Chicanos have been limited in their educational opportunities, as evidenced by their underrepresentation in occupations and professions requiring extended education. It is proposed that intelligence testing is one part of an educational ideology that ascribes the Chicanos' unequal educational existence to the group's inability to function competently within the Anglo-American institutional environment. This paper discusses intelligence testing as an educational activity, its implicit assumptions, and the educational and social policy implications of intelligence testing for Chicanos. The hereditarian and environmentalist positions are described. The hereditarian position places greater responsibility on the person for his level of inequality, whereas, the environmentalist position employs the aggregation of personal inequality by social group to support structured levels of social inequality. The simple observation that intelligence test scores and performance in school and at work are closely associated has too often prompted intelligence test experts to conclude that the benefits of education and occupation are distributed on the basis of intelligence. On the contrary, it has been demonstrated that one's socioeconomic origin has a closer association with economic and occupational success than level of intelligence. (Author/RL)
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Pyramidal magic - the magic of hierarchy - is inevitable in social relations, and it is not the individual, but his hierarchical office which contains and generates the charisma of a hierarchical order. Thus, when we hear slogans of "complete equality" or "equal shares in the land," we may be sure that in the new system in which all are to be equal, some social offices will soon develop which will be "more equal than others." Thus, the principle of equality is used to sustain inequality.

With an estimated constituency of 6.5 to 8 million people, Chicanos, like other nonwhite minorities in the United States, find themselves at a heavy political (Taebel, 1978; Garcia, 1977), economic (Table 1), and educational (Table 2) disadvantage with respect to the white majority.

As one of the major target populations for the provision of equal educational opportunity (National Institute of Education, 1977), intelligence testing becomes an important concern for the Chicano community because of its use in the public schools as a major instrument for the allocation of educational opportunity (Cleary, et al., 1975; Goslin & Glass, 1967; Karier, 1972; Keogh & Barkett, 1978).

Table 1
Average Annual Income for Chicano Families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Income</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>less than $4,000</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000 to $6,999</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,000 to $9,999</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $19,999</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 or more</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Median Income = $10,259*

Source: Social Indicators of Equality for Minorities and Women, United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1978.)
Table 2
Comparison of the Educational Attainment of Chicanos and Anglos

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of School Completed</th>
<th>Less than 5 years</th>
<th>4 years of high school or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Chicanos</td>
<td>Anglos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 29</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 34</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 - 44</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 - 64</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - Over</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


That Chicanos have been limited in their educational opportunities and in the enjoyment of the "fruits of American society" is evident in their underrepresentation in occupations (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights 1975; 1978) and professions (Romero, 1977; Madrid-Barela, et al., 1976; Arce, 1976, 1978) requiring extended education. For example, in 1977, 60 percent of employed Chicanos were working in

1The extent of these disadvantages has been discussed at some length in the educational literature. In particular, see the following: Sanchez (1972), Roos (1977), Casso & Roman (1976), TenHouten, et al. (1971), Guerra, et al. (1969), Salazar (1970), Anderson & Johnson (1971), Blair (1973), Thornburg & Grinder (1975).
blue-collar occupations compared with 45 percent of the employed white male population; and 20 percent of employed Chicanos were working in white-collar jobs compared with 40 percent of the employed white male population.2 In addition, a report on the quality of education for Chicanos prepared by the United States Commission on Civil Rights (1974) shows that less than 11 percent of the total professional staff in state departments of education for the five southwestern states is Chicano, even though nearly one of every five children in the public schools is Chicano.

Our primary intent in this essay is not to depict intelligence testing as a causal agent for the Chicano's unequal educational existence, because this particular part of his existence is also affected by socio-structural factors that have been historically determined. Rather, we will propose that intelligence testing is part of an educational ideology that ascribes the Chicano's unequal educational existence to the group's inability to function competently within the Anglo-American institutional environment.

For instance, given the degree to which intelligence tests measure (a) knowledge of the dominant society's sociocultural patterns and (b) involvement with the dominant society's principal social institutions,

---
Chicanos' chances of performing poorly on such tests are quite high because social and historical forces have limited their existence to social environments separate from the mainstream of the dominant society (Barrera, 1979; Light & Smith, 1969). Thus, our concern is with the description of intelligence testing as a social activity in the public school used for determining educational opportunity, and with the ideological use of intelligence testing for determining the Chicanos' quality of life.

THE EDUCATIONAL SYSTEM

Perhaps the one universal function of all educational systems is the transmission and maintenance of cultural patterns, with the specific objective of instilling in the individual a "social consciousness" reflective and supportive of the culture's institutional structure (Freire, 1970). It has been proposed that the degree of support one demonstrates for dominant social institutions is dependent on one's educational experience. That is, one's level of institutional dependence reflects the political socialization one undergoes within the educational system, and one's level of commitment to the institutional structure is, in turn, an indicator of one's citizenship or membership status (Meyer & Rubinson, 1975; Boli-Bennett & Meyer, 1978; Ziegler & Peak, 1970).

Maintenance of cultural patterns provides for continuity in the accumulation of knowledge in each area of social life and for the aggregation of such knowledge into a society's cultural heritage.
In an institutional environment, education becomes a functional prerequisite to formalizing relationships with those institutions responsible for the legitimation of social behavior. One of the purposes in this essay will be to show that the introduction of intelligence testing into the educational system resulted in the development of a schooling industry aimed at formalizing a person's relationship to and maintaining an institutional environment rooted in inequality (Boulding, 1972; 1976).

The educational system contributes to the maintenance of inequality because it is the transmitter and translator of knowledge by relevant audience (Figure 1). The term relevant audience refers to the aggregations of persons that differ in the type of knowledge they receive. Since persons differ in the type of knowledge they receive, we can assume that the opportunity for expressing this knowledge will also differ. In this way, the educational system maintains the transmission of audience-specific knowledge, and structures opportunities for its specific expression. As Blau and Duncan (1967) have demonstrated, family background (audience membership) affects the education one will receive (audience-specific) and the first job one will obtain (specific expression). Thus, the educational systems ensure that persons are only provided knowledge and those opportunities for its expression that are audience-specific.

