Walter Adams, Bureau of Applied Social Research Columbia University

#### Part I. Introduction

If one were to characterize American education over the past century, representing the span for which we have reasonably adequate statistics, one might well speak of constancy accompanying change. The constant factor would be consecutive escalation in educational attainment for both sexes, and for whites and non-whites alike. The other face of this same coin, presenting itself as change, would be successive upward shifts in the modal level of educational attainment -- once again for all four sex-race groups. These patterns are clearly revealed in an age-cohort analysis of educational attainment conducted recently at the Bureau of Applied Social Research. The analysis, deriving from Census data, covered the span of years from about 1880 through the early 1960s.

In addition to escalation in attainment, the cohort analysis yielded a second major constant. Racial minority youth, as well as considerable proportions of majority youth, have consistently lagged a generation or two behind in the overall rise in attainment. Such relative deprivation has affected most of the one in eight of all youth belonging to racial minorities. It has affected far smaller proportions of majority youth. Nevertheless, given the relatively large size of the white majority, at any point in time the numerical total of the educationally deprived among whites has totalled three to four times the number within the non-white minority.

If escalation in educational attainment represents a major positive achievement, its enduring correlate, relative deprivation for specific population groups, represents an abiding problem. Public concern, and the concern of educators and officials as well, has consistently focused upon students who fail to reach the modal white attainment level pertaining at a particular time. Any apparent lessening of the attainment gap has been greeted with enthusiasm. In 1893, for example, we find James Elodgett, special agent for the educational statistics of the 1890 Census, exulting over the fact that, and I quote

\*The research upon which this paper is in large part based was supported by the U. S. Office of Education, and was conducted under the direction of A. J. Jaffe at the Bureau of Applied Social Research.

<sup>1</sup>For extended discussion and detailed tabulations of this age-cohort analysis see: Jaffe, A. J. and Adams, Walter, <u>American Higher Education in Transition</u>, Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, New York, 1969, mimeo. See especially Sections II and III and Part I of Appendix C (Detailed Statistical Tables), plus discussion of historical educational data in Appendix D (Methodology). him: "The Negro race leaped from the illiterate slavery of 30 years ago, and in that time it has taken rank with the white in eagerness to go to school." In Blodgett's day the modal white level of attainment was the seventh to eighth grades. He further noted: "There was never a time when in the whole breadth of the land there was more interest on the subject of education than now. The gains in recent years have been very great. . . " But at this point Blodgett interjected a word of caution: ". . there is widespread complaint that the advancement of pupils is unsatisfactory."<sup>2</sup> Today, with a vastly altered and augmented educational establishment, the American people voice the identical mix of enthusiasm and chagrin.

Now, in the late 1960s, the modal level of attainment appears about to shift upwards once again, from high school graduation to college attendance. If we turn to Office of Education school retention rate data, we note that in the latter 1960s first-year college students repre-sented 40% of the total of fifth graders eight years previously. The fifth graders approximated the total age-cohort. Moreover, the retention data reveal an uninterrupted rise since the immediate post-World War II years in the size of the first-year college population relative to that of high school graduates the previous year. By the late 1960s, college freshmen were appreciably more numerous than the previous year's high school graduates who failed to enter college, representing a departure from the long-term trend from the late 19th century to the depression 1930s for about nine in twenty high school graduates to enter college -- somewhat more of the white boys and somewhat fewer of the other three sexrace groups.4 (Parenthetically, there is considerable evidence that Negro youth have not shared in this recent rise in the high school to college transfer rate, and there is further evidence that the principal obstacle for Negroes increasingly relates to securing the high school diploma\_rather than in reaching the twelfth grade.)<sup>5</sup>

<sup>2</sup>Blodgett, James H., <u>Report on Education in</u> the United States at the Eleventh Census: 1890, Census Office, Department of the Interior, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1893, pp. 21 and 23.

<sup>3</sup>Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1968, Bureau of the Census, U. S. Department of Commerce, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1968, Table 181, p. 126.

<sup>4</sup>Jaffe and Adams, <u>op. cit.</u>, footnote 1. See also: Jaffe, A. J. and Adams, Walter, "Trends in College Enrollment," <u>College Board Review</u>, Winter, 1964-65, No. 22, pp. 27-32.

<sup>5</sup>Jaffe and Adams, <u>op. cit.</u>, footnote 1, Section III, Parts I and II. In general, then, we characterize college attendance, at least for a year or two, as the most significant educational "rite of passage" in the late 1960s. Our concern in the balance of this paper will be with determinants of college planning and attendance which appear to be losing a considerable portion of their earlier relevance, and with identification of residual determinants which would appear to represent the principal obstacles to college entrance today and tomorrow.

Before reporting the findings, we shall briefly identify our major data sources for factors associated with post-high school plans from the late 1930s to the mid-1960s.

#### Part II. The Data

Our information on college planning in the late 1930s and mid-1950s derives from a number of national sample surveys of high school students which we obtained from the Roper Public Opinion Center at Williams College. More recent data were obtained from two very similar Census Bureau surveys, conducted in Fall 1959 and 1965 as a portion of Current Population Surveys in those years. These various surveys permitted us to determine the changing relevance of socio-economic factors to college planning. The two Census surveys were followed-up in Fall 1960 and February 1967 to determine actual post-high school behavior, and to an extent we may relate socio-economic and academic characteristics to this behavior. Such relationships are somewhat tentative, however, since only immediate entrants to college were identified, and over a third of college entrants delay entrance more than a year following high school graduation. Accordingly we concentrate on the plans of the high school seniors, simply noting in passing that the limited findings for behavior appear to support the findings for plans. As far as we can determine, about eighteen in twenty college-planners eventually reach college, plus about three in twenty non-planners.<sup>6</sup> Plans as seniors represent a generally realistic indicator of future eventuations.

Our information on less researched and less understood, but nevertheless significant, factors associated with post-high school plans derive from a secondary analysis of the twelfth grade computer tapes from the Office of Education's 1965 benchmark <u>Equality of Educational Opportunity</u> survey, commonly referred to as the Coleman study. For the sample of over 90,000 high school seniors we were able to examine over forty variables for

## possible relationships to post-high school plans.7

With these few words on the data let us turn to the findings. Our initial concern is with "classic" socio-economic determinants of posthigh school plans. For the whole span of years, 1939 through the mid-1960s, we have information on the occupation of the head of the senior's household, and for the 1959 and 1965 Census surveys data on family income are available in addition. The simple question is whether, with the passage of time, democratization in collegeplanning by socio-economic class took place--and if so, precisely when this occurred.

