INTRODUCTION

Beginning with the seminal work of Robert Park (1950), there have been numerous efforts to develop sociological theories to classify and explain the variations in ethnic (and racial) inequality over time and space. Yet it is apparent even to the novice that there is no single paradigm that dominates the field. Research findings accumulate, but rarely lead to systematic and cumulative empirical generalizations about the nature and evolution of interethnic relations. There is a wide range of theoretical propositions in the field of race and ethnic relations (Blalock, 1967). Yet few are integrated with larger theory or uniform methods of empirical research. To the extent that schools of research exist, they tend to focus upon common sources of data and analytical methods (historical, attitude surveys, etc.). In this paper, I review the development of a school of
research that may be emerging as a paradigm for studies of ethnic inequality. I suggest that extensions of what might be called the "models of ethnic stratification" school can provide a broad analytic framework that allows for testing some of the classical theoretical questions of changes and variations in systems of ethnic inequality. Before reviewing the development and directions of this emerging school, I will briefly note some of the critical limitations of earlier perspectives.

The well-known race relations cycle of Robert Park (later developed and elaborated by Frazier, 1957) was based on a universal sequence of stages of interethnic relations, beginning with contact, leading to competition, followed by a period of stable accommodation, and eventuating in a process of assimilation. Park's bold formulation of a natural history of ethnic relations was probably the closest approximation to a paradigm of sociological research on race and ethnic relations. It spawned a series of studies by Park's students and others to fit the theory to the empirical world. But the fit was poor in most cases, and a number of conceptual problems regarding the identification of stages and the transitions between stages led to impasse in further research (Lyman, 1968; for an alternative assessment, see Geschwender, 1978: Chapter 2).

Other sociologists, most notably Barth and Noel (1972), Lieberson (1961), Noel (1968), Schermerhorn (1970), Shibutani and Kwan (1965), and van den Berghe (1967) have put forth theories, most generally in the form of typologies, to order the field of race and ethnic relations. But it seems fairly clear that none of these theoretical perspectives have become paradigms in the sense of leading a dominant research tradition. The obstacles to cumulative research based on these alternative perspectives have been the difficulties of operationalizing basic concepts and of finding appropriate data to test emergent hypotheses. In general, the basic relationships in these different theories are expressed in fairly abstract terms and are then illustrated with examples from a few societies. What is to be explained—interethnic stratification, political or economic dominance, assimilation or lack of it—varies considerably between and within theoretical perspectives, and it is often assumed that these quite different dimensions all co-vary together.

The basic kernel of most macro-sociological theories of ethnic inequality is that the type and organization of society shape the structure of ethnic relations. And as societies are transformed in various ways, ethnic relations are posited to change or evolve in certain directions. Other factors such as the relative size of majority and minority groups, the nature of the encounter (migration, conquest), and initial distribution of
power (military, economic) are additional contingencies that affect the outcome. How to put all these ideas into a systematic framework to guide research is the awesome task. First of all, the lack of comparable data for historical-comparative research is enough to deter all but the most gifted or foolhardy investigators. Moreover, what are the dimensions or characteristics of societies that might shape ethnic structures? Is it industrialization, the type of polity, who owns the means of production, Western tradition or racism that is the key to the puzzle? These are some of the central variables in the varied theories of race and ethnic relations. At the present time it seems that no consensus has emerged and the field remains eclectic in its orientation.

Premature closure of the widely varied research on race and ethnic relations into a common framework may not be universally regarded as a positive achievement. Diversity has its uses, especially in the search for an understanding of the nature and causes of social phenomena. But there are real gains to be had from cumulative science as well. Within a broad paradigm of research that encompasses elements of theory and a framework for empirical inquiry, it is possible to take many aspects of the research endeavor for granted and to concentrate on replications and extensions of empirical investigation. It is not necessary for each scientist to develop a new theory or strategy for research, but rather there is an emphasis on elaboration of the underlying theory and critical empirical tests of emergent hypotheses. It is the thesis of this paper that research in the field of race and ethnic relations has, over the past decade, begun to gravitate around a perspective, labeled here as "models of ethnic stratification." This "emergent paradigm" has yet to become dominant, but the basic perspective has been widely diffused, and it seems appropriate to take stock of its background, emergence, and potential for cumulative research in the field.

