DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 088 620 RC 007 743

AUTHOR Falk, William W.; And Others
TITLE The Occupational Projections of Rural Blacks from Segregated and Desegregated Schools.
INSTITUTION Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Texas Agricultural Experiment Station.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO TAES-H-2811; USDA-CSRS-S-81
PUB DATE Mar 74
NOTE 32p.; Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Association annual meeting, Dallas, Tex., March 1974; Related document is ED081543

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; Disadvantaged Groups; Educational Research; *Environmental Influences; *Negro Students; *Occupational Aspiration; Occupational Mobility; Perception; Racial Segregation; Research Projects; Rural Areas; *School Integration; School Policy; *School Segregation; Vocational Development
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

The study seeks an answer to the broad question: do black youths who attend racially desegregated schools have occupational aspirations and expectations which are significantly different (higher or lower) from black youths who attend racially segregated schools? The sample was limited to youths from 3 rural Texas counties and only those with parental SES scores, using the Duncan socioeconomic index (1961), of equal to or less than 45 were included. In addition to testing for differences in occupational projections, analysis of 2 previously tested propositions was also reported. These dealt with the goal blockage an individual envisioned might prevent his obtaining the occupation he most desired. The 2 blockage items analyzed were race and schools attended. Information used in this analysis was obtained by combining data collected from a panel of high school sophomores and seniors in 1966 and 1968, with a follow-up in 1972. The differences in occupational projections of blacks from segregated and desegregated schools were minimal. It was noted that it was the desegregated, not the segregated, blacks who saw schools attended as comparatively more detrimental; this was the opposite of what had been posited. The overall finding of the study concluded that school desegregation in and of itself will have little, if any, effect on the mobility chances of black youths. (FF)

THE OCCUPATIONAL PROJECTIONS OF RURAL BLACKS FROM SEGREGATED AND DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

by

William W. Falk, Arthur G. Cosby and Bonnie S. Burris

Texas A&M University

Paper presented at the Southwestern Sociological Association annual meeting, Dallas, Texas, March 1974. Development of this paper was sponsored by the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station as a contribution to TAES Project H-2811 and USDA (CSRS) Research Project S-81, "Development of Human Resource Potentials of Rural Youth in the South and Their Patterns of Mobility." Appreciation is expressed to John Womack, Betsy Strode, Hester Hanlon and Leslie Rust for their assistance in the preparation of this manuscript.

THE OCCUPATIONAL PROJECTIONS OF RURAL BLACKS FROM SEGREGATED AND DESEGREGATED SCHOOLS

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

In general, the present study seeks an answer to one broad question "Do black youth who attend racially desegregated schools have occupational aspirations and expectations which are significantly different (either higher or lower) from black youth who attend racially segregated schools?" To facilitate this, this study not only examines black youth's occupational projections but also reports a summary of relevant findings reported in Falk and Cosby (1974) and includes a measure of certainty of occupational expectations. In every case the problem is to compare segregated and desegregated populations to see if any differences are observed.

There is, of course, a much broader problem to which this study addresses itself; namely to help expand the present knowledge base about the effects of segregation versus desegregation. Stated differently, this study's objective is to provide information on a social phenomenon about which relatively little is known and which has important policy implications. As Jencks has pointed out:

> It is easy to construct theories showing either that desegregation will make things better or that it will make them worse. Past experience can also be cited to support either view. Our own prejudice is that in most contexts desegregation will probably increase tension in the short-run and reduce it in the long-run. But we have no real evidence for this. (Jencks et al., 1972:156)

The present paper will have been of utilitarian value if for no other reason than that of providing additionally needed 'evidence'. Further this evidence will be provided so that desegregation effects may be

observed in the short-run (i.e., after two years) and in the longer-run (i.e., four years after anticipated high school graduation or put differently, six years after experiencing the initial desegregation process: the temporal aspect is more understandable if Illustration 1 is examined).

DEFINITIONS OF CONCEPTS

For present purposes, there are at least five concepts which must be given some consideration. These concepts are (1) equal opportunity, (2) occupational aspirations, (3) occupational expectations, (4) integration, and (5) desegregation. While economy of space prohibits lengthy discussion of any one concept or any pair of concepts, the following discussion is meant to clarify the use of these terms in this paper.

Even a cursory reading of the literature which discusses equal opportunity leads one to conclude that conceptual clarity is lacking and that any one definition utilized will be problematic. The concept is most often discussed in an evaluative context; thus the criteria most often mentioned in attempting to operationalize the concept may be generally referred to as: (1) inputs, (2) outputs, and (3) a combination of inputs and outputs. (For examples of the ways in which the concept could be and has been operationalized, see Coleman, 1968:9-24; Guthrie, et al., 1971:2-5;93;138-139; Gordon, 1972:423-434; Jencks, et al., 1972:3-15; Mosteller and Moynihan, 1972:6-7.) The present paper is most in accord with the conceptualization which emphasizes outputs -- a position presently favored by many other authors as well. (Substantiation of this may be found in the previously cited references.) Coleman (1966 and 1969), Jencks (1972), and Gordon (1972) would all agree that it is outputs

(i.e., results as indicated for example, by achievement tests, aspirations, or attainment) which have the most significant implications for a better understanding of social mobility. This receives further support from researchers studying status attainment. In particular, the models of Sewell et al., (1969 and 1970) include such variables as mental ability and grade point average.