#### Part III. Socio-Economic Class and Post-High School Plans<sup>8</sup>

Between 1939 and 1959 it appears that the proportion of high school seniors planning on college rose modestly, or about seven per cent, from roughly four in ten to just under five in ten of all seniors. In the far briefer six-year period, 1959 through 1965, the rise was about thirteen per cent, or nearly double that for the previous twenty years. In 1965 sixty per cent of the Census Bureau sample of seniors planned on college. By February 1967 forty-seven per cent of the seniors had entered college, and we estimate that fully sixty per cent will have entered when all of the delayed entrants are accounted for. As we have noted, a few planners will fail to enter and a few non-planners will in fact enter.

We may supplement these findings with several others which appear to explain them to an extent. All socio-economic groups of seniors, as measured by the father's occupation, shared about equally in the modest rise in expectations between 1939 and 1959. At both dates very nearly twice the proportion of white-collar seniors as of bluecollar ones planned on college. Between 1959 and 1965, however, though white-collar children increased college planning by eight per cent, manual and service children increased planning nearly twice as much, or by about fifteen per cent. In a brief six years the twenty-nine per cent planning gap between the two occupational groups was reduced by a quarter.

For the 1959-1965 span family income data are available, and for this variable democratization in college planning is even more pronounced. The findings pertain whether we do or do not reconstitute the income categories to reflect distribution changes. College planning for poor seniors, those

<sup>7</sup>For methodological details of this analysis see: Jaffe and Adams, <u>op. cit.</u>, footnote 1, Appendix D (Methodology).

<sup>8</sup>For detailed analysis and tabulations relevant to this section of the present paper, see: Jaffe and Adams, <u>op. cit.</u>, footnote 1, Sections VI and VII and Part IV of Appendix C (Detailed Statistical Tables). See also: Forthcoming volume by Joseph Froomkin, <u>Aspirations, Enrollments, and Resources</u>, Part I, Section 2, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., 1969.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>This estimate is based on the following facts: 1) About 47 per cent of Fall 1965 high school seniors in the Census Bureau survey entered college immediately; 2) A 1966 Census Bureau study of the college population indicated that over a third of first-time college students delayed entrance over a year following high school graduation. At least 60 per cent of the 1965 seniors should enter college eventually. We simply projected the planning-non-planning distribution for the immediate entrants to include the delayed entrants.

from families with 1965 incomes of under \$4,000, increased by twenty-three per cent, whereas the increase for seniors from families with incomes of \$8,500 or more in 1965 was only six per cent. The planning discrepancy between the two income groups was reduced by roughly forty per cent in six years.

In general, it would seem that it is the financial component of socio-economic status, rather than the social and psychological elements, that has been most clearly losing its earlier strong relationship to college planning. In addition, since the Coleman study clearly established the strong positive relationship between above average tested academic ability or achievement and high socio-economic status, we infer that the chief residual liabilities of low socioeconomic status-liabilities, that is, in terms of post-high school aspirations and eventuations --are social and psychological ones, <u>plus</u> academic ones.

Supplementary findings from the 1965 Census Bureau survey support our belief that the financial deterrent to college entrance has lost much of its earlier significance. When seniors not planning on college were asked to cite the chief reason for failure to so aspire, only about one in ten of white and non-white seniors alike cited lack of money or the necessity of going to work to supplement family income. Most cited alternatives to college such as learning a trade, or taking a job from choice rather than from necessity. Between one and two in ten of all nonplanners cited simple lack of interest in college. Only sixteen per cent with family incomes of under \$5,000 per year cited lack of funds or the financial necessity of going to work.

In brief, by the mid-1960s it would seem that the financial factor, if we can credit the seniors' testimony, was a relatively minor determinant of post-high school aspirations. The question becomes one of accounting for this finding.

> Part IV. Higher Educational Innovations in Recent Years

Since the latter 1950s a number of higher educational innovations in combination would seem to explain the liberalization in access to college for lower socio-economic high school graduates. All of the innovations represent direct or indirect financial subsidies of higher education on the part of Federal, State, and local governments. Let us identify the most significant of these factors, and also attempt to determine their rough relative significance for less affluent college aspirants.

The factor of overriding significance would seem to be massive growth of "open-door" public commuter 2-year colleges during the 1960s. In 1961 there were just over four hundred such schools enrolling about 645,000 students. By 1968 there were over seven hundred public 2-year colleges (a seventy-five per cent increase) enrolling one and three-quarters millions of students (or an increment of one hundred and seventy-one per cent in seven years).?

Viewed in another way, the 1960 Census Bureau follow-up of the 1959 high school seniors found about 22% of the immediate college entrants enrolling in 2-year schools. The parallel follow-up of the 1965 study in February 1967 found thirty-four per cent entering 2-year colleges, or over half again the earlier proportion. In 1967, Office of Education data indicate that about thirty-eight per cent of all first-time collegians were enrolled in 2-year colleges. 10 This latter figure includes delayed as well as immediate college entrants. It is significant to note that Fall 1966 Census data on the college population indicate that about forty-one per cent of firsttime students at 2-year colleges had delayed entrance over a year following high school graduation, whereas this was the case for only twentyseven per cent at 4-year colleges.

The significance of the 2-year versus 4-year college entrance trends becomes clear when we compare estimated costs of a year of college in the academic year 1966-1967 for the three major types of colleges. For private 4-year colleges the cost, including direct and indirect collegerelated expenses, was about \$2,600; for public 4-year colleges the equivalent figure was \$1,600; and for public 2-year colleges the cost was only about \$1,100.11

For generally less affluent Negro youth the 2-year college appears to be particularly important. In the Far West, where such colleges are especially prevalent, just over seventy per cent of first-time Negro collegians in 1965 were attending 2-year schools, whereas this was the case for less than fifty per cent of white entrants.<sup>12</sup> There are relatively few Negroes in the Far West, but parallel findings pertain in states with large numbers of Negroes, and where 2-year colleges are generally available as well, such as Florida. It is also significant that in very recent years networks of public junior colleges are being legislated into existence in many Southern states with large Negro populations -states where 2-year public colleges were previously largely non-existent, such as Virginia and Alabama 1

<sup>9</sup>American Education, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., December-January 1968-69, p. 30.

100pening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1967, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., 1967, Table 2, p. 7.

11 Froomkin et al., Students and Buildings, Office of Education, Washington, D. C., 1968, p. 14.

12Coleman et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity, U. S. Office of Education, OE-38001, Washington, D. C., 1966, Table 5.5.5, p. 445.

<sup>13</sup>For a discussion of the significance for Negroes of 2-year colleges in the South, and Finally, the February 1967 Census Bureau follow-up yields profiles of 2- and 4-year college entrants. Two-year entrants are about a quarter again as likely as 4-year entrants to derive from blue-collar homes, half again as likely to come from families with incomes under \$6,000, and once again as likely to have fathers who failed to graduate from high school.14

Direct student aid, principally from Federal sources, also increased a great deal during the 1960s. Federal and Federally guaranteed student loans commenced in the late 1950s, followed by Work-Study funds a few years later. Veterans' educational benefits are once again provided. Finally, the most recent major Federal program, Educational Opportunity Grants, is specifically addressed to lower socio-economic college aspirants.

