the public's ambivalence with respect to what they expect from these public servants.

Two broad areas needing study that have been identified relate, on the one hand, to <u>internal</u> problems such as the selection and development of personnel and, on the other, to <u>external</u> problems such as the changing expectations of the public relative to functions of law enforcement officials, particularly at the state level. From each of these broad areas, a research proposal idea has been formulated which deserves, and is amenable to, immediate research attention. Specific, detailed research proposals relating to the following two studies can only be developed through discussions with appropriate representatives of the Department of Public Safety.

<u>Public Perception of and Attitude toward State Police and Civil</u> <u>Disorder</u>. In order to understand the phenomenon of violent activity in Georgia, information is needed from representative segments of the population regarding their attitudes toward the justification, the effects, and the control of violence. Some approaches to the study of the phenomenon have been made at the national level (see references in Appendix C) and to some extent, in the large metropolitan cities. No known studies have been directed toward residents in small towns, in rural areas, or even in the South as a whole.

The first objective of the proposed study would involve the construction of an appropriate instrument or instruments. As a part of the feasibility study, some elements of a potential instrument which were either obtained from previous studies or developed by the Study Team were administered to one segment of the population. Further refinement of the instrument is required. In addition, procedures must be developed to facilitate the collection of information from other segments of the population.

Performance Evaluation of the State Police. Evaluation of police

performance is difficult both because of a lack of adequate, observable criteria and because of the multidimensional nature of, and changing role of, the police officer's job (Peres, 1958; Wetteroth, 1971). A further complication is the fact that supervisors generally experience only limited contact during most of the officer's shift (Robinson, 1970). The development of performance criteria specifically tailored to the state police mission is a prerequisite to other efforts toward modernization and professionalization of an agency such as the Georgia State Patrol.

The first objective of the proposed study would be the construction of a reliable criterion measure which then could be used in subsequent selection, training, and evaluation procedures relating to state troopers. An illustration of the development of an evaluation form for highway patrolmen by psychologists at the Ohio State University is provided in Appendix F.

#### REFERENCES IN THE REPORT NARRATIVE

- Astin, A. W. Campus disruption, 1968-69: An analysis of causal factors. In Karten, F. F., Cook, S. W., & Lacey, J. I. (Eds.), <u>Psychology and the problems of society</u>. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, 1970, 377-387.
- Baskin, J. <u>Urban racial violence in the twentieth century</u>. Beverly Hills: Glencoe Press, 1969.
- Blumenthal, M., Kahn, R. L., & Andrews, F. <u>Men's attitudes toward</u> <u>violence</u>. Institute for Social Research Project Report, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, May, 1971.
- Bureau of Census. <u>1970 census of population Georgia</u>. Report PC (V2)-12, February, 1971.
- Clark, K. B. Group violence: A preliminary study of the attitudinal pattern of its acceptance and rejection; the 1943 Harlem riot. Journal Social Psychology, 1944, 19, 319-377.
- Conant, R. W. Rioting, insurrection and civil disobedience. <u>American</u> Scholar, 1968, <u>37</u>, 420-433.
- Conant, R., & Levin, M. <u>Problems in research on community violence</u>. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1969.
- Gawiser, S. R. <u>Towards a simulation model of urban civil disorder</u>. Unpublished MA thesis. Cleveland: Case Western Reserve University, June, 1969.
- Harper, D. White reactions to a riot. In Masotti, L. H., & Bowen, D. R. (Eds.), <u>Riots and rebellion</u>. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1968.
- Kerner, O. <u>Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Dis</u>order. New York: Bantam Books, 1968.

- Lee, A. M., & Humphrey, N. D. <u>Race riot</u>. New York: Dryden Press, 1943.
- Lee, A. M., & Humphrey, N. D. <u>Race riot</u>. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1968.
- Peres, S. H. <u>A diagnostic forced-choice evaluation of highway patrol-</u> <u>men.</u> Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1958. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1971, No. 59-411.
- Ransford, H. E. Isolation, powerlessness and violence: A study of attitudes and participation in the Watts riot. <u>American Journal of</u> Sociology, 1968, 73(5), 581-591.
- Reynolds, H. W. Black power, community power, and jobs. In Massotti, L. H., & Bowen, D. R. (Eds.), <u>Riots and rebellion</u>. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1968.
- Robinson, J. D. Predicting police effectiveness from self reports of relative time spent in task performance. <u>Personnel Psychology</u>, 1970, 23, 327-345.
- Wetteroth, W. J. <u>The psychological training and education of New York</u> <u>City policemen</u>. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Psychological Association. Washington, D. C., September, 1971.
- Wright, N. <u>Black power and urban unrest</u>. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1967.

Appendix A

## STAGES WITHIN THE RIOT PROCESS

The riot process has now been studied to the extent that four major stages can be identified. Not all local civil disturbances go through all four stages; in fact, the majority do not reach stage three (Conant, 1968). It is still not certain at what point in the process it is appropriate to use the word "riot" to describe the event. More information is needed about the process and better reporting of the phase structure itself.

## Phase I. The Precipitating Incident

- . . . an inflammatory gesture, act or event viewed by the aggrieved community as evidence of injustice
- ... draws together a large number of people

## Phase II. Confrontation

- . . . local people swarm to the scene; potential riot promoters articulate the crowd's rage--a keynoting process
- . . . law enforcement arrives
- . . . response of civil authorities
- . . . news media identify the precipitating incident

## Phase III. Roman Holiday

... older persons drop out; young people take over the action, displaying angry intoxication (throw things, taunt police, swap rumors)

## Phase IV. Siege

- ... polarization; limited, if any, communication
- . . . curfew declared; patrol or guard assistance summoned; fire bombing, sniping
- . . . both sides tire of this fruitless, devastating way of resolving conflict

Appendix B

BIBLIOGRAPHY RELATING TO VIOLENCE AND LAW ENFORCEMENT

- A. Descriptive Comments and Books Relating to Studies of Violence
  - Etzkowitz, H., & Schaflander, G. M. <u>Ghetto crisis</u>. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1969.
  - Fogelson, R. M. White on black: A critique of the McCone Commission report on the Los Angeles riots. <u>Political Science Quarterly</u>, 1967, <u>82(3)</u>, 337-367.
  - Gilbert, B. W., & the staff of the Washington Post. <u>Ten blocks from</u> the White House: Anatomy of the Washington riots of 1968. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968.
  - Harper, D. White reactions to a riot. In Masotti, L. H., & Bowen, D. R. (Eds.), <u>Riots and rebellion</u>. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1968.
  - Hayden, T. <u>Rebellion and repression</u>. New York: World Publishing Company, 1969.
  - Hayden, T. Trial. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1970.
  - Jacobs, P. <u>Prelude to riot, a view of urban America from the bottom</u>. New York: Random House, 1968.
  - Kapsis, R.; Smith, J.; Saunders, B.; Takaji, P.; & Williams, O. <u>The reconstruction of a riot: A case study of community tensions</u> <u>and civil disorder</u>. Waltham, Massachusetts: Lemberg Center for the Study of Violence, Brandeis University, 1970.
  - Locke, H. G. <u>The Detroit riot of 1967</u>. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1969.
  - McCord, W. M. Burn, baby, burn! The Los Angeles riots. <u>The New</u> <u>Leader</u>, 1965, <u>48(17)</u>, 3-5.
  - Masotti, L. H., & Bowen, D. R. <u>Riots and rebellion</u>. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1968.
  - Masotti, L. H., & Corsi, J. R. <u>Shoot-out in Cleveland</u>. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1969.

- Berg, K. R., & Turner, J. L. Cultural differences in psychosocial distress: Northern-born Negroes and southern-born Negroes. <u>Proceedings of the 76th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1968, 3, 547-548.</u>
- Berkowitz, L. Aggressive cues in aggressive behavior and hostility catharsis. Psychological Review, 1964, 71(2), 104-122.
- Berkowitz, L., Corwin, R., & Heironimus, M. Film violence and subsequent aggressive tendencies. <u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>, 1963, <u>27</u>, 217-229.
- Berkowitz, L., & LePage, A. Weapons as aggression-eliciting stimuli. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7(2), 202-207.
- Caplan, N. S., & Paige, J. M. A study of ghetto rioters. <u>Scientific</u> <u>American</u>, 1968, <u>219(2)</u>, 15-21.
- Davies, J. C. Toward a theory of revolution. <u>American Sociological</u> Review, 1962, 27(1), 6-19.
- Dynes, R., & Quarantelli, E. L. What looting in civil disturbances really means. Trans-action, 1968, 5(6), 9-14.
- Fogelson, R. M. From resentment to confrontation: The police, the Negroes, and the outbreak of the nineteen-sixties riots. <u>Political</u> Science Quarterly, 1968, 83(2), 217-247.
- Grimshaw, A. D. Urban racial violence in the United States: Changing ecological considerations. <u>The American Journal of Sociology</u>, 1960, <u>66</u>, 109-119.
- Grimshaw, A. D. Changing patterns of racial violence in the United States. Notre Dame Lawyer, 1965, 40, 534-548.
- Gurr, T. R. <u>Why men rebel.</u> Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1970.
- Hundley, J. R., Jr. The dynamics of recent ghetto riots. <u>Journal of</u> <u>Urban Law</u>, 1968, <u>45(3,4)</u>, 627-639.

- Momboisse, R. <u>Riots, revolts, and insurrections</u>. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1967.
- Nation Magazine. Violence: New York, Los Angeles, Newark, East Harlem, Detroit. <u>The Nation</u>, 1967, <u>205(4)</u>, 101-107, 126.
- Oberschall, Anthony. The Los Angeles riot of August, 1965. <u>Social</u> Problems, 1968, 15(3), 322-342.
- Paletz, D., & Dunn, R. Press coverage of civil disorders: A case study of Winston-Salem, 1967. <u>Public Opinion Quarterly</u>, 1969, <u>33(3)</u>, 328-344.
- Parmentor, T. Breakdown of law and order: A firsthand account in the words of Detroit ghetto dwellers. Trans-action, 1967, 4(9), 13-22.
- Rubenstein, R. E. <u>Rebels in eden: Mass political violence in the</u> <u>United States</u>. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1970.
- Rudwick, E. M., & Meier, A. Negro retaliatory violence in the twentieth century. <u>New Politics</u>, 1966, 5, 41-51.
- Sauter, V. G., & Hines, B. <u>Nightmare in Detroit: A rebellion and</u> its victims. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1968.
- Willhelm, S. M., & Powell, E. H. Who needs the Negro? In Hadden, J. K., Masotti, L. H., & Larson, C. J. (Eds.), <u>Metropolis in</u> <u>crisis: Social and political perspectives</u>. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1967.
- Wright, N. <u>Black power and urban unrest</u>. New York: Hawthorn Books, Inc., 1967.
- Wright, N. <u>Ready to riot</u>. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1968.
- B. Theory and Dynamics of Violence and Disruption
  - Astin, A. W. Campus disruption, 1968-69: An analysis of causal factors. In Karten, F. F., Cook, S. W., & Lacey, J. I. (Eds.),
     <u>Psychology and the problems of society</u>. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, 1970, 377-387.