Aspirations and expectations have been conceptually differentiated by a number of authors, most often in the study of occupational choice (Blau, et al., 1956; Stephenson, 1957; Glick, 1963; Kuvlesky and Bealer, 1966; Rehberg, 1967). The work of Kuvlesky and Bealer has been frequently cited by researchers studying within the status projection area of interest. (See the bibliography of Cosby, et al., 1973). The primary difference between the two concepts is found in the desirability in orientation toward either an aspiration or an expectation as a goal. A person's occupational aspiration is generally thought to be more or less desired; however, the person need not necessarily desire the occupation which he actually expects (as opposed to aspires) to attain. For present purposes the distinction made by them has been found to be useful and thus has been employed in this study.

Two other terms are in need of clarification. Throughout this paper the term desegregation will be used as opposed to the term integration. This is in keeping with the usage employed by Jencks. Jencks differentiated the two concepts as follows, "Desegregation is defined as housing black and white students under the same roof. Integration is defined as knitting the two groups into a single social community."

(Jencks, et al., 1972:98; a similar argument has been made on this by other authors. See for example, Carter, 1964; Pettigrew, 1968; McPartland, 1968; Weinberg, 1970.) In the present study there has not been sufficient data on the students' patterns of interaction to justify the use of the term integration, at least as Jencks and others have defined it, thus the use of the term desegregation.

INFERENCES FROM JENCKS' *INEQUALITY*

While there is a voluminous body of research reported which deals with occupational aspirations and expectations (See Kuvlesky and Reynolds, 1970), by comparison, there is truly a paucity of research looking at these same aspects considering the racial make-up of schools attended by those populations studied. Although much of the work done on occupational aspirations and expectations has considered race, very little of it has considered the segregation-desegregation dimension. (There are exceptions here, of course, reference to which may be found in the bibliographies of Weinberg, 1970, Jencks, 1972 and the present study.) The information which has existed has usually been of a limited nature; especially that research which has been done on aspirations. Jencks, et al., have pointed out both the lack of research which includes appreciable numbers of black students and the lack of longitudinal analyses (Jencks, et al., 1972).

There are other problems encountered by the researcher who refers to extant studies --- that is, 'problems' arising due to studies which report conflicting findings, poor designs, poor data sets, different inferences each of which may be theoretically plausible, etc. Examples

of these problems are abundant. (For a good overview of this type of thing, see Weinberg (1970), especially Chapter 2, "Aspirations and Self Concept.") (1) When individuals with similar family backgrounds and test scores were compared, the aspirations of students in predominantly white and predominantly black schools were very nearly the same. (Jencks, et al., 1972; also see Riley and Cohen, 1969; Armor, 1967). (2) As one might expect, aspirations are reported to be lower in working-class than in middle-class schools; but aspirations seem to be higher in black working-class schools than they are in white working-class schools. (Jencks, et al., 1972). (3) Finally, it is not clear exactly how the desegregation experience may affect the way blacks perceive their life-chances. It may make black students more optimistic about the future, but if too much negativity is encountered from students and teachers the desegregation experience may have the opposite effect. (Jencks, et al., 1972).

In summary, the research on desegregation is replete with ambiguity (and the research referred to by Jencks receives additional support in the section below on "Propositions"). Theoretical arguments, both pro and con, can be put forth about the possible effects of school desegregation, however any conclusions other than tentative ones are problematic and probably unwarranted. To quote Jencks,

> There is still a real need for studies of districts where high schools have been desegregated by court order or by deliberate administrative changes in attendance patterns... the most reasonable assumption at present is that desegregation makes little or no difference... (Jencks, et al., 1972:155)

PROPOSITIONS

In the present study, the sample has been limited to youth from three rural counties and only those youth with parental SES scores, using the Duncan socioeconomic index (1961), of equal to or less than 45 have been included. As will be discussed in greater detail below, these schools would not generally be considered to be providing a middle-class milieu; they are located in rural areas with predominantly lower-class or working-class youth attending them. Within these parameters, it is possible to be somewhat more precise with our propositions. In fact, each proposition is meant to be implicitly prefaced by "Controlling for SES and (nonmetropolitan) place of residence..."

The main limitations of referring to extant literature in formulating research propositions about desegregation are (1) the lack of referable studies available and (2) the shortcomings of those usable studies found. Even in the two best bibliographic sources on desegregation to date, the bulk of research reports cited refer to comparisons of segregated populations; that is, if comparisons are made at all, they are most often between blacks and whites who have attended, respectively, either all black or all white schools. Rare is the study that truly considers the effects of racial desegregation as an intervening process in the evolution of social mobility.