We can roughly gauge the relative importance of major sources of college funding by noting that in the academic year 1966-67 students and their families supplied about fifty-seven per cent of the total outlay required to educate undergraduates; major government programs, including loans, defrayed about ten per cent of the costs; and subsidies to the institutions (including scholarship funds), passed on directly or indirectly to the students, accounted for the remaining thirty-three per cent.<sup>15</sup>

The Federal programs seem particularly important to the minority of less affluent students who enroll in relatively expensive and chiefly private 4-year colleges--colleges charging \$500 or more per year in tuition and fees in the mid-1960s. About two in ten entrants from families with incomes under \$10,000 per year chose such colleges according to the 1967 Census Bureau follow-up, and about one in ten entered colleges charging over \$1,000. Students at colleges costing \$500 or more were about two and a half times as likely to take out loans as students at less expensive schools.<sup>10</sup>

We can summarize by saying that the recent large increases in student aid would appear, at

especially for the relationships between 2-year colleges and primarily Negro colleges, see: Jaffe, A. J., Adams, Walter, and Meyers, Sandra G., Negro Higher Education in the 1960's, Chapter 8, Praeger Special Studies in U. S. Economic and Social Development, Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1968.

L4Jaffe and Adams, <u>op. cit.</u>, footnote 1, Section IX and Part III of Appendix C (Detailed Statistical Tables).

<sup>15</sup>Froomkin <u>et al.</u>, <u>op. cit.</u>, footnote ll, p. 16. least inferentially, to make attendance at expensive private 4-year colleges possible for less affluent students. In general these are academically selective colleges. But it is the lowcost public 2-year college per se which seems to have played the principal role in the marked liberalization of access to college for less affluent students during the 1960s.

All evidence points to further expansion of 2-year colleges in the years ahead. Further increases in student aid, though far from certain, would seem probable--and especially so for less affluent racial minority youth. In short, the higher educational establishment appears to be reshaping itself to meet the needs of the "underclasses." In turn, the focus of concern is shifting from purely financial barriers to college to ones which, though correlated with social class in considerable measure, are principally non-financial in nature.

#### Part V. Non-Financial Determinants of College Planning17

Let us establish a rough ranking of better known non-financial variables associated with college entrance. We except several variables, such as the student's plans as a senior and parental aspirations for the senior, since such variables chiefly represent the net effect of various prior variables, in combination, upon the senior. However descriptively interesting, in and of themselves they tell us little about the process of reaching college.

The February 1967 Census Bureau follow-up would seem to indicate that the 2-year college not only has substantially reduced the relevance of family income to college entrance, but also has sharply reduced the relevance of several "classic" academic variables -- namely, tested academic performance according to national norms and high school grades. In the 1966-67 academic year 2-year college entrants included only ten per cent more high-performance students (highperformance, that is, according to national test-score ranking) than was the case for non-entrants to college, whereas 4-year college entrants included thirty-three per cent more high-performance students than was the case for the 2-year college--or forty-three per cent more than for the non-entrants. For high school marks, nonentrants were in fact slightly more likely than 2-year entrants to include students with B or

<sup>16</sup>Jaffe and Adams, <u>op. cit.</u>, footnote 1, Section VII. See also: Adams, Walter, "The Cost of College--Who Pays the Bills?", <u>The New York</u> <u>Statistician</u>, Vol. 20, No. 1, September-October 1968, pp. 3-5.

<sup>17</sup>For this section of the present paper, findings and detailed tabulations may be found in: Jaffe and Adams, <u>op. cit.</u>, footnote 1. Sections VIII and IX are especially relevant, as well as Parts III and V of Appendix C (Detailed Statistical Tables). See also: Adams, Walter, "Academic Self-Image as a Strong Determinant of College Entrance and Adult Prospects: Relative Deprivation Theory Applied to High School Curriculum Choice," forthcoming article in <u>The American</u> Journal of Economics and Sociology.

better averages. The explanation for this apparent anomaly (in part at least) would seem to be the greater likelihood for 2-year entrants, as compared to non-entrants, to have followed the more difficult college preparatory program in company with generally more able classmates. Nevertheless, the finding remains that high school grades differentiate only between 2- and 4-year college entrants. Four-year college entrants were nearly twice as likely as 2-year entrants to have been B or better students in high school. Low ability students and students with poor grades--students who strongly tend to be lower socio-economic and racial minority ones --appear generally able to enter college by the junior college route.

It is only the high school program a student has followed which strongly differentiates 2-year college entrants from non-entrants, as well as 2-year from 4-year college entrants. Under two in ten non-entrants had followed college preparatory programs, whereas nearly six in ten 2-year entrants had done so--and over eight in ten 4-year entrants. The important point is that the high school program is entered at the start of the high school career, and for many students one program or another undoubtedly is simply assumed from a far earlier age. In brief, the financial and academic liberalization of college entrance which we have described does not appear to have altered the critical role of the early high school program decision for post-high school eventuations. Consequently, we are principally concerned with the determinants of program choice. We turn to the Coleman study data for insights regarding such determinants, and we append several illustrative and relatively detailed supporting tables.

#### What we found is the following:

First, entering the college preparatory program is indeed considerably related to a student's tested academic performance. It is also related to the educational tradition in the home, as evidenced by such measures as parental educational attainment. But several additional variables appear to be fully as independently related to program choice as tested ability, and even more strongly so than parental education. The student's academic self-image relative to classmates, controlling simultaneously for ability and parental education, seems to be the principal additional determinant of program choice. Academic self-image is also highly correlated with the student's perceived social status in his high school class, and we consequently assume that the academic self-image is part of a relatively unified overall assessment of self.

Next, we note that relative academic selfimage, controlling for ability, is closely and positively associated with the marks a student receives in high school. Inferentially, the strength of the classroom competition determines academic self-image as much as does tested ability. Low ability students who receive good marks have generally favorable academic selfimages, and vice versa.

In turn, we found that high school guidance advice, strongly related to a student's posthigh school plans and his high school program, was also closely associated with the student's academic self-image and his grades. Guidance counselors appear to offer advice favoring more or less ambitious educational aspirations not alone in terms of the student's objectively tested ability, but also in terms of the student's performance relative to classmates, quite apart from ability level. For students and counselors alike the local scene often obscures clear perception of objectively tested college potential.

The relationships we have just described apply to racial majority and minority students alike, and to roughly the same extent. The fact that predominantly low ability lower socioeconomic ethnic minority students plan on college about as frequently as do majority ones would appear to be attributable to the fact that minority students generally do not attend academically selective high schools. The majority and minority students base post-high school plans on identical criteria, including the relative self-image variables, but they appear to do so within rather than across ethnic lines. We may only speculate upon the effects of further and extensive desegregation of schools for the aspirations and plans of minority students.

