

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Sociology Department, Faculty Publications

Sociology, Department of

1981

Resegregation Processes in Desegregated Schools and Status Relationships for Hispanic Students

Helen A. Moore

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, hmoore1@unl.edu

Peter Iadicola

Indiana University - Purdue University Fort Wayne

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/sociologyfacpub>



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Educational Sociology Commons](#), and the [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#)

Moore, Helen A. and Iadicola, Peter, "Resegregation Processes in Desegregated Schools and Status Relationships for Hispanic Students" (1981). *Sociology Department, Faculty Publications*. 138.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/sociologyfacpub/138>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Sociology, Department of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Sociology Department, Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Resegregation Processes in Desegregated Schools and Status Relationships For Hispanic Students

Helen A. Moore
Peter Iadicola

The rank ordering of majority and minority group statuses in American society is often reflected by the interaction of students within the social structure of the school environment. The increasing complexities of the desegregated educational institution suggest that variations in the formal school setting may influence the conditions of Anglo and Hispanic student contact and interaction. The current policy of school desegregation was initiated, in part, as the prerequisite to the integration process which Allport concluded would lead to the status equalization of students within the schools and a reduction in racial prejudice.¹

The structure of the desegregated school itself poses a dilemma for this policy goal. The desegregated environment is

Helen A. Moore is Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

Peter Iadicola is Assistant Professor in the Department of Sociology at Indiana-Purdue University, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Research findings reported in this paper were supported by Public Health Service Research Grant No. MH 26607-03 from the National Institute of Mental Health, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The opinions and conclusions stated in this paper are not to be construed as officially reflecting the policy of the granting agency.

designed to both assimilate Hispanic students academically and to create a setting which fosters equal status contacts among students for the reduction of prejudice. Research suggests that academic assimilation of minority students is optimized in a school environment which contains a student body with a sizable representation of high socioeconomic status students and/or a high percentage of Anglos.² This structure of the school population theoretically creates opportunities for the "lateral transfer" of values and motivations involving achievement and educational opportunity.³ However, both high socioeconomic levels in the school and high percentage Anglo in the student body are also related to greater inequality of status between Anglo students and Hispanic students.⁴ This replicates the hierarchy of majority-minority relations present in the larger society and creates a contradiction between two of the policy goals of desegregation. The assimilation of Hispanic students in a stratified desegregated environment may be incongruent with the goal of creating an environment which improves student interracial relations through equal status contact.

Specifically, in this research we address the problem of those internal resegregation processes which reinforce peer group stratification by ethnicity, thus contributing to the dilemma. These resegregation processes are hypothesized to affect the status inequalities between Hispanics and Anglos within the school system. A model proposed by Mercer, Iadicola, and Moore specifies that certain school programs and processes, including the resegregation of students by ethnicity, may serve to increase status inequalities in a desegregated school.⁵ Conversely, these programs and processes may be utilized to break down the status inequalities between ethnic groups under certain conditions. The resegregation processes described in this study may provide a partial resolution to the dilemma of a desegregated environment which can become more conducive to improving intergroup relations.⁶

The resegregation processes of testing, classroom grouping, competition, and busing are identified as mechanisms

which differentiate students by ethnicity as well as by socioeconomic status. These resegregation processes are assumed to contribute, in part, to the perception of inferior social status positions for Hispanic students when they are selected out as a distinct group. We hypothesize that the higher the level of resegregation processes within a desegregated school, the more dominant the Anglo students will be in their relations with Hispanic students.

Status Equalization

The framework for this study is based upon the status equalization model.⁷ The model specifies conditions under which students might interact on equal terms (i.e., without reference to ascriptive characteristics of race, ethnicity, sex, etc.). From Gordon Allport's work we draw the following premises for the effects of school process upon student status outcomes: (1) Desegregation is a prerequisite to contact and acquaintance and the initiation of the integration/assimilation process. (2) Equal status contact among students, staff, and parents of various ethnic groups in desegregated schools will promote that integration. (3) Equal status contact in schools is enhanced when (a) these equal statuses are sanctioned explicitly by school policy, (b) students of various ethnic groups work together, and (c) the school program emphasizes the common interests and humanity of all persons in all ethnic groups (i.e., multicultural programs).

