Black, white and Latin students in selected Milwaukee public schools were interviewed in the spring of 1974 and reinterviewed in the spring of 1975 to measure two dimensions of attitudes: that of integration versus separatism and that of approach versus avoidance. These two dimensions were arrived at through a factor analysis of racial attitude items. Findings indicate that the dimensions studied constitute separate and distinct responses for all three groups of students and indicated that student reactions to intergroup school experiences are complex. Black students in all black schools scored more on the avoidance end of the approach-avoidance dimension while the black students in the integrated schools scored on the approach end. The black students in the all-black schools scored on the integration end of the integration-separatism dimension while the black students in the integrated schools scored on the separatism end. White students in essentially all white schools scored on the avoidance and separatist end of the two dimensions. The white students in mixed Latin schools were more accepting of the minority students than the white students in the mixed black schools. No differences on the two dimensions were found among the Latin students in schools of different ethnic compositions. (Author/AM)
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Support for integration versus separatism and approach versus avoidance reactions among junior and senior high school students were examined in integrated and segregated schools. Black, white, and Latin students in selected Milwaukee public schools were interviewed in the spring of 1974 and reinterviewed in the spring of 1975. The approach-avoidance and integration-separatism dimensions emerged from a factor analysis of racial attitude items. The dimensions constitute separate and distinct responses for all three groups of students and indicate that student reactions to inter-group school experiences are complex. Black students in all-black schools scored more on the avoidance end of the approach-avoidance dimension while the black students in the integrated schools scored on the approach end. However, the black students in the all-black schools tended to score on the integration end of the integration-separatism dimension while the black students in the integrated schools tended to score on the separatism end. The attitudes of the students in the all-black schools changed towards those in the integrated school during the year between interviews. Reasons for the changes are suggested and partially tested with additional analysis. White students in essentially all-white schools scored on the avoidance and separatist end of the two dimensions. The white students in mixed Latin schools were more acceptant of the minority students than the white students in the mixed black schools. No differences on the the two dimensions were found among the Latin students in schools of different ethnic composition.
For over two decades social scientists conducted research which generally supported the "contact hypothesis" that equal status contact reduces inter-group hostilities (Allport, 1954; for reviews of this literature see Pettigrew, 1971; Pettigrew, et al., 1973). Recently, however, Armor (1972) reported that support for black power, black power ideology, and desire for predominantly black schools increased among (forced) bused students more than among non-bused students. Of course, integration whether forced or voluntary does not mean the conditions of the contact hypothesis have been met (see the review of Armor's study by Pettigrew et al., 1973). This no doubt is, in part, why the results on desegregation/integration research are so contradictory and inconsistent. For whatever reasons, and there are no doubt many, St. John (1975) in her excellent review of desegregation studies found a general lack of consistency in studies which examined the effects of desegregation on prejudice and found contradictory results when the study designs and voluntary versus non-voluntary desegregation were considered (p. 73-76). Furthermore her conclusions were unchanged when only the most carefully designed studies were examined and she concluded that the results of desegregation on student prejudice were so variable that they must be affected by circumstances other than the mere fact of desegregation. The present study improves in some ways upon the design of previous research. First, longitudinal data are used whereas most of the previous literature is based on cross-sectional research. Secondly, a multi-dimensional approach to student reactions to segregated versus integrated school experiences is utilized. Finally some correlates of the attitudinal changes are examined as an ad hoc explanation of some rather dramatic changes that occurred in the course of the study.
Numerous studies have focused on some aspect of attitudes toward integrationism versus separatism. Marx (1969) and Schuman and Hatchett (1974), for example, examined conventional militancy while Orum (1972) examined support for the civil rights movement itself. Feagin (1970) studied support for black separatism while Aberbach and Walker (1973) examined support for both integration and black power. Others were concerned with support or participation in the urban riots (see Aberbach and Walker, 1973:117-118 for a quick review of this literature, but see also Tomlinson, 1970; Forward and Williams, 1970; and Aberbach and Walker themselves). Indeed Cruse (1967; 1968) has cited the integration-separatism dimension as the critical choice that black Americans have to make in American society (see also Goldman, 1970; and Pettigrew, 1971 for discussion of this issue).