- Le Grande, J. L. Nonviolent civil disobedience and police enforcement policy. <u>The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and</u> <u>Police Science</u>, 1967, <u>58</u>, 393-404.
- Locke, H. G. Riot response: The police and the courts. Journal of Urban Law, 1968, 45(3,4), 805-813.
- Mallick, S. K., & McCandless, B. R. A study of catharsis of aggression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, <u>4(6)</u>, 591-596.
- Nelson, B. Brandeis center for violence study: Exploring the causes of urban riots. <u>Science</u>, 1968, <u>161</u>, 246-249.
- Spiegel, J. P. Psychosocial factors in riots old and new. <u>The Amer-</u> ican Journal of Psychiatry, 1968, 125(3), 37-41.
- C. Applications Relating to Civil Disturbance
  - Chamberlain, G. M. Part I. What cities have done to stop riots, once they have started. <u>American City</u>, 1967, 87-89.
  - Chamberlain, G. M. Part II. What can be done to prevent riot situations from arising. American City, 1967, 107-109.
  - Chevigny, P. Police power. New York: Pantheon Books, 1969.
  - DeLong, H. Detroit remembers July, 1967 prepares to avoid another. Police, 1968, 12(5), 6-12.
  - Fox, H. G. Demonstrations demand specialists. <u>Police</u>, 1968, <u>12(4)</u>, 33-35.
  - Green, R., Schaeffer, G., & Finckenauer, J. O. <u>Law enforcement</u> <u>training project: Survey of community expectations</u>. New Brunswick: New Jersey Police Training Commission. January, 1969.
  - Lahman, J. Law enforcement and the police. In Masotti, L. H., & Bowen, D. R., <u>Riots and Rebellion</u>. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1968.
  - Lee, A. M., & Humphrey, N. D. <u>Race riot</u>. New York: Octagon Books, Inc., 1968.

- Levy, B. Cops in the ghetto: A problem of the police system. In Masotti, L. H., & Bowen, D. R. <u>Riots and Rebellion</u>. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1968.
- Moenssens, A. A. A riot that didn't happen. <u>Police</u>, 1967, <u>12(2)</u>, 47-50.
- Momboisse, R. M. Demonstrations and civil disobedience. <u>Police</u>, 1967, <u>12(2)</u>, 76-82.
- Niederhoffer, A. <u>Behind the shield: The police in urban society</u>. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1967.
- Sikes, M. P., & Cleveland, S. E. Human relations training for police and community. <u>American Psychologist</u>, 1968, 23(10), 766-769.
- Wetteroth, W. J. <u>The psychological training and education of New York</u> <u>City policemen</u>. Paper presented at the annual meetings of the American Psychological Association. Washington, D. C., September, 1971.
- Wilson, J. Q. <u>Varieties of police behavior</u>. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.
- Wilson, O. W. Civil disturbances and the rule of law. <u>The Journal</u> of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 1967, <u>58(2)</u>, 155-159.

# PRELIMINARY DATA RELATING TO COMMUNITY RELATIONS

Reviews of the available literature on civil disorder and policecommunity relations revealed numerous post-riot surveys of attitude toward the disturbances, the perceived results, and the participants. The frequency and intensity of violence in the 1960's prompted sponsorship of several large-scale nationwide studies of the broader issues such as current racial attitude (Campbell & Schuman, 1968) and the public's definition of and attitude toward violence (Blumenthal, Kahn, & Andrews, 1971). Other investigations focused on smaller segments of the American public and on more specific aspects of the general community relations dilemma. Findings have been reported on the Negro American attitude toward protest strategy and participation (Friedman, 1968), participant views toward victimization and law enforcement (Biderman, Johnson, McIntyre, & Weir, 1967), public perceptions of the police (Allman, 1963; Coe & Duke, 1963; Falk, 1964; Head, 1971), including children's perception of police (Derbyshire, 1968). As we entered the Seventies, the public opinion polls observed law and order, crime and race relations to be salient issues of concern among the general citizenry.

Prior to the Georgia Tech Study Team's consideration of attitude studies in Georgia, it seemed desirable to identify several critical variables and to explore the feasibility of instrument construction and use among small, immediately available samples. Some progress was experienced in this direction during the summer of 1971. For example, it became evident--from extensive reading of the written resources and from accounts of several civil disorder disturbances in Georgia--that categories of variables could be identified for more specific study throughout the state. A preliminary research design, incorporating some of the measurable variables, is portrayed in Table 2.

# Initial Data in Georgia from a Student Sample

Summary percentage data will be reported for a sample of 90 white upperclassmen attending Georgia Tech. The views were expressed in August, 1971. It is apparent that these young men endorse the Congressional laws passed in the 1960's, feel that discrimination prevails and that protest may be justifiable, and believe Negro children would receive better education in integrated schools. The reader should be cautioned, however, that these descriptive data only begin to portray the views even among younger Georgians. Responses to each question in the four-page Community Relations Questionnaire (experimental version) are reproduced in this Appendix. A refined version of this instrument could be used, by mail survey, group administration, or personal interviews, in future studies of group comparison and as a source of normative data every few years.

A second sample of 90 upperclassmen was given, during the Fall of 1971, a series of self-administered measures relating to several variables in the initial research design (see Table 2). Tables 3 through 6 illustrate both the operational definition of the variable and the empirical findings. For example, the field of Social Psychology suggests that a nonchance relationship exists between selected indices of personality (e.g., dogmatism, authoritarianism) and prejudicial attitude and behavior (e.g., low sympathy with the aims of civil rights demonstrations, unfavorable attitude toward Negroes). The present data provided preliminary support for these hypotheses.

The earlier national surveys revealed that many people believe police brutality had occurred. A starting point here in Georgia might be the overall perception various segments of the public have of law enforcement agencies such as the State Patrol. This kind of information can be obtained. Summary ratings by the students on a specially constructed semantic differential instrument are given in Table <sup>3</sup>.

The profile of ratings reflects a generally favorable perception of the State Patrol among these students. Presumably, their focus was on Georgia state police; at least one-half of the sample consisted of Georgia natives. In addition to the descriptive profile for the target concept or object, semantic differential data of this nature may be submitted to statistical analyses which uncover the underlying dimensionality and reveal the predictive utility of "meaning" attributed to this law enforcement agency. It would be helpful to obtain the perceptions of several subgroups--citizen residents in numerous communities, community leadership and even patrolmen.

The descriptive profiles for national and local police are given in Table 4. However, these stimulus objects would be more appropriate in surveys of specific communities.

T	abl	е	2
---	-----	---	---

Public Perception and Attitude Relating to Civil Disorder and Law Enforcement (illustrative research design)

Independent Variables	Dependent Variables*
attitude toward	prejudiced-nonprejudiced <sup>e</sup>
violence and protest <sup>a</sup>	
law enforcement <sup>b</sup>	contact with Negroes <sup>1</sup>
Negroes and segregation	at work
new legislation	in education
discriminatory practices	in housing
perception of law enforcement <sup>d</sup>	sympathy with <sup>g</sup>
State Patrol	demonstrators
National Guard	violence for social control
local police (inspecific town	violence for social change
or county) respondent characteristics <sup>e</sup>	willingness to be violent <sup>h</sup>
dogmatism/authoritarianism	endorse police policy and action
community origin	(in general and during
community origin	disturbances

\*Several of the variables may be treated as manipulable, independent indices as well as criterion measures.

<sup>ab</sup>Questionnaire to be constructed by the Georgia Tech Study Team in 1972.

<sup>C</sup>Several short rating scales have been developed and pretested (Robinson, Rusk, & Head, 1968).

<sup>d</sup>Adaptation of the Semantic Differential Technique; quick, easy ratings according to specified frames of reference (e.g., minority relations).

<sup>e</sup>Adorno's F-scale on Authoritarianism.

<sup>f</sup>Reported exposure and experiences with Negroes.

<sup>g</sup>Indices used earlier by Rossi (the Johns Hopkins group) for the Kerner Commission and by Blumenthal (the Michigan group).

<sup>h</sup>Criterion used by Gawiser in Cleveland simulation study among minorities.

<sup>i</sup>Awareness of policy and observed police behavior, particularly during civil disturbances/riot situations.

unfair	0	3	4	22	28	39	4	fair
bad	0	1	1	12	24	52	11	good
unhelpful	0	0	5	5	20	49	19	helpful
unimpo <b>rta</b> nt	0	1	0	8	23	42	27	important
worthless	0	1	0	4	29	40	26	valuable
irrational	0	1	5	23	35	29	6	rational
dishonest	0	2	4	24	33	30	6	honest
loud	2	4	17	40	20	13	3	quiet
uninformed	2	4	6	33	29	20	4	informed
undisciplined	1	4	0	10	25	45	14	disciplined
unpleasant	2	6	11	30	25	22	4	pleasant
small	0	0	4	38	35	16	6	large
unfriendly	2	6	6	24	32	16	7	friendly
weak	0	0	0	16	32	41	10	strong
passive	0	1	4	8	27	45	15	active
ineffective	0	2	3	15	26	47	6	effective

Response Percentages Relating to Perceptions of the State Patrol\*

Table 3

\*Sample of 90 college males.

.

Т	abl	е	4
---	-----	---	---

.