3Historically, because education has been preoccupied with the coordination of audience with role-knowledge and corresponding opportunity structures, it has not been a successful intervention strategy for the upward mobility of children (e.g., a change in audience membership) from poor families (Bowles & Gintis, 1973; Katz, 1971; Spring, 1976). Quite the opposite has occurred in that public schools have served to deprive poor children of a quality education (Carnoy, 1974; Katz, 1970), by crystallizing audience differences (Keniston, 1977; Thurow, 1976).
Figure 1. Interaction of Person, Education, and Audience
The effectiveness of the educational system in maintaining a system of audience-specific knowledge transmission is largely dependent on its ability to control individuals (Galpin, 1965; Callahan, 1962). That the educational system maintains a structured arrangement of audiences demonstrates its global control over the individual. However, at the institutional level, social control is exercised through the teacher who, as an agent from the adult society, is responsible for ensuring that students will accept those expectations specific to their audience membership. Students will, in turn, respond to those expectations because as members of the same audience, they will perceive each other as equal within a general activity. Consequently, social control over the student is dependent on the student's acceptance of a general body of expectations that defines him, and others like him, in a shared activity (Parson, 1959).

**INTELLIGENCE TESTING IN EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITY**

With its origin in America's response to the military's need to rationalize and standardize manpower during World War I, the intelligence test quickly became the "great" psychological experiment destined to differentiate men within disciplined and highly stratified social organizations (Spring, 1972). Strong supporters of the intelligence test, such as Robert Yerkes, were confident that the lesson in human engineering taught by the war would allow for the entrance of intelligence testing "... directly and effectively into our civil institutions and activities" (Yoakum & Yerkes, 1920:viii).
During this period of history, the institutional environment required that social action respond to external demands brought about by increased socialization (assuming a corporate work role) rather than internal demands (personal satisfaction). There was also an increasing demand for specialization in social activity and the growing belief that what worked for one institution would work for another. It was in the midst of all this social realignment that the intelligence test was incorporated into educational activity as an instrument aimed at formalizing a person's acceptance of external institutional demands. As a result, education was transformed from a process concerned with the acquisition of knowledge into a strategy for adapting the person to his environment (Strong, 1919).

Despite the fact that intelligence testing has become a legitimate part of educational activity, the rationale behind such testing practices is not generally known (McNemar, 1964; Levine, 1976; Cronbach, 1971; Riegle, 1977; White, 1975). Sorgen (1973) has suggested that because intelligence testing allows for the grouping of students by ability, it is presented as a necessary component in the school's blueprint for effective and efficient teaching. Similarly, Karier (1972) has suggested that because corporate interests, such as those of Rockefeller and Carnegie, were instrumental in the initial financing of the testing movement, the push to educate individuals to assume a corporate identity resulted in intelligence testing becoming a corporate enterprise essential
to education's need for continuous measurement and accountability. Consequently, intelligence testing has come to be regarded as an effective educational vehicle for facilitating the efficient transfer of individuals from educational to occupational roles. In brief, justification for administering intelligence tests to every youngster who goes to school is usually provided by rationalizations that stress the importance of testing in an educational technology's attempt to provide quality education (Benson, 1977; Bauernfeind, 1971; Brookover, et al., 1974).

Perhaps one way to examine this issue is to look at the influence exerted by the implicit assumptions in intelligence testing on twentieth-century ideas and the role of education in a democratic society.

Implicit Assumptions

From its beginning, the movement behind the intelligence test has been preoccupied with the premise that mental capacity is inherited; that is, the belief that intelligence tests measure something innate, something that is fixed at the moment of a person's conception and persists over...
time. The significant role this premise played in the intelligence testing movement can be observed in the rapid growth of a eugenics movement led by some of the principal intelligence investigators (Rose & Rose, 1978), such as H. H. Goddard and Lewis Terman, that was principally aimed at guarding society from the "... menace of the feebleminded" (Terman, 1914).

For instance, regarding the development of intelligence measures, implicit in Terman's (1923) theoretical strategy that questions on the Stanford-Binet intelligence test were designed to measure the progressive difficulty in performing tasks necessary for achievement in ascending the hierarchical occupational structure was the assumption that people were at a particular occupational level because of heredity and social environment. Using the observation that close to 50 percent of the fathers of gifted children in his studies of genius belonged to professional groups, while none belonged to unskilled groups, Terman (1925)

5 Two populations that were unfortunate victims of this movement, specifically concerned with the maintenance of social order by sterilizing "undesirables," were blacks and immigrants from southern and southwestern Europe. For example, according to Popenoe (1930), in California, where only 20 percent of the foreign-born population and 1.5 percent of the black population were over 21 years of age in 1930, 30 percent of the men and 31 percent of the women sterilized were foreign-born, while 4 percent of the total number were black.

It's interesting to note that the attempt to demonstrate that whites are superior to blacks in intelligence goes as far back as the 1890s. For example, psychologist R. M. Bache tried to measure the quickness of sensory perception between 12 whites and 11 blacks. Despite the result that blacks had faster reaction times than whites, Bache proclaimed that whites were the superior group because "they belonged to a more deliberate and reflective race..." than blacks (quoted in Gossett, 1963:364).
came to promote the general principle that social stratification corresponds to native ability. That is, because intelligence levels were closely associated with the stratification system, biology came to be seen as the agent fostering this relationship (Kamin, 1975).

This central premise in the measurement of intelligence introduced a clear pessimism in the United States concerning the potential for improving individual abilities through education. Arguing that the children of working-class parents were simply unable, and could not learn, to compete, Terman (1925, 1926:96) came to believe that it was "of greater value to discover a single gifted child than to train a thousand dullards to the limits of their educability or to prevent the birth of a thousand feebleminded." Similarly, this pessimism was expressed in 1940 by Edward L. Thorndike as: "if one has imagined that the genes of a dull normal... develop into a mind able to graduate from a reputable law school, he will be disappointed to learn that differences in home life and training probably cause less than a fifth of the variation among individuals in I.Q."