However, a third possible reaction that young people as well as adults might adopt is that of avoidance. Several years ago Pettigrew (1964) categorized three reactions to oppression, defining them as (1) movement toward the oppressor, or the effort to achieve integration or full acceptance, (2) movement against the oppressor, the aggressive, "fight" or go our own way pattern, and (3) movement away from the oppressor or avoidance. Avoidance may be a totally different kind of reaction than either the integrationist or separatist reaction or it may be a mild though still negative reaction to oppression, a weak separatist reaction. The greater support that Armor (1972) found for black power, black ideology, and the desire for predominantly black schools among the bused than among the non-bused students may have been an avoidance rather than separatist reaction. These kinds of reactions are possible for white students as well as minority students, however. Integrated versus
segregated school experiences and the effects they have on a variety of student reactions need to be more fully examined and are the topic of study in this paper. Furthermore we shall attempt to assess whether these multiple reactions to the school experience were responsible in part for the decision of drop-outs and transfer students to leave the schools.

Method

Blacks, whites and Latins are the major groups in the Milwaukee public school system in which the study was conducted. The Latins are defined by the enrollment reports of the school system as persons considered by themselves, by the school, or by the community to be of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Central-American, Cuban, Latin-American, or other Spanish origin. In fact, however, almost all who appeared in the sample were either Mexican-American (ca. 61%) or Puerto Rican (ca. 39%). These two groups were combined for the analysis reported in this paper since the number from each group appearing in the sample was small. Furthermore they refer to themselves locally as Latin or Latino as well as either Mexican-American or Puerto Rican. There is little animosity between the two groups locally and, indeed, a great deal of solidarity exists since the Latin community itself is quite small.

Sample

Students from four high schools and six junior high schools selected for their varying racial and ethnic compositions participated in the study in the spring of 1974 and the spring of 1975. Limited time and funding prevented the inclusion of all the schools. In most cases the junior high schools fed into the senior high schools included in the sample. The four high schools included one with 17.6% Latin
students, one that was essentially all black, one that had 45.7% black students and 51.6% white students, and one that had 94.6% white students. The junior high schools ranged from 70.7% Latin to 24.4% Latin and from 98.6% black to 93.4% white. Schools with both stable and changing racial (or ethnic group) compositions were included. Students were randomly selected within the schools. The total number of senior high school students was 323 including 110 blacks, 161 whites, and 52 Latins. The junior high sample was composed of 14 blacks, 2 141 whites, and 72 Latins for a total of 227. The group totals were 124 blacks, 302 whites, and 124 Latins. To control for age differences, minimize disruptions to the schools and allow for the planned follow-up only seventh and tenth grade students were included in the sample. Furthermore many students in those grades were probably in schools of different composition the previous year and their attitudes would probably be more crystallized and salient after the change.

Permission notices describing the study were sent in advance to the parents both years. They were informed that if they desired, their child would not be included. Approximately one percent of the parents each year requested withdrawal of their child from the study.

Approximately one week after the notices were sent, the students were asked to report to a pre-assigned area of the school building where they were interviewed individually by undergraduate student interviewers who had been trained on the project. Whenever possible students were interviewed by someone of their own race and sex. The interviews averaged 25 minutes after which the students completed a four-page self-administered, pre-coded questionnaire. In cases where the interviewer ascertained that the student had reading problems the self-administered
questionnaire was read to him/her. Less than one percent of the students indicated that they did not wish to participate in the study. As in most school related research, absentees were a problem. Members of the research team made at least two efforts to contact all students and three or four attempts were made to contact frequently absent students. Eventually 84 percent of the students initially selected to be interviewed the first year actually participated in the study. Of those 550 students, 412 or 75 percent were interviewed the second year so that the working N for this paper is 412.