It is generally conceded that blacks will have educational aspirations equal to or greater than those of whites (In addition to Jencks, 1972; Riley and Cohen, 1969; and Armor, 1967; also see, for example, Boyd, 1952; Wilson, 1959; Blake, 1960; Geisel, 1962; Gottlieb, 1967. A good bibliographic reference on this is Kuvlesky and Reynolds, 1970.), thus in the

present study we have chosen to ignore this to concentrate specifically on the segregation-desegregation dimension as it effects segregated and desegregated blacks. When we consider only these groups, the literature to which we can refer becomes even more scanty. There are, however, some studies relevant for present purposes and it is to these studies that we refer in stating the research propositions to be tested in this paper.

It has been previously noted that the findings we have to date are nothing else if not both limited and confusing. It is precisely this ambiguity which has led Jencks and others to so often conclude in a tentative fashion. A good example of this is found in an analysis of the possible effects of a positive versus negative environment (Jencks, et al., 1972; Gottlieb, 1964; Pettigrew, 1964; Crain, 1971; Cohen et al., 1972). The dilemma faced here is of particular relevance for black youth. Desegregation and a positive environment might lead to blacks having higher aspirations, however if a negative environment were encountered, the effect could be one of repressing aspirations. Conversely, segregation may provide greater peer group support and a more positive environment but on the other hand, segregation may provide a negative environment from the standpoint of more negative reinforcement about upwardly mobile attitudes. A third alternative would be that desegregation would have no measurable impact one way or the other. Considering these conflicting suppositions the following propositions were constructed:

Proposition I: The occupational aspirations of segregated and desegregated black youth will not be significantly different.

Proposition II: The occupational expectations of segregated and desegregated black youth will not be significantly different.

In addition to testing for differences in occupational projections, analysis of two previously tested propositions will also be reported. (See Falk and Cosby, 1974). These two propositions dealt with the goal blockage an individual envisioned might prevent his (or, her) obtaining the occupation he most desired (i.e., his aspiration). The two blockage items analyzed were "race" and "schools gone to". The assumption was that in either the segregated or desegregated schools, any positive effects are in some way offset by negative effects. This lead to asking the question, "Is the segregated or desegregated group more or less pessimistic about the effects of race and schools attended?" Since we felt that blacks would respond similarly in their perception of race as a blocking factor, the following proposition was tested:

Proposition III: Race will be perceived as a blocking factor equally by segregated and desegregated black youth.

In examining the "schools gone to" item, we made the assumption that schools attended by segregated blacks might be of poorer quality than the schools attended by the desegregated blacks; i.e., they would have been more poorly funded, have generally poorer teachers, and in short, have a poorer overall educational environment. Our assumption here was based essentially on Silberman's (1970) critique of the schools he examined, even though we were aware of the Coleman et al., (1966) finding that such things as physical environment, materials, etc., did not really seem to be of much importance. In the rural areas from which our panel was drawn, our assumption that there was a difference seemed to generally

be true. Thus we felt that blacks who began attending desegregated schools would have access to a generally better (although not necessarily more positive) educational environment. Considering this, the following proposition was constructed:

Proposition IV: Segregated black youth will perceive schools attended as a blocking factor significantly more intensely than desegregated black youth.

It was also decided to include a measure on the certainty of occupational expectation. Since we were able to draw on our previous analysis of selected blockage items, there was good reason to assume that desegregated blacks might be less certain of realizing their occupational expectations. In other words, there had been a tendency for desegregated blacks to be somewhat more negative in their responses to goal blockage items. On the other hand, however, we had found little difference (Falk, et al., 1973) in the certainty of educational expectations between the groups. Thus we have chosen to state this final proposition in the null form.

Proposition V: The certainty of occupational expectations will be perceived equally by segregated and desegregated black youth.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY SITE

Information used in this analysis was obtained by combining data collected from a panel of high school sophomores (Wave I-1966) and seniors (Wave II-1968) conducted by Kuvlesky and his colleagues with a recent post-high school follow up study - four years after high school (Wave III-1972). The original high school study, sometimes referred to in the literature as the East Texas Youth Study (See Cosby and Kuvlesky, 1972 for a bibliography of resulting reports), was concerned in general

with the formation and change of selected mobility-linked attitudes among rural youth. The 1972 follow-up was essentially an extension of the first studies into the early adult years.

The three counties which constitute the study site were selected as a result of the high proportion of rural residence and the high proportion of blacks in the population. Each county was classified as 100% rural by the 1960 U.S. Census and each had a substantial black population, (percentage black ranged from 31% to 51% in 1960). Each county also had a heavy dependency on agricultural enterprises, and each had experienced little industrialization -- there was only one firm in any of the three counties that employed more than twenty workers in 1964. As would follow, all three counties had a recent history of high rates of out-migration of their youth to metropolitan centers. Among the other indicators of the social and economic conditions prevalent in the study area were: (1) a stable or declining population between the 1960 and 1970 censuses; (2) a low median level of education with relatively few high school graduates (in neither of the three counties had more than one quarter of the population graduated from high school) and (3) a low median level of income (median income in 1960 ranged from a low of $1737 to a high of $2875 in 1960.)