Let us summarize the relationships we have outlined in the last few paragraphs. For racial minority and majority students alike, relative assessment of self appears to be as strong a determinant of high school curriculum, in turn the principal objective determinant of post-high school plans and behavior, as is tested ability. Both the student and the student's counselor appear to base self-image and advice as much upon the strength of the classroom competition as upon national test ranking. The net effect is that many able students fail to plan on college and that many students with marginal or even submarginal qualifications plan to enter.

#### Part VI. Conclusions and Implications

What we have said so far would seem to indicate considerable relevance of relative deprivation theory to high school curricular choice, and ultimately to post-high school plans and behavior. It would also seem that the high school guidance counselor is a strong mediating force in the set of complex interrelationships we have summarized. The important point is that relative self-image is a psychological variable unlikely to be significantly affected by further economic liberalization of access to college. It is a variable rooted in a student's early experience in the particular primary and secondary schools he attends. If increased proportions of able students, of whatever race and family background, are to plan on and attend the increasing roster of liberal-access colleges, it would seem imperative that students should have accurate perceptions of their own potential at least as

early as the time of the pivotal high school program decision. For racial majority and minority students alike, roughly one in four who ranked above average on national ability and performance test distributions nevertheless rated themselves academically average or below average relative to classmates. Over half such students had failed to enter college preparatory curricula. Roughly two and a half times the proportion of able majority and minority seniors with unfavorable academic self-images failed to plan on college as was the case when the self-image was favorable.<sup>18</sup>

It would seem that extended investigation of relationships between relative academic selfimage and educational plans and aspirations are in order. It would seem that the role of the guidance counselor should be determined more explicitly than is possible from available data.

Several generations ago, when high school graduation represented the passport to better jobs, high school curricular choice and its determinants were not too relevant for most students. But today, when roughly six in ten high school graduates seem destined to enter college eventually, the curricular decision is crucial. Our findings suggest that it is precisely at the time of this decision that the characterization of American education suggested by the sociologist Ralph Turner seems open to serious qualification. Comparing the British and American educational establishments, Turner spoke of the "sponsored mobility" of the former and the "contest mobility" of the latter. It would seem that the accident of more or less able classmates often limits the "openness" of the contest for American high school students. Guidance personnel, in most instances unwittingly I am sure, often reinforce erroneous student appraisals of self, and consequently limit academically reasonable post-high school aspirations.<sup>19</sup>

We suggest that further erosion of economic barriers to college (and many academic ones as well) will take place in the years ahead, thereby increasing the relative significance of the remaining obstacles--and principally, in our opinion, the self-image variables. National sample studies, such as the Coleman one, permit identification of such residual obstacles, and also permit some insights into their determinants. But the sheer complexity of the relationships between the relevant residual variables dictate that future liberalizing programs and policies must be based on research in depth for specific high school environments. We believe that our findings, however limited, clearly call for mounting such an effort.

180p. cit., footnote 17.

19For a discussion of Turner's characerization of the American system, relative to American guidance counselling, see: Cicourel, A. V. and Kitsuse, J. I., <u>The Educational Decision Makers</u>, Advanced Studies in Sociology Series, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Indianapolis, Indiana, 1963.

#### APPENDIX TABLES

(For additional detailed tabulations, the reader is referred to the published materials cited in the footnotes to the various sections of this paper.)

## Table I. Race, Modal Level of Educational Attainment, and Per Cent Above and Below Modal Level for White Youth

		White			Non-Whi	te	Ratio per cent white to	Ratio per cent non-white
Approximat year of high schoo graduation	ol Modal n level	Per cent above white mode	Per cent below white mode	Modal level	Per cent above white mode	Per cent below white mode	per cent non-white below white modal level	to per cent white above white modal level
	Years	Per cent	Per cent	Years	Per cent	Per cent	Ratio	Ratio
1896 and earlier	7-8	21	37	0-6	5	86	•43	•24
1904-05	7-8	34	27	0-6	15	64	•42	• <b>1</b> 41
19 <b>1</b> 4 <b>-1</b> 5	7-8	1414	18	0-6	18	61	•30	•भग
1924-25	7-8	<b>59</b>	10	0-6	27	46	.22	•46
1933	12	15	51	0-6	7	80	•64	•47
1944-45	12	30	37	9-11	12	64	•58	<b>.</b> 40
1952	12	30	30	12	17	47	•64	•57
1957	12	30	25	12	17	44	•57	•57
1962	12	35	21	12	18	յդդ	.48	.51
Sources:	Current Pop	pulation Rej	ports, Serie	es P-20:	No. 169, 1	1968, Table	1; No. 15, 19	48, Table 1.

Table II. Proportion	of Whites and Non-Whites in Recent lears who
Completed at Least	the 8th, 9-11th, and 12th Grades, and the
Proportion Who	Completed at Least a Year of College

	Grades											
	8th			9-11th		l2th			13th			
			Differ- ence			Differ- ence			Differ- ence			Differ- ence
Approximate year of high school	White	White	White vs. Non- White	White	Non <b>-</b> White	White vs. Non- White	White	Non- White	White vs. Non- White	White	Non- White	White vs. Non- White
graduation	WIIICe d	d d	d d	9		1	%	%	%	%	%	%
1935	89	61	28	75	46	29	55	26	29	19	9	10
1945	92	76	16	83	63	20	64	37	27	24	12	12
1952	94	86	8	88	79	9	70	53	17	27	17	10
195 <b>7</b>	96	91	5	91	83	8	7.5	56	19	30	17	13
1962	97	93	4	93	86	7	79	56	23	35	18	17

### + Voomo Who . ... 17.24

Source: As for Table I.

Table III. Various Measures of School Retention in the United States for Cohorts of High School Graduation Age in the Late 1930s Through the Late 1960s

Year of high school graduation	High school freshmen as a proportion of fifth grade pupils four years previous	College freshmen as a proportion of fifth grade pupils eight years previous	High school graduates as proportion of high school freshmen three years previous	College freshmen as a proportion of high school graduates one year previous
	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent
1938	77	15	54	35
1944	84	12*	48 <b>≭</b>	31*
1950	81	21.	63	归
1956	86	30	67	52
1962	92	34	<b>7</b> 0	53
1967	97	40	75	55

\*Drops from the 1938 proportions presumably attributable to World War II.

Source: Proportions calculated from Office of Education data in Table 181, page 126, of the Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1968.

.