A factor analysis of racial attitude items was conducted and reported more thoroughly in a previous paper ( ). Two important dimensions emerged and are designated for the purposes of this paper as an integration-separatism dimension and an approach-avoidance dimension. The items and weights used to measure these factors are presented in Table 1. The items were factor analyzed separately for the three groups of students. Note that four items all loaded heavily on the approach-avoidance dimension for all three groups. Several of the other items loaded heavily for two groups. The approach-avoidance factor was more salient (in terms of explained variance and relationship to school-related variables) for all three groups than was the integration-separatism dimension. The latter dimension was nearly as important for the black students, however. The reason for the greater saliency of the approach-avoidance dimension for white and Latin students was that some of the items initially thought to reflect integration-separatism loaded with the avoidance dimension. Thus the Latin and white students failed to make some of the conceptual distinctions that would be made by social scientists.

------------------
Table 1 about here
------------------
The black students on the other hand appear to be more politically sophisticated regarding racial attitudes and race relations and exhibited a more salient reaction to the integration-separatism items. Thus the items are empirically as well as conceptually clustered. Although a slightly different configuration of items resulted for the three groups, the approach-avoidance clustering is essentially the same core reaction.

It is a willingness to approach, on an interpersonal level, a member of another group—or an avoidance of such contacts.

The integration-separatism items are another matter and they should be since integration or separatism means different things for the three groups. The integration-separatism items, as opposed to the personal, situational reaction of the approach-avoidance items, appears to reflect more general orientations to the possibility of integration. Whites were concerned with the experiences they had undergone with minority students and with whether or not they should be involved in the minority communities. The Latin students were concerned with the possibility of inter-group friendships and how minority students might best learn—kind of a how best to succeed in white society orientation. Finally the black students were concerned with the extent to which they wanted and trusted white involvement in their community. Although these reactions are different, they all reflect a concern with how integration (or separatism) would affect their own group.

A further indication that integration-separatism responses were separate and distinct from the approach-avoidance response is given by the correlations of the dimension for each of the groups. The correlations were \(-0.154\) for the black students, \(-0.011\) for the white students, and \(0.147\) for the Latin students (only the correlation for the
black students is statistically significant). It is the distribution of these reactions—support for integration versus separatism, and approach versus avoidance of other group members—in schools of different racial and ethnic composition that will be examined in this paper.

For the analysis reported here the student-respondents were classified according to both race and school composition. This resulted in the following groupings. The number of schools included in each category is listed in the parentheses.

1. Whites in an essentially all-white senior high school (1)
2. Whites in an essentially all-white junior high school (1)
3. Whites in a mixed white-black senior high school (1)
4. Whites in mixed white-black junior high schools (2)
5. Whites in a mixed white-Latin senior high school (1)
6. Whites in mixed white-Latin junior high schools (2)
7. Blacks in an all-black senior high school (1)
8. Blacks in mixed black-white senior high schools (2)
9. Blacks in mixed black-white junior high schools (3)
10. Latins in a mixed Latin-white senior high school (1)
11. Latins in a predominantly white junior high school (1)
12. Latins in a predominantly Latin junior high school (1)

Responses for each of the three groups (blacks, whites, and Latins) were analyzed separately through analyses of covariance with repeated measures on years (a split-plot design) and unequal n's. Subsequent analyses of covariance were computed with parental occupation and education of both the father and the mother simultaneously controlled. Parental occupation and education, measured on nine-point scales, had relatively little effect and the results reported below refer to the regular analysis of covariance unless otherwise noted.
Results and Discussion

Latin Students

The Latin junior high school students in both the predominantly white and the predominantly Latin schools scored slightly on the avoidance end of the standardized approach-avoidance dimension (-.157) while the Latin senior high school students scored slightly on the approach end of the dimension, but the differences were not statistically significant (F = 0.87). From 1974 to 1975 there was a slight shift towards the avoidance stance for both the junior and senior high students, but again the change was not statistically significant (F = 2.31, p=n.s. with 2 and 115 d.f.) and there was no interaction effect (F = 0.29). The F-ratios were even smaller when parental occupation and education were controlled (0.89, 0.22, and 0.29). Likewise there was no difference on the separatism-integration dimension for the Latin students in the three different kinds of schools and none of the effects approached statistical significance.

