

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Sociology Department, Faculty Publications

Sociology, Department of

1983

The Desegregated School and Status Relationships among Anglo and Hispanic Students

Peter Iadicola

Indiana University - Purdue University Fort Wayne

Helen A. Moore

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, hmoore1@unl.edu

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



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

Iadicola, Peter and Moore, Helen A., "The Desegregated School and Status Relationships among Anglo and Hispanic Students" (1983). *Sociology Department, Faculty Publications*. 139.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/sociologyfacpub/139>

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.

The Desegregated School and Status Relations among Anglo and Hispanic Students: The Dilemma of School Desegregation*

Peter Iadicola and Helen Moore†

Introduction

This paper examines the effect of mixing students from different ethnic/racial and social class backgrounds on status relations among Anglo and Hispanic students. Its objective is to integrate two streams of research on desegregation which emanate from the two goals of the social policy as noted in the social science literature. Taking the two goals of the policy together and examining their interrelationships may shed new light on the problems of policy implementation.

Desegregation: The Two Policy Goals

Desegregation as a social policy has two objectives, as prescribed in the literature. First, it is a movement to assimilate culturally divergent populations which have been segregated from the dominant society. This assimilationist position

*Research findings reported in this paper were supported by Public Health 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 representing the policy of the granting agency. An earlier draft was presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, August 1979, Boston, Massachusetts.

†Peter Iadicola is Chair of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at Indiana University, Fort Wayne, Indiana. Helen Moore is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at the University of Nebraska, Lincoln Nebraska.

defines equal opportunity as affording culturally “deprived” students the means to become assimilated and, thus, to have an equal opportunity to achieve in school and the larger society.¹ The goals of the policy are often explicitly noted in the past writings of social scientists, as well as newspaper and magazine columnists.

In 1961, former Harvard University President James Conant recommended improved schooling for the black child to overcome the “adverse” influence of the home and the street. Busing black students to schools outside the slums to bring them in contact with white classmates was the method recommended to prepare them for entrance into middle class society and to motivate them to discard their black and lower class culture.² Stuart Alsop, a well-known and respected columnist, succinctly expresses the goal of assimilation:

An enormous educational effort, starting as early as the second year of life, will have to be made if the children of the Negro immigrant, like the children of other immigrants before them, are to become Americans first and Afro-Americans only second.³

Iannacone⁴ notes that, according to the court’s decision in the *Brown vs. the Board of Education* case, separate is not equal: They took a position consistent with the unitary community view of the progressive period, that is, an assimilationist position. Iannacone concludes that the court’s ruling carried the doctrine of progressivism to its inevitable conclusion.

Gerard and Miller⁵ note eleven theoretical assumptions of the policy of desegregation. A central assumption of this policy model is that social influence will occur in any group such that the majority’s norms of conduct, beliefs, values will influence the minority. Gerard and Miller contend that this assumption, as well as the others, are made implicit or explicit in the three processes outlined within the policy of desegregation. The first process discussed is that children will raise their level of aspirations by virtue of a presumably more advanced curriculum and the higher standards imposed

within the desegregated classroom. The second process detailed by the policy involves the lateral transmission of values. This transfer of values is necessary if minority children are to have the "correct" cultural disposition to achieve in the system. This latter process is the keystone for the assimilationist foundation of the policy. The third process discussed specifies a positive effect upon minority group children's self-esteem, resulting from the belief that they are being treated in the same way as majority children. The success of the assimilation effort will be evidenced in the decreasing achievement differentials between minority and dominant Anglo populations. Although today the goal of desegregation currently may not be explicitly described as assimilation, Rist⁶ notes that the implementation of the policy of desegregation around the country pursues this goal. Recent developments in the policy direction of the Department of Education regarding bicultural education programs indicate that the policy goal of assimilation may become more explicit in the near future.

The second major goal of desegregation is the reduction of racial prejudice through contacts between students. Allport⁷ concludes that only equal status contact improves intergroup relations by leading to the perception of common interests and common humanity. The following premises are derived from Allport's work: (1) desegregation is a prerequisite to contact and acquaintance, (2) equal status contact among student, staff, and parents of various racial/ethnic groups in desegregated schools will reduce prejudice, and (3) equal status contact in schools is enhanced when (a) it is sanctioned by explicit school policy, (b) students, staff, and parents of various racial/ethnic groups work together, and (c) the school program emphasizes the common interests and common humanity of persons of all racial/ethnic groups. Gerard and Miller⁸ lists the elimination of prejudice as preceding the achievement of assimilation. Thus, theoretically, as conceived by Gerard and Miller, and Allport, equal status contacts must precede the transmission of majority cultural values.

The Dilemma of School Desegregation

The dilemma of school desegregation lies in the possibility that these two policy goals may not be complementary. Can both goals be achieved within the same institutional setting? Are equal status contacts possible in an environment which is conducive to assimilation? Or, put another way, can assimilation be accomplished in an environment of equal status contacts? In an earlier paper, Iadicola⁹ develops a model of the assimilation process in the desegregated school. A prerequisite of the model is the numerical minority position of Mexican American students in the school. This condition serves to inhibit ingroup segregation and encourage structural assimilation. This also follows from one of Gerard and Miller's assumptions: "Many proponents of desegregation argue that as long as the black students in a given classroom are in a minority, majority white influence over the minority will prevail, thus changing the achievement-related conduct, the beliefs, and the values of the black children in the class."¹⁰ However, being from a numerical minority may have a negative effect upon status relations between students, serving to reinforce a condition of status deprivation in interaction with those in the majority. In a recent work, Blau¹¹ discusses these same structural factors as determinants of status or power, and assimilation.