Equal status relations are defined in this literature as the result of a structured social interaction in which diffuse status characteristics of ethnicity, sex, etc., are not significant for the interaction within the structure or group. More recent empirical and theoretical work indicates that achieving equal status contact among ethnic group members is complicated by additional factors not foreseen in Allport's early model. Particularly, four elements in school processes appear critical for eliminating status differentials for students: (1) that students participate in racially mixed groups; (2) that they experience success in those groups; (3) that teacher evaluations

not be based upon individualistic competition; and (4) that adult role models should reflect or exemplify a balance of status, power, and authority among ethnic group members.⁸ These conclusions emphasize the importance of investigating those school processes which might replicate societal stratification and contribute to status differentials within the desegregated school environment.

Resegregation Processes

From the set of institutional processes hypothesized by Mercer, Iadicola, and Moore,⁹ we draw upon four school processes which highlight the issue of resegregation in the desegregated school: norm-referenced testing, classroom grouping, classroom competition, and busing rates. Experimental research suggests that these processes are likely to reinforce status differentials between majority and minority students.¹⁰ We hypothesize that those schools which have modified the resegregating processes of testing, grouping, competition, and busing will have an informal social system characterized by more equal status relations between Hispanic and Anglo students. Thus, school processes can be conceptualized as a series of bipolar dimensions which either reinforce status differences for students, or mitigate those status differences:

1. *Testing.* The use and misinterpretation of norm-referenced tests versus an absence of norm-referenced tests which implies reliance upon other institutional indicators of student status and success (e.g., criterion referenced testing and grading).
2. *Grouping.* The presence of classroom grouping practices which resegregate students along ethnic lines versus instructional techniques which do not replicate ethnic rankings from the larger society.
3. *Competition.* The use of classroom competition in academic instruction which isolates individuals and highlights student status differences, versus group evaluation and the encouragement of cooperative learning among students.

4. *Busing*. The burdening of minority students and parents with large amounts of busing, and disproportionate amounts of busing, versus a transportation program which equalizes the burden of busing among ethnic groups.

Testing

Norm-referenced testing is a status-ranking process which is hypothesized to affect status relationships between students of different ethnic groups. When schools use norm-referenced tests of "intelligence," "aptitude," or "achievement" to assess and label students, a disproportionately large number of minority students are labeled as "special" or "sub-normal" and are placed in classes for the mentally retarded.¹¹ These norm-referenced tests are not constructed to take into account the cultural background of the student. The resulting process labels the minority student as less competent than the Anglo student and recreates the rank order status of American society.¹² Teachers often use these labels and perceive minority students as less competent. Borich and Peck tested the relationship between pupil attitude, standardized achievement, and teacher's grades and found that aptitude-achievement correlations were highest for Anglos then for blacks and Hispanics, respectively.¹³

Katz has also documented emotional reactions which interfere with the performance of minority students when they are told that they are taking an "intelligence" test or are competing against Anglo norms.¹⁴ Thus, norm-referenced tests often legitimate diffuse status characteristics for both teachers and minority students, and possibly for majority students. They serve the latent function of assigning subordinate statuses to minority students, discrediting minority cultures, and providing schools with a mechanism which "cools out" parents and students who criticize the schools. The result is that tests are used to convince students, teachers, and the community that minority students are responsible for their own low educational achievement and school status, rather than the school and its processes.¹⁵ It is therefore

hypothesized that schools with lower usage of these norm-referenced tests will have more equal status relations between Anglo and Hispanic students.