More recently, Arthur Jensen (1969) has employed a similar position in his attack on compensatory education programs, such as Head Start, by arguing that such programs can not have lasting effects on children's intelligence scores because they can do little more than promote maximum development of the kind of intelligence a person is born with. As a result, Jensen suggests that because it is impossible to change cognitive patterns, different educational goals should be established for different groups of children. However, Jensen's position ignores the fact that
while compensatory education programs have not been effective in raising intelligence scores, they have been partly effective, but by no means successful, in increasing the child's ability to do well in school (Shea, 1977).

Serious questions regarding the assumptions of American democracy are raised by this pessimistic view of education. The premise that mental capacity is inherited has come to mean that people are not born equal, that it is impossible to make them equal, and that the most education can do is to enhance individual differences by tailoring itself to the needs of the child. As a result, education is not a vehicle for attaining an equitable relationship within the social system, but rather a structure inhibiting individuals from adopting a dynamic model of personality development aimed at modifying one's lifestyle (March, 1972). What this, in turn, predicts is that the most an individual can accomplish through education is to learn how to equalize his inequality as much as possible.

From a social system's approach then, we can observe that equality has become a function of structural inequality in that educational systems are perceived as "equal" to the degree that patterns of social inequality are maintained, and, conversely, educational systems are "unequal" to the degree that patterns of social inequality are either

6In this regard, Bowles (1972:45) has written that: "the older democratic ideology of the common school - that the same curriculum should be offered to all children - gave way to the 'progressive' insistence that education should be tailored to the 'needs of the child'."
rapidly changing or nonexistent. Thus, from the very beginning in the measurement of intelligence, the possibility of a strictly egalitarian democracy was not forged, and democracy came to be defined not as rule by the people but rather as rule by the intelligent: "The argument for democracy is not that it gives power to men without distinction, but that it gives greater freedom for ability and character to attain power" (Thorndike, 1920:235).

While those who have advanced the assumptions and applications of intelligence testing have persistently denied the possibility of using education as a reform mechanism to help make all men capable of equal participation in a democratic society, they have not rejected the possibility of creating the "good society" in the twentieth century (DuBois, 1972). However, if American educational institutions are principally designed to distort personal and social development by limiting their expression to those instances largely determined by external conditions (audience membership), then the "good society" will consist not of individuals performing meaningful and equitable actions, but rather of an alienated and stratified labor force (Bowles & Gintis, 1976).

Educational and Social Policy Implications

The redefinition of democracy that emerged early in the testing movement, as a social system where people would be channeled to their appropriate stations in life based on their respective levels of native intelligence, became a moral ideology for education: "What an intelligent father desires for his own son, an intelligent democracy desires and should provide for its children - an education for each according to his
"capacity" (Pritchett quoted in Marks, 1976-77:8). Similarly, Arthur Jensen (1969:15) has stated: "We have to face it: the assortment of persons into occupational roles simply is not 'fair' in any absolute sense. The best we can hope for is that true merit, given equality of opportunity, act as the basis for the natural sorting process." However, if "true merit" is simply a reflection of the real world of economic and social privilege, and intelligence tests reflect socioeconomic biases, then equality of educational opportunity becomes a mechanism for controlling movement into and within the American system of social stratification. As such, Jensen is well in support of Terman's initial position that when it comes to education, all have a chance to succeed; however, merit alone is to be rewarded. What is ironic, however, is simply that merit corresponds to one's position in the stratificational system of society.

Interpreting "equality" in education as providing for individual differences (individual abilities and interests) was also consistent with the growth of an American meritocracy; a meritocracy supportive of equality of opportunity for all and impartial treatment for everyone. One way of ensuring the implementation of these two principles in everyday life was through the use of intelligence tests as objective and impartial procedures supported by everyone. Education, as a result, became a "schooling industry" responsible for selecting individuals for and assigning them to differentiated education and various positions in society (Henning, 1969; Kazamias, 1961). The concept of "differential intelligence" now justified the selection of particular students for differentiated academic, vocational, or other programs. In short,
The development of tests and measurements designed to measure presumed differences of ability provided a means for differentiation on presumed objective and universalistic criteria rather than on such factors as wealth or ethnic identity. The apparent unfairness of selection, grouping, and tracking procedures on the basis of social class background was objectified and justified by the educational testing program. Equality of opportunity was provided for . . . by a program that would fit a lower-class child for a lower-class position as the upper-class child was fitted for an upper-class position (Brookover, et al., 1974:172).

Equality was thus manifest in the acceptance of one's social position as that which one can fill best, and the belief in a meritocracy facilitated one's acceptance of the situation, that is, the acceptance of one's fate.

The emergent ideology of "individual differences" implied that equal educational opportunity was for individuals the best of two possible worlds: equal education, the principle that all children should receive a common education regardless of intellectual ability, and equal opportunity, educational opportunity commensurate with one's ability as measured by the intelligence tests (Ziegler & Trickett, 1978). The educational technology of measurement and classification made possible by the incorporation of the intelligence test into educational activity was instrumental in differentiating educational programs that would, in turn, decrease the possibility of providing equal educational opportunity and equal access to positions in the stratification system. Thus, equal educational opportunity does not mean that schools should, or even could,
be responsible for improving the intellectual abilities of various portions of the American population.7

In summary, the emergent ideology of "individual differences" resulted in educational and social policy8 aimed at providing for human diversity. Implicit within the resulting educational policy were the assumptions that individual differences are important in policy decisions, that appropriate measures are available for detecting differences, and that adequate programs can be developed to meet these needs. For education, these assumptions were instrumental in fabricating the myth that different educational programs enhance individual freedom and opportunity. However, the role of intelligence testing in the ideology of "individual differences" provided for continuity in the maintenance of unequal educational opportunity structures for certain populations, which, in turn, assured them an unequal relationship with the dominant social institutions.

7The ideology of "individual differences" was extremely important from a political standpoint because it socialized people to view social and economic inequality as individual deprivations rather than as group deprivations. This practically ensured that those populations suffering most from this ideology would not perceive their situation as one not of their own choosing and would not perceive it as susceptible to change through collective political action. For some literature that looks at various aspects of this phenomenon see the following: Inglehart, 1976; Goodenow, 1975; Ravitch, 1976; Cross, et al., 1978; Publisi, 1974.