The Latin students who were unavailable for reinterviewing were very similar in their attitudes to the students who remained and were interviewed the second year. Basically two kinds of students were unavailable for reinterviewing, those who dropped from school altogether and those who moved or changed schools. Only about 1 percent of the total sample declined to be reinterviewed; in any case the results for the Latin students would have remained the same if the drop-outs and transfer students had been reinterviewed; they were not substantially different from the continuing students. This also indicates that the drop-out and transfer students did not leave for racial or inter-group reasons.
White Students

White student scores on the approach-avoidance dimension changed slightly toward the approach end of the dimension over the year’s time, but the change was not statistically significant ($F = 0.19$). Further, there was no overall interaction effect ($F = 1.16$). These results are portrayed in Figure 1. The distribution of the race-school groups on the dimension was itself significant, however ($F = 3.38$, d.f. = 5 and 233, $p < .01$). The white junior high students in both integrated white-black and basically all-white schools scored most heavily on the avoidance end of the dimension while the older students in the high schools of similar composition scored in the middle of the dimension. The white students in both junior and senior high schools with the Latin students, on the other hand, were quite willing to approach the minority Latin students. These differences are consistent with previous research which has found less hostility toward lighter skinned minorities than blacks.

Among the white students, however, the students who were unavailable for reinterviewing, either because they had dropped from school or had transferred, did make a difference for students in three types of schools. Among the white students in the basically all-white senior high and in both the junior and senior mixed Latin schools those who were unavailable for reinterview tended to score higher on the avoidance end of the approach-avoidance dimension than did the continuing students ($t = 2.38, 4.12$, and $2.53$ respectively for students in three kinds of schools, $p < .01$ using one-tailed test).

The white students in mixed white-Latin and mixed white-black junior high schools who were unavailable for reinterview also tended to be more
separatist than the other students on the integration-separatism dimension: (t = 2.12 and 1.84 respectively, p < .05 with one-tailed test). This was not true of seniors in any of the schools, indicating that those who favored separatism most strongly and those who were avoiders left these schools. Thus there was some evidence of white flight under the school system's open enrollment-transfer policy. However, the flight occurred primarily in the younger years, not during high school. The exception to this is whites in mixed white-Latin schools where there is more acceptance of the minority students and thus a later decision to leave the school.

The white students who remained in the mixed white-black junior and senior high schools and in the all-white and mixed white-Latin junior highs also exhibited a strong shift towards the separatist end of the dimension. These results are shown in Figure 2; the total shift is significant at the .001 level, but becomes nonsignificant when parental occupation and education are simultaneously controlled. The interaction effect remains significant, however (F = 3.62, p < .01). Only the scores of the senior high students in the all-white and mixed white-Latin schools remained constant. The white students in both the junior and senior mixed white-Latin schools, when compared to students in the mixed white-black school, were also much more in favor or integration than separatism. The main effect for school composition was significant at the .001 level (F = 4.63). Thus, although the intergroup experiences in the schools did not produce any increase in avoidance reactions, they did produce a separatist reaction among the white students in four of the six types of schools.

Black Students

For the black students significant differences appeared on both dimensions. The black students in both the integrated junior and integrated senior high schools scored on the approach end of the approach-avoidance dimension while the students in the all-black senior high school scored strongly on the avoidance end (see Figure 3). These differences are significant at the .001 level (F = 13.27)
and are corroborated by additional data from the surveys. The black students in the all-black senior high, when asked directly whether they preferred integration in society or separatism, expressed a preference for separatism more often than the black students in the integrated schools ($x^2 = 11.10$, $N = 55$ for each group, d.f. = 2, $p < .01$). Although the question asked about integration, the responses appear to be approach-avoidance reactions for they are in the same direction and portray the same pattern as the avoidance reactions on the avoidance-approach dimension.