Classroom Grouping

Homogeneous grouping, when used in the desegregated school, operates to resegregate students along racial/ethnic lines, with Hispanic children often assigned to “slow” groups and Anglo students assigned to accelerated programs. Jones et al. maintain that racism is often unintentionally built into systems which group by ability, whether grouping occurs by classroom or within classrooms.¹⁶ Cohen and Roper found that reorganizing students into racially mixed, cooperative teams was an important factor in eliminating status discrepancies among students.¹⁷ They conceptualized this status equalization as reinforcing interaction abilities between students. More generally, Lavatelli et al. point out that ability grouping stigmatizes students and perpetuates “existing unfair social stratification in society.”¹⁸ It is from this past research that we hypothesize that schools with less homogeneous classroom grouping will have more equal status relations between their students.

Classroom Competition

Some research has been conducted on the effects of competition upon student outcomes. The present meritocratic model of the public school system emphasizes the image of a contest mechanism.¹⁹ Like the grouping mechanism, this contest model serves to sort and select students on the basis of status group membership. Katz cites an extensive literature which documents the negative effects of minority student competition with Anglo students upon minority student performance.²⁰ Cohen and Roper concluded that the elimination of teacher evaluation of individuals in favor of group evaluations and the encouragement of cooperative learning among students was an important factor in producing equality in bi-racial interaction.²¹ It is hypothesized that a school characterized by a high level of academic competition will also have a high level of status differences between Anglo and Hispanic students.

Burden of Busing

Most research into the effect of busing focuses upon achievement outcomes for students, showing some improvements in minority student achievement scores in programs utilizing busing,²² while others indicate a negative effect of the busing process upon standardized test scores.²³ Few studies, however, have focused upon the outcome of busing for the quality of contact among students. James Davis indicates that transportation effects in desegregated southern school districts might impact upon nonacademic outcomes, but concludes that “. . . there is no evidence that busing per se has any negative consequences.”²⁴

Our research focuses upon the process of busing which is hypothesized to affect student relationships. A relatively common practice in school desegregation programs is the busing of minority children into predominately Anglo schools. This permits Anglo students to remain in their neighborhood schools where social statuses are already crystallized. This places the Hispanic student in the role of the “outsider” who comes into the neighborhood only during the school hours. Another result of one-way busing is that Hispanic students often do not have access to after-school programs or other neighborhood activities. It is not uncommon for teachers and students to refer to the “bused students” as a special category of children, meaning those from “outside” the neighborhood. In contrast, a program of equalized cross-busing distributes the burden of being bused, and the burden of being the “outsider,” across both ethnic groups, and might also remove the busing stigma. We hypothesize that those schools where the burden of busing is equally shared by both groups of students will have more equal status relationships among students than schools where a disproportionate burden of busing is held by Hispanic students.

The focus of our analysis is on the effect of these four re-segregation processes upon status relationships among Anglo and Hispanic students. Evidence that these re-segregation processes do exist within desegregated schools has been described in other studies. Smith finds that after five years of

desegregation, the interaction of students in classrooms, on the playgrounds, and around the cafeteria is “internally segregated” in his case study.²⁵ A field study by Eddy describes a symbolic realignment of pupils, teachers, and administrators along ethnic lines in a newly desegregated and reorganized middle school. These realignment patterns expressed the traditional patterns of minority student subordination, particularly in the homogeneous grouping of students in the classrooms.²⁶ The National Opinion Research Center’s study of desegregated schools indicates that minority students are routinely grouped into stigmatized remedial classrooms, as well as into the lower-achievement groups within classrooms.²⁷

Research Design

Most of the status relations research has been conducted in an experimental setting to gain control over the various diffuse status characteristics which influence interaction. However, the measurement of the resegregation processes proposed in this model utilizes survey methods to gain information about the school structure and the interaction of the students within that environment.

Sample

Data is derived from case studies of ten desegregated elementary schools in California. These 10 schools were selected from a 1973–74 sample of 182 desegregated elementary schools for which profiles were available on student outcomes. Rank orders of the standardized residual scores on academic and mental health outcomes for each school and ethnic group were comprised.²⁸ The final sample of ten schools utilized in this study included an equal number of schools with positive outcomes for Hispanic students and schools with negative outcomes for Hispanic students. Hispanic student enrollment ranged from 10 to 53 percent of the school population.

