

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 387 281

RC 020 226

AUTHOR Donato, Ruben; And Others
 TITLE Segregation, Desegregation, and Integration of Chicano Students: Problems and Prospects. Chapter 2.
 PUB DATE 93
 NOTE 39p.; In: Chicano School Failure and Success: Research and Policy Agendas for the 1990s; see RC 020 224.
 PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Historical Materials (060)
 EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS *Academic Failure; Bilingual Education; Desegregation Effects; Educational Change; Educational History; Educational Policy; Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Low Achievement; *Mexican American Education; Mexican Americans; *Racial Discrimination; *Racial Integration; *School Desegregation; *School Resegregation
 IDENTIFIERS *Chicanos; Hispanic American Students; Language Minorities

ABSTRACT

This chapter examines connections between segregation and Chicano school failure. The isolation of Chicano students in "Mexican schools" or in high-density ethnic minority schools is a long-standing fact of the Chicano schooling experience. Current data reveal that Chicanos and other Latino students continue to be segregated and are becoming more and more isolated from their White peers. In addition, there is a great deal of historical and contemporary evidence that the school segregation of Chicano students is connected to school failure, hence inequality. Segregated schools tend to be characterized by low funding, high dropout rates, low achievement test scores, a disproportionately high percentage of low-income students, and few college preparatory courses. The ideological foundations of school segregation date back to the 19th-century belief that White groups should not socially interact with biologically inferior races. By the early 1900s, most states practiced some form of social segregation and had institutionalized school segregation as the main vehicle to maintain a segregated society. In the Southwest, the growth of residential segregation was accompanied by school segregation and was strongly linked to racial prejudice. Language was also used to segregate Mexican students. Mexican students were not permitted to attend classes with their White peers because they needed special instruction in English and would impede the academic progress of other children. In 1945, federal legislation finally ended the era of de jure segregation. Although Chicanos won the battle against de jure segregation, their isolation in segregated schools has continued. Suggestions for achieving integration include encouraging residential integration, busing Chicano students to predominantly White schools, two-way bilingual education programs, multicultural education in teacher education, proactive technical assistance in desegregation planning, and conceptualization of integration. Contains 124 references.
 (LP)

Chapter 2

Segregation, Desegregation, and Integration of Chicano Students: Problems and Prospects

Rubén Donato, Martha Menchaca and Richard R. Valencia

Segregation has been, and continues to be, a schooling reality for a substantial proportion of the Chicano elementary and secondary school-age population. In that segregation practices and conditions are not conducive for optimal learning, it is not surprising that school segregation is inextricably linked to Chicano school failure. As noted by Valencia (chapter 1, this volume), the segregation of Chicano students constitutes a major obstacle in their schooling experience — that is, segregation can be considered a key institutional process in denying Chicanos equal educational opportunities.

In this chapter, we will examine the connections between segregation and Chicano school failure from both historical and contemporary vantage points. We begin by providing a descriptive overview of the current prevalence of Chicano segregation, as well as an empirical look at the adverse relation between school segregation and diminished academic achievement. Second, we provide an overview of the roots of Chicano school segregation. Our contention is that in order to understand the current problems and remedies associated with segregation, one needs to examine its ideological and structural foundations. In particular, we examine the relation between racism and the implementation, maintenance, and persistence of school segregation. In this historical section we also discuss, in brief, the efforts Chicano parents exerted to desegregate barrio schools in their pursuit for a better schooling for Chicano youth. Third, we describe the contemporary manifestations of segregation — with a special emphasis on language segregation as a form of resegregation. The chapter closes with a discussion of reform. Granted that school integration (and not merely desegregation) is a desirable goal, how might true integration (e.g., interethnic contact, equal status) be achieved by the Chicano community? How can we move towards integration and Chicano school success? In our discussion we weave in research and policy dimensions.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. STRELSAND
(FALMER PRESS)

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

The Segregation of Chicanos: Prevalence and Adverse Effects

Prevalence of Segregation

The isolation of Chicano students in 'Mexican schools' or in high-density ethnic minority schools is a longstanding fact of the Chicano schooling experience. Historian Gilbert Gonzalez (1990) notes that Mexican children were denied admission to 'American' schools as early as 1892.¹ This case in point involved the school district in Corpus Christi, Texas, where a separate school was built just for the Mexican students. Within years the school enrolled 110 students, and by the late 1920s the same school had an enrollment of 1,320 Mexican children (Gonzalez). The segregation of Mexican students would continue to escalate in Texas and elsewhere, and as Gonzalez comments, by 1920 segregation was in full force as 85 per cent of school districts in the Southwest practiced the segregation of Mexican students in the form of either having 'Mexican schools' or 'Mexican rooms' (i.e., Mexican students were deliberately isolated in ethnically mixed schools).

With the increase in the Mexican-origin population and the barrierization of Chicano communities, school segregation from the 1920s to the 1970s became an entrenched condition for numerous Chicano students throughout the Southwest. In 1971, the landmark US Commission on Civil Rights *Mexican American Education Study (Report Number 1: Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest)* made public what Chicano parents had known for many years, their children were relatively isolated from White children. Based on a well-designed and extensive data-gathering procedure, the Commission reported that nearly 1 in 2 Chicano students in the Southwest in 1968 attended elementary and secondary schools in which they comprised the predominant ethnic group (i.e., 50 to 100 per cent Chicano enrollment). It was also found that 1 in 5 Chicano students in 1968 attended schools in which they were the near total enrollment (80 to 100 per cent).

In the 1970s, school segregation actually increased nationally for Black students. Yet, for Chicano and other Latino students (particularly Puerto Ricans), segregation increased. This steady rise in school segregation has been to such a degree that Latino students (two-thirds of whom are Chicanos) now have the unfortunate characteristic of being the most segregated of America's student groups (Orum, 1986).² In 1980, 68.1 per cent of Latino students nationally were enrolled in schools with minority enrollments of 50 per cent or greater, and more than 25 per cent of Latinos attended schools in which minority density was 90 to 100 per cent (Orum).

More recent data (Orfield, 1988) confirms the intensification of Chicano and other Latino student segregation. Table 2.1 shows Latino public school segregation nationally by region from 1968 to 1984. Reported are data for (a) percentage of Latinos enrolled in predominantly White schools, and (b) percentage of Latino students in near total (i.e., 90 to 100 per cent) minority schools.

The data presented in Table 2.1 reveal distinct patterns: on a region-by-region basis, the percentage of Latino students attending predominantly White schools declined from 1968 to 1984. Conversely, the percentages of Latino students enrolled in near total minority schools increased in each of the four US regions. Using the national data in Table 2.1 as a fairly representative indicator of

Table 2.1 Latino segregation by region, 1968-1984

Region	% of Latino students in predominantly White Schools		% of Latino students in 90-100% minority schools		Change (%)
	1968	1984	1968	1984	
West	58	32	12	23	+91.7
South	30	25	34	37	+8.8
Northeast	25	22	44	47	+6.8
Midwest	68	46	7	24	+242.9
US	45	29	23	31	+34.8

Source: Adapted from Orfield (1988).

Latino segregation, we can see that the percentage of Latinos enrolled in White schools over the sixteen-year period dropped by 36 per cent, whereas the percentage of Latino students attending 90-100 per cent minority students jumped 35 per cent. In sum, taking all the available information together, there is clear and ample evidence that as a whole, Chicano and other Latinos students are becoming more and more isolated from their White peers — and vice versa.

Adverse Effects of Segregation

Historically, the context for learning in Chicano segregated schools has been extremely poor. There is no doubt that the separate schooling Chicano students experienced was inferior. Gonzalez (1990) describes these early conditions as such:

Inadequate resources, poor equipment, and unfit building construction made Mexican schools vastly inferior to Anglo schools. In addition, school districts paid teachers at Mexican schools less than teachers at Anglo schools, and many times a promotion for a teacher at a Mexican school meant moving to the Anglo school. Quite often, however, teachers in Mexican schools were either beginners or had been 'banished' as incompetent. (p. 22)

There are a number of references that document the considerably poor conditions endured by Chicano students in segregated schools. For example, Menchaca and Valencia (1990) contrast the Mexican and Anglo schools built in the mid-1920s in Santa Paula, California. The Mexican school enrolled nearly 1,000 students in a schoolhouse with eight classrooms (grades kindergarten through eighth) and contained two bathrooms and one administrative office. On the other hand, the Anglo school enrolled less than 700 students and contained twenty-one classrooms, a cafeteria, a training shop, and several administrative offices. In short, the Mexican school — compared to the Anglo school — had a much higher student per classroom ratio and inferior facilities. Fifteen miles away from Santa Paula, in the coastal city of Oxnard, Chicano students fared no better in segregated schools. McCurdy (1975) in a *Los Angeles Times* article reported how several past school superintendents described the deplorable schooling conditions Chicano children experienced in the 1930s.³

One school was described as 'literally no more than a chicken coop. It had a dirt floor, single thickness walls, very run down, some stench from the toilet facility. Another school had a floor made from just black asphalt of the type you would see placed on street pavement', a former superintendent said. 'In the classroom, there was a single light bulb, not a large one . . . It may have been a 100-watt bulb, screwed into an outlet in the center of the ceiling', he said.

Suffice it to say that the inadequate educational conditions experienced by Chicano students in the past were detrimental to promoting an optimal learning environment. Although the current facilities in Chicano segregated schools may not be as deplorable as in the past, the legacy of inferiority continues. A major contributing factor to the maintenance of inferior conditions as manifested in resources in Chicano segregated schools is school financing inequity (see Valencia, chapter 1, this volume). As the funding discrepancy between rich and poor schools narrows, however, there is some optimism that learning opportunities will improve for Chicano segregated schools (e.g., Pinkerton, 1989).

Notwithstanding the extreme importance of attaining equity in school financing for Chicano schools, there remains the stubborn relation between school segregation of Chicanos and lowered academic achievement. For example, Jaeger (1987; cited in Orfield, 1988) examined the relation between test scores and percent Black and Latino high school students in metropolitan Los Angeles (1984-85 school year). The observed correlations were very strong: (-.90), mathematics (-.88), and writing (-.85). That is, as minority enrollment increased, achievement decreased. Jaeger reported that the correlations between school enrollment percentage of White students and achievement test scores were likewise of very high magnitudes, but of the opposite direction (i.e., as White enrollment in the high schools increased, test scores also increased). Finally, Jaeger disaggregated the data and found that when only the percentage of Latino students in the high schools was correlated with achievement, the relations were not as strong for the Black/Latino aggregate, but still quite substantial (range from -.53 to -.58).

Espinosa and Ochoa (1986) have also provided supporting evidence for the connection between Chicano segregation and diminished achievement in California — a state in which Chicano school segregation has also increased in the last twenty years. Using a large state-wide sample (4,268 public elementary schools and 791 public high schools), Espinosa and Ochoa correlated California Assessment Program (CAP) scores (average of math and reading achievement) with percent of Latino students in grades three, six and twelve. The relation between Latino concentration and CAP achievement was strongly defined (e.g., at grade twelve the observed r was -.49).

In another investigation, Valencia (1984) also found a substantial relation between minority concentration in schools and academic achievement. The setting for the study was the Phoenix Union High School District (PUHSD) No. 210. Valencia — as part of his work as an expert witness in a school closure trial in the PUHSD — calculated the correlation between the percentage of Black/Latino enrollment with mean stanines of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills for grades nine through twelve in the District's eleven high schools. Table 2.2

Table 2.2. Rank order comparison between percentage of minority student body enrollment and academic achievement

School	Minority student enrollment %	Minority rank	Achievement rank (lowest)
Union	94.2	1	1
South	87.7	2	2
Hayden	75.0	3	3
North	64.4	4	4
East	56.7	5	5
West	25.7	6	7
Maryvale	19.5	7	8
Browne	18.0	8	6
Alhambra	13.2	9	9
Central	9.4	10	11
Camelback	7.8	11	10

Source: Valencia (1984)

Based on autumn 1978 mean stanines of the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills for grades 9-12 $p = .96$ (significant < 0.1)

lists the ranking of the eleven schools by minority student enrollment accompanied by each school's respective rank (lowest to highest) on achievement.

The statistical analysis (Spearman rank-order correlation) computed by Valencia revealed that the association between Black/Latino percentage of the various high schools with their respective test scores was very strong ($p = .96$) — once again underscoring the ubiquitous connection between school segregation and low academic performance.