			No college	
	At	ge		
Total	Total	Plan to go	Hope to go	or Undecided
%	%	%	%	%
100	75	62	13	25
100	70	56	14	31
100	47	3Ż	15	53
100	46	32	14	54
100	51	35	16	49
100	54	40	14	46
	Total % 100 100 100 100 100 100	<u>At</u> <u>Total</u> <u>Total</u> <del>8</del> 100 75 100 70 100 47 100 46 100 51 100 54	$\begin{array}{c c} & \underline{1939}^{a} \\ & \underline{1039}^{a} \\ \hline \\ & \underline{100} \\ & 100 $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $

					20				
Table	IVa.	Atti	tudes	and	Plan	s of	High	School	Students
Towa	ard At	tendi	ng Co	llege	e by	Majo	r Occi	pation	Group
	of	Head	of Ho	useho	old,	1939	<b>,</b> 195	5, 1959	

<u>1955</u> b Attend college						
Total	Total	Plan to go	Inter- ested only	No college or <u>Undecided</u>		
*	%	%	%	%		
100	72	68	4	28		
100	68	63	5	32		
100	48	40	8	52		
100	45	38	7	55		
100	50	43	7	50		
100	56	49	7	<u>ц</u> ,		
		<u>1959</u> °				
100		68		32		
100		61		39		
100		37		63		
100		34		66		
100		43		57		
100		47		53		
	Total % 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	Total  Total    %  %    100  72    100  68    100  48    100  45    100  50    100  56    100     100	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		

	sch	All hig ool sen	h io <b>rs</b>	<b>G</b>		• • • •	7
Major occupation group of household head	1959°	1965 <sup>d</sup>	Per cent change	Total	College	No Nollege	Undecided
	%	%	%	%	ø	%	%
All white collar	34	37	+3	•			
1959 1965 Per cent change				100 100	66 74 +8	19 18 -1	15 8 -7
Manual and service	48	48					
1959 1965 Per cent change				100 100	37 52 +15	4日 36 -5	22 12 -10
Farm	. 9	6	-3				
1959 1965 Per cent change				100 100	34 Цц +10	39 33 -6	27 23 -4
Unemployed and not in labor force	9	9					
1959 1965 Per cent change				100 100	43 54 +11	37 28 -9	20 18 -2
Total	100	100					
1959 1965 Per cent change				100 100	47 60 +13	33 29 -4	20 11 -9

Table IVb. High School Seniors' Post-High School Plans, Fall 1959 and 1965, by Major Occupation Group of Head of Household

# Table Lc. Seniors' Post-High School Plans, Fall 1959 and 1965, by Family Income

	sch	All hig	h iors	Contourl work birk school plans				
Family income	1959°	1965 <sup>d</sup>	Per cent change	Total	College	No college	Undecided	
· .	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Under \$3,000	19	13	-6					
1959 1965 Per cent change		· ·		100 100	23 46 +23	52 39 -13	25 15 -10	
\$3,000-4,999	24	17	-7					
1959 1965 Per cent change				100 100	40 47 +7	40 38 -2	20 15 <del>-</del> 5	
\$5,000 <b>-7,199</b> 1959 1965	28	26	-2	100 100	52 58	29 31	19 11	
Per cent change					+6	+2	-8	
\$7,500 and over	29	կկ	+15					
1959 1965 Per cent change				100 100	68 71 +3	17 22 +5	15 7 -8	
Total	100	100						
19 <b>59</b> 1965 Per cent change				100 100	49 60 +11	32 29 -3	19 11 -8	

Table 4d. Comparison of High School Seniors' Post-High School Plans, Fall 1959 and 1965, by Family Income Roughly Adjusted for Changes in Income Distribution

Adjusted fam	ily income		
<u>1959</u> °	<u>1965</u> d	Year	Per cent planning on college
Under <b>\$3,0</b> 00	Under \$4,000		• • •
Per cent change		1959 1965	23 46 +23
\$3,000-4,999	\$4,000-5,999		
		1959 1965	40 52
Per cent change			+12
\$5,000 <b>~7,</b> 499	\$6,000 <b>-</b> 8,499		
Per cent change		1959 1965	52 65 +13
\$7,500 and over	\$8,500 and over		
Per cent change		1959 1965	68 74 +6

#### Sources for Table IV.

<sup>a</sup>Source: Unpublished data from a 1939 survey, conducted by Elmo Roper and Associates, Roper Commercial number 15. The 1,148 respondents were a national sample of persons under 20 years of age. Those already in college are excluded from this tabulation. The specific question was: "Do you plan on going to college?" The answers indicating attitudes favorable to attending college were: "Plan on going" and "Hope to go." The totals for all occupations were obtained by weighting the replies for each occupation by the distribution for total U.S., 1940, from 1940 Census of Population, <u>Families: Employment</u> <u>Status</u>, Table 19, Distribution of males aged 35-44 having children under 18 years of age.

<sup>b</sup>Source: Unpublished data derived from a study conducted by the Educational Testing Service in Spring 1955, <u>Background Factors Relating to College</u> <u>Plans and College Enrollment Among Public High School Students</u>. The 35,400 respondents were a national sample. The specific questions were: "What is your father's occupation? What does he do . . .?" and, in relation to college plans, "Think of what you would really like to do when you finish high school . . ." and "What do you really think you will do when you finish high school?" To the latter two questions, answers favorable to going to college, without expectation of so doing, were one answer category, expectations of attending formed another, and negative answers to both queries formed a third category. The respondents also specified, if they intended to enter college, whether they planned to do this immediately or later, after a period of work. For comparability with the 1939 study above, those foreseeing a delay in entrance were not included in the "plan on going to college" category.

<sup>C</sup>Source: Data derived from a national survey, <u>Educational Status, College Plans, and Occupational Status of Farm and Nonfarm Youths: October 1959,</u> by James C. Cowhig and Charles B. Nam, U.S. Bureau of the Census, Series ERS (P-27), No. 30, August 1961. The study sample was composed of 1,279 high school seniors dwelling in the approximately 35,000 households interviewed in connection with the monthly population sample survey of the Bureau of the Census. The specific question was: "Does . . . plan to attend college next fall?"

<sup>d</sup>Source: Data derived from a Census Bureau study, paralleling the one described in <u>c</u> above. The appreciably larger number of households sampled in 1965 yielded 1,464 high school seniors for tabulation.

