PROMOTING ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT AND RACIAL UNDERSTANDING: STRATEGIES FOR CREATIVE PROGRAMMING TO HELP RESOLVE THE DILEMMAS OF INTEGRATED EDUCATION*

Morley D. Glicken
California State University, San Bernardino

Randi L. Miller
California State University, San Bernardino

This paper offers both a review and critique of past desegregation studies, many of which have not provided concrete strategies for improving integration efforts in schools. In part, much of the desegregation literature relies on assimilationist notions of schooling that see desegregation as successful by its attempt to influence (change) minority students' values through increased exposure to majority student norms. Yet important issues such as high drop out rates, hostile racial climates, long bus rides, and stagnant academic achievement point out concerns in the desegregation effort. In order to improve academic and social climates in desegregated schools, both the realities and potentials of busing, as a social policy, must be challenged.

Integrated Education

Efforts to promote better race relations between white and minority children and the improvement of minority academic performance through integration efforts face predictable obstacles from parents, children and school personnel. Those obstacles are well documented in the popular media and present formidable resistance to genuine improvement in the way schools provide socially and educationally for our most needy young citizens.

Among the problems encountered is the history of parental reaction by vocally and sometimes physically challenging integration efforts and the tendency for children themselves to remain aloof from minority classmates. Violent confrontations between races are not uncommon. Additionally, school personnel, often ambivalent about integration efforts, sometimes respond half-heartedly or transfer out of heavily minority populated schools. Clearly, since

17

Brown vs. the Topeka Board of Education ruling in 1954, integration efforts have met with a high degree of active and passive resistance. Not a few school districts have witnessed a race by parents to suburban areas, leaving many school districts with large minority populations segregated-defacto -because of the absence of white children.

The busing effort, the most widely used means of achieving racial balance in schools, improving academic performance of minority children, and promoting positive race relations, is surely one of the least popular plans to cultivate improved social functioning in America today. It has had wide spread criticism throughout its tenure as well as continued non-compliance, conditions which create ill-will among parents and children and considerably complicate the role of educators. Transportation costs for busing are increasing yearly and dwindling funds for education must be spent on the transportation of children rather than on purely academic efforts, salaries, and the upgrading of school buildings and other facilities.

Yet as the criticisms of integration efforts mount, the social and educational condition of minority children has become increasingly fragile and tenuous. Early predictions that integration would lead to increased academic achievement have not been fully realized and scores on standardized tests seem only slightly improved. Dropout rates among minority children continue to be many times that of whites. Racial tensions continue unabated and only marginal evidence suggests that integration efforts have led to improved race relations. Most telling are recent findings that minority children living in highly segregated areas with court-mandated desegregation plans are increasingly isolated from whites and fail in countless ways to experience even rudimentary contact with other racial and ethnic groups.

Because of white flight from integrated school districts, tax bases have been appreciably reduced in our most impoverished school districts and efforts to provide remediation and other needed educational experiences are limited by lack of funding. And finally, districts with largely poor and marginally educated parents often fail to provide lay leadership leaving schools most in need to be run by politicians, the courts and school personnel with limited vision.

One could go on, but the point seems clear. Thirty-five years after integration became the law, our most needy children are still subject to inferior education, hostile racial climates, and predictably troubled educational experiences which result in grossly higher dropout rates than whites, lower levels of academic achievement, and interpersonal relationships which promote racial aloofness and increasingly limited social contact with whites. Integration efforts aren't working well. To help our most needy and socially constrained children achieve educationally, integration must work. This paper proposes a series of strategies and programmatic directions to improve the racial and academic experiences of minority children and to promote harmony between whites and minorities.

Literature Review

Park (1928) and later Stonequist (1937) have written about the concept of "marginality," or the degree to which people live on the border of two societies, each of which make incompatible demands. This concept is of significance in understanding integration efforts because it points out that the degree of difference in both the values and resources of bused minority students and other students produces a dilemma for children bused to schools in which they are clearly outsiders. Bused minority children are, in a sense, forced to choose between separation and acculturation. The resultant choice risks both estrangement from their own racial group and rejection by the host group (St. John 1975). Problems are created when minority students are expected to accept a new and "better" value system and at the same time continue to live in a society that offers them an unequal system of reward distribution which insures that minorities will not, as a group, be allowed to succeed in the same manner as whites (Ogbu 1978). In school, bused minority students will, at best, form close bonds with children most like themselves, and at worst remain hopelessly alienated and/or openly hostile. Consequently, the rationale for integration efforts (better race relations) is almost de facto negated.