The interaction of students in the informal social system of the secondary school has been recognized for some time as reflecting the rank order statuses and relationships of the larger society.¹² Such a reproduction of status relations implies the presence of similar structural constraints. The generally heterogeneous population of secondary schools reflects the demographics of the larger community. On the other hand, neighborhood elementary schools are relatively homogeneous in racial and social class composition because of residential segregation. In these latter schools, status relations within the informal social system, as defined racially, do not generally reflect those of the larger society. Since desegregation increases the heterogeneity of the populations of elementary schools with a dominance of Anglo students, it

is likely that the status structure within the desegregated school will tend to reproduce the status differences of the larger society? The specific question is, what is the effect of this increasing level of Anglo percentage and socioeconomic status of the school on status relations between Anglo and minority students?

Desegregation: The Two Research Paths

There appear to be two directions that desegregation research has taken which corresponds to the two policy goals. The assimilation goal is reinterpreted in terms of desegregation's effect upon achievement. Assimilation, the intermediary step between implementation and outcome, is often assumed to be operating as a result of the mixing of students. Gerard and Miller¹³ specifically test this assumption, without providing any additional support for the hypothesis. There have been two major reviews of the desegregation-achievement literature. Weinberg¹⁴ notes that "of the studies cited . . . twenty-nine found definite achievement effects by minority students in a desegregated setting: nineteen reported no effect." St. John¹⁵ concludes in her review that biracial schooling is neither a success nor a failure. The National Opinion Research Center's¹⁶ analysis of 200 southern biracial high schools generally found weak effects of school racial composition. Bradley and Bradley¹⁷ contend that studies which show beneficial effects of desegregation suffer severe methodological deficiencies, while those studies which are relatively well-designed provide both support and non-support for the integration thesis.

Other research dealing specifically with the effects of the social class level of the school also have mixed results. The relationship between the overall social class of the school and its effects upon college aspirations and attendance has been extensively explored.¹⁸ A number of researchers have hypothesized and found that a working class student attending a school where most students are middle class will be more likely to go to college.¹⁹ These results have been disputed by the research of Hauser, and Sewell and Armer²⁰,

which concluded that the contextual effect of school social class on college aspirations was small. An explanation, which has become known as the frog pond effect,²¹ contends that discouragement on the part of the working class students occurs when they compare their success in school to that of middle class students. This comparison effect may also manifest itself in the status relations between the students in the school. Schools in which a frog pond effect is taking place may also be characterized by unequal status relations. Assimilation may be taking place in these schools in terms of the effect on achievement; however, status inequality may be serving to depress the student's aspiration, or in some cases, status inequality may be altogether inhibiting achievement by means of obstructing assimilation. Iadicola²² found that in conditions of Anglo population dominance, those students who had integrated into the Anglo peer group (achieved structural assimilation) and achieved academically in school (cultural assimilation) were more ethnically outgroup-oriented than those who did not. A clear understanding of the dynamics of the relationship between the two goals, assimilation and status relations, may provide some additional insight to account for the mixed nature of the research on the effects of racial and social class desegregation.

Research in the area of status relations has taken another path toward the investigation of the second policy goal. Empirical and theoretical work in the area of status relations indicates that achieving equal status contacts among persons of different racial/ethnic groups is complicated by factors not foreseen in Allport's earlier model. Katz and Benjamin found that in biracial work groups matched on measured intelligence, blacks displayed marked social inhibition and subordination to white partners, making fewer proposals, accepting contributions of whites uncritically, and talking more to whites than to other blacks.²³ Similar findings were reported in over a dozen other investigations between 1950 and 1960.²⁴ Cohen and associates²⁵ report that black and white public school children display similar responses in

expectations of competence when involved in a biracial group game. White students had higher initiation rates and were more influential than blacks.

The literature on status organizing processes in small groups has been generalized and developed into a single theoretical framework by Berger, Cohen, and Zelditch.²⁶ A central concept in the theory is that diffuse status characteristics, such as race, age, and sex, are: (1) differentially valued, (2) associated with a perceived set of specific abilities (i.e., blacks are athletic, women are emotional), and (3) individually defined as some general expectation for relative competence. Under conditions where a task is valued and group members are motivated both to succeed and to take others' behaviors into account, and where individuals are perceived as having status characteristics and their attributes, competence is expected. Moreover, general expectations for superior competence will be held by *both* low- and high-status subjects if no other social basis for discrimination exists.

In situations where race/ethnicity exists as a diffuse status characteristic, the general expectation is that Anglos expect minority individuals to participate at lower levels of competence, and minority individuals fulfill that expectation of inferiority by lower levels of participation, deference to Anglo suggestions, etc. This cycle of rank order status differentiation forms the basis for unequal status relationships and results in what Cohen²⁷ has termed "interracial interaction disability." This "interracial interaction disability" on the part of minority students serves to reinforce the negative stereotypes the dominant Anglo student population has of them, thus preserving and legitimizing the status structure of the dominant society in terms of ethnicity.

The two streams of research which stem from the goals of the policy may inadvertently point to the dilemma of school desegregation mentioned earlier. What is the effect of a policy of mixing students from different racial and social classes to achieve "resocialization" upon status relations in desegregated schools? What effect does a policy to achieve

equal status relations between Anglo and minority students in order to improve inter-group relations have upon achieving the goal of assimilation? The gap in the status relations literature, that is, the effect of peer group contextual factors on status relations, is the primary focus of the assimilation-achievement research. Closing this gap may provide insight into the mixed findings discussed earlier, as well as into the policy problems in achieving the goals of desegregation.