8Though we have not elaborated on this issue, findings of intelligence testing also came to be used as a rationale for immigration exclusion. Specifically, results showing that the "old" Americans of Nordic stock were intellectually superior to the "new" Americans of Alpine or Mediterranean stock were instrumental in the enactment of the Immigration Act of 1924, which clearly discriminated against the new immigrants (e.g., Marks, 1975).
The 60s were a trying decade for the intelligence test and its advocates. The social and political climate that came to characterize the 60s, largely the product of antiwar demonstrations and civil rights movements, challenged the American consciousness by demonstrating that the social conditions people found themselves in were not solely the result of individual effort but also the result of external factors unrelated to personal qualities. The effects of this period on the intelligence testing movement may be observed in the change in thinking regarding the movement. On the one hand, some persons come to argue that intelligence is an inherited trait, while on the other, it was argued that intelligence is the product of environmental conditions.

There are many things that can be said about the hereditarian versus environmentalist position without drifting away from our primary task. The general view within intelligence testing circles is that all measured mental abilities are a function of both genetic and environmental variables, the contribution of neither of these being zero. However, that is not intended to imply that two separate camps do not exist. In the following pages, both sides of the controversy will be outlined, not as a treatise in genetic psychology, but as a discussion of the dimensions relevant to the concerns of this paper.

As early as the 1930s and 1940s, the notion of equal opportunity in the enjoyment of the fruits American society offers was directly challenged by sociological studies illustrating the significant effect of social stratification on the distribution of opportunity and wealth (for example, see: Lynd & Lynd, 1929, 1937; Warner & Lunt, 1941; Warner, et al., 1949; Hollingshead, 1949). One may venture to state that the historical conditions were set for what was later to be realized as the "politics of turmoil" in the 1960s.
The Camps

Intelligence investigators such as Herrnstein (1973), Jensen (1969, 1972), and Eysenck (1971) argue that intelligence is dependent on genetic factors. Implicit in their argument is the assumption that innate potential exists before the individual interacts with the environment and establishes upper limits for what the individual can achieve in school and later life. Perhaps the individual most often associated with the hereditarian position is Arthur Jensen—in particular, his 1969 paper in which his findings demonstrate the persistence of differences in intelligence test scores between blacks and whites. What is most significant in his 1969 paper is that it was used by some members of the research community to argue that blacks are genetically inferior to whites.10

While Jensen does argue that the critical issue is not whether a particular characteristic is due to either heredity or environment but, rather, what proportion of the characteristic is due to each factor, he does promote the observation that the environmental influence is much smaller than the genetic influence:

To be more specific, all major facts are comprehended quite well by the hypothesis that somewhere between one-half and three-fourths of the average IQ difference... is attributable to genetic factors and the remainder to environmental factors and their interactions with the genetic differences (1969:116).

This is in sharp contrast with Kamin's (1974) argument that heredity has zero effects on intelligence.

On the other hand, the environmentalist position refutes the hereditarian argument by proposing that intelligence is the result of cumulative interactions with the social and/or cultural environment. The environment is equated with social class (for example, audience membership), with intellectual performance becoming a reflection of one's social class membership. The connotation of intelligence then changes from one in which it is the product of internal characteristics (genetic) to one in which it reflects how well one internalizes external characteristics (audience variables). Thus, differences in intelligence test results are not the result of genetic factors but of social class. For instance, by assuming that success or failure in school is an individual responsibility, one largely dictated by level of intelligence, the hereditarian position diffuses the role of class identity. However, the environmentalist position acknowledges the importance of class membership in the allocation of social roles and success, so that opportunity is not a reflection of individual ability but of opportunity accorded to one's class membership.

In summary then, the hereditarian position argues that differences in intelligence are the result of genetic factors, whereas the environmentalist argues that such differences are the result of restricted exposure to mainstream sociocultural elements associated with the expression of intelligence (Sanday, 1972; Loehlin, et al., 1975; Scarr-Salapatek, 1971a, 1971b). Interpreting this in another manner, where the
hereditarian position argues that homogeneity in measured intelligence for any one group of persons is the product of inbreeding, the environment-alist position argues that such homogeneity simply reflects the group's existence in an environment uniform in those components important in the measurement of intelligence.

The Political Dimension

Some writers (Carnoy, 1974; Bowles & Gintis, 1976) have argued that the ideology of individual differences underlying the early beginnings of the intelligence test is a useful political device for attaining some level of social control in educational areas. Since, from the beginning, intelligence test results were assumed to be an objective reflection of a person's "own limitations," responsibility for individual productivity was placed upon the person and away from the structure and organization of the economy. This general recognition of the intelligence test aided in the development of a political and educational climate that made possible the institutionalization of a meritocracy designed to ensure that only those with the "correct" characteristics got the highest positions in society. To enhance the idea of a meritocracy, the social climate of America presented itself as "... the land of opportunity, where the best excelled and the inferior found themselves in the lowest status (and paid) occupation" (Carnoy, 1974:253).

From an everyday level of political understanding, the hereditarian position strengthens society's rationale for the maintenance of structured social inequality. The hereditarian position that differences in intelligence are largely the result of genetic factors implies that some types
of people will be more intelligent than others and provides some support for the old belief that "... social classes sort themselves out on the basis of innate individual capacity to cope successfully in the social environment" (Bowles & Gintis, 1976:118). For example, the observation that racial and ethnic minorities are overly represented in environments limited in educational and occupational opportunity, or in social classes low in prestige and social power, is too often used by the hereditarian to argue that minority-group members are in these situations because they lack the intellectual ability to function in another area of social life. Thus, the hereditarian position would have one believe that social inequality is related to intelligence—low levels of social status are associated with a low degree of intelligence, while high levels of social status are associated with a high level of intelligence.