Whether school desegregation actually improves race relations is certainly unclear. As Allport (1954) cautioned, intergroup contact can only improve intergroup relations if the contact situation provides equal status for members of both the minority and majority groups and there is strong institutional support for positive relations. While busing may be a prerequisite for both student acquaintance and contact, most of the literature suggests that the "successful" integration of minority students requires more (e.g., Pettigrew 1971; Amir 1976; Iadicola and Moore 1979). Much of the most recent desegregation literature places added emphasis on the specifics of particular schooling situations in an effort to better determine which factors lead to the successful integration of bused minority students. These studies maintain that when schools intervene in conscious and deliberate ways to provide conducive experiences, desegregation can promote positive race relations (Epstein 1985; Slavin 1985; N. Miller, M. Brewer and K. Edwards 1985). In fact, proponents of "situational analysis" (see Prager, Longshore, and Seeman 1986) have argued that more emphasis must be given to the specifics of particular schooling situations and contexts in order to better understand which factors affect the desegregation experiences of bused minority students in a variety of educational settings and under a number of different conditions.

In a study of five primarily white suburban schools participating in the same voluntary busing program, Miller (1990) found that the more affluent the community to which minority children are bused, the less positive their desegregation experience. This study suggests that merely busing children to better school districts will not necessarily create positive educational or integration experiences for them. However, when busing is used and the community bused to (the host community) is not altogether unlike that of the

community in which bused minority children live, integration efforts are enhanced.

Essentially, Miller's findings are that the more similar white and minority students are initially in terms of their attitudes, experiences, and view points, the more likely they are to feel comfortable with one another at school. If substantial social class differences can be controlled for, then the challenge of improving race relations can be unimpeded by serious socioeconomic differences or problems related to affluence or the lack thereof. It may then make sense to concentrate on creating integration efforts in schools where a high level of situational congruence exists regarding such important life issues as value base, outlook for the future, work ethic, religion, etc.

One of the core criticisms of desegregation efforts is that children must go through the trauma of being uprooted from neighborhood schools and bused distances from home so that they might interact with whites while in reality little takes place to promote better relations in anything approaching a planned way. In fact, several studies have noted that black and white children in desegregated schools have very limited contact with one another beyond their actual classroom experiences (Dickinson 1975; Gerard 1983; Schofield and Sagar 1979; Silverman and Shaw 1973). Within desegregated schools, the tendency is for children to form relationships and to interact almost exclusively on racial grounds (Clement, Eisenhart and Harding 1979). If that is the case then the effort to promote racial understanding and harmony seems limited at best and unsuccessful at worst. It has even been argued that this type of superficial interracial contact is particularly damaging to efforts promoting positive race relations because such contact really only serves to reinforce and perpetuate negative stereotypes (Hawley, et al. 1983).

Yet some integration efforts are at least partly successful, even if their results are not exceptional. For example, minority students in Project Concern, an impressive integration effort using voluntary busing of inner city minority youth to suburban schools, were more likely to graduate from high school, perceived less discrimination in adult life, and reported better race relations with whites after graduation than did those attending segregated inner city schools (Crain, 1984). Yet Miller (1986; 1989) later noted that a core problem with the Project Concern experience was that bused children were often largely on their own with little guidance or direction from school personnel. Interestingly enough, little was done in these studies to determine whether the attitudes of whites towards minorities had been effected. Therein lies one of the major problems with integration efforts. The locus of desegregation efforts is geared primarily toward minority change.