# Table V. 1966 High School Graduates Entering and Not Entering College the Following Fall or Early Winter, and For

Those Who Entered, the Type of College Entered

Student characteristics	Did not enter college	Entered a 2-year college	Entered a 4-year college	All college entrants	All high school graduates
Ser	%	%	%	%	%
Male Female Both sexes	46 54 100	58 42 100	54 46 100	55 45 100	50 50 100
Age, October, 1966					
18 years or less 19 years or more All ages	75 25 100	86 14 100	95 5 100	92 8 100	83 17 100
Family income:					
Under \$3,000 \$3,000-3,999 \$4,000-5,999 \$6,000-7,1499 \$7,500-9,999 \$10,000-14,999 \$15,000 and over All incomes	16 9 24 17 18 14 2 100	5 6 22 11 25 23 8 100	5 4 13 15 21 28 14 100	5 16 14 22 26 12 100	11 7 20 15 20 20 20 7
Under \$7,500 \$7,500 and over All incomes	66 34 100	لبل 56 100	37 63 100	39 61 100	53 47 100
Under \$6,000 \$6,000 and over All incomes	49 51 100	33 67 100	22 78 100	26 74 100	38 62 100
Occupation, head of household:					
Blue collar White collar All occupations	75 25 100	56 山山 100	ЦЦ 56 100	Ц8 52 100	62 38 100
Father's education:					
ll grades or less 12 grades 13-15 grades 16 grades or more All levels	60 27 9 Ц 100	27 21 8 100	23 37 14 26 100	30 34 16 20 100	45 30 13 12 100
ll grades or less 12 grades or mo <b>r</b> e All levels	60 ЦО 100	цц 56 100	23 77 100	30 70 100	45 55 100
ll grades or less 12 grades 13-15 grades 16 grades or more		50 27 43 14	50 73 57 86	100 100 100 100	  
Ability score:					
High Medium and low All levels	19 81 100	29 71 100	62 38 100	51 49 100	35 65 100
Average high school marks	:				
B- or better C+ or poorer All marks	45 55 100	39 61 100	73 27 100	61 39 100	53 47 100

Student characteristics	Did not enter college	Entered a 2 <b>-y</b> ear college	Entered a 4-year college	All college entrants	All high school graduates
	×	%	%	%	%
High school curriculum:					
College preparatory All other All curricula	19 81 100	56 44 100	84 16 100	74 26 100	45 55 100
College plans as high school senior:					
No college 2-year college only 4-year college only 2 + 4 year college** All plans	66 15 11 8 100	17 25 20 38 100	8 2 81 9 100	11 10 60 19 100	40 12 34 14 100
No college 2-year college only 4-year college only 2 + 4 year college** All plans	87 63 17 34 53	7 33 9 45 16	6 4 74 21 31	13 37 83 66 47	100 100 100 100 100
No college 2-year college only 4-year college only 2 + 4 year college All plans	  	52 90 11 68 34	48 10 89 32 66	100 100 100 100 100	
Number of cases*	1,387,696	419,268	805,549	1,224,817	2,612,513

<sup>\*</sup>National sample inflated to national totals, according to known national distributions for the major demographic variables.

Source: Unpublished data from February 1967 Census Bureau follow-up of 1965-66 high school seniors.

Table VI. College Financing of 1965-66 High School Seniors Entering College Immediately in Fall 1966 and Early 1967

Proportion of college expenses met by students' families by family income

Income	Over 75%	75% and under	Total
	%	%	%
Family income of student, total	54	46	100
Under \$5,000	<u>ц</u> а.	59	100
\$5,000 to \$9,999	47	53	100
\$10,000 to \$14,999	59	<u>ц</u> а.	100
\$15,000 and over	74	26	100

Proportion of college expenses met by students' families by supplementary sources of financing

Non-family sources of financing	0ver 75%	75% and	Total
Loan	25%	under 29%	27%
Summer earnings	64	63	63
Other savings	28	22	24
Scholarship	14	30	24
Veterans' benefits		2	1
Employment during school year	11	34	25
College Non-college	5 6	13 21	10 15
All further sources	10	9	10
Total	152*	189*	174*
Per cent	39	61	100

\*Percentages add to more than 100 because of multiple mentions.

## College tuition and fees

Family income	Under \$250	\$250-499	\$500 <b>-</b> 999	\$1,000 and over	Total
	%	%	%	ø	%
Under \$10,000	49	31	11	9	100
\$10,000 and over	30	36	13	21	100
,Total	Ът	33	12	14	100

# Proportion of expenses met by families of students in private and public colleges

# Auspice of college attended and student's residence while attending

	P	ublic college		Private college				
Proportion of college expenses met by family <sup>#</sup>	Family or relatives*	Dormitory, All frat house, living rooming arrange- house, etc. ments		Family or relatives*	Dormitory, frat house, rooming house, etc.	All living arrange- ments		
	%	%	%	ø	%	%		
More than 75%	57	62	5 <b>9</b>	62	64	64		
50 to 75%	16	ጊኒ	15	19	14	15		
Some, but less than 50%	27	12	20	19	17	18		
None		12	6		5	3		
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100		

\*Our data indicate that nearly all students who live at home do so at family expense, and do not report this item as part of college costs. The table includes this imputed expenditure.

Non-family sources	·		
of financing	Under \$500	\$500 and over	Total*
	<b>%</b>	%	%
Loan	16	-39	23
Summer earnings	65	71	67
Other savings	24	27	25
Scholarship	22	35	25
Veterans' benefits	2		l
Employment during school year:	26	22	25
College	8	13	9
Non-college	18	9	16
All further sources	10	8	9
Total	165**	203 <sup>***</sup>	175 <sup>***</sup>

#### Source of financing by college tuition level

College tuition and fees

\*Proportions citing various sources in this table differ slightly from proportions in the earlier table (where family financing is the independent variable) because of differences in "non-response" for the independent variables. The differences are too slight to affect any of the findings which we report.

\*\*Sources add to more than 100% because of multiple mentions.

Data source: Unpublished data from 1967 Census Bureau follow-up of 1965-66 high school seniors.

#### Table VII.

I s 	Proportion of school seniors college by hig curriculum		Proportion of high school g entering coll February 1967 school curric	1965-1966 raduates ege, as of , by high ulum			
Coleman	data	Census	data	Census	Census data		
College preparatory	Other programs	College preparatory	Other programs	College preparatory	Other programs		
90	46	90	47	78	22		

Ratio college entrants to college planners\* by high school curriculum

#### Census data

College	Other
preparatory	programs
.87	•47

<sup>\*</sup>This is not precisely a measure of proportions of college planners who in fact entered college, since a small proportion of the entrants (about one in nine) had been non-planners.

## Table VIII. Senior's Estimate of Own Brightness Relative to Classmates and Senior's National Verbal Ability Ranking by Senior's High School Curriculum

#### Majority Seniors

Senior's estimate of relative brightness Senior's verbal Very Don't ability and high Low to Above Among school curriculum Total brightest low average average know Low ability 5,716 655 775 258 Number reporting 3.818 210 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% Total 8 College prep 9 4 10 16 21 General 32 38 33 26 28 29 59 58 59 58 Other courses 51 61 Medium ability 551 Number reporting 28,456 17,442 7,842 1,230 1,391 Total 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% College prep 30 14 23 46 44 23 General 26 Ц2 29 19 20 30 Other courses 44 44 48 35 36 47 High ability 28,587 Number reporting 6,991 14,910 5,968 山9 299 Total 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 75 College prep 71 Щ 50 87 68 General 14 31 11 7 16 23 15 25 Other courses 27 14 6 16 All ability levels Number reporting 62,759 2,345 28,251 23,527 7,408 1,228 Total 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 47 15 College prep 27 64 78 36 25 General 21 39 28 14 10 Other courses 32 <u>μ</u>6 15 22 12 39