Information about processes at the school level were obtained through interviews with school administrators, tabulations from school files, observations of classrooms, and teacher questionnaires. The classroom subsample was a ran-

dom selection within each school: two classrooms each from grades two, four and six or from four, five and six in schools encompassing only those latter grades. Classroom observers were trained in using a series of semantic differentials measuring classroom environment as well as gathering information on competitive and grouping activities. A total of fifty-nine classrooms were observed for all ten schools. All of the teachers in the ten schools were also asked to complete two questionnaires and response rate was 94 percent.

A student subsample for the Pegasus game measure was randomly drawn from the sixth-grade enrollment. Each Pegasus session involved six sixth-grade children, all females or all males, three of whom were Anglo and three of whom were Hispanic. Within these ten schools, a total of thirty-five Pegasus sessions were conducted and videotaped yielding a sample of 102 Anglo and 100 Hispanic students.²⁹

Testing

A school-level measure of the "testing" process was derived for each school in the study from four sources of data: (1) the number of IQ test scores (both group and individual) recorded in each student's cumulative (CUM) file; (2) the percentage of grade levels in each school reported as giving IQ tests; (3) the percentage of grade levels reported as giving achievement tests; and (4) the percentage of students referred and tested compared to the total number of students in the school.

A composite score for each individual sample student in the school was calculated by summing the number of IQ tests on the student's CUM files (weighted by 20), the percentage of grades giving IQ tests, the percentage of grades giving achievement tests, and the percentage of students referred for testing. A school level measure of testing was computed by averaging the summed scores of the sample students in that particular school. The scoring range is 34 to 173, with a higher score representing a higher level of norm-referenced testing in the school. Table 1 presents the ten school scores for each of the four resegregated processes.

Table 1
School Level Mean Scores for Resegregation Processes

<u>Testing</u>		<u>Grouping</u>		<u>Competition</u>		<u>Busing</u>			
						Amount of Hispanic Busing		Hispanic minus Anglo	
School	\bar{X}	School	\bar{X}	School	\bar{X}	School	\bar{X}	School	\bar{X}
H	48	I	2.68	E	4.00	B	0	B	-831
D	51	J	2.68	I	5.00	C	0	I	-47
G	68	B	3.00	C	5.00	D	0	C	-22
E	95	D	3.30	G	5.00	G	0	D	0
B	100	H	4.00	D	5.30	H	0	G	0
F	105	E	4.29	H	5.33	I	0	H	0
I	109	A	4.75	J	5.50	J	0	J	0
J	110	F	4.93	B	5.67	F	1792	E	1532
A	118	G	5.25	A	5.75	A	1816	F	1586
C	124	C	5.92	F	5.83	E	2314	A	1666
\bar{X}	92.80	\bar{X}	4.08	\bar{X}	5.25	\bar{X}	588.60	\bar{X}	388.40
SD	32.37	SD	1.37	SD	.47	SD	905.16	SD	826.00

Grouping

The process of classroom grouping is measured at the school level from two sources of data: (1) the teachers' "yes" or "no" responses to a six-item scale about their own grouping practices on the basis of academic ability and achievement; and (2) the observers' "yes" or "no" responses to a five-item scale asking about their observations of classroom grouping by academic criteria during class sessions (reliability of the subscales is .54, Cronbach's Alpha). The individual teacher's and observer's scores were summed and an average score calculated for each school. The scoring range is 0 to 6, with a higher score representing a higher incidence of classroom grouping by academic ability and achievement.

Competition

A school-level measure of classroom competition was derived from a three-item scale responded to by the classroom observers. "Yes" or "no" responses were gathered on items concerning the posting of individual student grades by the teachers, the encouragement of cooperative student tutoring,

and the use of contests in academic subjects. The questions were then summed for each classroom and the averages calculated for a school-level measure (reliability .46, Cronbach's Alpha). Possible school scores ranged from 0 through 6 and a higher score indicates less competition in the school's classrooms.