In the initial 1966 contact, data were collected by interviewing all sophomores present the day of the interview in all schools in the three counties. There were at this period thirteen segregated black high schools, nine segregated white high schools and one desegregated high school for a total of 23 schools in the study area. As might be

expected from the aforementioned discussion of demographic characteristics, the schools generally "suffered" from a lack of facilities normally associated with what might be considered a "quality education". Subjectively, the physical plants, equipment, classroom materials, curricula, and counseling services were substandard. The severity of conditions for some of these schools can be illustrated by the observation that several were inaccessible in wet weather and some relied on the use of out-door toilets. Generally, black schools were considered to have poorer facilities than those observed for whites.

In 1968, second wave interviews were carried out with the same students when most were high school seniors. Again from a subjective basis, improvement in the general conditions of schools was slight or unnoticeable. There was, however, one drastic and clearly observable change. Several of the previously segregated high schools had become desegregated. That is, six of the segregated black high schools and six of the segregated white high schools had desegregated in the interim. In addition, three of the white schools and five of the black schools remained segregated in 1968. Also two of the original black schools had been closed by 1968 and merged with other segregated black schools.

DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH: AN ACCIDENTAL QUASI-EXPERIMENT FIELD STUDY

During the third wave (1972) interviews with the panel, it became apparent that the data set afforded an excellent opportunity to assess the effects of initial desegregation on the formation of mobility-linked attitudes. An "after the fact" examination of both the introduction of the new policy of desegregation between the

sophomore and senior data waves along with the timing of and the procedure used in our data collection has led us to the opinion that we had, in effect, the unusual opportunity to analyze both the short and long run effects of desegregation on this panel in a near-experimental situation. We have chosen to characterize the resulting design as an accidental quasi-experiment. It was accidental in that neither the problem nor the design was anticipated prior to the collection of data. It was considered quasi-experimental in that several but not all the conditions necessary for rigorous field experimentation were present (for a discussion of such issues see: Campbell, 1957, and Campbell and Stanley, 1963). Illustration 1 presents the conditions of the Quasi-Experimental Situation.

BEFORE MEASUREMENT (SOPHOMORES, 1966)

For the purpose of our experimental analysis of desegregation, the 1966 sophomore survey was considered to provide the basis for before-observations. Actually at the time of the sophomore interviewing, one of the twenty-three schools in the study area had already desegregated. Students who attended this one desegregated school in 1966 were deleted and not considered further in the analysis. Recalling that this report considers only black students, our before-measurements consisted of observation of mobility attitudes of all black students present in the thirteen segregated black high schools just prior to the partial introduction of the policy of desegregation.

Illustration I. Conditions of the Quasi-Experimental Situation.

	Before Measures of Mobility Attitudes Sophomores 1966)	Experimental Treatment	Short Run, After Measurement of Mobility Attitudes (Seniors 1968)	Long Run, After Measurement of Mobility Attitudes (Post-High School 1972)
Quasi-Experiment Group	Black youth who will eventually experience desegregation	Introduction of the policy of desegregation	Black youth who had experienced desegregation	Black youth who had experienced desegregation
Quasi-Control Group	Black youth who will not eventually experience desegregation	Continuation of the policy of segregation	Black youth who had not experienced desegregation	Black youth who had not experienced desegregation

AFTER-MEASUREMENTS, SHORT RUN EFFECTS (SENIORS, 1968)

In 1968, second wave interviews were conducted with the same panel of students who had participated in the sophomore survey. In the two year period that had elapsed between the two contacts, twelve of the schools in the study area had desegregated. Thus, we were in the fortunate situation of having measured mobility attitudes just prior to and just after the introduction of the desegregation policy. These after-measurements (Wave II) were considered to give us the potential for estimating short-run effects of desegregation on mobility-linked attitudes.

AFTER-MEASUREMENTS, LONG RUN EFFECTS (POST-HIGH SCHOOL, 1972)

In 1972, third wave interviews were conducted with the same panel of students when they were four years beyond the normal date of high school graduation. This third wave contact was considered to provide the additional information needed for a second and long-run estimate of the effects of desegregation on mobility-linked attitudes. By comparing effects observed at Wave II and Wave III, it would be possible to distinguish between relatively temporary and lasting effects of the desegregation experience.

EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP DETERMINATION

It should be recalled that at the sophomore interviews, all students who were included in the analysis had been attending segregated schools. However, by the senior year of high school the introduction of desegregation had occurred resulting in the observation (Wave II)

that about 50% of the students were attending desegregated schools and 50% still remained in their previously segregated situation. The desegregated-segregated groups obtained in the senior wave (1968) made up our quasi-experimental and quasi-control groups. One additional procedure was introduced at this point. In order to make the groups more homogeneous, students with parental socioeconomic index scores greater than 45 increments were eliminated.