"Models of ethnic stratification" are not really theories in the mold of linking social structure and ethnic relations, as did those cited in the opening paragraphs of this paper. Indeed the framework has been exceedingly narrow, basically measuring and interpreting interethnic socioeconomic inequality, typically in terms of income, occupation, and education. The interpretation is founded on causal models, estimated with multivariate regression techniques, that measure how social background characteristics affect differential socioeconomic achievement. While most of the research to date has not spoken to the broad issues raised by the classical theories, there are clear signs that the widening scope of empirical studies using the basic model of ethnic inequality is leading in
directions that address some of the broader questions of the linkages between social change, social organization, and ethnic inequality. These topics will be addressed in the following review of models of ethnic inequality.

**PRE-MODEL FORMULATIONS**

It has always been tempting to interpret measures of ethnic inequality as indicators of discrimination, the degree to which members of disadvantaged groups are confined to a subordinate position solely on the basis of their ascribed status—race or ethnicity. Yet apologists for the existing social order could simply argue that ethnic disparities were due to differences on other criteria that determined socioeconomic success such as education, mental ability, or minority concentrations in depressed geographic areas. Thus, there was (and remains) a great scientific interest in measuring what fraction of ethnic inequality is due to discrimination. Perhaps the single most influential article along these lines was Siegel’s (1965). Using the standard statistical methods of controlling for population composition between two populations (Kitagawa, 1955), Siegel was able to estimate how much of the gross income differences between white and black men in the United States would remain if both races had exactly the same distributions by region of residence, education, and occupation. His results showed that most of black-white income inequality was not due to differences in occupation, education, or region, but something else—most likely discrimination. Siegel noted that differences in education, occupation, and region (the control variables) might also reflect discrimination. As a first step, his study presented a basic, though somewhat cumbersome, analytic framework for the interpretation of ethnic inequality.

Another pioneering study along these lines was Lieberson and Fuguitt’s (1966) application of Markov chain techniques to estimate the separate effects of social origins and social mobility on black-white occupational differences. By noting that differences in the distribution of black and white men by occupation can be algebraically separated into vectors of social origins (father’s occupation) and matrices of mobility (from father’s to son’s occupation), it is possible to hold one factor constant and vary the other. Lieberson and Fuguitt discovered that black-white occupational inequality would virtually disappear in a couple of generations if discrimination were to be eliminated (equivalent mobility matrices).² Clearly discrimination, indexed by unequal achievement among persons
with equivalent backgrounds, has long been the primary cause of racial inequality in American society.

The basic question of the differential effects of social background variables and the residual differences between ethnic groups due to discrimination can be more adequately addressed in a broader multivariate framework that formalizes both the implicit theory and the basic methods of investigation.

BASIC ETHNIC STRATIFICATION MODELS

The recent development of models within the field of social stratification can be dated from 1967 with the publication of Blau and Duncan's *The American Occupational Structure*. By transposing the question of social mobility into a multivariate analysis of the socioeconomic life cycle with the aid of statistical/theoretical technique of path analysis (Duncan, 1966), a new school of social research emerged. This new school could not do everything, and indeed, many of the classic questions of social stratification were beyond its purview. But the study of the impact of parental socioeconomic status upon son's socioeconomic position—the question of social mobility—was broadened and reinvigorated.

Perhaps the major contribution of the new stratification school was the possibility for the accumulation of knowledge via replication and extension of the basic models. The statistics of multiple regression allow for the incorporation of additional independent variables, but the rigor of path models required that the relationship of each new independent variable to all other variables be posited in advance and interpreted in a causal framework. Since the notion of the socioeconomic life cycle provides a temporal ordering of most variables, this was not a major obstacle. Duncan and his students were keenly aware of the possibilities for extension of the basic stratification model to include many other relevant variables (Duncan, Featherman, Duncan, 1972). These early studies included analyses of the factors accounting for inequality between blacks and whites (Blau and Duncan, 1967: Ch. 6; Duncan, 1969) and among other American ethnic groups (Duncan and Duncan, 1968). The application of models of the intergenerational process of stratification to ethnic inequality made for a more thorough investigation of the questions raised in the Siegel and Lieberson-Fuguitt analyses, yet also raised some new issues. This can be most clearly seen in the models and analysis presented in Duncan's (1969) classic article "Inheritance of Poverty or Inheritance of Race?.."