Hypothesis

The dilemma of desegregation manifests itself in the adverse effects of a high percentage of Anglo student enrollment and a high level of socioeconomic status on status relations between Anglo and minority students in desegregated schools. Mixing students in a manner which increases the likelihood of resocialization, or assimilation, may serve to recreate the unequal status relations of the larger society. Creating an environment which is conducive to equal status relations, on the other hand, may negate the "positive" influence which higher status Anglo students have on minority student performance. When desegregated schools have a high percentage of Anglo students and a high level of socioeconomic status, it enhances the status differences between Anglo and minority students. In this environment, the minority student is in a dependent position in the school in terms of achieving status in the Anglo dominant peer group. The assimilation process serves to downgrade the ethnicity of the minority student and to reward conformance to Anglo middle class behaviors and attitudes.

If an incongruence is present in the two policy goals, one would hypothesize that (1) there is a positive relationship between percent Anglo enrollment in the school and level of status inequality between Anglo and Hispanic students, and (2) there is a positive relationship between total socioeconomic status of the school and the level of status inequality between Anglo and Hispanic students.

Design

Sample

Data are derived from cases studies of ten desegregated elementary schools in California. There are two samples which will form the basis of the analysis: a school sample of ten desegregated elementary schools and a student sample of 102 Anglo and 118 Hispanic sixth grade students. The ten schools were selected from a 1973-1974 sample of 182 desegregated elementary schools for which school evaluation profiles were available on student mental health and academic outcomes. Rank orders of the standardized residual scores on academic and mental health outcomes, controlling for grade, political environment, and socioeconomic and ethnic composition, were calculated for each school and ethnic group.²⁸ The final sample of ten schools includes an equal number of schools with positive outcomes for Hispanic students and schools with negative outcomes for Hispanic students. Thus, the sample is analytic in that we have attempted to obtain the widest variance in school outcomes to determine the effects of school characteristics. Hispanic student enrollment in these schools ranged from 10 to 53 percent of the school population.

The student subsample was selected for the interaction game session. This subsample was randomly drawn from the sixth grade enrollment. It was designed to contain an equal number of males and females. Hispanic students were over-sampled in the sixth grade in order to obtain a large enough sample.

Operationalizations

The Anglo percentage of the school was obtained from the school records. The range of scores for the ten schools is 21 percent to 86 percent Anglo. The mean Anglo percentage of the school sample is 53.6 percent; standard deviation is 23.02 percent. The measure of the school level of socioeconomic status is derived from two sources of data: (1) sixth and third grade teachers' ratings of head of household's occupation for

each student in their classes, and (2) the percent of students from each ethnic group enrolled in the school. In order to approximate a measure of SES for the entire school, it was necessary to combine the information on the SESs of both third and sixth grade students from each ethnic group with a measure of their ethnic representation in the school. The teachers' 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 merchants, "3" for clerical workers, "4" for managerial positions, and "5" for professional positions. In comparing the teachers' ratings of parental SES with the sixth grade sample's parents' self-reports of their own occupations, the correlations were approximately .70.²⁹ Teachers' ratings of parental SES from each ethnic group attending the third and sixth grades were summed, averaged, and then standardized against a sample of 10,000 students from 174 desegregated schools involved in an earlier study, with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of 15.³⁰ A single school level score was computed for the standardized SES scores assigned to each ethnic group as follows: Anglo SES score x (percent Anglo students enrolled ÷ 100) + black SES score x (percent black students enrolled ÷ 100) + Hispanic SES score x (percent Hispanic students enrolled ÷ 100) + Asian SES score x (percent Asian students enrolled ÷ 100). The scoring range is 27.30 to 58.44. A higher score represents a higher parental socioeconomic status for students enrolled in the school. Table 1 presents the school scores for Anglo percentage and socioeconomic status.

The measure of individual SES is derived from a questionnaire administered to the parents of the sixth grade students selected for the student sample. Parents' responses are coded in terms of Duncan occupational codes.³¹ If the parents did not respond to the question, the teacher's rating (multiplied x 20 to maintain similar scale values) was used. Sex of the student was indicated by the teachers, coded "1" for male and "2" for female.

Status Relations: Procedures for Data Collection and Scoring
A survey instrument was developed to measure status rela-

Table 1
School Level Mean Scores for
Group Contextual Variables*

Socioeconomic Status		Percent Anglo Students	
Schools	School \bar{X}	Schools	Percent
F	58.44	C	21%
A	57.62	I	33%
D	50.10	K	35%
E	45.48	G	38%
M	44.44	D	51%
G	43.66	J	65%
K	41.24	E	69%
I	40.71	M	76%
J	38.03	A	79%
C	27.30	F	86%
	\bar{X} 44.70		\bar{X} 55.3
	SD 9.20		SD 22.65

*Six of the schools were biethnic: Hispanic/Anglo (A,D,E,F,J,M). Four of the schools were triethnic: Black/Hispanic/Anglo (C,G,I,K).

tions between Anglo and Hispanic sixth grade students. It was necessary for the instrument to meet the two scope conditions specified in the literature: task orientation and collective orientation.³² Task orientation refers to the specification that the group member's purpose in meeting with the group is to solve some problems, rather than simply to enjoy each other's company. The interaction game developed incorporated a problem of group survival to be solved to meet this specification. Collective orientation means that the members regard it as legitimate and necessary to consider every individual's ideas in working on the task. Instructions in the game emphasized that the decision would be a group decision and that ranking the survival supplies was to be discussed among the members. Students were told that at the conclusion of the game, their group answers would be compared to the ranking of supplies completed by the NASA astronauts, to see how well they had done.

The game, Space Station Pegasus, incorporates an initial sociometric status ranking dimension at the beginning and an individual and group decision task derived from a classroom instructional tool³³ in the second half of the game. The game

is divided in two parts in terms of the two tasks to be completed.