From an experimental point of view, the factors involved in the determination of the quasi-experimental and control groups represented the greatest departure of the present design from that of "pure" experimentation. Since the design was in large - part accidental, the desirable procedures of randomization and perhaps matching of students was not utilized. It is doubtful that the local school boards would have allowed such procedures even if the study had been proposed in 1966. Nevertheless, since there was an absence of randomization and matching, the question of possible bias in the selection of students for either segregated or desegregated groups becomes a crucial concern. That is, we would like to assume that the desegregation experience was the only unique variable (all other things being equal) introduced to the experimental but not to the control group. Unfortunately we were in a poor position to make this assumption without additional information.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

In keeping with the design employed and the propositions stated

earlier in this report, simple analysis of variance (ANOVA) procedures were applied to the differences between the various experimental and control means, i.e., intra-race differences between experimental and control group means were tested. For convenience, the .05 level of significance was selected for statistical decisions. Means, standard deviations, F-ratios and significance levels were reported for each comparison.

MEASURES

The following procedures were used to operationalize the variables included in the analysis. When repeated measures were taken across the three-contact period, identical measurement procedures were used.

(1) *Main Breadwinner Occupation (1966)*: This variable was determined by asking the respondent to indicate the occupation held by the family's main breadwinner. The responses were coded according to the Duncan Socio-Economic Index (SEI).

(2) *Occupational Aspiration (1966, 1968, and 1972)*: The respondents were asked the following question:

"If you were completely free to choose any job, what would you desire most as a lifetime job?"

As with number (1) above, these responses were coded with the Duncan SEI.

(3) *Occupational Expectation (1966, 1968, and 1972)*: The respondents were asked the following question:

"Sometimes we are not always able to do what we want most. What kind of job do you really expect to have most of your life?"

Again, the Duncan SEI was used to code responses.

(4) *Goal Blockage--Race (1966, 1968, and 1972):* The respondents were asked: "How much effect do you think each of the following things will have in keeping you from getting the job you desire?" One of the items listed was "My race". The strength of response was again coded on a forced-choice format as follows:

1= None

2= Some

3= Much

4= Very Much

(5) *Goal Blockage--School Attended (1966. 1968, and 1972):* Measures for a second blockage factor, "The effect of the schools I have gone to" was determined in the same manner as for race goal blockage.

(6) *Certainty of Occupational Expectation (1966, 1968, and 1972):* The respondents were asked the following question:

"How certain are you that this is the job you will have most of your life?"

Again, the responses were coded on a forced-choice format:

1= Very Uncertain

2= Uncertain

3= Not Very Certain

4= Certain

5= Very Certain

RESULTS

Analysis of Propositions I & II:

It is apparent from Table I that the differences in occupational projections of blacks from segregated and desegregated schools are minimal. In only two cases are there observed differences which indicate some statistical significance. The difference between groups on occupational expectation in 1968 was large enough to obtain P = .15. The between groups difference on occupational aspiration in 1972 was of the greatest magnitude of all comparisons made on mobility attitudes with P = .054, or nearly attaining a commonly accepted level of statistical significance. None of the other comparisons evinced especially large differences. It should be noted that in all cases but one, the desegregated groups gave higher aspirational and expectational levels than the segregated group. However, since a difference was observed beginning with the pre-desegregation measure (1966), and since the observed difference in 1966 (4.89) was virtually the same in 1968 (4.85) it does not seem that desegregation exerted much effect to either raise or lower aspirations.

The pattern in the differences of occupational expectations is somewhat different than that for occupational aspirations. While the aspirational differences were fairly constant, some variation was observed when comparing occupational expectations. Desegregated blacks had occupational expectations slightly higher than segregated blacks in 1966 and this difference had increased by 1968. However in 1972 this difference had reversed so that the segregated group had expectations higher than

the desegregated group. Although no differences were of statistical significance the size of the difference, the F-ratio, and the probability of the 1968 measure indicate an expectational level some 14 per cent higher for the desegregated group. More will be said on this point in the "Discussion".

Analysis of Proposition III:

In this proposition it was posited that race as a blockage factor would be perceived equally by segregated and desegregated black youth. This proposition was not supported. In the pre-desegregation measure (1966), no difference was observed ($F = .05$, $P < .82$). However, once desegregation had occurred, significant differences were found with desegregated blacks perceiving race as more detrimental than segregatd blacks. This was true in both 1968 ($F = 7.94$, $P < .006$) and 1972 ($F = 3.73$, $P < .05$). We will defer additional comment on this until the "Discussion" section.

