DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 052 695 HE 002 305

AUTHOR Melnick, Murray
TITLE Higher Education for the Disadvantaged: Summary. Abstracts and Reviews of Research in Higher Education. Number 12.
INSTITUTION Hofstra Univ., Hempstead, N.Y. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE Apr 71
NOTE 48p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Achievement, *Disadvantaged Youth, Educational Research, *Performance, *Performance Factors, *Student Characteristics, *Student Research
IDENTIFIERS *Upward Bound

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews research on the success of Upward Bound students and the performance of disadvantaged students in college. An examination of more than 20 Upward Bound studies tends to show that slight gains in motivational readiness for college were registered. Upward Bound students appear to enter college at a higher rate (80%) than the national average (65%) and are only slightly behind in the number still enrolled among non-program counterparts. The studies indicate the extent of institutional involvement with disadvantaged students is not great. As late as 1968, three-quarters of the institutions surveyed sponsored no special efforts for the disadvantaged; few institutions with such programs approached the problem with maximum utilization of their resources. The graduation rate of black students is said to be high (90% versus 60% for whites) but there are little data on the progress of students specifically designated as disadvantaged. Existing data usually refer to first semester college GPAs as the dependent variable. Suggestions for further research are discussed in relation to remediation strategies, the role of the instructore, and application of the definition "high-risk." (JS)

ERIC

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED052695

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACTS AND REVIEWS OF RESEARCH IN HIGHER EDUCATION NUMBER 12

April 1971

Higher Education for the Disadvantaged: Summary

Murray Melnick, Ph.D.

Prior to the engagement of federal funds for the disadvantaged, research had indicated that the absence of appropriate environmental stimulation had tended to handicap disadvantaged youth at an early level of development. Government supported intervention in Head Start and Title I was later extended to the level of college entrance by the Upward Bound program. An examination of more than twenty Upward Bound studies tended to show that slight gains in motivational readiness for college were registered. Apparently Upward Bound participants enter college at a higher rate (80%) than the national average (65%), and are only slightly behind in the number still enrolled among their non-program counterparts. The specific factors responsible for the favorable enrollment picture have not been determined.

The remainder of the review was concerned with the disadvantaged student in college. The major reviews of Gordon & Wilkerson (1966), Egerton (1968) and Hood (1969) were discussed, as well as about twenty-five other studies. The extent of involvement is not great; as late as 1968, three-quarters of the institutions queried sponsored no special efforts for the disadvantaged. Few of the institutions that had such programs approached the problem with maximum utilization of resources.

The graduation rate of black students is said to be high (90% versus the 60% rate for whites according to Clark & Plotkin's (1963) survey of blacks at integrated colleges). Direct information on the progress of students specifically designated as disadvantaged is scarce. The little data that exist usually refer to first semester college GPA's as the dependent variable. It would appear that the disadvantaged perform generally at the C level or slightly below, but it is not yet possible to determine whether even this level of functioning involved the same grading standard for both disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged students.

Suggestions for further and more adequate research were discussed in relation to remediation strategies, the role of the instructor, and application of the definition, "high-risk." In general

HE 002 305

ERIC

there is a need for well-executed investigations which control for student ability and educational accomplishment, where the programs are similar with respect to standards and practices, and where sufficient time periods elapse to properly assess longitudinal variations. It is questionable whether current practice has done all it can to induce successful outcomes. Tentative and probing indications offered in the literature suggest that the potential for the disadvantaged student's effective use of the college experience is there; more work is needed regarding objective signs of progress and how maximum improvement and development can be effected.

(Copies of the full review are available from the Center for the Study of Higher Education).

ERIC Full Text Provided by ERIC

CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

HOFSTRA UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACTS AND REVIEWS OF RESEARCH IN HIGHER EDUCATION NUMBER 12

April 1971

Higher Education for the Disadvantaged

Murray Melnick, Ph.D.

At first, it was only the democratic ethos, for one couldn't really tolerate an America where lack of money, sheer money prevented a person from going to college. So the state universities were built where tuition fees were minimal and elsewhere there were scholarships. But one day came the realization that this was not enough. The poor were too far down. Beaten, demoralized, diverted, they had lost the battle in high school, possibly in the kindergarten or before they ever came to school. It wasn't only money that was keeping the poor out of the colleges, it was their inadequate performance in the lower grades.