Clearly improved race relations cannot be one-sided. Research efforts surely must also consider whether white children in desegregated schools improve academically and have more positive attitudes toward minorities. Yet as long as desegregation is primarily viewed as a way for minorities to gain access to education that was previously denied to them, we can expect the central programmatic concern to be that of sending minority youngsters to school

systems offering better educational facilities. After this goal is realized, then the assumption of most policy makers is that through direct exposure, bused minority students will somehow embrace the belief system of the host community. In other words, minority students will learn prevailing white norms and values, since it is simply assumed that it is in their best interest to do so. Following this line of reasoning, it comes as little surprise that most desegregation research focuses on the process of minority assimilation, euphemistically referred to as promoting "positive" race relations or "true" integration. In fact, Metzger (1971) has argued that most social policy remedies for racial problems in America revolve around granting equal opportunity for individual members of minority groups to gradually assimilate into mainstream culture.

An intriguing example of such reasoning can be seen if we look at the desegregation literature dealing specifically with speculation on the optimum number of minority to white children in a school. One belief is that the smaller the number of minority to white children the more likely the degree of assimilation of values by minority children and the better the academic experience. The rationale for such an approach is that when the number of blacks in a school is small, the dominance of white students is not threatened (Larkin 1979; Shaw 1973). A somewhat different point of view is that the greater the number of minority children, the more numerous the potential for contacts between groups which ultimately leads to reduced prejudice (St. John 1975). Regardless of the exact ratios, most proponents of desegregation perceive that the busing process can only be successful if black students are in a minority so that the majority white influence will prevail. As an example, the Coleman Report (1966) suggested that a 60:40 ratio of whites to blacks (60 percent white, 40 percent minority) seemed optimum both for promoting a degree of comfort in minority children while at the same time ultimately changing their attitudes. Once again, these studies all seem to be directed toward the change in behaviors of minority children without considering similar changes in white children. And additionally, they seem to be quite blatant in their belief that if the correct interactional ratios can be discovered then minority children will internalize preferable white values, beliefs, and behaviors.

In fact, initial findings promote this belief. Patchen (1982), for example, reported that standardized scores for black students decrease as the number of black students increase in a given school. Patchen also reported the same finding for white students (white achievement scores decrease as the number of black students increase). Interestingly, grades for both whites and blacks improve as the number of blacks increase.

Much of the desegregation literature operates under the fundamental assumption that busing produces educational and social benefits primarily through a lateral transmission of values. According to N. Miller (1980), such an approach suggests that the values most white, middle class children possess can be passed on to lower class minority children by the interracial mixing of students. The preponderance of white middle class students ensures that minority

students will be exposed to and internalize white middle class norms and values. This solution to problematic race relations stresses the importance of shared values as the major mechanism by which excluded minorities can embrace prevailing white norms. Such is the case despite the fact that there is strong evidence that in desegregated schools, interracial contacts are constrained among both minority and majority students (Gerard and Miller 1975; Stephan and Rosenfield 1978), and that after desegregation same-race friendships seem either to increase or remain unchanged rather than decline (Gerard and Miller 1975; Rosenberg and Simmons 1971; Schofield 1975; Silverman and Shaw 1973). Given that most integration efforts clearly seem to have the one-sided bias that change is only to take place in minorities, it is not surprising that minority children tend to feel isolated in desegregated schools. One wonders if minority children have something to teach white children, particularly survival skills and the ability to deal with unconditional negative regard by others.

Configurations on optimum size of student populations for the purpose of values transmission may be missing the point. Instead of counting the ratio of minority to Anglo students, there quite clearly needs to be a more systematic accounting of other factors that enhance or diminish the **quality** of contact between black and white students in desegregated schools. To do so requires that principals, teachers, and counselors actively participate in providing a school milieu which affects both educational and social experiences of all students. It has been suggested that teachers and administrators play a crucial role in determining the success or failure of desegregated education (Collins and Noblitt 1977), and that schools can improve the academic performance of minorities and contribute to peaceful race relations through better staff training and communication (Chesler, Crowfoot and Bryant 1978). There are indeed compelling arguments for giving more thought to how school climate and outlook affect race relations. According to Schofield and Sagar (1983, p. 59):

> the fact is that social learning occurs whether it is planned or not. Hence, an interracial school cannot choose to have no effect on intergroup relations. Even a laissez-faire policy concerning intergroup relations conveys a message -- the message that either school authorities see no serious problem with relations as they have developed or they do not feel that the nature of intergroup relations is a legitimate concern for an educational institution. So those who argue that schools should not attempt to influence intergroup relations miss the fundamental fact that whether schools consciously try to influence such relations or not, they are extremely likely to do so anyway, in one way or another.