Analysis of Proposition IV:

This proposition posited that segregated black youth would perceive the schools attended as a blocking factor significantly more intensely than desegregated black youth. While there can be no clear conclusion on this proposition, what was found contradicted the proposition as stated. Although no difference was observed in the pre-desegregation period ($F = .46$, $P < .51$), a difference of statistical significance was observed in 1968 ($F = 4.42$, $P < .04$). The important thing to be noted here was that it was the desegregated not the segregated blacks who saw schools attended as comparatively more detrimental; this was the opposite of what had been posited. The difference observed in 1972 was not of statistical

significance ($F = .21$, $P < .65$).

Analysis of Proposition V:

The occupational certainty proposition was neither clearly supported nor clearly refuted. Since we are dealing in this case with variables which can only take on values of from one-to-five, the differences we observe tend to be rather small.. Just as in the previous analyses, the differences generally indicate higher levels for desegregated students. In both the 1966 and the 1972 measures, the differences are not of sufficient magnitude to attain statistical significance. However the 1968 measure, which was taken most recently after desegregation occurred, did attain high statistical significance ($P = .005$) and it is this measure which is of substantive import in our analysis.

DISCUSSION

From our earlier reference to Jencks, et al., and others writing about the school desegregation phenomenon, it is apparent that three general positions are taken with reference to desegregation and social mobility.

(1) The most popular position (i.e., the one most consonant with many researchers personal values) is that which posits that experiencing school desegregation will enhance the mobility chances of black youth. The assumption here is that equal opportunity will eventuate in equal results and thus serve as a leveling device so that the proportions of blacks in various statuses, especially occupational ones, will be more nearly equal with that of whites.

(2) A second position is that black youth experiencing school desegregation will, in the aggregate, actually suffer negative consequences as a result of competing with white youth who have stronger academic backgrounds. It is generally posited here that certain negative consequences are initially to be expected and that these early negative consequences will diminish over time. A more segregationist position is often one of "neighborhood schools" or almost any action perpetuating segregation.

(3) A third position is in some ways the most controversial. In this case it is posited that school desegregation in and of itself will have little if any effect on the mobility chances of black youth. It is this position which has been taken by Coleman, et al., and Jencks, et al., and it is this position which challenges the very role education may play in status attainment since the more important factors are considered to be associated with one's family and one's ascribed SES.

It is apparent that the findings of this study, when taken collectively tend to support the third position. The admittedly brief desegregation experience of our panel of black youth seemed to have little significant effect on mobility related attitudes. In none of the comparisons made were differences of statistical significance observed. We failed to observe significant between group differences in either the short-run (high school senior year) or in the post high school measure. The consistency of the minimal differences thus supports both the null form of Propositions I & II and more saliently the position that the desegregation experience has a small effect on mobility-linked attitudes.. It must be pointed out, however, that while the desegregation experience did not raise the level

of occupational projections, neither did it depress them. Any conclusion on this must be that the desegregation experience seemed to exert a rather neutral effect.

Although the finding of a minimal difference in occupational projections is important, equally as important are the findings on goal-blockage items and on the occupational certainty measure. As we have reported elsewhere (Falk and Cosby, 1974), the desegregated black youth gave greater weight to race as a blockage factor in both the short and long runs. This suggests that the desegregated group became increasingly aware of the possible effects of racial discrimination in the soon-to-be-encountered labor market (where competition would be between blacks and whites, just as in a desegregated school, rather than only between blacks, as in a segregated school).

Another important finding here has been the response of desegregated black youth to the schools attended goal-blockage item. It is not really clear whether the desegregated group was responding (in 1968) to their present status of attending a desegregated school or if they were more generally responding to their total school's attended background. The paradox here is that the former interpretation would be related to a negative reaction to a predominantly white desegregated school; the latter interpretation might be a negative reaction to their previously attended schools when compared with attending a white desegregated school. In any case, this between groups difference had disappeared by the third interview.

A final comment is in order on the finding that the desegregated group expressed greater certainty about occupational expectations in the

1968 interview. It does not seem to be strictly spurious that this greater certainty was paralleled by a higher level of occupational expectation in 1968. While this latter measure was not different at an acceptable level of statistical significance, it may be that the more important interpretation here is a substantive one. Thus in 1968, the desegregated group had both higher occupational expectations and higher certainty of realizing their occupational expectations. Additionally, these two consonant occurrences were evinced at a time when the desegregated group reacted negatively toward both race and schools attended.

There are at least two theoretical interpretations from the above discussion. Jencks, et al. had suggested that tensions might increase in the short run but abate through time. This is similar to the W. I. Thomas dictum about defining situations and the consequences of those "real" defined situations. Another interpretation which can subsume the Thomas notion is that individuals will more realistically appraise their occupational chances as they mature. It could be theorized then that desegregated black youth, partially because of experiencing a desegregated school situation, develop a more realistic estimate of what their chances will be once they enter a labor market in which they will be competing with whites. This would explain why race is perceived as it is, and might suggest that although a certain amount of racial discrimination is expected, the youth still anticipate with fairly high certainty that their expectations can be attained. Unfortunately, we cannot even put much faith in a plausible explanation

such as this. When the divergence between aspirations and expectations is examined, it is clear that the within and between group differences for 1966 and 1968 are very nearly the same. However, when the differences are examined for 1972, the desegregated group evinces a much greater disparity between aspirations and expectations than did the segregated group. This may mean that while the segregated group had rather consistently lower occupational projections, these projections were nonetheless more homogeneous and perhaps, given their greater stability, reflected more realism than the projections of the desegregated group.