In contrast to the hereditarian position, the environmentalist's contention that differences in intelligence are the result of social class membership implies that knowledge is socially determined. Assuming that intelligence tests are reliable measures of knowledge, and that social classes are hierarchically organized, the differences in intelligence imply that all types of knowledge, or knowledge as the product of social class, do not have equal validity. Differences in intelligence, then, are going to be reflective of the unequal relationships people occupy in the social and cultural institutions (Hodges, 1976). It has been suggested (Rose & Rose, 1978) that the differential performance of social groups on intelligence tests is merely the consequence of designing a test that reflects social expectations in a class-stratified educational system.
From a political point of view then, the environmental position challenges the assumption that a true meritocracy exists in America where selection is based solely on merit and ability is rewarded. By arguing that selection is largely the result of cultural background, personal contacts, favoritism, and so on, the environmentalist position describes selection as a process whereby "... some with ability get substantial rewards, while many with equal ability are left in the dust, and others with less ability may on numerous occasions attain even higher rewards" (Miller & Ratner, 1972:13).

**Educational Implications**
What implications does each of these positions have for education? On the one hand, the hereditarian argument implies that an understanding of the way hereditary factors influence intelligence is a prerequisite to developing educational programs for children with low scores on intelligence tests. For instance, Eysenck (1971:42) maintains that a high level of intelligence is essential for academic success and that it is unreasonable to disregard the importance of this fact:

> It makes no sense to reject the very notion of such abilities as being important...and at the same time demand access to institutions closely geared to the view that such abilities are absolutely fundamental to successful study.

Accordingly, Herrnstein (1973) describes a "hereditary meritocracy" as one where social stratification is based on innate differences, and where education is instrumental in maintaining a caste society in which intelligence, and its corresponding level of social advantage, is transmitted from one generation to the next. Consequently, mobility within
the educational system becomes a reflection of mobility in the social
stratification system:

... schooling has contributed to the reproduction of the
social relations of production largely through the corre-
spondence between school and class structure (Bowles & Gintis,
1976:130).

On the other hand, the environmentalist position that educational
systems differentiate children on class-associated information implies
that education is a legitimating agency for social hierarchies. The
educational system is portrayed as the agency primarily responsible for
socializing persons to perceive socioeconomic structures as objectively
selecting persons for high status occupations and incomes on the basis of
school performance. For example, the environmentalist position maintains
that the knowledge and experiences of the lower classes, and those of
the middle and upper classes, are so disparate that for lower-class
children to succeed in school they must be exposed to a vast program of
cultural remediation. However, success in school activity is not so much
the goal as is the incorporation of children into an environment of
middle-class institutions (Carnoy 1974:233-269). In the end, education
is simply an instrument for the maintenance of middle-class culture.

EQUALITY IN EDUCATION

From its very beginning, American public education was conceptualized
as a political activity responsible for building and maintaining a
democratic republic (Cremin, 1976). Maintenance of a democratic republic
was to be accomplished through the public schools by socializing children
to the practical meaning of social equality in the form of a free and
public education. Equality of educational opportunity thus came to acquire the following characteristics (Coleman, 1966; Clark, 1976):

a. provision of a free education up to a level that constituted the principal entry point into the labor force,

b. development of and instruction in a common curriculum for all children,

c. providing equality within a given locality, since local taxes provided the source of support for schools.

What implications, then, can we draw from the hereditarian and environmentalist position regarding equality in education?

The principal argument for the hereditarian position that intelligence is dependent on genetic factors implies that people are not born equal and the attempts of educational programs to make people equal are futile. The most educational programs can do is ensure that people will equalize their respective levels of social inequality. At the social system level, equality will be present only if clear-cut patterns of differential opportunity structures, segmented by audience membership, are maintained by the educational system. The role of equality in education is best described for the hereditarian position by Herrnstein (1973:64) as the promotion of an egalitarian society based on inborn traits:

---

11 No attempt to summarize the literature in the area of equal educational opportunity will be attempted. To do so would lead us away from our principal topic. The interested reader, however, is referred to the following sources in the area: Coleman et al. (1966, 1975), Mosteller & Moynihan (1972), Feinberg (1975), Clark (1976), Shanks (1970), Thurow (1972), Sorenson (1971), Kurland (1968), Yudof (1973), Blake (1973), Carlson (1972), Cordasco (1973a, 1973b), Glickstein (1977), Benson (1977), Brown (1976), Francis (1977), Levin (1975), Campbell (1973), and Raggatt (1976).
Greater wealth, health, freedom, fairness and educational opportunity are not going to give us the egalitarian society for our philosophical heritage. It will instead give us a society sharply graduated, with ever greater innate separation between the top and bottom, and ever more semiformity within families as far as inherited abilities are concerned.

In comparison, the principal argument in the environmentalist position, that education is a reflection of class differences, implies that equality in education can only occur by means of a vast program of compensation requiring all persons to experience the best and most successful educational and social conditions; that is, a program of compensation that would alter the configuration of institutions that debases the self-concept and group identity of lower-class individuals (Baratz & Baratz, 1970; Havighurst, 1970; Coleman, 1966). There would, therefore, be no change in the social organization of people and things but a restructuring of that configuration of institutions that is least likely to change.

Both the hereditarian and environmentalist positions raise questions concerning the relative cost in attaining equality. The hereditarian position would have us believe that equality cannot be achieved, and that the most one can do is to optimize one’s level of inequality. By comparison, the environmentalist position promotes equality only to the degree that lower-class members admit that their social environment is inferior, and that they are willing to adopt middle-class norms (Clark & Plotkin, 1972; Kelly & McConnochie, 1974). While it is clear that the hereditarian position places greater responsibility on the person for his level of inequality, the environmentalist position employs the aggregation
of personal inequality by social group to support structured levels of social inequality.

**CHICANOS AND INTELLIGENCE TESTS**

Since the relation between education, society, and Chicanos appears to be one of social accommodation rather than one directed at social reform, the question arises, "Where do Chicanos stand in the intelligence test area?"

An investigation of this question may well serve as a guide for unraveling the various kinds of educational and occupational opportunities that would make for equal opportunity for the Chicano population. Such an investigation may also provide some insight regarding the frustration experienced by Chicanos when thinking about the American dream:

> When the Mexican American in the Southwest complains about having nightmares instead of the American dream, he's usually told: "Education is the answer, amigo. Get an education and your problems will be solved" (Salazar, 1970:53).