## [Table VIII. continued]

#### Minority Seniors

Senior's estimate of relative brightness Senior's verbal Don't ability and high Very Low to Among Above school curriculum Total average brightest low average know Low ability 815 1,526 · Number reporting 14,631 7,776 3,096 1,418 100% 100% 100% 100% Total 100% 100% 15 8 12 22 College prep 20 13 25 General 32 27 23 23 24 57 55 Other courses 60 60 61 63 Medium ability 12,386 6.095 1,605 656 Number reporting 367 3,663 100% Total 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 35 29 College prep 17 44 44 29 General 26 35 21 30 27 27 35 Other courses 39 <u></u>μ8 <u>14</u> 29 ш High ability Number reporting 3,091 78 756 1,369 792 96 100% 100% 100% Total 100% 100% 100% 55 College prep 67 29 73 73 61 General 16 27 21 14 12 17 15 Other courses 44 24 17 13 22 All ability levels Number reporting 1,260 14,627 8,128 3,815 2,278 30,108 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% 100% Total College prep 28 12 21 40 42 19 General 25 27 20 22 26 33 55 52 55 Other courses Ъ7 <u></u>μо 36

# Table IX. Senior's Estimate of Own Brightness Relative to Classmates, Verbal Ability of Senior, and Highest Grade Completed

by Senior's Mother by Post-High School Plans of Senior

## Majority seniors

#### Estimated brightness above average

		Above	averag	e abili	ty	]	Low to	averag	e abilit	ty		Ve	ry low	ability		
Post-high school plans of senior	13 or more	12	9 <b>-</b> 11	8 or less & don't know	All grades	13 or more	12	9-11	8 or less & don't know	All grades	13 or more	12	9 <b>-</b> 11	8 or less & don't know	All	All Abilities
	%	%	%	Х	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	ø
No college	4	12	24	24	13	12	24	39	39	28	25	40	50	50	44	18
College probably	11	18	25	27	18	19	26	30	32	27	29	32	29	31	30	21
College definitely	85	<b>7</b> 0	51	49	69	69	50	31	29	45	56	28	21.	19	26	61
All plans	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Per cent of cases	9.0	17.0	4.9	3.0	33.9	2.2	6.7	3.5	2.4	14.8	0.2	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.5	50.2
					Es	stimated	l brigh	tness	average	or below	T					
No college	16	29	45	48	34	24	44	58	63	50	34	60	68	71	65	47
College probably	29	31	28	27	29	32	31	27	25	29	33	27	24	23	25	28
College definitely	55	40	27	25	37	44	25	15	12	21	33	13	8	6	10	25
All plans	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Per cent of cases	1.7	5.8	2.6	1.7	11.8	2.6	13.0	8.5	6.6	30.7	0.3	2.3	2.3	2.4	7.3	49.8
Per cent whose estimated bright- ness is average or below	16	25	35	36	26	5),	66	71	69	68	67	81	81	85	82	50

Source: Our own tabulations of the Coleman Study 12th grade data.

## [continued]

[Table IX. continued]

## Minority seniors

## Estimated brightness above average

•

LS	59	89	99	69	£S	<del>አ</del> አ	99	95	ናና	ናካ	52	۶٤	τ£	82	77	Per cent whose estimated bright- ness is average or below
٤٠٢٢	٤° τ ٤	<b>≤•</b> ٤٦	9°0T	8 <b>°</b> 5	ל•ד	55°6	٤٠٢	0°2	5•9	2°7	τ•ε	8°0	2°0	0•τ	9°0	Per cent of cases
00T	00τ	00T	00τ	00τ	00τ	<b>00T</b>	00τ	00T	00τ	00T	00T	00τ	00T	00τ	00T	ansiq ii <b>A</b>
54	6Т	ετ	8τ	56	07	72	Lτ	56	55	22	ζţ	56	78	$\eta\eta$	99	College definitely
2E	68	8£	07	ቲካ	8£	8 <b>E</b>	86	86	38	35	52	٥٤	98	82	52	College probably
65	75	67	54	55	55	۶E	ናካ	9E	52	9T	56	ካተ	30	82	тs	No college
					M	se or perc	gereve 2	santig.	ind be	tenijeA						
7•24	9 <b>•</b> 9T	٤•9	9 <b>°</b> 5	τ°ε	٤°۲	5 <b>°</b> 8T	6 <b>°</b> 7	9°5	<b>۲°</b> 5	5 <b>°</b> 9	9°L	<b>Ϋ</b> *τ	<b>≤•τ</b>	۲•۲	5.0	Per cent of cases
00T	00τ	00τ	00T	σοτ	00τ	οοτ	οοτ	00τ	00T	00T.	00T	οοτ	00T	00τ	οοτ	ansiq ilA
97	78	52	55	07	69	20	86	ረካ	ηs	69	59	<b>£</b> £	٤۶	99	08	College definitely
ተደ	6E	ቲቲ	<u>t</u> t2	36	τr	55	85	۶£	τε	ъ	53	52	55	ηz	ήτ	College probably
50 ¥	2Z	ηε «	52 v	τz «	٤T	۲Ľ	SL	81 %	ST «	OT ≪	TS %	55 %	ήτ «	OT	9	No соддеве
P	A Branco	MOUN	ρ 			P Sene.td		ρ ΤΤ=4	2T	A TOT	Raues	MOUT	P TT=6			OT POILTOL
LLA 23i4i[id4	TLA	ses ک don't f'nob	[[-6	61	10 EL	TIA	g or for for for for for for for for for f	11-0	61	J3 OL	TLA	8 or Jess & J'roon	LL <sup>-</sup> O	с <b>г</b>	13 or	Post-high school plans Post-pign
		VJIIty	N JON	TeV		<u> </u>	ilids eg	S VELS	от мол		λ	tilids e	averag	9vod A		

Source: Our own tabulations of the Coleman Study 12th grade data.