Undoubtedly, school principals are instrumental in both influencing school climate and setting its tone, as well as in making policy decisions that affect student experiences. For example, Schofield and Sagar (1983) demonstrated that the principal's ability to create a humane and well-disciplined school climate positively affected race relations. Additionally, a study by Forehand and Ragosta

(1976) showed that the principal's racial attitudes directly influenced teachers' attitudes and behaviors.

As pointed out by Jencks et al. (1972), if we could first structure schools so that they were reasonably pleasant places to be, then particular school policies and practices that affect the interracial attitudes of *both* black and white students could be better addressed. In terms of affecting interracial behaviors and attitudes, particular school policies and practices and careful planning may be of some value. Yet so long as desegregation's underlying assumption is that minorities should easily and willingly be able to assimilate into static schools that are unwilling or unable to acknowledge and accommodate true ethnic diversity, then such reasoning is inherently flawed and likely to fail.

One additional problem in evaluating the desegregation literature is the almost constant difference in findings among researchers. For example, on the issue of academic achievement Hawley et al. (1983, p. 12) noted that, "Moreover, desegregation does not seem to impair, and may even facilitate, the achievement of white students." Patchen (1982) as noted earlier, reported a decrease in white achievement as the number of black students increased in schools studied. Regarding friendly contacts between blacks and whites Crain (1984) reported generally positive results when a voluntary busing effort is used to suburban schools. Hawley et al. (1983) noted that the voluntary nature of a busing effort has little actual impact on interracial contact defined as "friendly." In fact as one reviews the desegregation literature it is increasingly clear that most findings are based on highly unique local experiences whose relevance in a larger social context may be very limited. This seems a questionable way of approaching one of the nation's most volatile and important social issues.

Discussion

Hawley et al. (1983, p. 19) noted that the integration effort must relate to attainment of one or more of the following outcomes:

1. Reducing racial isolation among and within schools.
2. Avoiding resegregation among and within schools.
3. Improving race relations among students.
4. Improving educational quality and student academic performance.
5. Promoting positive public reaction to desegregation that includes avoiding overt opposition to desegregation, increasing levels of racial and ethnic tolerance, and building support for schools.

Our findings show consistent disagreement among researchers on the impact of integration efforts on all five of these suggested outcomes. However, the following seem major findings.

Most integration efforts are directed toward a change in minority values, beliefs and behaviors. Changes in white children seem only peripheral and secondary when they are considered at all. Even when integration efforts work, gain may be superior to segregated inner-city schools but it may not be substantial enough to warrant the effort. Similar gains may have been possible if levels of funding for segregated schools were anywhere near the level of much

more affluent schools. Consequently, improvement when it does take place, may be a function of funding and what it buys rather than the integration effort itself. Further, even the best integration efforts seem inordinately inactive. They provide the student the ability to attend better schools but they offer little in the way of programming for better social relations.

Another troubling finding is the range of differences among researchers and theorists as to how integration efforts need to be programmed and their predicted results. Virtually no agreement exists. The end result seems to be extraordinary confusion in the literature. Anyone trying to develop a creative integration effort would be severely limited by questions related to proper mix between white and minority children, optimum level of congruence in values between schools bused from to schools bused to, whether integration efforts promote drop-out rates because children in integrated schools feel isolated and uncomfortable and a host of other questions. Nor do we have a sense of the impact of long distance busing on learning and whether children in bused integration efforts experience dysfunctional levels of stress and fatigue when busing is used instead of neighborhood schools which may be close enough to reach with a short walk. Nor, interestingly have we much data on how busing affect revenues for other educational functions.