# Response Percentages Relating to Perceptions of the National Guard and Local Police<sup>\*</sup>

			INGLIC	nal G	<u>aru</u>			
unfair	1	5	5	32	28	19	9	fair
bad	2	4	5	31	25	20	12	good
unhelpful	1	6	13	25	23	20	12	helpful
unimportant	5	5	16	18	17	18	19	important
worthless	4	6	17	16	19	20	16	valuable
irrational	3	6	12	44	18	13	3	rational
dishonest	0	0	4	32	31	18	13	honest
loud	2	3	12	39	24	13	8	quiet
uninformed	2	9	14	34	26	12	3	informed
undisciplined	2	4	14	16	22	23	19	disciplined
unpleasant	3	6	12	38	20	13	6	pleasant
small	1	2	4	31	25	19	17	large
unfriendly	2	6	10	37	22	17	6	friendly
weak	1	2	11	23	25	23	14	strong
passive	1	3	13	23	24	25	12	active
ineffective	6	5	12	22	<b>2</b> 6	18	11	effective
			Loc	al Pol	ice			
unfair	3	4	13	22	25	27	6	fair
bad	2	2	9	18	27	31	11	good
unhelpful	1	2	9	13	25	37	14	helpful
unimportant	0	1	2	10	19	33	34	important
worthless	1	3	4	8	13	35	34	valuable
irrational	3	9	13	16	34	20	4	rational
dishonest	2	6	22	22	20	22	6	honest
loud	3	8	25	32	22	9	2	quiet
uninformed	4	10	15	20	29	15	6	informed
undisciplined	0	8	10	18	34	20	10	disciplined
unpleasant	3	11	12	29	27	10	9	pleasant
small	0	2	10	32	35	14	6	large
unfriendly	3	6	18	22	29	14	8	friendly
-	0	1	4	23	40	27	5	strong
weak	•							
weak passive	0	3	2	14	31	37	13	active

\*Sample of 90 college males.

Table	5
-------	---

Tentative Relationships among Two Personality Measures and Attitude toward Blacks<sup>a</sup>

	Variables	1 <sup>b</sup>	2 <sup>b</sup>	3 <sup>b</sup>
1.	Dogmatism		. 68**	32**
2.	Authoritarianism			47**
3.	Positive Attitude toward Blacks			

\*\*p <.01 level of significance.

<sup>a</sup>Sample of 90 white, male college students in Atlanta. <sup>b</sup>Legend of Variables:

- 1. A 20-item measure of the extent to which the "total mind is open or closed" to opposing beliefs; higher scores reflect more dogmatic thinking (Rokeach, 1960).
- 2. A 28-item measure of a cluster of personality traits characterized by rigidity of thinking, high conformity, ethnocentrism, and dependence upon authority; higher scores reflect more authoritarianism (Adorno, et al., 1950).
- 3. A 22-item measure which assesses attitude toward black people; an older attitude scale using the expression "Negro"; higher scores more favorable (Rosander, 1937).

For the present student sample, the two personality measures

of dogmatism and authoritarianism were correlated highly and positively (.68) as has been suggested in the literature but not always documented. A significant negative relationship was obtained between positive "attitude toward Negroes" scores and the personality indices. This finding suggests that the more authoritarian and dogmatic individuals have less favorable attitudes toward black people. The implication for future research relating to interracial harmony is that personality characteristics deserve specific attention.

#### Table 6

Tentative Relationships among Selected Indices of Protest Sympathy, Contact with and Attitude toward Blacks and Authoritarian Personality

	Variables	1	2	3	4
1.	Sympathy with Demonstrations <sup>a</sup>		. 39**	43**	. 32**
2.	Social Exposure to Blacks <sup>b</sup>			22*	.28**
3.	Positive Attitude toward Negroes				47**
4.	Authoritarian Personality				

\*\*p <. 01 level of significance.
\*p <. 05 level of significance.</pre>

<sup>a</sup>Expressed sympathy with the aims of civil rights demonstrations. Responses to one question, scored: 1-yes and have participated 2-yes, but not participated 3-no, not sympathetic

<sup>b</sup>Prior or present membership or participation in social clubs involving blacks. Scored: 1-yes, 2-no.

For the student data given in Table 6, degree of sympathy with civil rights demonstrations is correlated significantly with the personality syndrome of authoritarianism (.32) and attitudes toward (-.43) and exposure to black people (.39). The obtained relationships suggest that the more sympathetic individuals also have a more favorable attitude toward Negroes and are less authoritarian in their views of other people. In addition, the respondents having these characteristics reported with greater frequency a history of membership or participation in social clubs involving blacks. This kind of research should be extended beyond student samples.

#### SELECTED REFERENCES RELATING TO ATTITUDES

#### Toward Violence and Civil Disorder

- Blumenthal, M., Kahn, R. L., & Andrews, F. <u>Men's attitudes toward</u> <u>violence</u>. Institute for Social Research Project Report, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, May, 1971.
- Campbell, A., & Schuman, H. <u>Racial attitudes in fifteen American</u> <u>cities</u>. Institute for Social Research Project Report, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, June, 1968.
- Friedman, C. R. Attitudes toward protest strategy and participation among Negro Americans. <u>Dissertation Abstracts</u>, 1968, <u>28(8-A)</u>, 3, 282.
- Head, K. B. The justification of violence as related to values and identification with students, blacks, and police. <u>Proceedings 79th Annual</u> <u>Convention, American Psychological Association</u>, 1971, <u>6(2)</u>, 836.
- Meyer, P. <u>A survey of attitude of Detroit Negroes after the riot of 1967</u>. Detroit: Detroit Free Press, 1967.

Toward Law Enforcement Process and Its Personnel

- Allman, J. Public attitude toward police. <u>Police Chief</u>, 1963 (January), 8-12.
- Biderman, A. D., Johnson, L., McIntyre, J., & Weir, A. W. <u>Report</u> on a pilot study in the District of Columbia on victimization and attitudes toward law enforcement. Washington, D. C.: Bureau of Social Science Research, 1967. 1 v. (various pagings) (U. S. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. Field Survey, 1).
- Coe, R. M., & Duke, A. B. Public attitudes toward the police. <u>Police</u>, 1963, <u>8</u>, 73-75.
- Derbyshire, R. L. Children's perceptions of police. <u>J. Criminal Law</u>, <u>Criminology and Police Science</u>, 1968, <u>59</u>, 183-190.
- Falk, G. J. The public's prejudice against the police. <u>American Bar</u> <u>Association Journal</u>, 1964, <u>50</u>, 754-757.
- Jensen, G. F. "Crime doesn't pay": Correlates of a shared misunderstanding. <u>Social Problems</u>, 1969, <u>17(2)</u>, 189-201.
- Kerner Commission. <u>Supplemental studies for the National Advisory</u> <u>Commission on Civil Disorders</u>. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1968. Especially Rossi, et al. Pp. 69-208.
- Watson, N. A. An application of social-psychological research to police work: Police community relations. <u>Dissertation abstracts</u>, 1967, 28(2-A), 791-792.

#### Toward Other People

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper, 1950.
- Bogardus, E. <u>Social distance</u>. Yellow Springs, Ohio: Antioch Press, 1959.
- Rosander, A. C. An attitude scale based on behavior situations. <u>Jour</u>nal of Social Psychology, 1937, <u>8</u>, 3-16.
- Sedlacek, W. E., & Brooks, G. C., Jr. The development of a measure of racial attitudes. <u>Experimental Publication System</u>, 1970, <u>5(177C)</u>, 1-21. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association.
- Shaw, M. E., & Wright, J. M. <u>Scales for the measurement of attitudes</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967. Especially the Steckler and Ford measures of attitude toward Negroes. Pp. 358-377.
- Smith, A. B., Locke, B., & Walker, W. F. Authoritarianism in college and noncollege oriented police. <u>Journal Criminal Law, Criminology</u>, and Police Science, 1967, 58(1), 128-132.
- Troldahl, V., & Powell, F. A short-form dogmatism scale for use in field studies. Social Forces, 1965, 44, 211-214.

## Related Personality Traits, Values, and Political Attitudes

- Campbell, A., Gwinn, G., & Miller, W. E. <u>The voter decides</u>. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson, 1954.
- Kilpatrick, F. P., & Cantril, H. Self-anchoring scaling, a measure of individuals' unique reality worlds. <u>Journal of Individual Psychology</u>, 1960, 16, 158-173.
- Rokeach, M. <u>Beliefs</u>, attitudes, and values: A theory of organization and change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.
- Troldahl, V., & Powell, F. A short-form dogmatism scale for use in field studies. Social Forces. 1965, 44, 211-214.

## Methodological Considerations in Attitude Measurement

- Cook, S. W., & Selltiz, C. A multiple-indicator approach to attitude measurement. Psychological Bulletin, 1964, 62, 36-55.
- Robinson, J. P., Rusk, J. G., & Head, K. B. <u>Measures of political atti-</u> <u>tudes</u>. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, Univ. of Mich., 1968.
- Selltiz, C., Jahoda, M., Deutsch, M., & Cook, S. W. <u>Research methods</u> in social relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.
- Shaw, M. E., & Wright, J. M. <u>Scales for the measurement of attitudes</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Snider, J. G., & Osgood, C. E. <u>Semantic differential technique: A</u> <u>sourcebook</u>. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.

Experimental Research Measure School of Psychology Georgia Institute of Technology

## COMMUNITY RELATIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please check the correct answers to the following questions. Your name will not be identified with these data; place your name and address on the detachable 3 by 5 card if you wish to receive a summary of the findings.

Your Home Town Population (Check the estimated category):

First 6 Years of My Life	
36 %	<b>2</b> 50,000 and over
2	100,000 - 250,000
<u> </u>	50,000 - 100,000
	25,000 - 50,000
1	10,000 - 25,000
18	5,000 - 10,000
5	2,500 - 5,000
	1,000 - 2,500
0	500 - 1,000
0	rural to 500
(Georgia) 50%	which state
( )	which county

Sympathy with the Aims of Civil Rights Demonstrators:

<u>7%</u> Yes, and I have personally participated in a civil rights demonstration.

73 Yes, but I have not participated in a civil rights demonstration.

20 No, not sympathetic to civil rights.

Do you feel that our racial problems in the U. S. A. have hurt this country abroad or not?

Hurt **66%** Not hurt **9** Not sure **25** 

Do you feel Negroes have tried to move too fast, too slow, or at about the right pace?

Too fast <b>20%</b> Too slow // About right <u>4/</u> Not sure <u>27</u>	Too fast <b>20 %</b>	Too slow <u>//</u>	About right <u>41</u>	Not sure_	27
--	----------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	-----------	----

Do you feel Negroes are discriminated against in this country or not? Discriminated against  $\frac{982}{80}$  Not discriminated against  $\frac{0}{20}$  Not sure  $\frac{2}{20}$ 

Over the past few years, Congress has passed several laws guaranteeing rights of Negroes. Do you personally favor or oppose the laws Congress has passed?