Each Pegasus session involved six sixth grade children, all females or all males, three of whom were Anglo and three of whom were Hispanic. The students were randomly selected from the total sixth grade population of each school in the study. In schools with an insufficient sixth grade population for sampling, the fifth grade was also sampled. However, sixth and fifth grade students were *not* mixed in the Pegasus session. From the ten schools selected, a total of thirty-five Anglo/Hispanic group sessions were conducted.

Equipment for the game involved a circular Pegasus game table 48 inches in diameter; six chairs positioned in a semicircle around the table; 3" x 4" supply cards; Pegasus crew position ballots and supply ranking scoring sheets; videotape recorder, camera and tripod; and name tags. The game was administered by two experimenters, both Anglo males. It was important that Anglo experimenters were consistently used in order to closely approximate the Anglo-dominant authority pattern in the classroom. Work was divided between the two experimenters, such that one consistently read the narration, while the other operated the videotape equipment. Because the locations provided varied from school to school, the luxury of a hidden, unobtrusive camera was not possible. The camera was positioned approximately 15 feet directly in front of the edge of the table. A microphone was placed on a chair under the front portion of the table. The camera remained stationary and focused on the six students facing it. The videotape equipment was in operation only in the second half of the game, during the group decision. This procedure was followed consistently throughout the thirty-five sessions.

Students entered the room together and were allowed to sit where they wished, given the constraint of the semicircular positioning of seats. Although it was recognized that randomization of seating would have reduced bias in the interaction derived from seat location, it was decided that the seat

choice itself formed a part of status relations that should not be excluded from the assessment. As a general rule, given the hybrid nature of the instrument, manipulation and experimental controls were minimized.

Crew Sociometrics

Students were asked individually to decide upon crew positions. Each of the crew positions was described in terms of its role and status rank: commander, second-in-command, medical officer, communications officer, cook, and deck hand. Students made their selections by secret ballot. Students were asked to draw lines on a sheet of paper connecting each student's name to one crew position. Students wore name tags during the game for easy identification. After students had marked their ballots, they were collected. To minimize the effect the crew vote may have had on the second part of the game, students were asked not to discuss their decisions. Each of the crew positions was weighted according to its status rank. Two scores were calculated from these data: an overall assessment of crew status based on the average score an individual received from members of the group, and a self-selection score.

Influence Score

In the second half of the game, students were asked to rank order a list of supplies in terms of their importance for moon survival. Students first individually ranked the supplies. Following the individual rankings, the group discussed the items and came to a group decision. The group interaction during the group decision was videotaped for later coding. During the group decision, the students' own individual rankings were kept before them for their own reference. An absolute difference score was calculated, comparing the individual's ranking of supplies with the group's final decision on the ranking. This provided an indicator of the individual's influence on the group decision: the higher the score, the less influence on the group's final decision.

Videotaped Interaction

Additional measures were obtained from videotaping the interaction. Interaction was scored along seven general behavioral dimensions: individual leadership behavior, individual task orientation, individual's behavior toward own ethnic group, individual's behavior toward other ethnic group, own ethnic group behavior toward the individual, other ethnic group behavior toward the individual, and rating of the group decision. Each behavioral dimension was composed of a listing of bipolar adjectives constructed along a seven-point semantic differential. These semantic differentials were pretested with twenty-five randomly selected cases from the sample. The adjective pairs were evaluated in terms of the observer's ability to clearly identify the subject's overt behavior in the game. Two observers scored the same cases in terms of sixty-seven bipolar adjectives. Ratings were compared and discussed. The adjectives were then factor analyzed in terms of the seven predefined dimensions. Table 2 presents the final factor analysis of those items selected.³⁴

Six raters, one male and one female from each of the three ethnic groups tested (Anglo, black, and Hispanic), underwent two-week training sessions (approximately twenty hours total). The training entailed (1) reviewing and discussing the verbal definitions of the adjectives, (2) viewing and discussing a ninety minute training videotape which served to define the adjectives behaviorally and present the extreme scores, 1 and 7, on each adjective rating, and (3) rating of a selection of subjects by observers; ratings were then discussed. Observers were released when they had attained a predetermined satisfactory percentage of agreement. Each observer was randomly assigned to a child in the game. Observers viewed the tape a minimum of two complete times for rating each of the seven dimensions. At the conclusion of the observations, the raters reviewed their scores by marking the numerical codes for each of the ratings alongside each of the adjectives. Observers were instructed not to consult with each other during the ratings. Raters were allowed to rate for a maximum of two hours at any one sitting. This limitation served to

Table 2
Final Factor Loadings and Reliability Coefficients for
Ratings of Videotaped Interaction for
Each Third of the Sample