---

Figure 3 about here

---

During the year's time the attitudes of the black students in the integrated school remained approximately the same. However, the attitudes of the black students in the all-black senior high changed dramatically; in 1975 they, like the black students in the integrated schools, also scored highly on the approach end of the dimension. The change from 1974 to 1975 for the three groups was statistically significant at the .001 level ($F = 27.40$) but was primarily the result of the change of the senior high students in the all-black senior high school (see Figure 1 again). This is indicated by the interaction between school composition and time ($F = 35.89$, $p < .001$). When the parental occupations and educational levels were controlled, the main effect and the interaction effect remained strong ($F = 35.89$ and $32.67$, $p < .001$). However, the change over time became nonsignificant ($F = 2.33$, p n.s. with 2 and 76 d.f.). The father's occupation explained 7.5 percent of the variance on the approach-avoidance dimension and the mother's occupational level explained an additional 8.8 percent thus diminishing slightly the main effect for
school composition and the interaction, but completely accounting for the overall change. In other words there was an association between parental occupation and the school composition, with parents of the students in the all-black school holding significantly lower status jobs than the parents from the integrated school. When this is controlled statistically the overall change is less. Nevertheless, overall differences remained between the students in the different kinds of schools and the interaction between school composition and time remained. Further, the differences were not attributable to dropouts or students who changed schools. The students unavailable for reinter-viewing were only slightly different on the dimension from the students successfully interviewed both years.

It should be noted that these results are the opposite of what Armor found in Boston. He found higher support for separatism, preference for segregated schools, and more support for black power among bused (integrated) students than among the non-bused students. The significant change in the present study was among the students in the all-black senior high, not in the integrated school. In addition when the students were asked directly whether they favored integration or separatism, the students in both junior and senior all-black schools more than the black students in integrated schools said separation. This again was the opposite of the Armor findings.

The results on the separatism-integration dimension resemble more closely Armor's results. The black students in the integrated school showed ideological support for separatism while the students in the all-black senior high school showed support for integration (see Figure 4). These results were significant at the .01 level ($F = 5.70$ with 2 and 76 d.f.).
However, contrary to Armor's results, the black students in the all-black school during the course of the year also became more separatist in orientation while the black students' sentiments in the integrated senior high remained nearly constant. The black students in the integrated junior high on the other hand became more supportive of the integrationist position during the intervening year. These cross-pattern changes result in the significant interaction shown in Figure 4 ($F = 8.33, p < .001$). The effects from the junior high students are less important, however, than the change by the students in the all-black senior high school since the change is small and the size of the group is small compared to the other groups. The overall change from 1974 to 1975 was also significant but again was reduced to non-significance when parental occupation and education were controlled. The father's occupational level explained 11.5% of the variance in the change, and the mother's occupational level explained an additional 6.6%. When the controls were applied, the main effect was diminished some ($F = 3.50, p < .05$), but the interaction effect increased ($F = 13.80, p < .001$).

The results from the two dimensions, although seemingly contradictory, are consistent for the black students in the integrated senior high. Those students feel, evidently in part because of their experience in the integrated school, that they can approach their white classmates. Yet, for ideological reasons, which again may be in part school based, they maintain a separatist orientation. During the course of the
year the students in the all-black senior high became much more like the black students in the integrated schools and they did this on both dimensions.

There are several possible explanations for the changes that occurred primarily among the students in the all-black senior high. First those students who were unavailable for reinterviewing, dropouts and moveouts, might have had strikingly different attitudes than those who were reinterviewed. As already stated this was not the case. A comparison of those available and unavailable for reinterviewing revealed no attitudinal differences. Like the Latin students, the black students' scores on the two dimensions were not related to their dropping out or transferring to other schools.