Burden of Busing

A school-level measure of the process "burden of busing" was derived for students of both ethnic groups attending a particular school from three data sources: (1) the number of minutes each student who was bused spent riding on the bus from home to school; (2) the number of students in each ethnic group enrolled in school; and (3) the number of students of each ethnic group who were bused. The time that each student of each ethnic group spent riding the bus was summed and then averaged. A separate index was derived for Hispanics and Anglos by multiplying the average time that students of each group were bused by the percentage of the enrollment of that ethnic group who were bused. This controls for the varying proportions of Hispanic students within schools and allows for a statistical comparison across schools. The scoring range for Hispanic students' index of busing is from 0 to 2314; for Anglo students, the index ranges from 0 to 4250. Note in table 1 that the index of Hispanic busing is highly skewed. The use of linear correlational analysis is thus questionable, and conclusions from analysis on this measure should be interpreted cautiously.

A difference score representing the inequities in the burden of busing between the two ethnic groups of students was calculated for each school by subtracting the index of busing score from Anglo students from that of Hispanic students. The scoring range for Hispanic minus Anglo busing differences is -831 to 1664 and does not have the problem of skewness displayed in the simple index of busing. A higher positive score represents a greater burden of busing for the Hispanic students within a school, taking into account the percentage of Hispanic students in the student population.

Student Ascriptive Characteristics

Student characteristics of ethnicity, sex, grade, and socioeconomic status are utilized in the analysis and in the sample as controls. These factors were indicated for each student by the classroom teacher in the selection of the initial sample by grade, sex, and ethnicity. The measure of socioeconomic status was derived from teacher ratings of the occupation of the head of household for each of the sample students. These SES ratings were based on a scale of 0 to 5, with 0 for unemployed or on welfare, 1 for unskilled laborers, 2 for skilled laborers or trades, 3 for clerical workers, 4 for managerial positions, and 5 for professional positions.

Status Differences

A survey instrument was developed to measure status relations between Anglo and Hispanic students. Space Station Pegasus, a group-decision interaction game, is the central measure of status relations. The interaction game incorporates a problem of survival which is dependent upon the decision making and discussion of the students as a group. These conditions meet the requirements of task orientation and collective orientation necessary to the measurement of status relationships within groups.³⁰

The game included a number of measurements which became the basis for two summary scales of status relations between the two ethnic groups. A peer sociometric was completed by each group member of all other members and him/herself which was then utilized to compare the individual and overall ethnic group statuses initially assigned. The interactions of the students during the game were videotaped and then analysed by randomly assigned coders (male and female of each ethnic group) along seven general dimensions: leadership behaviors, individual task orientation, individual behavior toward own ethnic group, individual behavior toward other ethnic group, own ethnic group behavior toward individual, other ethnic group behavior toward individual, and rating of the group decision environment. These behaviors were rated along a series of bipolar semantic differentials.

The actual decisions made by the group and the initial decisions made separately by individuals were compared to yield a measure of individual influence upon the group. Several timing measures were also developed to indicate the amount of time spent by each individual in manipulating and controlling the game supply cards and the time spent speaking. Each of these timed measures were standardized in terms of the overall group interaction time.

From the above measures, two final scales of student status relationships were derived. A detailed description of the factor analysis and weighted composition of the status relationship measures is available in an earlier paper.³¹ The final scales are reflections of status differences between (1) the individual Hispanic student and the other students in the interaction game (Individual Status Differences), and (2) the Hispanic students as a group and the Anglo students as a group (Group Status Differences). A high score on either scale reflects unequal status in terms of Anglo dominance. A zero or negative score indicates equal status relations, defined as either the absence of Anglo student dominance, or as a situation in which diffuse status characteristics of ethnicity do not significantly influence the game interaction.

