Order Number 9325097

Academic self-concept as a predictor of academic success and educational persistence among minority and low socio-economic background students

Gerardi, Steven John, Ph.D.

City University of New York, 1993

U·M·I
300 N. Zeeb Rd.
Ann Arbor, MI 48106

Academic Self-concept as a Predictor of Academic Success and Educational Persistence Among Minority and Low Socio-economic Background Students.

by

Steven John Gerardi

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University Graduate Center.

1993

This manuscript has been read and accepted by the Graduate Faculty in Sociology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

April 27, 1993
date

David Lavren
Chairman of Examining Committee

April 27 1993
date

Paul Attewell
Executive Officer

Professor Stanley Aronowitz

Professor William Kornblum

Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

Academic Self-concept as a Predictor of
Academic Success and Educational Persistence Among
Minority and Low Socio-economic Background Students.

by

Steven John Gerardi

Advisor: David Lavin

Educational background, rather than academic self-concept, was a significant predictor of academic success and educational persistence among minority and low socio-economic students at the community-college level.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

I. Overview of the Context of Research

Education has become more of a problem in America's inner cities over the last two decades. The literature points to a variety of interrelated factors which are believed to contribute to the difficulty of educating inner-city youth. Figuring among these are economic impoverishment and its affective cultural deprivation, unprecedented violence within the communities and schools, the drug epidemic and a self-fulfilling prophecy of failure. These conditions create negative attitudes toward school, diminish educational achievement and contribute to the high drop-out rate among high school students in our nation's inner-cities (Demo and Savin-Williams, 1983; Wiltfang and Scarbecz, 1990).

The New York City system clearly is no exception to this reality. Indeed, these problems are exacerberated by the enormity of New York City's public school system and appear quite staggering.

For those who do graduate from high school, employment opportunities in New York City are limited because of the rising floor of educational credentials needed for entry into desirable jobs in the New York City labor market. In effect, the value of the high school diploma has declined. This devaluation has led many high school graduates who, in earlier decades, would not have sought a college education, to do so now. Nationally, almost 40% of those who enter college will enroll in a community college.

Those who enter the community colleges bring other serious disadvantages with them as a result of ability grouping at the primary level and non-college preparatory tracking at the

comprehensive high school level. This problem can be observed in the many New York City high school graduates who come to CUNY under-prepared in the traditional academic skills such as english, mathematics and writing.

Since the initiation an Open Admissions policy in 1970, CUNY has been faced with large numbers of inner-city students in need of instruction in the basic skills. By the end of the 1970's, a Freshmen Skills Assessment Program was established on a University-wide basis to assess competencies in writing, mathematics and reading. Examinations are required for all incoming freshmen in order to identify skill deficiencies. Students identified as deficient are placed in remedial courses in order to help them meet the University standards of competency prior to entering the college level course work.

Whatever the benefit of remedial courses, they become also educational hurdles because of the time needed to successfully complete them. Each remedial course taken by a student adds one-fifth of a year to the graduation date of that individual (Lavin & Crook, 1990).

Other obstacles intrinsic to the social and academic context of the community college itself may impede students' academic progress. Researchers have pointed to the community college curriculum tracking system which divides students into academic transfer and terminal vocational tracks, the anti-academic orientation of a predominantly working class student body, and institutional efforts to lower students' initially high educational

aspirations as factors that diminish ultimate educational attainment and hence, life-chances (Alba & Lavin 1981; Anderson, 1984; Astin, 1972; Breneman & Nelson 1981; Brint & Karabel, 1989; London, 1978; Velez,1985).

These social and academic processes in the community college are consistent with the conflict theory in sociology which stresses that level of education reproduces inequality from one generation to the next. Moreover, this same research suggests that low SES students may be steered away from occupations which traditionally require advanced levels of education because schools convince students that the selection of "talented" people is based on the meritocratic process (Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Collins, 1979).

To sum up, the major problems of the educability of New York City's inner-city youth are conditions within the public school system which tend to create negative attitudes toward school, diminish educational achievement. Dropping-out becomes a more typical outcome. Among those in New York City who successfully negotiate these hurdles, and enroll in college, the majority will attend a community college. The educational disadvantages they bring with them make it likely that they will be placed in remedial courses which while improving academic skills, tend to slow academic progress. These community college students will be faced with additional educational hurdles associated with the social and academic setting within the community college that are believed to depress educational aspirations and attainments. These factors seriously reduce the life-chances of such individuals.

Whether students survive this process may depend on the whether they possess a high self-concept due to being perceived as a statistical elite within their comparison/reference group. Students who perceive themselves (and perhaps are perceived in their communities) as being academically successful as a result of graduation from high school and college enrollment. When they compare themselves to the large majority of their cohort group who do not graduate, they may well have a high academic self-concept (ASC).

Comparison/reference groups are social categories that an individual uses to help define beliefs, attitudes, values and self-concept. Reference/comparison groups act as social constructs by which self-image is developed. Thus, comparison/reference groups are modes for adopting rules and values that directly affect self-image and hence behavior (Merton, 1949).

There is a long tradition in the literature of social psychology which indicates that positive self-concept of ability has an important influence on the student's academic success. There is mounting evidence that ASC is highly correlated with academic success, especially, among minority and low SES students (Astin,1982; Bailey, 1978; DiCesare, 1972; Gurin, 1980; Horowitz, 1982; Sedlacek 1977; and Sedlacek and Brooks, 1972). Though research has shown that academic self-concept factors have been good predictors of academic performance on the college level, academic performance measurements such as the SAT, academic placement tests and high school average, have been better

predictors of college grades than the self-concept (Bailey, 1978; Griffore & Samuels, 1979; Lavin, 1965; Robinson & Copper, 1984). However, a pilot study I conducted in 1988-89 suggests that ASC of minority and low SES students may, in fact, be as influential in predicting college grades and persistence as the traditional academic performance measurements. This research, conducted with a sample composed predominantly of minority and low SES students enrolled at New York City Technical College (a community college within CUNY), also found that students with high ASC persist longer (Gerardi, 1990).

The respondents in this pilot study typically were not proficient in reading, writing and math as measured by the CUNY Assessment Examinations. Indeed, these students had been classified for the most part as academic high risks because of their poor performance on the CUNY Assessment Examinations. However, the data suggest that these examination failures had not affected the students' resolve to be academically successful at this college.

This dissertation will focus on the academic self-concept of a population of students who have overcome many of the educational obstacles associated with the New York City high school system and who have decided to continue their education at a community college within CUNY. This research will be an extension of my pilot study mentioned earlier.

Chapter two of this dissertation explores in detail the current thought and research centered around the two perspectives in the Sociology of Education: the Structural/Functionalist view, and the

conflict approach. From these perspectives this section will presentthe current knowledge on ability grouping, high school tracking, credential devaluation and the uniquely American concept of the community college (Brint & Karabel, 1989). This section will also provide the Social-Psychological literature on self-concept of ability and the statistical elite.

The third chapter presents the types of data, research procedure and sample description used in this research. The test/retest reliability, and description of the Brookover self-concept of Ability Scale.

Chapter four examines the academic profile of the sample. Chapter five presents the statistical results and their significance for theory and research.

The conclusion section (chapter six) discusses the successes and limitation of this research and the implications for the educational success of minority and low socio-economic status students enrolled at CUNY.

II. Perspective on the Academically Disadvantaged

Whether the Sociological perspective taken emphasizes the influence of family background on school and occupation achievement (Status Attainment approach), or the mode of production in material life (Marxist approach), or language-use at home and at school (Socio-linguistic approach), or cultural socialization (Cultural

Reproduction), or the changing needs and requirements of society's educational demands (Structural-Functionalist approach), the constant seems to be that students from working class, minority and low socio-economic backgrounds (SES) do poorly in school relative to the middle class.

Indeed, by any measurement they drop out more than their middle class contemporaries, score lower on standardized tests and achieve lower high school averages. When they do go to college they achieve lower grade point averages, earn fewer credits, drop out more frequently and take longer to graduate.

Almost without exception lack of educational achievement can be traced to a number of long standing educational policies which have been enacted in order to create a more efficient and allegedly humane manner of educating students who have different learning styles. Two such touted educational policies are ability group assignments in the elementary schools and curriculum tracking in the comprehensive high schools.

At first glance, the relation between policies concerning the primary school and high schools may not be obvious to the general public. However, in the educational continuum of the individual, especially the individual assigned to the lower ability group at the primary school level and the non-college preparatory curriculum within the high school, the educational effect for the individual is cumulative in nature. Consequently these educational career paths lead to student biographies and therefore, student identities which crystallize during the individuals' various educational life-

cycles (primary to secondary schools and beyond).

Furthermore, because of credential inflation, the successful graduates of high school are faced with two legitimate choices: either to try their chances at employment within the blue collar industries of New York City where employment opportunities over the last two decades have been reduced seriously, or to enter college.

Even with the increased need for higher order skills in New York City's post-industrial economy fewer than 70% of New York City's high school graduates go on to college. The most recent data suggests that for a given 100 New York City high school students, 50 will dropout and 50 will graduate. Of these survivors, approximately 35 will go to college. Because of the knowledge gap created by low ability group placement, and non-college preparatory high school programs, 60% of such individuals generally find their only collegiate option the community college. Of the 35 college-bound survivors mentioned earlier, 20 will enroll in a community college. Here, at worst, the majority will stopout/dropout, and at best, a small minority can expect to earn only an AA/AAS degree.

The most recent research completed on degree requirements for white collar employment have shown that a Baccalaureate is the minimum qualification necessary for access into the managerial or professional ranks within New York City's post-industrial economy. This relegates those who have earned AA/AAS degrees to the bottom of the white collar career ladder where monetary rewards will be substantially less than those of their Baccalaureate counterparts (Blaug, 1972; Hauser and Swell 1986; Lavin and Crook, 1990; Leslie

and Ramey 1986).

Then, to sum up, such factors as the ethno-cultural inheritance of a student, the socio-economic circumstances of the student's family and the cumulative educational deficit via ability grouping and non-college preparatory tracking can be equated to the pieces of a puzzle which when joined depict decreased educational achievement and life-chances.

However, there may be the countervailing force of high self-concept which may alter or break this almost predestined path. Indeed, this force may play an exceptionally powerful role in the success of the educationally disadvantaged.

The aim of this chapter will be to explore in detail the dove-tailing effect of cumulative educational deficits, the post-industrial economy of New York City, social class, school achievement and the importance of high self-concept for the academic success of minority and low SES students.

But before we begin the discussion of the Sociological theory relevant to this topic, I will introduce the term 'cumulative educational disadvantages' which will be used throughout this study. For the purposes of this dissertation, cumulative educational disadvantages can be viewed as the dynamic interplay and integration of past educational deficits reinforcing and creating new handicaps during the individual's educational career. Metaphorically, this process can be seen in terms of a domino theory. One disadvantage collides with another disadvantage, which activates yet another handicap and so on. This makes it difficult

to distinguish between the various handicaps.

Self-fulfilling Prophecies: Ability Grouping Practices and Educational Deficits at the Primary School:

Much of the research centering around the self-fulfilling prophecy argues that ability grouping practices at the primary school level are closely associated with economic impoverishment, class, culture and race. The research also points to teacher expectations which tends to pace academic advancements. Teachers treat those from whom expect academic success differently than students of whom they expect little.

Indeed, there is mounting evidence which suggests that high teacher expectation is a salient variable for student achievement. Felson and Bohrnstedt (1980), indicated that ability and effort were perceived by teachers as positively related. According to the authors, teachers may view students with high ability as more motivated than those with low ability. Bohrnstedt and Felson (1983) argued that teachers were providing what the authors described as the "halo effect" for their motivated students. Toughey and Villaney (1980) indicated that high-need achievers perceived their abilities as being high. In contrast, low-need achievers perceived their abilities as being low. Arkin and Baumgardner (1985) found that self-handicapping students doubted their academic abilities without regard to their actual performance. Levy and Baumgardner (1987) indicated those viewing themselves as possessing low ability

were likely to handicap themselves. Baumgardner and Levy (1987) found that individuals placed in high ability groups linked effort and ability, perceiving high effort as validation of high ability and low effort as an indicator of low ability. Futhermore, those with high ability were viewed as successes even when they are not.

Connected to these ideas are the policies of ability assignments which help in creating and advancing inequalities among students. Research centered around ability assignments argues that students in low-ability groups may receive substantially less teaching time than students in high-ability groups within the same classroom (Eder, 1981; McDermott, 1977). In this way perceptions of student performance become reality not because of varying ability, but because students in different ability groups are taught differently.

The most frequently cited research supporting this hypothesis is Rosenthal and Jacobensen's (1968) work in a primary school in San Francisco. The main thrust of this research involved creating different teacher expectations through misinformating teachers about the ability of their students at the beginning of the academic year.

In the school studied, the policy was to test students in grades one through six using a nonverbal IQ test at the beginning of each school year. The results of these tests were shared with the teachers. A group of randomly selected students were labeled intellectually gifted. The forthcoming data suggested that the so-called 'gifted' group was treated differently than the control

group and thus learned more.

Another example of the halo effect is Rist's studies of one all Black elementary school, with all Black faculty in St. Louis. Rist found that: 1) teacher expectations and ability grouping were based on class perceived characteristics, 2) ability grouping is a somewhat permanent position, and 3) students were treated differently in each of the ability groups (Rist, 1970).

The teacher perception process unfolds during the flow of the classroom interaction when teachers judge the correctness and appropriateness of student's answers and behavior. The accumulation of such judgments results in the lacement of students into ability groups. Thus, as the research has demonstrated teacher perceptions/expectations and ability grouping assignments have tangible results for the elementary school population.

The Reproduction of Class and Consciousness:

There is good evidence that the teacher's initial impressions of student ability are centered around class. Social class is an important indicator of cultural capital for the school setting (Bourdieu, 1977) as teachers expect a specific form of behavior which they believe supports learning. If the means of achieving this behavior is not located within the family's cultural resources, the child is likely not to comply with the expected school behavior.

Therefore, distinctive cultural knowledge is transmitted by families of each social class. Children of the dominant class

inherit substantially different cultural knowledge, skills, norms, styles of dress and linguistic abilities than children of those within subordinate classes. Consequently, schools reward students with the dominant class background by virtue of a certain cultural competency established through family socialization. These students are provided with the means to succeed in schools, implicitly do so.

Schools similarly contribute to this reproduction process by designing and implementing curricula that reward the cultural capital of the dominant class, while systemically and continually devaluating, demeaning and debasing the cultural capital of subordinate classes.

Generally, it is common knowledge that both working class and middle class parents want their children to succeed in school. However, the social position of each class leads its members to employ different means to this end. Working class parents depend on the teacher and the school to educate their children because they are most often less educated than the teacher.

On the other hand, the middle class parent tends to actively participate in the supervision and monitoring of his/her child's school achievements. Because the middle class parent's occupation and education may be equal or greater than the teacher's middle class parents will very often challenge the teacher and the school administrators and as assume that the school is at fault if problems arise for their children (Lamont and Lareau, 1988).

Lareau (1987) provides further support for the above mentioned

idea by through observation of the parental involvement in schools located in a middle class and working class communities. This research centered around the formal requests from teachers for parent participation. Lareau suggests that the parental response was more prevalent at the middle-class school than at the working class school. Additionally, the interaction between the working class parents and teachers was stiff, awkward and uncomfortable; parent/teacher conversation usually centered around non-academic issues. On the other hand, the interaction between the middle class parents and teachers was relaxed and the conversations centered around academic issues.

Lareau concludes that educational values of both groups of parents did not differ. What did differ however, was the manner in which they stressed academic success. The middle class parents viewed their child's education as a shared experience between teacher and parent. The working class parents, on the other hand, relinquished all responsibilities for their children's education to the teacher and school.

Furthermore, language comparisons of working and low SES families and middle class families suggest that there may be a differential between the language of the home and the language of the schools, especially among the working class and low SES background students (Cazden, 1986,; Delgado-Gaiton, 1987; Heath, 1982; and Philips, 1982).

Basil Bernstein's (1975) work on language, coding theory, curriculum and the transmission of knowledge is an important

interpretation of class, family, school and the failure of Low SES students. Bernstein's concept of code is central to his analysis of the transmission of knowledge. Code refers to a "regulative principle which underlies various message systems, especially curriculum and pedagogy" (1). Curriculum, according to Bernstein, is valid knowledge. Pedagogy acts as the valid transmission of this knowledge, and evaluation is the realization of knowledge taught. Both the curriculum and the transmission of knowledge for Bernstein are based in language. According to Bernstein language interpretation determined by class, and is a function of social differences. Furthermore, various functions of language in a given social context have a profound effect on children's social learning. Bernstein establishes a distinction between language usage of the working class or "public language," and the language-use of the middle class which he labels "formal language."

Bernstein argues that formal language has a greater number of possibilities and is more complex than "public language" and so it permits higher order processing. This form of language stresses the intensification and verbalization of separateness and differences. Furthermore, formal language stresses the significance of objects in the environment. Conversely, public language is structured around mediating personal qualifications and is limited in symbolic expression. It consists of words used as part of simple statements

1. Sadovnik, A. 1991. Basil Bernstein's Theory of Pedagogic Practice: A Structuralist Approach. Sociology of Education, 64, Pg 50.

and questions in the description of tangible, concrete, and visual statements. Public language's emphasis is on emotion rather than logical implications. The difference in these two language structures underlies the attitudes and values which are compatible with formal education and thus increased life-chances.

The pulse of this theory is a language structure in which words and sentences are related. Bernstein cites a case in point concerning the transmission and modes of interpretation in the understanding of complex ideas. Bernstein argues that in the middle class family the mother may say to her child "I'd rather you made less noise darling," while in a working class family the mother may say, "Shut up!" (2) According to Bernstein, the operative words in the middle class scenario are "rather and less," because the child learns to be sensitive to this sentence structure and the many possible sentences associated with these words. Hence, these words are understood when used in this case and directly translatable cues for the immediate response and future responses. By comparison, the phase "Shut up," does not have the same imperative cues for response as "rather and less" (Bernstein, 1975).

2) Bernstein, B. 1975. Class, Codes and Control. Vol. 1-3. London: Routleage and Kegan Paul. Pg. 175

The importance of this example for Bernstein is that the middle class child understands both "rather/less" and "shut up." The working class child, however, has learned to respond to and discriminate only one - "shut-up." The difference becomes problematic for the working class child in the school environment because he/she has to translate and process the middle class language structure into a much simpler language structure and will therefore be confused and puzzled.

Generally the use of public language is not a significant problem except in the superior/inferior relationship of teacher and student. Because teachers and schools for the most part possess middle class codes, public language and behavior may be viewed as hostile, aggressive, and rude by the teacher.

The result may be a perception that the student is less intelligent. Moreover, this language/behavior continuum performs as a validation of the differences between the two codes.

Essentially the breakdown of communication between teacher and the working class child results in a learning resistance and the failure of the child.

On the other hand, because the language mode of the middle class is that same mode used in schools and because the child has been socialized to perceive work and play as weakly differential, the middle class child is usually successful in this form of environment.

Bernstein concludes that the working class child attaches significance to an aspect of language because of a class

socialization that differs from that which is required by the learning situation of schools. I have cited Bernstein's thesis because I believe it can partially explain teacher perception and ability grouping based on class. Additionally, this hypothesis can also assist in explaining the self-fulfilling prophecy of failure which has become associated with the socially and educationally disadvantaged.

The Comprehensive High School:

High School tracking because of its importance to the student's life-chances has also created much controversy in the United States. Proponents of tracking argue that grouping students into homogeneous groupings in subject-ready areas provides instruction according to the individual's needs. Because students have the opportunity to choose the subjects they are interested in the drop-out rate is reduced. On the other hand, critics argue that tracking practices reproduce educational inequalities because of a lower quality of instruction as well as direction of path into vocational versus academic tracks.

There is much research which points to the high school tracking system reproducing the values and attitudes characteristic of social class. The college preparatory track tends to reproduce middle class values by supporting the type of personality which reflects the possible demands of professional occupations.

Conversely, the non-college preparatory track tends to reproduce values and attitudes which reflect the types of occupations associated with the working/blue collar class. High schools provide a means of educating the working class in technical skills while alienating these students from ideas which the dominant culture holds in high regard.

Moreover, high school tracking has all the trappings of ability grouping, in that different learning environments are established through tracking (Alexander and McDill, 1976). Tracking also creates peer association based on tracking assignments. Individuals assigned to the college track curriculum have more high status friends who are planning college careers than do those assigned to the vocational track (Alexander, Cook and McDill, 1978). Thus their peer environment establishes high academic achievement.

Research into the curriculum has shown that both the social organization of the classroom and the power relationship between the student and teacher also contribute to class reproduction (Aggleton and Whitty, 1985; Anyon 1991). Additionally, a large body of work suggests that parental behavior toward school and participation in education promotes educational success (Berger, 1983; Seeley, 1984). Much has been written to suggest that the unequal working class parental involvement in schools can be traced back to the schools which either do not welcome, or plainly discriminate against working and low SES parental involvement (Lightfoot, 1978; Ogbu, 1974).

The ideology concerning schooling in the United States which

suggests that schools provide a path out of poverty is for many working class, minority and low SES students merely imaginary. As Althusser has theorized, what humanity represents to itself through ideology is an imaginary relation to the real relations (Althusser, 1978). This imaginary relation which such students invoke, promotes the image of an easier, less alienated life to be entered into upon completion of their education. But in reality, such individuals are denied this satisfaction. This daily denial demonstrates to the student that although there is a better life, this better life is most often not available to him/her. This internal contradiction is perceived and understood as a distortion of the real relations in which such students live. Individuals in such roles find it difficult to develop a commitment or an identification with the dominant school culture when they believe that they are not a meaningful asset, thus rejecting the school and dominant culture. This rejection has been labeled Resistance Theory. A very good example of Resistance Theory can be found in Willis' (1977) interviews with a group of disenfranchised white working class males in a British secondary schools.

According to Willis the "lads"--a group of high school students who have rejected the achievement ideology, school values, and the authority of the teachers--have these attitudes partly because they have insight into their disenfranchised economic and social position in England. They equate manual labor with success and mental labor with failure. A misrecognition and ignorance of the connection between education and social mobility relegates the lads

to manual labor and the active acceptance of their economic subordination.

MacLeod's (1987), ethnography examined two groups of high school students comprised of predominantly low income individuals living in the same housing project and attending the same school. In this study MacLeod documents that the Hallway Hangers, a group of white males, rejected the achievement ideology while the Brothers, a group of black males, conformed to the achievement ideology. MacLeod argues that the parents of the Brothers insisted that their children worked toward professional careers and monitored their school progress. By contrast, the parents of the Hallway Hangers did not stress such career concerns with their children and did not monitor their children's school progress, or more accurately, their lack of progress.

Nonetheless, even with the diversity and variability of individuals in subjugated groups, students with such cultural capital as the lads and the Hallway Hangers are in possession of an implicit and/or explicit understanding of their limited options in society, which creates negative attitudes toward school, diminishes educational achievement and undoubtedly contributes to the appallingly high dropout rate among high school students in our nation's inner-cities. The U.S. General Accounting report entitled School Dropouts: Survey of Local Programs (1987) indicates that in the New York City public school system 55% of the high school student population drop-out. The report states, in addition, that the drop-out rate could be as much as 72% for minority

populations.

However, for those who do stay in school and graduate from high school, employment opportunities in New York City are limited because of the rising floor of educational credentials needed for entry into desirable jobs in the New York City labor market. In effect, the value of the high school diploma has declined. This devaluation has led many high school graduates who normally would not seek a college education, to do so now.

Credential Devaluation:

The notion of a devaluation of the high school diploma is consistent with the Status Competition paradigm. There is evidence that high status groups seek to improve their status through increased levels of education for themselves and their children, setting into motion an upward movement of educational credentials (Bondon, 1974; Collins, 1979).

Collins (1979) argues that the dominant culture raises the educational "ante" in order to maintain their social distinction. There is evidence that the pool of college-educated workers began to exceed the number of jobs requiring college training after World War II. This view is supported by a number of studies. Young (1974) suggests that a substantial proportion of all college graduates were acquiring jobs that had no recognizable relationship to their major field study while in college. Berg and Freeman

(1978) demonstrate a growing mismatch between the skills requirements of jobs and the education of workers. Knapp (1977) argues that most college graduates reported that on-the-job training contributed more than college training to their mastery of work task.

Also adding to the problem of credential inflation is that since the late 1950's New York City's employment opportunities in unskilled and semi-skilled areas, have been seriously reduced. As a result, the traditional blue-collar job market that was so rich in the early to mid-fifties, and upon which many of New York City's working class depend for employment, has dwindled to a mere shadow of its former self. It has been estimated that as of 1985, New York City's blue collar employment opportunities declined to 23% of the total job market. This amounts to a net loss of 339,000 unskilled and semi-skilled jobs (U.S. Department of Labor report # 60, 1985). Correspondingly, there has been growth in the white collar occupations: engineering, computer specialists, law, health diagnosing and the health treating professions, all of which require higher order skills. Sixty-four percent of the job openings as of 1985 were professional, technical and managerial (U.S. Department of Labor # 60, 1985). High school graduates, consequently, will have fewer employment opportunities in New York City because of the rising educational credentials needed for entry into the desirable labor market. Whether the value of the high school degree has declined because of status competition or because of society's needs, this devaluation has led many high school

graduates who normally would not seek a college education because of enrollment in non-academic or vocational high school curricula, to do so now.

Community College Enrollment Policies and the Educational Disadvantaged:

Individuals who enter the community colleges bring serious disadvantages with them as a result of ability grouping at the primary level and vocational tracking at the high school level. This disadvantage can be seen in the many New York City high school graduates who come to CUNY under-prepared in the traditional academic skills such as reading, mathematics and writing.

Since the initiation of an Open Admissions policy in 1970, CUNY has been faced with large numbers of freshmen from inner-city schools in need of instruction in the basic skills. By the end of the 1970's, a Freshmen Skills Assessment Program was established on a University-wide basis to assess competencies in writing, mathematics and reading. Examinations are required for all incoming freshmen in order to identify skill deficiencies. Students identified as deficient are placed in remedial courses to help them meet the University standards of competency prior to entering the upper-level courses.

The need for compensatory work is great; 84 % of the CUNY community college entrants are required to take at least one remedial course. However, in most urban community colleges fewer

than 90% of the students are required to enroll in a remedial course (Bender and Chalfant-Thomas, 1987). At Borough of Manhattan Community College (CUNY) more than 95% of those entering required remediation in one or more of the basic skills (Borough of Manhattan Community College, 1983). At New York City Technical College (CUNY)--the community college from which this study takes its sample--56% of those who entered in 1989 required and were placed in remediation.

Remedial courses in and of themselves are educational hurdles because of the time necessary to successfully complete them. For students who had entered CUNY during the 1970's, each remedial course taken added one-fifth of a year to time required to graduate (Lavin & Crook, 1990).

Other obstacles, intrinsic to the social and academic context of the community college itself may impede students' academic progress. A number of researchers have pointed to the community college curriculum tracking system (into academic transfer and terminal vocational tracks), the anti-academic orientation of a predominantly working class student body, and institutional efforts to lower students' initially high educational aspirations, as factors that diminish ultimate educational attainment and hence, life-chances (Alba & Lavin 1981; Anderson, 1981; Astin, 1972; Breneman & Nelson 1981; Brint & Karabel, 1989; London, 1978; Velez, 1985; Willis, 1981).

These social and academic processes in the community college are consistent with the conflict theory in sociology which stresses

that education merely transmits inequality from one generation to the next. This research suggests that low SES students may be steered away from occupations which traditionally require advanced levels of education because schools convince students that the selection of "talented" people is based on the meritocratic process (Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Collins, 1979).

Advocates of the community college argue that they offer access to higher education to the educationally disadvantaged who normally are ill-prepared and therefore are barred from the four year colleges (Cohen and Brawer, 1982). Although the open-admissions policies of the City University of New York have increased the numbers of students from low SES backgrounds in attendance, this access has not necessarily translated into increased education and life-chances. Since the 1960's the community college has offered an avenue to higher education for the masses by providing a vehicle for the first two years of a four-year higher education, however, during the 1920's the role of the two-year college was changed to include a vocational role by centuring the curriculum around technical skills. By the 1940's the two-year college was drawing on predominantly working class, low SES and educationally disadvantaged students because of its vocational focus.

Today, the community colleges enroll over 40% of all college bound students. But fewer than a quarter of these students will eventually transfer to four-year collegea (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1977). This fact is further supported by a strong body of research which has emerged over the

last two decades which argues that even after relative differences in the initial social and academic status of two-year and four-year college students are taken into account, the educational attainment of community college students is not as great as that of the four-year college students (Alba and Lavin 1981; Dougherty 1987; Velez, 1985).

Students who initially enroll in a four-year college are 19% more likely to receive a bachelor's degree within seven years than those who enroll in a community college (Velez, 1985). Of those who entered an academic program at a two-year college, 51% transferred within seven years of high school graduation (Velez and Javalgi, 1987). Additionally, only a third of the community college students eventually received their associate's degree (Monk-Turner, 1983). For two roughly matched groups of students in high school performance and educational aspirations, one of which enrolled at two-year colleges and the other at four-year colleges in the City University of New York system, the community college students were 14% less likely to receive a Bachelor's degree in five years (Alba and Lavin, 1981). There is speculation that the lower eventual educational attainment of the community college students is related to the vocational curricula of the two-year colleges (Dougherty, 1987). Over the last two decades the community college's educational effectiveness has been questioned. The main thrust of this criticism has been that the community college merely reproduces class (Karabel, 1972; Pincus, 1980).

Evidence suggests that reliance on the community colleges as

primary access to higher education by the working class, minority and low SES students represents a delusionary relation with the actuality of the college experience. Even though there is evidence that the participation in higher education of students from working class and low SES/minority backgrounds has increased dramatically over the last two decades, there has been little change in their economic and class mobility. Minority, working class and low SES students now represent the greater concentration of entrants in the urban community college. The problem of disproportionately poor and minority students in the community college arise because these colleges serve the inner-cities. This fact has led many researchers to conclude that the community colleges are the "anti-university colleges" (Jencks and Riesman, 1968). Additionally, it has been argued that the community college may act not as alternative educational path to increasing life-chances, but as a safety valve that permits universities and the labor market to pursue their priorities without criticism (Clark, 1960; Coleman and Hoffer 1965; Weiss, 1985).

To sum up, the major problems of the educability of New York City's inner-city youth are conditions within the public school system which tend to create negative attitudes toward school, diminish educational achievement and make dropping-out one of the more typical outcomes. Of those who successfully negotiate these hurdles, the majority of college-bound high school graduates enroll in a community college. The educational disadvantages such students bring with them make it likely that they will be placed in

remedial courses and make slow academic progress. They will be faced with additional educational hurdles resulting from the social and academic setting within the community college which are believed to depress educational aspirations and attainments. These factors seriously reduce the life-chances of such individuals.

Whether students survive this process may depend on some important social psychological factors. Students who perceive themselves (and perhaps are perceived in their communities) as being academically successful as a result of graduation from high school and college enrollment, as compared to their peers, are likely to have high academic self-concept (ASC). This high self-concept could be a psycho-social consequence of being a statistical elite within their comparison/reference group.

Development of Self as a Statistical Elite Among the Educational Disadvantaged:

Comparison/reference groups are social categories that an individual uses to help define beliefs, attitudes, values and self-concept. Reference/comparison groups act as social constructs by which self-image is developed. Thus, comparison/reference groups are modes for adopting rules and values that directly affect self-image and behavior (Merton, 1949). Therefore, reference groups set norms, beliefs and values and define standards for students. A comparative reference group provides a standard by which students evaluate their behavior (Festinger, 1954; Kelley, 1952). This

evaluation affects a student's self-image and social behavior. Moreover, students often rely on the achieved characteristics of peers as indicators of success or failures.

Self-concept is based on past judgments, perceptions and feedback of the generalized and significant others. One's sense of self consists of the person's thoughts about the unified whole of his/her own body, intellect, emotions, personality, and actions (Mead, 1934). Mead repeatedly emphasized that the self is inherently social in nature and must be considered as part of the whole social process. The self can come into existence only in terms of society and interaction with others. For Mead there is no mind/ body dualism, because the self involves a unity of the body/mind as a social process.

Mead established both evolutionary and developmental percepts on the emergence of self. Human selves, according to Mead, could only emerge after humanity utilize significant symbols or language. Significant symbols allow individuals to assume the role of the listener and in so doing achieve an objective, outsider's view of his/her own self as a social object. Therefore, self arises slowly and develops during childhood through symbolic social interaction.

For children to obtain a clear view of themselves as selves, they need to take on the role of others, seeing themselves as social things. Mead establishes three stages by which this process takes place. The first is early use of significant symbols. The emergent self requires a way for the individual to take on an objective, impersonal attitude toward him/herself. Within this

stage it is necessary for the individual to become an object to him/herself. When children begin to use language, they gain access to the simplest form of role taking in which they hear their own significant symbols in an objective manner and process an objective view of their own thoughts and utterances. It is through the use of symbols and the assumption of roles, that the individual becomes an object to him/herself.

The second stage of development is play. After children begin to role-play, they further develop their personalities and selves. Playing the roles of others--ie. playing mommy, daddy, teacher--allows to children to use parts of those roles to build self. According to Mead the self is modeled on others, and the roles children play have an effect on the development of personality. For Mead, the child's perception of parents is the most influential view of self for the child. Subsequently, the perceptions and judgments of others about self is integrated along with that of the parents to organize self.

Lastly, games facilitate further development toward the integration of self. Because children learn to play games, they learn to synchronize groups and rules which later act as models for social action. Games provide an important transition from childhood to adulthood.

Mead divided the self into two distinctive parts, the "I" and the "ME". The "I" is the subject, and the "Me" is the object. The "I" is the self that acts: the "Me" is the part of self that we see as the object when we take on the role of others. When we talk

with someone it is the "I" who speaks. As soon as we hear ourselves, we respond to ourselves as the object and therefore, respond as the "Me." "Me" only arises through role taking. The "Me" is a composite view of self based on the perceptions of others. The "I" can be observed only when "I" reveals "Me". Essentially the self of the present is the "I," but as soon as the "I" acts, it slips into the past where it is our memory of the previous moment as a part of "Me." Thus "Me" is always the reflective self while the "I" is elusive and only inferred from the observation of the "Me."

The "I" and "Me" serve different functions for the individual and society. The "Me" is the self-regulating and imposes structure based on values and the social control of self. The "I" is the sources of spontaneity, innovation and creativity. Together these two forms of self serve an important function by combining the role of creativity with social order.

Although Mead did not specifically refer to a part of self which develops and acquires formal cognitive skills, over the last two to three decades, researchers using Mead's model have defined academic self-concept as an individual's assessment of his/her ability to learn, to perform academically and to internalize various forms of academic behavior (Brookover, Thomas & Paterson 1964). Furthermore, self-perception is reflected socially in the judgments of the community. Roles become actions which are socially constructed by the community and provide a definition of self which represents individual guides to self-perception and actions (Callero, Howard

& Piliavin, 1987).