Leadership	Task Orientation			Group Decision			Factor Loading				
	Factor Loading	1	2	3	Factor Loading	1		2	3	Factor Loading	
Dominant/Submissive	.91	Interested/Bored	.81	Democratic/Authoritarian	.77						
Directing/Nondirecting	.84	Industrious/Lackadaisical	.84	Group decision/Individual decision	.78						
Initiates/Follows	.85	Concentrating/Distracting	.72	Organized/Disorganized	.48						
Opinionated/Unopinionated	.78	Independent/Dependent	.59	Participating/Nonparticipating	.76						
Decisive/Indecisive	.77	Logical/Illlogical	.62	Integrative/Separative	.83						
Innovative/Rigid	.54	Orderly/Unorderly	.68	Cooperative/Noncooperative	.75						
Manipulative/Nonmanipulative	.33	Helpful/Not helpful	.44	Equal group participation/ Unequal group participation	.67						
Organizing/Nonorganizing	.80	Participating/Nonparticipating	.83	Group unified/Group split	.75						
Demanding/Complacent	.77	Attentive/Inattentive	.61								
Extroverted/Introverted	.74	Persevering/Quitting	.62								
Effective/Ineffective	.84	Enthusiastic/Indifferent	.79								
Reliabilities (Cronbach's Alpha)											
1	2	3	All	1	2	3	All	Reliabilities (Cronbach's Alpha)			
.94	.93	.92	.93	.91	.90	.91	.91	Entire Sample			
.89											
Individual Behavior											
Toward Own and Other											
Ethnic Group Behavior											
Toward Individual											
Toward Other Group											
Factor Loading											
Friendly/Aloof	.84	Friendly/Aloof	.79	Own Group	Factor Loading	Other Group	Factor Loading				
Warm/Cold	.88	Warm/Cold	.80	Friendly/Aloof	.82	Warm/Cold	.83				
Agreeable/Disagreeable	.57	Agreeable/Disagreeable	.56	Agreeable/Disagreeable	.69	Agreeable/Disagreeable	.69				
Sociable/Self-contained	.63	Smiles/Frowns	.59	Smiles/Frowns	.72	Smiles/Frowns	.72				
Smiles/Frowns	.65	Popular/Unpopular	.64	Popular/Unpopular	.66	Popular/Unpopular	.66				
Supports/Does not support	.64	Supports/Does not support	.66	Supports/Does not support	.89	Supports/Does not support	.89				
Cheerful/Morose	.77	Accepts suggestions/ Rejects suggestions	.68	Accepts suggestions/ Rejects suggestions	.70	Accepts suggestions/ Rejects suggestions	.65				
Accepts suggestions/ Rejects suggestions	.61		.53								
Reliabilities (Cronbach's Alpha)											
1	2	3	All	1	2	3	All	Reliabilities (Cronbach's Alpha)			
.86	.89	.88	.88	.86	.82	.87	.86	1	2	3	All
				.85	.90	.90	.88	.87	.88	.89	.88

reduce the fatigue factor in the ratings. A seventh observer (Anglo female), who trained with the group of six, together with the two trainers, also randomly selected cases which were being rated by the six observers in order to evaluate their ratings in terms of agreement. Internal consistency reliability coefficients were calculated for each one-third of the sample of cases completed in order to check the performance of the six observers over the full length of the ratings. Table 2 presents the reliabilities³⁵ for each of the dimensions of each third of the sample, as well as the composite reliabilities. Meetings of observers and supervisors were held periodically, and more frequently during the first month, to discuss problem cases or general problems with definitions and procedures.

Timing Measures

At the conclusion of coding the verbal interaction, timing measures were carried out. Each subject was timed for the length of time he or she spoke and the length of time she or he manipulated and held a series of supply cards during the group decision. Each subject was independently timed three times by three different observers. An average score was calculated for time speaking and time manipulating and holding cards. Each score was standardized in terms of the total length of time for the group interaction.

Status Difference Scores

Six measures of individual status differences and six measures of group status differences are derived from the game. The individual status difference measures are designed to measure the individual student's level of status differences when compared to Anglo student status. Individual Hispanic student's scores on a series of status (performance) measures are subtracted from the average of Anglo student's scores on the same measures to calculate a level of individual status differences. The status measures are ratings of leadership differences, differences in the amount of speaking time, differences in the amount of card manipulation, differences

in crew status rank, differences in the level of influence over the final group decision, and the individual's own perception of status differences as measured by the individual's choice of crew rank for himself or herself subtracted from the average choice the student gave to the three Anglo students in the game.

The six measures of group status differences are designed to indicate the average differences between Anglo and Hispanic students in each game session in each school. To calculate the level of group status differences between Anglo and Hispanic students, the average Hispanic scores on the status scores are subtracted from the average scores of the Anglo students in the game. The status difference measures range from a negative score, indicating a lack of Anglo student dominance, to a positive score, indicating Anglo status dominance. The only exception to this scoring frame is the case of influence differences, which is just the opposite (negative score indicating Anglo student dominance). A seventh measure of status relations is derived from a series of ratings made by group observers on the level of equal participation in the group decision (see table 2 for adjective pairings within this measure). A high score on the measure of group decision refers to more equal participation in the group decision.

Two composite status difference scores (individual and group) are calculated from a factor analysis of the twelve status difference measures and the group decision measure. Factor score coefficients were calculated for each of the items to construct the two composite measures. Table 3 presents the factor score loadings for each of the status difference items comprising the two composite factors. A high score on each of the status difference measures, except where previously noted, and the composite score indicate unequal status in terms of Anglo dominance; a zero or negative score indicates an absence of Anglo student status dominance. This latter pattern of scores is defined in terms of the theoretical conceptualization as equal status relations; diffuse status characteristics are irrelevant to the interaction.

Table 3
Factor Loadings for
Status Differences, Group and Individual

Group Status Differences		Individual Status Differences	
Variable	Factor Loading	Variable	Factor Loading
<i>Leadership</i>	.67	<i>Leadership</i>	.69
Anglo group score minus Hispanic score		Anglo group score minus individual score	
<i>Speaking</i>	.59	<i>Speaking</i>	.69
Anglo group score minus Hispanic score		Anglo group score minus individual score	
<i>Card Manipulation</i>	.62	<i>Card Manipulation</i>	.58
Anglo group score minus Hispanic score		Anglo group score minus individual score	
<i>Average Crew Status Ranking</i>	.63	<i>Crew Status Ranking</i>	.48
Anglo group score minus Hispanic score		Anglo group score minus individual score	
<i>Influence</i>	-.28	<i>Influence</i>	-.26
Anglo group score minus Hispanic score		Anglo group score minus individual score	
<i>Individual Crew Selection</i>	.42	<i>Crew Self-Selection Score</i>	.30
Anglo group self-selection score minus Hispanic self-selection score		Anglo group self-selection score minus individual self-selection score	
<i>Group Decision</i>	-.21	<i>Group Decision</i>	-.14