On a final note, there is evidence that the relation between school segregation and schooling problems is not confined to test score outcomes. For example, Orfield (1988) found that the correlation between graduation rate with the percentage of Black/Latino students in metropolitan Chicago high schools was a staggering -.83. Furthermore, a correlation of -.47 was observed between percent minority high school students and percent of students taking the college entrance examinations. Orfield also reported that the Black/Latino percentage of schools was very negatively associated ($r = -.92$) with average college admissions test scores. When the analyses were disaggregated by ethnicity, the correlations for Latino high school students were -.40 (percent Latino with graduation rate) and -.43 (percent Latino with college entrance scores). A clear and direct implication stemming from the findings of Orfield and others is that the school segregation of Chicanos is linked to their very limited matriculation to higher education. Orum (1986), for example, has identified poor high school preparation as a key obstacle in college access for Chicano and other Latino students. She reported that the Latino eligibility pool for entrance to college is substantially reduced, as 75 per cent of Latino high school graduates have not completed a college preparatory curriculum. Also, approximately 33 per cent of Latino high school graduates have very low grades ('D' or 'F' averages) in one or more vital academic subjects.

In conclusion, there is a great deal of historical and contemporary evidence that the school segregation of Chicano students in our nation's public elementary

and secondary schools is connected to school failure, hence inequality. Various sources inform us that segregated Chicano schools tend to be schools characterized by low funding, high dropout rates, low achievement test scores, a disproportionately high percentage of low-income students, and few college preparatory courses. There is no doubt that the isolation of Chicano students in schools that suffer from inequities in facilities, resources, and curricula offerings is far from desirable. The desegregation of Chicano schools and the subsequent integration of Chicano and other 'minority' and 'majority' students in equitable learning contexts is a commendable goal. Later, we share our thoughts and ideas how such integration may be realized. But first, it is necessary to understand the historical roots of segregation. Our proposition is that in order to move towards the goal of desegregation and integration of Chicano students, one must have a sense of the events and forces that helped shape the educational isolation of Chicanos.

Racism and Chicano School Segregation in the Southwest: An Historical Perspective

Racism and the Structural Foundation of Segregation

There is ample evidence that the ideological foundations of school segregation date back to the nineteenth century racial belief that White groups should not socially interact with biologically inferior colored races (Konvitz 1946; Menchaca 1987; Menchaca and Valencia, 1990). During the nineteenth century, White supremacy ideologies helped to promote the belief that racial minority groups were inherently inferior and helped to provide the rationale to segregate the 'colored races' (Comas, 1961; Jackson, 1986). Racism was institutionalized within the academic, religious, and governmental spheres and it culminated in the passage of *de jure* segregation (Menchaca and Valencia). Within the academic sphere, historians were at the forefront in proselytizing a White superiority ideology and argued in favor of eugenics to ensure that the White races would remain pure (Feagin, 1989; Gossett, 1953, 1977). Historians also favored the social segregation of the colored races as being the most practical method of preventing racial intermingling. The religious sphere was also included in the racist ideologies of the era, in which some churches practiced segregation. The belief that the Anglo-Saxons were 'God's Chosen People' provided the rationale to support the view that God did not intend the races to mix because he had 'not created all the races equal'. Within the Protestant Church, White supremacist pastors interpreted the doctrine as God's plan to rid the world of the 'colored' races and thus make room for the superior White races. For example, the genocide of the American Indian was figuratively interpreted to be the result of God's predestined will to improve the racial makeup of the world (Gossett, 1953, 1977; Newcombe, 1985). In many congregations, racism was manifested in the total exclusion of racial minority groups. 'Colored people' were expected to attend services in their own churches, and in more tolerant congregations racial minorities were allowed to attend church but were expected to sit apart from the White congregation (Cadena, 1987; Glazer and Moynihan, 1963; Menchaca, 1987, 1989; Menchaca and Valencia, 1990).

Segregation, Desegregation, and Integration of Chicano Students

White supremacist views also surfaced in the governmental sphere and culminated in the legislation of segregationist laws. The passage of 'separate but equal legislation' in the nineteenth century reflected the government's endorsement of the widespread racial ideologies of the period (Feagin, 1989; Hendrick, 1977; Wollenberg, 1978). At the federal level the passage of *Plessy v. Ferguson* in 1896 was a blatant example of the government's approval of the rationale that the colored races should not mix with Whites. Though *Plessy v. Ferguson* was passed with the specific intention of segregating Blacks, the case was used to justify all forms of social segregation. At the local level, city governments used the legislation to segregate other racial minority groups by arguing that the spirit of the law 'applied to all 'coloreds'' (Hyman and Wiecek, 1982; Konvitz, 1946). Moreover, *Plessy v. Ferguson* represented a symbolic action on part of the federal legislators to enact an undisputable law that gave the states the right to practice segregation.

By the early 1900s, most states practiced some form of social segregation and had institutionalized school segregation as the main vehicle to maintain a segregated society (Feagin, 1989). The rationale being that if the children of the White and 'colored' races were socialized not to intermingle, the groups would not marry, and thus the purity of each race would be retained (Konvitz, 1946). Racial minorities questioned the extension of segregationist legislation to the educational domain and therefore took their plight to the Federal Supreme Court. In several Federal Supreme Court cases, however, the courts asserted the states' rights to segregate the 'colored races' and ruled against anti-segregationist practices. For example, in 1927 the Federal Supreme Court ruled in *Gong Lum v. Rice* that the separation of the colored races in the schools was within the discretion of the State and not in conflict with the fourteenth amendment (Konvitz, 1946). Over a decade later, the rule of separate but equal facilities in educational institutions was reasserted in the US Federal Supreme Court of 1938 in *Gaines v. Canada*. Although the federal courts did not legislate a mandate that 'all colored children must be segregated', they supported the states' rights to institute school segregation if desired by the legislators.

Paradoxically, although Chicanos were not specifically mentioned in the 'separate but equal legislation' there is ample evidence that they were often treated as 'colored' and were consequently segregated in most social spheres. Historically, the rationale used to socially segregate Mexicans was based on the racial perspective that Mexicans were 'Indian', or at best 'half-breed savages' who were not suited to interact with Whites (Menchaca and Valencia, 1990; Paredes, 1978; Surace, 1982). Although the ratification of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo had guaranteed Mexicans the political privileges enjoyed by Whites, state legislators in the latter half of the nineteenth century and early 1900s attempted to violate the agreement (Menchaca, 1990). Legislators sought to limit the Mexicans' political and social rights based on the rationale that Mexicans were Indians. They argued that because Indians by law were prohibited from voting, residing in White neighborhoods, and attending schools with White children, these laws also applied to Mexicans (Heizer and Amquist, 1971). For example, in California the state constitution prohibited 'Indian-looking Mexicans' from voting and only extended that privilege to 'White-looking Mexican' males (*California State Constitution of 1849*, article 11, section 1; Menchaca, 1990; Padilla, 1979). In the area of naturalization the federal government also attempted to deny Mexican immigrants their right to apply for citizenship on the basis that they were Indian

Mexican population increased in the Southwest, the Anglo Americans responded by demanding residential and school segregation (Wollenberg, 1978). It also became common to segregate Mexicans in most public facilities including swimming pools, theaters, restaurants, and schools. In California, for example, when the Mexican-origin population tripled in the 1920s, from 121,000 to 368,000, the local school boards responded by instituting widespread school segregation (Wollenberg). In 1928, sixty-four schools in southern California responded to a government survey and reported that they had 90 to 100 per cent Mexican enrollments. Three years later, the state of California conducted a second survey and reported that 9 out of 10 school districts practiced school segregation in some form or another (Leis, 1931; cited in Gonzalez, 1985). Hendrick (1977) also reported in 1931, 85 per cent of California schools surveyed by the state government reported segregating Mexican students either in separate classrooms or in separate schools.

The school segregation of Mexican students was also widespread in Texas and coincided with a period of dramatic growth in the immigrant population (Montejano, 1987). As in California, segregated schools were a direct outgrowth of residential segregation, increasing Mexican immigration, and in particular large-scale growers as a means of preventing the Mexican students from attending White schools. One of the first Mexican schools was established at the turn of the century in Central Texas (Seguin), and afterwards the process of separate Mexican schools became a common practice throughout the state (Rangel and Alcalá, 1972). Moreover, in the late 1920s school segregation became more intense and it coincided with the growth of the Mexican immigrant population (Montejano). In the areas where the newcomers were concentrated, such as the lower Rio Grande Valley, the school segregation of Mexican students radically increased. Reconstructing the educational histories of local communities in the lower Rio Grande Valley, Montejano concluded that Mexican immigration and residential and school segregation were inextricably part of the same process:

The towns of Edinburg, Harlingen, and San Benito segregated their Mexican school children through the fourth and fifth grades. And along the dense string of newcomer towns of Highway 83 — the 'longest mile' of McAllen, Mercedes, Mission, Pharr-San Juan, and Weslaco — Mexican school segregation was an unbroken policy. On the Gulf Coast plains, Raymondville, Kingsville, Robstown, Kennedy, and Taft were among the new towns where segregation was practiced. And in the Winter Garden area, Mexicans were segregated through the fifth grade in Crystal City, Carrizo Springs, Palm, Valley Wells, Asherton, and Frio Town. (p. 168)

By 1930, 90 per cent of the schools in Texas were racially segregated (Rangel and Alcalá, 1972).

The rationales used to segregate Mexican students ranged from racial to social deficit justifications. Overall, these beliefs were ideological smokescreens used to prevent Chicano students from attending White schools. For example, in California during the 1920s and 1930s, government officials attempted to classify Mexican students as Indians in order to segregate them on the basis that they

(Hull, 1985; Kansas, 1941; Konvitz, 1946; *People v. De La Guerra*, 1870; *Rodriguez v. Texas Circuit Court*, (1893, 81F.337-355).

Racial discrimination against the 'Indianism' of Mexicans was also manifested in the form of residential segregation. This exclusionary practice eventually provided the underlying structure for the school segregation of Mexican students, and thus it is important to examine the structural relation between residential and school segregation. By 1870, the residential segregation of the Mexican was firmly entrenched in the multiethnic structure of the Southwest and such housing patterns were viewed by Anglo-Americans to be the natural division between the inferior 'half-breed Mexican' and the 'superior' White race (Acuna, 1988; Camarillo, 1984). Using nineteenth-century archival records, historian Alberto Camarillo attributes the early stages of Mexican residential segregation to Anglo-American racial prejudice. Camarillo states, 'The old Mexican pueblos were viewed by most Americans as "foreign", "backward", and undesirable locations in which to live' (p. 224). For example, in California the residential segregation of the Mexican began as early as 1850 and the process was completed by 1870. In San Francisco, San Jose, Santa Barbara, Los Angeles, San Diego, Santa Cruz, and Monterey, Anglo-American settlers restructured the old pueblos by constructing new subdivisions in the towns and prohibited Mexicans from moving into Anglo neighborhoods. Throughout California the residential segregation of the Mexican was enforced by the use of racial harassment and violence, and in many cities by the use of housing covenant restrictions prohibiting Mexicans from residing in the White zones (Hendrick, 1977).

Social historian David Montejano (1987) also reports that a similar process of residential segregation became widespread and provided the foundation for school segregation in Texas. Throughout the state, Mexicans were segregated in separate sections of the cities, and in many Anglo-American farm communities local *de jure* laws were used to prevent Mexicans from establishing residence. Residential segregation was planned by the ranchers and town developers and maintained through local laws and real estate policies. For example, in Weslaco, Texas, Mexicans were only allowed to buy property in designated areas near the Missouri Pacific Railroad tracks, and municipal ordinances required that Mexican neighborhoods and businesses only be established in those areas.

By the early 1900s the intensification of Mexican residential segregation became more complex in Texas, California, and other parts of the Southwest. Contributing factors were the industrial and urban development of the Southwest. It is very clear, however, that the growth of such residential segregation accompanied school segregation and was strongly linked to Anglo-American racial prejudice. Later, we will discuss the need for policy makers to explore strategies that might lead to residential integration — a major solution to eliminate school segregation.