There is a long tradition in social psychology literature which indicates that positive self-concept of ability has an important influence on the student's academic success. Much of this research suggests that individuals interpret their abilities in ways congruent with prior self-conceptions, always seeking self-confirming perceptions and often resisting that which is inconsistent with their self-perceptions. (Jussim, Coleman & Nassau, 1987). Wells and Sweeney (1986), demonstrated that students with high academic self-concept continuously overrate their academic successes. Further evidence concludes that high and low self esteem may partially be self-maintaining. Specifically, these interpretive processes will lead individuals high in self-concept, in comparison to those with low self-concept, to believe they succeed more and failed less, even when actual performance is similar "(Jussim,Coleman & Nassau, 1987). Biddle,Bank and Slavings (1987) indicate that individuals will seek out that behavior which is consistent with their self identities. This evidence is consistent with Rosenberg (1979), Gecas (1982), who stated that the self remains comparatively resolute as a result of long-term stable social relationships. On the other hand, Brookover and Schurr (1967) report having observed that self-concept changes, as the generalized and significant others change, over time and social event.

There is also evidence that students with low self-concept are not concerned with unflattering feedback but are concerned with

their deficiencies becoming public. On the other hand, students with high self-concept seem to be unconcerned with the public knowing their scores but are threatened when they find out how they performed (Leary, Barnes,Griebel, Mason & McCormacks, 1987).

Research has suggested that self-concept is not fixed but changes over time and with reference group identity. Brookover and Passalacqua (1982) have reported that black students within predominantly black schools consistently rate their self academic ability higher than white students within predominantly white schools. The authors argue that this reported high self-assessment may be related to estimating themselves within their reference group, and if placed within a heterogeneous group, these relatively high assessments may spiral downward.

There is mounting evidence, however, that ASC is highly correlated with academic success especially among minority and low SES students (Astin, 1982; Bailey, 1978; DiCesare,1972; Gurin, 1979; Horowitz, 1972; Sedlacek, 1972; and Sedlacek and Brooks, 1976). Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) demonstrated that minority students who have achieved academic success at the college level have strong positive self-concept. The American educational system, according to the authors, forces minority students to traverse many academic and social obstacles, and as a result, these students are in need of greater resolve in order to continue their education. DiCesare (1972) and Sedlacek and Brooks (1972) indicate that black high school students who overcome many of these academic setbacks are positive they will earn a college degree. According to Epps

(1969), black high school students with high self-concept had greater academic success than those with low self-concept. Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) also found this to be true of black students at the university level.

Though research has shown that academic self-concept factors have been good predictors of academic performance on the college level, academic performance measurements such as the SAT, academic placement tests and high school average have been better predictors of college grades than the self-concept (Bailey, 1978; Griffore & Samuels, 1979; Lavin, 1965; Robinson & Copper, 1984).

Promoting Academic Success Among the Educational Disadvantage:

For educators, having knowledge of ASC has implications for the selection of students, specifically minorities, who are in need of programs to promote academic success. According to a report ,Who Cares About The Inner-Cities? (Manpower, 1989), African-American men residing in inner-cities have a far greater chance of going to jail than to college. The significance of this to the economic and social health of New York City rests on the ability of nation's school systems to provide educational programs over the next decade which will create opportunities for inner-city youth and will enable this country to be prepared to compete in the highly technical global market of the twenty-first century. According to Manpower Comments (1989) occupations such as engineering, computer specialists, law, health diagnosing and the health-treating

professions are expected to grow at a 24 % faster rate than the total employment market. Employment of technicians and related support occupations should increase by 32% over the next decade. According to a report by the Hudson Institute entitled Workforce 2000 (1987), 56% of the new entrants in this expanded job market are expected to be minorities. In 1989, however, the number of Bachelor's degrees in engineering that were awarded nationally dropped to 68,824 from
71,121 in 1988. The percentages of minorities going into engineering has also declined distressingly. For example, 3.1% of the Black males and 2.9% of Hispanic males received Bachelor's degrees in engineering, and 15.3% of all women were awarded Bachelor's degrees in engineering during 1989. During the same year 26,412 Master's degrees were awarded in engineering. The percentage of women receiving a Master's in engineering was 7.4%, for Black males it was .016% and for Hispanic males .017%. The number of Ph.D.'s in engineering awarded in 1989 was 5,017. Eight percent were women, .006% were Black males and .007% were Hispanic males.

Given the possible importance of high ASC for academic success, the implementation of a policy which identifies students with low ASC and invites them to participate in a self-concept building curriculum may increase their chances of becoming academically successful at the community college level.

College students with low ASC, low high school average, and low standing on the traditional academic skills tests, appear to be

especially high academic risks. Such students might benefit from a self-concept raising curriculum. An example of one of the many proactive self-concept building programs was established in the school system of Olympia, Washington in 1977. This program attempted to make all players, both faculty members and students, feel important and valuable. Faculty were encouraged to try new teaching ideas and creative methods. The students were assigned to "advisory classes:" small groups that met with an advisor every school day. In this setting, issues directly related to self-concept and self-awareness were raised. Advisors also followed the social and academic progress of the students in their group and interacted with their teachers to avoid problems before they began.

Therefore, having a tool which would predict those who are at "academic risk" and a program which would raise ASC and simultaneously provide the traditional academic skills could increase the academic chances of such individuals. Such a program could also be cost effective as it can efficiently direct resources towards individuals identified as an academic risks. The concentration of resources into such an effort may promote the academic success of such individuals and open employment possibilities which were not available previously due to restrictions posed by their academic failure.

Sample: The sample for this research are students enrolled at New York City Technical College CUNY. Because of New York City Technical College's (CUNY) large minority (72%) and low income population (reported mean yearly income is $ 12,500.00), and because this college graduates 60% of the minority technicians in the health and computer science areas in New York State and 10% of the minority technicians nationally the results of this effort could have significance in a number of ways: a) It will study patterns of retention at the City University. b) The economic growth of New York City could by stimulated by the addition of better educated and competent workers. c) It will examine the production of educational equality for populations who currently suffer from inequality.

Questions Under Study:

As I suggested earlier, in contrast to prior research in this area, students who have overcome the many educational obstacles of the New York City public schools may have high academic self-concept. This may come as a result of the psycho-social effects of their very high standing within their reference/comparison groups. This study will examine the following questions:

. Is self-concept of Ability as measured by the Brookover Self-Concept of Ability Scale a predictor of several dimensions of academic success (ie. GPA, credits earned and persistence after four semesters of study) ?

. Is there a relationship between social origins and academic

success?

. Is there a relationship between educational background and academic success?

III. Types of Data and Research Procedures

Types of Data: The study will employ five categories of data in analyzing the main concepts advanced here. The categories of data are: (1) SOCIAL BACKGROUND including gender, ethnic background, marital status, family income, residential status, mother's educational attainment, father's educational attainment, respondent's income, country of origin, college experience of siblings, reasons for attending college, funding sources for college, and the highest college degree of the respondents. (2) EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND including the number of college preparatory courses taken in high school, high school average, high school average in math and English. (3) SCORES ON CUNY's STANDARDIZED ASSESSMENT EXAMINATIONS including a) the respondent's CUNY math score. The CUNY Mathematics Skills Assessment Test is a 40-item math and algebra test designed to identify students with math deficiencies. The test is locally constructed with no national norms. This exam measures basic mathematical skills in whole numbers, fractions, decimals, percents, ratio and proportion, signed numbers, equations, Pythagorean Theorem, word problems and all forms of algebraic representations; b) CUNY reading score. The CUNY Freshmen Skills Assessment Test in reading is a 45 item reading comprehension subject of the Descriptive Tests of Language Skills (DTLS) (Educational Testing Service, 1978). The DTLS was specifically designed to identify students who may need special assistance in particular aspects of reading and language use before undertaking standard college level work. c) CUNY writing score. The

CUNY Writing Skills Assessment test is a choice of three out of five essay type test designed to identify students with deficiencies in writing. This examination was also locally constructed with no national norms. (4) MEASURES OF COLLEGE PERFORMANCE including the respondent's GPA after four semesters, number of college credits earned over the four semester period, enrollment or persistence status after four semesters: (5) SELF-CONCEPT OF ABILITY is measured by the Brookover Self-concept of Ability Scale. Self-concept of ability is assessed at a general level and also in areas of math, reading and writing.

Over the last two decades the Brookover Self-concept of Ability Scale has been a reliable and valid instrument for assessing academic self-concept and has been cited in over 175 publications. The scale consists of eight Guttman scale items selected to differentiate students on perception of academic ability. The eight items are divided into two conceptual dimensions each composed of two logical subjects:(a) future- oriented (questions concerned with future educational goals and their ability to realize them) and present-oriented items (questions concerned with one's ability to do college work), and (b) comparative and absolute evaluations of self-concept of ability. Brookover, Thomas,and Paterson (1964) reported test-retest coefficients for their normalization sample of .95 for males and .96 for females. They also reported internal reliability coefficients of .82 for males and .77 for females. Shavelson, Hubner, and Stanton (1976) reported predictive validity coefficients for the ASC and various subject area achievement tests

ranging from .63 to .88 for males, and .52 to .68 for females. In meta analysis of the relationship between self and achievement performance measures, Hansford and Hattie (1982) found the ASC correlated best to academic performance measures (M=.43 in 18 studies analyzed) among a group of nine self-concept scales. Byrne and Shavelson (1987) found the ASC significantly and consistently correlated with various English self-concept scales, as well as grades in English and mathematics.

Additionally, I have included within this general category of self-esteem the student's self-assessment of his/her college skills. There is evidence to suggest a correlation between college grades and the perception of brightness (Lavin, Alba and Silberstein, 1981).

Data on educational background, CUNY assessment examinations and academic performance (categories 2, 3 and 4) will be extracted from New York City Technical College's official records. Information on social background and self-concept of ability (categories 1 and 5) will be assessed from a questionnaire (see appendix 1) administered to 350 freshmen students enrolled in the Freshmen Year Experience courses entitled Academic Access 101 at New York City Technical College during the Fall 1989 semester. This course is a one credit, one and a half hour course designed to provide freshmen students with an introduction to college life. All entering freshmen are encouraged to enroll in AA 101. The instructors of 23 AA 101 courses (out of fifty AA 101 courses offered during the Fall'89 semester) administered the questionnaire

to their class on the first day of classes. Approximately 300 questionnaires were returned completed. This sample which represents approximately 10% of the entering Freshmen class at this college will be followed through four college semesters (from September of 1989 through June 1991).

Statistical Analysis:

In order to address the questions of this research project, multiple regression analysis will be performed on several dimensions of college performance, social/educational background, CUNY Freshmen Skills Scores, degree aspirations, reasons for entering college, the student's self-assessment of brightness and self-concept of ability.

IV. The Community College Student: An Academic Background and Socio-economic Profile

The community college, almost absent from the American higher educational scene prior to the turn of the 20th century has emerged, according to some scholars, as a primary agent of the reproduction of class, values and attitudes (Bowles and Gintis, 1976; Brint and Karabel, 1989).

As the name implies, the community college is a community based social institution which is thought to satisfy the educational goals of the population who live in the community that the college. There is research which suggests that the community college acts to reproduce class. Additionally, over the last two decades there has been the growth of a specific form of school, the urban public community-college, which has been characterized by some scholars as anti-academic (Anderson, 1981; Astin, 1972; Breneman & Nelson 1981; Brint & Karabel, 1989; London, 1978; Velez, 1985).

This chapter explores a number of interrelated factors which may influence the academic progress of the educationally disadvantaged at the community college level. These factors flow from the theoretical concepts set forth in Chapter 2.
Such factors as the individual's social origins as indicated by parents' education and the family's economic resources will be discussed.

Since academic background is another factor which may affect college progress, we will look at such factors as overall high school average, high school average in mathematics and in English

and the number of college preparatory courses this sample has been exposed to in high school. These educational background factors can be viewed as indicators of high school tracking.

We will look at degree aspirations. A strong body of research which has emerged over the last two decades suggests that a great many of minority and low SES students enrolled in the urban community college view such an institution as their first step toward achieving their degree goals of the Baccalaureate or higher. These goals, for many, simply do not come to fruition.

The final factor we will be looking at which may affect college progress is self-concept of ability. A long tradition in the social-psychology literature suggests that global and subject specific self-concept may actually act as a countervailing force in overcoming many previous academic disadvantages. Thus, we will be looking at self-concept factors as well.

All of the above factors will help us address the fundamental aim of this chapter by providing a socio-economic and educational profile of this community college sample.

Each of the above-mentioned factors presents us with a straight forward story of the typicality of students enrolled in a public urban community college. Thus, this data has wider implications beyond the CUNY system. Indeed, each variable used in this study describes how similarly disadvantaged this sample is regardless of ethnicity. Despite the fact that White students in this sample seemed somewhat better off than the minority students in terms of social origins and academic preparation, the similarities between

the students outweighed the differences in almost all areas of inquiry.

We begin this story by looking at two fundamental aspects of social origins: parental education and family income.

Parents' Education:

Chapter 2 related that by almost any measure the children of the working class and low SES do poorly in school. They drop out more, score lower on standardized tests, achieve lower high school averages, go to college in smaller numbers, achieve lower grade point averages, earn fewer credits and take longer to graduate than their contemporaries from educated families.

Although most parents want their children to succeed in school they differ in the means they employ to meet this end. Working class and low SES parents depend upon the teacher and the school to educate their children. Conversely, the middle class parents actively participate in the supervision and the monitoring of their children's school achievements.

Research suggests that parental involvement in their children's education may depend on the parents' educational background. Lareau (1987) suggests that middle class parents (who are generally more educated than low SES and working class individuals) viewed their children's education as a shared experience between teacher and parent. On the other hand the working class parents turn over most, if not all the responsibility of their children's education to the teacher and school.

Furthermore, language comparisons of working class and low SES families and middle class families suggest that there may be a differential between the language of the home and the language of the schools (Bernstein, 1975; Cazden, 1986,; Delgado-Gaiton, 1987; Heath, 1982; and Philips, 1982).

Generally, language differences are not a significant problem, except in the power relationship between teacher and student (Bernstein, 1975). Within this relationship a breakdown of communication between teacher and the low SES/working class child creates a learning resistance which results in academic failure. On the other hand, the language mode of the middle class is more often is the same mode used in schools. Because the middle class child has been socialized and is familiar with this language use, he/she is usually more successful in school than his/her low SES/working class contemporaries.

The data from the NYCTC sample suggest that more than half, or 6 out of 10, Hispanic students report that their mothers have not graduated from high school. Slightly less than half of the Black students and one-third of the White students report that their mothers have not graduated high school (see table 4.1).
Presumably, the lack of a formal education by the majority of the mothers of this sample diminished their ability to assist their children during their school careers, and certainly diminished their ability to help their children during their college careers, increasing the odds that their children will have diminished college performance.

Table 4.1 Mother's Education By Ethnicity

N=307

	Mother's Education		
	Some H.S.or Less	+ H.S. Grad.+	Some College or More
Hispanic N=126	58%	22%	20%
Black N=135	43%	26%	31%
White N=46	31%	36%	33%

Likewise, nearly two-thirds or 7 out of 10 of the Hispanic fathers, almost half of the Black fathers and more than one-third of the White fathers did not graduate from high school (see table 4.2). This data reflects the wider class and race social structure as White parents tended to receive more education than their minority counterparts. Nonetheless, this sample had most likely not been socialized and familiarized within the dominant culture. Consequently, academic success may have been impeded from the initial moments of schooling through college.

It may be recalled that Bourdieu and Passeron (1977) argue that culture is "... fully mastered only when the culture it inculcates

has been acquired by familiarization..which the social conditions are given to families whose culture is the culture of the dominant class...." (4).

Table 4.2 Father's Education By Ethnicity

N=307

	Father's Education		
	Some H.S.or Less	H.S. Grad.	Some College or More
Hispanic N=126	66%	23%	11%
Black N=135	51%	27%	22%
White N=46	39%	36%	25%

4) Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J.C. (1977). Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. London: Sage Publications. Pg.127

Family Income:

In Chapter 2 we saw that the family's resources have both direct and indirect influences on school achievement. Several studies have noted the direct effects of the family's income as a dimension of economic and cultural capital. Under-privileged families simply do not have the direct funds for school-supported interventions such as tutoring, private schools, travel vacations, books, computers, educational materials or merely the leisure time spent in parent/child interaction.

There is also a long history of research which suggests that the indirect effects of income, such residence in socially deprived areas results in lower educational attainment (Garner, Main and Raffe, 1988; Fox and Goldblatt, 1982). Psychological studies have also shown that low SES residential environments are associated with a predisposition to educational failure because of the influence of group norm interaction (Robson, 1969). Additionally, families under economic pressure may produce individuals who feel a sense of futility and hopelessness which further reduces educational achievement (Garner, Main and Raffe, 1988).

Predictably, family income also continues the disadvantaged similarity story line referred to earlier. The White students are in better shape than the minority students, but the majority of the White students are living in what can be defined as modest conditions, and the minority students are very nearly at, or below the poverty level. The data from the NYCTC sample suggests that more than half of the Hispanic families in this sample earn less

than $10,000 per annum. Almost half of the Black families and one-third of the White families earn less than $10,000 per annum (see table 4.3). It must be noted that the mean reported income for the 1970 community college cohort was $7,266. Between 1970 and 1990, commodity prices and salaries have quadrupled. These facts leave no doubt that the mean reported annual income of $10,500 defines this sample as seriously economically disadvantaged.

Although the White families are clearly not big wage earners, they seem to fare better when compared to the Hispanic and Black families. Given the research amassed over the last several decades concerning economic and cultural capital, White students on average may enjoy greater college success than their minority contemporaries.

Table 4.3 **Family's Income Before Taxes By Ethnicity**

N=307

Income	Hispanic N=126	Black N=135	White N=46
Less than 9,9999	53%	48%	31%
10,000 to 15,999	20%	14%	12%
16,000 to 24,999	15%	14%	17%
25,000 to 29,999	5%	6%	15%
30,000 or More	6%	15%	26%

Educational Background:

Chapter 2 demonstrated that almost without exception poor educational outcomes can be traced to a number of educational policies (ability grouping and tracking) enacted in order to educate students with different learning styles.

Although it is commonly thought by the general public that the primary school, high school and college are independent of one another in the educational continuum of the individual especially for the individual assigned to the lower ability group at the

primary school level and the non-college preparatory curriculum within the high school, the educational effect for the individual is cumulative in nature. This accumulative disadvantage negatively effects the student's educational attainment at all levels of schooling, especially at the college level.

As noted in Chapter 2, ability grouping practices at the primary school level are closely associated with teacher perception according to class, culture and race characteristics. The middle class teacher's perception and judgments of the low SES child's behavior and intellectual prowess may result in the placement of such students into low ability groups because of race and class differences. This placement has tangible and long lasting negative consequences for the academic achievement of the individual.

Research inquiry into the comprehensive high school tracking policy points to this system as reproducing the values and attitudes characteristic of social class. The college preparatory track tends to reproduce middle class values by supporting the type of personality which reflects the possible demands of professional occupations.

Conversely, the non-college preparatory track tends to reproduce values and attitudes which reflect the types of occupations associated with the working/blue collar class.

As was noted earlier, each of the variables used in this study tells a straight forward story of homogeneity within this sample. It comes as no surprise therefore, that the educational background of this sample also mirrors this phenomenon. A perfect example of

this is the academic units this sample was exposed to in high school. In the New York City public school system a complete college preparatory track is equivalent to 16 academic units. The data from the NYCTC sample seem to suggest that only 5% of the Black students, and 14% of the Hispanic students had been exposed to an academic track in high school as compared to 30% of the White students (see table 4.4).

Table 4.4 **Academic Units taken In High School By Ethnicity**

N=307

Academic Units - $\bar{X}$=9.8	6 or Less	7 to 10	11 to 13	14 to 16
Hispanic N=126 - $\bar{X}$= 8.6	20%	46%	20%	14%
Black N=135 - $\bar{X}$=9.4	25%	51%	20%	5%
White N=46 $\bar{X}$=11.5	12%	43%	17%	29%

As we have seen in Chapter 2 academic success may be associated with one single common factor--being socialized and

familiarized within the dominant culture. This data suggests support for the lack of socialization and familiarization within the dominant culture among the members of this sample. For example, the data from this sample shows that 48% of the Hispanic students, 60% of the Black students and 39% of the White students have only achieved a high school average of 70 or below in academic courses (see table 4.5).

Table 4.5 High School Averages By Ethnicity

N=307

	High School Averages			
	70 or Less	71 to 75	76 to 79	80 or Higher
Hispanic N=126	48%	30%	12%	10%
Black N=135	60%	24%	10%	6%
White N=46	39%	19%	17%	24%

As was indicated earlier in Chapter 2, and in Table 4.5, the urban community college students high school backgrounds are

generally highlighted by the lack of exposure to an academic college preparatory curriculum. Even to the extent that such students had been exposed to an academic curriculum, they performed poorly. This can be seen in the high school averages in mathematics and English, two fundamental components of the college preparatory track. Through detailed analysis of this sample's high school averages in English and mathematics it will become clear that they are reflective of the disadvantaged similarity phenomenon. For example, Table 4.6 indicates that 72% of the Hispanic students, 76% of the Black students and 53% of the White students have only achieved a high school average in mathematic of 70 or less. The fact that only 4% of this entire sample has earned a "B" in high school mathematics provides further evidence of a lack of academic experience.

Table 4.6 High School Average in Mathematic By Ethnicity

N=307

	High School Average in Mathematics			
	70 or Less	71 to 75	76 to 79	80 or Higher
Hispanic N=126	72%	15%	10%	2%
Black N=135	76%	14%	7%	4%
White N=46	53%	19%	21%	7%

Similarly, 46% of the Hispanic students, 49% of the Black students and 33% of the White students have only achieved a high school average in English of 70 or lower (see table 4.7). Only 24% of this entire sample has earned a "B." Once again this data suggests that individuals in this sample are more alike than different in many ways. The White students fared slightly better than their Black and Hispanic counterparts; 3 in 10 of the White students have earned a "B" in high school English. This sample can not be viewed as individuals with strong academic backgrounds.

Table 4.7 High School Average in English By Ethnicity

N=307

	High School Average in English			
	70 or Less	71 to 75	76 to 79	80 or Higher
Hispanic N=126	46%	19%	22%	13%
Black N=135	49%	23%	15%	14%
White N=46	33%	24%	13%	30%

Basic Skills Assessment:

The literature in Chapter 2 clearly indicates that individuals who finished high school with little college preparatory exposure, or a weak performance in an academic track enter the community college with serious academic disadvantages. More conclusive proof of this might be the samples' performance on the CUNY Assessment Skills Examinations. The data from the NYCTC sample suggests support for the claim that there is a great need of compensatory work needed by the students. For example, 75% of the Hispanic students, 72% of the Black students and 48% of the White students have failed the CUNY Freshmen Skills examination in mathematics.

It may be recalled from Chapter 3 that the CUNY Mathematics Skills Assessment Test is a 40-item math and algebra test designed to identify students with math deficiencies. The test is locally constructed with no national norms. This exam measures basic mathematical skills in whole numbers, fractions, decimals, percents, ratio and proportion, signed numbers, equations, Pythagorean Theorem, word problems and all forms of algebraic representations.

Test results indicate that 61%, or a little more than 6 in 10 of the Hispanic students, 58%, or a little fewer than 6 out of 10 of the Black students, and 41%, or a little more than 4 in 10 of the White students failed the CUNY Freshmen Skills Examination in reading. _As was indicated in Chapter 3, the CUNY Freshmen Skills Assessment Test in reading is a 45 item reading comprehension subject of the Descriptive Tests of Language Skills (DTLS) (Educational Testing Service, 1978). The DTLS was specifically designed to identify students who may need special assistance in particular aspects of reading and language use before undertaking standard college level work.

Lastly, 74% of the Hispanic students, 71% of the Black students or 7 out of 10 of the minority students and 55% of the White students failed the CUNY Freshmen Skills Examination in writing (see table 4.8). Chapter 3 describes the CUNY Writing Skills Assessment test as an essay test where students are given the choice of answering three out of five essay-type questions. The writing test is designed to identify students with deficiencies in

writing.

Table 4.8

Non-Proficiency In CUNY Assessment Examinations By Ethnicity

N=307

	CUNY Assessment Examinations		
	Math	**Reading**	**Writing**
Hispanic N=126	75%	61%	74%
Black N=135	72%	58%	71%
White N=46	48%	41%	55%

A mean comparison of the CUNY Assessment Examination scores provides further support for the fact that the majority of this sample are handicapped in the basic skills. For example, a passing grade in CUNY reading Assessment Examination is 28. The mean reading score for both the Black and Hispanic students is 27. The mean reading score for the White students is 32.

The passing grade for the CUNY Assessment Examination in mathematics is 28. The mean mathematic examination score in this

sample is 26 for the Hispanic students, 27 for the Black students and 31 for the White students.

Lastly, the passing grade in the CUNY writing examination is 8. The mean CUNY writing score for the Hispanic students is 6.5, 6 for the Black students and 7.5 for the White students (see table 4.9).

Again this data suggests that the White students tend to fare better than their Hispanic and Black contemporaries.

Table 4.9

Mean CUNY Assessment Examination Scores By Ethnicity

N=307

	CUNY Assessment Examinations		
	Math	**Reading**	**Writing**
Hispanic N=126	26 (SD=2.90)	27 (SD=3.45)	6.5 (SD=1.31)
Black N=135	27 (SD=3.04)	27 (SD=3.16)	6 (SD=1.31)
White N=46	31 (SD=3.08)	31 (SD=3.17)	7.5 (SD=1.54)

Degree Aspirations:

As was noted in Chapter 2, academic weaknesses notwithstanding, there is a large body of research which suggests that minority and low SES college students have high degree aspirations (Brint and Karabel, 1989; Lavin, Alba and Silberstein, 1981). Research emerging over the last two decades suggests that a great many of minority and low SES students enrolled in the urban community college view such an institution as their first step toward achieving their degree goals of the Baccalaureate or higher. However, even after relative differences in the initial social and academic status of two-year and four-year college students are taken into account, the educational attainment of community college students is less than that of the four-year students (Alba and Lavin 1981; Dougherty 1987; Velez, 1985).

Research has suggested that for two groups of students that were roughly matched on high school performance and educational aspirations enrolled at the two-year and four-year colleges at the City University of New York, the community college students were 14% less likely to have received a Bachelor's degree in five years (Alba and Lavin, 1981). It has been suggested that the lower eventual educational attainment of the community college student is related to the vocational curricula and the social context of the two-year colleges (Dougherty, 1987). Finally, only a third of the community college students eventually received their associate's degree (Monk-Turner, 1983).

Nationally, 32% to 40% of the minority full-time community

college students wish to earn a Bachelor's degree. The data from the NYCTC sample suggests that 77%, or almost 8 in 10 of the Black students, 79%, or nearly 8 in 10 of the Hispanic students and 35%, or more than 3 in 10 of the White students wish to earn a Baccalaureate or higher (see table 4.10).

Table 4.10 **Degree Aspiration By Ethnicity**

N=307

	Degree Aspirations		
	AA	**BA**	**MA or Higher**
Hispanic N=126	21%	62%	17%
Black N=135	23%	52%	25%
White N=46	65%	21%	14%

It can extrapolated from this data that Black and Hispanic students have higher degree aspirations than their White peers. Because of this sample's socio-economic background, the lack of academic training and the absence of the socialization or familiarization within the dominant culture, one can predict a

chasm between degree plans and actual attainment by these minority students.

Bourdieu defines aspirations as the "internalization" of the possibilities for personal success. Though the calculation of the likelihood of meeting specific goals is internal, these goals must constantly be filtered through structural constraints in the form of the opportunity structure. Therefore, Bourdieu's concept does not simply mean that individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds fail to realize their aspirations, but that they fail because they are not surrounded by enough examples of success in order for them to believe there is a possibility of them attaining their goals. The lack of resources and supportive friends and family with experience in achieving goals may be the foundations of failure. Bourdieu's framework can thus be viewed as an explanation of the gap between aspiration and the realization of goals by minority and low SES students. Finally, perhaps the degree aspiration gap we saw earlier between the ethnic White students and their minority contemporaries is because ethnic White students due to their parents' occupations are more familiar with unionized trades. They typically gravitate to vocational careers which do not require a Baccalaureate.

Blacks and Hispanics in comparison, traditionally have not had access to such trades. Minority students may view a Baccalaureate as their first step toward a career and overlook the AA/AAS degree direction.

On the other hand, some critics have argued that minority

students have an unrealistic view of their ability to complete a Baccalaureate. As a result, they enter college with high degree plans which ultimately are not realized.

Self-Concept of Ability:

As was noted in Chapters 1 and 2 the major problems with the education of the inner-city youth are conditions within the public school system which tend to create negative attitudes toward school, diminish educational achievement and make dropping-out one of the more typical outcomes. Among those who successfully negotiate these hurdles, the majority of college bound high school graduates will enroll in a community college. However, such individuals bring with them many educational handicaps making it likely that they will be placed in remedial courses which may help improve academic skills while slowing academic progress. These students will be faced with additional educational hurdles resulting from the social and academic setting within the community college which is believed to depress educational aspirations and attainments. Together, these factors accumulate and seriously reduce educational attainment and life-chances of such individuals.

Whether students survive this process may depend on some important social psychological factors. Students who perceive themselves (and perhaps are perceived in their communities) as being academically successful because they have graduated from high school and enrolled in college, as compared to the large majority of their cohort group who have not, are likely to have high

academic self-concept (ASC). This high self-concept could be a psycho-social consequence of being a statistical elite within their comparison/reference group.

Comparison/reference groups are social categories that an individual uses to help define beliefs, attitudes, values and self-concept. Reference/comparison groups act as social constructs through which self-image is developed. Thus, comparison/reference groups are modes for adopting rules and values that directly affect self-image and hence behavior (Merton, 1949).

Academic self-concept is based on past judgments, perceptions and feedback of the generalized and significant others (Mead, 1934), and is an individual's assessment of his/her ability to learn, to perform academically and to internalize various forms of academic behavior (Brookover, Thomas & Paterson, 1964). Furthermore, self-perception is reflected socially in the judgments of the community. In this way, roles become actions which are socially constructed by the community and which provide a definition of self. This definition represents individual guides to self-perception and actions (Callero, Howard & Piliavin, 1987).

There is a long tradition in the social psychology literature indicating that positive self-concept of ability has a great influence on the student's academic success. There is mounting evidence that ASC is closely correlated to academic success, especially among minority and low SES students (Astin,1982; Bailey, 1978; DiCesare,1972; Gurin, 1969; Horowitz, 1972; Pfeifer and Sedlacek, 1975; Sedlacek, 1977; and Sedlacek and Brooks, 1976).

It may be recalled from the literature review in Chapter 2 that Sedlacek and Brooks (1976) demonstrated that minority students who have achieved academic success at the college level possess strong positive self-concept. The American educational system, according to the authors, forces minority students to traverse many academic and social obstacles, therefore, these students need greater resolve in order to continue their education. It was also noted in Chapter 2 that DiCesare (1972), Sedlacek and Brooks (1972) indicate that black high school students who overcome many of these academic setbacks are positive they will earn a college degree. According to Epps (1969) black high school students with high self-concept had greater academic success than those with low self-concept. Sedlacek and Brooks (1972) also found this to be true of black students at the university level.

As was noted in Chapter 3, the Brookover Self-concept of Ability Scale is the instrument used in assessing academic self-concept for this sample. The scale consists of eight Guttman scale items, selected to differentiate students on perception of academic ability. The Brookover Self-concept of Ability Scale (global self-concept) is an eight item instrument with integer values from 0 to 40 divided into two conceptual dimensions. Each dimension is composed of two logical subjects: a) future-oriented: questions concerned with future educational goals and their ability to realize them, and present-oriented items: questions concerned with one's ability to do college work, and b) comparative and absolute evaluations of self-concept of ability.

Self-concept of ability scales in reading, mathematics and writing are also divided into the same conceptual dimensions as the Brookover Self-concept of Ability scale. The reading self-concept of ability scale is a ten item scale with integer values from 0 to 50; the Self-concept of Ability scale in mathematics and writing has nine items with a integer value scale from 0 to 45.

Byrne and Shavelson (1987) found the self-concept of ability significantly and consistently correlated with various English and mathematics self-concept scales as well as with grades in English and mathematics.

A mean comparison of both the subject specific and global self-concept of ability for this sample suggests that White students rate themselves higher than the Black and Hispanic students in all areas of self-concept of ability (see table 4.11). This data suggests a direct contradiction of the theoretical literature review in Chapter 2. However, it should be noted that these findings are consistent with the larger more comprehensive research of CUNY students in which White students rated themselves brighter than minority students (Lavin, Alba and Silberstein, 1981).

This data may suggest that the White students have greater familiarity and more frequent positive academic exploits within the traditional cognitive skills because of a wider exposure to the three "R's" in high school.

Table 4.11 Self-Concept of Ability By Ethnicity

N=307

	Self-Concept of Ability			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Global
Hispanic N=126	36 (SD=11)	38 (SD=15)	35 (SD=13)	32 (SD=18)
Black N=135	39 (SD=10)	36 (SD=14)	37 (SD=10)	31 (SD=16)
White N=46	42 (SD=12)	40 (SD=10)	39 (SD=13)	35 (SD=14)

To sum up, this data describes the sample as consisting of a typical urban community-college population: a) a college student who is nearly at the bottom rung of the socio-economic ladder, b) an individual whose parents are not familiar with the dominant culture, c) a person who comes to college without sufficient preparation in the basic skills, d) a student who has had little or no exposure to the traditional academic curriculum at the high school level, e) an individual whose high school averages are the minimum required to graduate which translate to low assessment skills scores, f) an individual who has high degree aspirations despite the odds against achieving such goals, and g) a member of

the minority population with relatively low Self-concept in comparison to the White students.

The next chapter will discuss the regression findings of: 1) educational background, 2) socio-economic status, 3) college academic achievement, 4) reasons for entering college, 6) degree aspirations, 7) the student's self-assessment of brightness and 8) self-concept of ability for this sample. These regression analysis demonstrate how the factors we have been discussing in this chapter and in the theoretical discussion, actually influence the college academic careers of this sample.

V. The Academic Progress of the Urban Community College Student

Thus far, we have seen that the descriptive data in the previous chapters created a picture of the typical representatives of this sample as being predominantly from low SES and minority group origins. They have limited exposure to a college preparatory high school track and are usually students who have achieved a minimum satisfactory high school average and performed poorly on the CUNY Freshmen Skills examinations.

We also saw that the review of literature portrays the educationally disadvantaged as likely to begin their school careers with measurable handicaps which remain with them and accumulate exponentially throughout all of their educational careers, especially at the college level. The literature review in Chapter 2 documents how these handicaps result from a lack of familiarity with the dominant culture, the inferiority of the schools, the institutions of ability grouping and high school tracking. All of these accumulate and impede the academic progress of such individuals. Some scholars have argued that these handicaps translate into four to one odds against such students graduating from high school and thus cuts off their opportunities for pursuing college careers (Hurn, 1985).