Yes, we had always lived with that knowledge. Some got good grades and some didn't and those that did went further and those that didn't stayed where they were.

But why did some pupils excel and others fail? Was the failure rooted in the child alone or had something gone wrong in the child's milieu: was ability absent or lacking a favorable environment, had it merely failed to appear?

Questions such as these led directly to the current interest in disadvantagement, cultural deprivation and compensatory education.

For a long time there had been prolonged discussion of the role of environment in shaping mental development (McNemar, 1940; Wellman, Skeels, & Skodak, 1940). Studies relating social class to child-rearing behavior (Davis & Havighurst, 1946; Sears, Maccoby & Levin, 1957) had also received widespread attention. Gradually, the validity of intelligence testing for children in impoverished environments came under close scrutiny as attempts were made to develop culture-free tests (Davis & Eels, 1953).

Deutsch (1963) brought the environmental hypothesis into sharp focus by positing that a child's readiness for school was due to a lack of variety of visual, tactile and auditory stimulation in the lower class home, where few objects were available for play activities. In centering his approach on stimulation per se, Deutsch was continuing a line of inquiry implicit in Piaget's (1936) observation that more

elaborate conceptual "schema" develop out of opportunities for low-level manipulation of objects; studies of feral man (Zingg, 1940), animal behavior (Hebb, 1949) and sensory deprivation (Bexton, Heron & Scott, 1954). Deutsch's position on early environmental stimulation was subsequently supported by Hunt (1964) and Wolf (1964).

Riessman (1962), who, about the same time, was faced with the same array of evidence, developed a different emphasis. He argued that the "culturally deprived" child has negative attitudes toward intellectualism, different value orientations generally, and a lack of school know-how. Reissman used the term "culturally deprived"[1] reluctantly; the lower-class child related poorly to the larger dominant culture, he was not devoid of his own culture and of values worthy of emulation.

Also associated with a lower-class milieu were the handicaps attendant upon lower-class training which features quick rewards and immediate gradification (Leshan, 1952; and Mischel, 1961). The importance of low self-esteem has been stressed by Caplin, (1969), Pettigrew (1964), Poussaint (1968) and Pruitt (1970). And simply being hungry can have adverse effects upon education (Schorr, 1964).

Research suggested, in short, that the child of poverty had serious problems in the effective pursuit of learning, handicapped by inadequate or irrelevant home stimulation and by an educational structure insensitive to its class biases.

Gordon & Wilkerson (1966) pointed out that it was the research, the increased demand for skilled manpower, and the intensification of the civil rights movement that eventually led the federal government to embark on a large-scale program designed to help the disadvantaged student, from pre-school to college. Efforts of this nature have come to be known as "compensatory education." Gordon & Wilkerson, defined compensatory education programs as those activities providing special and extra services which are intended to compensate for a complex of social, economic, and educational handicaps suffered by disadvantaged children.

In turn, the disadvantaged are defined as those who are below average in standardized tests and in addition have one or more of these problems: 1) economic deprivation, 2) social alienation due to discrimination, 3) geographic isolation. Generally their motivation is inappropriate and they have a values conflict with selves and school.

---

[1]Riessman's use of the term has been disputed by several writers (Goodman, 1969; Mackler & Giddings, 1965) who assert that it runs counter to the demand for cultural pluralism and an appreciation of the disadvantaged person's own culture. Some aspects of their argument seem misdirected. Riessman was not unaware of the special culture of the disadvantaged; he used the designation "culturally deprived" because it conveyed some of the difficulties the poor have with the dominant culture.

Government projects at the lower levels, viz., "Head Start" for pre-schoolers (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, 1969) and Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, no date) for elementary schools, will not be discussed in this paper. For an evaluation, the interested reader is referred to the cited publications. The present interest was centered instead on higher education for the disadvantaged.

At the present time the main thrust of the federal government's involvement in aiding college-age disadvantaged youth is represented by the Upward Bound projects; which attempt to introduce disadvantaged students to the college environment by immersing them in ten-week summer sessions at the universities and by providing guidance during their remaining period of high school attendance. It is thus a strategy of transition designed to encourage more of the disadvantaged to enter college and to increase the likelihood that they will make a favorable adjustment upon entering.