A second possibility is that the students in the all-black high school matured and outgrew the effects of segregation and thus became more like the black students in the integrated schools. This may have been facilitated by the approaching job market in which the students would in all probability be working with whites, a situation similar to research results that show peoples' attitudes changing as an abstract possibility becomes a concrete reality. Another possibility is that the black students were experiencing the same processes of alienation and disenchantment with white society that the black students in the integrated schools experienced earlier. But then we would expect them to become more avoidance oriented, not approach oriented. Furthermore, both of these possibilities are rather remote, given that the shifts were dramatic and occurred over a relatively short period of time. Still another possibility is that the black leadership locally and nationally became more separatist and this was communicated to the students. However, there is no striking evidence to indicate that this happened and even if it did occur, it would not explain the change towards the approach orientation.
However, an important event which occurred during the course of the year at the all-black senior high school does appear to account in part for the changes. With great pressure by the black community the school board made a final decision to replace the all-black school with a new building and bids were let. The site of the new building, previously a matter of public controversy was finally established at the old location, the black community's preferred site. The black community had been heavily involved in these issues for some time and the final battles were won during the intervening year in which this study was conducted. The success had a significant impact on the feelings of the black community. St. John points to the positive effects such an event might have in a black community. In discussing the symbolic message that desegregation conveys to the black community she also stated that a new all-black school might have similar effects:

It is probable, though not yet adequately demonstrated, that an all-black school in a new location and beautiful building and conspicuous in the quality of its staff and program might contribute as much to the self-esteem of pupils as attendance at a high-status predominantly white school. (St. John, p93).

Note that the successful effort to have the new school built would explain the changes that occurred on both the approach-avoidance and the integration-separatism dimensions. Because the struggle had been with whites and been successful, there would be more of a sense that blacks could successfully approach whites on a personal level. However, since the goal had been a school of their own, a new all-black school, there would likely be a change towards ideological support of separatism.
If the successful fight for the new building was in fact the cause of the changes on the approach-avoidance and integration-separatism indices, certainly the students' sense of personal control and self-concept should increase. This would be particularly true if the students themselves and their parents were involved in the effort. To the extent that the teachers had been active in the issue the students would also feel their teachers were more responsive to their needs. Changes in these variables and two measures of anxiety were examined in additional analyses of covariance. The variables were also included because they were personality variables and because previous regression analyses had shown all five variables to be important predictors of both the approach-avoidance and integration-separatism dimensions (see Jacobson, forthcoming). All five variables were measured with three to five Likert-type items. The personal control items were taken from Coleman et al. (1966), and the anxiety items were adapted from Alpert and Haber (1960).

Significant changes in the anxiety scores of the students did not occur during the course of the year, nor were there significant interactions between the type of school and the anxiety scores. The black students in the integrated schools had significantly higher debilitating anxiety scores, but there was not a significant change by the students in the all-black senior high school. At the same time the interaction for the sense of personal control was not statistically significant, although it approached significance \(F = 2.03, p < .14\). Furthermore the students in the all-black school did not experience an increase in sense of control (3.48 to 3.52) but rather the black students in the integrated schools showed a decrease from 3.61 to 3.14. However, the
students in the all-black school did change significantly and positively in terms of both self-concept and perceived teacher reactions to themselves. Their score on the self-concept measure increased from 3.61 to 4.07 while the black students in the integrated senior high schools decreased from 3.64 to 3.22 and the integrated junior high school black students' scores remained fairly constant (3.62 to 3.65). This interaction was significant at the .01 level ($F = 5.90$) with no main effects present. At the same time the students in the all-black school viewed their teachers reactions to themselves much more positively—changing from a score of 2.23 to 3.84 while the black student scores in the integrated senior high school decreased slightly from 3.47 to 3.19 and the junior high school students' scores went from 3.47 to 3.97. This interaction effect was significant at the .001 level ($F = 16.58$).

Thus although all of the variables did not display the expected pattern, several did. This analysis therefore lends support to the interpretation that the construction of the new school had some effect on the students' scores on the integration-separatism and approach-avoidance dimensions.

**Conclusion**

Clearly, student reactions to integrated and segregated school experiences are complex. This is true for white students as well as the minority students. We have examined two dimensions in this paper and have found different responses by each group over time. The profound differences that occur in schools with different racial and ethnic compositions indicate that the schools and their compositions are in part responsible for these attitudinal and ideological differences. Certainly selection operates to affect these variables. But the longitudinal design employed here shows that the schools themselves and events in the broader community have an effect.
The reactions of the white students in mixed-black schools is of particular importance for there is some indication of white flight. Thus it is important for the schools and society to remedy the causes of the reactions to stem white flight. Of course, parental reactions are strongly involved in white flight, but we need to better understand the processes that lead to avoidance and separatist reactions for all groups, black, white, and Latin, and for adults as well as youth.