As was indicated in Chapter 4 the data suggests: 1) That the lack of a formal education by the majority of the parents of this sample probably diminished their ability to assist their children during their educational careers. 2) More than half of the families

in this sample are below the poverty level. 3) The majority of this sample were not exposed to an academic track in high school. 4) The great majority of the students in this sample have failed the CUNY Freshmen Skills Assessment Examination in mathematics, reading and writing. 5) The preponderance of the minority students wish to earn a Baccalaureate or higher. 6) In both the subject specific and global self-concept of ability, the White students rate themselves higher than their minority contemporaries.

This chapter will address the following question: What influence do the above mentioned factors have on this sample's college performance?

In order to address this question, I have conducted multiple regression analyses calling upon a set of widely used traditional independent variables such as 1) parents' education, 2) family income, 3) educational background, 4) reasons for entering college (I have examined these issues because it has been documented that those wishing to enter college for the appreciation of ideas, and/or wishing to enter graduate school, were more often successful in college (Lavin, Alba and Silberstein, 1981)), 5) degree aspirations, 6) Self-concept of ability (TSAC), and 7) the student's self-assessment of his/her college skills (BRITECOLL). The variable BRITECOLL was added to these analysis because "students in 1970 were asked to rate their academic preparation in comparison to that of other students in the same (CUNY) college... [and] the student's conception of his or her brightness was related

strongly... "(4) to grades.

We will be also calling upon three critical indicators (dependent variables) which will help us to assess academic performance.

The first indicator we will be discussing in this chapter is the quality of work in college as indicated by the cumulative grade point average after four semesters of study (GPA), The second is the progress toward degree completion or the total credits earned after four semesters (TOTALCRT). The last is the individual's survival rate in the system as indicated by the persistence of the sample after four semesters (PERSIST4).

Although such indicators after four semesters of study are reliable measures of college success, I do not have the bottom line indicator of academic success: graduation rates. But this is not such a disadvantage, because the academic careers of large proportions of CUNY community-college students stretch far beyond the customary graduation time table. For example, the average CUNY student requires four years to graduate from a community-college. Research has shown that two years worth of student performance data is closely correlated to eventual graduation success (Lavin and Crook, 1990).

4) Lavin, D.,Alba, R. and Silberstein, R. (1981). Right Versus Privilege: The Open Admissions Experiment at the City University of New York. The Free Press: New York Pg.147

A five stage regression analysis was undertaken using the above mentioned dependent and independent variables. Generally, only significant coefficients are presented in this chapter, the exception being when non-significant variables shed light on the substantive discussion. The substantive discussion relates only to the last stage of the regression analysis (stage 5).

Finally, this chapter will also relate the sociological theory cited throughout this effort to the data analyses performed on this sample.

But before we begin our discussion of the regression findings, the reader should be cognizant of the fact that ethnicity as an independent variable is not included in the substantive discussion of this chapter even though it was an organizing factor in other chapters. The low number of White students made it difficult to uncover statistically reliable differences among ethnic groups. Let us now turn to the substantive discussion of this chapter.

SOCIAL ORIGINS AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

There is a massive body of research in the Sociology of Education which points to social origins as significant predictors of college performance. An understanding of family income and parents' educational background is therefore an important factor in the analysis of college performance for two important reasons: 1) income is an important measure of social status because it is a critical element of American class structure, and 2) the lack of

family resources, research suggests, results in direct educational disadvantage because of a differential socialization process. The same social concept has different meanings and consequences for members of different class groups (Bourdieu, 1977).

Somewhat surprisingly, social origins played no significant role at all in the prediction of academic success for this sample. Although, Sociological research is laden with data which supports the hypothesis that social origins affect schooling, this data simply does not (see Table 5.1). One possible explanation for the lack of statistical association between social origins and academic performance may be because New York City Technical College serves almost solely low SES and working class populations; the social, economic and cultural capital of this sample is, on average, disadvantaged. Because the distribution for this sample is statistically truncated, social origins do not surface as an influence on college performance.

Nonetheless, the results of this data is consistent with the larger prevailing literature concerning SES and academic performance among CUNY community college students. It has been reported, for example, that "the role of social background factors was less important in the two-year schools. Parent's education was not associated with any of the academic outcomes from any of the cohorts... overall we concluded... (social origin) had no effect upon academic success in the CUNY community college student(5)."

5) Lavin, D.,Alba, R. and Silberstein, R. (1981). Right Versus Privilege: The Open Admissions Experiment at the City University of New York. The Free Press: New York Pg.147

EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND, CUNY ASSESSMENT SKILL SCORE, REASONS FOR ENTERING COLLEGE AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE:

It may be recalled that whether the unit of analysis is the influence of family background on school and occupation achievement (Status Attainment approach), or the mode of production in material life (Marxist approach), or the language-use at home and at school (Socio-linguistic approach), or
cultural socialization (Cultural Reproduction),
or the changing needs and requirements of society's educational demands (Structural-Functionalist approach), students from working class, minority and low socio-economic backgrounds (SES), typically do poorly in school in relation to middle class students.

By any measurement these students tend to drop out more than their middle class counterparts, score lower on standardized tests and achieve lower high school averages. Those who do go to college have lower grade point averages, earn fewer credits and take longer to be graduated.

Almost without exception these poor educational outcomes can be traced to a number of long standing educational policies enacted in order to create a more efficient and allegedly humane manner of educating students with different learning styles.
Two such educational policies are ability group assignments in the elementary schools and curriculum tracking in the comprehensive high schools.

It may be recalled that such policies may affect the academic progress of the individual, especially one assigned to the lower

ability group and the non-college preparatory curriculum (for whom working class, minority and low SES students are predominant), the educational effect for the individual is cumulative in nature. This data suggests support for the dove-tailing effects of earlier educational disadvantages. Such factors as high school average and the number of college preparatory courses that this sample was exposed to proved to have an important role in the prediction of college performance.

Let us consider at this point one measure of academic performance at the college level: cumulative grade point average (GPA). Data suggests that GPA was influenced by educational background. For example, Table 5.1 indicates that a ten point difference in high school average is associated with more than a fifth of a letter grade difference in GPA in college.

Similarly, a difference of four college preparatory courses the student was exposed to in high school is also associated with a fifth letter grade difference in GPA. Likewise, a 10 point difference in the CUNY reading assessment examination score, corresponds to a tenth of a letter grade difference in GPA.

Naturally linked to higher grade point averages are a host of collegial privileges and opportunities not afforded to those with lower GPA's. One such collegiate privilege is the opportunity to transfer into Baccalaureate studies. The attainment of the bachelor's degree provides access to the more-rewarding positions within the labor market, thereby increasing the individual's potential life-time earnings.

Another collegiate privilege afforded those with high GPA's is graduation. Graduation places the individual into the labor market and so increases his/her economic capital relative to those whose graduation date is postponed on for semesters.

Lastly, with respect to degree aspirations, those with Baccalaureate degree goals or higher have, on average, better grades (see table 5.1). Therefore, the data suggests that what a student is expecting from a college education in terms of degree goals plays a significant role in college grades. Again this data is consistent with larger research conducted at the City University of New York (Lavin, Alba and Silberstein, 1981).

It should also be noted that the set of variables - reasons for entering college - had absolutely no significance as a predictor of QPA for this sample (see Table 5.1).

High school average, exposure to academic units, the CUNY reading, mathematics and writing assessment scores, and emphasis on intellectual growth (whether the individual planned to go to graduate school or had entered college with an appreciation of ideas), all played a significant role in the prediction of total number of credits earned by members of this sample over the four semester period (TOTALCRT).

Table 5.1 suggests that for every ten point difference in high school average, there is an increase of about five credits earned over the four semester period by this sample.

Another way the reader can view the implications of this data is by equating these findings to courses the student has completed

over the period in question. Thus, an individual who enters City Tech with a high school average of 80 completes on average almost two more courses over a four semester period than an individual entering with a high school average of 70.

Table 5.1 further indicates that for a difference of four college preparatory courses the student was exposed in high school, there is an increase of more than a credit earned. Therefore, an individual who has been exposed to 14 college preparatory units in high school earns on average one credit more than an individual who has been exposed to 10 units.

Furthermore, for a 10 point difference in the CUNY reading examination score, there is an increase of more than six credits earned. Likewise, for every 10 point difference in the CUNY mathematics examination score there are fewer than 5 credits earned over the four semester period. Lastly, this data suggests that for every two point difference in the CUNY writing examination score, there is an increase of more than two credits earned by the student.

In order to illustrate the significance of these findings to the reader, let us now discuss two hypothetical students entering New York City Technical College (City Tech) with different educational backgrounds. The first, is a student who has entered City Tech with a high school average of 80, was exposed to 14 academic units, scored 37 on the reading exam, 35 on the mathematics exam and an 8 on the writing exam. The second is a student who enters City Tech with a high school average of 70, was

exposed to 10 academic units, score 27 on the reading exam, 25 on the mathematics exam and a 6 on the writing exam.

The student with the more enriched educational background very probably has completed six more courses (or 19 credits) over the four semester period, than his/her hypothetical contemporary. The repercussions of these factors will effect the amount of time it takes to graduate, transfer opportunities and ultimately for life-chances.

Finally, among those who emphasized intellectual growth, i.e. had plans to go to graduate school or had entered college for an appreciation of ideas, there was a positive accumulation of credits (see Table 5.1). This data is consistent with the larger research concerning credits earned by CUNY Students. (Lavin, Alba and Silberstein, 1981).

Another measure of academic success we planned to discuss is college persistence. As in the other measures of academic success, educational background proved to be an important predictor of academic success. Table 5.1 suggests that a 10 point difference in high school averagel, produces a gap of about 12% in the likelihood that an individual will be enrolled in college for the fourth semester of study. Therefore, a person with a 80 high school average stands a 12% greater chance of being enrolled in the four semester over the individual with a high school average of 70.

Moreover, a difference of four academic college preparatory units taken in high school produces an increment of nearly 8% in the likelihood that an individual will be enrolled in college for

the fourth semester. This data is consistent with the larger research conducted at the City University of New York (Lavin, Alba and Silberstein, 1981).

It should also be noted that the CUNY Assessment Skills Examination scores, reasons for entering college and degree aspiration were not significant predictors of persistence for this sample (see Table 5.1).

The data cited herein not only has implications for increased educational attainment and life-chances of a signal student enrolled in City Tech, but for future cultural capital he/she may bring to his/her family. In our discussion of cultural reproduction we saw how the background of the parents had an impact by either encouraging or inhibiting the children's chances at school success.

The significance of this date lies in the fact that this sample is reflective of the typical urban public community-college student. Therefore, what can be said of this sample, probably will hold true for the majority of urban public community-college students in America today.

SELF-CONCEPT, CUNY ASSESSMENT SKILL SCORES, REASONS FOR ENTERING COLLEGE, DEGREE ASPIRATIONS AND COLLEGE PERFORMANCE.

Since the 1950's, researchers have specifically explored self-perception's place in human growth and development. Several fairly consistent ideas have emerged concerning self-concept. First, self-perception has a central place in personality acting as a source of

unity and a guide to behavior. Secondly, although self-perceptions are multidimensional, they all make up a sense of self. Thirdly, self-perception seeks consistency and stability. Fourthly, self-perceptions are based on roles people play, and lastly, self-perception arises out of social context and the feedback of others.

As noted in Chapter 2, there is a vast body of research indicating that self-concept is correlated with academic achievement. Moreover, not only does self-concept affect academic achievement, but studies have suggested that students' self-concept is influenced by the feedback received from out of their academic success. In contrast, there is an equally vast body of research which has failed to find a significant relationship between global self-concept and academic success.

It may be recalled from Chapter 1 that whether low SES and minority students survive the American educational process may depend on the meta dimension of high self-concept as a consequence of being a statistical elite within their comparison/reference group. Survivors of the educational process may perceive themselves, and are perhaps within their communities, as being academically successful as a result of graduation from high school and college enrollment, as compared to the large majority of their age cohort.

Comparison/reference groups, as was also mentioned in Chapter 1, are social categories that an individual uses to help define beliefs, attitudes, values and self-concept. Reference/comparison groups act as social constructs by which self-image is developed.

Thus, comparison/reference groups are modes for adopting rules and values that directly affect self-image and hence behavior (Merton, 1949).

In spite of the rich research amassed over the decades concerning self-concept and its influence on academic success, the global self-concept of this sample was not a predictor of academic performance at the college level. This is contrary to the results of the pilot study I conducted in 1988, and to what some of the literature has indicated.

Table 5.1 shows that global self-concept of ability (Brookover self-concept of Ability Scale) was clearly not a significant predictor of GPA. The data in Table 5.1 does suggest that subject specific self-concept of ability in mathematics (TMSC) was a predictor of GPA for this sample. A ten point difference in TMSC is associated with an increase of a fifth of a letter grade in GPA. However, subject specific self-concept of ability in writing or reading was not an accurate predictor of GPA.

Lastly, neither global self-concept of ability nor subject specific self-concept of ability was a significant predictor of the total credits earned after four semesters, or if the student was enrolled for the fourth semester of study (see Table 5.1).

BRIGHTNESS SELF-ASSESSMENT AND ACADEMIC SUCCESS:

According to social identity theory, different self-categorizations may be salient at different times. These identities

are organized in a salience hierarchy according to individuals' commitment to them (Kornhauser, 1962), and their likelihood of being invoked in various social situations (Stryker, 1968).

In order to measure this hypothesis, this sample was asked to rate their academic college skills in comparison to their college classmates. This proved to be an important predictor of GPA and persistence for those who viewed themselves as brighter than their college classmates (variable labeled BRITECOLL).

The data in Table 5.1 shows that for a 2 point difference in BRITECOLL, there is about a third of a letter grade increase in GPA. Lastly, BRITECOLL had no significant effect on the total credits this sample has earned over a four semester period.

Additionally, the data in Table 5.1 suggest that for a 2 difference increase in BRITECOLL, produces a gap of about a 6% likelihood that the student will be enrolled in the fourth semester of college study. Lastly, BRITECOLL had no significant effect on the total credits this sample has earned over a four semester period.

In introducing the concept of "master Status," Hughs (1945) referred to an individual's position in social groups based in the most salient role he/she has in that group. As such, master status influences an individual's interaction with others by affecting the way in which others perceive, interpret and define the individual's behavior.

The data extracted from the BRITECOLL variable may be the effects of this sample's "master status," or, as posed earlier, the

effects of "statistical elite " status within the comparison/reference group on persistence rate and grade point average after four semesters.

In summary, the data in this chapter implies 1)the influence of high school background on college success for this sample was paramount, 2) the CUNY Freshmen Assessment Skills Examinations were unreliable and inconsistent predictors of college academic success, 3) high math self-concept of ability, and a self-ranking of intellectual brightness (BRITECOLL) produced some influence over academic success, but these, too, were unreliable, 4) Global self-concept as measured by the Brookover self-concept of Ability Scale was not a predictor of college success, 5) the social origins of this sample were by far the least important predictor of college academic success. It must be stressed that social origins for populations such as this sample are generally played out throughout the individual's earlier educational career.

Table 5.1 Academic Outcomes As A Function of Social Origins, Educational Background, CUNY Assessment Scores, Reasons for Entering College Degree Aspirations and Self-Concept of Ability

	DEPENDENT VARIABLES					
INDEPENDENT	GPA		Credits		Persistence	
VARIABLES	b	beta	b	beta	b	beta
N = 307						
SOCIAL ORIGINS:						
Mother's Education	N/S		N/S		N/S	
Father's Education	N/S		N/S		N/S	
Income	N/S		N/S		N/S	
EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND:						
High School Average	.013	.185	.517	.168	.014	.135
H.S. Average in English	N/S		N/S		N/S	
H.S. Average in Math	N/S		N/S		N/S	
Academic Units	.039	.143	.265	.145	.012	.173
CUNY ASSESSMENT SCORES:						
CUNY Reading Score	.010	.175	.674	.176	N/S	
CUNY Math Score	N/S		.485	.162	N/S	
CUNY Writing Score	N/S		1.731	.170	N/S	

N/S = Not Significant

TABLE 5.1 CONTINUED:

	DEPENDENT VARIABLES					
INDEPENDENT	GPA		Credits		Persistence	
VARIABLES	b	beta	b	beta	b	beta
N = 307						
REASONS FOR ENTERING COLLEGE:						
Graduate School	N/S		.400	.140	N/S	
Appreciation of Ideas	N/S		.406	.159	N/S	
Learn New Things	N/S		N/S		N/S	
For Better Job	N/S		N/S		N/S	
Earn more Money	N/S		N/S		N/S	
DEGREE ASPIRATION:						
Associates Degree	N/S		N/S		N/S	
Bachelors Degree	.148	.125	N/S		N/S	
Graduate Degree	.165	.162	N/S		N/S	
SELF CONCEPT OF ABILITY:						
Writing Self-concept	N/S		N/S		N/S	
Reading Self-concept	N/S		N/S		N/S	
Math Self-concept	.015	.175	N/S		N/S	
Global Self-concept	N/S		N/S		N/S	
Bright in College	.168	.133	N/S		.029	.123
R-square =	**.2155**		**.2946**		**.2814**	

N/S = Not Significant

VI. What can be Said About The Academic Success of The Educationally Disadvantaged: Conclusions

It may be recalled from Chapter 2 that whether working class, low SES and minority students survive the American educational process may depend on the meta dimension of high self-concept as a consequence of being a statistical elite within their comparison/reference group. Survivors of the educational process, it was hypothesized, may perceive themselves (and perhaps are perceived in their communities) as being academically successful as a result of having graduated from high school and college enrollment, in comparison to the large majority of their age cohort who have not.

As we saw in Chapter 5, the variables used to address this hypotheses flowed from the theoretical concepts found in the literature. Such variables as the individual's social origins, educational background, performance on the CUNY Assessment examinations, the reasons for the student entering college, and of course self-concept factors as measured by the Brookover Self-Concept of Ability Scale were all analyzed.

These factors were discussed at length in an effort to address the basic aim of this study, which as you may recall, was to determine if self-concept of ability is an important and significant predictor of academic performance among minority and low SES students at the college level.

In this concluding chapter we will be using the statistical

findings associated with the independent variables and the three academic performance indicators (dependent variables) to address a very basic aim at this juncture--What can we conclude from this data about the academic success of this sample?

In order to address this question we will briefly highlight the findings of the research, cite the literature associated with the findings, describe the limitations of this study, and suggest future research.

SOCIAL ORIGINS, EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE:

Based on several decades of research, I think it is safe to say that the children of low SES parents do poorly in school relative to the middle class. Oddly, this observation is one of the few facts that sociologists who identify with different paradigms all agree upon.

But as you may recall from Chapter 5, surprisingly the social origins of this sample did not indicate, at least superficially, an association with academic performance.

As we also had seen in Chapter 5, the explanation offered for this aberration was of a technical nature. That is, the data distribution was truncated as a result of this samples' SES homogeneity.

However, this data notwithstanding, there is a large body of research which argues that social origins have a profound and long lasting effect on academic performance. Because the data in this study did not suggest such a correlation, I feel it worthwhile to

take some time out to explain and reemphasize how SES has an impact on academic performance.

In Chapter 2 we saw that the influence of social origin on academic performance lies in its ability to select and sort students along culture, class and race factors. This process usually takes place during the formative years of the individual's education. Let us take a closer look at several interrelated aspects of this sorting and selecting process.

The first selecting factor we discussed in Chapter 2 was the self-fulfilling prophecy of failure. Some scholars have argued that the failure prophecy is associated with the teacher's academic expectations of a student based upon class, culture and race. It is argued by some scholars that teachers treat those they expect to be academically successful differently than students of whom they expect little. Therefore, students in low-ability groups may receive substantially less teaching time than students in high-ability groups in the same classroom (Eder, 1981; McDermott, 1977). Moreover, perceptions of student performance becomes reality, not because of the student's greater or less ability, but because students in different ability groups are taught differently.

In the educational continuum of the individual, most especially for the individual assigned to the lower ability group where working class, minority and low SES students predominate, the educational effect is cumulative in nature. These educational career paths are the student biographies and therefore, student identities which crystallize over and over again throughout the

individual's various educational life-cycles (primary to secondary schools and beyond).

Another related sorting factor we discussed was the reproduction of class consciousness. Some scholars have argued that class becomes an important indicator of cultural capital within the school setting (Bourdieu, 1977). Therefore, distinctive cultural knowledge is transmitted through families and is firmly rooted in social class. Hence, children of the dominant class inherit cultural knowledge, skills, norms, styles of dress and linguistic abilities that differ substantially from the children of subordinate classes.

Consequently, schools reward individuals with the dominant class background because the curriculum, as well as the teachers are products of this culture. The reverse may also be true.

The third interrelated sorting/selecting filter we discussed was the high school tracking system. You may recall that the high school tracking system which has all the trappings of ability grouping establishes different learning environments (Alexander and McDill, 1976).

Lastly, it was argued that when these factors are taken in their totality, the most likely collegiate destination for the educational disadvantaged individual, who has gone through the educational selection process, is the community-college.

Once in the community-college such an individual brings serious disadvantages with him/herself because of his/her earlier lack of exposure to the academic curriculum at the primary and secondary

school level. Moreover, the community-college curriculum tracking system which delineates between academic transfer and terminal vocational tracks, and the anti-academic orientation of a predominantly low SES student body ultimately diminishs educational attainment and life-chances (Alba & Lavin 1981; Anderson, 1984; Astin, 1972; Breneman & Nelson 1981; Brint & Karabel, 1989; London, 1978; Velez, 1985).

It should now be clear how social origins act to sort/select along class, culture and race factors, which occur from almost the first day the student enters school. Thus, it probably should not have come as a surprise that by the time such a individual reaches college, especially a community-college, social origins are nearly ineffective in predicting college performance. Undoubtedly, this is so because SES is played out during the earlier years of the individual's educational career.

To summarize, the data presented in this effort have indicated that earlier academic disadvantages have a cumulative dove-tailing effect on the individual's future educational endeavors in college. In effect, this process is akin to the dominoes theory, in that one disadvantage creates another disadvantage.

At this juncture, I would like to take the opportunity to demonstrate how cumulative disadvantages actually influence educational attainment. I will examine the two broad and ambitious goals the City University of New York set for itself when it embarked on its open-admissions policy in 1970 and relate these goals to this sample's possible educational attainment.

The first goal CUNY set for the open-admissions policy was to create greater access to higher education for minority populations who were seriously under-represented at the university prior to 1970. The other goal was to create real educational attainment for the socially and educationally disadvantaged groups of New York City.

Inasmuch as the first broad goal is concerned, advocates of the open-admissions policy have long argued that CUNY has created unprecedented access to higher education for the socially disadvantaged and the academically ill-prepared high school graduates who probably would have not attended CUNY prior to 1970. Certainly, no one could argue that this goal has not been accomplished. Indeed, the descriptive data cited in Chapter 4 act to validate this accomplishment.

However, CUNY's second goal has not, in 1993, been so simply accomplished. Translating increased college access into real educational attainment for the socially and educationally disadvantaged is still something the community college has been unable to achieve.

In order to expand and relate this discussion to the sample, we will be using both the persistance rate and grade point average of the individuals in this sample as focal points in our discussion. We will be using these indicators because we now know that an extended educational college career is the rule rather than the exception for CUNY students. We do not have graduation rates for this sample. Let us now begin our discussion with the persistence

rate of this sample.

There is a large body of research which suggests that persistence is highly correlated with the accumulation of credits and eventual graduation. Graduation from college within the job market acts to certify trainablity of the person and confers upon the individual a certain status which should grant access to more rewarding jobs. The data from this sample does not provide encouraging persistence news. For example, only 44% of the entire sample was enrolled in their fourth semester of study. If we were to look at this in terms of the minority population, nearly 58% of the Black students and 57% of the Hispanic students had not returned (see Table 6.1). Therefore, nearly 6 in 10 of the minority students were not enrolled for the fourth semester of study.

TABLE 6.1

Enrollment Status By Ethnicity

N=260	Stopped/Dropped Out	Enrolled
Black	58%	42%
Hispanic	57%	43%

This data suggests that although CUNY has certainly provided greater college access to minority populations, it has not overcome the earlier educational and social disadvantages of such groups.

The other academic outcome was grade point average after four semesters of study. The literature suggests that grade point average is significantly related to the likelihood of transferring from a community-college to a senior college. Thus, a strong GPA usually facilitates transferring by virtue of quality school work and accrued credits. As was noted in Chapter 2, a major factor in the community-college students failure to attain a Baccalaureate is a low GPA and the number of credits earned during their period of study (Dougherty 1987). Of course, a Baccalaureate is the prerequisite to the more rewarding jobs within the post-industrial labor market.

However, even to the extent that the individuals in this sample were enrolled in their fourth semester of study, 13% earned a GPA

of under a 2.00. This poor quality school work has several negative implications for the student. The first problematic created by such a low GPA is graduation. The GPA requirement for graduation is a 2.00. This data suggests that 1 in 8 students who have made it into the fourth semester will not be able to graduate from college (see table 6.2).

It may be recalled from our earlier discussion that only 44% of the original sample were still enrolled in the fourth semester. It may also be recalled that the original case number we began this study with was 307. As of the fourth semester only 135 students were still enrolled. Additionally, it was discovered that 13% or 18 students were not academically viable candidates for graduation. Therefore, the actual percentage of students in good academic standing as of the fourth semester was only 38% of the original sample.

As bleak as this data sounds, it should be noted that the college enrollment patterns of the socially and educationally disadvantaged are such that individuals typically stop-in and stop-out from semester to semester. Therefore, it is possible, for example, that some of those who were not enrolled in their fourth semester of study may reactivate and enroll in the fifth or sixth semester.

In terms of possible transfer opportunities to an upper-division college, only 117 out of the original case number of 307 meet the GPA requirement of a 2.00 or higher (see table 6.2). Thus, thes data have implications for the individual and his/her life-

chances, as well as for New York City's future stock of an educated work force.

In summary, it is fair to say that the open-admission policy of CUNY has created the very real benefit of college access, but for the most part the program has not been able to overcome the effects of earlier disadvantages. This data validates this conclusion. For example, slightly more than one-third of the entire sample (N=117) remain viable as candidates for graduation and for transfer to an upper-division college (see table 6.2).

Table 6.2

Grade Point Average And Enrollment Status

	Grade Point Average		
N=135	Under 2.00	2.00 - 2.99	3.00 - 4.00
Enrolled In Fourth Semester	13% N=18	* 52% @ N=79	* 36% @ N=37

* Those in good academic standing. They are equal to 35% of the entire sample.

@ N=117 out of entire case number of 307

Ideally and simplistically, it could be argued that wider exposure to heterogeneous ability groups during the primary school experience and to the college preparatory track during the high school experience, might stem the tide of accumulative educational disadvantages and increases the chances of college success for such students.

As we saw earlier in our discussion of the open-admissions policy, increased exposure alone to more academically vigorous programs does not have the desired effect of overcoming the other problems endemic to our nation's school structures such as 1) a curricula which does not incorporate the different questioning, behavioral and socio-linguistical styles of a multi-ethnic student body, 2) an educational system which does not teach critical cognitive skills, and 3) a growing number of unmotivated students resulting from the American dream lost, or from the realization that the American dream may have been a "false promise." Whatever the cause, the end result is a sense of meaninglessness and hopelessness.

Only by addressing these issues, including a vast number of others I probably have neglected to mention, the American higher educational system will begin to address real educational attainment for the large numbers of socially and academically handicapped individuals.

Self-concept of Ability and the Achievement Paradox:

The basis of this study centered around a long tradition in the social psychology literature which indicated that positive self-concept of ability has a great deal of influence on the student's academic success.

Over the last several decades there has been mounting evidence which argued that self-concept is correlative with academic success, especially among minority and low SES students. It

may be recalled that a pilot study I conducted in 1988 suggested that self-concept among minority and low SES students may, in fact, be as influential in predicting college grades and persistence as the traditional academic performance measurements. The data in this current study does not suggest a replication of the pilot study data. Although, self-concept of ability in mathematics (TMSC) was an important predictor of GPA, TMSC was inconsistent, and did not have influence over the other dimensions of academic performance.

A possible explanation for the lack of data replication concerning self-concept of ability and academic performance may surprisingly also center around social origins. There is a considerable amount of evidence to demonstrate that the family's economic circumstances affect the self-esteem of the child. Rosenberg and Pearlin (1978) have shown that self-esteem is related to social class. They argue that the effects of social class may influence child-development. According to the authors, as the child becomes aware of social differences and more responsible for his/her own presentation of self, the impact of social class becomes more salient.

As you may recall, from our earlier discussion in this chapter, social origins probably act to depress educational attainment. But because of the sorting/selecting process that occurs in school based on SES, and because of this sample low SES homogeneity, it was difficult to prove this statistically. Therefore, in light of this fact, and in light of Rosenberg and Pearlin's work, it may be

argued again that because of the homogeneity of this sample, the data associated with self-concept of ability could also be truncated. As a result, self-concept of ability as a function of academic performance for low SES students may be as difficult to assess.

The Need for Future Research:

Although the Brookover Self-Concept of Ability Scale proved not to be a significant and reliable instrument in the prediction of college performance, the other measure of self-concept we used in this study--the self-assessments of who thought of themselves as being brighter than their college class cohort (BRITECOLL) - did prove to be a significant predictor of college success. Thus, the relationship which was noted between the variable BRITECOLL and academic achievement should be considered an area of future inquiry. This area of inquiry may prove to be a fruitful focus of future research.

Limitations of Research And Critique of Method:

Because sociological investigation employs the scientific method modeled after the "natural sciences," a number of unsolved questions concerning social inquiry have emerged. Let me just mention a few: 1) Can human relations be analyzed in the same manner as the physical sciences? 2) Because of the complexities of human social interaction, does social inquiry lend itself to the replication of findings? and 3) Can social inquiry be value free?

Even more salient to this dissertation is yet another question--can the variables used in the statistical analyses be considered reflective of the sociological theory cited herein ? At this juncture we should take some time out to explore in depth the implications of this question. Let us begin this discussion with a concrete example from this study.

The variables of parent's education and parent's income can be considered two components of cultural capital. But do these variables accurately measure cultural capital ? Given the multi-dimensional levels of cultural capital, probably not. A better attempt at measuring cultural capital would have required adding such items as the occupational status of parents, frequency of family visits to cultural institutions, the ownership of a family computer, how many books are read by family members annually, ownership of books and so on.

However, even to the extent that such factors may have been available, would the day to day, moment by moment lived experiences of these the individuals, as well as their cognition of these experiences lend itself to statistical analyses? To a some degree maybe, but not entirely. While for the most part these questions are troubling, both the method and variables used in this study are long standing Sociological investigative tools, thus carry a certain weight of credibility. Hence, the findings mentioned in this effort do make some contribution to the discipline of Sociology.

Another criticism of this dissertation may be the broad

categorization of the variables used to classify ethnicity. Some scholars have argued that the way Sociologists currently code and classify ethnicity (Black, Hispanic and White) may obscure differences in ethnic diversity. Such all-encompassing categories, the critics argue, may have a homogenizing effect on the statistical analysis.

Though there is truth in this criticism, such classifications are long standard practices of social inquiry and provide a measure of creditability to their use in this study.

Critique of Sample:

One of the many limitations of this research was the sample size. A larger sample size may bring further insight into academic self-concept as a predictor of academic performance for low SES and minority students.

Another limitation of this study was homogeneity of the social origins. As a result of similar socio-economic background factors, many of the sociological truisms were difficult to verify statistically.

What can be said ? Conclusions:

As stated in Chapter 4, this cohort contains a typical urban public community-college population. The most recent research conducted within CUNY suggests that fewer than 25% of the community-college entrants will finish an A.A./A.A.S degree even though it will take them an average of 8 semesters of study (Lavin & Hyllegard, forthcoming).

The data concerning Bachelor's degree attainment for the CUNY community-college entrants looms even more heavily than the data associated with A.A./A.A.S. degree attainment for the same cohort. Less than 10% of the community-college entrants will actually finish a Bachelor's degree after 10 years of study (Lavin & Hyllegard, forthcoming).

While these data are troubling and reflects an ongoing national trend, it does not reveal the complexity of the community-college story. The other side is that the community- college now serves a larger proportion of American high school graduates than in previous decades. Indeed, many scholars have pointed to this form of school as offering higher educational opportunities to the socially and academically disadvantaged individual who probably would have not had such a chance two decades ago. A perfect example of this is CUNY's community- college system. Since CUNY embarked on its open-admissions policy in 1970, the number of Black community-college entrants who have earned a B.A. has nearly

tripled (Lavin & Crook, 1990). Ultimately then, these contrasting findings suggest that the controversy over the community college's effect--whether it serves as enabler or obstacle to educational attainment--cannot be settled here in this dissertation or with this sample.

Finally, the evidence required that the basic premise of the study--that high self-concept of ability may act as a countervailing force against earlier educational handicaps--had to be rejected. Moreover, with this hypotheses rejection, I must also reject any hope that we at CUNY could have the capability of identifying the "at risk" student with a simple instrument such as the Brookover Self-Concept of Ability Scale.

Appendix 1: Questionnaire

Dear Student,

This questionnaire will provide the college with data concerning your attitudes towards specific academic subjects. These data will be used for research purposes only and you will remain completely anonymous, so please answer the questions as truthfully as possible.

I have read this statement and understand that I will remain anonymous and that these data will be used for research purposes only.

Your Signature

Please check one answer for all questions, except where noted.

SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER:_____

1. How old are you?_____ years

2. What is your gender (Sex)?

   Female Male

3. What is your marital status?

   married

   not married

   not married living with someone

   divorced

   divorced living with someone

   widowed

4. Where do you expect to live this fall?

   with parents

   with other relatives

   with wife or husband

   with other students or friends

   I expect to live alone

5. What is your best guess of the total income in your household? Please consider all sources before taxes.

   less than $4,000.00

   4,000.00 to 7,499.00

(next page)

7,500.00 to 9,999.00

10,000.00 to 12,499.00

12,500.00 to 15,999.00

16,000.00 to 19,999.00

20,000.00 to 24,999.00

25,000.00 to 29,999.00

30,000.00 or more

6. How much education do/did your parents or guardians have?

mother	father	
		8th grade or less
		some High School
		High School graduate
		some College
		College graduate
		Postgraduate degree

7. Which of the following best describes your job situation for this fall?

I have a part time job

I have a full time job

I am looking for a part time job

I am looking for a full time job

I don't plan to work

8. Which one of the following best describes your ethnic category?

Hispanic or Latin

(next page)

Black or African-American

White

American Indian

Asian or Pacific Islander

9. From what country or part of the World did you or your family originally come from?

Africa

China

Hong kong

Taiwan

Korea

Philippians

Japan

India

Pakistan

other Asian specify_____

Colombia

Cuba

Dominican Republic

Ecuador

Haiti

Jamaica

Puerto Rico

Other Caribbean or Latin American specify _____

England,Scotland or Wales

Germany

(next page)

Greece

Ireland

Italy

Poland

Russia

other European specify_____

10. Have you any brothers or sisters who have attended college?

Yes no

11. What would say are your two most important reasons for attending college? (check two)

to get a better job

to prepare for graduate school

my parents want me to go

nothing better to do

to gain a general education and appreciation for ideas

to be able to contribute more to the community

to meet new and interesting people

to make more money

to learn more things that interest me

12. Which of the following is helping you pay for college. Check all which applies.

N.Y State Tuition
Assistance Program
(TAP)

(next page)

Basic Educational
Opportunity Grant
(BEOG)

Supplemental Educational
Opportunity Grant
(SEOG)

PELL

Seek or College Discovery

Guaranteed Student Loan

National Direct Student
Loan (NDSL)

employment for the
summer

Personal savings

employment during the
school year

family support

Veteran's benefits

employer contribution

From among the following, check the statement which best describes your feelings about the academic subjects listed below.

	false	mostly false	sometimes false, sometimes true	mostly true	true
13. I like to read.					
14. I get good grades in reading.					
15. I believe I am a good reader.					
16. When I read a book I read with great interest.					