As an example, Hawley et al. (1983) reported no appreciable difference in educational outcome between walking, riding or being bused to school when the time required for all three approaches is a half hour or less. Realistically, however, busing particularly long distance busing to suburban schools may require multiple transfers and much more than an hour each way in transit. Hawley et al. (1983) admitted that much more needs to be done on the effects of long distance busing and suggest that busing of more than an hour may have a negative impact on learning. It should add to the generalized confusion in the literature to find that the most commonly recommended desegregation strategy, busing to suburban schools, may have a negative impact on learning but no one is absolutely certain.

Another troubling finding is the obvious research bias in the literature. Clearly everyone wants integration to work. But the nagging questions which must be answered often are not. An example is Hawley et al. (1983) and their finding that white flight takes place *before* actual integration efforts begin. The authors go on to note that once in place the fears parents may have regarding lower standards, racial strife, violence and drug abuse are not realized. But white flight does take place and its consequence has very real jeopardy for city school districts. One thing white flight does is to reduce the absolute ability to control the ratio of minority to majority students because, in the absence of white students, the integration effort becomes largely futile.

But Hawley et al. (1983) neglected to consider the popular perception that, at the very least, educational achievement is reduced in integrated schools as the number of majority students to minority students decreases. Patchen (1982) noted increasingly reduced achievement test scores as black students become a greater percentage of the student body while at the same time overall grade point

averages increased. Interestingly, the author attributes increased G.P.A. to lowering of standards by school personnel. And a daily review of the media and the violence and drug abuse associated with schools in desegregated city districts would support the popular concern that desegregation encourages white flight.

The reality of integration is that it is a highly emotional subject and the perception of whites is very important. To reduce white flight and to promote cooperative race relations within communities is a key ingredient to the success or failure of integration efforts. Our findings support generalized public concerns that integration efforts produce highly mixed results. A decidedly pro-integration bias among researchers cannot help but cloud the issue. While it is important that desegregation works, it won't work more effectively when nudged along by avoidance of important research issues which might lead to better policy efforts or creative strategies. In an effort to develop creative strategies which flow from the literature the following section is offered.

Strategies to Improve Integration Efforts

It seems obvious that something needs to be done to improve race relations and promote educational achievement for all students. Separate but equal is certainly not a tenable approach. It has never existed even in the best of worlds and segregation is a noxious concept for most Americans. Since integration is clearly preferable to segregation even if it fails to achieve the results we had hoped for, it seems vital to our national economic and social health that it works. The authors propose several modest directions for successful integration efforts.

As a start, the overall quality of American schools, both segregated and integrated, is shameful. Standardized test scores have been remarkably flat for some time. Employers indicate deep concern for the ability of students to function in the work place because basic skills are lacking. And the academy has become more a place of remediation than education.

Certainly schools are not entirely responsible. The increased fragility of family life and the growing reliance on economically stretched single-parent households to manage family life must be seen as a growing problem which affects school performance. Similarly the generalized lessening of institutional authority has had its effect on the ability of schools to control negative behavior and enforce rules necessary for productive institutional life.

Still schools are required to educate. They certainly cannot negate that responsibility even in a less than ideal world. As a starter, Gottfredson and Daiger (cited in Hawley et al. 1983), from their analysis of six hundred schools, recommend the return of control to schools using the following general measures:

1. Smaller schools and smaller classes, with considerable teacher control over curriculum.
2. Clear, explicit and firm administration of schools.
3. Cooperation between teachers and administrators, particularly as it relates to policies and sanctions for disruptive behavior by students.

4. School rules that are fair, clear and well publicized.

5. Application of rules in ways which are fair, even handed and systematic.

With schools that have order and control it may then be possible to reduce white flight and organize communities to promote integration efforts. Hawley et al. (1983, p.98) suggest, "...communitywide multi-ethnic citizen-parent-teacher-student committees to assist in planning and implementing desegregation." The authors offer impressive examples of success in promoting integration efforts when community planning is effective. However, as is true of much of the desegregation research, the outcomes reported are largely philosophical and subjective. As the authors note, "There is no quantitative evidence that communitywide elected leadership has any substantial direct influence on public acceptance of school desegregation, white flight, and protest" (Hawley et al. 1983, p.83). Rather, the general belief, as reported by the United States Commission on Civil Rights (1976) is that official support of desegregation efforts by public figures, "...generally directs the attention [of communities] toward making the process work" (Hawley, et al., 1983, p. 95).