	Favor	Oppose	Not sure
Giving Negroes equal voting rights	100%	0	_0
Outlawing segregation in education	73		16
Outlawing discrimination in housing	70	_14	16
Guaranteeing Negroes equal use of buses & trains	100	0	
Guaranteeing Negroes equal use of restaurants and restrooms	98	0	

Some people have said that jobs are hard enough to find these days and that if Negroes are to be given jobs, it will mean taking jobs away from white people. Do you feel that will happen if better job opportunities are given to Negroes, or don't you think that would happen?

Would happen 25% Wouldn't happen 48 Not sure 27

Some people have suggested that Negroes, who are 10 per cent of the population, should be guaranteed 10 per cent of the jobs that are available. Would you favor or oppose such a quota system?

Favor <u>5%</u> Oppose <u>89</u> Not sure <u>7</u>

Compared with five years ago, do you feel Negroes are getting a better break in jobs now, a worse break, or about the same now as five years ago?

Better break <u>89%</u> Worse break <u>•</u> About same <u>9</u> Not sure <u>2</u>

As far as education goes, do you feel that Negroes have been receiving as good an education in this country as white people, or not as good an education?

As good as whites 7% Not as good 86 Not sure 7

If Negro children attended the same school as white children, do you feel they would receive a better education than they do now or wouldn't it make much difference?

Better education 68% Not much difference 16 Not sure 16

It's been said that if Negro children all went to school with white children, the education of white children would suffer. The reason given is that the Negro children would hold back the white children. Do you believe that or not?

Believe 30% Don't believe 52 Not sure 18

As far as your own personal feelings go, would you be concerned personally or not if:

		Not	Not
	Concerned	concerned	sure
A Negro sat down next to you at a lunch counter	0%	98	2
A Negro sat next to you in a movie theater	0	95	5
A Negro used the same public restroom as you	0	98	2
A Negro sat next to you on a bus A Negro tried on a suit of clothes (a		_93_	<u> </u>
dress) before you did in a clothing store	2	80	18
Your child brought a Negro child home for supper	25	66	9
Your teenage child dated a Negro	55	20	25
A Negro family moved in next door to you	30	61	9
A close friend or relative married a Negro	48	39	14

Would it upset you a lot, some but not a lot, only a little, or not at all if Negroes moved into your neighborhood?

A lot  $1/\frac{4}{5}$  Some, not a lot 23 Only a little 14 Not at all 48Not sure 5

It has been claimed that white policemen often engage in police brutality against Negroes. Do you tend to believe that is true or not true?

True **39%** Not true **32** Not sure **29** 

All in all, do you feel the demonstrations by Negroes have helped more or hurt more the advancement of Negro rights?

Helped more <u>57%</u> Hurt more <u>18</u> Not sure <u>25</u>

Do you think the riots that have taken place in Los Angeles and other cities have helped or hurt the cause of Negro rights or don't you think it makes much difference?

Helped 11% Hurt 66 Not much difference 7 Not sure 16

## Community Relations Questionnaire

Now, on each of the following, I'd like to ask you if you were in the same position as Negroes, whether you think it would be justified or not:

		Not	Not	
	Justified	justified	sure	
To march and protest in demonstrations	6670	18	16	
To protest against discrimination in jobs	86			
To protest against discrimination in education	89	_5_	7	
To protest against discrimination in housing	86		_7_	

Now, a list of groups and institutions. Do you think (U. S. Supreme Court, etc.) has tended more to help Negroes or has tended more to keep Negroes down? Help Keep down Not

negroes down.	merb	Keep down	INOL
	more	more	sure
U. S. Supreme Court	86%	2	11
Johnson administration	73	2	25
Business corporations	34	34	32
Real estate companies	18	64	18
Congress	80	7	14
White Protestant churches	14	50	36
Professions (law, medicine, etc.)	25	23	52
Retail stores	39	23	39
Labor unions	32	43	25
Catholic church	32	16	52
Local government here	61	20	18
State government here	34	39	27
Restaurants, hotels, motels	23	50	_27
Railroads, bus companies	34	34	<u> 32</u>
Local police	_27_	25	48

On the whole, do you feel Negroes are asking for more than they are ready for or not?

Asking for more than ready for 30%Not asking for more than ready for 45Not sure 25

Table	7	
TWDTC		

.

Population Data by County and Race

		Inhab	oitants	Decade	1970
	County	1960	1970	Growth	White/Negro Ratio
1.	Appling	13,246	12,726	_	10,059 / <b>2,</b> 660
	Atkinson	6,188	5,879	-	4,020 /1,857
3.	Bacon	8,359	8,233	-	7,124 /1,093
4.	Baker	4,543	3,875	-	1,843 /2,007
5.	Baldwin	34,064	34, 240	+	21,240 /12,976
6.	Banks	6,497	6,833	+	6,368 /453
7.	Barrow	14,485	16,859	+	13,923 /2,926
8.	Bartow	28,267	32,663	+	28,251 /4,376
9.	Ben Hill	13,633	13,171	-	9,063 /4,091
10.	Berrien	12,038	11,556	-	9,953 /1,575
11.	Bibb	141,249	143,418	+	94,372 /48,91
12.	Bleckley	9,642	10,291	+	7,983 /2,295
13.	Brantley	5,891	5,940	+	5,338 /595
14.	Brooks	15,292	13,739	-	7,354 /6,361
15.	Bryan	6,226	6,539	+	4,594 /1,927
16.	Bulloch	24,263	31,585	+	20,198 /11,33
17.	Burke	20,596	18 <b>,2</b> 55	-	7,247 /11,00
18	Butts	8,976	10,560	+	6,005 /4,547
19.	Calhoun	7,341	6,606	-	2,544 /4,059
20.	Camden	9,975	11,334	+	6,970 /4,357
21.	Candler	6,672	6,412	-	<b>4,251 /2,</b> 159
22.	Carroll	36,451	45,404	+	37,806 /7,531
	Catoosa	21,101	28,271	+	27,757 /476
24.	Charlton	5,313	5,680	+	3,753 /1,924
25.	Chatham	188,299	187,767	-	123,454 /63,52
26.	Chattahoochee	13,011	25,813	+	20,868 /4,351
27.	Chattooga	19,954	20, 541	+	18,487 /2,052
28.	Cherokee	23,001	31,059	+	29,674 /1,344
29.	Clarke	45,363	65,177	+	51,963 /12,72
30.	Clay	4,551	3,636	-	1,383 /2,248
31.	Clayton	46,365	98,043	+	93,365 /4,476
32.	Clinch	6,545	6,405	-	4,389 /2,005
33.	Сорр	114,174	196,793	+	188,160 /8,180
34.	Coffee	21,953	22,828	+	16,919 /5,880
35.	Colquitt	34,048	32,200	-	24,659 /7,526
36.	Columbia	13,423	22, 327	+	17,334 /4,864
37.	Cook	11,822	12, 129	+	8,332 /3,790
38.	Coweta	28, 893	32,310	+	21,993 /10,29
39.	Crawford	5,816	5,748	-	2,735 /3,013
40.	Crisp	17,768	18,087	+	10,761 /7,312
41.	Dade	8,666	9,910	+	9,591 /304
42.	Dawson	3,590	3,639	+	3,630 / -
43.	Decatur	25,203	22,310	-	12,960 /9,334
44.	DeKalb	256,782	415, 387	+	357,518 /56,86
45.	Dodge	16,483	15,658	-	11,694 /3,957
46.	Dooly	11,474	10,404	-	5,181 /5,215
47.	Dougherty	75,680	89,639	· +	58,628 /30,64
48.	Douglas	16,741	28,659	+	25,462 /3,163
49.	Early	13,151	12,682	_	6,604 /6,048
50.	Echols	1,876	1,924	+	1,372 /543
51,	Effingham	10,144	13,632	+	10,188 /3,416
52,	Elbert	17,835	17,262	-	11,631 / 5,627
	Emanuel	17,815	18,189	+	12,703 /5,478
F 2	TUTIGHT CI	1,010	10,107		
53. 54.	Evans	6,952	7,290	+	4,847 /2,434

56.	Fayette	8,199	11,364	+	9,377 /1,959
57.	•	69,130	73, 742	+	63,969 /9,697
	Forsyth	12,170	16, 928	+	16,754 /159
59.	Franklin	13,274	12,784	-	11,213 /1,552
60.	Fulton	556,326	607,592	+	368,559 /237,404
61.	Gilmer	8,922	8,956	+	8,914 /28
62.	Glascock	2,672	2,280	-	1,723 /556
63.	Glynn	41,954	50,528	+	37,733 /12,534
64.	Gordon	19,228	23,570	+	22,153 /1,402
65.	Grady	18,015	17,826	-	11,517 /6,292
66.	Greene	11,193	10,212	-	4,937 /5,264
67.	Gwinnett	43, 541	72,349	+	68,547 /3,696
68.	Habersham	18,116	20,691	+	19,453 /1,213
	Hall	49,739	59,405	+	53,314 /6,015
	Hancock	9,979	9,019	-	2,412 /6,607
	Haralson	14,543	15,927	+	14,686 /1,220
	Harris	11,167	11,520	+	6,313 /5,188
	Hart	15,229	15,814	+	12,099 /3,707
	Heard	5,333	5,354	+	4,087 /1,265
	Henry	17,619	23,724	+	16,182 /7,514
	Houston	39,154	62,924	+	52,084 /10,603
	Irwin	9,211	8,036	-	5,305 /2,729 18,369 /2,707
78.	Jackson	18,499	21,093	+	3,004 /2,753
79.	-	6,135	5,760 9,425	-+	7,656 /1,761
80.	Jeff Davis Jefferson	8,914 17,468	17,174	+ -	7,861 /9,305
82.		9,148	8,332	-	4,658 /3,671
83.	Johnson	8,048	7,727	_	5, 342 /2, 383
84.		8,468	12,218	+	7,499 /4,708
85.		10,240	10,688	+	6,520 /4,164
86.	Lanier	5,097	5,031		3,520 /1,505
	Laurens	32,313	32,738	+	21,520/11,212
88.		6,204	7,044	+	3,970 /3,068
	Liberty	14, 487	17,569	+	11,334 /6,078
90.	-	5,906	5,895	-	3,175 /2,715
91.		3,874	3,746	-	2,543 /1,200
92.	Lowndes	49,270	55,112	+	38,910 /16,085
93.		7,241	8,728	+	8,519 /199
94.	McDuffie	12,627	15,276	+	8,925 /6,334
95.	McIntosh	. 6,364	7,371	+	3,481 /3,875
. 96.		13,170	12,933	-	5,069 /7,850
97.	Madison	11,246	13,517	+	11,602 /1,906
	Marion	5,477	5,099	-	2,450 /2,646
	Meriwether	19,756	19,461	-	10,178 /9,250
	Miller	6,908	6,397	-	4,522 /1,872
	Mitchell	19,652	18,956	-	9,754 /9,198
	Monroe	10,495	10,991	+	5,893 /5,091
	Montgomery	6,284	6,099	-	4,066 /2,030
	Morgan	10,280	9,904	-	5,437 /4,465 12,830 /155
	Murray	10,447	12,986	+	123,453 /42,981
	Muscogee Newton	158,623 20,999	167,377 26,282	++	18,069 /8,193
-		6,304	7,915	+	6,646 /1,267
	Oconee Oglethorpe	7,926	7, 598	-	4,775 /2,816
	Paulding	13,101	17,520	-+	16,119 /1,372
	Paulding Peach	13,846	15,990	+	6,910 /9,058
	Pickens	8,903	9,620	+	9,226 /386
	Pierce	9,678	9,281	-	7,493 /1,785
	Pike	7,138	7,316	+	4,357 /2,956
			•		