The Rooting of Chicano School Segregation

The period of Mexican immigration to the United States in the 1920s delineates how racism continued to be the ideological force that pushed forward the growth of all forms of segregation, in particular residential and school segregation (Camarillo, 1984a, 1984b; Montejano, 1987). That is, when the size of the

were 'colored'. On January 23, 1927, the Attorney General of California stated that Mexicans could be treated as Indians, thereby placing them under the mandate of *de jure* segregation (Hendrick, 1977). In 1930, the California Attorney General once again issued an opinion on the racial background of the Mexican students. According to Attorney General Webb, Mexicans were Indians and therefore should not be treated as White. Webb stated, 'It is well known that the greater portion of the population of Mexico are Indians and were [sic] such Indians migrate to the United States, they are subject to the laws applicable generally to other Indians' (cited in Weinberg, 1977, p. 166). Webb's opinion was used by school boards to classify Mexicans as Indians and therefore attempted to segregate them on the basis that they were non-White. Finally, in 1935, the California legislature passed a law to segregate officially Mexican students on the basis that they were Indian. Without explicitly mentioning Mexicans, the 1935 school code prescribed that schools segregate Mexicans who descended from Indians. The California school code of 1935 stated:

The governing board of the School district shall have power to establish separate schools for Indian children, excepting children of Indians who are the wards of the US government and children of all other Indians who are the descendants of the original American Indians of the US, and for children of Chinese, Japanese, or Mongolian parentage. (Cited in Hendrick, 1977, p. 57)

Although the school code did not mention Mexicans by name, it was explicit that the state's intention was to segregate dark-skinned Mexican students. Thus, Mexican children became the principal target of the discriminatory school code without being identified, and American Indians, though named directly, were released from legally mandated segregation.

Language was a second rationale used to segregate Mexican students. Allegedly, Mexican students were not permitted to attend classes with their Anglo American peers because they needed special instruction in English (Gonzalez, 1990; Menchaca and Valencia, 1990; San Miguel, 1986, 1987). The pedagogical rationale was that the limited- or non-English-speaking Mexican children would impede the academic progress of the Anglo children. The racial overtones of these practices were blatantly seen when Mexican American students, who did not speak Spanish, were also forced to attend the Mexican schools (Alvarez, 1986; Menchaca, 1987). The need to acculturate Mexican students in special Americanization classes was a third major excuse used to justify segregation. Mexican students were characterized as dirty, dull, unchristian, and lacking any social etiquette. Therefore, the educational belief was that Mexicans needed special classes where they would learn to emulate their Anglo American counterparts (Garcia, 1979; Gonzalez, 1990).

The results of IQ tests were also used, in part, to segregate Mexican students and provided the alleged scientific rationale. Lewis Terman, Professor of Education at Stanford University, presented many findings from racial studies of intelligence testing supporting the view that Blacks, Indians, and Mexican Americans were intellectually inferior to Whites (Blum, 1978). In the case of Mexican Americans, William Sheldon of The University of Texas at Austin also used IQ tests such as the Cole-Vincent and Stanford-Binet tests to measure the

mental ability of Mexican Americans in Texas (Wollenberg, 1974). Sheldon concluded that Mexican students, as measured by IQ tests, only had '85 per cent of the intelligence' of White students. Moreover, Thomas Garth of the University of Denver administered the National Intelligence Test to over 1,000 Mexican origin students in Texas, New Mexico, and Colorado and discovered that the median IQ of those tested was 78.1 (the lowest of any study to that date). According to Garth, there was a connection between the Mexican children's heritage and their very low IQ, thus suggesting a racial interpretation (Wollenberg, 1974).

Using the research of the social scientist, school boards manipulated the IQ data to support their racist beliefs. Because it was common for Mexican students to score considerably lower than their White peers, school boards members used test results in part to separate the Mexican and Anglo students. It was rationalized that Anglo students must be instructed in separate schools in order to prevent them from getting behind. Mexican students, on the other hand, were identified to be slow learners needing special instruction in separate schools. Gonzalez (1974, 1990) also posits that IQ testing was an ideological foundation used to track minority students in the schools and to provide them with inferior education.

The Mexican community in the Southwest did not idly stand by while its children were being segregated in inferior facilities. The struggle for desegregation was initiated in Texas and California in the early 1930s. In Del Rio, Texas, Mexican parents successfully proved that the Independent School District had illegally segregated Mexican students on the basis of race (Rangel and Alcalá, 1972). The court ruled in the case of *Del Rio Independent School District v. Salvatierra* (1930) that Mexicans were White and had been arbitrarily segregated because they were Mexican. The judgment, however, was overturned by the appellate court on the basis that the school board had the right to segregate Mexican students because of their 'language problems'.

In California, the Mexican parents of Lemon Grove were able to successfully overturn school segregation on March 13, 1931. *Alvarez v. Lemon Grove School District* represented one of the first successful desegregation cases of Mexican students in the United States. The court ruled in favor of the Mexican community on the basis that separate facilities for Mexican students were not conducive towards their Americanization and retarded the English language competency of the Spanish-speaking children.

In 1945, the era of *de jure* segregation finally came to an end for the Mexican community of the Southwest. The highly touted *Mendez v. Westminster* (1947) case ended *de jure* segregation in California and provided the legal foundation to end the school segregation of Mexican students throughout the Southwest. In *Mendez*, Judge McCormick concluded that the school board had segregated Mexicans on the basis of their 'Latinized' appearance and had gerrymandered the school district in order to ensure that Mexican students attend the Mexican schools. Judge McCormick concluded that this was an illegal action because there was no constitutional or congressional mandate that authorized school boards to segregate Mexican students. On the contrary, he stated that the fourteenth amendment and the ratification of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo had guaranteed Mexicans equal rights in the United States. Although the *Mendez* case helped to end *de jure* segregation, the school segregation of Mexican students remained

widespread (Hendrick, 1977), and increased over the generations. Moreover, as Gonzalez (1990) notes when speaking of the *Mendez* case, 'Eventually, *de jure* segregation in schools ended throughout the Southwest, but not before an educational policy reinforcing socioeconomic inequality severely victimized generations of Mexican children' (p. 29).

Following the *Mendez* case, the *Delgado v. Bastrop Independent School District* (1948) in Texas was another example of the Chicano's struggle for desegregation. The court ruled that placing Mexican students in separate schools was discriminatory and illegal. Paradoxically, although the court passed this ruling it also allowed school boards to segregate Mexican students within a school on the basis of their limited-English competency. Thus, this initiated a new form of school segregation within desegregated school settings based on a language rationale (San Miguel, 1987).

In conclusion, the history of Chicano school segregation is a troubled one — filled with numerous events of forced isolation. History informs us that racism was a driving force in the relations between school segregation and Chicano school failure. But, Chicano communities did not idly stand by. *Salvatierra, Alvarez, Mendez, Delgado*, and others are testimony to the Chicano's struggle for desegregated schools and equal educational opportunity. Notwithstanding these legal accomplishments, one can argue that to some degree these were empty victories: that is, although Chicanos won the battle against *de jure* segregation, their isolation in segregated schools continued. We now turn to an analysis of a modern form of school segregation in desegregated schools — resegregation.

Contemporary Issues in Chicano School Segregation: Resegregation

Thus far, we have examined the historical inequalities that structured Chicano segregated elementary and secondary public schools. With the end of *de jure* segregation of 'Mexican schools', the process of school desegregation in the Southwest began slowly. Furthermore, desegregation over the few decades touched only a small number of Chicano students and contained a number of pitfalls. In this section, we will examine these problems by analyzing the phenomenon of resegregation; that is, the process of Chicanos being segregated within desegregated settings. We discuss five aspects of current school desegregation and resegregation. First, we will briefly look at Chicano segregation as a silent problem; second, language segregation as an old problem but new issues brought forth; third, the relationship between bilingual education and desegregation; fourth, the bilingual teacher shortage and its impact on resegregation; and fifth, academic resegregation and its implication for the schooling of Chicanos.

Chicano School Segregation: A Silent Problem

In 1954 the Supreme Court decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* stated that public schools could not place students in separate facilities based on race.

religion, or national origin. Racially segregated schools were 'inherently unequal' and practices fostering them were unconstitutional (*Brown*, 1954). The impact of *Brown* was so dramatic in the United States that many social scientists concurred that the case helped launch the modern civil rights movement. School desegregation, thus, became one of the leading and most controversial issues in American educational history (Welch and Light, 1987). During the 1960s and 1970s school desegregation received an enormous amount of public attention. Stories depicting communities in conflict over the school desegregation process became a common observance for anyone who kept up with the issue. Social scientists and political commentators wrote extensively about school desegregation. In the initial stages of the process, studies focused on the desegregation of schools in the deep South, but then as the movement gathered momentum, the focus shifted to eastern, mid-western, and western regions of the nation (Crain, 1968; Edwards and Wirt, 1967; Kirp, 1982; Rist, 1979). Given the scholarly and public attention that school desegregation received, most Americans immediately identified the school desegregation process exclusively as a Black/White issue. As Orfield, Monfort, and George (1987) have noted, 'School segregation has been widely understood as a problem for blacks. There is little public discussion of the fact, however, that black students are now less likely to attend schools with less than half whites than are Hispanics' (p. 24).

Although Chicanos were actively involved in several court cases for desegregated schooling throughout the Southwest during the pre-*Brown* era, they quickly became an invisible minority group and did not receive much attention in the desegregation process after the 1950s. The two most important cases in the post-*Brown* era concerning the desegregation of Chicano children were *Cisneros v. Corpus Christi Independent School District* in Texas (1970) and *Keyes v. School District Number One* in Denver, Colorado (1975). Brought on by Mexican Americans in the Corpus Christi area, the *Cisneros* case was extremely significant in their struggle for desegregated schools. This case demonstrated how Mexican Americans thought it was necessary to be identified as a separate class or an identifiable minority group in order to benefit from *Brown*. Because the court ruled that Mexican Americans were an identifiable ethnic minority group, they were found to be unconstitutionally segregated in Texas public schools. As San Miguel noted, Mexican Americans wanted to discard '... the "other white" legal strategy used ... during the 1940s and 1950s to eliminate segregation and substitute the equal protection argument used in black desegregation cases' (San Miguel, 1987, p. 178).

The *Keyes* case in Colorado was similar to the *Cisneros* case in the sense that it compelled the court to recognize '... how to treat Mexican American children in the desegregation process' (San Miguel, 1987, p. 180). Originally brought on by Blacks, the court was forced to make the decision whether to recognize Chicano students as 'White' and to integrate them with Blacks or view them as an identifiable minority group and mix them with White children. Once again, Chicano students were in fact recognized as an identifiable minority group and thus entitled to special services in desegregated settings in Colorado. Yet, despite the importance of *Cisneros* and *Keyes*, the educational isolation of most Chicano students continued — in both segregated and desegregated American public schools.

Language Segregation: Old Problem New Issues

Language segregation is not a new issue. American public schools have attempted to segregate Chicano children based on language for over six decades. The defendants in the *Del Rio v. Salvatierra* (1931), *Alvarez v. Lemon Grove* (1931), and the *Delgado v. Bastrop* (1948) cases all ventured, to some degree, to use the argument that the Chicano students' inability to speak English justified the use of separate classes. Two decades after the *Brown* decision, however, the Supreme Court case in the landmark *Lau v. Nichols* (1974) litigation brought forth new issues of equity that dramatically changed the course of schooling for Chicano students. The decision held that public schools had to provide an education that was comprehensible to limited-English-proficient (LEP) students. Because the English language was the *only* vehicle of instruction, LEP children were being denied access to a meaningful educational experience. The Supreme Court recognized that in order for LEP students to participate in the schooling process, they first had to understand the English language. This dilemma was an educational contradiction and thus made a 'crisis of public education' (*Lau*, 1974). Because LEP children, in general, could not benefit from an education that was conducted entirely in English, many Chicano LEP students were not able effectively to participate in the American educational system.

After *Brown* (1954), providing schooling in desegregated institutions was the law of the land. But, it was not until after the *Cisneros* (1970) and *Keyes* (1973) decisions that the 'ethnicity' of Chicano students was clarified. That is, they were no longer considered to be 'White' or 'other-White' in the desegregation process. They were now considered to be an 'identifiable minority group' and had to be integrated with White children. Twenty years after *Brown*, following the *Lau* (1974) decision, these same public schools found themselves in a position where they had to provide Chicano LEP children an education that considered their special language needs. These benchmark decisions placed Chicano LEP children in school settings where educators were mandated to address an additional host of background needs. Given the legal forces behind *Brown* and *Lau*, a new form of school segregation began to emerge in American public schools — that is, language segregation within desegregated schools, a new form of resegregation.