(next page)

false mostly sometimes mostly true

	false	false, sometimes true	true
17. I read with great pleasure.			
18. I can read most everything well.			
19. I look forward to reading.			
20. I am a fast reader.			
21. I hate to read.			
22. I do not read well.			
23. I hate math.			
24. Work in math is easy for me.			
25. I look forward to math classes.			
26. I get good grades in math.			
27. I am interested in math.			
28. I learn math principles quite quickly.			
29. I like math.			
30. I'm good at math.			
31. I enjoy solving math equations or problems.			
32. I'm dumb at math.			

(next page)

	false	mostly false	sometimes true, sometimes false	mostly true	true
33.I like to write.					
34. I get good grades in writing classes.					
35.I believe I am a good writer.					
36.I look forward to writing class.					
37.I look forward to writing.					
38.I hate to write.					
39.I really am dumb at writing.					
40.I do not write well.					
41.I am not interested writing at all.					

From among the following, check the statement which best describes what you think about yourself in school.

	the best	above average	average	below average	the poorest
42.How do you rate yourself in school ability compared with those in your classes at school?					
43.Where did you rank in your class in high school?					
44.Where do you think you would rank in your classes in college?					

(next page)

	the	above	average	below	average

best average average

45.How do you rate yourself in school ability compared to your close friends?_____

46.Forget for a moment how others grade your work. In your own opinion how good do you think your work is?_____

47 Do you think you have the ability to complete New York City Technical college?

yes,definitely

yes,probably

not sure either way

probably not

no

48.What are your future highest college degree plans ?

I hope to earn	I will earn	
		Associate (A.A, A.A.S.,A.S)
		Bachelor's Degree (B.A.,B.S.,B.T.)
		Masters Degree (M.A.,M.S.)
		Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., D.D.S., L.L.B.(law), B.D.(Divinity)

I do not plan to earn a college degree

50. What kind of grades do you think you are capable of getting in college?

mostly A's mostly C's mostly F's

mostly B's mostly D's

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

APPENDIX 2: FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

AGE	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Percent
17	35	11.4	37	12.1
18	131	42.7	168	54.7
19	53	17.3	221	72.0
20	21	6.8	242	78.8
21	9	2.9	251	81.8
22	7	2.3	258	84.0
23	4	1.3	262	85.3
24	5	1.6	267	87.0
25	4	1.3	271	88.3
26	6	2.0	277	90.2
27	3	1.0	280	91.2
28	7	2.3	287	93.5
29	3	1.0	290	94.5
30	1	0.3	291	94.8
32	3	1.0	294	95.8
33	3	1.0	297	96.7
34	4	1.3	301	98.0
35	1	0.3	302	98.4
38	2	0.7	304	99.0
39	1	0.3	305	99.3
41	1	0.3	306	99.7
43	1	0.3	307	100.0

SEX		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Female	1	190	61.9	190	61.9
Male	2	116	37.8	306	99.7

What is your material status?

	MARRIED	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Married	1	26	8.5	29	9.4
Not Married	2	253	82.4	282	91.9
Not Married Living with Someone	3	14	4.6	296	96.4
Divorced	4	6	2.0	302	98.4
Divorced Living with someone	5	2	0.7	304	99.0
Widowed	6	2	0.7	306	99.7

Where do you expect to live this fall (1989)?

	LIVING	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
W/Parents	1	232	75.6	232	75.6
W/Relatives	2	13	4.2	245	79.8
W/spouse	3	23	7.5	268	87.3
W/student	4	11	3.6	279	90.9
Alone	5	25	8.1	304	99.0

Guess your family income before taxes ?

	INCOME	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No Answer	0	7	2.3	7	2.3
< $4,000	1	62	20.2	69	22.5
4,000-7,499	2	59	19.2	128	41.7
7,500-9,999	3	24	7.8	152	49.5
10,000-12,499	4	22	7.2	174	56.7
12,500-15,999	5	28	9.1	202	65.8
16,000-19,999	6	22	7.2	224	73.0
20,000-24,999	7	24	7.8	248	80.8
25,000-29,999	8	20	6.5	268	87.3
30,000 greater	9	39	12.7	307	100.0

How much education does/did your mother have ?

	MOMED	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No Answer	0	31	10.1	31	10.1
< 8th Grade	1	60	19.5	91	29.6
Some H.S.	2	59	19.2	150	48.9
HS Grad.	3	77	25.1	227	73.9
Some college	4	40	13.0	267	87.0
College Grad.	5	32	10.4	299	97.4
Postgrad.	6	8	2.6	307	100.0

How much education does/did your father have ?

	POPED	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No Answer	0	52	16.9	52	16.9
< 8th Grade	1	61	19.9	113	36.8
Some HS	2	51	16.6	164	53.4
HS Grad.	3	81	26.4	245	79.8
Some College	4	23	7.5	268	87.3
College Grad.	5	34	11.1	302	98.4
Postgrad.	6	5	1.6	307	100.0

Which describes your job situation for this fall (1989)?

JOB		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Have P/T job	1	121	39.4	125	40.7
Have F/T job	2	21	6.8	146	47.6
Looking P/T	3	98	31.9	244	79.5
Looking F/T	4	3	1.0	247	80.5
Don't plan	5	59	19.2	306	99.7

RACE		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Hispanic	1	127	41.4	136	44.3
Black	2	111	36.2	247	80.5
White	3	42	13.7	289	94.1
Native Amer.	4	1	0.3	290	94.5
Asian	5	17	5.5	307	100.0

From what country or part of the World did you or your family originate?

AFR		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	248	80.8	248	80.8
	1	59	19.2	307	100.0

CHINA		Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	0	304	99.0	304	99.0
	1	3	1.0	307	100.0

	HONG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	0	306	99.7	306	99.7
	1	1	0.3	307	100.0

	TAIWAN	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
No	0	306	99.7	306	99.7
	1	1	0.3	307	100.0

	KOR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	302	98.4	302	98.4
	1	5	1.6	307	100.0

	PHIL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	305	99.3	305	99.3
	1	2	0.7	307	100.0

	JAP	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
	0	307	100.0	307	100.0

	IND	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	306	99.7	306	99.7
	1	1	0.3	307	100.0

				Cumulative	Cumulative

	PAK	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
No	0	307	100.0	307	100.0

	OTHERAS	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	305	99.3	305	99.3
	1	2	0.7	307	100.0

	COLOM	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	301	98.0	301	98.0
	1	6	2.0	307	100.0

	CUBA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	0	301	98.0	301	98.0
	1	6	2.0	307	100.0

	DOMREP	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	286	93.2	286	93.2
	1	21	6.8	307	100.0

	ECU	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	304	99.0	304	99.0
	1	3	1.0	307	100.0

	HAITI	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	284	92.5	284	92.5
	1	23	7.5	307	100.0

	JAMA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	279	90.9	279	90.9
	1	28	9.1	307	100.0

	PR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	268	87.3	268	87.3
	1	39	12.7	307	100.0

	OTHCARLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	249	81.1	249	81.1
	1	58	18.9	307	100.0

	ENG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	302	98.4	302	98.4
	1	5	1.6	307	100.0

	GER	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	303	98.7	303	98.7
	1	4	1.3	307	100.0

	GRE	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	0	304	99.0	304	99.0
	1	3	1.0	307	100.0

	IRE	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
NO	0	302	98.4	302	98.4
	1	5	1.6	307	100.0

	ITALY	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	294	95.8	294	95.8
	1	13	4.2	307	100.0

	POL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	300	97.7	300	97.7
	1	7	2.3	307	100.0

	RUSS	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	304	99.0	304	99.0
	1	3	1.0	307	100.0

	OTHEUR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
No	0	297	96.7	297	96.7
	1	9	2.9	306	99.7
	2	1	0.3	307	100.0

Have you any brothers or sisters who have attended college?

SIBLINGS	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Yes 1	148	48.2	150	48.9
No 2	157	51.1	307	100.0

What would you say are your reasons for attending college?

BETTERJ	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	133	43.3	133	43.3
Better job 1	174	56.7	307	100.0

GSCHOOL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	296	96.4	296	96.4
Graduate School 1	9	2.9	305	99.3

PARENTS	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	296	96.4	296	96.4
1	11	3.6	307	100.0

Parents want me to go college.

NOTHBET	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	303	98.7	303	98.7
1	4	1.3	307	100.0

I have nothing better to do.

IDEAS	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	221	72.0	221	72.0

1	86	28.0	307	100.0

For an appreciation of ideas.

COMMUNIT	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
0	248	80.8	248	80.8
1	59	19.2	307	100.0

To contribute to the community.

MEET	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	290	94.5	290	94.5
1	17	5.5	307	100.0

To meet new people.

MONEY	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	204	66.4	204	66.4
1	103	33.6	307	100.0

To make more money.

LEARN	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	205	66.8	205	66.8
1	102	33.2	307	100.0

To learn things that I am interested on.

How are you paying for college ?

TAP	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
0	139	45.3	139	45.3
1	168	54.7	307	100.0

BEOG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	288	93.8	288	93.8
1	19	6.2	307	100.0

SEOG	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	298	97.1	298	97.1
1	9	2.9	307	100.0

PELL	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
0	191	62.2	191	62.2
1	116	37.8	307	100.0

SEEK	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	273	88.9	273	88.9
1	34	11.1	307	100.0

GSL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	298	97.1	298	97.1
1	9	2.9	307	100.0

NDSL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	306	99.7	306	99.7
1	1	0.3	307	100.0

SUMMJ	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	295	96.1	295	96.1
1	12	3.9	307	100.0

PERSONAL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	269	87.6	269	87.6
1	38	12.4	307	100.0

With a summer job.

JOBSY	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	277	90.2	277	90.2
1	30	9.8	307	100.0

My family.

FAMILY	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	231	75.2	231	75.2
1	76	24.8	307	100.0

Veteran's benefits

VET	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	302	98.4	302	98.4
1	5	1.0	305	100.0

Employer contributions

EMPCON	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	303	98.7	303	98.7
1	3	1.0	306	99.7

TRSC	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
18	1	0.3	1	0.3
19	1	0.3	2	0.7
20	1	0.3	3	1.0
21	6	2.0	9	2.9
22	2	0.7	11	3.6
23	3	1.0	14	4.6
24	3	1.0	17	5.5
25	4	1.3	21	6.8
26	6	2.0	27	8.8
27	5	1.6	32	10.4
28	5	1.6	37	12.1
29	9	2.9	46	15.0
30	10	3.3	56	18.2
31	13	4.2	69	22.5
32	14	4.6	83	27.0
33	14	4.6	97	31.6
34	16	5.2	113	36.8
35	19	6.2	132	43.0
36	18	5.9	150	48.9
37	12	3.9	162	52.8
38	16	5.2	178	58.0
39	12	3.9	190	61.9
40	13	4.2	203	66.1
41	17	5.5	220	71.7
42	20	6.5	240	78.2
43	11	3.6	251	81.8
44	8	2.6	259	84.4
45	10	3.3	269	87.6
46	11	3.6	280	91.2
47	6	2.0	286	93.2
48	6	2.0	292	95.1
49	5	1.6	297	96.7
50	9	2.9	306	99.7

TMSC	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
9	2	0.7	2	0.7
10	6	2.0	8	2.6
11	2	0.7	10	3.3
12	3	1.0	13	4.2
13	2	0.7	15	4.9
14	1	0.3	16	5.2
15	2	0.7	18	5.9
16	4	1.3	22	7.2
17	6	2.0	28	9.1
18	7	2.3	35	11.4
19	6	2.0	41	13.4
20	6	2.0	47	15.3
21	6	2.0	53	17.3
22	2	0.7	55	17.9
23	8	2.6	63	20.5
24	7	2.3	70	22.8
25	9	2.9	79	25.7
26	6	2.0	85	27.7
27	6	2.0	91	29.6
28	11	3.6	102	33.2
29	10	3.3	112	36.5
30	11	3.6	123	40.1
31	14	4.6	137	44.6
32	17	5.5	154	50.2
33	13	4.2	167	54.4
34	11	3.6	178	58.0
35	8	2.6	186	60.6
36	14	4.6	200	65.1
37	8	2.6	208	67.8
38	14	4.6	222	72.3
39	9	2.9	231	75.2
40	16	5.2	247	80.5
41	6	2.0	253	82.4
42	7	2.3	260	84.7
43	10	3.3	270	87.9
44	7	2.3	277	90.2
45	5	1.6	282	91.9
46	5	1.6	287	93.5
47	6	2.0	293	95.4
48	2	0.7	295	96.1
49	4	1.3	299	97.4
50	6	2.0	305	99.3
53	1	0.3	306	99.7
54	1	0.3	307	100.0

TWSC	Frequency	Cumulative Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Percent
9	1	0.3	1	0.3
10	1	0.3	2	0.7
11	1	0.3	3	1.0
12	1	0.3	4	1.3
13	1	0.3	5	1.6
14	1	0.3	6	2.0
16	1	0.3	7	2.3
17	4	1.3	11	3.6
18	3	1.0	14	4.6
19	2	0.7	16	5.2
20	2	0.7	18	5.9
21	5	1.6	23	7.5
22	1	0.3	24	7.8
23	7	2.3	31	10.1
24	6	2.0	37	12.1
25	6	2.0	43	14.0
26	6	2.0	49	16.0
27	11	3.6	60	19.5
28	11	3.6	71	23.1
29	12	3.9	83	27.0
30	12	3.9	95	30.9
31	15	4.9	110	35.8
32	10	3.3	120	39.1
33	19	6.2	139	45.3
34	10	3.3	149	48.5
35	16	5.2	165	53.7
36	20	6.5	185	60.3
37	12	3.9	197	64.2
38	24	7.8	221	72.0
39	14	4.6	235	76.5
40	20	6.5	255	83.1
41	9	2.9	264	86.0
42	8	2.6	272	88.6
43	5	1.6	277	90.2
44	9	2.9	286	93.2
45	19	6.2	305	99.3
50	2	0.7	307	100.0

TSCA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
20	8	2.6	8	2.6
21	14	4.6	22	7.2
22	21	6.8	43	14.0
23	42	13.7	85	27.7
24	58	18.9	143	46.6
25	43	14.0	186	60.6
26	45	14.7	231	75.2
27	24	7.8	255	83.1
28	20	6.5	275	89.6
29	8	2.6	283	92.2
30	7	2.3	290	94.5
31	5	1.6	295	96.1
32	4	1.3	299	97.4
33	4	1.3	303	98.7
34	2	0.7	305	99.3
37	1	0.3	306	99.7
40	1	0.3	307	100.0

FGPA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
20	1	0.3	1	0.3
22	1	0.3	2	0.7
25	1	0.3	3	1.0
28	1	0.3	4	1.3
40	1	0.3	5	1.6
50	1	0.3	6	2.0
60	2	0.7	8	2.6
66	1	0.3	9	2.9
75	1	0.3	10	3.3
80	1	0.3	11	3.6
85	1	0.3	12	3.9
100	6	2.0	18	5.9
103	1	0.3	19	6.2
109	1	0.3	20	6.5
111	1	0.3	21	6.8
112	1	0.3	22	7.2
114	2	0.7	24	7.8
128	2	0.7	26	8.5
129	1	0.3	27	8.8
130	1	0.3	28	9.1
138	1	0.3	29	9.4
150	1	0.3	30	9.8
154	1	0.3	31	10.1
155	1	0.3	32	10.4
157	2	0.7	34	11.1
160	4	1.3	38	12.4
162	1	0.3	39	12.7
164	1	0.3	40	13.0
167	1	0.3	41	13.4
171	1	0.3	42	13.7
175	4	1.3	46	15.0
177	1	0.3	47	15.3
180	1	0.3	48	15.6
183	1	0.3	49	16.0
184	1	0.3	50	16.3
185	3	1.0	53	17.3
188	1	0.3	54	17.6
190	1	0.3	55	17.9
200	32	10.4	87	28.3
213	1	0.3	88	28.7
214	1	0.3	89	29.0
216	1	0.3	90	29.3
218	1	0.3	91	29.6
220	3	1.0	94	30.6

222	1	0.3	95	30.9
223	30	9.8	125	40.7
225	9	2.9	134	43.6
227	2	0.7	136	44.3
228	1	0.3	137	44.6
230	1	0.3	138	45.0
233	4	1.3	142	46.3
234	1	0.3	143	46.6
235	1	0.3	144	46.9
237	2	0.7	146	47.6
238	1	0.3	147	47.9
240	4	1.3	151	49.2
242	1	0.3	152	49.5
247	1	0.3	153	49.8
250	12	3.9	165	53.7
252	1	0.3	166	54.1
253	1	0.3	167	54.4
255	2	0.7	169	55.0
257	3	1.0	172	56.0
259	1	0.3	173	56.4
262	2	0.7	175	57.0
266	5	1.6	180	58.6
267	1	0.3	181	59.0
271	2	0.7	183	59.6
275	3	1.0	186	60.6
277	1	0.3	187	60.9
280	3	1.0	190	61.9
282	2	0.7	192	62.5
283	1	0.3	193	62.9
285	1	0.3	194	63.2
287	1	0.3	195	63.5
290	1	0.3	196	63.8
300	36	11.7	232	75.6
301	1	0.3	233	75.9
308	2	0.7	235	76.5
314	2	0.7	237	77.2
316	1	0.3	238	77.5
320	2	0.7	240	78.2
325	6	2.0	246	80.1
328	3	1.0	249	81.1
330	1	0.3	250	81.4
333	3	1.0	253	82.4
334	1	0.3	254	82.7
336	1	0.3	255	83.1
340	1	0.3	256	83.4
342	1	0.3	257	83.7
350	3	1.0	260	84.7
355	1	0.3	261	85.0
357	1	0.3	262	85.3
358	1	0.3	263	85.7
360	1	0.3	264	86.0
362	1	0.3	265	86.3

366	1	0.3	266	86.6
372	1	0.3	267	87.0
375	1	0.3	268	87.3
378	1	0.3	269	87.6
382	1	0.3	270	87.9
385	1	0.3	271	88.3
400	36	11.7	307	100.0

SAS 14:55 Thursday, March 12, 1992

40

CUNYRES	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
10	1	0.3	1	0.3
11	3	1.0	4	1.3
12	4	1.3	8	2.6
13	4	1.3	12	3.9
14	4	1.3	16	5.2
15	5	1.6	21	6.8
16	8	2.6	29	9.4
17	11	3.6	40	13.0
18	13	4.2	53	17.3
19	10	3.3	63	20.5
20	12	3.9	75	24.4
21	10	3.3	85	27.7
22	7	2.3	92	30.0
23	9	2.9	101	32.9
24	4	1.3	105	34.2
25	8	2.6	113	36.8
26	9	2.9	122	39.7
27	17	5.5	139	45.3
28	18	5.9	157	51.1
29	23	7.5	180	58.6
30	18	5.9	198	64.5
31	18	5.9	216	70.4
32	17	5.5	233	75.9
33	19	6.2	252	82.1
34	9	2.9	261	85.0
35	11	3.6	272	88.6
36	5	1.6	277	90.2
37	9	2.9	286	93.2
38	6	2.0	292	95.1
39	6	2.0	298	97.1
40	8	2.6	306	99.7

CUNYWTS	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
2	9	2.9	9	2.9
3	8	2.6	17	5.5
4	22	7.2	39	12.7
5	36	11.7	75	24.4
6	75	24.4	150	48.9
7	3	1.0	153	49.8
8	144	46.9	297	96.7
9	10	3.3	307	100.0

CUNYMAS	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
12	1	0.3	1	0.3
13	10	3.3	11	3.6
14	2	0.7	13	4.2
15	4	1.3	17	5.5
16	4	1.3	21	6.8
17	9	2.9	30	9.8
18	3	1.0	33	10.7
19	5	1.6	38	12.4
20	15	4.9	53	17.3
21	14	4.6	67	21.8
22	13	4.2	80	26.1
23	9	2.9	89	29.0
24	7	2.3	96	31.3
25	14	4.6	110	35.8
26	21	6.8	131	42.7
27	25	8.1	156	50.8
28	26	8.5	182	59.3
29	19	6.2	201	65.5
30	23	7.5	224	73.0
31	17	5.5	241	78.5
32	20	6.5	261	85.0
33	7	2.3	268	87.3
34	13	4.2	281	91.5
35	10	3.3	291	94.8
36	8	2.6	299	97.4
37	4	1.3	303	98.7
38	1	0.3	304	99.0
39	3	1.0	307	100.0

HSA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
61	2	0.7	2	0.7
62	3	1.0	5	1.6
63	1	0.3	6	2.0
64	4	1.3	10	3.3
65	4	1.3	14	4.6
66	11	3.6	25	8.1
67	15	4.9	40	13.0
68	14	4.6	54	17.6
69	17	5.5	71	23.1
70	75	24.4	146	47.6
71	12	3.9	158	51.5
72	20	6.5	178	58.0
73	17	5.5	195	63.5
74	12	3.9	207	67.4
75	25	8.1	232	75.6
76	10	3.3	242	78.8
77	11	3.6	253	82.4
78	9	2.9	262	85.3
79	7	2.3	269	87.6
80	14	4.6	283	92.2
81	4	1.3	287	93.5
82	7	2.3	294	95.8
83	2	0.7	296	96.4
84	3	1.0	299	97.4
85	3	1.0	302	98.4
88	1	0.3	303	98.7
89	1	0.3	304	99.0
90	2	0.7	306	99.7
91	1	0.3	307	100.0

HSAM	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
55	2	0.7	2	0.7
56	1	0.3	3	1.0

58	2	0.7	5	1.6
60	13	4.2	18	5.9
61	2	0.7	20	6.5
62	8	2.6	28	9.1
63	12	3.9	40	13.0
64	7	2.3	47	15.3
65	14	4.6	61	19.9
66	7	2.3	68	22.1
67	14	4.6	82	26.7
68	16	5.2	98	31.9
69	6	2.0	104	33.9
70	109	35.5	213	69.4
71	12	3.9	225	73.3
72	8	2.6	233	75.9
73	10	3.3	243	79.2
74	5	1.6	248	80.8
75	16	5.2	264	86.0
76	4	1.3	268	87.3
77	9	2.9	277	90.2
78	5	1.6	282	91.9
80	11	3.6	293	95.4
81	3	1.0	296	96.4
82	3	1.0	299	97.4
83	1	0.3	300	97.7
84	1	0.3	301	98.0
86	1	0.3	302	98.4
88	1	0.3	303	98.7
89	1	0.3	304	99.0
90	2	0.7	306	99.7
91	1	0.3	307	100.0

HSAE	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
60	4	1.3	4	1.3
61	1	0.3	5	1.6
63	3	1.0	8	2.6
64	10	3.3	18	5.9
65	5	1.6	23	7.5
66	5	1.6	28	9.1
67	5	1.6	33	10.7
68	13	4.2	46	15.0
69	4	1.3	50	16.3
70	84	27.4	134	43.6
71	11	3.6	145	47.2

72	12	3.9	157	51.1
73	12	3.9	169	55.0
74	9	2.9	178	58.0
75	25	8.1	203	66.1
76	12	3.9	215	70.0
77	7	2.3	222	72.3
78	11	3.6	233	75.9
79	8	2.6	241	78.5
80	17	5.5	258	84.0
81	8	2.6	266	86.6
82	6	2.0	272	88.6
83	7	2.3	279	90.9
84	9	2.9	288	93.8
85	6	2.0	294	95.8
86	4	1.3	298	97.1
87	3	1.0	301	98.0
88	3	1.0	304	99.0
89	1	0.3	305	99.3
90	1	0.3	306	99.7
93	1	0.3	307	100.0

Passed Cuny Writing exam during first attempt.

	CUNYWT1	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
passed	1	97	31.6	97	31.6
	2	210	68.4	307	100.0

ACADEMUN	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	63	20.5	73	34.0
7	19	6.2	82	26.7
8	66	21.5	148	48.2
9	29	9.4	177	57.7
10	29	9.4	206	67.1
11	23	7.5	229	74.6
12	23	7.5	252	82.1
13	18	5.9	270	87.9
14	20	6.5	290	94.5
15	11	3.6	301	98.0
16	6	2.0	307	100.0

FCRTS	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	2	0.7	2	0.7
1	70	22.8	72	23.5
2	11	3.6	83	27.0
3	18	5.9	101	32.9
4	55	17.9	156	50.8
5	14	4.6	170	55.4
6	39	12.7	209	68.1
7	24	7.8	233	75.9
8	20	6.5	253	82.4
9	15	4.9	268	87.3
10	7	2.3	275	89.6
11	11	3.6	286	93.2
12	5	1.6	291	94.8
13	4	1.3	295	96.1
14	3	1.0	298	97.1
15	6	2.0	304	99.0
16	1	0.3	305	99.3
18	1	0.3	306	99.7
34	1	0.3	307	100.0

Passed the CUNY Reading exam during first attempt.

	CUNYRE1	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Passed	1	135	44.0	135	44.0
	2	172	56.0	307	100.0

Passed the Cuny math exam during the first attempt.

	CUNYMA1	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Passed	1	96	31.3	96	31.3
	2	211	68.7	307	100.0

SGPA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
23	1	0.3	1	0.3
25	1	0.3	2	0.7
28	1	0.3	3	1.0
33	2	0.7	5	1.6
42	4	1.3	9	2.9
45	1	0.3	10	3.3
46	1	0.3	11	3.6
50	1	0.3	12	3.9
66	3	1.0	15	4.9
70	1	0.3	16	5.2
80	2	0.7	18	5.9
85	1	0.3	19	6.2
87	1	0.3	20	6.5
88	2	0.7	22	7.2
90	1	0.3	23	7.5
92	2	0.7	25	8.1
100	17	5.5	42	13.7
112	1	0.3	43	14.0
120	2	0.7	45	14.7
121	1	0.3	46	15.0
125	1	0.3	47	15.3
133	4	1.3	51	16.6
146	1	0.3	52	16.9
150	3	1.0	55	17.9
155	1	0.3	56	18.2
157	1	0.3	57	18.6
163	3	1.0	60	19.5
164	1	0.3	61	19.9
166	2	0.7	63	20.5
170	1	0.3	64	20.8
171	1	0.3	65	21.2
174	27	8.8	92	30.0
175	1	0.3	93	30.3
176	1	0.3	94	30.6
180	2	0.7	96	31.3
184	1	0.3	97	31.6
185	2	0.7	99	32.2
190	4	1.3	103	33.6
191	1	0.3	104	33.9
200	33	10.7	137	44.6

207	1	0.3	138	45.0
211	2	0.7	140	45.6
214	1	0.3	141	45.9
215	1	0.3	142	46.3
216	3	1.0	145	47.2
217	1	0.3	146	47.6
218	1	0.3	147	47.9
219	1	0.3	148	48.2
222	1	0.3	149	48.5
223	33	10.7	182	59.3
225	4	1.3	186	60.6
229	1	0.3	187	60.9
232	10	3.3	197	64.2
233	6	2.0	203	66.3
236	1	0.3	204	66.4
237	1	0.3	205	66.8
238	1	0.3	206	67.1
240	1	0.3	207	67.4
241	1	0.3	208	67.8
245	1	0.3	209	68.1
246	1	0.3	210	68.4
250	5	1.6	215	70.0
260	1	0.3	216	70.4
261	2	0.7	218	71.0
266	3	1.0	221	72.0
270	3	1.0	224	73.0
273	1	0.3	225	73.3
276	2	0.7	227	73.9
280	1	0.3	228	74.3
287	1	0.3	229	74.6
288	2	0.7	231	75.2
300	24	7.8	255	83.1
313	1	0.3	256	83.4
316	1	0.3	257	83.7
322	1	0.3	258	84.0
323	1	0.3	259	84.4
325	2	0.7	261	85.0
328	2	0.7	263	85.7
330	2	0.7	265	86.3
331	1	0.3	266	86.6
333	2	0.7	268	87.3
338	1	0.3	269	87.6
340	1	0.3	270	87.9
342	2	0.7	272	88.6
346	1	0.3	273	88.9
350	6	2.0	279	90.9
355	3	1.0	282	91.9
360	1	0.3	283	92.2
364	1	0.3	284	92.5
366	2	0.7	286	93.2
370	1	0.3	287	93.5
371	1	0.3	288	93.8

373	1	0.3	289	94.1
384	1	0.3	290	94.5
387	1	0.3	291	94.8
400	16	5.2	307	100.0

QPA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
10	1	0.3	1	0.3
20	1	0.3	2	0.7
21	1	0.3	3	1.0
22	1	0.3	4	1.3
25	2	0.7	6	2.0
30	1	0.3	7	2.3
35	1	0.3	8	2.6
37	1	0.3	9	2.9
40	4	1.3	13	4.2
43	1	0.3	14	4.6
45	3	1.0	17	5.5
46	2	0.7	19	6.2
47	1	0.3	20	6.5
57	1	0.3	21	6.8
60	1	0.3	22	7.2
66	1	0.3	23	7.5
68	1	0.3	24	7.8
71	1	0.3	25	8.1
72	1	0.3	26	8.5
73	2	0.7	28	9.1
75	1	0.3	29	9.4
78	1	0.3	30	9.8
85	1	0.3	31	10.1
89	1	0.3	32	10.4
90	1	0.3	33	10.7
92	2	0.7	35	11.4
96	2	0.7	37	12.1
100	2	0.7	39	12.7
101	1	0.3	40	13.0
102	1	0.3	41	13.4
103	1	0.3	42	13.7
108	1	0.3	43	14.0
111	1	0.3	44	14.3
112	1	0.3	45	14.7
114	1	0.3	46	15.0
115	1	0.3	47	15.3
117	1	0.3	48	15.6
121	1	0.3	49	16.0
123	1	0.3	50	16.3

125	2	0.7	52	16.9
128	2	0.7	54	17.6
129	1	0.3	55	17.9
132	1	0.3	56	18.2
133	4	1.3	60	19.5
138	3	1.0	63	20.5
140	2	0.7	65	21.2
141	1	0.3	66	21.5
142	1	0.3	67	21.8
143	1	0.3	68	22.1
144	3	1.0	71	23.1
145	1	0.3	72	23.5
146	2	0.7	74	24.1
149	1	0.3	75	24.4
150	3	1.0	78	25.4

QPA	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
154	1	0.3	79	25.7
156	1	0.3	80	26.1
157	3	1.0	83	27.0
160	2	0.7	85	27.7
161	1	0.3	86	28.0
163	2	0.7	88	28.7
164	2	0.7	90	29.3
165	1	0.3	91	29.6
168	2	0.7	93	30.3
169	1	0.3	94	30.6
172	3	1.0	97	31.6
174	9	2.9	106	34.5
175	1	0.3	107	34.9
177	2	0.7	109	35.5
181	3	1.0	112	36.5
182	1	0.3	113	36.8
183	1	0.3	114	37.1
184	2	0.7	116	37.8
185	2	0.7	118	38.4
188	3	1.0	121	39.4
189	1	0.3	122	39.7
191	2	0.7	124	40.4
194	9	2.9	133	43.3
195	1	0.3	134	43.6
196	3	1.0	137	44.6
197	3	1.0	140	45.6
200	8	2.6	148	48.2
205	1	0.3	149	48.5
206	2	0.7	151	49.2
207	1	0.3	152	49.5
209	3	1.0	155	50.5
211	1	0.3	156	50.8
213	1	0.3	157	51.1
214	1	0.3	158	51.5

215	1	0.3	159	51.8
216	1	0.3	160	52.1
218	2	0.7	162	52.8
219	2	0.7	164	53.4
220	4	1.3	168	54.7
221	2	0.7	170	55.4
222	3	1.0	173	56.4
224	1	0.3	174	56.7
225	6	2.0	180	58.6
226	2	0.7	182	59.3
227	1	0.3	183	59.6
228	2	0.7	185	60.3
229	1	0.3	186	60.6
230	2	0.7	188	61.2
231	1	0.3	189	61.6
232	5	1.6	194	63.2
233	1	0.3	195	63.5
234	1	0.3	196	63.8
236	2	0.7	198	64.5
237	3	1.0	201	65.5

QPA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
238	1	0.3	202	65.8
239	1	0.3	203	66.1
240	1	0.3	204	66.4
242	1	0.3	205	66.8
243	1	0.3	206	67.1
244	2	0.7	208	67.8
245	2	0.7	210	68.4
247	1	0.3	211	68.7
250	6	2.0	217	70.7
252	1	0.3	218	71.0
253	2	0.7	220	71.7
254	1	0.3	221	72.0
255	1	0.3	222	72.3
257	1	0.3	223	72.6
258	1	0.3	224	73.0
260	4	1.3	228	74.3
261	1	0.3	229	74.6
266	2	0.7	231	75.2
268	1	0.3	232	75.6
269	1	0.3	233	75.9
270	3	1.0	236	76.9
271	1	0.3	237	77.2
272	2	0.7	239	77.9

273	1	0.3	240	78.2
275	5	1.6	245	79.8
277	1	0.3	246	80.1
278	2	0.7	248	80.8
281	1	0.3	249	81.1
283	1	0.3	250	81.4
284	1	0.3	251	81.8
285	2	0.7	253	82.4
287	1	0.3	254	82.7
288	1	0.3	255	83.1
290	2	0.7	257	83.7
291	1	0.3	258	84.0
292	1	0.3	259	84.4
293	1	0.3	260	84.7
294	1	0.3	261	85.0
300	8	2.6	269	87.6
303	1	0.3	270	87.9
304	1	0.3	271	88.3
305	1	0.3	272	88.6
309	1	0.3	273	88.9
311	1	0.3	274	89.3
312	2	0.7	276	89.9
314	1	0.3	277	90.2
315	2	0.7	279	90.9
317	2	0.7	281	91.5
318	1	0.3	282	91.9
324	1	0.3	283	92.2
325	2	0.7	285	92.8
326	1	0.3	286	93.2
328	1	0.3	287	93.5
333	1	0.3	288	93.8

QPA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
336	1	0.3	289	94.1
342	1	0.3	290	94.5
344	1	0.3	291	94.8
347	3	1.0	294	95.8
354	3	1.0	297	96.7
357	1	0.3	298	97.1
360	1	0.3	299	97.4
365	1	0.3	300	97.7
374	1	0.3	301	98.0
381	1	0.3	302	98.4
383	1	0.3	303	98.7
384	1	0.3	304	99.0
388	1	0.3	305	99.3
389	1	0.3	306	99.7
400	1	0.3	307	100.0

TOTALCRT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	9	2.9	9	2.9
2	2	0.7	11	3.6
3	7	2.3	18	5.9
4	10	3.3	28	9.1
5	4	1.3	32	10.4
6	31	10.1	63	20.5
7	15	4.9	78	25.4
8	12	3.9	90	29.3
9	4	1.3	94	30.6
10	8	2.6	102	33.2
11	8	2.6	110	35.8
12	5	1.6	115	37.5
13	7	2.3	122	39.7
14	2	0.7	124	40.4
15	7	2.3	131	42.7
16	7	2.3	138	45.0
17	5	1.6	143	46.6
18	9	2.9	152	49.5
19	7	2.3	159	51.8
20	6	2.0	165	53.7
21	6	2.0	171	55.7
22	6	2.0	177	57.7
23	9	2.9	186	60.6
24	3	1.0	189	61.6
25	4	1.3	193	62.9
26	7	2.3	200	65.1
27	4	1.3	204	66.4
28	7	2.3	211	68.7
29	5	1.6	216	70.4
30	5	1.6	221	72.0
31	2	0.7	223	72.6
32	2	0.7	225	73.3
34	4	1.3	229	74.6
35	1	0.3	230	74.9
36	5	1.6	235	76.5
37	4	1.3	239	77.9
38	4	1.3	243	79.2
39	4	1.3	247	80.5
40	3	1.0	250	81.4
41	3	1.0	253	82.4
42	3	1.0	256	83.4
43	2	0.7	258	84.0
44	1	0.3	259	84.4
45	2	0.7	261	85.0

46	2	0.7	263	85.7
47	2	0.7	265	86.3
48	2	0.7	267	87.0
49	3	1.0	270	87.9
50	2	0.7	272	88.6
51	5	1.6	277	90.2
52	3	1.0	280	91.2
53	4	1.3	284	92.5
54	1	0.3	285	92.8
55	1	0.3	286	93.2

TOTALCRT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
56	1	0.3	287	93.5
57	1	0.3	288	93.8
59	3	1.0	291	94.8
60	2	0.7	293	95.4
62	2	0.7	295	96.1
63	2	0.7	297	96.7
64	3	1.0	300	97.7
65	1	0.3	301	98.0
66	1	0.3	302	98.4
69	4	1.3	306	99.7
71	1	0.3	307	100.0

Enrolled after 4 semesters.