Apart from federal funding and an evaluation of Upward Bound, there is the separate question of evaluating efforts initiated by the universities themselves, of determining how well disadvantaged students have performed after being enrolled in college.

Upward Bound, and the disadvantaged student's performance in college thus emerge as two rubrics under which the topic of higher education for the disadvantaged can be explored.

I. Upward Bound

Upward Bound began as a nationwide program in June, 1966 under the sponsorship of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Control later shifted to the United States Office of Education. By 1969, 26,000 high school students were involved but there has still not been any official comprehensive evaluation of the program (Bybee, 1969).

Soon after Upward Bound's inception a number of progress reports appeared, but most studies do not present evaluation data, that is, much of their information is in the form of rhetoric" (McDill, McDill, & Sprehe, 1969, p. 34). The following series of brief reviews[2] (listed alphabetically by author) is intended to give some indication of the level of progress reported thus far.

Billings (1968) emphasized that novel approaches are more important than novel subjects in teaching the disadvantaged. United States History can be taught with a twelve-string guitar and folk ballads rather than a text. In order to illustrate probability theory the classroom was turned into a simulated Las Vegas casino -- and "the students learned."

[2]The studies are summarized in Appendix I, p. 43

Boney (1967) discussed the Upward Bound program at the University of Illinois. He reported that the students didn't notice details; their writing was flat and they had difficulty detecting similarities and differences. The latter defect was undoubtedly associated with low analogy test scores. Particular notice was taken of their deficiencies in speech; the disadvantaged tended to use approximations in their communications, lacking in exactness. For example, they couldn't describe an object, such as a table, except in the grossest terms. Reiterating Karon's view (1958), Boney suggests that the victim of poverty finds his environment so depressing that he does not really wish to look at it too closely. Another observation concerning these students was their feeling of debasement, their deferential attitude. To counter this impediment, the author recommended that we reward assertive behavior. To accomplish this end he suggested that role playing and discussions might be helpful.

Brown's (1967) Upward Bound study was based on one hundred and twenty tenth graders involved in Upward Bound at Southwest State Teachers College, 75% of whom were Mexican-Americans, 15% Negro, and 10% Caucasians. College upper-classmen lived in dormitories with the Upward Bound students and served as counsellors in the ratio of 1 to 12, a source of contact and support which apparently was appreciated.

Courses were given in study skills, communication skills, current issues, and mathematics. The Current Issues course was rated the most popular, followed by Study Skills. On an effective study test the students entered the program at the 30th percentile, but later scored at the 80th percentile on a second administration. On the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes, which provides a measurement of motivation to use study skills, the students went from the 65th to the 90th percentile after six weeks.

Bybee (1969) reported on an Upward Bound program at Colorado State College during the summers of 1968 and 1969, in which 18 Upward Bound students took up to nine quarter-hours of college classes. He focussed specifically on a course in earth science in which he compared the performance of Upward Bound and non-Upward Bound students enrolled in the same class. There were three lectures a week for ten weeks, with movies, optional laboratory discussions and field trips. All students took two examinations before and after the course; a comprehensive earth science examination given by the Psychological Corporation and a Test in Understanding Science (Form W), offered by the Educational Testing Service. An analysis of covariance adjusted for differences in the initial scores of the two groups and it was found that there was no significant difference between the posttest scores of the Upward Bound and regular students. This is a remarkable finding, not only because it might have been presumed that the Upward Bound students would have been somewhat poorer in performance than the students already matriculated by the university, but also because the Upward Bound group was a high school sample, younger and presumably of weaker background than the college students with whom they were compared.

In Granowsky's (1969) Upward Bound study at Marist College, Poughkeepsie, New York, half of the students were white; there were no tests, although there were evaluation reports. The students could read anything. During the six-week summer session, many read, "Raisin in the Sun," and "Lord of the Flies." Mechanically, many left as weak as they came in. The prevalence of such phrases as "I ain't got nothing" was unchanged. But the author believed they were turned on -- they would seek out books and write to express honest feelings. No evidence was given, however, to support the impression.

One hundred percent of the first Upward Bound class of Marist College placed in a college or other program of post-high school education. At the end of the first year, 83% of the students were still in attendance, two were on the Dean's List and set to return for the sophomore class. The author affirmed the importance of warm relationships.