The path diagrams in Figure 1 show the basic model of the
Figure 1. Models of Stratification Among Black and White Men, Based upon 1962 Occupational Change in a Generation (OCG) Survey.

Source: Duncan, 1969, p. 90 (Figure 4-1).

Socioeconomic life cycle separately for black and white men based upon the 1962 Occupational Change in a Generation Survey data (see Duncan, 1969, for more detail). This schematic presentation of the results of multiple regression equations with coefficients in standardized form is designed to facilitate causal interpretation. Straight lines indicate uni-
directional causal lines, while curved lines represent unanalyzed joint associations between exogenous variables. What is immediately obvious from this form of presentation (that is not in the usual multiple regression analysis) is that outcome variables are dependent not only on direct (or net) effects from prior variables but also upon indirect effects that are mediated by intervening variables. Thus the "model" (it need not be of a path analysis type) uses the statistical techniques to test the causal/theoretical framework, not vice versa.

Since the intention here is exposition of an approach, not interpretation of substance, I will not elaborate extensively upon the content of Figure 1. Basically, it shows the relationships between socioeconomic background and socioeconomic attainment among black and white men. But it does not directly address the handicap of black men in the American stratification system. This requires combining the information on differential racial translation of background into attainment (standardized regression coefficients in Figure 1) with the racial differentials in socioeconomic background resources. Duncan ties these together in statistical "experiments" by controlling the racial inequality in various social background variables, such as father's occupation, etc., and observing the effects upon racial inequality in attainment (black means on background variables are entered into the regression equations for whites). He concludes that the major source of racial inequality is not the poorer social background or education of blacks, but the poorer rewards that society provides blacks with equivalent backgrounds and qualifications as whites. Thus it is not the "inheritance of poverty" that most limits the socioeconomic success of blacks, but the recurrent discrimination that each successive generation encounters (inheritance of race).

Duncan's clear exposition of how to "model" and interpret racial/ethnic differences in stratification has greatly influenced contemporary studies of this topic. But some observers have pointed out that the statistical decomposition of racial/ethnic inequality using regression techniques actually leads to more complexity than Duncan's neat interpretation suggests (Winsborough and Dickinson, 1971; Althauser and Wigler, 1972). Specifically, decomposition procedures can reveal at least four empirical factors: (1) inequality due to differences in social background, e.g., means on independent variables, (2) differences in slopes, the regressions of the dependent variables on the independent variables, (3) differences in the intercept values, whose value is constant over all categories of the independent variables (basically the residual term), and (4) statistical interactions between race and other relationships in the model. The problem is that these factors are not necessarily conceptually
or empirically distinct. Recall that the original objective underlying these basic investigations was to separate inequality into two interpretable factors: those due to discrimination, and those due to other factors. As noted earlier, differences in social background (composition in Siegel's work or means on independent variables in the regression models) may actually be due to the legacy of discrimination from earlier generations. But the other components are problematic in their interpretation as well.

While it might be useful to label intercept differences as discrimination that affects all members of the disadvantaged groups and differences in slopes as discrimination that varies in degree depending on the values on an independent variable, the empirical distinction between these terms in any equation is partially a function of the assignment of a zero value on the independent variable. The statistical "interaction" appears in the different component solutions, depending on which standard population is used in equations in the statistical experiments (Althauser and Wigler, 1972). In Duncan's analysis the interaction component is averaged into one or more of the other components. Winsborough and Dickinson (1971) show how to estimate it separately, but its interpretation remains opaque.

A statistically equivalent method of the basic model of ethnic inequality is to run ethnic/race categories as separate variables (as dummy variables in binary coding) in a single equation (Duncan and Duncan, 1968; Duncan and Featherman, 1972; Hirschman, 1975). The typical sequence of analytical steps in this procedure is somewhat different than in Duncan's example. A brief illustration of the series of basic equations in such an analysis might best convey the ideas and techniques that are part of the process of model building.