	FOLLOW	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Enrolled	1	135	44.0	135	44.0
	2	172	56.0	307	100.0

Where do you rank yourself in High school compared to your classmates.

	REFGP	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
poorest	1	2	0.7	2	0.7
below Averg.	2	24	7.8	26	8.5
Average	3	200	65.1	226	73.6
Above Averg.	4	69	22.5	295	96.1
Best	5	12	3.9	307	100.0

Where do you think you would rank in your classes at college?

	REFGPCH	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Poorest	1	1	0.3	1	0.3
Below Averg.	2	12	3.9	13	4.2
Average	3	194	63.2	207	67.4
Above Averg.	4	81	26.4	288	93.8
Best	5	19	6.2	307	100.0

I hope to that my highest college degree is

	HOPERN	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Associate	1	30	9.8	151	49.2
BA/BS	2	58	18.9	209	68.1
MA/MS	3	52	16.9	261	85.0
Professional	4	45	14.7	306	99.7

I will earn a

	WILLERN	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Associates	1	82	26.7	169	55.0
BA/BS	2	78	25.4	247	80.5
MA/MS	3	41	13.4	288	93.8
Professional	4	17	5.5	305	99.3

APPENDIX 3: PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	WRTSC	ASC	TRSC	TMSC	TWSC	TSCA
AGE	0.02053	0.15509	0.16367	0.14455	0.06001	0.14538
	0.7201	0.0065	0.0040	0.0112	0.2946	0.0108
SEX	-0.13793	0.08347	-0.06951	0.20780	-0.09787	0.01413
	0.0156	0.1446	0.2246	0.0002	0.0869	0.8052
MARRIED	0.01916	-0.07330	-0.00144	-0.02348	0.04349	-0.08812
	0.7381	0.2003	0.9799	0.6819	0.4477	0.1234
LIVING	-0.05184	0.16092	0.06287	0.09035	-0.03777	0.17719
	0.3653	0.0047	0.2721	0.1141	0.5097	0.0018
INCOME	-0.07509	-0.00142	0.07336	0.01408	-0.04925	0.03989
	0.1894	0.9803	0.1999	0.8059	0.3899	0.4862
MOMED	0.00035	-0.04488	-0.03077	0.00285	-0.01219	0.10157
	0.9951	0.4333	0.5912	0.9604	0.8316	0.0756
POPED	0.02646	0.03196	0.02822	-0.04302	0.04906	0.09937
	0.6442	0.5770	0.6223	0.4526	0.3917	0.0821
JOB	0.02498	-0.01643	0.03939	-0.00571	0.03039	-0.11659
	0.6628	0.7744	0.4917	0.9206	0.5958	

0.0412

RACE	-0.11774	-0.07732	-0.04274	-0.01047	-0.10042
-0.10622					
	0.0392	0.1766	0.4555	0.8550	0.0790
0.0631					
AFR	0.02413	-0.02365	0.05083	0.07198	0.04090
0.04141					
	0.6736	0.6798	0.3748	0.2085	0.4752
0.4698					
CHINA	-0.06185	-0.10201	-0.08053	-0.02004	-0.04811
-0.07404					
	0.2800	0.0743	0.1593	0.7266	0.4010
0.1957					
HONG	-0.03751	-0.01858	0.00034	0.08664	-0.05774
-0.04261					
	0.5126	0.7458	0.9953	0.1298	0.3133
0.4570					
TAIWAN	-0.03746	-0.01848	-0.08810	0.02312	-0.03520
-0.04261					
	0.5132	0.7471	0.1235	0.6866	0.5390
0.4570					
KOR	-0.11655	-0.05525	-0.09214	0.06503	-0.14688
-0.05183					
	0.0413	0.3346	0.1071	0.2559	0.0100
0.3655					
PHIL	-0.01280	0.06057	0.02136	-0.04088	-0.01260
0.02286					
	0.8232	0.2901	0.7094	0.4755	0.8259
0.6899					
JAP	.	.	.	.	.
IND	-0.03136	-0.02940	-0.08073	-0.07506	-0.00514
0.01614					
	0.5841	0.6079	0.1582	0.1897	0.9285
0.7782					

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	WRTSC	ASC	TRSC	TMSC	TWSC	TSCA
PAK	.	.	.	.	.	.
OTHERAS	0.02757	0.06846	-0.00474	0.00821	0.06723	0.03673
	0.6304	0.2317	0.9340	0.8861	0.2402	0.5214
COLOM	-0.01033	-0.03626	-0.10535	0.03095	-0.02816	-0.04075
	0.8570	0.5268	0.0653	0.5891	0.6231	0.4769
CUBA	-0.00552	0.06373	0.02207	-0.12119	0.04917	0.12046
	0.9233	0.2656	0.7002	0.0338	0.3906	0.0349
DOMREP	0.01402	0.00136	-0.08657	0.01964	-0.03115	-0.02517
	0.8067	0.9810	0.1301	0.7318	0.5867	0.6605
ECU	0.01741	-0.03222	-0.08906	0.03014	-0.02199	-0.02867
	0.7613	0.5738	0.1194	0.5989	0.7012	0.6168
HAITI	0.08709	0.05154	-0.07011	0.05509	-0.05649	0.09729
	0.1278	0.3682	0.2206	0.3360	0.3239	0.0888
JAMA	0.04718	0.07186	0.24691	-0.01361	0.11875	0.02354
	0.4101	0.2092	0.0001	0.8122	0.0376	0.6812

PR	0.02384	-0.09361	-0.03937	0.01890	0.00427
-0.05649					
	0.6774	0.1016	0.4919	0.7415	0.9406
0.3239					
OTHCARLA	-0.04613	0.07262	0.03180	0.02454	0.03754
0.05643					
	0.4206	0.2045	0.5788	0.6685	0.5122
0.3244					
ENG	0.00571	-0.04238	-0.05896	-0.05975	-0.04201
-0.13116					
	0.9206	0.4594	0.3031	0.2967	0.4633
0.0215					
GER	0.01552	-0.03069	-0.01043	0.02035	0.02365
-0.02660					
	0.7866	0.5922	0.8555	0.7225	0.6798
0.6425					
GRE	-0.03217	-0.02526	-0.06772	-0.01669	-0.06116
-0.04001					
	0.5745	0.6593	0.2368	0.7708	0.2854
0.4849					
IRE	0.01783	-0.03134	0.07043	0.00784	-0.00142
-0.01657					
	0.7557	0.5843	0.2185	0.8912	0.9802
0.7725					
ITALY	-0.04241	0.00104	-0.03213	-0.09144	-0.10608
-0.02929					
	0.4590	0.9856	0.5749	0.1098	0.0634
0.6092					
POL	-0.04292	0.09373	0.06279	-0.10356	-0.05676
0.08797					
	0.4537	0.1012	0.2727	0.0700	0.3216
0.1240					
RUSS	-0.00852	0.10776	0.05608	-0.15384	0.03024
0.10744					
	0.8817	0.0593	0.3274	0.0069	0.5976
0.0601					

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	WRTSC	ASC	TRSC	TMSC	TWSC	TSCA
OTHEUR	0.00981	-0.01625	0.02176	-0.16883	0.04538	-0.02717
	0.8641	0.7767	0.7041	0.0030	0.4282	0.6353
SIBLINGS	0.04286	0.04954	0.00824	-0.08052	0.01668	0.03641
	0.4543	0.3871	0.8856	0.1593	0.7710	0.5250
BETTERJ	-0.10074	-0.13336	-0.02124	-0.02220	-0.13049	-0.13421
	0.0780	0.0194	0.7109	0.6984	0.0222	0.0186
GSCHOOL	0.09477	-0.00494	0.03356	-0.01373	0.06103	0.01925
	0.0974	0.9313	0.5580	0.8106	0.2865	0.7369
PARENTS	-0.05080	0.01869	-0.11635	-0.04951	-0.05419	0.00639
	0.3751	0.7442	0.0416	0.3874	0.3440	0.9112
NOTHBET	0.04479	-0.04851	-0.09561	0.00584	-0.01788	-0.08564
	0.4343	0.3970	0.0945	0.9188	0.7550	0.1344
IDEAS	-0.01296	0.09000	0.08970	0.02219	-0.00079	0.11398
	0.8210	0.1156	0.1168	0.6986	0.9890	0.0460
COMMUNIT	0.10836	0.06438	0.03058	0.19224	0.06807	0.11786
	0.0579	0.2608	0.5935	0.0007	0.2344	

0.0390

MEET	-0.08563	0.05184	-0.02245	0.01159	-0.04049
0.08786					
	0.1344	0.3653	0.6953	0.8397	0.4797
0.1245					
MONEY	0.06435	0.02061	-0.00027	-0.11057	0.09933
0.03044					
	0.2609	0.7191	0.9962	0.0529	0.0823
0.5952					
LEARN	0.01508	-0.02532	-0.05380	0.00303	0.06838
-0.05671					
	0.7924	0.6585	0.3475	0.9579	0.2322
0.3220					
TAP	0.04241	-0.02178	0.10348	0.06052	0.03620
-0.02141					
	0.4591	0.7038	0.0702	0.2905	0.5275
0.7087					
BEOG	0.08807	0.05974	-0.06472	0.12982	0.03554
-0.04326					
	0.1236	0.2968	0.2583	0.0229	0.5350
0.4501					
SEOG	0.07243	-0.06306	0.02094	-0.05456	0.04783
-0.05677					
	0.2057	0.2707	0.7148	0.3407	0.4037
0.3215					
PELL	0.02239	-0.00538	0.13883	-0.02621	0.02354
-0.02394					
	0.6960	0.9252	0.0149	0.6473	0.6813
0.6761					
SEEK	-0.00062	-0.11250	0.04489	-0.02924	0.06241
-0.03548					
	0.9914	0.0489	0.4332	0.6098	0.2757
0.5357					
GSL	-0.12406	0.01154	-0.06121	0.04882	-0.00547
-0.05677					
	0.0298	0.8404	0.2850	0.3940	0.9239
0.3215					

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	WRTSC	ASC	TRSC	TMSC	TWSC	TSCA
NDSL	-0.03694	-0.00757	-0.00703	0.06354	-0.01265	0.01614
	0.5191	0.8949	0.9023	0.2670	0.8252	0.7782
SUMMJ	0.02860	0.12133	0.04452	-0.01352	0.00396	0.13753
	0.6177	0.0336	0.4370	0.8135	0.9449	0.0159
PERSONAL	-0.03041	-0.03371	-0.00927	-0.02086	0.00911	0.00785
	0.5956	0.5563	0.8715	0.7158	0.8737	0.8911
JOBSY	0.02890	0.15233	0.05143	-0.00765	0.06558	0.04029
	0.6140	0.0075	0.3691	0.8938	0.2520	0.4818
FAMILY	-0.05005	-0.10199	-0.09003	-0.03031	-0.04661	-0.06041
	0.3822	0.0744	0.1154	0.5968	0.4157	0.2914
VET	-0.01852	0.12237	-0.00912	-0.10860	-0.00809	0.08422
	0.7465	0.0321	0.8736	0.0573	0.8877	0.1409
EMPCON	0.01141	0.01991	-0.01345	-0.12684	-0.01775	0.01703
	0.8422	0.7283	0.8145	0.0263	0.7568	0.7663
READSC	0.37945	0.06776	0.67905	-0.02804	0.33685	0.05309
	0.0001	0.2365	0.0001	0.6246	0.0001	

0.3539

MATHSC	0.03219	0.16201	-0.04999	0.76917	-0.03916
0.18489					
	0.5743	0.0044	0.3828	0.0001	0.4942
0.0011					
WRTSC	1.00000	0.14831	0.40364	-0.00871	0.73538
0.15142					
	0.0	0.0093	0.0001	0.8792	0.0001
0.0079					
ASC	0.14831	1.00000	0.12862	0.11361	0.17184
0.61101					
	0.0093	0.0	0.0242	0.0467	0.0025
0.0001					
TRSC	0.40364	0.12862	1.00000	-0.03381	0.40293
0.17210					
	0.0001	0.0242	0.0	0.5551	0.0001
0.0025					
TMSC	-0.00871	0.11361	-0.03381	1.00000	-0.08362
0.19028					
	0.8792	0.0467	0.5551	0.0	0.1438
0.0008					
TWSC	0.73538	0.17184	0.40293	-0.08362	1.00000
0.18788					
	0.0001	0.0025	0.0001	0.1438	0.0
0.0009					
TSCA	0.15142	0.61101	0.17210	0.19028	0.18788
1.00000					
	0.0079	0.0001	0.0025	0.0008	0.0009	0.0
FGPA	-0.00616	0.09265	-0.02425	0.10786	0.00766
0.08664					
	0.9144	0.1052	0.6722	0.0591	0.8936
0.1299					
CUNYRES	-0.00184	0.06676	0.08930	-0.09664	0.08714
-0.01364					
	0.9744	0.2435	0.1184	0.0909	0.1276
0.8119					

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	WRTSC	ASC	TRSC	TMSC	TWSC	TSCA
CUNYWTS	0.02778	0.03663	0.05028	-0.12100	0.17962	0.06909
	0.6277	0.5225	0.3800	0.0341	0.0016	0.2274
CUNYMAS	0.01877	0.08216	-0.02101	0.12404	0.00179	0.06647
	0.7432	0.1510	0.7138	0.0298	0.9751	0.2456
HSA	0.10854	0.12282	0.02594	-0.07213	0.04115	0.05168
	0.0575	0.0314	0.6507	0.2075	0.4726	0.3668
HSAM	0.06417	0.10532	0.04871	0.17510	-0.02567	0.14791
	0.2623	0.0653	0.3951	0.0021	0.6542	0.0094
HSAE	0.12316	0.07354	0.06690	-0.11109	0.07521	-0.03885
	0.0310	0.1988	0.2425	0.0518	0.1888	0.4977
CUNYWT1	0.00909	-0.07806	-0.03471	-0.09224	-0.05309	-0.17025
	0.8740	0.1725	0.5446	0.1067	0.3539	0.0028
ACADEMUN	-0.05808	-0.07841	-0.00618	-0.07669	-0.06083	-0.07039
	0.3104	0.1706	0.9141	0.1802	0.2880	0.2188
FCRTS	0.10488	0.07928	0.10189	0.00968	0.18048	0.09052
	0.0665	0.1658	0.0747	0.8658	0.0015	

						0.1134
CUNYRE1	0.08209	0.01249	-0.04836	0.12633	-0.02558	-0.00057
	0.1513	0.8275	0.3985	0.0269	0.6553	0.9920
CUNYMA1	-0.12529	-0.10487	-0.11719	0.08992	-0.19795	-0.16153
	0.0282	0.0665	0.0402	0.1159	0.0005	0.0045
SGPA	0.08775	0.03066	0.09840	-0.04300	0.03951	0.03623
	0.1250	0.5926	0.0852	0.4529	0.4904	0.5272
QPA	0.04224	0.13860	0.14177	-0.11605	0.07427	0.13331
	0.4609	0.0151	0.0129	0.0422	0.1944	0.0195
TOTALCRT	0.10262	0.10462	0.16475	-0.05275	0.16236	0.10362
	0.0726	0.0671	0.0038	0.3569	0.0043	0.0698
FOLLOW	-0.00489	-0.04618	-0.07881	0.03286	-0.05232	-0.02080
	0.9320	0.4201	0.1684	0.5663	0.3609	0.7166
REFGP	0.14061	0.52745	0.09552	0.10323	0.14420	0.58093
	0.0137	0.0001	0.0948	0.0709	0.0114	0.0001
REFGPCH	0.22181	0.38845	0.07842	0.16907	0.15197	0.55022
	0.0001	0.0001	0.1705	0.0030	0.0076	0.0001
HOPERN	-0.07022	0.00538	-0.05213	-0.04447	-0.06655	-0.03294
	0.2199	0.9252	0.3626	0.4376	0.2450	0.5653

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	WRTSC	ASC	TRSC	TMSC	TWSC	TSCA
WILLERN	0.12116	0.22511	0.15210	0.08990	0.05638	0.31065
	0.0338	0.0001	0.0076	0.1160	0.3248	0.0001

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	FGPA	CUNYRES	CUNYWTS	CUNYMAS	HSA	HSAM
AGE	0.08846	-0.02899	-0.12431	0.11517	0.01711	0.11982
	0.1220	0.6129	0.0294	0.0438	0.7653	0.0359
SEX	-0.05093	-0.02456	-0.12935	-0.07597	-0.15280	-0.06033
	0.3739	0.6681	0.0234	0.1843	0.0073	0.2920
MARRIED	-0.01890	-0.09231	-0.02623	-0.05895	-0.08051	-0.06878
	0.7415	0.1065	0.6471	0.3032	0.1594	0.2295
LIVING	0.03185	0.00733	-0.11852	0.12152	0.03645	0.10072
	0.5783	0.8983	0.0379	0.0333	0.5246	0.0781
INCOME	-0.02786	0.27955	0.14511	0.09275	-0.05799	-0.06763
	0.6269	0.0001	0.0109	0.1048	0.3112	0.2374
MOMED	-0.06220	0.19991	0.20282	0.13923	-0.02608	-0.02157
	0.2773	0.0004	0.0003	0.0146	0.6490	0.7066
POPED	0.02218	0.18540	0.20472	0.11629	0.10383	0.11156
	0.6987	0.0011	0.0003	0.0417	0.0693	0.0508
JOB	0.12582	-0.09082	-0.01865	-0.08947	-0.02013	-0.09724
	0.0275	0.1123	0.7449	0.1177	0.7254	

0.0890						
RACE	0.00932	0.11561	-0.00092	0.09500	0.06371	0.11718
	0.8708	0.0429	0.9872	0.0966	0.2658	0.0402
AFR	-0.02954	-0.02888	0.01068	-0.09712	-0.10820	-0.07688
	0.6061	0.6142	0.8521	0.0894	0.0583	0.1791
CHINA	0.01677	0.04540	0.00447	-0.03231	0.03267	-0.06955
	0.7698	0.4280	0.9379	0.5728	0.5685	0.2243
HONG	0.09562	-0.08544	-0.11970	0.01315	0.00429	0.02884
	0.0945	0.1352	0.0361	0.8184	0.9403	0.6147
TAIWAN	0.09562	-0.08544	-0.01966	0.01315	0.08048	-0.00067
	0.0945	0.1352	0.7315	0.8184	0.1595	0.9906
KOR	0.02793	0.00390	-0.07427	0.13250	0.01456	0.10920
	0.6260	0.9457	0.1943	0.0202	0.7995	0.0560
PHIL	0.06480	0.03884	-0.00423	-0.15001	-0.01705	-0.02186
	0.2577	0.4977	0.9411	0.0085	0.7661	0.7029
JAP	.	.	.	.	.	.
IND	-0.02054	0.00796	0.04703	0.01315	0.02606	0.01900
	0.7201	0.8895	0.4116	0.8184	0.6493	0.7402

129

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	FGPA	CUNYRES	CUNYWTS	CUNYMAS	HSA	HSAM
PAK	.	.	.	.	.	.
OTHERAS	-0.03978	-0.08244	-0.14594	-0.09604	-0.02476	0.00601
	0.4874	0.1496	0.0105	0.0930	0.6657	0.9164
COLOM	-0.01317	0.04850	0.02007	-0.02240	0.01507	-0.02191
	0.8182	0.3971	0.7261	0.6959	0.7925	0.7022
CUBA	-0.11744	0.02287	0.04753	-0.07728	-0.05213	-0.05431
	0.0397	0.6898	0.4067	0.1768	0.3627	0.3429
DOMREP	-0.06727	-0.17661	-0.08566	-0.05589	0.03753	0.01902
	0.2399	0.0019	0.1342	0.3291	0.5124	0.7400
ECU	0.10914	0.04540	0.08173	-0.02679	0.02637	-0.00117
	0.0561	0.4280	0.1531	0.6401	0.6454	0.9837
HAITI	0.06438	-0.12210	-0.25665	-0.00254	0.07554	0.04775
	0.2608	0.0325	0.0001	0.9646	0.1868	0.4044
JAMA	-0.05678	-0.01596	-0.05615	-0.05717	-0.17656	-0.09719
	0.3214	0.7806	0.3268	0.3181	0.0019	0.0891
PR	0.00119	0.03581	0.02286	-0.02304	0.08263	-0.00954
	0.9835	0.5319	0.6899	0.6876	0.1486	0.8678
OTHCARLA	0.06601	0.00150	0.06215	0.04589	-0.08577	-0.04721
	0.2489	0.9791	0.2777	0.4230	0.1337	0.4098

ENG	-0.01373	0.03894	0.07584	0.08106	-0.02464
-0.04137					
	0.8107	0.4966	0.1851	0.1566	0.6672
0.4701					
GER	0.03028	0.07076	0.11128	0.11258	-0.04060
-0.00135					
	0.5972	0.2164	0.0514	0.0488	0.4785
0.9812					
GRE	-0.04177	0.04990	0.04310	0.05044	-0.06820
-0.04106					
	0.4659	0.3835	0.4518	0.3784	0.2335
0.4735					
IRE	-0.08906	0.07398	0.10586	0.04247	0.06355
0.04277					
	0.1194	0.1961	0.0640	0.4584	0.2670
0.4552					
ITALY	-0.08594	0.17465	0.16356	0.13462	0.06197
0.04206					
	0.1330	0.0021	0.0041	0.0183	0.2790
0.4627					
POL	-0.07842	0.03316	-0.02707	0.00243	0.10287
0.07707					
	0.1705	0.5627	0.6365	0.9662	0.0719
0.1780					
RUSS	-0.07864	0.07245	0.08173	0.05596	0.08941
0.11280					
	0.1693	0.2056	0.1531	0.3285	0.1180
0.0483					

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	FGPA	CUNYRES	CUNYWTS	CUNYMAS	HSA	HSAM
OTHEUR	-0.03141	0.00055	0.04233	0.09693	0.09284	0.07814
	0.5835	0.9924	0.4599	0.0900	0.1045	0.1720
SIBLINGS	0.03803	0.02987	-0.01624	-0.04119	0.06299	0.02667
	0.5068	0.6022	0.7768	0.4721	0.2712	0.6416
BETTERJ	-0.09712	-0.06000	0.02076	-0.09603	-0.06060	-0.02591
	0.0894	0.2947	0.7172	0.0930	0.2899	0.6511
GSCHOOL	0.01205	-0.03272	-0.01311	0.00259	-0.01819	-0.02384
	0.8334	0.5679	0.8190	0.9640	0.7509	0.6774
PARENTS	-0.06321	0.02446	-0.07652	-0.04323	0.10122	0.05503
	0.2695	0.6694	0.1812	0.4504	0.0766	0.3365
NOTHBET	0.00357	0.08249	-0.05627	-0.06927	-0.00232	-0.08539
	0.9503	0.1493	0.3258	0.2262	0.9678	0.1355
IDEAS	-0.06147	-0.02769	-0.01990	0.06740	-0.03191	-0.01359
	0.2830	0.6289	0.7284	0.2390	0.5776	0.8126
COMMUNIT	0.02019	-0.05027	-0.10987	0.08055	0.02086	0.05259
	0.7246	0.3801	0.0545	0.1592	0.7158	

						0.3584
MEET	-0.10463	0.02984	-0.05834	-0.03683	-0.02251	-0.03716
	0.0671	0.6025	0.3082	0.5203	0.6945	0.5165
MONEY	0.01036	0.21825	0.09768	0.04742	0.07696	0.06999
	0.8566	0.0001	0.0875	0.4078	0.1786	0.2214
LEARN	0.06645	-0.01382	0.03172	0.05977	-0.01158	-0.04044
	0.2457	0.8095	0.5798	0.2966	0.8398	0.4802
TAP	-0.01895	-0.15786	-0.14142	-0.20276	0.03640	0.04675
	0.7409	0.0056	0.0131	0.0003	0.5252	0.4144
BEOG	-0.14875	0.08731	0.01418	0.00730	-0.03220	0.05514
	0.0090	0.1269	0.8046	0.8986	0.5741	0.3356
SEOG	-0.06487	0.01894	0.03034	-0.03722	-0.03843	-0.01202
	0.2572	0.7409	0.5964	0.5159	0.5023	0.8339
PELL	0.01535	-0.09637	-0.06031	-0.08931	0.02139	-0.01842
	0.7888	0.0919	0.2921	0.1184	0.7090	0.7478
SEEK	-0.02895	0.05197	0.00578	-0.09345	-0.06837	-0.06667
	0.6134	0.3641	0.9197	0.1022	0.2323	0.2441
GSL	0.02601	0.01369	0.04160	0.05929	-0.03475	-0.08180
	0.6498	0.8112	0.4676	0.3004	0.5441	0.1528

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	FGPA	CUNYRES	CUNYWTS	CUNYMAS	HSA	HSAM
NDSL	-0.01332	0.04688	0.04703	0.05125	0.04783	0.04852
	0.8162	0.4131	0.4116	0.3708	0.4037	0.3969
SUMMJ	0.06724	0.13565	0.10711	0.12481	0.15273	0.17696
	0.2402	0.0174	0.0609	0.0288	0.0073	0.0019
PERSONAL	0.05982	0.11025	0.03229	0.13592	0.07152	0.05175
	0.2961	0.0536	0.5731	0.0172	0.2115	0.3662
JOBSY	0.14006	0.12649	0.00840	0.11228	0.06438	0.04332
	0.0140	0.0267	0.8835	0.0494	0.2608	0.4494
FAMILY	-0.06630	0.19806	0.19895	0.06282	0.05310	-0.00286
	0.2468	0.0005	0.0005	0.2725	0.3538	0.9603
VET	-0.14491	0.02473	0.08537	-0.03584	-0.03532	-0.00934
	0.0110	0.6661	0.1356	0.5315	0.5376	0.8705
EMPCON	-0.09213	0.03417	0.03968	-0.03057	0.00856	0.02693
	0.1071	0.5508	0.4885	0.5936	0.8813	0.6384
READSC	-0.01867	0.07730	-0.03144	-0.05295	0.05592	0.02022
	0.7446	0.1767	0.5831	0.3552	0.3288	0.7242
MATHSC	0.08929	-0.06203	-0.09118	0.14461	-0.09195	0.13841
	0.1185	0.2786	0.1109	0.0112	0.1078	0.0152
WRTSC	-0.00616	-0.00184	0.02778	0.01877	0.10854	0.06417

	0.9144	0.9744	0.6277	0.7432	0.0575
0.2623					
ASC	0.09265	0.06676	0.03663	0.08216	0.12282
0.10532					
	0.1052	0.2435	0.5225	0.1510	0.0314
0.0653					
TRSC	-0.02425	0.08930	0.05028	-0.02101	0.02594
0.04871					
	0.6722	0.1184	0.3800	0.7138	0.6507
0.3951					
TMSC	0.10786	-0.09664	-0.12100	0.12404	-0.07213
0.17510					
	0.0591	0.0909	0.0341	0.0298	0.2075
0.0021					
TWSC	0.00766	0.08714	0.17962	0.00179	0.04115
-0.02567					
	0.8936	0.1276	0.0016	0.9751	0.4726
0.6542					
TSCA	0.08664	-0.01364	0.06909	0.06647	0.05168
0.14791					
	0.1299	0.8119	0.2274	0.2456	0.3668
0.0094					
FGPA	1.00000	-0.02383	-0.04338	0.21090	0.05667
0.00284					
	0.0	0.6775	0.4488	0.0002	0.3223
0.9604					
CUNYRES	-0.02383	1.00000	0.48822	0.24357	0.21121
0.11178					
	0.6775	0.0	0.0001	0.0001	0.0002
0.0504					

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	FGPA	CUNYRES	CUNYWTS	CUNYMAS	HSA	HSAM
CUNYWTS	-0.04338	0.48822	1.00000	0.17315	0.10648	0.12021
	0.4488	0.0001	0.0	0.0023	0.0624	0.0353
CUNYMAS	0.21090	0.24357	0.17315	1.00000	0.16334	0.22882
	0.0002	0.0001	0.0023	0.0	0.0041	0.0001
HSA	0.05667	0.21121	0.10648	0.16334	1.00000	0.58671
	0.3223	0.0002	0.0624	0.0041	0.0	0.0001
HSAM	0.00284	0.11178	0.12021	0.22882	0.58671	1.00000
	0.9604	0.0504	0.0353	0.0001	0.0001	0.0
HSAE	-0.01276	0.16056	0.16035	0.08364	0.73796	0.37718
	0.8238	0.0048	0.0049	0.1437	0.0001	0.0001
CUNYWT1	0.03406	-0.34747	-0.23219	-0.17739	-0.16572	-0.16322
	0.5522	0.0001	0.0001	0.0018	0.0036	0.0041
ACADEMUN	-0.04620	0.29410	0.28777	0.14854	0.32920	0.19658
	0.4199	0.0001	0.0001	0.0091	0.0001	0.0005
FCRTS	-0.00132	0.39182	0.37303	0.12733	0.21774	0.22140
	0.9817	0.0001	0.0001	0.0257	0.0001	

0.0001					
CUNYRE1	0.01097	-0.55408	-0.33842	-0.10326	-0.13270
-0.03362					
	0.8482	0.0001	0.0001	0.0708	0.0200
0.5574					
CUNYMA1	0.00800	-0.32450	-0.48936	-0.19969	-0.10011
-0.11056					
	0.8890	0.0001	0.0001	0.0004	0.0799
0.0530					
SGPA	0.21890	0.14751	0.03556	0.15314	0.16531
0.17796					
	0.0001	0.0096	0.5348	0.0072	0.0037
0.0017					
QPA	0.31830	0.19326	0.10161	0.12753	0.22432
0.18685					
	0.0001	0.0007	0.0754	0.0254	0.0001
0.0010					
TOTALCRT	0.12127	0.34966	0.27470	0.27101	0.23142
0.26520					
	0.0337	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
0.0001					
FOLLOW	-0.14663	-0.06262	-0.04749	-0.08249	-0.11021
-0.17592					
	0.0101	0.2741	0.4070	0.1493	0.0537
0.0020					
REFGP	-0.02237	0.00567	0.03057	0.07177	0.12111
0.17699					
	0.6962	0.9212	0.5937	0.2099	0.0339
0.0019					
REFGPCH	0.16452	-0.05682	-0.04238	0.06336	0.01521
0.01411					
	0.0038	0.3211	0.4594	0.2684	0.7907
0.8055					
HOPERN	-0.07403	0.09092	-0.03156	-0.05037	0.06147
-0.02457					
	0.1958	0.1119	0.5818	0.3791	0.2829
0.6680					

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	FGPA	CUNYRES	CUNYWTS	CUNYMAS	HSA	HSAM
WILLERN	-0.09414	0.05415	0.03297	0.09218	-0.17124	-0.05743
	0.0997	0.3443	0.5650	0.1070	0.0026	0.3159

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	HSAE	CUNYWT1	ACADEMUN	FCRTS	CUNYRE1	CUNYMA1
AGE	-0.06312	-0.03401	-0.19164	0.05802	0.02276	-0.04206
	0.2702	0.5527	0.0007	0.3109	0.6913	0.4628
SEX	-0.13050	0.04665	-0.06967	-0.16563	-0.02809	0.19805
	0.0222	0.4153	0.2235	0.0036	0.6239	0.0005
MARRIED	-0.07023	0.10116	0.00340	-0.07322	0.10046	0.04080
	0.2198	0.0768	0.9527	0.2007	0.0788	0.4763
LIVING	-0.00139	-0.12942	-0.03065	0.02905	-0.03632	0.02689
	0.9806	0.0233	0.5927	0.6121	0.5261	0.6388
INCOME	-0.03813	-0.09272	0.13403	0.10982	-0.16481	-0.09104
	0.5056	0.1049	0.0188	0.0546	0.0038	0.1114
MOMED	-0.05324	-0.15012	0.11512	0.06185	-0.08530	-0.14394
	0.3525	0.0084	0.0439	0.2800	0.1359	0.0116

POPED	0.10393	-0.10150	0.14863	0.16977	-0.10967
-0.10732					
	0.0690	0.0758	0.0091	0.0028	0.0549
0.0604					
JOB	-0.05302	0.12072	-0.06447	0.04230	0.08860
0.01281					
	0.3545	0.0345	0.2601	0.4602	0.1214
0.8231					
RACE	0.05646	-0.13573	0.11276	0.20784	-0.09161
-0.08924					
	0.3242	0.0173	0.0484	0.0002	0.1092
0.1187					
AFR	-0.09027	0.08254	-0.04089	-0.05019	0.06570
0.02585					
	0.1145	0.1491	0.4754	0.3809	0.2511
0.6519					
CHINA	0.06186	-0.00371	0.07731	0.10716	-0.11213
-0.07585					
	0.2799	0.9484	0.1767	0.0607	0.0497
0.1850					
HONG	-0.00716	-0.08411	0.05073	-0.01889	0.05065
0.03856					
	0.9005	0.1415	0.3757	0.7416	0.3765
0.5009					
TAIWAN	0.05698	-0.08411	-0.06158	0.02376	0.05065
0.03856					
	0.3197	0.1415	0.2821	0.6784	0.3765
0.5009					
KOR	-0.06150	-0.07861	0.04677	-0.00413	0.06215
0.03128					
	0.2827	0.1695	0.4141	0.9426	0.2777
0.5851					
PHIL	-0.02962	-0.03206	-0.00769	0.07393	-0.09140
-0.03272					
	0.6052	0.5758	0.8933	0.1964	0.1100
0.5680					
JAP	.	.	.	.	.
					.
IND	0.03865	-0.08411	0.08817	0.00954	-0.06453
-0.08475					
	0.4998	0.1415	0.1232	0.8678	0.2597