Amidst heated national discussions over school desegregation, some educators began to voice concerns about the education of Chicano LEP students (Feagin, 1989; US Commission on Civil Rights, 1972). The growth rate of LEP students, low academic achievement, and high dropout rates — coupled with increasing segregation and their low socioeconomic backgrounds — encouraged Congress to pass a number of educational programs in the late 1960s. As it was argued for Black children, poverty was perceived as a major culprit of Chicano school failure. The increasing number of Chicano children who could not communicate in English, however, caused educators and legislators to question that perception. The passage of Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965, the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, and ESEA Title I remedial programs resulted in federal resources that were sought by politically and socially conscious minority groups (Solomone, 1986). Many programs were developed with federal funds in order to improve schooling for Chicano students, but the passage of these programs purporting to shift the

Segregation, Desegregation, and Integration of Chicano Students

Chicano LEP student into the educational mainstream did not have much of an impact.

Although *Lau* did not prescribe specific remedies or pedagogical strategies for the limited-English proficient, this ruling paved the way for more equitable opportunities for Chicano LEP children in public schools. In California, for example, many educators became actively involved in, and supportive of, enhancing educational opportunities for Chicano LEP children. The California State Department of Education passed a bill (AB-1329) requiring bilingual education in its public schools two years after the *Lau* decision (California State Department of Education, AB-1329, 1976; AB-507, 1982). This passage motivated an interest in equity for LEP students and provoked many influential policy makers throughout the nation to respond to the educational needs of the limited-English proficient. Schools not only had to provide a 'comprehensible education' for Chicano LEP children, but it was also intended that they receive their education in ethnically and linguistically mixed classroom settings. Unfortunately, as we shall see next, this was not to be the case in many instances.

Bilingual Education and Linguistic Segregation

In the mid-1970s, researchers and policy makers began to examine the legal ramifications of policies stemming from the joint application of the Supreme Court's ruling in the *Lau* and *Brown* decisions. Almost immediately, some researchers pointed to a potential 'conflict' between bilingual education (although not mandated by *Lau*) and school desegregation (Cardenas, 1975; Carter and Segura, 1979). By the late 1970s, friction between bilingual education and desegregation began to attract more attention. Although educators were beginning to recognize that bilingual education and desegregation were both essential elements in the schooling process promoting educational equality for Chicano students, the issue was much more complicated than most had initially realized. For example, Zerkel (1977) argued that bilingual education and desegregation had different, if not opposite, meanings. Desegregation typically meant '... scattering Black students to provide instruction in "racially balanced" settings. Bilingual education, on the other hand, has usually meant the clustering of Spanish-speaking students so they could receive instruction through their native language' (p. 181). Even if bilingual education and desegregation were not completely conflicting remedies, Zerkel argued, '... they were not fully compatible' (p. 181). He further asserted that bilingual education and desegregation were at conflict because the two mandates competed with each other in school systems with limited resources.

Educators as well as the layperson were copious about the desegregation process. Mixing ethnic minority students, in order to reach racial/ethnic balance in schools, was not difficult to conceptualize. Integrating Chicano LEP students with their English-speaking counterparts, however, was more complex. For many policy makers responsible for school desegregation, it appeared that the language issue only complicated the process. One year after the landmark *Lau* case, Cardenas (1975) began to write about school systems throughout the Southwest that were beginning to pit the educational needs of Chicano LEP

children (bilingual education of native language instruction programs) against the desegregation process. He found many Chicano LEP children to be in . . . either segregated bilingual education or integration without bilingual education . . . (p. 20). It was not long before many educators throughout the nation took advantage of the 'either/or situation'. Many recalcitrant school systems circumvented the implementation of bilingual education programs by scattering LEP children throughout their districts; others used bilingual education as an opportunity to segregate Chicano LEP children, thus separating them from White children (Cardenas, 1975; Carter, 1970).

By the early 1980s, desegregation and bilingual education increasingly received more attention. Although some desegregation experts were impartial about bilingual education in general, astute researchers pointed out that successful plans should . . . include in the desegregation plan provisions that preserve existing bilingual programs' (Stephan and Feagin, 1980, p. 323). By 1983, bilingual education and desegregation became a serious enough problem that the California State Department of Education (1983) sponsored the Desegregation and Bilingual Education Conference to address the issue. Speakers attended from the US Department of Education, the Office for Civil Rights, and the California State Department of Education; scholars, legal experts, and policy makers from various school districts throughout the state also attended. During the conference, participants seriously discussed issues and concerns over the friction between bilingual education and desegregation. Researchers, policy makers, and practitioners concurred that . . . integration and bilingual education, [were] in effect, looking at two different but valid definitions of equality' (California State Department of Education, 1983, p. 7). Most presenters were optimistic that . . . integrated education and bilingual education [were] partners in the social enterprise' (p. 15). Most everyone concluded that schools could provide quality education to the limited-English proficient in integrated classroom settings. Bilingual education and desegregation were thus perceived as two harmonious forces working together for the LEP student in California.

Some educators were optimistic that bilingual education and desegregation could work without being a risk. Most were cognizant that bilingual education should not be used as an excuse to linguistically segregate LEP children. At the same time, the desegregation process was not intended to dismantle bilingual programs. In reality, most school systems overlooked (or neglected) the needs of the limited-English proficient in the desegregation process (Arias and Bray, 1983). For example, many desegregation plans threatened bilingual education programs because they broke up racially/ethnically segregated schools and assigned students throughout school districts without considering their language needs. In districts where bilingual programs were already operative, there was a concern that desegregation planners would dismantle them. On this issue Roos (1978) argued:

It all children in need of bilingual education programs were dispersed without consideration of that [language] need, it is unlikely in most communities that there would be sufficient numbers of children in any school or area to justify separate classes for comprehensive bilingual-bicultural instruction. (p. 135)

Cognizant that bilingual education could not be used as a method to justify language segregation, it was also argued that it was absolutely necessary to ensure that adequate numbers of LEP students be grouped together so these programs could be established (Roos, 1978).

In the late 1970s, Lau Centers were established throughout the nation with the mission to technically assist school systems, providing more equitable opportunities for LEP children (Roos, 1978). One of the objectives of Lau centers was to convince policy makers to think about the importance of language integration in bilingual classrooms. The controversial Boston case was one example in the early 1980s where bilingual education and desegregation were simultaneously analyzed (Roos). Legal experts argued that Boston's desegregation plan had: (a) ordered a specific number of LEP students to specific schools in order to attain linguistic integration in classrooms and (b) made certain that the proper delivery of curriculum and instruction in certain classrooms was provided. Roos stated:

The court resolved the problem by initially concluding that three consecutive bilingual classes were the minimum necessary for an effective program of bilingual instruction, which would mean an enrollment of sixty LESA [limited-English speaking ability] students — twenty students for each grade level. Then the court determined how large the minority population in each school should be. (p. 136)

The Boston school system in its reconciliatory negotiations with the courts demonstrated how a large inner-city school system was able to assign LEP students to certain schools in order to ensure that bilingual programs were implemented in integrated classroom settings. Although not always carried out in practice, the court's motive was not only to assign students to schools according to race/ethnicity but that their language backgrounds were considered as well. In Boston as well as other school systems across the nation, it appeared that some educators and legal experts ultimately wanted to prevent resegregation — that is, language segregation within desegregated schools. On paper many schools appeared to be racially balanced, but beneath the facade of many 'desegregated schools' there was an increasing trend that many LEP children would be linguistically segregated.

Over the last few years, some social scientists have unfairly blamed the segregation of Chicano LEP children on bilingual education. Adversaries of bilingual education argue that . . . for the sake of bilingual education, some thirty-five years after *Brown v. Board of Education*, we have resegregated the classroom along ethnic and linguistic lines' (Bikales, 1989). Evidence shows that Chicano LEP children are clearly experiencing an increasing segregation trend in public schools. We contend, however, that this cannot be attributed to bilingual education. A study conducted by Baratz (1985) found that in spite of the increasing numbers of segregated schools, . . . 68 per cent of eighth-grade and 82 per cent of eleventh-grade language minority students received neither bilingual or English-as-a-second language instruction' (cited in Valdivieso, 1986, p. 191). To argue that bilingual education is the culprit for language segregation is inaccurate because evidence suggests that a substantial proportion of LEP students who are eligible are not (and have not been) enrolled in bilingual classroom settings. For

ample, Olsen (1988) found that 75 per cent of LEP students in California public schools received little, if any, instructional support in their native language. To blame bilingual education as the cause for language segregation only distorts a more complicated issue. That is, how does one go about meeting the challenge of linguistically integrating classrooms in a desegregated school setting?

In conclusion, most Chicano LEP students are segregated whether they are placed in bilingual or non-bilingual classes. But the linguistic segregation of Chicano LEP students in desegregated schools is becoming a new form of resegregation. One can argue that segregation based on language is just as harmful as segregation based on race or ethnicity. Unless language segregation in desegregated schools is taken more seriously, such resegregation is likely to intensify in the 1990s and beyond. The current and projected numbers of language minority students has brought forth an enormous amount of attention to Chicano, other Latino, and Asian students in our nation's public schools. For example, California's overall public school LEP enrollment more than doubled from 6.8 per cent in 1976 to 14.1 per cent in 1988-89 (California State Department of Education, CBEDS, 1976-1989). In Texas, LEP enrollments grew tenfold, from 0.9 per cent in 1982 to 9.0 in 1988 (Texas Education Agency, 1982-1988). These percentages, however, are but state averages and they do not reflect an accurate picture of the impact LEP children have at the local level. For example, in the 1988-89 academic year the Los Angeles Unified School District had a 31.0 per cent LEP enrollment; San Francisco Unified School District was at 28.7 per cent; San Diego Unified School District, 16.3 per cent; Denver Public Schools, 16.9 per cent; Houston Independent School District, 15.5 per cent; Albuquerque Unified School District, 42.6 per cent; and the Chicago Public School, 8.9 per cent (LAUSD; SFUSD; SDUSD; DPS; HISD; AUSD; and CPS District Surveys, 1988-89).

The percentage of LEP students at the national level are projected to increase at dramatic rates over the next three decades. Pallas, Natriello, and McDill (1988) estimated that there were slightly under 2 million LEP children in the United States in 1982. The number of LEP children is expected to triple, reaching 6 million by the year 2020 Pallas *et al.* underscore that more than two-thirds of the LEP population is located in three states, California, Texas, and New York. With respect to the Chicano student population, California and Texas combined contain a majority of the nation's LEP students (these two states have 70 per cent of the total national Chicano student population; see Valencia, chapter 1, this volume).

In sum, given the growing number of Chicano LEP students it is perplexing why little has been written about the issues of linguistic segregation in desegregated schools. For example, *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) only briefly mentioned language minorities, and then only in terms of demographic trends, completely ignoring their unequivocal and protracted educational problems. National reports and reforms focusing on the improvement of education for the Chicano LEP student have not received much attention. There are, however, some educators who are voicing their concerns about the general linguistic isolation of Chicano LEP students. In addition, these educators are raising serious questions about an exacerbating factor — the small number of properly trained bilingual teachers to provide an appropriate education to Chicano LEP students in desegregated schools. We now turn to this issue.

Valencia and Aburto (in press), as well as Orum (1986), report that bilingual education has the largest percentage of teacher shortage of any field in education. The limited and dwindling supply of certified bilingual teachers is so severe that the situation has placed increased pressure on many school systems. Because some desegregated school systems are required to meet both *Brown* and *Lau* mandates, policy makers, school principals, and teachers are pedagogically torn between meeting the needs of Chicano LEP children in segregated bilingual classroom settings or ethnically mixing these students without providing the native language instruction in mainstream classrooms. As such, bilingual education and desegregation have reached a numerical 'catch 22' in some large inner-city public school systems. For example, Donato and Garcia (in press) reported LEP enrollment increases in California desegregated school systems have been so dramatic that many Latino and Asian children are either (a) linguistically segregated in bilingual classrooms where many of them are receiving the appropriate curriculum and instruction, or (b) they are enrolled in mainstream classes, but the instruction is often incomprehensible to the student.

Given the shortage of certified bilingual teachers many Latino LEP students are clustered together in classrooms where the priority is to serve as many of them as possible in their native language. There is no doubt that these students experience very little contact with their English-speaking peers. But in those desegregated schools where linguistic/ethnic classroom integration is a priority, a large number of Latino LEP students assigned to mainstream classes do not receive an education that is comprehensible to them — thus violating the whole essence of the *Lau* decision.