First, a basic equation with only the dependent variable regressed upon the categories of the ethnic variable is estimated:

\[ Y = a + b_{1}E \]  

where \( Y \) is an occupational attainment variable, measured in an interval scale and \( E \) represents a series of dummy variables, one for each category of the ethnic/race classification. The associated regression coefficients, represented by \( b_{1} \), would be the gross effects of ethnicity on occupational attainment. These coefficients can be adjusted to deviations from the grand mean of the dependent variable, and thus would be exactly the same as differences between the average occupational attainment of each ethnic group.3 This simple model is then expanded to include other background variables such as Father's Occupation, Father's Education, Number of Siblings, etc. For instance, consider the equation:

\[ Y = a + b_{1}E + b_{2}F + b_{3}A \]
where \( Y \) and \( E \) are the same as before, \( F \) is Father's Occupation, and \( A \) is the educational attainment of the respondent. The change in the ethnic effects \((b_i)\) from Model 1 to Model 2 is due to the differential distribution of the ethnic groups by Father's Occupation and Education. The resulting net ethnic coefficients in Model 2 are the effects not mediated by or associated with the two other variables. The form of the equation in Model 2 assumes additive relationships between Education and Father's Occupation and Occupational Attainment across ethnic groups.

To test the hypothesis of different slopes of occupation on education among the different ethnic communities, it is necessary to expand the basic model with additional interaction terms. This is shown in Model 3:

\[
Y = a + b_1E + b_2F + b_3A + b_4EA \tag{3}
\]

where all variables are as before and \( EA \) represents a series of dummy variables of each ethnic category times the education variable. If the variance explained by Model 3 is significantly greater than that of Model 2, one can interpret the \( b_4 \) coefficients as the impact of differential educational slopes on occupation, net of the additive educational variable.

Even with only a few independent variables, this sort of model building can quickly become very complicated in both the statistical models and in the interpretation of results. Yet the basic ideas that underlie such an approach remain rather straightforward. The underlying question is always the same: What social background characteristics explain the differential socioeconomic attainment of ethnic groups? Part of the effects of differential social background may represent the legacy of past discrimination while the unexplained residual differences are due to other factors—most likely discrimination in the socioeconomic achievement process. This approach can also be used to address whether differential socioeconomic attainments by ethnic communities are mediated by or uniquely due to social psychological variables such as ambition. The empirical assessments of this hypothesis in American society have not supported the widespread belief that differential cultural orientations across ethnic communities account for their varying degrees of socioeconomic success (Featherman, 1971; Duncan and Featherman, 1972).

**EXTENSIONS OF MODELS OF ETHNIC STRATIFICATION**

The models of ethnic stratification described above, however elaborate, do not address the core issues raised by some of grander theories of race
and ethnic relations. First, these models only address one aspect of ethnic relations—socioeconomic inequality. Moreover, these models only specify the relative impact of social background variables on inequality and provide indirect measures of specific forms of discrimination. The content of the grander theories specified (or attempted to specify) the societal conditions or social structure that gave rise to relationships between ethnicity and other variables and changes in these relationships. Of course, the lack of standardized methodology to accompany these theories has greatly inhibited their potential impact on cumulative empirical research. However, it is possible to extend the basic models with longitudinal and comparative data to address some aspects of the broader theoretical issues. I will outline the direction of these extensions, first considering models of changes in ethnic inequality over time, and second, the comparative analysis of social structure upon ethnic inequality.

Changes in Ethnic Stratification

In spite of the diminished position of Park’s original race relations cycle hypothesis, the eventual end-state of assimilation has remained a useful empirical expectation for trends of ethnic inequality. The hypothesis is that modernization and industrialization will gradually weaken the importance of ethnic, racial, and other ascriptive criteria, and lead to a stratification system with an emphasis on achieved characteristics. The logic of this hypothesis clearly rests on the assumption that industrial society has certain functional needs that can only be satisfied by rational decision making (for the classic exposition, see Kerr, Dunlop, Harbison, and Myers, 1964), and that discrimination on the basis of religion, language, and ethnicity are primordial sentiments which are counterproductive and will diminish over time. This hypothesis is implicit in the considerable literature on “structural assimilation” and “institutional disparity” (Taeuber and Taueber, 1965; Eisenstadt, 1953; Lieberson, 1963). Although not directly focused upon ethnic stratification, Treiman’s (1970) arguments in his summary of propositions dealing with the process of stratification during the course of industrialization clearly support the thesis that ethnicity and race, like all other ascriptive criteria, will become less important as determinants of socioeconomic achievement as economic development proceeds.