As early as the 1920s it was generally argued that when Chicanos were compared with their Anglo counterparts in the same school grade, they would be shown to be about 14 months behind in normal mental development (Sheldon, 1924). In a 1928 study by Garretson, it is reported that "... the native capacity, if we assume that intelligence quotients are indicative of native capacity, of the Mexican pupil is less than that of the American child" (p. 38). Similarly, in a 1932 study of school achievement for grades 2 through 8 in the Lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas, it was reported that the intelligence of Chicano school children was, on the average, one year below the average intelligence level of Anglo school children for the same age and grade (Manuel & Hughes,
1932). Much more recently, in the now famous study of equal educational opportunity by James Coleman (1966), it is reported that not only are the mental abilities of Chicano children below those of white children, but that the difference grows larger as the children grow older and move through school grades.\textsuperscript{12}

Were one to do a decade-by-decade review of the literature discussing Chicanos and intelligence testing, such as the one presented by Padilla (1979), one could make the observation that mean group differences in intelligence test results for Chicanos and Anglos have been used to imply that the average level of intelligence in the Chicano population is significantly below that in the Anglo population. Despite the very early criticism of such studies and their interpretations by Sanchez (1932a, 1932b, 1934), regarding their failure to control for cultural and demographic differences, we still find that group mean differences in intelligence test results for Chicanos and Anglos are assumed to reflect innate characteristics in each group. From a social policy perspective, what is important about studies focusing on group mean differences is that they become a vehicle for the reinforcement of the hierarchical arrangement of Chicano and Anglo school children.

\textbf{Approaches to the Problem}

Various approaches have been employed for the testing of the Chicano child's intellectual ability. A rather standard approach has been to

\textsuperscript{12}Possibly the most extensive and elaborate review of this literature can be found in Padilla & Ruiz (1973:65-94). Also see: Hernandez (1973), Sanchez (1932), TenHouten et al. (1971), Cauce et al. (1976), Samuda (1973, 1975).

Another approach employed attempts to control for the intervening influence of linguistic background by comparing the performance of Chicano children on the English and Spanish versions of the same intelligence test. Results from studies employing this approach generally show that Chicano school children attain higher scores on the Spanish than on the English version of the test (Zirkel, 1972; Mitchell, 1937; Mahakian, 1939; Gimon, et al., 1975). Some research has even shown that Chicano children who have been placed in classrooms for the educable mentally retarded obtain higher scores on the Spanish version than on the English version of the test (Chandler & Plakos, 1969, 1970), with many of these children also performing above the cutoff point for special class placement (Mercer, 1970, 1971, 1972, 1977).

A third approach compares the results obtained on verbal and nonverbal intelligence tests. In an early study using this approach, Shotwell (1945) compared the performance of Mexican and American "mental defectives" on verbal (Stanford-Binet) and nonverbal (Arthur Performance Scale)

---

13 For critical studies of this approach see the following: Palmer & Gaffney (1972), Keston & Jimenez (1954), Swanson & DeBlassie (1971), Thomas (1977).
tests of intelligence. Both groups scored higher on the nonverbal test, with the Mexican group mean being 22 points higher than the American group mean. Shotwell (1945:448) explained the higher Mexican group mean by stating: "It may be that Mexicans of moron or borderline grade of intelligence have a special aptness along manual lines that is not found in Americans who are similarly retarded mentally." In general, results from studies employing this approach show that Chicano school children perform significantly better on nonverbal than on verbal measures of intelligence (Mercer & Smith, 1972; Christiansen & Livermore, 1970; Silverstein, et al., 1962; Philippus, 1967).

Some Implicit Assumptions

Before undertaking the "scientific" description and explanation of social phenomena, assumptions must be made about the nature of what is to be described and explained (Bandura, 1974; Belth, 1977). These initial assumptions are necessary for structuring the explanation of social phenomena in everyday language. The resultant structures of explanation, in turn, reflect the general patterns of everyday life. One may observe then that the explanation is a constant, but the interpretation of the explanation is what changes.

Regarding the administration of intelligence tests to Chicano children, two blanket assumptions are fundamental. On the one hand, it is assumed that the examiner is properly trained to administer the test regardless of the characteristics of the test takers (Newland, 1973; Robertson, 1980). However, Zirkel (1972) has suggested that special training is required for administering intelligence tests to
linguistically different learners. Bordie (1970) and Thomas et al. (1971) have shown that the test performance of Spanish-speaking children is affected by such examiner variables as level of bilingualism, ethnic group membership, and style of test administration. The findings of Phillips (1966) and Mycue (1968), and the review of effects of experimenter race by Sattler (1970), show that Anglo examiners tend to arouse anxiety in minority-group children, which impairs their performance on tests. Empirical evidence, therefore, does show that examiners are not totally neutral in the testing situation. The implicit assumption of examiner qualifications does not appear to hold, then, and the whole activity of testing the intelligence of Chicano children becomes questionable.

On the other hand, it is generally assumed that the subjects being tested have had exposure to comparable acculturation. For the Chicanos, intelligence tests are assumed to be culturally fair. In a 1972 study, Mercer set out to examine the reflection of middle-class achievement values in intelligence testing instruments by comparing the scores of Anglo and Chicano children, with the latter group being controlled on selected class and ethnic variables. Results of the study showed that: (a) the standard intelligence test was more predictive of behavioral skills for Anglos than for Chicanos, and (b) Chicano children whose families were least like the average Anglo family scored lowest on the intelligence test. Mercer's results, thus, do illustrate that intelligence tests are not culturally fair, and that results reflect one's level of acculturation to Anglo society.
The nonoperability of these two general assumptions when testing the intellectual ability of Chicanos implies that intelligence testing is an activity no longer grounded in rules employed when generalizing social phenomena. For instance, social phenomena are the same, or their referents are the same, if they satisfy all their underlying assumptions, explicit and implicit. Should any assumption not be satisfied, then one would not be referring to the same phenomenon. We are not excluding the issue of similarity where a phenomenon might satisfy some of the assumptions in the generalizing of social phenomena. As such, it would have something in common with other phenomena with the same underlying assumptions, but it would not be the same.