The actual need for bilingual teachers is difficult to determine. Evidence suggests that the number of bilingual teachers needed throughout the nation depends largely on specific criteria used to identify LEP students. That is, the criteria used to identify LEP students varies by state (and by school systems within each state). Regardless of the method used, the need for more bilingual teachers is growing steadily. The number of bilingual teachers needed at the national level has grown from 120,000 in 1976 to a projection of 170,000 in the year 2000. This projection includes teachers of all languages, although Spanish-speakers comprise the highest percentage (72 per cent). The severity of the problem becomes clearer when these needs are broken down by state. California, for example, projected that its public schools would need another 12,000 bilingual teachers in 1990 and almost 17,000 more by the year 2000. Early projections, however, significantly underestimated the need according to a recent survey conducted by the state. The California State Department of Education (1987-88) now estimates that 23,000 bilingual teachers will be needed in 1990 and 29,000 by the year 2000. The state had severely underestimated its needs by approximately 11,000 teachers for 1990 and 12,000 for the year 2000. In Texas, the supply of bilingual teachers is similarly dismal and the demand is enormous. The 1980s witnessed a moderate growth (approximately 9,000) in the number of bilingual teachers; however, during the late 1980s through the early 1990s, that growth (an increase of roughly 12,000 teachers) will not be enough to compensate for the increasing number of LEP students (Macias, 1989).

Throughout the Southwest, many stubborn school systems are unwilling to

adhere to bilingual education implementation/compliance. Some school systems do not report the precise number of LEP students. By underreporting the number of LEP students, the number of teachers needed is dramatically underestimated. The increasing number of LEP students and the small pool of qualified bilingual teachers cannot satisfy most school district needs. As a result, many districts have moved in the direction of developing their own alternative certification plans in order to meet their bilingual teacher shortages. Large school districts in Texas such as Dallas, Houston, and many school systems in the Rio Grande area are now training and certifying their own bilingual teachers. District alternative certification plans will be somewhat helpful in meeting the demand for bilingual teachers, but the final results are not yet available. In theory, if more bilingual teachers were available, integration would be more manageable (Olsen, 1988).

Resolution of the conflicts brought on by the *Brown* and *Lau* decisions has not received much attention in recent educational history. Although the issue has been raised by a small number of scholars over the past decade and a half, few answers are forthcoming. Furthermore, the influence of a rapidly growing number of Chicano LEP students in our public schools has been ignored to a large extent. Indeed, the new form of resegregation (language segregation in desegregated schools) will inevitably gain more attention as LEP students continue to increase. The growing number of Chicano LEP students and continuing shortage of bilingual teachers will intensify the pressure on policy makers as concerned parents, interest groups, and teachers press for immediate solutions. Depending on the philosophical positions of school systems, policy makers may choose bilingual education over integration or integration over bilingual education. In our judgment, Chicano LEP students should not be pawns in this contentious discourse. It is imperative that they receive their native language instruction in linguistically/ethnically integrated classrooms.

School systems functioning under voluntary or court-ordered desegregation, however, have had more experience with this issue posed by *Brown* and *Lau*. The growing numbers and the lack of coordination within individual school systems make it almost impossible to integrate the limited-English proficient. It is common throughout the nation that the physical mixing of students from different racially and ethnically diverse backgrounds continues to be the primary goal. We have no quarrel with this objective, but in the final analysis the language needs of most Chicano LEP students often take a back seat in the desegregation process.

If the number of certified bilingual teachers does not increase, Chicano LEP students in desegregated settings will either be segregated in bilingual classes or they will be ethnically/linguistically mixed without the proper native language instruction. What may ultimately happen — given the growing number of Chicano LEP students and the limited supply of bilingual teachers — is that policy makers will have a more difficult time meeting the goals of both *Lau* and *Brown*, thus making it more difficult to accommodate the curricular and pedagogical needs of Chicano LEP children in the truest sense of integrated educational experiences. Granted, providing an integrated bilingual educational environment for Chicano LEP students will be extremely challenging for educators in the 1990s and beyond. Yet, we are optimistic that appropriate reform can be achieved.

Academic Resegregation

Another form of resegregation in desegregated schools is referred to as 'academic' or 'intellectual' resegregation. This type of resegregation . . . generally takes place when schools that have been racially desegregated go to a system of academic tracking or ability grouping' (Hughes, Gordon, and Hillman, 1980, p. 14) It is widely acknowledged that ethnic minority students, as a whole, achieve at lower levels than their White peers. Thus, under circumstances when minority and White students attend the desegregated setting, there is likely to be a stratified and hierarchical structure in the delivery of instruction. On the general issue of tracking, Brophy and Good (1974) note:

The effects of student achievement differences on teachers are magnified when the school uses a tracking system . . . students in the high tracks are likely to be from high SES homes, which usually means preferential treatment in the teacher assignments and resources allocations made by school administrators . . . the tracking systems insures that the highest achieving children are likely to get the best education that the school system has to offer, while the low achievers are likely to get the worst. Over time this factor alone is liable to increase the differences between the two groups of children. (p. 85)

The contention of Brophy and Good (1974) and related empirical literature (e.g., Oakes, 1985; Rist, 1970; US Commission on Civil Rights, 1974) raise critical issues about the practices of homogeneous groups and resultant curriculum differentiation in shaping the denial of equal educational opportunity for minority students. There is a fairly strong consensus in the available scientific literature that ability grouping at the elementary level and tracking at the secondary level have adverse psychological and cognitive effects on students placed in 'low-achieving' groups. For example, Oakes in her study of tracking, reports that students in low tracks typically were denied access to 'high status' knowledge — i.e., the knowledge that is a prerequisite for college admissions and academic success.

Aside from the broad issue of ability grouping, and tracking, is there evidence that Chicano students experience academic resegregation in desegregated schools? Direct evidence is difficult to come by. There is some research, however, that provides indirect confirmation that academic resegregation occurs. For example, Valencia (1984) examined potential curriculum differentiation in a Phoenix high school that was likely to undergo considerable ethnic mixing in light of a school closure court case. The anticipated enrollment of Central High School — a 90 per cent White, high-achieving, high SES background school — was to increase in size by 57 per cent in the 1982-83 school year (a jump from 2,044 to 3,200 students). This dramatic 1,000 plus increase in enrollment would be predominantly Chicano and Black students from two high schools that were being proposed for closure (Phoenix Union, 94 per cent minority; East, 56 per cent minority).

In the Phoenix case, minority plaintiffs from the schools targeted for closure sued in order to keep their schools open. Valencia (1984) — an expert witness for

the plaintiffs — predicted that academic resegregation would occur at Central High School, the host school. This hypothesis was given some credence based on Valencia's analysis of 1982-83 resegregation statistics in which preregistration course-by-course enrollments were listed by ethnicity. In court, Valencia testified that because of the very sharp differences in academic performance between the high-achieving Central High White students and the incoming, low-achieving Chicano and Black students, there would be serious academic resegregation at Central High. To provide some support for this claim of resegregation along lines of achievement, Valencia did a comprehensive analysis of the preregistration data and prepared exhibits for the court. His discussion of the resegregation findings as presented in trial testimony are:

In a series of exhibits, tabular data were presented for Anglo vs. minority enrollment across grade (9-12), subject area (English, mathematics, science, and social studies), designation (Alpha, Gamma, and Beta), and curriculum type (remedial, basic, less advanced, advanced/college preparatory, and special). The major result of this analysis revealed that minority students were overrepresented in remedial courses, showed parity in enrollment in basic courses and were underrepresented in advanced college preparatory courses. For example, in mathematics courses, 228 students were preregistered for remedial courses. Of these, 61 (26.6 per cent) were Anglo and 167 (73.4 per cent) were minorities. This meant that minorities were overrepresented by 73.1 per cent, compared to their overall student body presence of 42.4 per cent. For the 939 students enrolled in basic mathematics courses, 421 (44.8 per cent) were Anglo, and 518 (55.2 per cent) were minority, indicating a minority overrepresentation of 30.2 per cent. Finally, regarding the 1,047 students enrolled in advanced/college preparatory courses, 748 (71.4 per cent) were Anglo, while 299 (28.6 per cent) were minority, a minority underrepresentation of 67.5 per cent. This similar pattern was also observed for courses in English, science, and social studies. Therefore, in contrast to the defendants' claim that tracking or ability grouping by ethnicity would not be practiced at Central, it appeared that in fact a form of ethnic resegregation by ability was extremely likely to occur. Clearly, this 'dual' educational system at Central raised serious issues of equal educational opportunity. (pp. 86-7)

Although the Phoenix situation was not a desegregation case, *per se*, it had all the ingredients of one (e.g., the typical one-way transfer of minorities to a White host school, mixing of low-achieving minorities with high-achieving White students). Thus, one can draw inferences from this case to understand more fully the potentialities of academic segregation within a desegregated setting. As Valencia (1984) concluded, there was sufficient predictive evidence that Central High School would undergo considerable curricular stratification between White and Chicano/Black students. Such a separation — as in other instances of academic resegregation — would likely result in the raising of barriers to equal educational opportunity for minority students. The bottom line, as Valencia underscores, is . . . that resegregation on intellectual grounds is just as invidious as segregation on racial grounds' (p. 94). The lesson we learn from

academic resegregation is that desegregation planners and educators must work with commitment and vigor to avoid homogeneous grouping. Integration, in its truest sense, has as a cornerstone the goal of equity, in which all students in a desegregated school should have equal access to knowledge.

Towards Integration

Although there have been scattered attempts in recent decades to desegregate our nation's schools, very little has improved in the reduction of racial/ethnic isolation. As Orfield *et al.* (1987) comment, much of the standoff in desegregation struggles is related to opposition at the national level:

Three of the four Administrations since 1968 were openly hostile to urban desegregation orders and the Carter Administration took few initiatives in the field. There have been no important policy initiatives supporting desegregation from any branch of government since 1971. (p. 1)

As seen in the case of Black student segregation, Chicano and other Latinos have also suffered from the lack of national leadership regarding school desegregation. Orfield *et al.* (1987) analyzed segregation/desegregation statistics for Latino students in the Southwest. The target locations were fifteen metropolitan areas (e.g., Los Angeles, Phoenix, Denver) with enrollments over 50,000 students and which contained more than 10 per cent Latino students. It was found (with some exceptions) that 'there was little evidence of any desegregation plans in the West powerful enough to substantially increase Hispanic integration' (p. 30).⁴ That is, Orfield *et al.*, contend that none of the metropolitan areas (e.g., Los Angeles) experiencing increased Chicano school segregation had in effect desegregation plans. True, the intensification of Chicano segregation in the Southwest is partially due to a groundswell of immigration patterns and the very high Latino birthrate. Yet, little evidence was found of voluntary desegregation or mandatory, court-ordered desegregation plans.⁵ In short, the segregation of Chicano students is easy to summarize . . . it is clear that there is a very strong tendency in American society today for an increasing isolation of Hispanic children and there have been no policies that have been able to reverse that tendency' (p. 28).

In this closing section of the present chapter, we attempt to fill this gap by discussing a number of research/policy suggestions that perhaps can serve as starting points to help reverse the intensification of Chicano school segregation and to help promote integration. We offer discussions on the following ideas: (a) community case studies of historical segregation, (b) residential integration, (c) busing, (d) two-way bilingual education (e) multicultural education in teacher education programs, (f) proactive technical assistance in desegregation planning, and (g) a conceptualization of school integration.

Community Case Studies of Historical Segregation

To understand the origins and persistence of school segregation of Chicano students, an historical community case study approach can provide the methodological base to explore this phenomenon (Alvarez, 1988; Menchaca and Valencia,

In particular, case studies may be useful in providing the background for litigation of school segregation cases. In light of the very limited amount of current Chicano and other Latino-initiated desegregation litigation (see Orfield *et al.*, 1987), it is likely that such lawsuits may be forthcoming in the 1990s and beyond as Chicano segregation further increases. A bonanza in these cases would be testimony, for example, on the roots of *de jure* segregation at the particular school district level.

An approach to community case studies of historical segregation includes: a collection of oral histories, analysis of residential patterns, analysis of the dates and construction of schools, and a review of available school records. Oral histories can provide data indicating if people attended segregated schools. Studying residential patterns will suggest whether the barrioization of the Mexican community was voluntary or involuntary, or both. Collection of school records will provide a documented history of the school board's intentional or unintentional plans in overall school district development, and can also be used to verify or discredit the oral histories. And, most important of all, an analysis of the dates and location of the construction of schools can possibly provide data to discern if the 'Mexican' schools were constructed for the specific purpose of segregating Chicano students.