The “rise of ethnicity” including persistent racial and ethnic divisions in post-industrial societies has given pause to some of the more general assumptions of this school of thought—that industrialization will weaken the structure of ethnic inequality (see Glazer and Moynihan, 1970;
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Greeley, 1974). There is also a counter-literature that questions the general thesis on both theoretical and empirical grounds. Blumer (1965) strongly challenged the hypothesis that industrialization will necessarily lead to a reduction of racial/ethnic inequality or conflict. He contended it would be more likely that the structure of industrialization will adapt to the existing racial institutions and mores rather than the other way around. Other theoretical perspectives posit that social change leads to growing interethnic conflict and competition as traditional arrangements break down (van den Berghe, 1967). It is possible to argue that social change will bring both greater interethnic conflict and a weakening of the structures of ethnic inequality.

Another important challenge comes from Marxist critics who have formulated alternative theoretical perspectives that specify how ethnic divisions can be maintained and strengthened through the normal processes of uneven capitalist development. These critics have argued theoretically and demonstrated empirically that ethnic and racial inequality can be long maintained and even institutionalized in industrial-capitalist societies via structures of regional inequality and segmented labor markets (Bonacich, 1972, 1976; Hechter, 1971, 1974). These ideas seem sure to inspire considerable empirical research in the coming years.

At present the debate over the consequences of industrialization on ethnic inequality is pretty much of a standoff. A plausible theoretical case can be made for either interpretation, and selective evidence can be brought to bear in support of both sides. While it would be premature to suggest that this debate over the effects of social change on ethnic stratification can be resolved with the models described in the previous section, it is clearly possible to measure trends in ethnic stratification systems. For instance, to the extent that the net effects of ethnicity (an indicator of discrimination) on socioeconomic status decrease over time, one might argue that the system is becoming "blind" with respect to ethnic status—thus supporting the industrialization thesis. Or if the differential slopes of occupation on education across ethnic communities persist undiminished, then one might question the convergence or assimilation hypothesis.

The fundamental prerequisite for such assessments of changes in ethnic stratification (or any study of social change) is comparable data for two or more time points. A significant study in this regard has been Featherman and Hauser's (1976) analysis of changes in racial stratification in the United States from 1962 to 1973. With the aid of replicated survey data, they examined the socioeconomic origins and attainments of blacks and
whites of successive cohorts, holding age constant. They found modest
evidence in support of the industrialization thesis, with the process of
stratification among young black men becoming quite similar to that of
young white men in recent years. Convergence was still far from being
realized and changes were minimal among older age groups, but move-
ment in the hypothesized direction had clearly occurred. It can be antic-i-
ipated that work along these lines will expand and models will be refined
in the coming years. There is already a tremendous scientific and policy
interest in the trend in black-white inequality in the United States (Farley
and Hermalin, 1972; Farley, 1977), and the growing availability of com-
parable time-series data will certainly spark creative attempts to formally
"model" the dynamics of ethnic change (Winsborough, 1975; Mason,
Taeuber, and Winsborough, 1977).

Even if these longitudinal models succeed in documenting changes (or
nonchange) in ethnic stratification systems over time in the United States
or other societies, we will still be left with uncertainty over the reasons for
the change. It may be possible to rule out some explanations, by noting
the relative impact of various variables in the models. For instance,
changes in the composition of social origins of ethnic/racial groups does
not require any reference to societal changes that affected the education-
occupation-income relationships of adults in the population. But if dis-
rimination (intercepts and slopes) seems to have lessened its impact,
there are a wide variety of competing explanations—a tightening labor
market, government policies to restrict discrimination, or the growth of
jobs in new sectors. Clearly, the links between social structure and ethnic
stratification can only be indirectly examined through trend analysis. But
there are ways to build models with explicit links between social structure
and ethnic inequality.