With the proper school climate and community support an impressive array of creative programs are available to schools. Creative programming might include peer mentoring, intensive orientation for new students, crisis intervention counseling to handle race-related problems when they develop, community or neighborhood efforts to make all students welcome, values clarification exercises, seating and locker arrangements which truly mix students and prevent non-interaction among races, and promotion of student projects with themes of racial harmony and understanding. Incentive pay for teachers might include evidence of improved academic performance, reduction in drop out rates of minorities and student ratings of teachers on their sensitivity to minority issues and compliance with integration efforts.

Schools have also tried a number of strategies to promote achievement and harmony which have promise. They include magnet programs which offer specialized and highly advanced training in the arts, sciences and trades, specially trained counselors to deal with problems associated with integration efforts, desegregation of faculties to promote role modeling for minority and majority children, experiments in optimum ratios of majority to minority students, comprehensive student human relations programs, peer mentoring and cooperative learning strategies in the classroom, desegregated student governments, and integrated extracurricular activities, to name a few.

The possibilities for creative programming are endless. But in reviewing the literature the success of any of the strategies appears dependent upon the willingness of administrators, teachers and staff to wholeheartedly promote integration efforts and the creative programming and organizational change such efforts demand. In-service training, consequently, must be an important part of a school's commitment to the integration effort. Rewards for faculty must also reinforce their progress with students. And really responsive districts should be the recipients of additional funding to promote their effort. As in all things, however, the inequitable funding system we have in America in which the richer

the populace the more the funding for local schools cannot help but be an impediment to those districts with children most in need.

Certainly we have our work cut out for us. This review of integration strategies makes all the more clear how confused and ambiguous research findings can be. Still, the desegregation effort, noble and high minded, promotes an essential belief in the equality of educational opportunity. With renewed commitment, better funding and a concentrated research agenda, desegregation efforts offer some possibility of meeting the goals of a pluralistic society. These efforts are altogether worthy of renewed direction and action. Our troubled educational system, divided by issues of race and social class and burdened with high dropout rates and a lowering of academic standards and requirements, demands our complete attention. All students, including the most needy and unlikely to achieve require our united efforts.

Conclusion

Clearly a reappraisal of desegregation efforts is in order. The best way to improve compliance when busing is used is to provide an incentive for students to remain in desegregated schools; an incentive which has broad appeal but is based upon cooperative efforts to improve academic performance of all children as well as measurably validated improvement in race relations. The reward might be significant improvement in funding for enhanced programming in the sciences and arts so that college preparation would be comparable to private schools. Or it might be based on overall improvement in basic educational skills through smaller classrooms and the very best instructors or high level trade preparation. To maintain high levels of funding, schools would have to promote integration efforts to improve race relations.

In our proposal for improved desegregation efforts, rewards are clearly related to achievement. Achievement would reward teachers with higher salary and presumably better work satisfaction. Parents and children are rewarded with very high level schools comparable to or better than private schools.

Another modest proposal is the need to find alternatives to busing. Moving the locus of busing efforts to the suburbs will further white flight and movement to private schools. It will also make for excruciatingly long rides on uncomfortable, noisy and often unsafe buses. And yet how do we achieve racial balance without moving minority children to where white children live or the reversal - moving white children to where minorities live?

One thought is that students spend much of the week in a neighborhood school and that busing be used on a regular but more limited basis for special programming in areas such as art, music, physical education, etc. When the busing effort is used, however, it should be accompanied by creative programming to promote racial harmony and understanding. To maintain high standards in the neighborhood school and to promote integration efforts all schools should offer specialized programming to attract a mix of children with interest in the subject areas promoted by that particular school. In light of recent decisions that make the future of court-ordered busing programs to achieve racial

balance rather problematic, individual schools and school districts may find that creative programming may be the only feasible method of providing integrated experiences for increasingly segregated student populations.