Results

School scores on the measures of Anglo percentage and SES are attached to the individual student and Pearson product moment correlations are calculated between the school and individual background characteristics, and the measures of status inequality. Table 4 presents these correlation coefficients. A sex difference is present in the level of status inequality Hispanic students experience in their relations with Anglo students. Hispanic females experience higher levels of status inequality than Hispanic males. This pattern is present for both the individual status difference variables and group status difference variables. For example, sex is correlated .33 ($p \leq .001$) with crew self selection (individual differences); .27 ($p \leq .01$) with card manipulation (individual differences); and .26 ($p \leq .01$) with individual status difference composite

score. Correlations with the groups status difference variables are more pronounced: .36 ($p \leq .001$) with card manipulation (group differences): .30 ($p \leq .01$) with crew self selection and crew rank (group differences); and .29 ($p \leq .001$) with group status difference composite score.

The relationships between individual socioeconomic status and status difference variables are, on the other hand, generally weak. For the sample as a whole, the only statistically significant correlation is with crew rank individual differences, $-.20$ ($p \leq .05$). Thus, the higher the level of individual socioeconomic status for Hispanic students, the lower the level of status differences between Anglo and Hispanic students as measured by crew rank differences. In looking at the relationships separately for males and females, we find that individual socioeconomic status is only statistically significant for the Hispanic males. Individual socioeconomic status is significantly correlated with crew rank (individual differences) $-.37$ ($p \leq .01$) with individual status differences composite score, $-.25$ ($p \leq .05$), and $-.27$ and $-.24$ ($p \leq .05$) with card manipulation and crew rank (group differences), respectively. Thus, the higher the level of socioeconomic status for Hispanic males, the lower the level of status inequality they experienced in their relations with Anglo males. Conversely, the lower the level of socioeconomic status for Hispanic males, the higher the level of status inequality they experienced in their relations with Anglo males.

The correlations between school factors and status differences for the sample as a whole indicate that only school socioeconomic status is significantly related to status differences. The relationships are also strongest with the group status difference variables. The level of socioeconomic status of the school is correlated .43 ($p \leq .001$) with rating of leadership (group differences), .32 ($p \leq .001$) with speaking (group differences), .21 ($p \leq .001$) with crew self selection (group differences), and .36 ($p \leq .001$) with the composite score of group status differences. Thus, the higher the level of school socioeconomic status, the higher the level of Anglo student dominance in the school.

Table 4
Pearson Correlations between Racial and Socioeconomic Status of the
School and Status Differences among Anglo and Hispanic Students

	Hispanic Students (n = 100)			Hispanic Males (n = 53)			Hispanic Females (n = 47)			
	School Socio- economic Status	School Percent Anglo	Sex	Individual Socio- economic Status	School Socio- economic Status	School Percent Anglo	Individual Socio- economic Status	School Socio- economic Status	School Percent Anglo	Individual Socio- economic Status
Individual Status Differences										
Leadership	.31***	.07	.11	-.07	.26*	.18	-.12	.36**	-.06	-.03
Speaking	.22**	.04	.09	-.03	.20	.14	-.09	.24*	-.07	.02
Card Manip.	.15	.04	.27**	-.02	-.14	-.07	-.21	.44***	.11	.18
Crew Rank	.10	.11	.23**	-.20*	-.15	-.38**	-.37**	.34**	.14	-.03
Influence	-.08	.05	.18*	.09	.07	.14	.12	-.44***	-.20	.02
Crew Self- selection	.19*	.12	.33***	-.03	.13	.20	-.04	.26*	.02	-.04
Individual Status Diff. Composite Score	.29**	.02	.26**	-.02	.11	-.03	-.25*	.43***	.02	.14
Group Status Differences										
Leadership	.43***	.11	.14	-.05	.39**	.27*	-.10	.46***	-.05	-.02
Speaking	.32***	.07	.13	-.01	.31**	.22*	-.04	.33***	-.11	.01
Card Manip.	.20*	.05	.36***	-.03	-.23*	-.12	-.24*	.54***	.14	.15
Crew Rank	.12	-.16*	.30***	-.11	-.17	-.46***	-.27*	.42**	.12	.06
Influence	-.10	.06	.23**	.11	.09	.19	.20	-.52***	-.23	-.04
Crew Self- selection	.21*	.05	.30**	.04	.09	-.07	.03	.36**	.17	.05
Group Status Diff. Composite Score	.36***	.05	.29***	-.01	.09	-.12	-.16	.55***	.12	.07
Rating of Group Decision	-.13	-.10	.06	.07	.16	.04	.09	-.45***	-.27*	.05

* p ≤ .05 ** p ≤ .01 *** p ≤ .001

Generally, the relationships between school socioeconomic status and status differences are stronger for the Hispanic female than for the Hispanic male. Nevertheless, the same pattern as found for the sample as a whole is present for both males and females. For males, socioeconomic status of the school is correlated .39 ($p \leq .01$) with rating of leadership (group differences), .31 ($p \leq .05$) with speaking (group differences), and .26 ($p \leq .05$) with rating of leadership (individual differences). The school's Anglo percentage is also significantly correlated with status differences for Hispanic males .27 and .22 ($p \leq .05$) with leadership and speaking (group differences). These relationships, however, are more likely to be spurious because of the high correlation between the Anglo and percentage and school socioeconomic status, .75 ($p \leq .001$).

For Hispanic males, there are some statistically significant correlations that are in the opposite direction hypothesized. School socioeconomic status is correlated -.23 ($p \leq .05$) with card manipulation group differences, and the Anglo percentage of the school is correlated -.46 ($p \leq .001$) with crew rank (group differences) and -.38 ($p \leq .01$) with crew rank (individual differences). With a small size, ten schools and fifty-three Hispanic males, the data are more vulnerable to relationships which are merely artifacts of the sample. Further research is necessary to determine if these aberrant findings are indeed artifacts of this specific sample.