Analysis

Pearson's product moment correlation coefficients were calculated for the process variables and the status difference measures for Hispanic students. The school level process scores were assigned to each of the students in the school, and the analysis was then performed at the individual level.³² Table 2 presents the correlation coefficients.

Findings

Testing

The positive correlation between the school testing process and student status relationships supports the hypothesis that the testing environment is associated with Hispanic and Anglo interaction in desegregated schools. The correlation between

Table 2
Correlations between Resegregation Processes
and Status Relations for Hispanic
Sixth Grade Students
(N = 100)

School Process	Individual Status Differences	Group Status Differences
Norm-referenced Testing	.20**	.24**
Classroom Grouping	.26**	.25**
Classroom Competition	-.06	-.14
Amount of Hispanic Busing	.34***	.36***
Hispanic Burden of Busing	.30***	.31***
	X .07 SD .95	X .06 SD .99

- Significant at the .05 level.
- ** Significant at the .01 level.
- *** Significant at the .001 level.

testing and individual status differences is .20 ($p \leq .01$). Hispanic group status differences are correlated with testing at .24 ($p \leq .01$). As hypothesized, those desegregated schools with greater amounts of norm-referenced testing show greater status differences between their Anglo and Hispanic students, both on group and individual measures. Conversely, schools with fewer normative testing processes appear to generate more equal status relationships.

Grouping

The process of classroom grouping correlates in the hypothesized direction with Anglo and Hispanic student status relationships. Grouping, measured at the school level, is correlated with greater individual status differences (.26, $p \leq .01$) and with greater group status differences between Hispanic and Anglo students (.25, $p \leq .01$). The greater the use of grouping practices within the desegregated school, the greater the domination by Anglo students, as measured in terms of group and individual status differences in the group sessions.

Competition

The competition variable is not significantly correlated with either measure of student status relations. It appears that

competition in the classroom does not increase status differences between Anglo and Hispanic students. However, both correlations, while not statistically significant, are in the hypothesized direction ($-.06$ for individual status differences and $-.14$ for group status differences). This indicates some trend for competitive school environments contributing to Anglo dominance. It is possible that these competitive processes differentially affect student relationships according to other student statuses of socioeconomic status or sex. This possibility is explored later in the analysis.

Burden of Busing

Both the absolute amounts of Hispanic busing, as well as the difference between Hispanic and Anglo burden of busing, are correlated with greater status differences between the two groups, as hypothesized. The absolute level of Hispanic busing, as well as the differences in the levels of busing, appear to reinforce Anglo student's dominance in the school. The skewness of school scores on the absolute index of busing requires a very conservative interpretation of the correlations. However, the Hispanic burden of busing index is robustly correlated with both individual status differences ($.34$, $p \leq .001$) and $.36$ ($p \leq .001$) with Hispanic group status differences.

Hispanic Male and Female Status Relations

Student characteristics of sex and SES were added to the analysis as control factors. Results indicate that individual socioeconomic status is not significantly correlated with any of the group or individual status relationship measures. A strong interaction effect of student sex appears in the correlations of the school processes with student relations between Anglos and Hispanics. Hispanic female students experience higher levels of status differences in their relationships with Anglo females. The school processes of testing, grouping, and busing are highly correlated with status inequalities for Hispanic females (see table 3). Only the processes of busing differences and classroom competition are significantly correlated with individual and/or group differences for Hispanic males.

Table 3
Correlations between Resegregation Processes
and Status Relations for Sixth Grade
Hispanic Students, by Sex

School Process	Hispanic Males		Hispanic Females	
	Individual Status Differences	Group Status Differences	Individual Status Differences	Group Status Differences
Norm-referenced Testing	.14	-.12	.44***	.45***
Classroom Grouping	.10	.01	.39**	.42**
Classroom Competition	-.24*	-.43***	-.02	-.02
Amount of Hispanic Busing	.19	.15	.38**	.42**
Hispanic Burden of Busing	.23*	.17	.41**	.48***
	X -.15	X -.21	X .33	X .33
	SD .71	SD .64	SD 1.22	SD 1.12
	N 53	N 53	N 47	N 47

- Significant at the .05 level.
- ** Significant at the .01 level.
- *** Significant at the .001 level.