Herson (1968) presented an account of 30 male Upward Bound students taught during the summer of 1966 at The University of Maryland. Twenty-five Negroes and five whites, the students were matched against a control group of 30 non-participants, on such variables as age, race, IQ, and previous semester GPA. Responding to a questionnaire, the experimental group preferred professional and white-collar occupations while the controls chose blue-collar occupations. To the question, "say you were promised a job, what would deter you?", the students in both experimental and control groups indicated that not having their mother's approval was a more significant deterrent than not having their father's approval. The Upward Bound group appeared more willing to complete requirements for college, to put in long hours and take qualifying examinations.

For example, before the start of the Upward Bound program, the Upward Bound students responded to an instrument containing 18 items. The eighteen items represented hypothetical deterrents in relation to a question which asked the respondent to indicate what would stop him from taking a good paying job with high prestige and good chances for promotion. The items were ranked in order of their deterrent value, the lower the ranking the more formidable the barrier. The first item involved having to complete college in order to get the job. The experimental group, at pretest, ranked this item as "7" out of the 18 items, but after the program it was seen as far less of an impediment ("14"). The control group shifted less upon retest, moving from "3" to "6"; for them, having to complete college remained one of the greater deterrents.

Hopkins (1969) studied Upward Bound at Wayne State University. The university continued to maintain contact with the Upward Bound students during their freshman year. It was noted that the vast majority of Upward Bound students go on to college, and that 75% of those who do so return for their sophomore year.

Jordan (1967a) in the first of two articles on Upward Bound at Indiana State University described a program involving 80 high school students. There was a pre-service orientation period for Upward Bound instructors, in which the teachers participated in sessions basically devoted to self-criticism. It was pointed out that teachers typically spent too much time on trivia, such as chewing gum and long hair and too little time on crucial issues with students such as those who were likely to participate in Upward Bound. It was felt that there was a need to focus on hidden talent, increasing the motive to learn by high rapport. Avoiding unnecessary correction of behavior, it was suggested that praise be employed liberally and that the material be made more relevant to the student's experience.

In a second article, Jordan (1967b) reported that instructors in the disadvantaged student program felt that the main achievement was in awakening new interests, increasing the level of aspiration and motivation to continue in school. On the first two days of the program, all of the Upward Bound students took six batteries of the Differential Aptitude Test, consisting of verbal reasoning, numerical ability, language usage and grammar, mechanical reasoning, space relations, and abstract reasoning. At the end of eight weeks, students took an alternate form of the test. Of the sixty one students who completed both forms, five went down in percentile rank, but the average gain was 12 percentile ranks. Employing a Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed-Ranks Test, a significant p value of .01 was obtained. This indicates that the number of gains on the aptitude test significantly exceeded the number of losses. Further, using the Dymond Adjustment Inventory, a Wilcoxon test again showed gains in a positive direction; in this instance, a more favorable self-image emerged following Upward Bound participation.

The most extensive study of Upward Bound took place at Rutgers University (Lang & Hopp, 1967). It compared the results at Rutgers with a 10% sample of 18,530 Upward Bound students. There were thus 1,853 Upward Bound students in the national sample and 136 in Rutgers Upward Bound. (The national sample was later summarized by Hunt & Hardt, 1969). Changes were measured in three periods: a) summer change--the impact of the campus summer experience, b) the academic year change, the follow-up covering the period from the end of the summer to the spring of the following year, and c) the total experience, which covered from June to the spring of the following year.

Motivation for college was assessed with the use of a story completion test, an indirect measure. There w[illegible] significant positive changes associated with each period of time for the Rutgers sample. The national sample, on the other hand, almost invariably (20 out of 21 programs) increased during the summer, but in only 11 of the programs was there an increase in the other periods as well.

A direct measure used to measure motivation for college centered on the perceived importance of college graduation. Students rated the importance of graduation on a five-point scale. Rutgers Upward Bound showed positive changes for the summer followed by significant decreases during the year. The national sample presented a comparable pattern.

Similarly, a question on the likelihood of college graduation led to fluctuating response, increases during the summer, decreases after the summer. The authors suggest that the drop reflects the negative influence implicit in the students' return to their homes and high school on their attitude toward college.