The relationships for the Hispanic female sample display a much stronger pattern for both sets of indicators of status differences. The pattern of a stronger effect of school socioeconomic status as compared to Anglo percentage is even more pronounced. The strongest correlations with individual status difference variables are .44 ($p \leq .001$) with card manipulation, -.44 ($p \leq .001$) with influence over final group decision (negative scores indicate Anglo influence dominance), .36 ($p \leq .01$) with rating of leadership differences, and .43 ($p \leq .001$) with the composite measure of individual status differences. The pattern is the same for the correlations with group status differences: .54 ($p \leq .001$) with card

manipulation, $-.52$ ($p \leq .001$) with influence over group decision, $.46$ ($p \leq .001$) with rating of leadership differences, and $.55$ ($p \leq .001$) with composite group status differences. The rating of the group decision is also consistent with this pattern, $-.45$ ($p \leq .001$) (negative score indicates less equal participation in group decision).

In general, the findings point to the fact that the higher level of school socioeconomic status, and not the percentage of Anglo students, has an impact on increasing status differences between Hispanic and Anglo students. This is especially the case with Hispanic females, where there are higher levels of status inequality experienced. In terms of the absence of an effect of Anglo percentage on status inequality, it may be that Hispanic ethnicity is not a diffuse status characteristic on which students are ranked. If so, the higher percentages of Anglo students in the school would not have an effect on status relations for Hispanic students. Thus, ranking may only be occurring in terms of social class, not ethnicity, for Hispanic/Anglo status differences. Further investigation must focus on this question of Hispanic ethnicity as a diffuse status characteristic in status relations. It is important especially in the case of Hispanic females, where the pattern of relationships is strongest, that individual SES did not have an effect on status relations. This reaffirms that the findings refer to a school context and are not an effect of the individual's social class background. This pattern is also present for males, but not as pronounced. Although the findings must be viewed as preliminary because of the small sample size, they do point, nevertheless, to important conclusions regarding the dilemma of school desegregation.

Discussion

The dilemma for policymakers concerned with desegregation is apparent. Placing Hispanic students in an environment which is conducive to their assimilation, that is, one dominated by high socioeconomic status students, develops a process by which there is a reproduction and reinforcement of the status inequalities found in the dominant society.

Lockheed³⁶ concluded in a study testing the effects of the diffuse status characteristics of sex on leadership patterns in mixed sex groups, that classroom tasks should be first initially performed in sex-segregated groups. Allowing female students to gain experience in the task in a sex-segregated environment improves the status relations in later mixed sex groups. The implications of these findings are central to the dilemma discussed. Is sex segregation in education beneficial to later status relations between males and females? By extension, the question arises, is race/ethnic and social class segregation in education beneficial to later status relations between Anglo and minority students?

Conclusions such as these lead to three major questions in terms of social policy. The first and foremost is whether or not assimilation, or resocialization, is the most beneficial policy for minorities. The ethnocentric and classist foundation of the policy of desegregation, which is evident in early theories of cultural deprivation, should be reevaluated in light of today's power relationships.³⁷ Nevertheless, if the answer is "yes" to this first question, then is status inequality necessary for the resocialization/assimilation of minority students into the Anglo dominant mainstream? It may be that placing a minority student in a position of inferior status makes him or her more dependent upon Anglo students for reward and acceptance, thereby encouraging conformance to Anglo norms and values. However, if this condition is not necessary, which school processes contribute or counteract the status inequality experienced in Anglo-dominant school environments?

Much research has been done on the effects of training sessions as reinforcers of performance characteristics to overcome the effects of diffuse status characteristics.³⁸ However, considering the scale of such endeavors and the expense, the practicality of such interventions on a large scale in schools is questionable. In a recent paper, Cohen and Deslonde³⁹ discuss structural factors, such as minority staffing patterns, as well as teaching methods in the classroom, grouping practices, and level of conflict in the school, as possibly affecting

status relations and academic outcomes. Mercer, Iadicola, and Moore⁴⁰ present a hypothesized model of status equalization and ranking processes in desegregated schools. In this model, ten processes which operate in the school are hypothesized to effect status relations between Anglo and minority students: (1) norm referenced testing practices, (2) classroom grouping practices, (3) minority staff influence, (4) minority parent influence, (5) multicultural curriculum, (6) Anglo dominant normative environment, (7) individual competitive environment, (8) busing practices, (9) resource allocation, and (10) Anglo dominance of extracurricular activities. By manipulating these school processes, it may be possible to accomplish both goals of desegregation. However, if it is impossible to reconcile the conflicting policy goals, the questions of who is to decide what the priority is and what other alternatives will be explored to reach the liberal social scientists goal of "equal opportunity" remain.

Notes

1. Peter Iadicola, "Desegregation: The Assimilation of a Minority Population." *Sociological Focus* (August) 1981, and Peter Iadicola, "Intellectual Models and School Policy; Desegregation as a Method of Assimilation" (paper presented at the North Central Sociological Association's Annual Meeting, 1980).

2. Robert A. Carlson, *The Quest for Conformity: Americanization through Education* (New York: Wiley, 1975).

3. Stewart Alsop, "The Anti Honky War" (*Newsweek*, December 16, 1968, p. 16).

4. Lawrence Iannacone, "Three Views of Change in Educational Politics," in Jay D. Scribner, *The Politics of Education* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977).

5. Harold B. Gerard and Norman Miller, *School Desegregation: A Long Term Study* (New York: Plenum Press, 1975).

6. Ray Rist, *The Invisible Children: School Integration in American Society* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978).