No immediate explanation is available from the model to predict this pattern of process effects for females as opposed to male Hispanic students. It is possible that the general female status in the elementary school differs from that of the male, across ethnic groups, and has consequences for their status relations with others. The strong correlation of testing and grouping to status differences between Hispanic and Anglo females may reflect the traditional emphasis on academic and behavioral success for the female in the elementary school years.³³

Conclusions

The hypothesis that resegregation processes in desegregated schools reinforce status differences between Hispanic and Anglo students is generally upheld. The three processes of testing, grouping, and busing are significantly related to group and individual status differences for Hispanic students overall. Additionally, by taking into account student sex, it is evident that the four school processes are consistently dif-

ferentiated between male and female Hispanic students. The finding that Hispanic females experience higher levels of status inequality is of particular interest given the higher dropout rate of the Hispanic female when compared to the Hispanic male and all other ethnic groups.³⁴

Overall, the four resegregation processes noted do seem to reinforce in student status relationships the stratifying effects of an Anglo dominated school environment. School processes which serve to select out and isolate Hispanic students, differentiating them from the majority population, appear to increase the status inequalities which are often initiated by the implementation of school desegregation policies. Conversely, schools which modify the school environment by limiting the amounts of norm-referenced testing, classroom grouping, and competition, and which equalize the burden of busing between ethnic groups appear to counteract the negative effects of an Anglo educational environment for Hispanic students. The reader is cautioned that at this point we regard these findings as exploratory rather than as definitive tests of the entire model of desegregated school processes. Specifically, the problems of partitioning variance in this small sample of schools preclude the examination of unique and spurious effects for each of the school processes. Additionally, the techniques of assigning school scores to individuals and then performing correlational analyses requires a conservative interpretation of subsequent findings. In light of our findings, even a conservative interpretation of these data suggest that further research into the differential impact of desegregated school environments upon Hispanic and other ethnic minority groups would be valuable.

Other processes which are suggested by the model of Mercer, Iadicola, and Moore as influencing the outcome of student status relations (access to adult role models) have been tested and reported by the authors.³⁵ Additional research in testing the model upon a larger sample is necessary before any definitive conclusions are possible. In general, the findings in this study lend support to the overall hypothesis that specific

school processes within a desegregated environment can have an impact upon student status relationships between Hispanics and Anglos, and possibly provide the solution to some dilemmas in school desegregation.

Notes

1. Gordon Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954).
2. Harold B. Gerard and Norman Miller, *School Desegregation: A Long Term Study* (New York: Plenum Press, 1975).
3. James Coleman et al., *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, vol. 1 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966).
4. Peter Iadicola and Helen Moore, "The Desegregated School and Status Relationships among Anglo and Minority Students" (Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Meetings, August 1979).
5. Jane Mercer, Peter Iadicola, and Helen Moore, "Building Effective Multi-Ethnic Schools: Evolving Models and Paradigms" in *Desegregation: Past, Present and Future*, eds. J. R. Feagin and W. G. Stephan (New York: Plenum Press, 1980).
6. Allport, *Nature of Prejudice*.
7. For a review of the theoretical framework, see I. Katz and M. Cohen, "The Effects of Training Negroes upon Cooperative Problem Solving in Bi-racial Teams," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 61 (1962); J. Berger, B. P. Cohen, and M. Zelditch, Jr. "Status Characteristics and Social Interaction," *American Sociological Review* 37 (1972); and J. Berger et al., *Status Characteristics and Social Interactions: An Expectations States Approach* (New York: Elsevier Press, 1977).
8. See L. Freese and D. Cohen, "Eliminating the Effects of Status Characteristics," Technical Report 45 (Stanford, California: Stanford University Laboratory for Social Research, 1972); Robert Lohman, "Changing a Racial Status Ordering," *Education and Urban Society* 61 (1960); and J. Berger et al., "Status Characteristics."
9. Mercer et al., "Building Effective Multi-Ethnic Schools."
10. Irwin Katz, Judith Goldstein, and Larry Benjamin, "Effects of White Authoritarianism in Biracial Work Groups," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 61 (1960).
11. James Vasquez, "Measurement of Intelligence and Language Differences," *Aztlán: Chicano Journal of the Social Sciences and the Arts* 3