In evaluating the results of this study, the reader should be cautioned on several points. Although the research design was a quasi-experiment and the temporal scope of the data exceeds that of comparable studies, certain very desirable attributes of experimentation were absent. The most serious of these was the absence of randomization procedures in determining experimental and control groups, and of course, the inability of the researchers to manipulate the introduction of desegregation. Second, the research was conducted in three low-income rural counties in Texas. There is no reason to believe the quality of the introduction of desegregation is directly comparable to non-rural groups or to deep South rural populations which have historically experienced greater difficulty in the process. Third, the facilities offered to youth in both segregated and desegregated situations may

have been of approximately the same quality. If this latter point were true, the change for the black youth to previously all white schools would have resulted in no real change in these factors. Fourth, since the desegregation experience was introduced in between the sophomore and senior years of high school, the exposure to a desegregated experience may not have been of sufficient time to get a really good estimate of its effect on mobility-linked attitudes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Armor, David
1967 "The racial composition of schools and college aspirations of negro students." In U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, Vol.2, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Blake, Elias, Jr.
1960 A Comparison of Intra-racial and Inter-racial Levels of Aspirations, (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Illinois) University Microfilms Order No. 60-1616.

Blau, Peter M., et al.
1956 "Occupational choice: a conceptual framework." Industrial and Labor Relations Review, No. 4:9, 531-543.

Boyd, G.F.
1952 "The levels of aspirations of white and negro children in a non-segregated elementary school." Journal of Social Psychology 36.

Campbell, Donald T.
1957 "Factors relevant to the validity of experiments in social settings." Psychological Bulletin 54:297-312.

Campbell, Donald T. and Julian C. Stanley
1963 Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally & Company.

Carter, Hodding
1964 "Desegregation does not mean integration." Pp. 134-139 in Hubert H. Humphrey's School Desegregation: Documents and Commentaries. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company.

Coleman, James S., et al.
1966 Equality of Educational Opportunity. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.

Coleman, James S.
1969 "The concept of equality of educational opportunity." Pp. 9-24 in the Editorial Board of the Harvard Educational Review, Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambridge; Harvard University Press.

Cohen, David K., Thomas F. Pettigrew, and Robert T. Riley
1972 "Race and the outcomes of schooling." Pp. 343-368 in Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan's, On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Vintage Books.

Cosby, Arthur G., et al.
1973 Youth Status Projections in the South: Structured Annotations of Research Literature from Regional Research Project S-61. College Station: Texas A&M University, Dept. of Ag. Eco. and Rural Soc., DIR 73-2.

Cosby, Arthur G. and William P. Kuvlesky
1972 "Development of human resource potentials of rural youth in the south and their patterns of mobility." Unpublished bibliography of research reports from Texas Agricultural Experiment Station Project H-2811.

Crain, Robert L.
1971 "School integration and the academic achievement of negroes." Sociology of Education 44 (Winter): 1-26.

Duncan, Otis D.
1961 "A socio-economic index for all occupations." Pp. 109-161 and Appendix B in Albert J. Reiss Jrs., Otis D. Duncan, Paul K. Hatt, and C.C. North, Occupations and Social Status. Glencoe: The Free Press.

Falk, William W. and Arthur G. Cosby
1974 "School desegregation and educational attitudes: a quasi-experiment in rural schools." Rural Sociology, forthcoming.

Falk, William W., Arthur G. Cosby and David Wright
1973 "The effects of school desegregation on high school youth's educational projections: a quasi-experimental study." Paper presented at the Rural Sociological Society annual meeting, University of Maryland, College Park, August 1973.

Geisel, Paul N.
1962 I.Q. Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southern City: A Racial Comparison. (Doctoral Dissertation, Vanderbilt University) University Microfilm Order No. 63-1838.

Ginzberg, Eli., et al.
1951 Occupational Choice: An Approach to a General Theory. New York: Columbia University Press.

Gordon, Edmund W.
1972 "Toward defining equality of educational opportunity." Pp. 423-434 in Frederick Mosteller and Daniel P. Moynihan, On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Vintage Books.

Gottlieb, David
1964 "Goal aspirations and goal fulfillments: differences between deprived and affluent american adolescents." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Orthopsychiatris Association (March).

Guthrie, James W., et al.
1971 Schools and Inequality. Cambridge: The M.I.T. Press

Jencks, Christopher., et al.
1972 Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Knapp, Melvin and Eliot Hammer
1970 "Racial composition of southern schools and adolescent educational and occupational aspirations and expectations." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Southern Agricultural Workers, Memphis (January).