In sum, many research queries with resultant policy implications might arise from community case studies. For example, could the 'Mexican' schools have been located in zones where both Mexican and Anglo students may have attended, rather than constructing the Mexican schools in the interior of the barrios or the Anglo school in the Anglo residential zones? And, did the construction of new schools follow a historical pattern indicating that the size of the student population did not necessitate the construction of new 'Mexican' or 'White' schools? Was the Chicano community included in the decision-making process in the construction and location of schools? The answers to these and related questions may potentially advance our understanding of the history of segregation in Chicano communities, particularly in litigation involving desegregation.

Residential Integration

As we have discussed earlier, a contributing source of Chicano segregated schools has historically been attributed to residential segregation or ethnically isolated residential zones (Camarillo, 1984a; Morajano, 1987; Menchaca and Valencia, 1990). We agree with Gottlieb (1983) that '... school and housing segregation are so deeply intertwined that much greater attention needs to be given to the interrelationships ...' (p. 106). As Gottlieb argues, ideally the best solution for bringing an end to school segregation is to terminate housing segregation. Of course, this will not be an easy goal to obtain.

One approach to attack this problem is for policy makers to lobby assertively for residential integration. Although it will be difficult to integrate existing neighborhoods, it can be achieved through long-term urban and suburban planning. For example, in order to attract minority families, affordable housing (i.e., single-family homes) will need to be constructed near or in White middle-class neighborhoods.

Furthermore, in White neighborhoods that are ethnically isolated, but are located adjacent to Chicano neighborhoods, the construction of new schools in the border zones might lead to ethnic mixing in the local schools. That is, when a school is constructed in the border zone of two ethnically isolated neighborhoods, an ethnically mixed school community would be formed. Although the neighborhoods would not be integrated, the students of the ethnically isolated neighborhoods would attend the same school and this may lead to the formation of interethnic friendships. Possibly these friendships may encourage the students to cross the residential boundaries and this may lead to ethnic mixing on a social basis. Although this does not lead to residential integration, it at least contributes to the formation of interethnic community bonds.

In conclusion, we strongly support efforts to achieve residential integration. Given the sharp increase in the Chicano school-age population and the growing desire for many of these families to buy homes, segregated municipalities have grand opportunities to realize residential integration. As Gottlieb (1983) notes, for those cities who remain silent on this issue, they reinforce their reputations as being closed communities.

Busing

Since the landmark *Suann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg* (1971) case, in which busing was upheld as an acceptable means for desegregating schools, the use of busing for such purposes has created enormous controversy (Coles, 1974; Mills, 1973, 1979; Pettigrew, 1975). Criticisms, typically from White parents, have ranged from charges that busing is dangerous to complaints that bus rides are much too long. Pettigrew contends that such opposition to busing reached such virulent levels in the 1970s that a national mania occurred.

There are an array of facts that make school busing for desegregation purposes a perplexing target (Pettigrew, 1975). First, busing as a perfunctory and major means of transporting students to schools was legally authorized throughout the nation in 1919. Millions of students travelling billions of miles have traditionally been bused to their respective schools each year. In contrast, busing for purposes of desegregation constitutes a minuscule percentage of students. Thus, the issue is not busing, *per se*. Rather, using buses for integration purposes has not been an 'acceptable' reason. In short, widespread busing for regular transportation of students to school is fine, but busing to achieve desegregation is typically deemed unacceptable. As a White mother from Richmond, Virginia candidly revealed, 'It's not the distance... It's the niggers' (Pettigrew, 1975, p. 232). A second myth of school busing for desegregation purposes is that busing is dangerous with respect to potential accidents. Contrary to this belief, busing by far is one of the safest modes of transportation. School buses — compared to regular buses, automobiles, and even walking to school — are clearly safer (Pettigrew).

In sum, we suggest that as our society enters the 1990s, the desegregation of Chicano students could be realized through the use of busing. We do acknowledge that any mention of busing for desegregation purposes is likely to be met with fierce opposition — from some White parents, and to a lesser degree, some Chicano parents. Yet, such opposition needs to be challenged with logic and

goodwill. There is no doubt that busing is the most efficient means of achieving desegregation. If busing is to be promoted for the reduction of Chicano and White student isolation, we contend that such plans incorporate certain principles. For example, Chicano students should not be forced to carry the exclusive burden of busing (i.e., one-way busing to White host schools). White students need to share in the adjustment problems associated with desegregation, including transportation. Second, the time and distances White and Chicano students travel to their host schools should not be excessive.

Taking all matters together, it is not surprising that resistance to busing for desegregation ends is filled with subtleties of racist overtones. After all, as we have discussed earlier, connections between racism and the history of Chicano segregation are well documented. As in the past, the present racial motives to keep Chicano and White students from attending school together are unacceptable. If opposition to busing continues (as it clearly is), our nation is very likely to see Pettigrew's (1975) foreboding prediction materialize: "... a future historian is likely to conclude that "busing" became in our time the polite, culturally sanctioned way to oppose the racial desegregation of the public schools' (p. 232).

Two-way Bilingual Education

The growing number of language minority students and the limited supply of certified bilingual education teachers will inevitably exacerbate language segregation in our nation's public schools. Ovando and Collier (1985) maintain, however, that 'two-way bilingual education' may be the only way to reduce the language segregation in desegregated schools. Two-way bilingual education is a model in which students of two different language backgrounds (i.e., Spanish- and English-speakers) are brought together in a bilingual class setting in order for both groups to become truly 'bilingual'. For example, the goal of a two-way bilingual education requires that English-speakers learn Spanish and Spanish-speakers learn English. But more important, '... two-way bilingual education can be seen as an effective method of teaching a second language to English-dominant students in the United States as well as providing an integrated class for language-minority students' (Ovando and Collier, 1985, pp. 40-1).

Two-way bilingual education, appears to be the only model that places and sensitizes English-speakers in a second language learning environment; it also stresses linguistic integration in the classroom. There is no question that implementing two-way bilingual education programs will be difficult because of the continued resistance to bilingual education in general. The most challenging facet of two-way bilingual programs will be to convince English-speaking parents about the value of their children learning a second language. Related to the politics and academic achievement in two-way bilingual programs, Crawford (1989) asks: 'Could language-minority and language-minority children, learning side by side as assisting each other, become fluent bilinguals while making good progress in other subjects?' (p. 165). Crawford contends that if public schools follow the criteria for effective two-way bilingual education programs, then it can be accomplished. We propose that once English-speaking parents recognize the life-long value of bilingualism for their children, there will be more of a need to train additional bilingual teachers in the profession. Thus, both Chicano LEP and

majority language students will benefit. In the final analysis, language integration as proposed in the two-way bilingual model should become more manageable.

Multicultural Education in Teacher Education

During the late 1960s and early 1970s, ethnic minorities became extremely vocal in public school politics. Minority groups contended that public schools were ethnocentric, monocultural, and undemocratic. They demanded 'multicultural education' at all levels in the schooling process. That is, they wanted educators to become more aware and sensitive to the cultural, linguistic, and learning style differences of minority students (Pai, 1990). A major step in the development of multicultural education in the United States was the 1972 publication by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) entitled: *No One Model American*. Cognizant that colleges and universities had a major responsibility in teacher training programs, AACTE (1972) stated that education for cultural pluralism included four parts:

... (1) the teaching of values which support cultural diversity and individual uniqueness; (2) the encouragement of the qualitative expansion of existing ethnic cultures and their incorporation into the mainstream of American socio-economic and political life; (3) the support of explorations in alternative and emerging life styles; and (4) the encouragement of multiculturalism, multilingualism, and multialecticism. (Pai, 1990, p. 100)

Although AACTE recommended that multicultural education be a major part in teacher training programs, Pai (1990) noted that many recalcitrant colleges and universities felt that '... multicultural education components were unnecessary in their programs because their institutions either did not have minority students or were located in ethnically homogeneous areas' (p. 101). Despite the rapidly changing 'color' of our schools, colleges and universities continue to disregard the need for multicultural experiences in teacher training programs. Valencia and Aburto (in press) recently noted that only a very small number of prospective teachers take a multicultural education class. Moreover, most prospective teachers are unqualified to teach in ethnically mixed urban settings. Valencia and Aburto note that 'Perhaps the limited preservice training in multicultural education received by prospective teachers explains, in part, teacher prejudice against minority groups' (p. 16). Educators continue to view multicultural education as a separate component in the teacher training process and, unfortunately, misconstrue the need for prospective teachers to gain a multicultural understanding.

Looking at both the changing ethnic demography in our public schools and teacher education training programs from a desegregation context, we recommend that colleges and universities emphasize a true multicultural education curriculum that is incorporated throughout its programs. Prospective classroom teachers need to be prepared for the real world. That is, assuming that school desegregation will occur, future teachers need to be trained to teach in a multicultural setting. Furthermore, they should be given an opportunity to better understand their own cultural identity so that they can learn how their culture

influences their perceptions of other ethnic groups. More important, they should also be able to recognize and accept that they have prejudices that might affect them in the desegregated classroom. By recognizing their own biases, preservice teachers can perhaps develop strategies to help them work more effectively in multicultural classroom settings in order to better understand Chicano students in desegregated classrooms and schools.

Proactive Technical Assistance in Desegregation Planning

Our intent here is to offer — in very general terms — a brief policy discussion of the need for desegregation planners to provide technical assistance to school districts that are faced with the challenge of desegregating high-density Chicano and White schools. By 'proactive' assistance, we mean guidance and advice from desegregation experts that are *actively sought* by school officials — either resultant of a voluntary desegregation plan, or a mandatory, court-ordered desegregation plan.

We are well aware of the literature indicating that voluntary desegregation plans sometimes do not work and, in general, are only partially successful in the reduction of racial/ethnic isolation (e.g., Hawley and Smylie, 1988; Orfield, 1978, 1988; Rossell and Hawley, 1983). Perhaps in such plans, the quality and quantity of voluntary planning could have been improved by a closer relationship of all agents involved. Of course, this improvement is based on the premise that all participants — which ideally would be minority and White parents, school officials, expert planners, and other community members — work in good faith and toward a common, shared and equitable vision.

How proactive technical assistance in desegregation of predominantly Chicano and White schools would occur is open for discussion. The federal government has allocated funds for Desegregation Assistance Centers (DACs) throughout the US in order to provide free assistance to school systems for the last few years. These centers have been very instrumental in providing technical assistance to many school systems in the desegregation process. Like many government agencies, however, they are underfunded and understaffed. For example, California currently has over 100 school systems under voluntary desegregation and about six large inner-city school systems under court-ordered desegregation. DACs are not capable of servicing all those school systems attempting to desegregate their schools. Should the federal government fund more DACs? If more money becomes available to fund more DACs, (given the fact that a DAC can only offer its services upon school district request) should they continue to operate the same way or should they become more assertive in shaping desegregation policy at the local level? These and other suggestions about desegregation assistance need to be addressed by school officials and policy makers so the desegregation of Chicano schools can be done more quickly and effectively.

Conceptualization of Integration

A common misconception is that school desegregation is synonymous with school integration. Frequently, one will see (particularly in the media and political circles) the two terms used interchangeably. On the contrary, although deseg-

regation and integration are related, they have very different meanings. Desegregation is best looked at as a mechanical process involving the physical mixing of students of different racial/ethnic backgrounds in a particular school setting that was formerly segregated. A more formal definition of desegregation is 'the reassignment of students and staff by race or ethnic identity so that the racial identifiability of the individual school and classes within the school is removed' (Hughes *et al.*, 1980, p. 168). Such desegregation is the law of the land.

The concept of integration is related to the notion of desegregation in the sense that in order for the former to occur, one must first have the physical mixing of students of racially/ethnically diverse backgrounds. While desegregation involves a mandatory, court-ordered (or in some cases voluntary) mechanical process of a predetermined numerical mix of racially/ethnically diverse students, integration is a social process involving mutual acceptance. Thus, integration cannot be mandated. That is, people cannot be legally forced to care for and accept one another on an equal basis. As such, the notion of integration involves 'affirmative efforts that facilitate the elimination of racial and ethnic indifference and at the same time provide multiethnic atmosphere and mechanisms to encourage mutual respect, understanding, and acceptance' (Hughes *et al.*, 1980, p. 169).