Finally, the level of hostility to integration efforts points to a very real fear many parents have that mixing children with very different backgrounds and levels of educational readiness and motivation may create an explosive atmosphere. The fact is that parents have reason to worry about desegregated schools, and their perceptions that desegregated schools present high risk factors for their children is far more likely a reason for parental hostility to integration than racial bias. The challenge before us then is to find ways to make all of our schools safe, educationally sound and socially nurturing environments for children. Only then can desegregation efforts truly succeed.

REFERENCES

Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Amir, Yehuda. 1976. "The Role of Intergroup Contact in Change of Prejudice and Ethnic Relations." Pp. 245-308 in *Towards the Elimination of Racism*, edited by P. Katz. New York: Pergamon.

Chesler, Mark A., James E. Crowfoot, and Bunyan I. Bryant. 1978. "Institutional Changes to Support School Desegregation: Alternative Models Underlying Research and Implementation." *Law and Contemporary Problems* 42: 174-213.

Clement, Dorothy C., Margaret Eisenhart, and Joe R. Harding 1979. "The Veneer of Harmony: Social-Race Relations in a Southern Desegregated School." Pp. 15-64 in *Desegregated Schools*, edited by R. Rist. New York: Academic Press.

Coleman, James, Earnest Q. Campbell, Carol J. Hobson, James McPartland, Alexander M. Mood, Frederic D. Weinfeld and Robert L. York. 1966. *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Office.

Collins, Thomas W. and George W. Noblitt. 1977. *Crossover High*. Memphis, TN.: Memphis State University. Unpublished manuscript.

Crain, Robert L. 1984. "Desegregated Schools and the Non-Academic Side of College Survival." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Assoc. New Orleans.

Dickinson, George E. 1975. "Dating Behavior of Black and White Adolescents Before and After Desegregation." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 37:602-608.

Epstein, Joyce L. 1985. "After the Bus Arrives: Resegregation in Desegregated Schools." *Journal of Social Issues* 41:23-44.

Forehand, Garlie and Majorie Ragosta. 1976. *A Handbook for Integrated Schooling*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Govt. Printing Office.

Gerard, Harold B. 1983. "School Desegregation: The Social Science Role." *American Psychologist* 38:869-877.

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

Hawley, Willis D., Robert L. Crain, Christine H. Rossell, Mark A. Smylie, Ricardo R. Fernandez, Janet W. Schofield, Rachel Tompkins, William T. Trent, Marilyn S. Zlotnik.1983. *Strategies for Effective Desegregation. Lessons From Research*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.

Iadicola, Peter and Helen Moore. 1979. *The Desegregated School and Status Relations Among Anglo and Minority Students: The Dilemma of School Desegregation*. National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service Research Grant No. MH 26607-03.

Jencks, Christopher, Marshall Smith, Henry Acland, Mary Jo Bane, David H. Gintis, Barbara Heyns, and Stephen Michelson. 1972. *Inequality*. New York: Basic Books.

Larkin, Ralph W. 1979. *Suburban Youth in Cultural Crisis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Metzger, L. Paul. 1971. "American Sociology and Black Assimilation: Conflicting Perspectives." *American Journal of Sociology* 76:627-647.

Miller, Norman. 1980. "Making School Desegregation Work." Pp. 309-348 in *School Desegregation, Past, Present, and Future*, edited by W. Stephen and J. R. Feagin. New York: Plenum.

Miller, Norman, Marilynn B. Brewer, and Keith Edwards.1985. "Cooperative Interaction in Desegregated Settings: A Laboratory Analogue." *Journal of Social Issues* 41:63-80.

Miller, Randi L. 1990. "Beyond Contact Theory: The Impact of Community Affluence on Integration Efforts in Five Suburban High Schools." *Youth and Society* 22:12-34.

Miller, Randi L. 1989. "Desegregation experiences of Minority Students: Adolescent Coping Strategies in Five Connecticut High Schools." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 4:173-189.

Miller, Randi L. 1986. *The Impact of Voluntary Busing on the Desegregation Experiences of Minority Students in Five Connecticut Suburban Communities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.

Ogbu, John. 1978. *Minority Education and Caste. The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Park, Robert E. 1928. "Human Migration and the Marginal Man." *American Journal of Sociology* 33:881-893.