Table X. Post-High School Plans of High School Senior by Senior's Tested National Verbal Ability Standing, by Senior's Own Estimate of His Brightness Relative to Classmates, and by Senior's High School Grades

## Racial majority males .

Senior's ve	erbal ability,	Post-high	school	plans	of high	schoo	ol s	enior
estimated f relative to and high so	orightness o classmates, chool grades	College definitel %	Co y pr	ollege obably %	N col	o lege %	p	All lans %
Above average	e verbal ability	<i>,</i> •		70		/-		1-
Above avera	ge brightness							
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	79 52 27 71		16 30 32 20		5 18 14 9		100 100 100 100
Average or	below brightness							
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	52 35 15 38		30 35 30 34		18 30 55 28		100 100 100 100
All levels	of brightness							
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	76 44 20 63		17 32 30 23		7 24 50 14		100 100 100 100
Low to average	ge verbal ability							
Above avera	age brightness							
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	57 39 15 48		27 33 30 30		16 28 55 22		100 100 100 100
Average or	below brightness							
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	34 22 12 24		34 34 25 33		32 44 63 43		100 100 100 100
All levels	of brightness							
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	49 27 13 33		29 34 25 32		22 39 62 35		100 100 100 100

[Table X. continued]

Racial majority males

Senior's v	verbal ability,	Post-high school plans of high school senior								
relative t	chool grades	College definitely %	College probably %	No <u>college</u> %	All <u>plans</u> %					
Very low ver	bal ability									
Above aver	age brightness									
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	39 214 17 29	35 31 20 31	26 45 63 40	100 100 100 100					
Average or	below brightness									
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	23 12 5 13	32 31 20 30	45 57 75 57	100 100 100 100					
All levels	of brightness									
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	30 14 7 17	33 31 20 30	37 55 73 53	100 100 100 100					
All levels o	f verbal ability									
Above aver	age brightness									
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	73 44 20 63	19 32 29 23	8 24 51 14	100 100 100 100					
Average or	below brightness									
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	39 24 11 26	32 34 24 33	29 142 65 141	100 100 100 100					
All levels	of brightness									
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	66 31 13 46	21 33 25 27	13 36 62 27	100 100 100 100					

[Table X. continued]

# Racial minority males

Senior's verbal ability,		Post-high school plans of high school senior								
estimated relative t and high se	brightness o classmates, chool grades	College definitely	College probably	No college ø	All plans ø					
Above average	e verbal ability	<b>/</b> 0	10	/0	<i>/</i> 0					
Above avera	age brightness									
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	71 148 32 63	21 33 32 25	8 19 36 12	100 100 100 100					
Average or	below brightness									
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	42 36 16 36	40 35 19 35	18 29 65 29	100 100 100 100					
All levels	of brightness									
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	67 43 23 55	24 34 2 <b>4</b> 28	9 23 53 17	100 100 100 100					
Low to average	ge verbal ability									
Above avera	age brightness									
Grades :	A or B C D All grades	54 38 25 47	33 43 25 37	13 19 50 16	100 100 100 100					
Average or	below brightness									
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	33 23 12 25	42 42 31 41	25 35 57 34	100 100 100 100					
All levels	of brightness									
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	47 28 15 35	36 43 29 39	17 29 56 26	100 100 100 100					

# [Table X. continued]

## Racial minority males

Senior's verbal ability,		Post-high school plans of high school senior					
relative t	o classmates, chool grades	College <u>definitely</u>	College probably	No <u>college</u>	All plans		
		×	%	%	%		
Very low ver	bal ability						
Above aver	age brightness						
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	38 23 21 30	39 45 36 42	23 32 43 28	100 100 100 100		
<b>Average</b> or	below brightness						
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	26 16 12 19	43 42 32 41	31 42 56 40	100 100 100 100		
All levels	of brightness						
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	33 18 14 23	41 43 33 42	26 39 53 35	100 100 100 100		
All levels of	f verbal ability						
Above avera	age brightness						
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	52 33 2և Լվվ	33 42 32 36	15 25 141 20	100 100 100 100		
Average or	below brightness						
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	31 20 12 22	42 42 30 41	27 38 58 37	100 100 100 100		
All Levels	of brightness						
Grades:	A or B C D All grades	46 24 15 32	36 42 31 39	19 34 54 29	100 100 100 100		

<b>_</b>	Among brightest				Above average				Average			
Post high school graduation guidance offered to senior	Very low	Low to average	Above average	All levels	Very low	Low to average	Above average	All levels	Very low	Low to average	Above average	All levels
Ma i and that wall a s	%	%	%	%	%	%	. %	%	%	%	%	%
College	1.0	63	80	82	1.).	6),	81	7).	20	1.1	58	3.1.
No college	40 60	27	עט רר	17	44 56	26	10	14	2/ 71	44. 50	1.0	44 56
NO COTTEGE		51	11	±/	50	30	19	20	1	29	42	50
All advice	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of cases	131	775	3,273	4 <b>,</b> 179	438	3 <b>,</b> 933	7 <b>,</b> 119	11,490	1,666	7 <b>,</b> 368	3,190	12,224
Minority males												
College	56	72	80	68	54	66	78	64	կկ	49	62	47
No college	<u></u> цц	28	20	32	46	34	22	36	56	51	38	53
All advice	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of cases	619	695	362	1 <b>,</b> 676	1 <b>,</b> 297	1,567	653	3 <b>,</b> 517	2,869	2 <b>,251</b>	348	5 <b>,</b> 468
Majority females												
College	40	59	<b>7</b> 9	76	29	54	73	66	18	29	42	31
No college	60	<u>41</u>	21	24	71	46	27	34	82	71	58	69
All advice	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of cases	60	358	2 <b>,75</b> 5	3 <b>,</b> 173	273	3 <b>,</b> 413	7 <b>,</b> 470	11 <b>,</b> 156	1,694	8 <b>,</b> 525	4 <b>,</b> 067	14 <b>,</b> 286
Minority females												
College	61	72	84	71	54	64	78	63	38	46	54	42
No college	39	28	16	29	46	36	22	37	62	54	46	58
All advice	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Number of cases	631	784	384	1 <b>,</b> 799	1 <b>,</b> 426	1,809	664	3,899	3 <b>,</b> 869	3,279	340	7 <b>,</b> 488

Table XI. Senior's Estimate of His Own Brightness Relative to Classmates and His Tested Level of Verbal Ability by the Post-High School Guidance Advice Offered the Senior

[Table XI. continued]									
Post high school	Below average				ALL ESTIMATES				
graduation guidance offered to senior	Very <u>low</u>	Low to average	Above average	All levels	Very <u>low</u>	Low to average	Above average	All levels	
M	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	
Majority males	- 7	-1						1-	
College	18	24	40	25	31	48	77	61	
No college	82	76	60	75	69	52	23	39	
All advice	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Number of cases	314	715	192	1,221	2 <b>,</b> 549	12 <b>,791</b>	13,774	29 <b>,</b> 114	
Minority males									
College	27	31	32	29	47	57	73	55	
No college	73	69	68	71	53	43	27	45	
All advice	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Number of cases	345	170	եր	5 <b>59</b>	5 <b>,13</b> 0	4,683	1,407	11,220	
Majority females									
College	8	19	- 33	17	19	36	65	49	
No college	92	81	67	83	81	64	35	51	
All advice	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Number of cases	256	55 <b>3</b>	86	895	2 <b>,</b> 283	12 <b>,</b> 849	14 <b>,</b> 378	29 <b>,</b> 510	
Minority females									
College	18	29	25	22	43	54	73	51	
No college	82	71	75	78	57	46	27	49	
All advice	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Number of cases	349	143	20	512	6 <b>,</b> 275	6,015	1,408	13,698	

Source: Our own tabulations of the Coleman Study 12th grade data.

.