115.Polk28,01529,656+24,994 /4,6,56116.Pulaski8,2048,066-5,120 /2,943117.Putnam7,7988,394+4,311 /4,074118.Quitman2,4322,180-867 /1,311119.Rabun7,4568,227+8,204 /121120.Randolph11,0788,734-3,877 /4,853121.Richmond135,601162,437+112,367 /48,545122.Rockdale10,57218,152+14,872 /3,255123.Schley3,2563,097-1,708 /1,384124.Screven14,91912,591-6,775 /5,800125.Seminole6,8027,059+4,545 /2,504126.Spalding35,40439,514+28,900 /10,544127.Stephens18,39120,331+17,905 /2,415128.Stewart7,3716,511-2,287 /4,220129.Sumter2,4652-2,136 /4,481131.Taliaferro3,3702,423-882 /1,541132.Tatinall15,83716,557+11,400 /5,149133.Taylor8,3117,865-4,338 /3,522135.Terrell12,74211,416-4,569 /6,840136.Thomas34,51934,515+20,825 /13,651137.Tift23,80023,505-16,847 /6						24 224 14 121
117.Putnam7,7988,394+4,311/4,074118.Quitman2,4322,180-867/1,311119.Rabun7,4568,327+8,204 /121120.Randolph11,0788,734-3,877/4,853121.Rickmond135,601162,437+112,367/48,545122.Rockdale10,57218,152+14,872/3,255123.Schley3,2563,097-1,708/1,384124.Screven14,91912,591-6,775/5,800125.Seminole6,8027,059+4,545/2,504126.Spalding35,40439,514+28,930/10,544127.Stephens18,39120,331+17,905/2,415128.Stewart7,3716,511-2,287/4,220129.Sumter24,65226,931-15,050/11,854130.Taliaferro3,3702,423-882/1,541131.Taliaferro3,3702,423-882/1,541132.Tattnall15,83716,557+11,400/5,149133.Taylor8,3117,865-4,338/3,522134.Telfair11,71511,381-7,426/3,952135.Terell12,74211,416-4,569/6,840136.Thomas34,31934,515+20,825/13,651137.Tift23,48727,288-19,417/7,7			28,015	29,656	+ ·	24,994 /4,636
118.Quitman2,4322,180- $667$ $71$ ,311119.Rabun7,4568,227+8,204 $121$ 120.Randolph11,0788,734- $3,877$ $4,853$ 121.Richmond135,601162,437+112,367 $48,545$ 122.Rockdale10,57218,152+14,872 $3,255$ 123.Schley $3,256$ $3,097$ - $1,708$ $1,384$ 124.Screven14,91912,591- $6,775$ $5,800$ 125.Seminole $6,802$ $7,059$ + $4,545$ $2,504$ 126.Spalding35,404 $39,514$ + $28,930$ $10,544$ 127.Stephens18,391 $20,331$ + $17,905$ $7,4220$ 129.Sunter24,652 $26,931$ - $15,050$ $11,854$ 130.Talbot $7,127$ $6,625$ - $2,136$ $4,481$ 131.Taliferro $3,370$ $2,423$ - $882/1,541$ 132.Tattnall15,837 $16,557$ + $11,400/5,149$ 133.Taylor $8,311$ $7,865$ - $4,338/3,522$ 134.Teffair11,715 $11,381$ - $7,426/3,952$ 135.Terrell12,742 $11,416$ - $4,569/6,840$ 136.Toombs16,837 $19,151$ + $13,983/5,148$ 137.Tift23,48727,288- $19,417/7,798$			•		-	
119.Rabun7,4568,327+8,204/121120.Randolph11,0788,734-3,877/4,853121.Richmond135,601162,437+112,367/48,545122.Rockdale10,57218,152+14,872/3,255123.Schley3,2563,097-1,708/1,384124.Screven14,91912,591-6,775/5,800125.Seminole6,8027,059+4,545/2,504126.Spaling35,40439,514+28,930/10,544127.Stephens18,39120,331+17,905/2,415128.Stewart7,3716,511-2,287/4,220129.Sunter24,65226,931-15,050/11,854130.Talbot7,1276,625-2,136/4,481131.Taliaferro3,3702,423-882/1,541132.Tatnall15,83716,557+11,400/5,149133.Taylor8,3117,865-4,338/3,522134.Terlair11,71511,381-7,426/3,952135.Terrell12,74211,416-4,569/6,840136.Thomas34,31934,515+20,825/13,651137.Tift23,48727,288-19,417/7,798138.Toombs16,83719,151+13,983/5,148139.Towns4,5384,565+4,559/5 <td></td> <td></td> <td>•</td> <td>•</td> <td>. +</td> <td></td>			•	•	. +	
120.Randolph11,0788,734-3,877 $/4,853$ 121.Richmond135,601162,437+112,367 $/48,545$ 122.Rockdale10,57218,152+14,872 $/32,55$ 123.Schley3,2563,097-1,708 $/1,384$ 124.Screven14,91912,591-6,775 $/5,800$ 125.Seminole6,8027,059+4,545 $/2,504$ 126.Spalding35,40439,514+28,930 $/10,544$ 127.Stephens18,39120,331+17,905 $/2,415$ 128.Stewart7,3716,511-2,287 $/4,220$ 129.Sumter24,65226,931-15,050 $/11,845$ 130.Talbot7,127 $6,625$ -2,136 $/4,481$ 131.Taliaferro3,370 $2,423$ -882 $/1,541$ 132.Tattnall15,83716,557+11,400 $/5,149$ 133.Taylor8,3117,865-4,338 $/5,522$ 135.Terrell12,74211,416-4,569 $/6,840$ 136.Thomas34,31934,515+20,825 $/13,651$ 137.Tift23,48727,288-19,417 $/7,798$ 138.Toombs16,83719,151+13,983 $/5,148$ 139.Towns4,5384,565+					-	
121.Richmond135, 601162, 437+112, 367 /48, 545122.Rockdale10, 57218, 152+14, 872 /3, 255123.Schley3, 2563, 097-1, 708 /1, 384124.Screven14, 91912, 591-6, 775 /5, 800125.Seminole6, 8027, 059+4, 545 /2, 504126.Spalding35, 40439, 514+28, 930 /10, 544127.Stephens18, 39120, 331+17, 905 /2, 415128.Stewart7, 3716, 625-2, 136 /4, 481130.Talbot7, 1276, 625-2, 136 /4, 481131.Taliaferro3, 3702, 423-882 /1, 541132.Tattnall15, 83716, 557+11, 400 /5, 149133.Taylor8, 3117, 865-4, 338 /3, 522134.Telfair11, 71511, 381-7, 426 /3, 952135.Terrell12, 74211, 416-4, 659 /6, 840136.Thomas34, 31934, 515+20, 825 /13, 651137.Tift23, 48727, 288-19, 417 /7, 798138.Toombs16, 83719, 151+13, 983 /5, 148139.Towns4, 5364, 565+4, 559 /-140.Treutlen5, 8745, 647-3, 761 /1, 885141.Troup47, 18944, 466-30, 323 /14,					+	
122.Rockdale10,57218,152+14,872 $3,255$ 123.Schley3,2563,097-1,708 $1,384$ 124.Screven14,91912,591-6,775 $5,800$ 125.Seminole6,8027,059+4,545 $2,504$ 126.Spalding35,40439,514+28,930 $10,544$ 127.Stephens18,39120,331+ $17,905$ $2,415$ 128.Stewart7,3716,511-2,287 $/4,220$ 129.Surnter24,65226,931-15,050 $/11,854$ 130.Talbot7,1276,625-2,136 $/4,481$ 131.Taliaferro3,3702,423-882 $/1,541$ 132.Tattnall15,83716,557+11,400 $/5,149$ 133.Taylor8,3117,865-4,338,3522135.Terrell12,74211,416-4,669 $/6,840$ 136.Thomas34,31934,515+20,825 $/3,651$ $/4,599$ $/-140$ 137.Tift23,48727,288-19,417 $/7,798$ 138.Toombs16,83719,151+13,963 $/5,148$ 141.Troup47,18944,466-30,323 $/14,121$ 142.Turner8,4988,790+5,650 $/3,604$ $/4,613$ 144.Union $6,510$ <		-			-	·
123.Schley3,2563,097-1,708 /1,384124.Screven14,91912,591-6,775 /5,800125.Seminole6,8027,059+4,545 /2,504126.Spalding35,40439,514+28,930 /10,544127.Stephens18,39120,331+17,905 /2,415128.Stewart7,3716,511-2,287 /4,220129.Sunter24,65226,931-15,050 /11,854130.Talbot7,1276,625-2,136 /4,481131.Taliaferro3,3702,423-882 /1,541132.Tattnall15,83716,557+11,400 /5,149133.Taylor8,3117,865-4,338 /3,522134.Telfair11,71511,381-7,426 /3,952135.Terrell12,74211,416-4,569 /6,840136.Thomas34,31934,515+20,825 /13,651137.Tift23,48727,288-19,417 /7,798138.Toombs16,83719,151+13,983 /5,148139.Towns4,5384,565+4,559 /-140.Treutlen5,8745,647-3,761 /1,885141.Troup47,18944,466-30,323 /14,121142.Turner8,4398,790+5,607 /3,133143.Twiggs7,9358,222+3			-			
124.Screven14,91912,591-6,775 /5,800125.Seminole6,8027,059+4,545 /2,504126.Spalding35,40439,514+28,930 /10,544127.Stephens18,39120,331+17,905 /2,415128.Stewart7,3716,511-2,287 /4,220129.Sunter24,65226,931-15,050 /11,854130.Talbot7,1276,625-2,136 /4,481131.Taliaferro3,3702,423-882 /1,541132.Tattnall15,83716,557+11,400 /5,149133.Taylor8,3117,865-4,338 /3,522135.Terrell12,74211,416-4,569 /6,840136.Thomas34,31934,515+20,825 /13,651137.Tift23,48727,288-19,417 /7,798138.Toombs16,83719,151+13,983 /5,148139.Towns4,5384,565+4,559 / -141.Troup47,18944,466-30,323 /14,121142.Turner8,4398,790+5,650 /3,133143.Twiggs7,9358,222+3,604 /4,613144.Union6,5106,811+6,810 /145.Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146.Walter43,21933,525-25,899				•	+	
125.       Seminole       6,802       7,059       +       4,545 /2,504         126.       Spalding       35,404       39,514       +       28,930 /10,544         127.       Stephens       18,391       20,331       +       17,907 /2,415         128.       Stewart       7,371       6,511       -       2,287 /4,220         129.       Sumter       24,652       26,931       -       15,050 /11,854         130.       Tallaferro       3,370       2,423       -       882 /1,541         131.       Tallaferro       3,370       2,423       -       882 /1,541         132.       Tattnall       15,837       16,557       +       11,400 /5,149         133.       Taylor       8,311       7,865       -       4,338,522         134.       Telfair       11,715       11,381       -       7,426 /3,952         135.       Terrell       12,742       11,416       -       4,569 /6,840         136.       Thomas       34,319       34,515       +       20,825 /13,651         137.       Tift       23,487       27,288       -       19,417 /7,798         138.       Toombs       16,837	123.	Schley	3,256	3,097	-	
126.Spalding $35,404$ $39,514$ + $28,930/10,544$ 127.Stephens18,391 $20,331$ + $17,905/2,415$ 128.Stewart $7,371$ $6,511$ - $2,287/4,220$ 129.Sumter $24,652$ $26,931$ - $15,050/11,854$ 130.Talbot $7,127$ $6,625$ - $2,136/4,481$ 131.Taliaferro $3,370$ $2,423$ - $882/1,541$ 132.Tatnall15,83716,557+ $11,400/5,149$ 133.Taylor8,311 $7,865$ - $4,338/3,522$ 134.Telfair11,715 $11,381$ - $7,426/3,952$ 135.Terrell $12,742$ $11,416$ - $4,569/6,840$ 136.Thomas $34,319$ $34,515$ + $20,825/13,651$ 137.Tift $23,487$ $27,288$ - $19,417/7,798$ 138.Toombs $16,837$ $19,151$ + $13,983/5,148$ 139.Towns $4,538$ $4,565$ + $4,559/-$ 140.Treutlen $5,674$ - $30,323/14,121$ 142.Turner $8,439$ $8,790$ + $5,650/3,133$ 143.Twiggs $7,955$ $8,222$ + $3,604/4,613$ 144.Union $6,510$ $6,811$ + $6,810/$ 145.Upson $23,800$ $23,505$ - $16,847/6,642$ 146.Walker $45,264$ $50,691$ + $48,134/2,511$ 1	124.	Screven		•		
127.Stephens18,39120,331+17,905 /2,415128.Stewart7,3716,511-2,287 /4,220129.Sumter24,65226,931-15,050 /11,854130.Talbot7,1276,625-2,136 /4,481131.Taliaferro3,3702,423-882 /1,541132.Tattnall15,83716,557+11,400 /5,149133.Taylor8,3117,865-4,338 /3,522134.Telfair11,71511,381-7,426 /3,952135.Terrell12,74211,416-4,569 /6,840136.Thomas34,31934,515+20,825 /13,651137.Tift23,48727,288-19,417 /7,798138.Toombs16,83719,151+13,983 /5,148139.Towns4,5384,565+4,559 / -140.Treutlen5,8745,647-30,323 /14,121141.Troup47,18944,466-30,323 /14,121142.Turner8,4398,790+5,650 /3,133143.Twiggs7,9358,222+3,604 /4,613144.Union6,5106,811+6,810 /145.Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146.Walker45,26450,691+48,988 /9,368151.Waynen17,92117,858-14,113 /	125.	Seminole	6,802	7,059	+	
128.Stewart7,3716,511-2,287 /4,220129.Sumter24,65226,931-15,050 /11,854130.Talbot7,1276,625-2,136 /4,481131.Taliaferro3,3702,423-882 /1,541132.Tattnall15,83716,557+11,400 /5,149133.Taylor8,3117,865-4,338 /3,522134.Telfair11,71511,381-7,426 /3,952135.Terrell12,74211,416-4,569 /6,840136.Thomas34,31934,515+20,825 /13,651137.Tift23,48727,288-19,417 /7,798138.Toombs16,83719,151+13,983 /5,148139.Towns4,5384,565+4,559 / -140.Treutlen5,8745,647-3,761 /1,885141.Troup47,18944,466-30,323 /14,121142.Turner8,4398,790+5,650 /3,133143.Twiggs7,9358,222+3,604 /4,613144.Union6,5106,811+6,810 /145.Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146.Walker45,26450,691+48,134 /2,511147.Walton20,48123,404+16,870 /6,512148.Ware3,2272,362-938 /1,379<	126.	Spalding	35,404	39, 514	+	
129.Sumter $24,652$ $26,931$ - $15,050/11,854$ 130.Talbot7,127 $6,625$ - $2,136/4,481$ 131.Taliaferro $3,370$ $2,423$ - $882/1,541$ 132.Tattnall $15,837$ $16,557$ + $11,400/5,149$ 133.Taylor $8,311$ $7,865$ - $4,338/3,522$ 134.Telfair $11,715$ $11,381$ - $7,426/3,952$ 135.Terrell $12,742$ $11,416$ - $4,569/6,840$ 136.Thomas $34,319$ $34,515$ + $20,825/13,651$ 137.Tift $23,487$ $27,288$ - $19,417/7,798$ 138.Toombs $16,837$ $19,151$ + $13,983/5,148$ 139.Towns $4,538$ $4,565$ + $4,559/-$ 140.Treutlen $5,874$ $5,647$ - $30,323/14,121$ 142.Turner $8,439$ $8,790$ + $5,650/3,133$ 143.Twiggs $7,935$ $8,222$ + $3,664/4,613$ 144.Union $6,510$ $6,811$ + $6,810/$ 145.Upson $23,505$ - $16,847/6,642$ 146.Walker $45,264$ $50,691$ + $48,134/2,511$ 147.Walton $20,481$ $23,404$ + $16,870/6,512$ 148.Ware $33,525$ - $25,899/7,574$ 148.Ware $3,247$ $2,362$ - $983/1,379$ 150.Washingto	127.	Stephens	18,391		+	·
130.Talbot7, 1276, 625-2, 136 /4, 481131.Taliaferro3, 3702, 423-882 /1, 541132.Tattnall15, 83716, 557+11, 400 /5, 149133.Taylor8, 3117, 865-4, 338 /3, 522134.Telfair11, 71511, 381-7, 426 /3, 952135.Terrell12, 74211, 416-4, 569 /6, 840136.Thomas34, 31934, 515+20, 825 /13, 651137.Tift23, 48727, 288-19, 417 /7, 798138.Toombs16, 83719, 151+13, 983 /5, 148139.Towns4, 5384, 565+4, 559 / -140.Treutlen5, 8745, 647-3, 761 /1, 885141.Troup47, 18944, 466-30, 323 /14, 121142.Turner8, 4398, 790+5, 650 /3, 133143.Twiggs7, 9358, 222+3, 664 /4, 613144.Union6, 5106, 811+6, 810 /145.Upson23, 80023, 505-16, 847 /6, 642146.Walker45, 26450, 691+48, 134 /2, 511147.Walton20, 48123, 404+16, 870 /6, 512148.Ware31, 21933, 525-25, 899 /7, 574149.Waren7, 3606, 669-2, 777 /3, 891150. <td>128.</td> <td>Stewart</td> <td>7,371</td> <td>6,511</td> <td>-</td> <td></td>	128.	Stewart	7,371	6,511	-	
131.Taliaferro3,3702,423- $882 / 1,541$ 132.Tattnall15,83716,557+11,400 /5,149133.Taylor8,3117,865-4,338 /3,522134.Telfair11,71511,381-7,426 /3,952135.Terrell12,74211,416-4,569 /6,840136.Thomas34,31934,515+20,825 / 13,651137.Tift23,48727,288-19,417 /7,798138.Toombs16,83719,151+13,983 /5,148139.Towns4,5384,565+4,559 / -140.Treutlen5,8745,647-3,761 /1,885141.Troup47,18944,466-30,323 / 14,121142.Turner8,4398,790+5,650 / 3,133143.Twiggs7,9358,222+3,664 / 4,613144.Union6,5106,811+6,810 /145.Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146.Walter45,26450,691+48,134 /2,511147.Walton20,48123,404+16,870 /6,512148.Ware34,21933,525-25,899 /7,574149.Waren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150.Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151.Wayne17,92117,858-14,11	129.	Sumter	24,652	26,931	-	
132.       Tattnall       15,837       16,557       +       11,400 /5,149         133.       Taylor       8,311       7,865       -       4,338 /3,522         134.       Telfair       11,715       11,381       -       7,426 /3,952         135.       Terrell       12,742       11,416       -       4,569 /6,840         136.       Thomas       34,319       34,515       +       20,825 /13,651         137.       Tift       23,487       27,288       -       19,417 /7,798         138.       Toombs       16,837       19,151       +       13,983 /5,148         139.       Towns       4,538       4,565       +       4,559 / -         140.       Treutlen       5,874       5,647       -       3,761 /1,885         141.       Troup       47,189       44,466       -       30,323 /14,121         142.       Turner       8,439       8,790       +       5,650 /3,133         143.       Twiggs       7,935       8,222       +       3,604 /4,613         144.       Union       6,510       6,811       +       6,810 /         145.       Upson       23,800       23,505	130.	Talbot	7,127	6,625	-	2,136 /4,481
133. Taylor       8,311       7,865       -       4,338/3,522         134. Telfair       11,715       11,381       -       7,426/3,952         135. Terrell       12,742       11,416       -       4,569/6,840         136. Thomas       34,319       34,515       +       20,825/13,651         137. Tift       23,487       27,288       -       19,417/7,798         138. Toombs       16,837       19,151       +       13,983/5,148         139. Towns       4,538       4,565       +       4,559/-         140. Treutlen       5,874       5,647       -       3,761/1,885         141. Troup       47,189       44,466       -       30,323/14,121         142. Turner       8,439       8,790       +       5,650/3,133         143. Twiggs       7,935       8,222       +       3,604/4,613         144. Union       6,510       6,811       +       6,810/         145. Upson       23,800       23,505       -       16,847/6,642         146. Walker       45,264       50,691       +       48,134/2,511         147. Walton       20,481       23,404       +       16,870/6,512         148. Ware	131.	Taliaferro	3,370	2,423	-	882 /1,541
134.Telfair11,71511,381-7,426 /3,952135.Terrell12,74211,416-4,569 /6,840136.Thomas34,31934,515+20,825 /13,651137.Tift23,48727,288-19,417 /7,798138.Toombs16,83719,151+13,983 /5,148139.Towns4,5384,565+4,559 / -140.Treutlen5,8745,647-3,761 /1,885141.Troup47,18944,466-30,323 /14,121142.Turner8,4398,790+5,650 /3,133143.Twiggs7,9358,222+3,604 /4,613144.Union6,5106,811+6,810 /145.Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146.Walker45,26450,691+48,134 /2,511147.Walton20,48123,404+16,870 /6,512148.Ware34,21933,525-25,899 /7,574149.Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150.Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151.Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152.Webter5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154.Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156.Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821	132.	Tattnall	15,837	16,557	+	11,400 /5,149