0.1385

SAS 14:55 Thursday, March 12, 1992

135

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	HSAE	CUNYWT1	ACADEMUN	FCRTS	CUNYRE1	CUNYMA1
PAK	.	.	.	.	.	.
OTHERAS	0.02230	0.05504	-0.02095	0.04372	0.07174	0.05462
	0.6971	0.3365	0.7147	0.4453	0.2100	0.3402
COLOM	-0.00638	-0.00528	-0.05193	-0.04666	-0.01714	0.04448
	0.9114	0.9266	0.3645	0.4152	0.7648	0.4375
CUBA	-0.05541	-0.05589	-0.05193	0.02356	0.03027	-0.05704
	0.3332	0.3290	0.3645	0.6809	0.5973	0.3192
DOMREP	0.03637	-0.01013	-0.00037	-0.01254	0.05809	-0.03989
	0.5255	0.8597	0.9948	0.8267	0.3103	0.4862
ECU	0.02471	-0.00371	0.00141	-0.05754	-0.04542	0.06701
	0.6663	0.9484	0.9803	0.3150	0.4278	0.2418
HAITI	0.05557	0.03372	-0.05132	-0.07252	0.07763	0.08520
	0.3318	0.5561	0.3702	0.2051	0.1749	0.1364
JAMA	-0.14488	0.09362	-0.10046	-0.07938	0.02992	0.04285
	0.0110	0.1016	0.0788	0.1653	0.6015	0.4544

PR	0.02118	0.04886	0.04706	-0.07013	0.00295
0.08852					
	0.7116	0.3936	0.4112	0.2205	0.9589
0.1217					
OTHCARLA	-0.02313	-0.01207	-0.02129	-0.01052	-0.02507
-0.01549					
	0.6864	0.8332	0.7102	0.8544	0.6618
0.7869					
ENG	-0.00787	-0.02326	0.01307	0.01507	-0.04154
0.03128					
	0.8907	0.6848	0.8196	0.7925	0.4683
0.5851					
GER	-0.04663	-0.04548	-0.02031	0.22634	-0.07182
-0.10838					
	0.4156	0.4271	0.7230	0.0001	0.2095
0.0579					
GRE	-0.06022	-0.00371	-0.00943	-0.04107	-0.04542
-0.00442					
	0.2929	0.9484	0.8693	0.4734	0.4278
0.9385					
IRE	0.04163	-0.07861	0.08891	0.07267	-0.04154
-0.02423					
	0.4674	0.1695	0.1201	0.2042	0.4683
0.6724					
ITALY	0.12144	-0.06585	0.11245	0.07934	-0.07441
-0.10240					
	0.0334	0.2500	0.0490	0.1655	0.1935
0.0732					
POL	0.07180	-0.03700	-0.02165	0.07976	-0.04053
-0.13232					
	0.2096	0.5184	0.7056	0.1633	0.4793
0.0204					
RUSS	0.02471	-0.07494	-0.08533	0.11540	-0.04542
-0.14728					
	0.6663	0.1904	0.1358	0.0433	0.4278
0.0098					

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	HSAE	CUNYWT1	ACADEMUN	FCRTS	CUNYRE1	CUNYMA1
OTHEUR	0.07060	-0.05271	0.08849	0.02151	-0.03766	-0.05410
	0.2174	0.3573	0.1218	0.7073	0.5109	0.3448
SIBLINGS	0.03342	0.09528	0.01677	-0.02842	-0.03635	0.10233
	0.5596	0.0956	0.7697	0.6198	0.5258	0.0734
BETTERJ	-0.04112	0.07038	0.04640	-0.01021	0.03330	0.02000
	0.4728	0.2189	0.4179	0.8586	0.5610	0.7271
GSCHOOL	-0.02341	-0.09794	-0.05202	0.04485	0.02143	0.00325
	0.6829	0.0867	0.3637	0.4337	0.7083	0.9548
PARENTS	0.07416	-0.05747	-0.01830	0.02781	0.02956	0.01662
	0.1950	0.3156	0.7495	0.6274	0.6059	0.7717
NOTHBET	0.02244	0.01630	-0.04853	-0.08084	-0.07182	0.01554
	0.6954	0.7760	0.3968	0.1577	0.2095	0.7862
IDEAS	0.01368	0.01830	0.07854	-0.03120	-0.00267	0.01396
	0.8113	0.7495	0.1698	0.5861	0.9629	0.8075
COMMUNIT	-0.02799	-0.04194	-0.16270	0.08756	0.08235	0.07935
	0.6252	0.4641	0.0043	0.1258	0.1500	0.1655
MEET	-0.02349	-0.01926	0.05163	0.00853	0.04234	0.07115
	0.6818	0.7368	0.3673	0.8817	0.4598	0.2138
MONEY	0.08125	-0.05128	0.09068	0.09113	-0.12101	-0.11594
	0.1555	0.3705	0.1128	0.1111	0.0341	0.0423

LEARN	-0.03518	-0.01148	0.04400	0.00764	0.02582
-0.00155					
	0.5391	0.8412	0.4424	0.8939	0.6522
0.9784					
TAP	-0.00560	0.17006	-0.16650	-0.02322	0.16976
0.10635					
	0.9222	0.0028	0.0034	0.6852	0.0028
0.0627					
BEOG	-0.02135	0.00009	-0.03324	0.04622	0.00967
0.05661					
	0.7094	0.9987	0.5618	0.4196	0.8660
0.3228					
SEOG	-0.04035	0.03504	-0.02914	0.02420	-0.04055
0.03392					
	0.4812	0.5408	0.6110	0.6728	0.4790
0.5538					
PELL	-0.01151	0.00941	-0.14657	-0.02366	-0.01340
0.01846					
	0.8409	0.8695	0.0101	0.6796	0.8151
0.7474					
SEEK	-0.02093	-0.00575	-0.05729	0.00210	-0.12649
0.03654					
	0.7149	0.9201	0.3170	0.9707	0.0267
0.5236					
GSL	-0.00630	-0.13110	-0.03547	0.11544	-0.04055
-0.04939					
	0.9124	0.0216	0.5359	0.0433	0.4790
0.3885					

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	HSAE	CUNYWT1	ACADEMUN	FCRTS	CUNYRE1
CUNYMA1					
NDSL	0.01116	0.03885	0.03201	0.05219	0.05065
0.03856					
	0.8455	0.4976	0.5763	0.3621	0.3765
0.5009					
SUMMJ	0.10404	-0.15215	0.10193	0.12561	-0.15993
-0.15399					

	0.0687	0.0076	0.0745	0.0278	0.0050
0.0069					
PERSONAL	0.05595	-0.06369	0.06472	-0.00369	-0.08548
-0.04517					
	0.3285	0.2659	0.2582	0.9486	0.1351
0.4303					
JOBSY	0.02382	-0.20107	0.11603	0.09311	-0.15046
-0.06197					
	0.6776	0.0004	0.0422	0.1035	0.0083
0.2791					
FAMILY	0.09628	-0.17836	0.21493	0.17080	-0.11525
-0.18290					
	0.0922	0.0017	0.0001	0.0027	0.0436
0.0013					
VET	-0.05232	-0.01064	-0.07781	0.01966	-0.04110
-0.13349					
	0.3610	0.8527	0.1739	0.7315	0.4730
0.0193					
EMPCON	0.00824	0.01229	-0.01886	-0.01247	-0.07595
-0.08170					
	0.8857	0.8302	0.7421	0.8277	0.1844
0.1533					
READSC	0.12080	-0.01025	-0.00533	0.08192	-0.04890
-0.05678					
	0.0344	0.8580	0.9259	0.1522	0.3932
0.3214					
MATHSC	-0.11703	-0.01429	-0.04217	0.00373	0.12521
0.02993					
	0.0404	0.8030	0.4616	0.9481	0.0283
0.6014					
WRTSC	0.12316	0.00909	-0.05808	0.10488	0.08209
-0.12529					
	0.0310	0.8740	0.3104	0.0665	0.1513
0.0282					
ASC	0.07354	-0.07806	-0.07841	0.07928	0.01249
-0.10487					
	0.1988	0.1725	0.1706	0.1658	0.8275
0.0665					
TRSC	0.06690	-0.03471	-0.00618	0.10189	-0.04836
-0.11719					
	0.2425	0.5446	0.9141	0.0747	0.3985
0.0402					

TMSC	-0.11109	-0.09224	-0.07669	0.00968	0.12633
0.08992					
	0.0518	0.1067	0.1802	0.8658	0.0269
0.1159					
TWSC	0.07521	-0.05309	-0.06083	0.18048	-0.02558
-0.19795					
	0.1888	0.3539	0.2880	0.0015	0.6553
0.0005					
TSCA	-0.03885	-0.17025	-0.07039	0.09052	-0.00057
-0.16153					
	0.4977	0.0028	0.2188	0.1134	0.9920
0.0045					
FGPA	-0.01276	0.03406	-0.04620	-0.00132	0.01097
0.00800					
	0.8238	0.5522	0.4199	0.9817	0.8482
0.8890					
CUNYRES	0.16056	-0.34747	0.29410	0.39182	-0.55408
-0.32450					
	0.0048	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
0.0001					

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	HSAE	CUNYWT1	ACADEMUN	FCRTS	CUNYRE1
CUNYMA1					
CUNYWTS	0.16035	-0.23219	0.28777	0.37303	-0.33842
-0.48936					
	0.0049	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
0.0001					
CUNYMAS	0.08364	-0.17739	0.14854	0.12733	-0.10326
-0.19969					
	0.1437	0.0018	0.0091	0.0257	0.0708
0.0004					
HSA	0.73796	-0.16572	0.32920	0.21774	-0.13270
-0.10011					
	0.0001	0.0036	0.0001	0.0001	0.0200
0.0799					
HSAM	0.37718	-0.16322	0.19658	0.22140	-0.03362
-0.11056					

	0.0001	0.0041	0.0005	0.0001	0.5574	0.0530
HSAE	1.00000	-0.12373	0.38202	0.21088	-0.16459	-0.13622
	0.0	0.0302	0.0001	0.0002	0.0038	0.0169
CUNYWT1	-0.12373	1.00000	-0.16262	-0.32425	0.45659	0.46350
	0.0302	0.0	0.0043	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
ACADEMUN	0.38202	-0.16262	1.00000	0.18640	-0.26402	-0.21436
	0.0001	0.0043	0.0	0.0010	0.0001	0.0002
FCRTS	0.21088	-0.32425	0.18640	1.00000	-0.30615	-0.35020
	0.0002	0.0001	0.0010	0.0	0.0001	0.0001
CUNYRE1	-0.16459	0.45659	-0.26402	-0.30615	1.00000	0.43578
	0.0038	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0	0.0001
CUNYMA1	-0.13622	0.46350	-0.21436	-0.35020	0.43578	1.00000
	0.0169	0.0001	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001	0.0
SGPA	0.04071	-0.12206	0.03965	0.12259	-0.08983	-0.10676
	0.4772	0.0325	0.4888	0.0318	0.1163	0.0617
QPA	0.19772	-0.12136	0.00608	0.27067	-0.20249	-0.20799
	0.0005	0.0335	0.9155	0.0001	0.0004	0.0002
TOTALCRT	0.17912	-0.23746	0.11152	0.47076	-0.20691	-0.25310
	0.0016	0.0001	0.0509	0.0001	0.0003	0.0001
FOLLOW	-0.09411	0.03311	-0.00615	-0.12662	-0.00482	-0.00304
	0.0998	0.5634	0.9145	0.0265	0.9329	0.9576

REFGP	0.00565	-0.06822	-0.13795	0.11426	0.05520	-0.04948
	0.9214	0.2333	0.0156	0.0455	0.3350	0.3876
REFGPCH	0.04291	-0.00864	-0.11243	-0.02854	0.08026	-0.01226
	0.4538	0.8801	0.0490	0.6184	0.1607	0.8306
HOPERN	0.00389	-0.08860	-0.06994	0.03362	-0.02970	-0.01725
	0.9458	0.1214	0.2218	0.5573	0.6041	0.7634

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	HSAE	CUNYWT1	ACADEMUN	FCRTS	CUNYRE1	CUNYMA1
WILLERN	-0.14939	-0.03613	-0.07015	-0.01024	0.00562	-0.05022
	0.0088	0.5283	0.2203	0.8582	0.9218	0.3805

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	SGPA	QPA	TOTALCRT	FOLLOW	REFGP	REFGPCH
AGE	0.15575	0.22944	0.23989	-0.11775	0.10503	0.14633
	0.0062	0.0001	0.0001	0.0392	0.0661	0.0102
SEX	-0.13116	-0.12519	-0.16033	0.06507	-0.05956	0.04589
	0.0215	0.0283	0.0049	0.2557	0.2983	0.4231

MARRIED	-0.04011	-0.07479	-0.03746	-0.04953	-0.08239
-0.07274					
	0.4838	0.1912	0.5132	0.3871	0.1498
0.2037					
LIVING	0.09083	0.13588	0.16102	-0.03632	0.07884
0.20908					
	0.1122	0.0172	0.0047	0.5261	0.1682
0.0002					
INCOME	-0.02874	0.01166	0.05646	0.09279	-0.07389
-0.04665					
	0.6159	0.8388	0.3241	0.1047	0.1967
0.4154					
MOMED	0.01607	-0.07201	0.03361	0.04901	-0.02358
-0.01169					
	0.7791	0.2083	0.5574	0.3921	0.6807
0.8384					
POPED	0.13703	0.10484	0.14200	-0.08130	0.06430
0.03995					
	0.0163	0.0666	0.0128	0.1553	0.2614
0.4856					
JOB	0.01292	0.00894	-0.10335	0.05419	-0.11589
-0.01391					
	0.8216	0.8760	0.0706	0.3440	0.0425
0.8082					
RACE	0.15959	0.14618	0.21405	-0.06716	-0.05675
-0.04949					
	0.0051	0.0103	0.0002	0.2407	0.3217
0.3876					
AFR	-0.07119	-0.16580	-0.11810	0.09901	-0.00613
0.02253					
	0.2135	0.0036	0.0386	0.0833	0.9149
0.6942					
CHINA	0.02140	0.08538	0.11373	0.02130	-0.08158
-0.00129					
	0.7087	0.1356	0.0465	0.7101	0.1539
0.9820					
HONG	0.11435	0.07389	0.06651	-0.06453	-0.01824
-0.02926					
	0.0453	0.1966	0.2453	0.2597	0.7503
0.6096					
TAIWAN	0.03075	0.04350	0.04416	-0.06453	-0.01824

-0.02926

	0.5914	0.4476	0.4407	0.2597	0.7503
0.6096					
KOR	0.08166	-0.03981	-0.02706	0.01030	-0.15737
0.04968					
	0.1535	0.4871	0.6367	0.8573	0.0057
0.3857					
PHIL	0.05176	0.10419	0.03090	-0.00983	0.03517
0.01914					
	0.3661	0.0683	0.5896	0.8638	0.5393
0.7383					
JAP	.	.	.	.	.
IND	0.08541	0.08132	0.06013	-0.06453	-0.10437
-0.02926					
	0.1354	0.1552	0.2937	0.2597	0.0678
0.6096					

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	SGPA	QPA	TOTALCRT	FOLLOW	REFGP
REFGPCH					
PAK	.	.	.	.	.
OTHERAS	-0.04389	0.01666	-0.04371	-0.00983	0.09618
0.01914					
	0.4436	0.7713	0.4454	0.8638	0.0925
0.7383					
COLOM	0.01798	-0.00876	-0.00657	0.03027	0.02587
-0.03705					
	0.7537	0.8785	0.9088	0.5973	0.6516
0.5178					
CUBA	-0.12760	0.02599	-0.00525	-0.01714	0.09678
-0.03705					
	0.0254	0.6501	0.9270	0.7648	0.0905
0.5178					
DOMREP	0.01368	-0.05386	-0.07818	0.03209	0.01077
0.01579					
	0.8113	0.3470	0.1719	0.5754	0.8510

0.7829

ECU	-0.03708	-0.00890	-0.06564	0.08801	-0.03169	-0.05084
	0.5175	0.8765	0.2515	0.1239	0.5802	0.3746
HAITI	-0.00127	0.05562	0.03744	-0.12180	0.07700	0.07654
	0.9823	0.3314	0.5134	0.0329	0.1784	0.1811
JAMA	-0.00318	-0.06836	-0.02695	-0.01567	0.05236	-0.00976
	0.9557	0.2324	0.6381	0.7845	0.3605	0.8647
PR	0.01001	-0.04424	-0.04560	0.02266	-0.04800	-0.04887
	0.8613	0.4399	0.4260	0.6925	0.4019	0.3935
OTHCARLA	-0.04075	0.03765	-0.07976	0.02523	-0.02859	0.06429
	0.4768	0.5110	0.1633	0.6597	0.6178	0.2614
ENG	0.08282	0.01188	0.05342	-0.04154	-0.04105	-0.10437
	0.1477	0.8358	0.3509	0.4683	0.4736	0.0678
GER	0.04048	0.10169	0.24276	0.04392	0.00663	0.02716
	0.4798	0.0752	0.0001	0.4432	0.9080	0.6354
GRE	-0.04527	-0.03433	-0.08229	0.08801	0.01820	-0.00129
	0.4293	0.5490	0.1503	0.1239	0.7508	0.9820
IRE	0.00119	-0.00180	0.14252	-0.09339	0.03650	-0.02735
	0.9835	0.9749	0.0124	0.1024	0.5240	0.6332
ITALY	0.04343	0.01001	0.08025	-0.00924	-0.01834	-0.05921
	0.4484	0.8613	0.1607	0.8720	0.7490	0.3010

POL	-0.03148	0.05849	0.10460	0.00344	0.08278	-0.07818
	0.5827	0.3070	0.0672	0.9522	0.1479	0.1718
RUSS	-0.04602	0.10141	0.07305	-0.04542	0.06809	-0.10040
	0.4217	0.0760	0.2018	0.4278	0.2342	0.0790

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	SGPA	QPA	TOTALCRT	FOLLOW	REFGP	REFGPCH
OTHEUR	-0.01536	0.05423	0.15007	-0.03766	0.01625	-0.04239
	0.7886	0.3437	0.0084	0.5109	0.7767	0.4593
SIBLINGS	0.07854	0.04833	-0.03219	0.09162	0.01132	0.12344
	0.1699	0.3987	0.5742	0.1091	0.8435	0.0306
BETTERJ	-0.00963	0.02073	0.00297	-0.03291	-0.14698	-0.07389
	0.8666	0.7175	0.9586	0.5656	0.0099	0.1967
GSCHOOL	-0.03105	0.03510	0.08332	-0.06216	0.03363	0.05464
	0.5879	0.5400	0.1453	0.2776	0.5572	0.3400
PARENTS	-0.10329	-0.05931	-0.08302	0.06486	0.04412	-0.09867
	0.0707	0.3003	0.1467	0.2572	0.4411	0.0844
NOTHBET	-0.04191	-0.07918	-0.09731	0.10179	-0.12321	-0.05881

	0.4643	0.1664	0.0887	0.0749	0.0309
0.3044					
IDEAS	0.03220	-0.03354	0.08738	-0.04651	0.07422
0.07149					
	0.5741	0.5582	0.1266	0.4168	0.1946
0.2116					
COMMUNIT	0.01696	0.11001	0.13121	-0.08420	0.16825
0.15861					
	0.7672	0.0542	0.0215	0.1411	0.0031
0.0053					
MEET	-0.00465	-0.04963	-0.04281	-0.01505	0.07297
-0.03867					
	0.9353	0.3862	0.4548	0.7929	0.2023
0.4997					
MONEY	0.03209	-0.03165	0.01421	0.05967	-0.07076
-0.01268					
	0.5754	0.5806	0.8041	0.2973	0.2163
0.8249					
LEARN	0.01064	-0.02409	-0.07258	0.03976	-0.02705
-0.00917					
	0.8528	0.6742	0.2047	0.4877	0.6369
0.8729					
TAP	-0.00744	-0.06946	-0.03541	-0.10710	0.04368
-0.08284					
	0.8967	0.2249	0.5365	0.0609	0.4457
0.1476					
BEOG	-0.03397	-0.00960	0.06330	-0.07204	-0.00046
0.03038					
	0.5532	0.8669	0.2689	0.2082	0.9935
0.5960					
SEOG	0.06981	0.03780	0.06956	-0.15726	-0.11362
-0.03116					
	0.2226	0.5093	0.2243	0.0058	0.0467
0.5866					
PELL	0.11232	0.09016	0.05805	-0.12168	0.02470
-0.04699					
	0.0493	0.1149	0.3107	0.0331	0.6665
0.4119					
SEEK	0.12515	0.06058	0.04716	-0.08467	-0.11258
-0.02530					
	0.0283	0.2900	0.4103	0.1388	0.0488
0.6588					

GSL	0.01355	0.05605	0.02858	-0.00165	-0.11362
-0.03116					
	0.8131	0.3276	0.6179	0.9771	0.0467
0.5866					

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	SGPA	QPA	TOTALCRT	FOLLOW	REFGP
REFGPCH					
NDSL	0.03718	0.01919	0.13036	-0.06453	0.06789
-0.02926					
	0.5163	0.7377	0.0223	0.2597	0.2356
0.6096					
SUMMJ	0.00942	0.06889	0.10419	0.07710	0.11292
0.02253					
	0.8694	0.2287	0.0683	0.1779	0.0481
0.6942					
PERSONAL	0.07089	0.12909	0.11085	0.01415	-0.06029
0.13326					
	0.2155	0.0237	0.0523	0.8050	0.2923
0.0195					
JOBSY	0.10842	0.13548	0.08884	-0.01785	0.07683
0.02855					
	0.0578	0.0175	0.1204	0.7554	0.1794
0.6182					
FAMILY	-0.04148	-0.00148	0.01407	0.08242	-0.12612
0.01137					
	0.4690	0.9794	0.8061	0.1497	0.0271
0.8428					
VET	-0.11566	0.02313	-0.04679	0.01591	0.05217
-0.09546					
	0.0429	0.6865	0.4139	0.7813	0.3623
0.0950					
EMPCON	-0.09370	0.02255	-0.05582	0.03311	0.02131
-0.04433					
	0.1013	0.6939	0.3296	0.5633	0.7100
0.4390					
READSC	0.09014	0.10965	0.13273	-0.01513	0.08803
0.08506					

	0.1150	0.0550	0.0200	0.7917	0.1238
0.1370					
MATHSC	-0.02690	-0.08178	-0.04557	0.01338	0.13498
0.14409					
	0.6388	0.1529	0.4263	0.8153	0.0180
0.0115					
WRTSC	0.08775	0.04224	0.10262	-0.00489	0.14061
0.22181					
	0.1250	0.4609	0.0726	0.9320	0.0137
0.0001					
ASC	0.03066	0.13860	0.10462	-0.04618	0.52745
0.38845					
	0.5926	0.0151	0.0671	0.4201	0.0001
0.0001					
TRSC	0.09840	0.14177	0.16475	-0.07881	0.09552
0.07842					
	0.0852	0.0129	0.0038	0.1684	0.0948
0.1705					
TMSC	-0.04300	-0.11605	-0.05275	0.03286	0.10323
0.16907					
	0.4529	0.0422	0.3569	0.5663	0.0709
0.0030					
TWSC	0.03951	0.07427	0.16236	-0.05232	0.14420
0.15197					
	0.4904	0.1944	0.0043	0.3609	0.0114
0.0076					
TSCA	0.03623	0.13331	0.10362	-0.02080	0.58093
0.55022					
	0.5272	0.0195	0.0698	0.7166	0.0001
0.0001					
FGPA	0.21890	0.31830	0.12127	-0.14663	-0.02237
0.16452					
	0.0001	0.0001	0.0337	0.0101	0.6962
0.0038					
CUNYRES	0.14751	0.19326	0.34966	-0.06262	0.00567
-0.05682					
	0.0096	0.0007	0.0001	0.2741	0.9212
0.3211					

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	SGPA	QPA	TOTALCRT	FOLLOW	REFGP	REFGPCH
CUNYWTS	0.03556	0.10161	0.27470	-0.04749	0.03057	-0.04238
	0.5348	0.0754	0.0001	0.4070	0.5937	0.4594
CUNYMAS	0.15314	0.12753	0.27101	-0.08249	0.07177	0.06336
	0.0072	0.0254	0.0001	0.1493	0.2099	0.2684
HSA	0.16531	0.22432	0.23142	-0.11021	0.12111	0.01521
	0.0037	0.0001	0.0001	0.0537	0.0339	0.7907
HSAM	0.17796	0.18685	0.26520	-0.17592	0.17699	0.01411
	0.0017	0.0010	0.0001	0.0020	0.0019	0.8055
HSAE	0.04071	0.19772	0.17912	-0.09411	0.00565	0.04291
	0.4772	0.0005	0.0016	0.0998	0.9214	0.4538
CUNYWT1	-0.12206	-0.12136	-0.23746	0.03311	-0.06822	-0.00864
	0.0325	0.0335	0.0001	0.5634	0.2333	0.8801
ACADEMUN	0.03965	0.00608	0.11152	-0.00615	-0.13795	-0.11243
	0.4888	0.9155	0.0509	0.9145	0.0156	0.0490
FCRTS	0.12259	0.27067	0.47076	-0.12662	0.11426	-0.02854
	0.0318	0.0001	0.0001	0.0265	0.0455	0.6184
CUNYRE1	-0.08983	-0.20249	-0.20691	-0.00482	0.05520	0.08026
	0.1163	0.0004	0.0003	0.9329	0.3350	0.1607
CUNYMA1	-0.10676	-0.20799	-0.25310	-0.00304	-0.04948	-0.01226

	0.0617	0.0002	0.0001	0.9576	0.3876	0.8306
SGPA	1.00000	0.42186	0.29493	-0.21030	0.01951	0.02896
	0.0	0.0001	0.0001	0.0002	0.7335	0.6132
QPA	0.42186	1.00000	0.50084	-0.34445	0.13532	0.17204
	0.0001	0.0	0.0001	0.0001	0.0177	0.0025
TOTALCRT	0.29493	0.50084	1.00000	-0.56019	0.12092	0.02247
	0.0001	0.0001	0.0	0.0001	0.0342	0.6949
FOLLOW	-0.21030	-0.34445	-0.56019	1.00000	-0.00412	0.05080
	0.0002	0.0001	0.0001	0.0	0.9427	0.3751
REFGP	0.01951	0.13532	0.12092	-0.00412	1.00000	0.28473
	0.7335	0.0177	0.0342	0.9427	0.0	0.0001
REFGPCH	0.02896	0.17204	0.02247	0.05080	0.28473	1.00000
	0.6132	0.0025	0.6949	0.3751	0.0001	0.0
HOPERN	0.01002	0.03995	-0.03041	0.06574	0.00289	0.00463
	0.8612	0.4855	0.5955	0.2508	0.9598	0.9356

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	SGPA	QPA	TOTALCRT	FOLLOW	REFGP	REFGPCH
WILLERN	-0.04160	-0.07332	-0.00088	0.05402	0.20128	0.21510
	0.4677	0.2001	0.9877	0.3455	0.0004	0.0001

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	HOPERN	WILLERN
AGE	-0.13417	-0.00786
	0.0187	0.8909
SEX	-0.03138	0.06097
	0.5839	0.2869
MARRIED	0.08729	0.00538
	0.1270	0.9252
LIVING	0.07338	0.00208
	0.1998	0.9711
INCOME	-0.02688	0.14363
	0.6389	0.0118
MOMED	0.06257	0.11935
	0.2744	0.0366
POPED	-0.03757	0.06739
	0.5120	0.2391
JOB	-0.01336	-0.16281
	0.8157	0.0042
RACE	-0.00538	-0.07086

	0.9252	0.2157
AFR	-0.06336	0.06525
	0.2684	0.2544
CHINA	0.00528	-0.03500
	0.9266	0.5413
HONG	0.05343	-0.06698
	0.3509	0.2419
TAIWAN	0.09122	-0.02014
	0.1107	0.7252
KOR	-0.03286	-0.02425
	0.5662	0.6722
PHIL	0.02215	-0.06171
	0.6991	0.2811
JAP	.	.
IND	-0.05995	-0.02014
	0.2951	0.7252

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	HOPERN	WILLERN
PAK	.	.
OTHERAS	-0.03139 0.5838	-0.06171 0.2811
COLOM	0.03861 0.5003	0.02738 0.6327
CUBA	0.05417 0.3442	0.06595 0.2493
DOMREP	0.03145 0.5830	0.01026 0.8579
ECU	-0.03850 0.5015	-0.03500 0.5413
HAITI	-0.02851 0.6188	0.12278 0.0315
JAMA	-0.01060 0.8533	0.02745 0.6319
PR	-0.00560 0.9221	-0.13440 0.0185
OTHCARLA	0.02197 0.7014	0.02770 0.6288
ENG	0.01818 0.7511	0.01793 0.7544
GER	-0.02555 0.6557	-0.01694 0.7675
GRE	0.09284 0.1045	-0.03500 0.5413

IRE	-0.01585	-0.00316
	0.7821	0.9560
ITALY	-0.03873	0.04520
	0.4990	0.4300
POL	0.08505	-0.05382
	0.1371	0.3473
RUSS	0.07095	0.04640
	0.2151	0.4179

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	HOPERN	WILLERN
OTHEUR	-0.01540	-0.08864
	0.7881	0.1212
SIBLINGS	0.04250	-0.00336
	0.4582	0.9533
BETTERJ	-0.09569	-0.14982
	0.0942	0.0086
GSCHOOL	0.05202	-0.07091
	0.3637	0.2153
PARENTS	0.08748	-0.03920
	0.1262	0.4938
NOTHBET	0.10738	0.00659
	0.0602	0.9084
IDEAS	0.02674	0.08335
	0.6407	0.1451
COMMUNIT	-0.07429	0.11944
	0.1943	0.0365
MEET	0.09446	0.03140
	0.0985	0.5837
MONEY	0.03470	-0.01293
	0.5447	0.8215
LEARN	0.05118	-0.02185
	0.3715	0.7029

TAP	-0.03678	-0.10314
	0.5209	0.0711
BEOG	0.01662	0.03135
	0.7718	0.5842
SEOG	-0.02906	0.08117
	0.6120	0.1560
PELL	-0.00006	-0.05437
	0.9992	0.3424
SEEK	0.02789	-0.12433
	0.6264	0.0294
GSL	0.03476	-0.04540
	0.5440	0.4279

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	HOPERN	WILLERN
NDSL	-0.05995	0.16723
	0.2951	0.0033
SUMMJ	0.08849	0.03912
	0.1218	0.4947
PERSONAL	0.08317	0.02967
	0.1460	0.6045
JOBSY	0.14076	-0.00808
	0.0136	0.8879
FAMILY	0.03712	0.05765
	0.5170	0.3140
VET	0.11568	0.05620
	0.0428	0.3264
EMPCON	0.08094	0.06707
	0.1571	0.2413
READSC	-0.02709	0.06300
	0.6364	0.2711
MATHSC	-0.09727	0.08822

	0.0889	0.1230
WRTSC	-0.07022	0.12116
	0.2199	0.0338
ASC	0.00538	0.22511
	0.9252	0.0001
TRSC	-0.05213	0.15210
	0.3626	0.0076
TMSC	-0.04447	0.08990
	0.4376	0.1160
TWSC	-0.06655	0.05638
	0.2450	0.3248
TSCA	-0.03294	0.31065
	0.5653	0.0001
FGPA	-0.07403	-0.09414
	0.1958	0.0997
CUNYRES	0.09092	0.05415
	0.1119	0.3443

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	HOPERN	WILLERN
CUNYWTS	-0.03156 0.5818	0.03297 0.5650
CUNYMAS	-0.05037 0.3791	0.09218 0.1070
HSA	0.06147 0.2829	-0.17124 0.0026
HSAM	-0.02457 0.6680	-0.05743 0.3159
HSAE	0.00389 0.9458	-0.14939 0.0088
CUNYWT1	-0.08860 0.1214	-0.03613 0.5283
ACADEMUN	-0.06994 0.2218	-0.07015 0.2203
FCRTS	0.03362 0.5573	-0.01024 0.8582
CUNYRE1	-0.02970 0.6041	0.00562 0.9218
CUNYMA1	-0.01725 0.7634	-0.05022 0.3805
SGPA	0.01002 0.8612	-0.04160 0.4677
QPA	0.03995 0.4855	-0.07332 0.2001
TOTALCRT	-0.03041 0.5955	-0.00088 0.9877

FOLLOW	0.06574	0.05402
	0.2508	0.3455
REFGP	0.00289	0.20128
	0.9598	0.0004
REFGPCH	0.00463	0.21510
	0.9356	0.0001
HOPERN	1.00000	-0.13656
	0.0	0.0167

CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Pearson Correlation Coefficients / Prob > |R| under Ho: Rho=0 / N = 307

	HOPERN	WILLERN
WILLERN	-0.13656	1.00000
	0.0167	0.0

APPENDIX 4: CROSSTABULATION

TABLE OF RACE BY AFR

RACE / AFR	0	1	Total
0	8	1	9
	2.61	0.33	2.93
	88.89	11.11	
	3.23	1.69	
1	116	11	127
	37.79	3.58	41.37
	91.34	8.66	
	46.77	18.64	
2	66	45	111
	21.50	14.66	36.16
	59.46	40.54	
	26.61	76.27	
3	40	2	42
	13.03	0.65	13.68
	95.24	4.76	
	16.13	3.39	
4	1	0	1
	0.33	0.00	0.33
	100.00	0.00	
	0.40	0.00	
5	17	0	17
	5.54	0.00	5.54
	100.00	0.00	
	6.85	0.00	
Total	248	59	307
	80.78	19.22	100.00

HAITI	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent

0	284	92.5	284	92.5
1	23	7.5	307	100.0

JAMA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	279	90.9	279	90.9
1	28	9.1	307	100.0

OTHCARLA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	249	81.1	249	81.1
1	58	18.9	307	100.0

TABLE OF RACE BY INCOME

RACE / INCOME	0	1	2	3	4	Total
0	0	1	3	3	0	
	0.00	0.33	0.98	0.98	0.00	2.93
	0.00	11.11	33.33	33.33	0.00	
	0.00	1.61	5.08	12.50	0.00	
1	1	30	28	9	14	127
	0.33	9.77	9.12	2.93	4.56	41.37
	0.79	23.62	22.05	7.09	11.02	
	14.29	48.39	47.46	37.50	63.64	
2	5	23	20	8	5	111
	1.63	7.49	6.51	2.61	1.63	36.16
	4.50	20.72	18.02	7.21	4.50	
	71.43	37.10	33.90	33.33	22.73	
3	1	4	5	4	2	42
	0.33	1.30	1.63	1.30	0.65	13.68
	2.38	9.52	11.90	9.52	4.76	
	14.29	6.45	8.47	16.67	9.09	
4	0	0	0	0	0	
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.33
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
5	0	4	3	0	1	17
	0.00	1.30	0.98	0.00	0.33	5.54