Suffice to say that in light of the above conceptualization of school integration, the goal of achieving integration of Chicano and White (and perhaps other minority) students in desegregated schools is no easy task. On the broader research level, there is evidence that desegregation can and does work, but there are few indications of integration (Hughes *et al.*, 1980). It has become widely acknowledged that in order for integration to occur, there has to be a concerted effort by state and federal agencies, school officials, teachers, and the local community. As seen in other contexts of improving race/ethnic relations, concerned leaders and participants need to strive for attainable objectives and workable processes.

There is some evidence, however, that schools have been lax in working towards integration. Sagar and Schofield (1984; cited in Bennett, 1990) in a research study of how host schools respond to desegregation, identified four possible response patterns: (a) business-as-usual, (b) assimilation, (c) pluralistic coexistence, and (d) integrated pluralism. The business-as-usual response — as the terms implies — contains no proactive efforts by school officials. That is, the same curriculum, same standards, same teaching methods, and so on, that prevailed in the segregated setting continue under desegregation. The assimilationist response, as noted by Sagar and Schofield, is basically designed to make racial/ethnic minority students more like White students. Under these circumstances, minority students who fail to assimilate become academic casualties — the dropout, the suspended student, and so forth. The third type of response — pluralistic coexistence — is based on separation in which 'students are allowed to maintain different styles and values, but within a school environment of separate turfs for different racial groups' (Bennett, 1990, p. 23). In short, the pluralistic coexistence response (as are the business-as-usual and assimilationist responses) results in desegregation.

The fourth and final response — integrated pluralism — is far different from the first three. Its major mark of distinction is that '... *integrated pluralism* actively seeks to avoid resegregation of students' (Bennett, 1990, p. 24). The host school attempts to achieve this by striving to attain the following:

[It] is pluralistic in the sense that it recognizes the diverse racial and ethnic groups in our society and does not denigrate them just because they deviate from the white middle class patterns of behavior. Integrated pluralism affirms the equal value of the school's various ethnic groups, encouraging their participation, not on majority-defined terms, but in an evolving system which reflects the contribution of all groups. However, integrated pluralism goes beyond mere support for the side-by-side coexistence of different group values and styles. It is integrationist in the sense that it affirms the educational value inherent in exposing all students to a diversity of perspectives and behavioral repertoires and the social value of structuring the school so that students from previously isolated and even hostile groups can come to know each other under conditions conducive to the development of positive intergroup relations. . . . Integrated pluralism takes an activist stance in trying to foster interaction between different groups of students rather than accepting resegregation as either desirable or inevitable. (Sagar and Schofield, 1984, pp. 231-2)

In sum, how the host school responds to the process of desegregation is critical in determining whether or not all students receive a culturally pluralistic and equitable schooling experience. We urge host schools that are undergoing desegregation to become aware and avoid those institutional responses that are unacceptable and to strive for that goal which is acceptable — integrated pluralism. By knowing the difference between desegregation and integration (and using that knowledge), school officials and desegregation planners — working closely with the community — can help provide the setting for improved racial/ethnic relations as well as optimal academic development for Chicanos and other students.

But is this mere rhetoric, or can integration actually be realized? As Bennett (1990) underscores, there are at least three necessary conditions that underlie the practice of cultural (i.e., integrated) pluralism in the school. First, there are positive teacher expectations. Teachers in integrated schooling must have high and reasonable expectations for Chicano student success (also, see Valencia and Aburto, this volume). Second, in integrated schooling it is critical that there be a learning environment that supports and encourages positive interracial/interethnic contact. Bennett notes that contact theorists are quite specific as to the nature of positive interaction (e.g., Chicanos and Whites share equal status; Chicanos and Whites be given opportunities for intergroup cooperation). Third, it is vital that Chicano and other students attending an integrated school be provided the opportunity to be exposed to a multicultural curriculum. What should such a curriculum contain and how might it be implemented? The vision of multicultural curriculum we find especially attractive is the one described by Bennett. She speaks of four core democratic values that underlie multicultural perspectives: . . . (1) acceptance and appreciation of cultural diversity, (2) respect for human dignity and universal human rights, (3) responsibility to the world community, and (4) reverence for the earth' (p. 281). From these core values, Bennett notes that teachers can develop a number of multicultural curriculum goals (e.g., to combat racism; to build skills along lines of social action).

Conclusion

In closing, we wish to leave the reader with several summary points that capture the core of this chapter. First, as history informs us, it is abundantly clear that racism is a driving force behind school segregation and Chicano school failure. Therefore, if we are to desegregate and integrate Chicano students, it is critical that we confront overt and institutional racism in the larger society, in particular within the educational system. Desegregation and integration of our schools must be viewed as important stages in the long struggle to combat and dismantle racism in the nation. Although adults are often resistant to accepting and building a culturally diverse and equitable society, children and youth are considerably more open. If Chicano students and other students from ethnically diverse backgrounds are mixed in classrooms and involved in multicultural education, then interethnic communication can be enhanced and integrated pluralism is likely to be attained. Thus, school desegregation — as a first step — can be viewed as a tremendous potential leading to integration and to the promotion of and respect for cultural diversity.

Second, there is the issue of resegregation — especially among Chicano LEP students. Notwithstanding the significant advances made by Chicano parents in their desegregative legal battles, the reality is that Chicano students continue — to a large degree — to remain segregated within desegregated settings. This is a mounting concern that certainly requires the attention of school officials, researchers, and policy makers in the years ahead. We cannot forget the changing demography and the increasing number of LEP students in our public schools. Chicano LEP students must receive the native language instruction in 'linguistically integrated' settings. Anything less than this is unacceptable.

Third — and our final summary point — is concerned with the issue of pace. It has been over four decades since *Mendez* and over three decades since *Brown*. There has been a lot of deliberation, but very little speed in eliminating school segregation in our nation. As noted earlier, Chicano segregation is intensifying. Given the projection that over the next thirty years, the Chicano/Latino youth population will account for *nearly all* of the increase in the country's youth sector (see Valencia, chapter 1, this volume), it is sad to predict that the next generation of Chicano students will experience school segregation far more severely than the current generation. This issue alone should stir educators, politicians, and parents of the 1990s to quicken the pace of desegregating and integrating our schools. Now is the time for concerted action.

In this chapter, we have covered a number of issues and aspects concerning the segregation, desegregation, resegregation, and integration of Chicano students. Suffice it to say that the numerous concerns and suggestions discussed earlier — if seriously considered — provide researchers and policymakers of the 1990s with full agendas. There is no doubt in our minds that the ethnic isolation of Chicano pupils constitutes one of the major educational issues of the times. Hopefully, the issues covered in this chapter will spark a renewed interest among concerned individuals and agencies to push forward in pursuing Chicano school success.

Notes

- 1 In our discussion of historical segregation in this chapter we typically refer to Mexican-origin students as 'Mexican', as that was the term generally used in the earlier periods.
- 2 Orum (1986), however, does provide this qualifier about Black and Latino segregation differences:

While the segregation of Black students declined between 1968 and 1980 in every region of the country except the Northeast, the segregation of Hispanic students increased nationwide. While Black students were more likely than Hispanic students to attend schools with minority enrollments of 90-100 per cent, Black enrollments in the nation's most segregated schools fell by 31.1 per cent between 1968 and 1980, while Hispanic attendance in those same schools rose during the same period by 5.7 per cent. (p. 19)

- 3 McCurdy's (1975) references are testimony given by former Oxnard Superintendents who testified in a desegregation trial in Oxnard in the mid-1970s.
- 4 An exception, for example, is Denver, Colorado, which is under a comprehensive desegregation order resultant from a 1973 Supreme Court decision (Orfield *et al.*, 1987).
- 5 One exception, however, is the San Jose, California, major urban case won by Chicano plaintiffs (Arias, 1987)

References

- ACUNA, R. (1988) *Occupied America*, San Francisco, CA, Canfield Press.
- ALBUQUERQUE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (1988-89) *Racial/Ethnic Survey*, Albuquerque, N.M. Office of Research and Development. Author.
- ALVAREZ, R. (1986) 'The Lemon Grove incident: The nation's first successful desegregation court case', *Journal of San Diego History*, Spring, pp. 116-35.
- ALVAREZ, R., JR. (1988) 'National politics and local responses: The nation's first successful desegregation court case', in H. TRUEBA and C. DELGADO-GAITAN (Eds) *School and Society Learning Content Through Culture*, New York, Praeger, pp. 37-52.
- ALVAREZ v. LAMON GROVE SCHOOL DISTRICT (1931) Superior court of the state of California, County of San Diego, Petition for Writ of Mandate No. 66625.
- AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES FOR TEACHER EDUCATION (1972) 'No one model American: A statement on multicultural education', *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 24, pp. 264-5.
- ARIAS, B.M. (1987) *Bilingual Education and Desegregation in the San Jose Unified School District Elementary Schools*, a report submitted by the office of the compliance monitor.
- ARIAS, B.M. and BRAY, J.L. (1983) *Equal Educational Opportunity and School Desegregation in Trichin Districts* (Report submitted to NIE) I.E.C-83-14.
- BENSLIT, C.L. (1990) *Comprehensive Multicultural Education: Theory and Practice*, 2nd ed., Boston, MA, Allyn and Bacon.
- BURTON, G. (1989) 'Maximum feasible misunderstanding: Bilingual education in our schools', *JMPRIMS*, 16, October, pp. 1-6.
- BUTM, J. (1978) *Intelligence and Mental Ability. The Origins and Fallacies of the IQ Controversy*, New York, Monthly Review Press.
- BROPHY, J.E. and GOOD, T.I. (1974) *Teacher-Student Relationships: Causes and Consequences*, New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- BROWN v. BOARD OF EDUCATION (1954) 347 US 483.

- CADENA, G. (1987) 'Chicanos and the Catholic Church: Liberation Theology as a Form of Empowerment', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Riverside.
- CALIFORNIA STATE CONSTITUTION OF 1849, Article 11, Section 1.
- CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (1976) Assembly Bill 1329.
- CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (1976 and 1988-89) CBEDS data collection.
- CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (1982) Assembly Bill 507.
- CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (1983) *Desegregation and Bilingual Education — Partners in Quality Education*, Sacramento, CA, Conference Proceedings, Author.
- CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, (1987-88) 'Estimate of bilingual teacher demand' (Report No. 87-4C) State Summary, Sacramento, CA, Bilingual Office.
- CAMARILLO, A. (1984a) *Chicanos in California: A History of Mexican Americans in California*, San Francisco, Boyd and Fraser.
- CAMARILLO, A. (1984b) *Chicanos in a Changing Society*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.
- CARDENAS, J. (1975) 'Bilingual education, desegregation and a third alternative', *Inequality in Education*, 14, pp. 19-22.
- CARTER, T. (1970) *Mexican Americans in Schools: A History of Educational Neglect*, New York, College Entrance Examination Board.
- CARTER, T. and SEGURA, R. (1979) *Mexican Americans in Schools: A Decade of Change*, New York, College Entrance Examination Board.
- CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS (1988-89) *Racial Ethnic Survey*, Chicago, The Bureau of Management Information, Author.
- CISNEROS v. CORPUS CHRISTI INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT (1970) 234 F. Supp. 599, S.D. Tex., appeal docket, No. 71-2397 (5th Cir., July 16, 1971).
- COLES, R. (1974) *The Buses Roll*, New York, W.W. Norton.
- COMAS, J. (1961) 'Racial myths', in UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION (Eds) *Race and Science*, New York, Columbia University Press, pp. 13-35.
- CRAIN, R. (1968) *The Politics of School Desegregation: Comparative Case Studies of Community Structure and Policy-making*, Chicago, IL, Aldine.
- CRAWFORD, J. (1989) *Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory, and Practice*, Trenton, NJ, Clare.
- DELGADO v. BASTROP INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT (1948) No. 388 (W.D. Texas).
- DEL RIO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT v. SALTATIERRA (1930) Tex. Civ. App., 4th Dist.
- DEL RIO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT v. SALTATIERRA (1931) 33 S.W. 2d 790, Cert. denied, 284 US 580.
- DENVER PUBLIC SCHOOLS (1988-89) *Racial/Ethnic Survey*, Denver, CO, Public Information and Services, Author.
- DONATO, R. and GARCIA, H. (in press) 'Language Segregation in Desegregated Schools: A Question of Equity', *Equity in Excellence*.
- EDWARDS, B.T. and WIRT, F.M. (1967) *School Desegregation in the North: Equity in Excellence Challenge and the Experience*, San Francisco, CA, Chandler.
- ESPINOSA, R. and OCHOA, A. (1986) 'Concentration of California Hispanic students in schools with low achievement: A research note', *American Journal of Education*, 95, pp. 77-95.
- FRAGIN, J. (1989) *Racial and Ethnic Relations*, 3rd ed., Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall.
- GAINES v. CANADA. (1938) 305 US 337.
- GARCIA, M. (1979) 'Americanization and the Mexican immigrant, 1880-1930', *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 6, pp. 19-34.
- GLAZER, N. and MOYNIHAN, D. (1963) *Beyond the Melting Pot: The Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Irish of New York*, Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