Posner (1968) cited in McDill, McDill & Sprehe (1969) also took note of the post-summer drop in his analysis of Upward Bound. He is said to have suggested a more sinister hypothesis: high school teachers might have tended to give lower grades to returning Upward Bound enrollees as if to penalize them for trying to surmount the educational deficiencies of their high school classes, an effort which may have been regarded by the teachers as a veiled criticism of their teaching competence.

Other measures used in the Rutgers study were: self-evaluations of intelligence (students rated the concept "myself" on a semantic differential's dumb-smart scale), interpersonal flexibility (agreement on such items as, "after you get to know people, most of them fit into a type"), self-esteem, degree of internal control, non-alienation, and future orientation.

To summarize the attitude changes noted: at the end of the summer, of the nine Rutgers primary change measures, eight showed a significant increase. The lone exception was "future orientation." Of the eight measures that increased during the summer, five decreased during the academic year. These were: importance of graduation; possibility of graduation; self-evaluation of intelligence; internal control; non-alienation. The first two measures showed significant decreases. The Rutgers sample provided more favorable effect attributable to the program than did many of the institutions in the national sample.

In addition to the data on attitude, an analysis of grade changes following return to high school in the fall, was also undertaken.

Each Upward Bound student was matched with a high school student not in Upward Bound of the same sex, age, and nearly equal June GPA. The GPA, June to February, moved slightly downward in the 20 target populations but the decrease was greater for the controls. By way of contrast, the Rutgers Upward Bound sample showed significant increases:

	EXPERIMENTAL		CONTROL	
	June	February	June	February
MALE				
National Sample	2.02	1.93	1.97	1.87
Rutgers Upward Bound	1.64	1.84	1.67	1.51
FEMALE				
National Sample	2.37	2.32	2.36	2.34
Rutgers Upward Bound	2.16	2.32	2.10	2.15

In view of Upward Bound's apparent salutary effect it is instructive to note that 70% of the Rutgers sample went on to post-secondary school education.

It should be observed that while the Rutgers sample showed an improvement in high school GPA, following return, the other colleges in the national sample did not. As indicated above Posner found no grade increase either. Nor did Hunt & Hardt (1966; 1967; 1967-68). Hunt & Hardt's attitudinal measures, on the other hand, seemed to show positive increments. In the Rutgers sample, it will be recalled that while GPA went up, favorable attitudes decreased upon return to high school. If the return to high school represents the renewal of a negative learning atmosphere allegedly reflected in the reappearance of unfavorable attitudes, why does this not lead in the Rutgers sample to unfavorable grades as well?

The answer to this question cannot be found in the Rutgers report, nor is it completely clear why Rutgers should have engendered forces stimulating GPA gains while other institutions did not, apart from the intimation that the Rutgers approach was more vigorously pursued, their program more intensive than most.

A report by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (1968) contained information on 156 institutions' experience with the disadvantaged. Some Upward Bound projects were included. For example, the College of St. Elizabeth indicated that 32 high school seniors involved in its Upward Bound program graduated from high school. Of these, 27 gained entrance into a two- or four-year college. Before Upward Bound, one couldn't expect to get more than two to six seniors into a college from a class of such a size.

A novel and altogether different approach is implicit in a program operating outside of conventional Upward Bound channels, "Project College Bound" at Pasadena City College (Riess, 1967). The project operated as a financial assistance program for high school graduates. College bound disadvantaged youth were paid $1.40 an hour for class hours and related summer work.

Rushmore & Scope (1969) report on Upward Bound at Hofstra University during the summer of 1968 which took in 98 students. Sixty required special work in reading. Although the students were in grades ten through twelve, their reading level was at the fifth to seventh grade.

The authors cited the program's use of "individual happenings and writer's workshops seven hours a week." There was also a study of dramas, such as "Raisin in the Sun," read aloud and taped in class.

The Triggs Diagnostic Reading Test Survey indicated that the students did most poorly in inference and higher comprehension skills. The main idea was to change attitudes toward self and education, not actually to prepare academically. The students were seen to be reading more but no data was presented to substantiate this observation.

Wisconsin State University (Silverstein, 1968) worked with 150 students during the summer of 1966. The teachers reported some progress, but much work was needed on the fundamental skills of reading, writing and listening. Some gained, some wanted approval from people who cared about their work.