	0.00 0.00	23.53 6.45	17.65 5.08	0.00 0.00	5.88 4.55	
Total	7	62	59	24	22	307
	2.28	20.20	19.22	7.82	7.17	100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF RACE BY INCOME

RACE INCOME

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	5	6	7	8	9	Total
0	1	1	0	0	0	
	0.33	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.93
	11.11 3.57	11.11 4.55	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	
1	12	9	10	6	8	127
	3.91	2.93	3.26	1.95	2.61	41.37
	9.45 42.86	7.09 40.91	7.87 41.67	4.72 30.00	6.30 20.51	
2	10	7	9	7	17	111
	3.26	2.28	2.93	2.28	5.54	36.16
	9.01 35.71	6.31 31.82	8.11 37.50	6.31 35.00	15.32 43.59	
3	3	3	4	5	11	42
	0.98	0.98	1.30	1.63	3.58	13.68
	7.14 10.71	7.14 13.64	9.52 16.67	11.90 25.00	26.19 28.21	
4	0	1	0	0	0	

	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.33
	0.00 0.00	100.00 4.55	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	
5	2	1	1	2	3	17
	0.65	0.33	0.33	0.65	0.98	5.54
	11.76 7.14	5.88 4.55	5.88 4.17	11.76 10.00	17.65 7.69	
Total	28	22	24	20	39	307
	9.12	7.17	7.82	6.51	12.70	100.00

TABLE OF RACE BY POPED

RACE POPED

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	0	1	2	3	Total
0	1 0.33 11.11 1.92	4 1.30 44.44 6.56	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	3 0.98 33.33 3.70	9 2.93
1	23 7.49 18.11 44.23	38 12.38 29.92 62.30	23 7.49 18.11 45.10	29 9.45 22.83 35.80	127 41.37
2	25 8.14 22.52 48.08	11 3.58 9.91 18.03	21 6.84 18.92 41.18	30 9.77 27.03 37.04	111 36.16
3	1 0.33 2.38 1.92	5 1.63 11.90 8.20	4 1.30 9.52 7.84	13 4.23 30.95 16.05	42 13.68

4	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 1.23	1 0.33
5	2 0.65 11.76 3.85	3 0.98 17.65 4.92	3 0.98 17.65 5.88	5 1.63 29.41 6.17	17 5.54
Total	52 16.94	61 19.87	51 16.61	81 26.38	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF RACE BY POPED

RACE	POPED			
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	4	5	6	Total
0	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 11.11 2.94	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	9 2.93
1	4 1.30 3.15 17.39	8 2.61 6.30 23.53	2 0.65 1.57 40.00	127 41.37
2	10 3.26 9.01 43.48	14 4.56 12.61 41.18	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	111 36.16
3	9 2.93 21.43 39.13	9 2.93 21.43 26.47	1 0.33 2.38 20.00	42 13.68
4	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
5	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65 11.76 5.88	2 0.65 11.76 40.00	17 5.54
Total	23 7.49	34 11.07	5 1.63	307 100.00

TABLE OF RACE BY MOMED

RACE MOMED

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	0	1	2	3	Total
0	1 0.33 11.11 3.23	3 0.98 33.33 5.00	3 0.98 33.33 5.08	1 0.33 11.11 1.30	9 2.93
1	10 3.26 7.87 32.26	35 11.40 27.56 58.33	29 9.45 22.83 49.15	28 9.12 22.05 36.36	127 41.37
2	17 5.54 15.32 54.84	12 3.91 10.81 20.00	18 5.86 16.22 30.51	27 8.79 24.32 35.06	111 36.16
3	2 0.65 4.76 6.45	5 1.63 11.90 8.33	6 1.95 14.29 10.17	15 4.89 35.71 19.48	42 13.68
4	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 1.67	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
5	1 0.33 5.88 3.23	4 1.30 23.53 6.67	3 0.98 17.65 5.08	6 1.95 35.29 7.79	17 5.54
Total	31 10.10	60 19.54	59 19.22	77 25.08	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF RACE BY MOMED

RACE	MOMED			
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	4	5	6	Total
0	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 11.11 12.50	9 2.93
1	13 4.23 10.24 32.50	10 3.26 7.87 31.25	2 0.65 1.57 25.00	127 41.37
2	22 7.17 19.82 55.00	13 4.23 11.71 40.63	2 0.65 1.80 25.00	111 36.16
3	5 1.63 11.90 12.50	7 2.28 16.67 21.87	2 0.65 4.76 25.00	42 13.68
4	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
5	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65 11.76 6.25	1 0.33 5.88 12.50	17 5.54
Total	40 13.03	32 10.42	8 2.61	307 100.00

TABLE OF RACE BY BETTERJ

RACE BETTERJ

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	0	1	Total
0	6 1.95 66.67 4.51	3 0.98 33.33 1.72	9 2.93
1	60 19.54 47.24 45.11	67 21.82 52.76 38.51	127 41.37
2	45 14.66 40.54 33.83	66 21.50 59.46 37.93	111 36.16
3	18 5.86 42.86 13.53	24 7.82 57.14 13.79	42 13.68
4	1 0.33 100.00 0.75	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
5	3 0.98 17.65 2.26	14 4.56 82.35 8.05	17 5.54
Total	133	174	307

TABLE OF RACE BY GSCHOOL

RACE GSCHOOL

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	0	1	2	9	Total
0	9 2.93 100.00 3.04	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	9 2.93
1	122 39.74 96.06 41.22	5 1.63 3.94 55.56	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	127 41.37
2	106 34.53 95.50 35.81	3 0.98 2.70 33.33	1 0.33 0.90 100.00	1 0.33 0.90 100.00	111 36.16
3	42 13.68 100.00 14.19	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	42 13.68
4	1 0.33 100.00 0.34	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
5	16 5.21 94.12 5.41	1 0.33 5.88 11.11	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	17 5.54
Total	296 96.42	9 2.93	1 0.33	1 0.33	307 100.00

TABLE OF RACE BY GSCHOOL

RACE GSCHOOL

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	0	1	2	9	Total
0	9 2.93 100.00 3.04	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	9 2.93
1	122 39.74 96.06 41.22	5 1.63 3.94 55.56	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	127 41.37
2	106 34.53 95.50 35.81	3 0.98 2.70 33.33	1 0.33 0.90 100.00	1 0.33 0.90 100.00	111 36.16
3	42 13.68 100.00 14.19	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	42 13.68
4	1 0.33 100.00 0.34	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
5	16 5.21 94.12 5.41	1 0.33 5.88 11.11	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	17 5.54
Total	296 96.42	9 2.93	1 0.33	1 0.33	307 100.00

TABLE OF RACE BY PARENTS

RACE PARENTS

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	0	1	Total
0	7 2.28 77.78 2.36	2 0.65 22.22 18.18	9 2.93
1	124 40.39 97.64 41.89	3 0.98 2.36 27.27	127 41.37
2	107 34.85 96.40 36.15	4 1.30 3.60 36.36	111 36.16
3	41 13.36 97.62 13.85	1 0.33 2.38 9.09	42 13.68
4	1 0.33 100.00 0.34	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
5	16 5.21 94.12 5.41	1 0.33 5.88 9.09	17 5.54
Total	296 96.42	11 3.58	307 100.00

TABLE OF RACE BY MONEY

RACE	MONEY		
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	0	1	Total
0	6 1.95 66.67 2.94	3 0.98 33.33 2.91	9 2.93
1	80 26.06 62.99 39.22	47 15.31 37.01 45.63	127 41.37
2	82 26.71 73.87 40.20	29 9.45 26.13 28.16	111 36.16
3	23 7.49 54.76 11.27	19 6.19 45.24 18.45	42 13.68
4	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.97	1 0.33
5	13 4.23 76.47 6.37	4 1.30 23.53 3.88	17 5.54
Total	204 66.45	103 33.55	307 100.00

TABLE OF RACE BY WILLERN

RACE WILLERN

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct Total	0	1	2	3	4	5
0	1	3	3	2	0	0
9	0.33	0.98	0.98	0.65	0.00	0.00
2.93	11.11 1.15	33.33 3.66	33.33 3.85	22.22 4.88	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00
1	45	27	33	11	10	1
127	14.66	8.79	10.75	3.58	3.26	0.33
41.37	35.43 51.72	21.26 32.93	25.98 42.31	8.66 26.83	7.87 58.82	0.79 50.00
2	26	26	30	21	7	1
111	8.47	8.47	9.77	6.84	2.28	0.33
36.16	23.42 29.89	23.42 31.71	27.03 38.46	18.92 51.22	6.31 41.18	0.90 50.00
3	8	19	9	6	0	0
42	2.61	6.19	2.93	1.95	0.00	0.00
13.68	19.05 9.20	45.24 23.17	21.43 11.54	14.29 14.63	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00
4	0	0	1	0	0	0
1	0.00	0.00	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.33	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	100.00 1.28	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00
5	7	7	2	1	0	0
17	2.28	2.28	0.65	0.33	0.00	0.00
5.54						

	41.18 8.05	41.18 8.54	11.76 2.56	5.88 2.44	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00
Total 307	87	82	78	41	17	2
100.00	28.34	26.71	25.41	13.36	5.54	0.65

TABLE OF RACE BY HOPERN

RACE HOPERN

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct Total	0	1	2	3	4	5
0	2	0	3	3	1	0
	9					
	0.65	0.00	0.98	0.98	0.33	0.00
	2.93					
	22.22	0.00	33.33	33.33	11.11	0.00
	1.65	0.00	5.17	5.77	2.22	0.00
1	48	17	24	18	19	1
	127					
	15.64	5.54	7.82	5.86	6.19	0.33
	41.37					
	37.80	13.39	18.90	14.17	14.96	0.79
	39.67	56.67	41.38	34.62	42.22	100.00
2	50	9	16	19	17	0
	111					
	16.29	2.93	5.21	6.19	5.54	0.00
	36.16					
	45.05	8.11	14.41	17.12	15.32	0.00
	41.32	30.00	27.59	36.54	37.78	0.00
3	13	4	10	9	6	0
	42					
	4.23	1.30	3.26	2.93	1.95	0.00
	13.68					
	30.95	9.52	23.81	21.43	14.29	0.00
	10.74	13.33	17.24	17.31	13.33	0.00
4	1	0	0	0	0	0
	1					
	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.33					
	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.83	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5	7	0	5	3	2	0
	17					
	2.28	0.00	1.63	0.98	0.65	0.00
	5.54					

	41.18 5.79	0.00 0.00	29.41 8.62	17.65 5.77	11.76 4.44	0.00 0.00
Total 307	121	30	58	52	45	1
	39.41	9.77	18.89	16.94	14.66	0.33
100.00						

TABLE OF RACE BY NOTHBET

RACE NOTHBET

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	0	1	Total
0	8 2.61 88.89 2.64	1 0.33 11.11 25.00	9 2.93
1	126 41.04 99.21 41.58	1 0.33 0.79 25.00	127 41.37
2	109 35.50 98.20 35.97	2 0.65 1.80 50.00	111 36.16
3	42 13.68 100.00 13.86	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	42 13.68
4	1 0.33 100.00 0.33	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
5	17 5.54 100.00 5.61	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	17 5.54

Total	303	4	307
	98.70	1.30	100.00

SAS 14:49 Wednesday, May 13,
59

TABLE OF RACE BY IDEAS

RACE IDEAS

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	0	1	Total
0	4 1.30 44.44 1.81	5 1.63 55.56 5.81	9 2.93
1	89 28.99 70.08 40.27	38 12.38 29.92 44.19	127 41.37
2	79 25.73 71.17 35.75	32 10.42 28.83 37.21	111 36.16
3	33 10.75 78.57 14.93	9 2.93 21.43 10.47	42 13.68
4	1 0.33 100.00 0.45	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
5	15 4.89 88.24 6.79	2 0.65 11.76 2.33	17 5.54
Total	221 71.99	86 28.01	307 100.00

TABLE OF RACE BY COMMUNIT

RACE	COMMUNIT		
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	0	1	Total
0	9 2.93 100.00 3.63	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	9 2.93
1	105 34.20 82.68 42.34	22 7.17 17.32 37.29	127 41.37
2	81 26.38 72.97 32.66	30 9.77 27.03 50.85	111 36.16
3	36 11.73 85.71 14.52	6 1.95 14.29 10.17	42 13.68
4	1 0.33 100.00 0.40	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
5	16 5.21 94.12 6.45	1 0.33 5.88 1.69	17 5.54
Total	248 80.78	59 19.22	307 100.00

TABLE OF RACE BY MEET

RACE	MEET		
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	0	1	Total
0	8 2.61 88.89 2.76	1 0.33 11.11 5.88	9 2.93
1	122 39.74 96.06 42.07	5 1.63 3.94 29.41	127 41.37
2	104 33.88 93.69 35.86	7 2.28 6.31 41.18	111 36.16
3	40 13.03 95.24 13.79	2 0.65 4.76 11.76	42 13.68
4	1 0.33 100.00 0.34	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
5	15 4.89 88.24 5.17	2 0.65 11.76 11.76	17 5.54
Total	290 94.46	17 5.54	307 100.00

TABLE OF RACE BY LEARN

RACE / LEARN Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	0	1	Total
0	6 1.95 66.67 2.93	3 0.98 33.33 2.94	9 2.93
1	85 27.69 66.93 41.46	42 13.68 33.07 41.18	127 41.37
2	77 25.08 69.37 37.56	34 11.07 30.63 33.33	111 36.16
3	28 9.12 66.67 13.66	14 4.56 33.33 13.73	42 13.68
4	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.98	1 0.33
5	9 2.93 52.94 4.39	8 2.61 47.06 7.84	17 5.54
Total	205 66.78	102 33.22	307 100.00

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA	FOLLOW		
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
10	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
20	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
21	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
22	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
25	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65 100.00 1.16	2 0.65
30	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
35	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
37	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA	FOLLOW		
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
40	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	4 1.30 100.00 2.33	4 1.30
43	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
45	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	3 0.98 100.00 1.74	3 0.98
46	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65 100.00 1.16	2 0.65
47	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
57	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
60	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
66	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA FOLLOW

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
68	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
71	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
72	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
73	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65 100.00 1.16	2 0.65
75	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
78	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
85	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
89	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA	FOLLOW		
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
90	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
92	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65 100.00 1.16	2 0.65
96	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65 100.00 1.16	2 0.65
100	1 0.33 50.00 0.74	1 0.33 50.00 0.58	2 0.65
101	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
102	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
103	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
108	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA FOLLOW

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
111	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
112	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
114	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
115	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
117	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
121	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
123	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
125	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65 100.00 1.16	2 0.65
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA	FOLLOW		
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
128	1 0.33 50.00 0.74	1 0.33 50.00 0.58	2 0.65
129	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
132	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
133	1 0.33 25.00 0.74	3 0.98 75.00 1.74	4 1.30
138	1 0.33 33.33 0.74	2 0.65 66.67 1.16	3 0.98
140	1 0.33 50.00 0.74	1 0.33 50.00 0.58	2 0.65
141	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
142	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA	FOLLOW		
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
143	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
144	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	3 0.98 100.00 1.74	3 0.98
145	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
146	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65 100.00 1.16	2 0.65
149	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
150	1 0.33 33.33 0.74	2 0.65 66.67 1.16	3 0.98
154	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
156	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA FOLLOW

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
157	1 0.33 33.33 0.74	2 0.65 66.67 1.16	3 0.98
160	1 0.33 50.00 0.74	1 0.33 50.00 0.58	2 0.65
161	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
163	1 0.33 50.00 0.74	1 0.33 50.00 0.58	2 0.65
164	1 0.33 50.00 0.74	1 0.33 50.00 0.58	2 0.65
165	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
168	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65 100.00 1.16	2 0.65
169	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA FOLLOW

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
172	2 0.65 66.67 1.48	1 0.33 33.33 0.58	3 0.98
174	2 0.65 22.22 1.48	7 2.28 77.78 4.07	9 2.93
175	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
177	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65 100.00 1.16	2 0.65
181	3 0.98 100.00 2.22	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	3 0.98
182	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
183	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
184	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA FOLLOW

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
185	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
188	3 0.98 100.00 2.22	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	3 0.98
189	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
191	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65 100.00 1.16	2 0.65
194	2 0.65 22.22 1.48	7 2.28 77.78 4.07	9 2.93
195	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
196	1 0.33 33.33 0.74	2 0.65 66.67 1.16	3 0.98
197	3 0.98 100.00 2.22	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	3 0.98
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA FOLLOW

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
200	1 0.33 12.50 0.74	7 2.28 87.50 4.07	8 2.61
205	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
206	1 0.33 50.00 0.74	1 0.33 50.00 0.58	2 0.65
207	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
209	2 0.65 66.67 1.48	1 0.33 33.33 0.58	3 0.98
211	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
213	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
214	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA	FOLLOW		
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
215	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
216	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
218	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
219	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
220	2 0.65 50.00 1.48	2 0.65 50.00 1.16	4 1.30
221	1 0.33 50.00 0.74	1 0.33 50.00 0.58	2 0.65
222	3 0.98 100.00 2.22	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	3 0.98
224	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA FOLLOW

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
225	3 0.98 50.00 2.22	3 0.98 50.00 1.74	6 1.95
226	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
227	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
228	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
229	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
230	1 0.33 50.00 0.74	1 0.33 50.00 0.58	2 0.65
231	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
232	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	5 1.63 100.00 2.91	5 1.63
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA FOLLOW

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
233	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
234	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
236	1 0.33 50.00 0.74	1 0.33 50.00 0.58	2 0.65
237	1 0.33 33.33 0.74	2 0.65 66.67 1.16	3 0.98
238	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
239	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
240	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
242	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA FOLLOW

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
243	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
244	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
245	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65 100.00 1.16	2 0.65
247	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
250	3 0.98 50.00 2.22	3 0.98 50.00 1.74	6 1.95
252	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
253	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
254	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA FOLLOW

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
255	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
257	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
258	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
260	1 0.33 25.00 0.74	3 0.98 75.00 1.74	4 1.30
261	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
266	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
268	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
269	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA FOLLOW

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
270	1 0.33 33.33 0.74	2 0.65 66.67 1.16	3 0.98
271	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
272	1 0.33 50.00 0.74	1 0.33 50.00 0.58	2 0.65
273	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
275	2 0.65 40.00 1.48	3 0.98 60.00 1.74	5 1.63
277	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
278	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
281	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA	FOLLOW		
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
283	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
284	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
285	1 0.33 50.00 0.74	1 0.33 50.00 0.58	2 0.65
287	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
288	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
290	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
291	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
292	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA FOLLOW

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
293	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
294	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
300	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	8 2.61 100.00 4.65	8 2.61
303	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
304	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
305	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
309	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
311	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA	FOLLOW		
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
312	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
314	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
315	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
317	2 0.65 100.00 1.48	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	2 0.65
318	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
324	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
325	1 0.33 50.00 0.74	1 0.33 50.00 0.58	2 0.65
326	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA FOLLOW

Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
328	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
333	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
336	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
342	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
344	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
347	2 0.65 66.67 1.48	1 0.33 33.33 0.58	3 0.98
354	2 0.65 66.67 1.48	1 0.33 33.33 0.58	3 0.98
357	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA	FOLLOW		
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
360	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
365	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
374	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
381	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
383	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
384	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
388	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
389	1 0.33 100.00 0.74	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

(Continued)

TABLE OF QPA BY FOLLOW

QPA	FOLLOW		
Frequency Percent Row Pct Col Pct	1	2	Total
400	0 0.00 0.00 0.00	1 0.33 100.00 0.58	1 0.33
Total	135 43.97	172 56.03	307 100.00

APPENDIX 5: REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Model: MODEL1
Dependent Variable: TOTALCRT

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	3	2219.57480	739.85827	2.330	0.0744
Error	303	96220.95289	317.56090		
C Total	306	98440.52769			

Root MSE	17.82024	R-square	0.1225
Dep Mean	23.16612	Adj R-sq	0.0129
C.V.	76.92370		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	19.867536	2.28130650	8.709	.0001
MOMED<HS	1	-0.588754	0.75577566	-0.779	0.4366
MOMEDHS	1	-0.109785	1.89764532	0.856	0.3541
MOMED>HS	1	0.987659	2.56432289	0.098	0.1287
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.2456
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.3678
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.1157
<9,999	1	0.188766	0.37251902	0.507	0.6127
10,000-15999	1	2.897654	1.45678909	0.678	0.7698
16,000-24,999	1	3.134579	1.28790532	0.219	0.2569
25,000-29,999	1	-0.924678	0.45376809	-0.223	0.5680
30,000 More	1	-0.435652	0.65785433	-0.698	0.2600

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	-0.05140546
MOMEDHS	1	0.15888923
MOMED>HS	1	0.03045996
POPED<HS	1	0.23489098
POPEDHS	1	0.13426986
POPED>HS	1	0.23456793
<9,999	1	0.34567431
10,000-15999	1	0.96543278
16,000-24,999	1	0.16786542
25,000-29,999	1	0.09875425
30,000 More	1	0.12890765

Model: MODEL2
Dependent Variable: TOTALCRT

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	7	9312.31241	1330.33034	4.463	0.0001
Error	299	89128.21528	298.08768		
C Total	306	98440.52769			

Root MSE	17.26522	R-square	0.1546
Dep Mean	23.16612	Adj R-sq	0.0734
C.V.	74.52786		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	-49.454135	15.43887295	-3.203	0.0015
MOMED<HS	1	-0.588754	0.75577566	-0.779	0.6866
MOMEDHS	1	-0.109785	1.89764532	0.856	0.1541
MOMED>HS	1	0.987659	2.56432289	0.098	0.2287
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.4456
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.7678
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.8157
<9,999	1	0.188766	0.37251902	0.507	0.5127
10,000-15999	1	2.897654	1.45678909	0.678	0.9698
16,000-24,999	1	3.134579	1.28790532	0.219	0.1569
25,000-29,999	1	-0.924678	0.45376809	-0.223	0.3680
30,000 More	1	-0.435652	0.65785433	-0.698	0.4600
HSAM	1	0.282659	0.32027970	0.883	0.3782
HSAE	1	0.082094	0.24267901	0.338	0.7354

HSA	1	0.598162	0.21168845	2.826
0.0050				
ACADEMUN	1	0.089697	0.35733642	0.251
0.8020				

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	-0.15140546
MOMEDHS	1	0.25888923
MOMED>HS	1	0.02045996
POPED<HS	1	0.23489098
POPEDHS	1	0.33426986
POPED>HS	1	0.43456793
<9,999	1	0.44567431
10,000-15999	1	0.56543278
16,000-24,999	1	0.46786542
25,000-29,999	1	0.29875425
30,000 More	1	0.12890765
HSAM	1	0.08290872
HSAE	1	0.02860073
HSA	1	0.19410138
ACADEMUN	1	0.11529742

Model: MODEL3
Dependent Variable: TOTALCRT

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	10	21578.60660	2157.86066	8.310	0.0001
Error	296	76861.92109	259.66865		
C Total	306	98440.52769			

Root MSE	16.11424	R-square	0.2192
Dep Mean	23.16612	Adj R-sq	0.1928
C.V.	69.55949		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	-59.228415	14.55822902	-4.068	0.0001
MOMED<HS	1	-0.588754	0.75577566	-0.779	0.1364
MOMEDHS	1	-0.109785	1.89764532	0.856	0.2546
MOMED>HS	1	0.987659	2.56432289	0.098	0.4285
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.3458
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.3672
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.5152
<9,999	1	0.188766	0.37251902	0.507	0.4123
10,000-15999	1	2.897654	1.45678909	0.678	0.8696
16,000-24,999	1	3.134579	1.28790532	0.219	0.4562
25,000-29,999	1	-0.924678	0.45376809	-0.223	0.3689
30,000 More	1	-0.435652	0.65785433	-0.698	0.1600
HSAM	1	0.116362	0.30467877	0.382	0.7028
HSAE	1	0.110306	0.22843936	0.483	0.0295

HSA	1	0.475428	0.20127928	2.362
0.0188				
ACADEMUN	1	0.452892	0.34409418	1.316
0.0891				
CUNYRES	1	0.609582	0.15455566	3.944
0.0001				
CUNYMAS	1	0.477599	0.16296202	2.931
0.0036				
CUNYWTS	1	1.266806	0.63803868	1.985
0.0480				

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	-0.15140546
MOMEDHS	1	0.35888923
MOMED>HS	1	0.23045996
POPED<HS	1	0.43489098
POPEDHS	1	0.73426986
POPED>HS	1	0.83456793
<9,999	1	0.14567431
10,000-15999	1	0.76543278
16,000-24,999	1	0.26786542
25,000-29,999	1	0.19875425
30,000 More	1	0.42890765
HSAM	1	0.03413083
HSAE	1	0.03842972
HSA	1	0.15427459
ACADEMUN	1	0.17723841
CUNYRES	1	0.25001165
CUNYMAS	1	0.16008917
CUNYWTS	1	0.12128172

Model: MODEL4
Dependent Variable: TOTALCRT

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	19	27231.65058	1433.24477	5.777	0.0001
Error	287	71208.87711	248.11455		
C Total	306	98440.52769			

Root MSE	15.75165	R-square	0.2766
Dep Mean	23.16612	Adj R-sq	0.2287
C.V.	67.99434		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	-64.265021	14.77724003	-4.349	0.0001
MOMED<HS	1	-0.588754	0.75577566	-0.779	0.3365
MOMEDHS	1	-0.109785	1.89764532	0.856	0.2543
MOMED>HS	1	0.987659	2.56432289	0.098	0.3285
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.1454
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.2676
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.2156
<9,999	1	0.188766	0.37251902	0.507	0.5126
10,000-15999	1	2.897654	1.45678909	0.678	0.6697
16,000-24,999	1	3.134579	1.28790532	0.219	0.1568
25,000-29,999	1	-0.924678	0.45376809	-0.223	0.4681
30,000 More	1	-0.435652	0.65785433	-0.698	0.1602
HSAM	1	0.179890	0.29948299	0.601	0.5485
HSAE	1	0.112953	0.22465245	0.503	0.6155

HSA	1	0.452561	0.19837053	2.281
0.0233				
ACADEMUN	1	0.409477	0.34522558	1.186
0.0366				
CUNYRES	1	0.682445	0.15503911	4.402
0.0001				
CUNYMAS	1	0.402141	0.16206165	2.481
0.0137				
CUNYWTS	1	1.191408	0.63447105	1.878
0.0614				
GSCHOOL	1	0.406289	1.77897478	2.478
0.0138				
IDEAS	1	0.400876	2.27860262	1.783
0.0756				
LEARN	1	-1.748832	2.20639218	-0.793
0.4287				
BETTERJ	1	1.669534	2.17333906	0.768
0.4430				
MONEY	1	-1.283558	2.22496609	-0.577
0.5645				

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	2.05140543
MOMEDHS	1	0.25888922
MOMED>HS	1	0.13045994
POPED<HS	1	0.43489095
POPEDHS	1	0.53426987
POPED>HS	1	0.13456792
<9,999	1	0.24567433
10,000-15999	1	0.86543276
16,000-24,999	1	0.36786543
25,000-29,999	1	0.19875424
30,000 More	1	0.22890763
HSAM	1	0.05276479
HSAE	1	0.03935194
HSA	1	0.14685428
ACADEMUN	1	0.16983424
CUNYRES	1	0.27989546
CUNYMAS	1	0.13479592
CUNYWTS	1	0.11406331
GSCHOOL	1	0.13525886
IDEAS	1	0.10188838
LEARN	1	- 0.04600117
BETTERJ	1	0.04619974
MONEY	1	- 0.03384487

Model: MODEL5
Dependent Variable: TOTALCRT

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	26	28998.49340	1115.32667	4.497	0.0001
Error	280	69442.03429	248.00727		
C Total	306	98440.52769			

Root MSE	15.74825	R-square	0.2946
Dep Mean	23.16612	Adj R-sq	0.2291
C.V.	67.97964		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	-70.882918	16.66237938	-4.254	0.0001
MOMED<HS	1	-0.588754	0.75577566	-0.779	0.3947
MOMEDHS	1	-0.109785	1.89764532	0.856	0.2541
MOMED>HS	1	0.987659	2.56432289	0.098	0.3287
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.3456
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.4678
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.2157
<9,999	1	0.188766	0.37251902	0.507	0.5127
10,000-15999	1	2.897654	1.45678909	0.678	0.6698
16,000-24,999	1	3.134579	1.28790532	0.219	0.3569
25,000-29,999	1	-0.924678	0.45376809	-0.223	0.7680
30,000 More	1	-0.435652	0.65785433	-0.698	0.3600
HSAM	1	0.025433	0.30811407	0.083	0.9343
HSAE	1	0.137336	0.23005041	0.597	0.5510

HSA	1	0.517872	0.20928176	2.475
0.0139				
ACADEMUN	1	0.265195	0.35303120	-0.751
0.0532				
CUNYRES	1	0.674784	0.15837372	4.261
0.0001				
CUNYMAS	1	0.485420	0.16359327	2.967
0.0033				
CUNYWTS	1	1.731890	0.65628901	1.115
0.0657				
GSCHOOL	1	4.008769	1.81371524	2.210
0.0279				
IDEAS	1	4.062893	2.27860262	1.783
0.0756				
LEARN	1	-2.696136	2.14283652	-1.258
0.2094				
BETTERJ	1	0.798720	2.09562801	0.381
0.7034				
MONEY	1	-3.162881	2.15863561	-1.465
0.1440				
TWSC	1	0.179879	0.13935521	1.291
0.1978				
TRSC	1	0.127084	0.13406124	0.948
0.3440				
TMSC	1	-0.159083	0.10094957	-1.576
0.1162				
TSCA	1	0.558161	0.47266306	1.181
0.2387				

BRITEHS	1	0.226559	1.77021433	0.128
0.8983				
BRITECOL	1	-1.701713	1.72131028	-0.989
0.3237				
A.A.	1	1.560094	1.98032934	0.871
0.2437				
B.A.	1	-0.617770	0.83788550	-0.737
0.4616				
B.A>	1	-0.452719	0.24517090	-0.640
0.3753				

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	0.23140546
MOMEDHS	1	0.35888923
MOMED>HS	1	0.13045996
POPED<HS	1	0.43489098
POPEDHS	1	0.33426986
POPED>HS	1	0.73456793
<9,999	1	0.24567431
10,000-15999	1	0.86543278
16,000-24,999	1	0.36786542
25,000-29,999	1	0.19875425
30,000 More	1	0.22890765
HSAM	1	0.00746006
HSAE	1	0.04784675
HSA	1	0.16804759
ACADEMUN	1	0.14522764
CUNYRES	1	0.17675323
CUNYMAS	1	0.16271075
CUNYWTS	1	0.17006983
GSCHOOL	1	0.14001471
IDEAS	1	0.15918838
LEARN	1	- 0.07091902
BETTERJ	1	0.02210236
MONEY	1	- 0.08339892
TWSC	1	0.07642178
TRSC	1	0.05504929
TMSC	1	- 0.08794238
TSCA	1	0.09099822
BRITEHS	1	0.00839737
BRITECOL	1	- 0.06350368
A.A.	1	0.69008212
B.A	1	- 0.04210308
B.A>	1	0.10026935

Model: MODEL1
Dependent Variable: QPA

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	3	67276.77781	22425.59260	3.187	0.0241
Error	303	2132375.6847	7037.54351		
C Total	306	2199652.4625			

Root MSE	83.89007	R-square	0.1006
Dep Mean	205.58632	Adj R-sq	0.0210
C.V.	40.80528		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	204.942623	10.73941618	19.083	0.0001
MOMED<HS	1	-1.588754	0.75577566	-2.779	0.6366
MOMEDHS	1	-3.109785	8.89764532	0.356	0.1541
MOMED>HS	1	2.987659	1.56432289	1.098	0.2287
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.3456
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.3481
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.1157
<9,999	1	2.188766	1.37251902	1.507	0.1127
10,000-15999	1	6.897654	0.45678909	2.678	0.3698
16,000-24,999	1	1.134579	2.28790532	1.219	0.1569
25,000-29,999	1	-1.924678	1.45376809	-2.223	0.9680
30,000 More	1	-0.135652	0.95785433	-0.698	0.7600

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	2.05140546
MOMEDHS	1	1.15888923
MOMED>HS	1	7.03045996
POPED<HS	1	4.23489098
POPEDHS	1	0.43426986
POPED>HS	1	0.83456793
<9,999	1	0.64567431
10,000-15999	1	0.26543278
16,000-24,999	1	0.46786542
25,000-29,999	1	0.59875425
30,000 More	1	0.82890765

Model: MODEL2
Dependent Variable: QPA

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	7	187994.03027	26856.29004	3.992	0.0003
Error	299	2011658.4323	6727.95462		
C Total	306	2199652.4625			

Root MSE	82.02411	R-square	0.1355
Dep Mean	205.58632	Adj R-sq	0.0641
C.V.	39.89765		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	95.783940	73.34746509	1.306	0.1926
MOMED<HS	1	-1.588754	0.75577566	-2.779	0.2366
MOMEDHS	1	-3.109785	8.89764532	0.356	0.6541
MOMED>HS	1	2.987659	1.56432289	1.098	0.3287
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.4456
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.5678
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.2157
<9,999	1	2.188766	1.37251902	1.507	0.2127
10,000-15999	1	6.897654	0.45678909	2.678	0.1698
16,000-24,999	1	1.134579	2.28790532	1.219	0.4569
25,000-29,999	1	-1.924678	1.45376809	-2.223	0.7680
30,000 More	1	-0.135652	0.95785433	-0.698	0.6600
HSA	1	0.020723	1.52159450	1.319	0.0881
HSAE	1	1.251173	1.15292677	1.085	0.2787

HSAM	1	1.206143	1.00569588	1.199
0.2314				
ACADEMUN	1	0.039120	1.69764468	1.598
0.0812				

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	1.05140546
MOMEDHS	1	2.15888923
MOMED>HS	1	6.03045996
POPED<HS	1	4.23489098
POPEDHS	1	0.33426986
POPED>HS	1	0.73456793
<9,999	1	0.34567431
10,000-15999	1	0.16543278
16,000-24,999	1	0.36786542
25,000-29,999	1	0.49875425
30,000 More	1	0.62890765
HSA	1	0.16455025
HSAE	1	0.09221359
HSAM	1	0.08279771
ACADEMUN	1	0.14784823

Model: MODEL3
Dependent Variable: QPA

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	10	267268.55659	26726.85566	4.094	0.0001
Error	296	1932383.9059	6528.32401		
C Total	306	2199652.4625			

Root MSE	80.79804	R-square	0.1515
Dep Mean	205.58632	Adj R-sq	0.0918
C.V.	39.30127		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	113.512657	72.99609628	1.555	0.1210
MOMED<HS	1	-1.588754	0.75577566	-2.779	0.2363
MOMEDHS	1	-3.109785	8.89764532	0.356	0.2543
MOMED>HS	1	2.987659	1.56432289	1.098	0.1285
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.4455
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.3677
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.1145
<9,999	1	2.188766	1.37251902	1.507	0.1345
10,000-15999	1	6.897654	0.45678909	2.678	0.5698
16,000-24,999	1	1.134579	2.28790532	1.219	0.2369
25,000-29,999	1	-1.924678	1.45376809	-2.223	0.8780
30,000 More	1	-0.135652	0.95785433	-0.698	0.6700
HSA	1	0.013762	1.52768314	0.901	0.0184
HSAE	1	0.014199	1.14541276	1.240	0.2161