The changes that occurred in the year's time also indicate that inter-group experiences can have a dramatic effect on student attitudes, attitudes that are likely to be carried into adult life. Certainly the response of the dominant white society to minority efforts to achieve better schooling is one of these. These plus additional reactions need to be examined in integrated and segregated schools, in changing versus stable schools, and in voluntary versus involuntary situations. They have important implications for the future of intergroup relations in our society.
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Footnotes

1. The research reported here was supported primarily by the National Institute of Education (Grant Ne-G-00-3-0053), but supplemental funds were provided by the Center for Latin America, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. I am indebted to Donald L. Noel and Cecilia L. Ridgeway for critical readings of an earlier draft of this paper.

2. One all black junior high school did not participate in the study the second year and was replaced in the sample by another all black junior high school. Students from additional schools were surveyed the second year. The analysis reported here excludes the students from these schools, however, since changes in student attitudes over time are the focus of this study.

3. A third reaction that occurred among the two minority groups was that of pride. However, the measurement of this dimension was not adequate, and results will not be reported here. It does, however, constitute an important dimension that should be investigated in future research on minority student reactions to integrated and segregated school experiences.

4. The question was actually lowly correlated with both dimensions for all three groups indicating that complex reactions cannot be easily examined with simple questions. This broad question tapped both dimension. The variance was also quite small since the question required only a simple yes-no-not sure response and analysis of it added no results. The question was simply not specific enough to elicit any interesting results. Rather it took the specific items about integration, separatism and avoidance to elicit the results presented here.
5. It is difficult to compare Armor's index with the dimensions used in the present study for he reports only two of his four items and neither of them was used in the present study. The one item that corresponds closest to any item used in this study reads "Most black people should live and work in black areas, and most whites should live and work in white areas." It corresponds with the following item used here "Schools with mostly black students should have mostly black teachers and schools with mostly white students should have mostly white teachers." However, that item loaded on the approach-avoidance dimension not on the integration-separatism dimension. It is likely that the Armor dimension is tapping both dimensions used in this study. Needless to say the results presented here indicate the necessity for maintaining the distinction.
Table 1
Items and Weights Used to Construct Integration-separatism and Approach-Avoidance Indices from Factor Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Approach-avoidance</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. All white people should be kept out of black (Latin) institutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. People learn things in general more quickly from people of the same race.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A wise person will think twice before he trusts a person of another race.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It is best to stay away from people of another race to avoid embarrassing situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Latin people do not need white people to help organize all-Latin programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Schools with mostly black (Latin) students should have mostly black (Latin) teachers and schools with mostly white students should have mostly white teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. White people can never fully understand the black condition.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. People should have nothing to do with people of another race if they can help it.</td>
<td></td>
<td>.398</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Integration-separatism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. People learn things in general more quickly from people of the same race.</td>
<td>.359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 (continued)

2. A wise person will think twice before he trusts a person of another race. .300 ---- ----

3. Most of my classroom experiences with students of another race have been enjoyable ---- .420 ----

4. Black people do not need white people to help organize all-black programs. .350 ---- ----

5. People of the different races can truly understand each other's problems. ---- .537 ----

6. White people can never fully understand the black condition. .372 ---- ----

7. Close friendship between Latins and whites is possible. ---- ---- -.523

8. White people should take part in civil rights activities. ---- .335 ----

*The reliability (P) of the approach-avoidance index is .810, .869, and .829 for the black, white and Latin students respectively (see Heise and Bohrnstedt, 1970). The validity coefficients (E) for the index are .958, .979 and .961. The reliability coefficients for the integration-separatism index are .795, .734, and .674 while the validity coefficients are .958, .976, and .876 for the three groups respectively.
Figure 1
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