If both Chicanos and Anglos satisfied the same body of assumptions employed in the conceptualization of intelligence, then its measurement would be a description of the same phenomenon for both groups. However, one group's inability to satisfy the body of assumptions would mean that the same phenomenon is not being measured across groups. We could say though, as is currently done, that we are measuring a similar attribute of the phenomenon. However, the difference in meaning between sameness and similarity causes either a loss for one group (low test result) or a gain by the other group (high test scores). Ironically, the lack of difference in intelligence test results for Chicanos and Anglos would not necessarily imply that one is operationally measuring the same phenomenon across groups.

**Alternative Approaches**

Current instruments for measuring intellectual ability have been criticized as inadequate for testing Chicanos because they do not sample from the
Chicano's linguistic and cultural experiences (Padilla & Garza, 1975). For instance, Smith (1974) has presented evidence that illustrates the nature of cultural bins in the Binet tests, and Mercer (1971), as already reviewed, has demonstrated the Anglo-centricity in standard measures of intellectual ability.

One factor contributing to the low intelligence test scores of Chicanos is language (Sanchez, 1934a; Vasquez, 1972; Gonzalez, 1974; Rincon, 1976; Cervantes, 1974; Angelis, 1977; Oller, 1977). To counter the intervening effects of language, standard measures of intellectual ability have either been translated into Spanish or the dialectical version of Spanish most familiar to the person being tested (Oliveira, 1972; Thomas, 1977; Levandowski, 1975). However, instead of creating a more equitable relationship between the Chicano and the measuring instrument, translated instruments have created a problem. For the most part, the root of the problem is that there has been more concern about facilitating the testing of Chicano children than on making the test more comprehensible to them. As a result, translated instruments are often filled with equivalent words that have different connotations for the child.

Despite the great lengths taken by intelligence researchers to eliminate further linguistic biases in intelligence measures, such biases will probably not be removed for at least two fundamental reasons. First, despite translation, test content will continue to be culture-bound in that test items will refer to concepts or life experiences in Anglo society. Second, while Chicanos may be familiar with some of those concepts or life experiences, they may not understand them in the context
of the test. (Garcia, 1972; Olmedo, 1977). For reasons such as these, some researchers believe that the development of a culture-fair intelligence test is extremely unlikely (Arvey, 1972).

Another factor contributing to the poor performance of Chicano children on intelligence tests is the sociocultural difference between Chicano and Anglo lifestyles. In an attempt to control for the intervening influence of this factor, Mercer (1976) has proposed a pluralistic approach in the evaluation of Chicano children based on the observation that sociocultural factors account for 30 percent of the variance in intelligence-test results among Chicanos when compared with Anglos. In brief, Mercer's approach views and compares each individual within his own sociocultural environment. Each individual is grouped by sociocultural environment on the basis of his family's characteristics along five dimensions:

a. Head of household has a white-collar job.

b. Family consists of five or fewer members.

c. Head of household is in a skilled or higher occupation.

d. Head of household was reared in an urban environment.

e. Head of household was reared in the United States.

Results from Mercer's work show that the more of these five sociocultural factors a Chicano possesses, the closer will be his or her approximation to Anglo society, and the higher will be his or her score on intelligence test measures.
EDUCATIONAL OVERVIEW

In the context of contemporary educational thinking, the measured difference in intelligence between the Chicano and Anglo child has come to mean that Chicanos perform poorly on measures used to predict academic success, and, therefore, they should be offered educational and occupational opportunities of less complexity, less abstraction, and that demand less intelligence. This line of educational thinking greatly restricts the Chicano's enjoyment of the benefits American society offers by narrowing their experiences of the larger world (Anderson, 1975).

As tools in an applied educational context, intelligence test results are interpreted to be objective measurements useful for the classification of students into high- and low-ability groups (Schafer, et al., 1970). This permits educators to justify the system of tracking students by arguing that the more academically able students should not be slowed down in their progress by the less academically able, and that the less bright will be more comfortable, and have greater self-esteem, in a group of children with similar abilities (Kirp, 1973; Sorgen, 1973; Comer, 1972; Beckwith, 1973).

The observation that the Chicanos' measured level of intelligence is below that of the general Anglo community has resulted in a restriction of educational opportunity by placing them in academic areas designed to limit academic growth and achievement. Perhaps the most serious and recognized restriction in the Chicanos' educational experience is due to
the fact that intelligence test results have been quite instrumental in
the overclassification of Chicano children as mentally retarded (Casas, 
1974). For example, Mercer (1971) has shown that in California, the
number of Chicanos enrolled in classes for the mentally retarded is
disproportionate to their numbers in the state population. Similarly,
six years later, a report prepared by the California Advisory Committee
to the United States Commission on Civil Rights (1977) reports that
Chicanos continue to be grossly overrepresented in classes for the
mentally retarded.

This brief look at the role intelligence test results play in the
classification of students has raised some suggestions regarding the
harmful effects of classification systems on the Chicano community. For
it is not just a simple observation that Chicanos are overrepresented in
classes for the mentally retarded, but a very complex social fact when
one considers how such a classification lowers self-esteem. From an
ideological perspective, this perpetuates and strengthens the Chicano's
feeling of being resigned to his fate in an Anglo society and reinforces
stereotypes held of him by the Anglo population.

Inequality and the Chicano

Regardless of difference in opinion about the causes of group variation
on intelligence tests, the fact remains that average test results for
the Chicano population are well below those of the Anglo population.
For this reason, members of the Chicano population have a much smaller
range of educational activity to choose from. In other words, they are
much more likely to be tracked into less achievement-oriented activities
than Anglos. This issue becomes even more important when one considers that the prevailing policy attitude toward Chicanos is one of non-concern:

We did not conquer most of the Mexican Americans. They came as immigrants, and why they should be "protected" more than other minorities is an interesting question (Glazer, 1978:74).

The question we can now ask is, "What role do intelligence test score results play, as part of an educational ideology, in the Chicano community's equality of life?" There are at least two possible answers. One is based on the observation that intelligence is a major determinant of the benefits a person is able to reap in society. For Chicanos, this implies that they are limited in the number or quality of benefits they derive from American society because, on the average, they are intellectually inferior.