134.Telfair11,71511,381-7,426 /3,952135.Terrell12,74211,416-4,569 /6,840136.Thomas34,31934,515+20,825 /13,651137.Tift23,48727,288-19,417 /7,798138.Toombs16,83719,151+13,983 /5,148139.Towns4,5384,565+4,559 / -140.Treutlen5,8745,647-3,761 /1,885141.Troup47,18944,466-30,323 /14,121142.Turner8,4398,790+5,650 /3,133143.Twiggs7,9358,222+3,604 /4,613144.Union6,5106,811+6,810 /145.Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146.Walker45,26450,691+48,134 /2,511147.Walton20,48123,404+16,870 /6,512148.Ware34,21933,525-25,899 /7,574149.Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150.Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151.Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152.Webter5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154.Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156.Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821	133.	Taylor	8,311	7,865	-	4,338 /3,522
136. Thomas34,31934,515+20,825 /13,651137. Tift23,48727,288-19,417 /7,798138. Toombs16,83719,151+13,983 /5,148139. Towns4,5384,565+4,559 / -140. Treutlen5,8745,647-3,761 /1,885141. Troup47,18944,466-30,323 /14,121142. Turner8,4398,790+5,650 /3,133143. Twiggs7,9358,222+3,604 /4,613144. Union6,5106,811+6,810 /145. Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146. Walker45,26450,691+48,134 /2,511147. Walton20,48123,404+16,870 /6,512148. Ware34,21933,525-25,899 /7,574149. Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150. Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151. Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152. Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153. Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154. White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155. Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156. Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157. Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158. Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /	134.	-	11,715	11,381	-	7,426 /3,952
137. Tift23,48727,288-19,417 /7,798138. Toombs16,83719,151+13,983 /5,148139. Towns4,5384,565+4,559 / -140. Treutlen5,8745,647-3,761 /1,885141. Troup47,18944,466-30,323 /14,121142. Turner8,4398,790+5,650 /3,133143. Twiggs7,9358,222+3,604 /4,613144. Union6,5106,811+6,810 /145. Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146. Walker45,26450,691+48,134 /2,511147. Walton20,48123,404+16,870 /6,512148. Ware34,21933,525-25,899 /7,574149. Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150. Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151. Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152. Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153. Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154. White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155. Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156. Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157. Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158. Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	135.	Terrell	12,742	11,416	-	4,569/6,840
138. Toombs16,83719,151+13,983 /5,148139. Towns4,5384,565+4,559 / -140. Treutlen5,8745,647-3,761 /1,885141. Troup47,18944,466-30,323 /14,121142. Turner8,4398,790+5,650 /3,133143. Twiggs7,9358,222+3,604 /4,613144. Union6,5106,811+6,810 /145. Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146. Walker45,26450,691+48,134 /2,511147. Walton20,48123,404+16,870 /6,512148. Ware34,21933,525-25,899 /7,574149. Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150. Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151. Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152. Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153. Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154. White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155. Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156. Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157. Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158. Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	136.	Thomas	34,319	<b>34,</b> 515	+	20,825 /13,651
139. Towns       4,538       4,565       +       4,559 / -         140. Treutlen       5,874       5,647       -       3,761 /1,885         141. Troup       47,189       44,466       -       30,323 /14,121         142. Turner       8,439       8,790       +       5,650 /3,133         143. Twiggs       7,935       8,222       +       3,604 /4,613         144. Union       6,510       6,811       +       6,810 /         145. Upson       23,800       23,505       -       16,847 /6,642         146. Walker       45,264       50,691       +       48,134 /2,511         147. Walton       20,481       23,404       +       16,870 /6,512         148. Ware       34,219       33,525       -       25,899 /7,574         149. Warren       7,360       6,669       -       2,777 /3,891         150. Washington       18,903       17,480       -       8,098 /9,368         151. Wayne       17,921       17,858       -       14,113 /3,730         152. Webster       3,247       2,362       -       983 /1,379         153. Wheeler       5,342       4,596       -       3,176 /1,410         154. Whi	137.	Tift	23,487	27,288	-	19,417 /7,798
140.Treutlen5,8745,647-3,761 /1,885141.Troup47,18944,466-30,323 /14,121142.Turner8,4398,790+5,650 /3,133143.Twiggs7,9358,222+3,604 /4,613144.Union6,5106,811+6,810 /145.Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146.Walker45,26450,691+48,134 /2,511147.Walton20,48123,404+16,870 /6,512148.Ware34,21933,525-25,899 /7,574149.Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150.Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151.Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152.Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153.Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154.White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155.Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156.Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157.Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158.Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	138.	Toombs	16,837	19,151	+	13,983 /5,148
141.Troup47,18944,466- $30,323/14,121$ 142.Turner $8,439$ $8,790$ + $5,650/3,133$ 143.Twiggs $7,935$ $8,222$ + $3,604/4,613$ 144.Union $6,510$ $6,811$ + $6,810/$ 145.Upson $23,800$ $23,505$ - $16,847/6,642$ 146.Walker $45,264$ $50,691$ + $48,134/2,511$ 147.Walton $20,481$ $23,404$ + $16,870/6,512$ 148.Ware $34,219$ $33,525$ - $25,899/7,574$ 149.Warren $7,360$ $6,669$ - $2,777/3,891$ 150.Washington $18,903$ $17,480$ - $8,098/9,368$ 151.Wayne $17,921$ $17,858$ - $14,113/3,730$ 152.Webster $3,247$ $2,362$ - $983/1,379$ 153.Wheeler $5,342$ $4,596$ - $3,176/1,410$ 154.White $6,935$ $7,742$ + $7,282/453$ 155.Whitfield $42,109$ $55,108$ + $52,821/2,210$ 156.Wilcox $7,905$ $6,998$ - $4,825/2,161$ 157.Wilkes $10,961$ $10,184$ - $5,328/4,846$ 158.Wilkinson $9,250$ $9,393$ + $5,030/4,362$	139.	Towns	4,538	4,565	+	4,559 / -
142.Turner $8,439$ $8,790$ + $5,650/3,133$ 143.Twiggs $7,935$ $8,222$ + $3,604/4,613$ 144.Union $6,510$ $6,811$ + $6,810/$ 145.Upson $23,800$ $23,505$ - $16,847/6,642$ 146.Walker $45,264$ $50,691$ + $48,134/2,511$ 147.Walton $20,481$ $23,404$ + $16,870/6,512$ 148.Ware $34,219$ $33,525$ - $25,899/7,574$ 149.Warren $7,360$ $6,669$ - $2,777/3,891$ 150.Washington $18,903$ $17,480$ - $8,098/9,368$ 151.Wayne $17,921$ $17,858$ - $14,113/3,730$ 152.Webster $3,247$ $2,362$ - $983/1,379$ 153.Wheeler $5,342$ $4,596$ - $3,176/1,410$ 154.White $6,935$ $7,742$ + $7,282/453$ 155.Whitfield $42,109$ $55,108$ + $52,821/2,210$ 156.Wilcox $7,905$ $6,998$ - $4,825/2,161$ 157.Wilkes $10,961$ $10,184$ - $5,328/4,846$ 158.Wilkinson $9,250$ $9,393$ + $5,030/4,362$	140.	Treutlen	5,874	5,647	-	3,761 /1,885
143. Twiggs7,9358,222+3,604 /4,613144. Union6,5106,811+6,810 /145. Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146. Walker45,26450,691+48,134 /2,511147. Walton20,48123,404+16,870 /6,512148. Ware34,21933,525-25,899 /7,574149. Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150. Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151. Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152. Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153. Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154. White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155. Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156. Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157. Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158. Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	141.	Troup	47,189	44,466	-	30,323 /14,121
143. Twiggs7,9358,222+3,604 /4,613144. Union6,5106,811+6,810 /145. Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146. Walker45,26450,691+48,134 /2,511147. Walton20,48123,404+16,870 /6,512148. Ware34,21933,525-25,899 /7,574149. Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150. Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151. Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152. Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153. Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154. White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155. Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156. Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157. Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158. Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	142.	Turner	8,439	8,790	+	5,650 /3,133
144.Union6,5106,811+6,810 /145.Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146.Walker45,26450,691+48,134 /2,511147.Walton20,48123,404+16,870 /6,512148.Ware34,21933,525-25,899 /7,574149.Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150.Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151.Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152.Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153.Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154.White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155.Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156.Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157.Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158.Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	143.	Twiggs	7,935	8,222	+	
145.Upson23,80023,505-16,847 /6,642146.Walker45,26450,691+48,134 /2,511147.Walton20,48123,404+16,870 /6,512148.Ware34,21933,525-25,899 /7,574149.Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150.Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151.Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152.Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153.Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154.White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155.Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156.Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157.Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158.Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	144.		6,510	6,811	+	
147.Walton20,48123,404+16,870 /6,512148.Ware34,21933,525-25,899 /7,574149.Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150.Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151.Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152.Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153.Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154.White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155.Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156.Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157.Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158.Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	145.	Upson	23,800	23,505	-	16,847 /6,642
148.Ware34,21933,525-25,899 /7,574149.Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150.Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151.Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152.Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153.Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154.White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155.Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156.Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157.Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158.Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	146.	Walker	45,264	50,691	+	48,134 /2,511
149.Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150.Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151.Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152.Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153.Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154.White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155.Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156.Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157.Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158.Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	147.	Walton	20,481	23,404	+	16,870 /6,512
149.Warren7,3606,669-2,777 /3,891150.Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151.Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152.Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153.Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154.White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155.Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156.Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157.Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158.Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	148.	Ware	34,219	33, 525	-	25,899 /7,574
150.Washington18,90317,480-8,098 /9,368151.Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152.Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153.Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154.White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155.Whiffield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156.Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157.Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158.Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	149.	Warren			-	
151.Wayne17,92117,858-14,113 /3,730152.Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153.Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154.White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155.Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156.Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157.Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158.Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	150.	Washington	18,903	17,480	-	
152.Webster3,2472,362-983 /1,379153.Wheeler5,3424,596-3,176 /1,410154.White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155.Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156.Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157.Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158.Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	151.	Wayne	17,921	17,858	-	
154. White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155. Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156. Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157. Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158. Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	152.	Webster	3,247		-	983 /1.379
154. White6,9357,742+7,282 /453155. Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156. Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157. Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158. Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	153.	Wheeler	5,342	4,596	-	3,176 /1,410
155. Whitfield42,10955,108+52,821 /2,210156. Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157. Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158. Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	154.	White	6,935	7,742	+	
156. Wilcox7,9056,998-4,825 /2,161157. Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158. Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	-					
157. Wilkes10,96110,184-5,328 /4,846158. Wilkinson9,2509,393+5,030 /4,362	-		• •			
158. Wilkinson 9,250 9,393 + 5,030 /4,362	-		•	•	-	
				-	+	• •
					-	
			· ·	•		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