Comparative Models of Ethnic Stratification

The plea for comparative research is one of the frequent, but neglected
tasks within sociology, and in the social sciences generally. The basic
requirement for comparative research is comparable data from different
societies or communities. For researchers who work within a quantitative
research orientation, as exemplified in the model construction strategy,
this requirement is almost never satisfied. Even in rare cases, when com-
parative quantitative analysis is attempted, the comparisons are limited to
a small number of cases, two, three, or four societies. Since different
patterns in two countries may result from an almost infinite variety of
other societal differences, explanations are always speculative. The situa-
tion is much like that of trend analysis, where differences can be described, some explanations can be ruled out, but conclusive explanations (linkages of social structure to patterns of ethnic stratification) remain rare.

However, a within nation approach to comparative analysis, using models of ethnic stratification, is possible with the dissemination of massive data files, such as large samples from national censuses. Such large data files make it possible to divide the population into a number of meaningful geographical areas that vary along structural characteristics that may affect the process of socioeconomic attainment among ethnic communities.

The rationale for this form of comparative analysis is rooted in the logic of sociological reasoning. While individual outcomes such as socioeconomic achievement are partially the function of individual characteristics, there are likely to be major influences from the institutional framework of the society or community as well. In fact, much of the interpretation of relationships in the basic models are couched in terms of how individual characteristics are evaluated by the social institutions in society. For instance, the differential effect of social background on achievement between ethnic groups is usually interpreted as institutional discrimination (by employers, supervisors, and other gate keepers). If social processes such as discrimination vary among communities, comparative research can specify both the magnitude of variation and the structural characteristics associated with the degree of variation.

The implicit hypothesis in the comparative analysis of ethnic inequality is that some institutional structures foster more egalitarian stratification process, with less emphasis on color and ethnic identity. Patterns of ethnic discrimination are intertwined with processes of mobility into and through schools, employing institutions and other organizations that affect socioeconomic achievement.

In a sense, this type of work is already part of mainstream sociological research with the use of ecological variables. For instance, size of place of residence (or size of birthplace) is a critical variable that is associated with availability of opportunities. Larger towns and cities are thought to provide more opportunities based upon achieved, rather than ascribed characteristics relative to small towns and rural areas (although empirical studies cast doubt on this hypothesis, see Mueller, 1977). The introduction of geographical variables always requires a simultaneous consideration of migration, for the effects of a community may be different for in-migrants and natives. In addition to size of place, the most common
ecological variable is region. Studies of racial inequality in the United States have shown that patterns varied considerably between the South and the non-South (Hogan and Featherman, 1977).

But the possibilities for inclusion of the ecological effects of social structure go far beyond just measures of urbanization and region. With extremely large data files, it is possible to create contextual variables of community structure that may influence the patterns of ethnic stratification. The appropriate geographical unit may vary according to the availability of data and the type of hypothesis, but metropolitan areas which closely approximate labor markets may be the most appropriate choice for studies of stratification processes. By constructing contextual variables of community structure, such as size, growth, or industrial structure, the investigator can specify and directly measure the impact of social structural variables upon ethnic stratification systems. The strategy of model-building for such analyses is akin to the previous efforts of measuring the effects of neighborhoods and schools upon academic achievement (Sewell and Armer, 1966; Hauser, 1969, 1971). While the variables would be quite different, the logic and methods of incorporating both individual social background variables and ecological variables in the same models are similar.

The idea of incorporating ecological characteristics into models of ethnic inequality is not an original one. There is a long tradition of research that seeks to explain black-white disparities in terms of the relative size of the minority population in the community (Blalock, 1957; Brown and Fuguitt, 1972; Frisbie and Neidert, 1977). In their analysis of development towns in Israel, Spilerman and Habib (1976) point out that the industry structure of towns shapes the distribution of occupational opportunities. And if ethnic groups are differentially distributed across towns, as is the case almost everywhere, ethnic inequality is partially a function of community characteristics. In a similar vein, Yancey et al. (1976) offer a revisionist perspective on ethnicity among European immigrants to the United States. They argue that ethnicity is largely a function of the structural conditions of American cities at the time of their arrival. Different immigrant-ethnic groups are often tied into a particular industrial-occupational structure (and associated culture) as a result of the opportunities that were available in the places and times in which they settled.