- ALEX, G.G. (1974) 'The System of Public Education and Its Function Within the Chicano Communities, 1910-1930', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- GONZALEZ, G.G. (1985) 'Segregation of Mexican children in a southern California city: The legacy of expansion and the American Southwest', *The Western Historical Quarterly*, 16, pp. 58-76.
- GONZALEZ, G.G. (1990) *Chicano Education in the Era of Segregation*, Philadelphia, PA, The Balch Institute Press.
- GOSSETT, J. (1953) 'The Idea of Anglo Superiority in American Thought, 1865-1915', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota.
- GOSSETT, J. (1977) *Race: The History of an Idea in America*, Dallas, TX, SMU Press.
- GOTTLEB, H.N. (1983) 'The school effects of Chicago suburban housing segregation', *Integrated Education*, 21, pp. 105-9.
- GRAY, L.M. (1927) 275 US 78.
- HAWLEY, W. and SMYTHE, M.A. (1988) 'The contribution of school desegregation to academic achievement and racial integration', in P.A. KATZ and D.A. TAYLOR (Eds), *Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversies*, New York, Plenum, pp. 281-97.
- HILZER, R. and ANQUIST, A. (1971) *The Other Californians: Prejudice and Discrimination under Spain, Mexico, and the United States*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- HENDRICK, J. (1977) *The Education of Non-Whites in California, 1848-1970*, San Francisco, CA, R & E Associates.
- HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT (1988-89) *Racial/Ethnic Survey*, Houston, TX, Research and Evaluation Department, Author.
- HUGHES, L.W., GORDON, W.M. and HILLMAN, L.W. (1980) *Desegregating America's Schools*, New York, Longman.
- HULL, E. (1985) *Without Justice for All: The Constitutional Rights of Aliens*, Westport, CT, Greenwood Press.
- HYMAN, H.M. and WIECEK, W.M. (1982) *Equal Justice under Law: Constitutional Development, 1835-1875*, New York, Harper and Row.
- JACKSON, A. (1986) 'Melville Herskovits and the search for Afro-American culture', in G. STOKINGS (ed.), *Malmoussi, River, Benedict, and Others*, Madison, WI, University of Wisconsin Press, pp. 95-126.
- JAGLER, C. (1987) *Minority and Low Income High Schools: Evidence of Educational Inequality in Metro Los Angeles* (Report No. 8), University of Chicago, Metropolitan Opportunity Project.
- KANAS, S. (1941) *US Immigration Exclusion and Deportation and Citizenship of the US of America*, New York, Mathew Bender's.
- KATZ, J. *School District v. Nimmo & Sons* (1975) 380 F. Supp. 673 (D. Colo. 1973), 531 F.2d 463 (10th Cir.)
- KEMP, D. (1982) *Just Schools: The Idea of Racial Equality in American Education*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- KONVITZ, M.R. (1946) *The Alien and the Asiatic in American Law*, New York, Cornell University Press.
- LAO, J. *Nachios* (1974) 414 US 563, 566.
- LITE, W. (1931) 'The Status of Education for Mexican Children in Four Border States', unpublished master's thesis, University of Southern California.
- LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (1988-89) *Racial/Ethnic Survey*, Los Angeles, Research and Evaluation Department, Author.
- MCCORDY, J. (1975) 'School board minutes play big role in Oxnard desegregation', *Los Angeles Times*, January 19.
- MAGIAS, R. (1989) *Bilingual Teacher Supply and Demand in the United States*, Los Angeles, University of Southern California Center for Multilingual and Multicultural Research.
- MENCHACA, M. (1987) 'Chicano-Mexican Conflict and Cohesion in San Pablo, California', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

- MENCHACA, M. (1989) 'Chicano-Mexican cultural assimilation and Anglo-Saxon cultural differences', *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 11, pp. 203-31.
- MENCHACA, M. (1990) 'Chicano Panindianism: Appropriating a Mestizo Racial Identity', manuscript submitted for publication.
- MENCHACA, M. and VALENCIA, R.R. (1990) 'Anglo-Saxon ideologies and their impact on the segregation of Mexican students in California, the 1920s-1930s', *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 21, pp. 222-49.
- MENDEZ V. WESTMINSTER (1947) 64 F. Supp. 544 (S.D. Cal. 1946), Aff'd, 161 F.2d 744 (9th Cir.).
- MILLS, N. (Ed.) (1973) *The Great School Bus Controversy*, New York, Teachers College Press.
- MILLS, N. (Ed.) (1979) *Busing USA*, New York, Teachers College Press.
- MONTEJANO, D. (1987) *Anglos and Mexicans in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986*, Austin, TX, University of Texas Press.
- NATIONAL COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION (1983) *A Nation at Risk: The Imperatives for Educational Reform*, Washington, DC, US Government Printing Office.
- NEWCOMBE, W. (1985) *The Indians of Texas*, Austin, TX, University of Texas Press.
- NICHOLS, L.B. and BROWN, W.S. (1989) 'Recruiting minorities into the teaching profession: An educational imperative', *Educational Horizons*, Summer, pp. 145-8.
- OAKES, J. (1985) *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.
- OLSEN, L. (1988) *Crossing the Schoolhouse Border: Immigrant Students and the California Public Schools*, Boston, MA, California Tomorrow.
- ORFIELD, G. (1978) *Must We Bus? Segregated Schools and National Policy*, Washington, DC, Brookings Institution.
- ORFIELD, G. (1988) 'The Growth and Concentration of Hispanic Enrollment and the Future of American Education', paper presented at the National Council of La Raza Conference, Albuquerque, NM, July.
- ORFIELD, G. (1988) 'School desegregation in the 1980s', *Equity and Choice*, 4, pp. 25-8.
- ORFIELD, G., MONTFORD, F. and GEORGE, R. (1987) *School Segregation in the 1980s: Trends in the States and Metropolitan Areas*, University of Chicago, National School Desegregation Project, report to the Joint Center for Political Studies.
- ORUM, L.S. (1986) *The Education of Hispanics: Status and Implications*, Washington, DC, National Council of La Raza.
- OVANDO, C. and COLLIER, V. (1985) *Bilingual and ESL Classrooms: Teaching in Multicultural Contexts*, New York, McGraw-Hill.
- PADILLA, F. (1979) 'Early Chicano legal recognition: 1846-1897', *Journal of Popular Culture*, 13, pp. 564-74.
- PAI, Y. (1990) *Cultural Foundations of Education*, Columbus, OH, Merrill.
- PALLAS, A.M., NATRIELLO, G. and MCDILL, E.L. (1988) 'Who Falls Behind? Defining the "At Risk" Population - Current Dimensions and Future Trends', paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April.
- PARDEES, A. (1978) 'The problem of identity in a changing culture: Popular conflict along the lower Rio Grande Border', in S. ROSS (Ed.) *Views Across the Border: The United States and Mexico*, Albuquerque, NM, University of New Mexico Press, pp. 68-94.
- PEOPLE V. DI LA GUERRA (1870) 40, Cal. 311 at 343.
- PETTIGREW, T. (1975) 'The racial integration of the schools', in T.F. PETTIGREW (Ed.) *Racial Discrimination in the United States*, New York, Harper and Row, pp. 224-39.
- PINKERTON, J. (1989) "'The future is secure': Edgewood savors hard-fought victory', *Austin American Statesman*, October 3, pp. A1, A6.
- PLESSY V. FERGUSON (1896) 163 US 551-552.
- RANGEL, S.C. and ALCALA, C.M. (1972) 'Project report: De jure segregation of Chicanos in Texas schools', *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review*, 7, pp. 307-91.

- R (1970) 'Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education'. *Harvard Educational Review*, 40, pp. 411-51.
- RIST, R.C. (1979) *Desegregated Schools: Appraisal of an American Experiment*. New York, Academic Press
- RODRIGUEZ V. TIJAS (1893) Circuit Court, 81F 333-355.
- ROOS, P.D. (1978) 'Bilingual education: The Hispanic response to unequal educational opportunity'. *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 42, pp. 111-40.
- ROSSEL, C.H. and HAWLEY, W.D. (Eds) (1983) *The Consequences of School Desegregation*. Philadelphia, PA. Temple University Press.
- SACAR, H.A. and SCHOFIELD, J.W. (1984) 'Integrating the desegregated school: Problems and possibilities', in D.E. BARTZ and M.L. MAERZ (Eds) *Advances in Motivation and Achievement: The Effects of School Desegregation on Motivation and Achievement*, 1, Greenwich, CT, JAI Press, pp. 203-42.
- SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (1988-89) *Racial Ethnic Survey*. San Diego, CA. Community Relations and Integration Services Division, Author.
- SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT (1988-89) *Racial/Ethnic Survey*. San Francisco, CA. Department of Planning, Research, and Information System, Author.
- SAN MIGUEL, G. (1986) 'Status of the historiography of Chicano education: A preliminary analysis'. *History of Education Quarterly*, 26, pp. 523-36.
- SAN MIGUEL, G. (1987) *Let Them All Take Heed. Mexican Americans and the Campaign for Educational Equality in Texas, 1910-1981*. Austin, TX, University of Texas Press
- SAN MIGUEL, G. (1987) 'The status of historical research on Chicano education'. *Review of Educational Research*, 57, pp. 467-80.
- SCHOMBURG, R. (1986) *Equal Education under Law*. New York, St. Martin's Press.
- STEPHAN, W.G. and FFAGIN, J.R. (1980) *School Desegregation: Past, Present and Future*. New York, Plenum.
- SURACE, S. (1983) 'Achievement discrimination and Mexican Americans'. *Society for the Comparative Studies in Society and History*, 24, pp. 315-39.
- SIJUAN V. GARFALOPE-MICKLESBERG BOARD OF EDUCATION (1971) 402 US 1.
- TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY (1988) *Special Programs: Planning and Implementation*. Austin, TX. Bilingual Education Department, Author.
- US COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS (1971) *Mexican American Education Study, Report 1: Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in the Public Schools of the Southwest*. Washington, DC, Government Printing Office.
- US COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS (1972) *Mexican American Education Study, Report 3: The Excluded Student Educational Practices Affecting Mexican Americans in the Southwest*. Washington, DC, Government Printing Office.
- US COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS (1974) *Mexican American Education Study, Report 6: Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans*. Washington, DC, Government Printing Office.
- VALDIVIOSO, R. (1986) 'Hispanics and schools: A new perspective'. *Educational Horizons*, 64-65, pp. 190-6.
- VALENCIA, R.R. (1984) *Understanding School Closures: Discriminatory Impact on Chicano and Black Students*. (Policy Monograph Series, No. 1). Stanford, CA, Stanford University, Stanford Center for Chicano Research.
- VALENCIA, R.R. and ABERIO, S. (in press) 'Competency testing and Latino student access to the teaching profession: An overview of issues', in J. DENLIN, G.D. KILLER, and R. MAGALLAN (Eds) *Assessment and Access: Hispanics in Higher Education*. Albany, NY, State University of New York Press.
- WEINBERG, M. (1977) *A Chance to Learn: The History of Race and Education in the United States*. Cambridge, MA, Cambridge University Press.
- WELCH, F. and LIGHT, A. (1987) *New Evidence on School Desegregation*. Washington, DC, US Commission on Civil Rights (Clearing House Publication 92).

- WILLIE, C.V. (1984) *School Desegregation Plans that Work*. Westport, CT, Greenwood Press.
- WOLLENBERG, C. (1974) 'Mendez v. Westminster: Race, nationality and segregation in California schools'. *California Historical Society Quarterly*, 53, pp. 317-22.
- WOLLENBERG, C. (1978) *All Deliberate Speed: Segregation and Exclusion in California Schools, 1855-1975*. Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.
- WYNER, N.B. (1989) 'Educating linguistic minorities: Public schools and the search for equity'. *Educational Horizons*, Summer, pp. 172-6.
- ZERKEL, P. (1977) 'Bilingual education and school desegregation: A case of uncoordinated remedies'. *The Bilingual Review*, 4, pp. 180-8.