	FOR REPORTING CIVIL D	ISORDER
Georgia D	epartment of Public Safety	
Form Completion Date		
(page 1 to be completed by		Location
representative for each ins	tance of intervention)	
SOURCE OF REQUEST		
Who initiated contact w	vith Department of Public S	afety?
	When?	To Whom?
INITIATING THE FIELD V	ISIT	
	prior to reaching the site	(Justice, GBI, etc.
COMMUNITY LIAISON		
First Contact made by	DPS (CD Unit) When?	Where?
To Whom?	Purpose	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Second Contact	When?	Where?
To Whom?	Purpose	
Next Contact		Where?
To Whom?	Purpose	
Next Contact	When?	Where?
To Whom?	Purpose	
(list	additional contacts on attac	hed sheet)
CIRCUMSTANCES in area	prior to precipitating event	(prevailing problem
	lationships with law enforce	
SOURCE of "information" of	on kinds of tension and leve	1.
	on kinds of tension and leve	-
Internal to DPS		When
Internal to DPS Newspapers		When When
Internal to DPS Newspapers Other Sources PRECIPITATING EVENT:		When When When
Internal to DPS Newspapers Other Sources PRECIPITATING EVENT: Place		When When When
Internal to DPS Newspapers Other Sources PRECIPITATING EVENT: Place		When When When
Internal to DPS Newspapers Other Sources PRECIPITATING EVENT: Place People Involved (numb	er and description)	When When When
Internal to DPS Newspapers Other Sources PRECIPITATING EVENT: Place	er and description) he disorder:	When When When
Internal to DPS Newspapers Other Sources PRECIPITATING EVENT: Place People Involved (numb	er and description) he disorder: c) low 1 2	When When When