Patchen, Martin. 1982. *Black-White Contact in Schools: Its Social and Academic Effects*. Indiana: Purdue University.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. 1971. *Racially Separate or Together*. U.S.A.: McGraw-Hill.

Prager, Jeffrey, Douglas Longshore, and Melvin Seeman, eds.1986. *School Desegregation Research. New Directions in Situtational Analysis.* New York: Plenum.

Rosenberg, M. and R.G. Simmons. 1971. *Black and White Self-Esteem: The Urban School Child.* Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association.

Schofield, Janet W. 1975. "To Be or Not to Be (Black)." Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association. Chicago.

Schofield, Janet W. and H. Andrew Sagar. 1979. "The Social Context of Learning in an Interracial School." Pp. 155-200 in *Desegregated Schools*, edited by Ray Rist. New York: Academic Press.

Schofield, Janet W. and H. Andrew Sagar. 1983. "Desegregation, School Practices, and Student Race Relations." in *The Consequences of School Desegregation*, edited by C.H. Rossell and W.D. Hawley, Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Shaw, Marvin E. 1973. "Changes in Sociometric Choices Following Forced Integration of an Elementary School." *Journal of Social Issues* 29:143-157.

Silverman, Irwin and Marvin E. Shaw. 1973. "Effects of Sudden Mass School Desegregation on Interracial Interaction and Attitudes in One Southern City." *Journal of Social Issues* 29:133-142.

Slavin, Robert E. 1985. "Cooperative Learning: Applying Contact Theory in Desegregated Schools." *Journal of Social Issues* 41:45-62.

St. John, Nancy H. 1975. *School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children.* New York: Wiley.

Stephen, Walter G. and D. Rosenfield. 1978. "The Effects of Desegregation on Race Relations and Self-Esteem." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 70:670-679.

Stonequist, Everett. 1937. *The Marginal Man.* New York: Charles Scribner.

U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. 1976. *Fulfilling the Letter and Spirit of the Law: Desegregation of the Nation's Public Schools.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Gov't. Printing Office, August.

CONSTRUCTING AND TESTING A MULTIPLE-THEORY (INTEGRATED) MODEL OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

Willie J. Edwards
East Texas State University

The present study positions constructs of five popular criminological/sociological theories into an integrated or multiple theory model to investigate the causation of delinquency. The model was tested on a sample (N=532) of males and females who were being detained in a county juvenile facility. The theories of differential association and anomie contributed the most to the model while social control and self-esteem theories contributed the least, leaving the labeling theory to contribute a moderate portion to the explanation of delinquency. The model indicated that the more anomic youths and those experiencing less social control were more likely to associate with delinquent peers resulting in higher labeling and lower self-esteem. A comprehensive model of delinquency is better structured to depict the sequential and progressive attraction toward delinquent involvement than single theory models.

Introduction

The desire for a better explanation of the occurrence of juvenile delinquency has motivated a number of researchers (Elliott et al., 1985; Menard and Morse, 1984; Simons et al., 1980; and Johnson, 1979) to create multiple theory models or to explore the use of integrated theories where propositions are grafted from compatible theories into a form that has a broader explanation of delinquency than a single original or classical theory. Examples of efforts to expand the theoretical scope of a particular theory has been conducted by Thornberry et al. (1990), Elliott eat al. (1985) and Weis and Sederstrom (1981). In these mentioned studies the researchers incorporated some elements of a social learning perspective (by including differential associations and deviant beliefs) with that of the elements of social bonding (Hirschi's social control theory). Although such a model cannot replace single theory models, it does provide an additional approach for social scientists as the etiological paths to juvenile delinquency are investigated. Dimensions of the social structure and social process representing the social environment and social interaction can be constructed into a multiple theory or comprehensive juvenile delinquency model. The melding of theories or propositions of theories chanllenges the traditional unidirectional causal order of delinquency. It argues that human behavior develops more dynamically over time as people interact with one another. A multiple theory approach recognizes the existence of a multidimensional pathway to delinquent involvement. a multiple theory or integrated model permits a synthesis and reconciliation among theories used in the model. Rather than single theories competing with one another there is a need for a more comprehensive investigation into the