The second possible answer rests upon the observation that group differences in intelligence test scores are a major justification for existing inequality (Jencks, 1980). Implicit in this observation is the social fact that the benefits of American society and the unequal distribution of income, jobs, power, prestige, and other benefits, are only justified but not caused by differences in intelligence. For Chicanos, this implies that they are not able to enjoy many of the benefits American society offers because they occupy social positions in environments characterized by low levels of prestige and power. However, their social condition is justified because it is interpreted to be a reflection of a low level of measured knowledge. Consequently, their
restricted enjoyment of American social benefits is justified by the attitude that they would not know how to enjoy more of those benefits.

When assessing any answer to the question of what role intelligence test results play in the maintenance of inequality, there are certain elements in the relationship between measured intelligence and school performance, and performance on the job, that cannot be denied. For example, intelligence test scores are said to be correlated with (a) occupational status and training time required to achieve certain skill levels (Legal, 1968; Cronbach, 1970; Ghiselli, 1966), (b) personality factors important for competing successfully in our society (Bowles & Nelson, 1974), and (c) grades in school (Goldman & Hewitt, 1975; Goldman & Widawski, 1976).

The difficulty, however, in accepting this relationship as a social fact is that it not only implies that intelligence test scores are related to performance in school and on the job, but that people are also selected for progressively higher levels of education and occupation on the basis of intelligence level. If it is true that intelligence test scores are a major factor in selecting people for higher levels of education, jobs, and social rewards, then it would be appropriate to say that Chicanos are restricted in their share of the benefits American society offers because they do not have the necessary level of intelligence; that is, because their knowledge of the specific structures directly related to educational attainment, and which promote equality in the Anglo-American consciousness, is limited (Berger, 1978).
The rather simple observation, however, that intelligence test scores and performance in school and at work, are closely associated has too often prompted intelligence test experts to conclude that the benefits of education and occupation are distributed on the basis of intelligence. This is clearly a questionable conclusion, and there is some evidence to suggest that it is false. For example, Bowles & Gintis (1976) demonstrate quite effectively that one's socioeconomic origin has a closer association with economic and occupational success than level of intelligence.

Similarly, studies of the educational decision-making process by which students are channeled into different types of academic programs show that a number of factors, such as the student's personal desires and aspirations, teachers' advice, grades, parental pressures, intelligence test scores, achievement test scores, and counselor assessments of academic ability, affect such educational decisions (Kirp, 1973; Schafer, et al., 1970; Gintis, 1972; Cicourel & Kitsuse, 1963). Other work within this general area has repeatedly demonstrated that whatever the precise factors figuring into decisions of this sort, the outcomes break down along social class and racial lines regardless of measured individual abilities (intelligence test scores and achievement test scores) (Levin, 1975; Tyack, 1976; Neelsen, 1975; Sewell, 1971; Carlssen, 1969). This type of evidence suggests that students are given different types of educational opportunities on the basis of racial and social class attributes and not so much because they have different levels of intelligence (Equality, 1969; Appleton, 1973).

More doubt is cast upon the observation that social benefits are distributed on the basis of intelligence when one examines the growing
body of literature that focuses on the relations between social class, intelligence, educational achievement, and occupational success. In a well known study, Jencks (1972) concludes that chance factors such as knowing the right people, or being in the right place at the right time, are more important in determining occupational success than is education. Also, Berg (1970) demonstrates that while increasingly higher levels of education are required to obtain many well-paying jobs, such levels of education are largely irrelevant when it comes to performing the job. Finally, Bowles & Gintis (1973) argue that while success tends to run in families, it does not do so because of any genetic inheritance of intelligence.

CONCLUSION

The association between quality of life and level of intelligence can be summarized as an Orwellian dictum: Intelligence is an attribute equally distributed among individuals, as are the social benefits American society has to offer. However, intelligence is an attribute more equally distributed among some than others, and consequently, some enjoy more social benefits than others. If Chicanos are shown to perform below normal expectations on measures of intelligence, and performance on such measures is closely associated with the quality of life one may enjoy, then Chicanos will be restricted in the enjoyment of those benefits American society has to offer. For Chicanos then, intelligence testing becomes both a political and social problem. By being instrumental in restricting their enjoyment of social benefits, it reinforces the popular social image that Chicanos are incapable of participating in and enjoying those social benefits (Aguirre, 1979).
Clearly, one of the restricted social benefits is the enjoyment of educational opportunity and attainment. Ideally, all Americans are assured of an equal opportunity to obtain as much education as possible. However, because intelligence tests have come to play a significant role in the ideology of educational opportunity, this ideal breaks down for Chicanos since they do not attain the same educational levels as those of the Anglo population (Olivas, 1979; Brown, et al., 1980). Consequently, this inequality of educational opportunity and attainment is largely perceived to be a reflection of the group's inability to further their education.

Regarding the Chicano's quality of life, one is led to believe that the role of intelligence testing is an ideological one. From our perspective, the ideology of intelligence testing is not just an explanation whose principal aim is to distort reality, but it is also the principal, and perhaps the only, explanation that justifies existing patterns of social conduct for the sake of their maintenance. As we have tried to demonstrate, the evidence concerning intelligence testing and this distribution of social benefits clearly show that differences in educational and occupational success in our society result more from social class and racial forces than from any attempts to promote equal opportunity on the basis of measured intelligence levels.

In brief, the ideology of intelligence testing, and the correspondent ideology of equal educational opportunity, are instrumental in justifying and maintaining current patterns of inequality by suggesting that Chicanos, and other who do not have an equal share of the American pie, are simply
not intelligent enough to secure such a share. Thus, attention is diverted away from the discriminatory practices, rooted in social class and ethnic forces, that remain the real causes of Chicano inequality and the limiting factors in their quality of life.
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Chicanos have been limited in their educational opportunities, as evidenced by their underrepresentation in occupations and professions requiring extended education. It is proposed that intelligence testing is one part of an educational ideology that ascribes the Chicano's unequal educational existence to the group's inability to function competently within the Anglo-American institutional environment.

This paper discusses intelligence testing as an educational activity, its implicit assumptions, and the educational and social policy implications of intelligence testing for Chicanos. The hereditarian and environmentalist positions are described.
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