7. Gordon Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954).
8. Gerard and Miller, *School Desegregation*.
9. Iadicola, "Desegregation: The Assimilation of a Minority Population."
10. Gerard and Miller, *School Desegregation*, p. 17.
11. Peter M. Blau, *Inequality and Heterogeneity: A Primitive Theory of Social Structure* (New York: Free Press, 1977).
12. See August B. Hollingshead, *Elmstown Youth* (New York: Wiley, 1947) and C. Wayne Gordon, *The Social System of the High School* (Glencoe: Free Press, 1957).
13. Gerard and Miller, *School Desegregation*.
14. Meyer Weinberg, *Minority Students: A Research Appraisal* (Washington: National Institute of Education, 1977, p. 22).
15. Nancy H. St. John, *School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children* (New York: Wiley, 1975).
16. Robert L. Crain (Ed.), *Southern Schools: An Evaluation of the Effects of the Emergency School Assistance Program and of School Desegregation, Volume I* (Chicago: National Opinion Research Center, 1973).
17. Lawrence A. Bradley and Giffert W. Bradley, "The Academic Achievement of Black Students in Desegregated Schools: A Critical Review," *Review of Educational Research* 47(3), 1977.
18. See William H. Sewell, A. O. Haller, and G. W. Ohlendorf, "The Education and Early Occupational Status Attainment Process: Replication and Revision" *American Sociological Review* (December) 1970; A. O. Haller and C. E. Butterworth, "Peer Influences on Levels of Occupational and Educational Aspirations" *Social Forces* (May), 1960; Norman C. Alexander, Jr., and Ernest Q. Campbell, "Peer Influences on Adolescent Educational Aspirations and Attainments" *American Sociological Review* (August) 1974; Otis Dudley Duncan, Archibald O. Haller, and Alejandro Portes, "Peer Influences on Aspirations: A Reinterpretation," *American Journal of Sociology* (1968).
19. Allen B. Wilson, "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," *American Sociological Review* (December), 1959; Ralph Turner, *The Social Context of Ambition* (San Francisco: Chandler, 1964); John A. Michael, "High School Climate and Plans for Entering College," *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Winter) 1961; Richard P. Boyle, "On Neighborhood Context and College Plans," *American Sociological Review* (October) 1966.
20. Robert M. Hauser, "Context and Consequence: A Cautionary Tale," *American Journal of Sociology* (January) 1970; William H. Sewell and J. M. Armer, "Reply to Turner, Michael, and Boyer," *American Sociological Review* (October) 1966.
21. J. A. Davis, "The Campus as a Frog Pond: An Application of the Relative Deprivation to Career Decisions of College Men," *American Jour-*

nal of Sociology (July) 1966; John W. Meyer, "High School Effects on College Intentions," *Public Opinion Quarterly* (Winter) 1961; J. I. Nelson, "High School Context and College Plans: The Impact of Social Structure on Aspirations," *American Sociological Review* (April) 1972; Karl Alexander and Bruce K. Edkland, "Contextual Effects in the High School Attainment Process," *American Sociological Review* (August) 1975.

22. Iadicola, "Desegregation: The Assimilation of a Minority Population."

23. I. Katz and L. Benjamin, "Behavior and Productivity in Biracial Work Groups," *Human Relations* (11) 1958; I. Katz and L. Benjamin, "Effects of White Authoritarianism in Biracial Work Groups," *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology* (61) 1960.

24. J. P. Berger, B. P. Cohen, and M. Zelditch, "Status Characteristics and Social Interaction," *American Sociological Review* (37) 1972.

25. Elizabeth C. Cohen, M. E. Lohman, K. Hall, D. Lucerno, and S. Roper, "Expectation Training I: Altering the Effect of a Status Characteristic," Technical Report #2, School of Education, Stanford University, 1970.

26. Berger, Cohen, and Zelditch, "Status Characteristics and Social Interaction."

27. Elizabeth C. Cohen, "Interracial Interaction Disability," *Human Relations* (25) 1972.

28. Peter Iadicola, June Lewis, Helen Moore, and Herbert Nickles III, *SEMS Technical Manual* (Riverside: Prime, 1977).

29. Iadicola, et al. *SEMS Technical Manual*.

30. Jane R. Mercer and Herbert L. Nickles III, *Evaluating Integrated Elementary Education: Technical Manual* (Riverside: Prime, 1974).

31. A. J. Reiss, *Occupations and Social Status* (New York: Wiley, 1961).

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

33. Victor J. Baldridge, *Sociology: A Critical Approach to Power, Conflict, and Change* (New York: Wiley, 1972).

34. All reliability coefficients and factor analyses are based on the fifty-nine biracial which includes not only Anglo and Hispanic groups, but also Anglo and black groups.

35. Jum C. Nunnally, *Psychometric Theory* (New York: McGraw Hill,, 1967).

36. Marlaine E. Lockheed, *The Modification of Female Leadership Behavior in the Presence of Males* (Princeton: Educational Testing Service, 1976).

37. Peter Iadicola, "Intellectual Models and School Policy' Desegregation as a Method of Assimilation." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the North Central Sociological Association, Dayton, Ohio, 1980.

38. Elizabeth C. Cohen, et al., "Expectation Training I."

39. Elizabeth C. Cohen and James L. Deslonde, "The Desegregated School: Problems in Status, Power, and Interracial Climate." Unpublished manuscript.

40. Jane R. Mercer, Peter Iadicola, and Helen Moore, "Building Effective Multi-Ethnic Schools: Evolving Models and Paradigms," in Walter G. Stephen and Joe R. Faegin (Eds.), *Desegregation: Past, Present, and Future* (New York: Plenum, 1980).