(1972); and J.R. Mercer and W.C. Brown, "Racial Differences in IQ: Fact or Artifact?" in *The Fallacy of IQ*, ed. C. Senna (New York: Free Press, 1973).

12. Caroline Persell, *Education and Inequality* (New York: Free Press, 1977).

13. J. Berger et al., "Status Characteristics."

14. Irwin Katz, Judith Goldstein, and Larry Benjamin, "Behavior and Productivity in Biracial Groups," *Human Relations* 11 (1958).

15. Jane R. Mercer, "Adolescent Prejudice: A Commentary" (Paper prepared for the National Invitational Conference on Adolescent Prejudice and Its Implication in Schools, Berkeley, California, 1976).

16. James Jones, Edsel Erickson, and Ronald Cromwell, "Increasing the Gap between Whites and Blacks: Tracking as a Contributory Source," *Education and Urban Society* 4 (1972).

17. Elizabeth Cohen and Susan Roper, "Modification of Interracial Interaction Disability: An Application of Status Characteristic Theory," *American Sociological Review* 37: 6 (1972).

18. Charles Lavatelli et al., *Elementary School Curriculum* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1972).

19. Ralph Turner, *The Social Context of Ambition* (San Francisco: Chandler, 1964).

20. Katz et al., "Behavior and Productivity."

21. Cohen and Roper, "Modification of Interracial Interaction Disability."

22. Daniel A. White, "Effects of Busing on Urban Students," *Educational Leadership* 29 (1971); Meyer Weinberg, *Minority Students: A Research Appraisal* (U.S. Government Printing Office, National Institute of Education, 1977).

23. Gerald Dunlop, Richard Harper, and Steven Hurka, "The Influence of Transporting Children to Centralized Schools upon Achievement and Attendance," *Educational Administration and Supervision* 44 (1968).

24. James Davis, "Busing," in *Southern Schools*, ed. Robert L. Crain (ERIC no. Ed 084 426, 1973).

25. William Smith, "A Study of Biracial Interaction in a Racially Balanced School" (Ph.D. diss., University of Tennessee, 1970).

26. Elizabeth Eddy, "Educational Innovation and Desegregation: A Case Study of Symbolic Realignment," *Human Organization* (1971).

27. Robert L. Crain, *Southern Schools* (ERIC no. Ed. 084 426, 1973).

28. Rank orders of the schools and the standardization procedures are available in the *Study of Effective Multiethnic Schools Technical Manual* (Riverside, California: Program Research in Integrated Multiethnic Education, 1979), p. 17.

29. Difficulties in scheduling necessitated six sessions with only four students, two of each ethnic group. Twenty-nine sessions were conducted

with all six students. See Peter Iadicola and Helen Moore, "The Desegregated School," for more sample information.

30. Murry Webster and J. E. Briskell, Jr., "Status Generalization: A Review of Some New Data," *American Sociological Review* 43 (1978).

31. The factor analysis and factor coefficients utilized to weight variables included in the final scales are described in detail in Iadicola and Moore, "The Desegregated School."

32. Cronback argues that very conservative statements should be made when analyses are done at the individual level and observations are made at the classroom and school level. See Luther Cronback, "Response Sets and Test Validity," *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 6 (1964).

33. Helen Moore, "Female Minority Students: Patterns of Conformity and Schooling Commitments" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Riverside, 1979).

34. Martha Cotera, *Diosa y Hembra* (Austin, Texas: Information Referral Services, 1976).

35. Peter Iadicola and Helen Moore, "The Desegregated School."