Kuvlesky, William P. and Robert C. Bealer
1966 "Clarification of the concept 'occupational choice'." Rural Sociology 31 (September): 265-276.

Laurenti, Luigi
1960 Property Value and Race. Berkeley: University of California Press.

McPartland, James
1968 "The segregated student in desegregated schools." Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for the Study of Social Organization of Schools, Report No. 21 (June).

Mosteller, Frederick and Daniel P. Moynihan
1972 On Equality of Educational Opportunity. New York: Vintage Books.

Musgrave, Peter W.
1967 "Towards a sociological theory of occupational choice." Sociological Review 15 (March): 33-46.

Pettigrew, Thomas F.
1969 "Race and equal educational opportunity." Pp. 69-79 in the Editorial Board of the Harvard Educational Review, Equal Educational Opportunity. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rehberg, Richard A.
1967 "Adolescent career aspirations and expectations: evaluation of two contrary stratification hypotheses." Pacific Sociological Review (Fall): 81-90.

Riley, Robert R. and David K. Cohen
1969 "Comparison or conformity: the effect of school environments on educational aspirations." Harvard Center for Educational Policy Research.

Rodgers, Roy H.
1966 "The occupational role of the child: a research frontier in the developmental conceptual framework." Social Forces 45 (December): 217-224.

Sewell, William H., Archibald O. Haller, and George W. Ohlendorf
1970 "The educational and early occupational status attainment process: replication and revision." American Sociological Review 35 (December): 1014-1027.

Sewell, William H., Archibald O. Haller, and Alejandro Portes
1969 "The educational and early occupation status attainment processes." American Sociological Review 34 (February): 82-92.

Silberman, Charles E.
1971 Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education, New York: Vintage Books.

St. John, Nancy H.
1970 "Desegregation and minority groups performance." Review of Educational Research 40 (February): 111-133.

Super, Donald E.
1957 The Psychology of Development. New York: Harper.

Weinberg, Meyer
1968 Integrated Education. Beverly Hills: The Glencoe Press.

Weinberg, Meyer
1970 Desegregation Research: An Appraisal. Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa.

Wilson, Alan B.
1959 "Residential segregation of social classes and aspirations of high school boys." American Sociological Review 24 (December): 843-854.

TABLE I

MOBILITY-LINKED ATTITUDES OF

SEGREGATED AND DESEGREGATED BLACK YOUTH

Variables and Time Measured	Experimental Group - Desegregated Youth			Control Group - Segregated Youth			Calculated Differences		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}^1$	SD	N	$\bar{X}-\bar{X}^1$	F	P>F
Occupational Aspirations (1966)	52.88	25.15	65	47.97	22.56	65	4.89	1.37	.24
Occupational Aspirations (1968)	52.93	21.86	61	48.08	22.12	63	4.85	1.51	.22
Occupational Aspirations (1972)	51.39	21.37	66	44.35	20.51	65	7.04	3.70	.054
Occupational Expectations (1966)	4. .66	24.27	62	44.84	20.96	64	2.82	.49	.51
Occupational Expectations (1968)	48.66	20.97	56	42.74	23.07	58	5.92	2.05	.15
Occupational Expectations (1972)	36.59	23.22	65	38.75	20.60	60	-2.16	.30	.59

TABLE II

PERCEIVED GOAL-BLOCKAGE OF

SEGREGATED AND DESEGREGATED BLACK YOUTH

Variables and Time Measured	Experimental Group-Desegregated Youth			Control Group-Segregated Youth			Calculated Differences		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}'$	SD	N	$\bar{X}-\bar{X}'$	F	P <
Race Blockage (1966)	1.78	1.17	63	1.73	1.01	64	.05	.05	.82
Race Blockage (1968)	1.92	1.09	61	1.43	.83	61	.49	7.94	.006
Race Blockage (1972)	1.49	.85	66	1.23	.61	64	26	3.73	.05
School Blockage (1966)	1.92	1.02	63	1.79	1.13	62	.13	.46	.51
School Blockage (1968)	1.80	.96	61	1.48	.74	61	.32	4.42	.04
School Blockage (1972)	1.59	.96	66	1.67	.92	63	-.08	.21	.65

TABLE III

MOBILITY-LINKED ATTITUDES OF

SEGREGATED AND DESEGREGATED BLACK YOUTH

Variables and Time Measured	Experimental Group- Desegregated Youth			Control Group- Segregated Youth			Calculated Differences		
	$\bar{X}$	SD	N	$\bar{X}^1$	SD	N	$\bar{X}-\bar{X}^1$	F	P <
Occupational Certainty (1966)	3.74	.98	66	3.56	.85	64	.18	1.24	.27
Occupational Certainty (1968)	3.70	.89	66	3.26	.83	65	.44	8.30	.005
Occupational Certainty (1972)	3.61	.97	66	3.40	.82	63	.21	1.74	.19