The formalization of a research strategy using community contextual variables in models of ethnic inequality is still incomplete. While prior studies point to community size and relative minority size as important structural factors, the interpretation of these variables and the incorpora-
tion of others is open to debate. Among the possibilities for further research are such structural features as recent migration to the community, percent of employment in manufacturing, and the percent of the adult population with post-secondary education. Migration may indicate that domestic labor was insufficient for employment growth, and it was necessary to attract workers from elsewhere. Such a situation of labor demand may weaken traditional patterns of discrimination against minority workers. Similarly, the growth of manufacturing employment may act as a force to minimize ethnic barriers. It is widely believed that ethnic bars to industrial employment are less than in other sectors of the economy. Communities with a sizable share of the work force in manufacturing activities may be less able to maintain informal criteria based upon status or ethnicity in hiring and promotion than other communities. Another provocative hypothesis is that communities with a higher level of educational attainment will be less likely to institutionalize ethnic discrimination. The reasoning would be based upon the assumption that higher education weakens beliefs that legitimate discriminatory practices. These are only some of the possibilities for hypothesis testing within this framework. With some ingenuity it would be feasible to include contextual variables from a wide variety of other data sources. Some examples might be: the level of government expenditures, the presence and activities of affirmative action programs, variations in minority groups political activity, and the strength of labor unions. The great virtue of this framework is its openness to a wide scope of variables that may represent quite different (and opposing) theoretical perspectives.

There is an empirical possibility that most cities in the United States are so similar in terms of labor market diversity that community effects will be insignificant. In fact, one recent study reported there was too little intercity variation in black-white inequality in the United States to merit further inquiry (Stolzenberg and D'Amico, 1977), but both the theoretical and empirical questions remain in dispute (Spilerman and Miller, 1977). One might argue that the comparative analysis of communities on regions within one country will hold constant many of the critical structural variables that shape stratification systems—namely, political institutions. This limitation is clearly acknowledged, but that should not be an argument against pursuing research on community effects within societies.

CONCLUSIONS

Theories of racial and ethnic relations have been plentiful, but the empirical testing of hypotheses has not led to a cumulative growth of know-
Disparate research findings from various studies increase in number, but do not seem to bear much relationship to one another. It is obvious that a strong paradigm of research has not emerged. But the growth of empirical studies of racial/ethnic inequality in the United States over the last decade suggests that formal models of the process of stratification may be a significant turning point in the development of the field.

Not only do such models offer a rigorous statistical method of analysis, but a cumulative research tradition seems to be developing. The more simple models were formulated to measure the relative amount of discrimination in overall measures of inequality. But the expansion of these models to include social origins and a full temporal ordering of the socioeconomic career required a causal specification and interpretation of how ethnic inequality is generated and transmitted across and within generations.

The "openness" of such models to the inclusion of other variables, and the requirement of a theoretical rationale for each relationship between variables in the system, encourages the development of a cumulative research strategy. The two major frontiers of research on ethnic stratification within this emergent paradigm are trend and comparative analysis. Trend analysis will speak to the question of whether there is a growing convergence in ethnic stratification, as suggested by the hypothesis that modernization leads to assimilation. While the extensions of models of inequality to temporal changes will show the mechanisms whereby inequality is maintained or reduced, it may not measure the direct links of social structure upon the stratification process.

But via comparative analysis, one can specify certain attributes of the social structure of geographical areas or cities that may affect the levels and processes of ethnic stratification. Such studies are increasingly possible with the availability of very large data files to measure geographic areas and ecological characteristics. In another decade or so, we may see development of a strong research paradigm for the study of race and ethnic stratification.
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NOTES

1. Much of the prior literature is phrased in terms of race; I prefer the more general term, ethnicity, which has fewer pejorative interpretations. Depending on prior usage by other authors, I will use the two terms interchangeably.

2. Thus illustrating the principle of weak ergodicity, a familiar idea to statisticians. For an overview of the potential applications of the matrix equation representation of social mobility, see Matras (1967).

3. The statistical technique for doing this is Multiple Classification Analysis, a form of multiple regression that incorporates categorical predictor variables. The method is presented in Melichar (1965). A computer program for this form of statistical analysis is documented in Andrews et al. (1975).

4. While other dimensions of interethnic relations such as conflict and ethnic identity may be closely intertwined with inequality, the analytical restriction to only inequality measures as dependent variables enhances the possibility of a standardized methodology.
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