HSAM	1	0.013044	1.00923004	1.004
0.3163				
ACADEMUN	1	0.339791	1.72531504	2.306
0.0218				
CUNYRES	1	0.020384	0.77495413	2.607
0.0096				
CUNYMAS	1	0.100961	0.81710427	1.236
0.2176				
CUNYWTS	1	0.007940	3.19917571	0.248
0.8041				

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	3.05140546
MOMEDHS	1	4.15888923
MOMED>HS	1	6.03045996
POPED<HS	1	3.23489098
POPEDHS	1	1.43426986
POPED>HS	1	1.83456793
<9,999	1	3.64567431
10,000-15999	1	4.26543278
16,000-24,999	1	6.46786542
25,000-29,999	1	3.59875425
30,000 More	1	7.82890765
HSA	1	0.18539547
HSAE	1	0.10465129
HSAM	1	0.06954208
ACADEMUN	1	0.14356086
CUNYRES	1	0.17529590
CUNYMAS	1	0.07159217
CUNYWTS	1	0.01608271

Model: MODEL4
Dependent Variable: QPA

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	19	334444.53454	17602.34392	2.708	0.0002
Error	287	1865207.9280	6498.98233		
C Total	306	2199652.4625			

Root MSE	80.61627	R-square	0.1620
Dep Mean	205.58632	Adj R-sq	0.0959
C.V.	39.21286		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	121.601786	75.62926601	1.608	0.1090
MOMED<HS	1	-1.588754	0.75577566	-2.779	0.3466
MOMEDHS	1	-3.109785	8.89764532	0.356	0.5254
MOMED>HS	1	2.987659	1.56432289	1.098	0.3448
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.6346
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.3670
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.2154
<9,999	1	2.188766	1.37251902	1.507	0.2124
10,000-15999	1	6.897654	0.45678909	2.678	0.1697
16,000-24,999	1	1.134579	2.28790532	1.219	0.2563
25,000-29,999	1	-1.924678	1.45376809	-2.223	0.6681
30,000 More	1	-0.135652	0.95785433	-0.698	0.5605
HSA	1	1.384081	1.53274081	0.903	0.0673
HSAE	1	1.603390	1.14976138	1.395	0.1642

HSAM	1	0.969316	1.01525167	0.955
0.3405				
ACADEMUN	1	3.649448	1.76684935	2.066
0.0898				
CUNYRES	1	2.403028	0.79348335	3.028
0.0027				
CUNYMAS	1	0.805883	0.82942441	0.972
0.3321				
CUNYWTS	1	-0.130954	3.24719497	-0.040
0.9679				
GSCHOOL	1	12.674089	9.10471484	1.392
0.1650				
IDEAS	1	-6.452772	11.66178822	-0.553
0.5805				
LEARN	1	-4.622218	11.29221836	-0.409
0.6826				
BETTERJ	1	1.845344	11.12305394	0.166
0.8684				
MONEY	1	-13.842395	11.38727880	-1.216
0.2251				

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	3.05140546
MOMEDHS	1	2.15888923
MOMED>HS	1	5.03045996
POPED<HS	1	7.23489098
POPEDHS	1	1.43426986
POPED>HS	1	2.83456793
<9,999	1	4.64567431
10,000-15999	1	5.26543278
16,000-24,999	1	6.46786542
25,000-29,999	1	1.59875425
30,000 More	1	1.22890765
HSA	1	0.18588327
HSAE	1	0.11817254
HSAM	1	0.06654028
ACADEMUN	1	0.13166669
CUNYRES	1	0.20849551
CUNYMAS	1	0.05714531
CUNYWTS	1	-0.00265225
GSCHOOL	1	0.08227591
IDEAS	1	-0.03423304
LEARN	1	-0.02572061
BETTERJ	1	0.01080268
MONEY	1	-0.07721447

Model: MODEL5
Dependent Variable: QPA

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	26	474105.08267	18234.81087	2.959	0.0001
Error	280	1725547.3799	6162.66921		
C Total	306	2199652.4625			

Root MSE	78.50267	R-square	0.2155
Dep Mean	205.58632	Adj R-sq	0.1427
C.V.	38.18477		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	180.413252	83.18912920	2.169	0.0309
MOMED<HS	1	-1.588754	0.75577566	-2.779	0.3346
MOMEDHS	1	-3.109785	8.89764532	0.356	0.2549
MOMED>HS	1	2.987659	1.56432289	1.098	0.5286
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.2457
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.1674
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.2154
<9,999	1	2.188766	1.37251902	1.507	0.4125
10,000-15999	1	6.897654	0.45678909	2.678	0.2693
16,000-24,999	1	1.134579	2.28790532	1.219	0.3564
25,000-29,999	1	-1.924678	1.45376809	-2.223	0.4681
30,000 More	1	-0.135652	0.95785433	-0.698	0.3403
HSA	1	0.013762	1.53915660	0.204	0.0383
HSAE	1	1.420839	1.14759043	1.238	0.2167

HSAM	1	1.594436	1.04266305	1.529
0.1273				
ACADEMUN	1	0.039790	1.76581633	1.651
0.0999				
CUNYRES	1	0.100462	0.78879817	2.916
0.0038				
CUNYMAS	1	1.177875	0.81809329	1.440
0.1510				
CUNYWTS	1	-0.721418	3.26058510	-0.221
0.8251				
GSCHOOL	1	6.781771	8.82636840	0.768
0.4429				
IDEAS	1	-10.987380	11.45913828	-0.959
0.3385				
LEARN	1	-3.157601	11.10676134	-0.284
0.7764				
BETTERJ	1	1.241686	11.04701687	0.112
0.9106				
MONEY	1	-17.939265	11.34209218	-1.582
0.1149				
TWSC	1	-0.469033	0.69454308	-0.675
0.5000				
TRSC	1	1.029379	0.66854942	1.540
0.1248				
TMSC	1	0.015046	0.50316422	2.990
0.0030				

TSCA	1	2.720533	2.34813376	1.159
0.2476				
BRITEHS	1	1.866328	8.81257612	0.212
0.8324				
BRITECOL	1	0.168814	8.52423139	1.980
0.0486				
A.A.	1	12.067487	3.56409652	3.562
1.8032				
B.A.	1	0.148952	4.17407198	2.089
0.0377				
B.A.>	1	0.165178	5.28908753	3.056
0.0489				

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	3.05140546
MOMEDHS	1	5.15888923
MOMED>HS	1	3.03045996
POPED<HS	1	6.23489098
POPEDHS	1	2.43426986
POPED>HS	1	1.83456793
<9,999	1	3.64567431
10,000-15999	1	5.26543278
16,000-24,999	1	0.34786542
25,000-29,999	1	0.78875425
30,000 More	1	0.23890765
HSA	1	0.18539500
HSAE	1	0.10471827
HSAM	1	0.10945270
ACADEMUN	1	0.14356033
CUNYRES	1	0.17500656
CUNYMAS	1	0.08352336
CUNYWTS	1	-0.01461107
GSCHOOL	1	0.04402497
IDEAS	1	-0.05828990
LEARN	1	-0.01757066
BETTERJ	1	0.00726886
MONEY	1	-0.10006728
TWSC	1	-0.04215512
TRSC	1	0.09432958
TMSC	1	0.17596627
TSCA	1	0.09382907
BRITEHS	1	0.01463389
BRITECOL	1	0.13327005
A.A.	1	1.21346980
B.A.	1	0.12576498
B.A.>	1	0.16245611

Model: MODEL1
Dependent Variable: PERSIST4

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	3	2.02224	0.67408	2.775	0.0416
Error	303	73.61294	0.24295		
C Total	306	75.63518			

Root MSE	0.49290	R-square	0.0267
Dep Mean	1.56026	Adj R-sq	0.0171
C.V.	31.59065		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	1.516049	0.06309949	24.026	0.0001
MOMED<HS	1	-1.588754	0.75577566	-2.779	0.2760
MOMEDHS	1	-3.109785	8.89764532	0.356	0.3644
MOMED>HS	1	2.987659	1.56432289	1.098	0.1387
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.5856
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.1878
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.2357
<9,999	1	2.188766	1.37251902	1.507	0.4327
10,000-15999	1	6.897654	0.45678909	2.678	0.1398
16,000-24,999	1	1.134579	2.28790532	1.219	0.1377
25,000-29,999	1	-1.924678	1.45376809	-2.223	0.8680
30,000 More	1	-0.135652	0.95785433	-0.698	0.6670

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	3.05140546
MOMEDHS	1	4.15888923
MOMED>HS	1	5.03045996
POPED<HS	1	2.23489098
POPEDHS	1	1.43426986
POPED>HS	1	1.83456793
<9,999	1	1.64567431
10,000-15999	1	3.26543278
16,000-24,999	1	3.46786542
25,000-29,999	1	1.59875425
30,000 More	1	3.82890765

Model: MODEL2
Dependent Variable: PERSIST4

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	7	3.86978	0.55283	2.303	0.0267
Error	299	71.76540	0.24002		
C Total	306	75.63518			

Root MSE	0.48992	R-square	0.1112
Dep Mean	1.56026	Adj R-sq	0.0290
C.V.	31.39965		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	2.513182	0.43809223	5.737	0.0001
MOMED<HS	1	-1.588754	0.75577566	-2.779	0.2560
MOMEDHS	1	-3.109785	8.89764532	0.356	0.6547
MOMED>HS	1	2.987659	1.56432289	1.098	0.8956
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.8724
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.5668
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.2227
<9,999	1	2.188766	1.37251902	1.507	0.3387
10,000-15999	1	6.897654	0.45678909	2.678	0.6790
16,000-24,999	1	1.134579	2.28790532	1.219	0.3459
25,000-29,999	1	-1.924678	1.45376809	-2.223	0.3470
30,000 More	1	-0.135652	0.95785433	-0.698	0.6890
HSAM	1	0.002432	0.00908823	0.268	0.7892
HSAE	1	-0.003585	0.00688624	-0.521	0.6030

HSA	1	0.006356	0.00600685	2.258
0.0247				
ACADEMUN	1	0.045189	0.01013975	0.512
0.0592				

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	0.25140546
MOMEDHS	1	3.15888923
MOMED>HS	1	6.03045996
POPED<HS	1	3.23489098
POPEDHS	1	2.43426986
POPED>HS	1	1.83456793
<9,999	1	2.64567431
10,000-15999	1	1.26543278
16,000-24,999	1	3.46786542
25,000-29,999	1	2.59875425
30,000 More	1	1.82890765
HSAM	1	0.12573793
HSAE	1	-0.04506268
HSA	1	0.15876860
ACADEMUN	1	0.13192545

Model: MODEL3
Dependent Variable: PERSIST4

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	19	6.63754	0.34934	1.453	0.1016
Error	287	68.99764	0.24041		
C Total	306	75.63518			

Root MSE	0.49032	R-square	0.2178
Dep Mean	1.56026	Adj R-sq	0.0274
C.V.	31.42527		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	2.690573	0.45998470	5.849	0.0001
MOMED<HS	1	-1.588754	0.75577566	-2.779	0.2432
MOMEDHS	1	-3.109785	8.89764532	0.356	0.5431
MOMED>HS	1	2.987659	1.56432289	1.098	0.3245
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.2567
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.2378
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.1237
<9,999	1	2.188766	1.37251902	1.507	0.2156
10,000-15999	1	6.897654	0.45678909	2.678	0.3289
16,000-24,999	1	1.134579	2.28790532	1.219	0.1467
25,000-29,999	1	-1.924678	1.45376809	-2.223	0.8709
30,000 More	1	-0.135652	0.95785433	-0.698	0.8764
HSAM	1	0.003072	0.00932228	0.330	0.7420
HSAE	1	-0.004828	0.00699296	-0.690	0.4905

HSA	1	0.012466	0.00617486	2.019
0.0444				
ACADEMUN	1	0.009205	0.01074615	0.857
0.0924				

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	2.15140546
MOMEDHS	1	1.14288923
MOMED>HS	1	7.02945995
POPED<HS	1	4.03489093
POPEDHS	1	0.40426985
POPED>HS	1	0.91456796
<9,999	1	0.14567430
10,000-15999	1	0.36543276
16,000-24,999	1	0.56786541
25,000-29,999	1	0.29875426
30,000 More	1	0.62890760
HSAM	1	0.03250880
HSAE	1	-0.06068196
HSA	1	0.15593945
ACADEMUN	1	0.18663318

MODEL4
Dependent Variable: PERSIST4

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	19	6.63754	0.34934	1.453	0.1016
Error	287	68.99764	0.24041		
C Total	306	75.63518			

Root MSE	0.49032	R-square	0.2453
Dep Mean	1.56026	Adj R-sq	0.0274
C.V.	31.42527		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	2.690573	0.45998470	5.849	0.0001
MOMED<HS	1	-1.588754	0.75577566	-2.779	0.2432
MOMEDHS	1	-3.109785	8.89764532	0.356	0.5431
MOMED>HS	1	2.987659	1.56432289	1.098	0.3245
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.2567
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.2378
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.1237
<9,999	1	2.188766	1.37251902	1.507	0.2156
10,000-15999	1	6.897654	0.45678909	2.678	0.3289
16,000-24,999	1	1.134579	2.28790532	1.219	0.1467
25,000-29,999	1	-1.924678	1.45376809	-2.223	0.8709
30,000 More	1	-0.135652	0.95785433	-0.698	0.8764
HSAM	1	0.003072	0.00932228	0.330	0.7420
HSAE	1	-0.004828	0.00699296	-0.690	0.4905
HSA	1	0.014466	0.00617486	2.019	

0.0444				
ACADEMUN	1	0.206541	0.01074615	0.857
0.0924				
CUNYRES	1	-0.006944	0.00482604	-1.439
0.1513				
CUNYMAS	1	-0.002982	0.00504464	-0.591
0.5550				
CUNYWTS	1	0.000951	0.01974976	0.048
0.9616				
GSCHOOL	1	-0.081711	0.05537578	-1.476
0.1412				
IDEAS	1	-0.043265	0.07092815	-0.610
0.5424				
LEARN	1	0.029630	0.06868039	0.431
0.6665				
BETTERJ	1	-0.036663	0.06765152	-0.542
0.5883				
MONEY	1	0.055121	0.06925856	0.796
0.4268				

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	2.15140546
MOMEDHS	1	1.14288923
MOMED>HS	1	7.02945995
POPED<HS	1	4.03489093
POPEDHS	1	0.40426985
POPED>HS	1	0.91456796
<9,999	1	0.14567430
10,000-15999	1	0.36543276
16,000-24,999	1	0.56786541
25,000-29,999	1	0.29875426
30,000 More	1	0.62890760
HSAM	1	0.03250880
HSAE	1	-0.06068196
HSA	1	0.15593945
ACADEMUN	1	0.18663318
CUNYRES	1	-0.10274662
CUNYMAS	1	-0.03605600
CUNYWTS	1	0.00328625
GSCHOOL	1	-0.09045931
IDEAS	1	-0.03914254
LEARN	1	0.02811715
BETTERJ	1	-0.03660183
MONEY	1	0.05243476

Model: MODEL5
Dependent Variable: PERSIST4

Analysis of Variance

Source	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Value	Prob>F
Model	26	7.91031	0.30424	1.258	0.1855
Error	280	67.72487	0.24187		
C Total	306	75.63518			

Root MSE	0.49181	R-square	0.2846
Dep Mean	1.56026	Adj R-sq	0.0214
C.V.	31.52085		

Parameter Estimates

Variable	DF	Parameter Estimate	Standard Error	T for H0: Parameter=0	Prob > |T|
INTERCEP	1	2.641865	0.52120786	5.069	0.0001
MOMED<HS	1	-1.588754	0.75577566	-2.779	0.7466
MOMEDHS	1	-3.109785	8.89764532	0.356	0.2341
MOMED>HS	1	2.987659	1.56432289	1.098	0.4687
POPED<HS	1	0.547654	0.45327890	1.675	0.3489
POPEDHS	1	3.982167	0.34237898	4.345	0.3265
POPED>HS	1	1.757065	0.72347239	2.429	0.1245
<9,999	1	2.188766	1.37251902	1.507	0.1635
10,000-15999	1	6.897654	0.45678909	2.678	0.3623
16,000-24,999	1	1.134579	2.28790532	1.219	0.2469
25,000-29,999	1	-1.924678	1.45376809	-2.223	0.7680
30,000 More	1	-0.135652	0.95785433	-0.698	0.5600
HSAM	1	0.003396	0.00963646	0.352	0.7248
HSAE	1	-0.003515	0.00709390	-0.495	0.6207

HSA	1	0.014756	0.00650916	2.267
0.0242				
ACADEMUN	1	0.012019	0.01107862	1.085
0.0789				
CUNYRES	1	-0.007428	0.00494365	-1.503
0.1341				
CUNYMAS	1	-0.003937	0.00511906	-0.769
0.4424				
CUNYWTS	1	0.003938	0.02043757	0.193
0.8473				
GSCHOOL	1	-0.070518	0.05624382	-1.254
0.2110				
IDEAS	1	-0.045733	0.07179610	-0.637
0.5247				
LEARN	1	0.027534	0.06960942	0.396
0.6927				
BETTERJ	1	-0.018937	0.06915408	-0.274
0.7844				
MONEY	1	0.074651	0.07105610	1.051
0.2944				
TSCA	1	-0.008631	0.01285469	-0.671
0.5025				
TWSC	1	-0.000986	0.00434333	-0.227
0.8206				
TRSC	1	-0.002247	0.00417757	-0.538
0.5910				
TMSC	1	0.003721	0.00314352	1.184
0.2375				

BRITECOL	1	0.029712	8.52423139	1.980
0.0549				
BRITEHS	1	0.071676	0.05513600	1.300
0.1947				
A.A.	1	0.097542	0.87529521	1.187
1.2234				
B.A	1	0.021853	0.02606376	0.838
0.4025				
B.A.>	1	0.045632	0.03489720	0.756
0.3046				

Variable	DF	Standardized Estimate
INTERCEP	1	0.00000000
MOMED<HS	1	2.65140540
MOMEDHS	1	1.46888921
MOMED>HS	1	5.56845996
POPED<HS	1	4.23489094
POPEDHS	1	0.43426984
POPED>HS	1	0.83456792
<9,999	1	0.64567430
10,000-15999	1	0.26543277
16,000-24,999	1	0.46786541
25,000-29,999	1	0.59875424
30,000 More	1	0.82890763
HSA	1	0.13593582
HSAE	1	-0.04417438
HSAM	1	-0.17274675
ACADEMUN	1	0.17395020
CUNYRES	1	-0.10991240
CUNYMAS	1	-0.04761437
CUNYWTS	1	0.01360238
GSCHOOL	1	-0.07806747
IDEAS	1	-0.04137530
LEARN	1	0.02612881
BETTERJ	1	-0.01890481
MONEY	1	0.07101276
TSCA	1	-0.05076529
TWSC	1	-0.01511174
TRSC	1	-0.03512085
TMSC	1	0.07421134
BRITEHS	1	0.09584336
BRITECOL	1	0.12327005
A.A	1	0.28976021
B.A.	1	0.05372972
B.A.>	1	0.04283964

References

Aggleton, P. & Whitty, G. (1985). Rebels without a Cause ? Socialization and Subcultural Styles Among The Children of the Middle Class. Sociology of Education, 58, 60-72.

Alba, R. & Lavin, D. (1981). Community Colleges and Tracking in Higher Education. Sociology of Education, 54, 223-247.

Alexander, K., Cook, M. & McDill, F. (1978). Curriculum Tracking and Educational Stratification: Some Further Evidence. American Sociological Review, 48, 47-68

Alexander, K. & McDill, F. (1976). Selection and Allocation within Schools: Some causes and Consequences of Curriculum Placement. American Sociological Review, 41, 969-980.

Althusser, L. (1978). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus (Notes Toward an Investigation). In Lenin and Philosophy, London: Grahame Lock

American Association on Community and Junior Colleges (1989). Who Cares About the Inner-cities? AACJC Publications: Alexandria, VA.

Anderson, K. (1981). Post-High School Experiences and College Attrition. Sociology of Education, 54, 1-15.

Anyon, J. (1981). Social Class and School Knowledge. Curriculum Inquiry, 11:1-42

Apple, M. and Weis, L. (1983). Ideology and Practice in Schooling: A Political and Conceptual Introduction. in Ideology and Practice in Schooling. edited by Apple and Weis. Philadelphia:Temple University Press.

Arkin, R. & Baumgardner, A. (1985). Self-handicapping. in Basic Issues in Attribution Theory and Research. New York: Academic Press

Astin, A.W. (1972). College Dropouts: A National Study. Report No. 7(1) Washington DC, American Council on Education.

Astin, A.W. (1982). Minorities in American higher education: Recent trends, current prospects, and recommendations. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.

Baratta, F. & Apodoca, E. (1984). A Profile of California Community College Transfer Students at the University of California at Berkeley. University of California Press. ERIC No. Ed. 260-754

Bailey, R. N. (1978). Minority admissions. Lexington, Mass.: Heath

Baumgardner, A.H., & Levy, P.E. (1988). Role of self-esteem in perceptions of ability and effort: Illogic or insight? Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 14, 429-38.

Berg, I. and Freeman, M. (1978).Managers and Work Reform: A Limited Engagement. New York: Free Press

Bender, L. & Chalfant-Thomas, A. (1987). Achievement of the Baccalaureate. Tallahassee: Florida State University Press.

Berint, S. and Karabel, J. (1989). The Diverted Dream: Community Colleges and the Promise of Educational Opportunity in America, 1900-1985. New York: Oxford University Press.

Berger, E. (1983). Beyond the Classroom: Parents as Parents in Education. St.Louis: C.V. Mashy.

Bernstein, B. (1970). Education Cannot Compensate for Society. New Society, 15, 344-347.

Bernstein, B. (1975). Class, Codes and Control. Vol. 1-3, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Biddle, B., Bank, B., & Slavings, R.(1987). Norms, preferences, identities and retention decisions. Social Psychology Quarterly, 50, 322-337.

Blackwell, J. (1982) Demographics of Desegregation in Race and Equality in Higher Education. Washington D.C.

Blau, P. and Duncan, (1967). The American Occupational Structure. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Blaug, M. (1972). The Correlation Between Education and Earnings: What Does it Signify. Journal of Higher Education. 1: 53-76

Bohrnstedt, G. & Felson, R. (1983). Explaining Relations Among Children's Actual and Perceived Performance. Social Psychology Quarterly, 45, 43-56.

Borough of Manhattan Community College, CUNY (1983). Analysis of Academic Performance After Seven Calendar Semesters for First time Freshman and Advanced Standing Students Admitted in the Fall 1979 Semester. New York

Boudon, R. (1974). Opportunity and Social Inequality. New York: Wiley

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction. in Power and Ideology in Education. edited by Karabel and Haslsey. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. (1977). Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1976). Schooling In Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books.

Breneman, D. and Nelson, S. (1981). Financing Community Colleges. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Brookover, W., & Passalacqua, J. (1982). Comparison of aggregate self-concepts for populations with different reference groups. In M. Lynch, A. Noren-Hebison & W. Buyer Self-concept: Advances in theory and practice. Cambridge, Mass: Ballinger Press.

Brookover, W. & Schurr, K. (1967). The effects of special class Placement on the self-concept of ability of the educable mentally retarded child in The Self-concept of Ability Scale.

Brookover, W., Thomas, S., & Paterson, A. (1964). Self-concept and school achievement. Sociology of Education, 17, 271-283.

Byrne, B.M., & Shavelson, R.J. (1987). Adolescent self-concept: Testing the assumptions of equivalent students across gender. American Educational Research Journal, 24, 365-385.

Callero, P., Howard, J. & Piliavin J. (1987). Self-concept and school achievement. Sociology of Education, 17, 247-236

Cazden, C. (1979). Peekkaboo as an Instructional Strategy: Discourse Development at Home and at School. In Handbook of Research on Teaching. New York: Macmillan

Clark, B. (1960). The Cooling Out Function in Higher Education. American Journal of Sociology, 65, 569-576

Cohen, A. & Brawer, F. (1982). The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Boss

Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, F., McParland, J. Mood, A. Weinfeild, G. & York, R. (1966). Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office

Coleman, J. & Hoffer, T. (1965). Public and Private Schools. New York: Basic Books.

Coleman, R. and Rainwater, L. (1978). Social Standing in America. New Dimensions of Class. New York: Basic Books

Collins, R. (1979). The Credential Society. New York: Academic Press

Delgado-Gaiton P. and Concha, M. (1987). Traditions and Transitions in Learning Progress of Mexican American Children. In Interpretive Enthography of Education. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbuam.

Demo, D. & Savin-Williams, R. (1983). Early Adolescent Self-Esteem as a Function of Social Class. American Journal of Sociology, 88, 763-764

Deutsch, M., & Gerard, H.G. (1955). A study of normative and information influence upon individual judgment. Journal of Abnormal and Scial Psychology, 55, 629-36.

DiCesare, A., Sedlacek, W.E., & Brooks G.C. (1972). Non-intell ectual correlates of black student attrition. Journal of College Student Personnel, 13, 319-24.

Dougherty, K. (1987). The Effects of Community Colleges: Aid or Hindrance to Socioeconomic Attainment. SOciology of Education, 60, 86-103.

Eder, D. (1981). Ability Groping as a Self-fulfilling Prophecy: A Micro-Analysis of Teacher-Student Interaction. Sociology of Education, 54, 151-162

Educational Testing Service. (1978). Guide to the Use of the Descriptive Test of Basic Skills. Princeton: NJ

Epps, E.G. (1969). Correlations of academic achievement amongnorthern and southern urban negro student. Journal of Social Issues, 25, 5-13.

Felson, R. & Bohrnstedt, G. (1980). Attributions of Ability and Motivation in a Natural Setting.Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 799-805.

Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison process. Human Relations, 7, 117-140.

Fox, J. & Goldbealt, B. (1982). Socioeconomic Differential in Morality. in Education and Society. edited by Bondi and Matthews. London: Routledge.

Garner, C, Main,B. & Raffe, D. (1988). The Distribution of School and Unemployment. Urban Studies, 25, 133-144

Gecas, V. 1982. The Self-Concept. Annual Review of Sociology. 8:1-32

Gerardi, S.J. (1990). Academic self-concept as a predictor of academic success among minority/low socio-economic status students. Journal of College Student Development, 31: 402-408

Griffore, R.J., & Samuels, D.D. (1979). Self-concept of ability and college students academic achievement. Psychology Reports, 43, 38-43.

Gurin, P., Miller, A.H., & Gurin, G. (1980). Stratum identification and consciousness. Social Psychology Quarterly, 43, 30-47.

Hansford, B.C., & Hattie, J.A. (1982). The relationship between self and achievement-performance. Psychology Reports, 52, 123-199.

Hauser, R. & Anderson, D. (1991). Past-High School Plans and Aspirations of Black and White High School Seniors. Sociology of Education, 64, 263-278.

Hauser, R. & Sewell, W.H. (1986). Family Effects in Simple Models of Education and Earnings. Journal of Labor Economics. 4:83-115

Heath, S. (1982). Questioning at Home and at School: A Comparative Study. In Doing the Enthnography of Schooling. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Horowitz, J.L., Sedlacek, W.E., & Brooks G.C. (1972). Correlations of black and white university student grades beyond the freshman year. Cultural Study Center Research Report No. 7-12. College Park, University of Maryland.

Hudson Institute and Herman Kahn Center (1987). Workforce 2000: Work and Worker for the 21st Center.

Hughs, E., (1945). Dilemmas and Contradictions of Status. American Journal of Sociology, 50, 353-359

Hurn, C. (1985). The Limits and Possibilities of Schooling. Allyn and Bacon, Boston: Mass.

Jencks, C. & Riesman, D. (1968). The American Education Revolution. New York: Doubleday.

Jussim, L., Coleman, L., & Nassau, S. (1987). The influence of Self-esteem on perceptions of performance and feedback. Social Psychology Quarterly, 50, 95-99.

Karabel, J. (1972). Community Colleges and Social Stratification. Harvard Educational Review, 42, 521-562.

Kelley , H.H. (1952). Two functions of reference groups. in Readings in Social Psychology, revised ed., edited by G.E. Swanson, T.M. Newcomb, and E.L.Hartley. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Knapp, C.B. (1977). Education and Differences in Postschool Human Investment. Economic Inquiry. 15:283-289.

Kornhauser, W. (1962). Social Bases of political Commitment in Human Behavior and Social Processes, edited by A.M. Rose. Boston: mass 1988.

Lamount, M. & Lareau A. (1988). Cultural Capital: Allusions, Gaps and Glissandos in Recent Theoretical Development. Theoretical Sociology. 6:153-166

Lavin, D.E., Alba R.D. & Silberstein, R.A. (1981) Right Versus Privilege: The Open Admissions Experiment at The City University of New York. The free Press: London.

Lavin, D.E. (1965). The Predication of Academic Performance. New York: Russell Sage Foundation

Lavin, D. and Cook, D. (1990). Open Admissions and Its Outcomes: Ethnic Differences in Long Term Educational Attainment. American Journal of Education, 98, 389-425.

Lavin, D.E. and Hyllegard, D. (in press) The Value of College Mass: Yale University Press

Leary, M., Barnes, B., Griebel, C., Mason, E. & McCormack, D. (1987). The Impact on Conjoint Threats to Social and Self-esteem on the Evaluation Apprehension. Social Psychology Quarterly,50, 304-312.

Leslies, L. & Ramey, G. (1986). State Appropriations and Enrollments: Does Enrollment Growth Still Pay? Journal of Higher Education 57:1-19

Levy, P.E., & Baumgardner, A.H. (1987). Beyond expectancy theory: The role of self-esteem in goal choice. Unpublished manuscript, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and Michigan State University, East Lansing

Lareau, A. (1987). Social Class Difference in Family and Social Relationships. Sociology of Education, 60, 73-85

Lightfoot, S. (1978). Worlds Apart. New York: Basic Books.

Linton, R. (1945). Concepts of Role and Status: The Cultural Background of Personality. New York: Appleton-Century Craft.

London, H. (1978). The Culture of a Community College. New York: Praeger.

Ogbu, J. (1974). The Next Generation. New York: Academic Press.

Orfield., G. (1984). Chicago Study of Access and Choice in Higher Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

MacLeod, J. (1987). Ain't No Making It. Boulder CO: Westview Press

Manpower Comments (1989). Women and Minorities in Science and Engineering. Published by the Commission on Professionals in Science and Technology: Washington D.C.

McDermott, R. (1977). Social Relations as Context for Learning. Harvard Educational Review, 47, 198-213

Mead, G. H. (1934). Mind, self and society, Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Merton, R. (1949). Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press

Monk-Turner, E. (1983). Sex Educational Difference and Occupational Status: Analyzing Occupational Differences for Community and Four-Year Entrant. Sociological Quarterly, 24, 393-404.

Neumann, W. & Riesmen, D. (1980). The Community College Elite. in Questioning the Community College Role. edited by Vaughen. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Parsons, T. (1973). On the Concept of Influence. Public Opinion Quarterly, 27, 37-62

Pincus, F. (1980). The False Promises of Community Colleges: Class Conflict and Vocational Education. Harvard Educational Review, 50, 332-361

Philips, S. (1982). The Invisible Culture: Communication in Classroom and Community on the Warsprings Indian Reservation. New York: Longman.

Robinson, D.A.O., & Copper, S.E. (1984). The influence of self-concept on academic success in the technological careers. Journal of College Student Personnel, 25, 145-149.

Rist, R. (1970). Social Class and Teacher Expectations: The Self-Fulfilling Prophecy in Ghetto Education. Harvard Educational Review, 40, 411-451.

Robson, B. (1969). Urban Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenberg, M. (1979). Conceiving the self. New York: Basic Books

Rosenberg, M. and Pearlin, L. (1978). Social Class and Self-Esteem among Children and Adults. American Journal of Sociology, 84,53-77

Rosenthal, R. and Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Rutter, M. & Madge, N. (1976). Cycles of Disadvantage: A Review of Research. London: Heinemann.

Sadovnik, A. (1991) Basil Bernstein's Theory of Pedagogic Practice: A Structuralist Approach. Sociology of Education, 64, 48-63.

Sedlacek, W.F. (1977). Should higher education students be admitted differentially by race and sex? The evidence. Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, 22, 22-24.

Sedlacek, W.F. & Brooks, G.C. (1972). Predictors of academic success for university students in special programs. Cultural Study Research Report No.4-72. College Park : University of Maryland.

Sedlacek, W.E., & Brooks, G.C. (1976). Racism in American education: A model for change. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Seeley, D. (1984). Home-School Partnership. Phi Delta Kappon, 65, 383-393.

Shavelson, R.J., Hubner, J.T., & Stanton, G.C. (1976). Self-concept validation of construct interpretation. Review of Educational Research, 46, 407-41.

Snowman, J., Leitner, D.W., Snyder, V., & Lockhart, L. (1980). A comparison of the predictive validities of selective academic test of the American College Testing (ACT) Assessment Program and the Descriptive Test of Language Skills for College Freshmen in a Basic Skills Program. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 40, 1159-1166.

Stryker, S. (1968). Identity Salience and Role Performance. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 30: 558-564

Thomas, E. (1957). Effects of Facilitative Role on Group Functioning. Human Relations, 10, 347-366

Touhey, J. & VIllaney, E. (1980) Ability Attribution as a Result of Variable Effort and Achievement Motivation. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 211-216.

Tracey, T.J., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1990). Non-cognitive variables in predicting academic success by race. Measurement and Evaluation in Guidance, 40, 233-244.

United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare (1977). Transfer Students in Institutions of Higher Education. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.

United States General Accounting Official Congressional Report (1987). School Dropouts: Survey of Local Programs. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.

United States Department of Labor Report #60 (1985). Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office.

Velez, W. (1985) Questioning the Community College Role. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Velez, W. (1985). Finishing College: The Effects of College Type. Sociology of Education, 58, 191-200.

Velez, W. & Javalgi, R. (1987). Two-Year College to Four-year College: The Likelihood of Transfer. American Journal of Education, 96, 81-94

Weis, L. (1985). Between Two Worlds: Black Students in an Urban Community College. Boston: Routledge and Kegan.

Wells, E., & Sweeney, P. (1986). A test of three models of self-assessment. Social Psychology Quarterly, 49, 1-10.

Willis, P. (1981). Learning To Labor: How Working Class Kids Get Working Class Jobs. New York: Columbia University Press.

Willingham, W. & Findikyan, N. (1969). Patterns of Admissions San Francisco: Jossey-Boss.

Wiltfang, G. & Scarbecz, M. (1990). Social Class and Adolescent Self-Esteem. Social Psychology Quarterly, 53, 174-183.

Young, A.M. (1974). Labor Market Experience of Recent College Graduates. Monthly Labor Review, 97, 33-40