ed	By	
	CDTA Unit Repre	sentative
viors of Happ	penings in Community:	
creased Lev	el of Tension	(by what kind of pers
	<u> </u>	
		-
•		
Which Might	t Provoke Reoccurrence	of Disorder:
: Which Might	t Provoke Reoccurrence	of Disorder:
Which Might	t Provoke Reoccurrence	of Disorder:
Which Might	t Provoke Reoccurrence	of Disorder:
ACTIVITIES	AFTER WITHDRAWAL	OF CD LIAISON
ACTIVITIES	AFTER WITHDRAWAL	OF CD LIAISON
ACTIVITIES Initiated by When	AFTER WITHDRAWAL t	OF CD LIAISON
ACTIVITIES Initiated by When Initiated by	AFTER WITHDRAWAL t	•
ACTIVITIES Initiated by When Initiated by When	AFTER WITHDRAWAL t	OF CD LIAISON
	viors of Happ ecreased Lev creased the T	creased the Tension and Polarization

67

Appendix F

# SELECTED REFERENCES RELATING TO A POTENTIAL PERFORMANCE EFFECTIVENESS STUDY

- Beck, G. N. Municipal police performance rating. <u>Journal of Criminal</u> Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1960-61, 51, 567-574.
- Chenoweth, J. H. Situational tests: A new attempt at assessing police candidates. <u>Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science</u>, 1961, 52, 232-238.
- Cormack, J. A. Plan of action in police community relations. <u>Police</u> <u>Chief</u>, 1967, 50-51.
- Dunnette, M. D. <u>Personnel selection and placement</u>. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1966.
- Flanagan, J. C. The critical incident technique. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 1954, 51(4), 327-358.
- Flanagan, J. C., & Burns, R. K. The employee performance record. Harvard Business Review, 1955, 33(5), 95-102.
- Guion, R. M. Personnel testing. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
- Holmes, B. Selection of patrolmen. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1942, 32(5), 575-592.
- Johnson, D., & Gregory, R. J. Police-community relations in U. S.: Recent literature and projects. <u>Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology</u> and Police Science, 1971, 62(1), 94-103.
- Kirkpatrick, J. J., Ewen, R. B., Barrett, R. S., & Katzell, R. A. <u>Testing and fair employment</u>. New York: New York University Press, 1968.
- Levy, R. J. Predicting police failures. <u>Journal of Criminal Law, Crim</u>inology and Police Science, 1967, 58, 265-276.
- McManus, G., Griffin, J., Wetteroth, W., & Boland, M. <u>Police training</u> and performance study. Technical Report #4. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Superintendent of Documents, 1970.

- Marsh, S. H. Validating the selection of deputy sheriffs. <u>Public</u> <u>Personnel Review</u>, 1962, 23(1), 41-44.
- Matarazzo, J. D., Allen, B. V., Saslow, G., & Wiens, A. N. Characteristics of successful policemen and firemen applicants. <u>Journal of</u> Applied Psychology, 1964, 48, 123-133.
- Mingle, G. Police personnel evaluation and development. <u>American</u> Journal of Police Science, 1945, 36, 277-289.
- Narroll, H. G., & Levitt, E. E. Formal assessment in police selection. Psychological Reports, 1963, 12(3), 691-694.
- Olson, B. T. <u>Selecting local law enforcement officers in Michigan</u>: <u>Current practice and future progress</u>. Report to Michigan Law Enforcement Officers Training Council, Grant No. 177, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U. S. Department of Justice, March, 1968.
- Parnas, R. I. The police response to the domestic disturbance. Wisconsin Law Review, 1967, 914-960.
- Peres, S. H. <u>A diagnostic forced-choice evaluation of highway patrol-</u> <u>men.</u> Unpublished dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1958. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1971, No. 59-411.
- Robinson, D. D., & Coffey, J. L. <u>Implementation of improved police</u> <u>training programs</u>. Report to Ohio Peace Officer Training Council, Contract No. 137, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, U. S. Department of Justice, September, 1968.
- Travers, R. M. W. A critical review of the validity and rationale of the forced-choice technique. <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, 1951, <u>48</u>, 62-70.
- Wherry, R. J., & Fryer, D. H. Buddy ratings: Popularity contest or leadership criteria? Personnel Psychology, 1949, 2, 147-159.
- Wilson, J. Q. Varieties of police behavior. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Peres, S. H. <u>A diagnostic forced-choice evaluation of highway patrolmen</u>. Unpublished dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1958. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1971, No. 59-411.

The construction, validation, and standardization of a performance rating instrument was undertaken within the program. Content for this performance report was solicited by mail from all uniformed <u>patrolmen</u> in Ohio; they were asked to submit an essay describing the best patrolman they'd ever known. Over 1,000 short phrases describing patrolman behavior were extracted (from 653 essays) then combined into 395 phrases which were sorted by 8 patrolmen into 5 subareas of performance.

- I. Quantity of Production
  - A. Drive
  - B. Hard Worker
  - C. Persistence
- II. Quality of Production
  - A. Obedient to Rules and Regulations
  - B. Does As He's Supposed To
- III. Job Knowledge
  - A. Skill
  - B. Learning Ability
  - C. Planner and Organizer
- IV. Loyalty or Attitude Toward Job
  - A. Pride
  - B. Satisfaction
  - C. Career Man
- V. Interpersonal Relations
  - A. Toward Superiors
  - B. Toward Peers
  - C. Toward Public

A description checklist of 229 phrases (those meeting 75% agreement among the sorters) was distributed to 145 supervisory officers throughout the state. Their task was to rate the "best man" he'd ever had under his command, and on a second answer sheet to rate the "poorest man" he'd experienced. The supervisor marked the 229 phrases on a 1-2-3-4-5 scale of applicability for each of these mind-sets.

The essays by the patrolmen and the two ratings by the supervisory force provided the raw data required for scaling the phrases and selecting those to be used in a Performance Report. Both a preference index and a discrimination index was obtained for each phrase. The 5 subarea scores and the applicability values were submitted to correlational analysis, then to factor analysis which produced a general factor of patrolman effectiveness and 5 specific factors (acceptance of responsibility, compliance to rules and procedures, manner and bearing, technical competence, and interpersonal relations) The resulting Patrolman Performance Report contained 3 sections, providing 10 scores.

- I. Overall Evaluation (rating of 80 statements in terms of man being rated)
- II. Descriptive Ranking

(4 categories, 10 phrases each, established from the statistical analyses of the raw data, yielding a diagnostic profile showing the man's strong and weak points)

- 1. Acceptance of Responsibility
- 2. Technical Competence
- 3. Obedience to Rules, Manner, and Bearing
- 4. Interpersonal Relations
- III. Summary Page

(5 adjectival descriptive paragraphs, each with 1-20 scale--one for overall efficiency and the 4 categories above)

Two men from Headquarters took the newly developed measures and held orientation meetings with supervisory men who did ratings on each man. These performance appraisals did not relate to seniority.

Peer nominations (the buddy-rating technique) served as the external <u>criterion</u> validating the Performance Report. Patrolmen were asked by mail to pick the two or three best all-around patrolmen in their post. These 455 nominations were anonymous.

It is now possible to evaluate not only a patrolman's overall performance but also construct diagnostic profiles showing his relative strengths and weaknesses in the four subareas. This personnel tool is also helpful in guidance and retraining.