Sinclair (1968) gives a description of the Upward Bound program at Bellarmine College and at the University of Louisville. Project personnel maintained contact with Upward Bound students after they returned to high school. Sinclair writes that although the students had not increased their grades there were significant changes in attitudes and behavior. No data are given on how the changes in attitude were measured or whether in fact, the changes were inferred from impressionistic accounts. The utility of the program, is evident however, in the observation that of the 16 high school seniors who completed the first Upward Bound cycle, 11 went on to college.

In the articles reviewed the general evaluation of Upward Bound has been favorable. Most investigators reported the students' satisfaction with the opportunity offered them. There was frequent mention of a positive change in the students' attitude toward college. With respect to performance during the summer program, some writers reported evidence of learning or improved skills, others admitted to having no data. After the summer, upon return to high school, there was some evidence of a decline in both motivation and high school grades, compared to levels of motivation and performance existing prior to Upward Bound participation.

This has been attributed by some to renewed contact with a discouraging school environment. The Rutgers study, a notable exception, reports high school GPA gains for the Upward Bound group, following the summer at college.

By far the most dramatic indication of the beneficial effect of Upward Bound arises out of the frequent mention that Upward Bound participants entered college at a greater rate than might be expected from individuals in their circumstances, sometimes at a greater rate than even the general student population. Shea (1967) calculated that 80% of Upward Bound registrants eventually enroll in college and 50% of those who do so do not dropout.

The exact college dropout rate reported varied from investigator to investigator since, writing at different times, they presumably had access to slightly different available Upward Bound statistics. Glickstein (1969), reviewing the period 1965-1968, stated that 65-80% of Upward Bound high school graduates entered college since 1965. Of these, 74-82% remained in, a better retention picture than that offered by Shea.

Billings (1968) broke down the dropout rates by program years: In the 1965 Upward Bound class, 12% of college enrollees dropped out as freshman, 21% as sophomores. The figures for 1966 were comparable: 13% dropped out as freshman, 18% as sophomores. In 1967, only 8% dropped out as freshman, (sophomore dropout rates were not yet available).

Bybee (1969), using what is apparently later data, made normative comparisons. Citing an OEO Bulletin by Robert Billings (4/19/68) he said that 80% of the 1965 Upward Bound class was admitted to college and that 57% of these students made it to their junior year. Nationally, 62% of college entrants maintain matriculation to the junior year. In 1966, 78% of the Upward Bound enrolled in college, 72% stayed in as sophomores, a figure only 3% below the national average. Summarizing, Bybee stated that Upward Bound students enter college at a higher rate than the national average (80% vs. 65%) and are only slightly behind in a comparison of the number still enrolled with their non-program counterparts.

Whether the heightened college involvement is due to increasing motivation for college, opportunity for familiarization with the college environment, the development of skills essential to improved grades, better test-taking skill and study habits, or the operation of some as yet unidentified selective factor, cannot be determined at this time.

It must be pointed out that although the evaluation was generally favorable, certain negative aspects have been noted by various writers. These included the opposition of some school personnel, occasional behavior problems or "acting-out," and the

widespread deficiencies in the use of the English language.[3] Some have not regarded the apparent language difficulties as a genuine handicap, even suggesting that American blacks have their own language, a second language with its own truly systematic grammar (Stewart 1969).[4] It has been argued that encouraging black usage of their idiom will instill pride and eventual mastery of other subjects.

An important consideration would be to use this grammar correctly once becoming conscious of its existence. But even were one willing to grant, philologically, that a "second language" for blacks exists, it would seem to the present reviewer that a thoroughgoing training in conventional English would not be contraindicated.

II. The Disadvantaged Student in College

Turning to a more generalized appraisal of the disadvantaged student's performance at the university, a selection of reports devoted to this topic follows.[5]

One of the earliest attempts to assess compensatory education programs in the colleges was undertaken by Gordon and Wilkerson (1966). During the spring of 1964, a six-page questionnaire was mailed to 2,093 institutions listed for the 50 states and District of Columbia in the United States Office of Education's Education Directory, 1962-63: Higher Education. Reports were received from 610 institutions of higher education (28.6% of the 2,131 colleges and universities in the country during 1963-64). The authors considered the sample return as representative. Of the 610 institutions, 37% reported that they were conducting a variety of compensatory practices--

> special recruiting and admissions procedures, financial aid, pre-college preparatory courses in college, special curriculums, counseling, tutoring, and other practices; .... (p. 125)

---

[3]See for example, Warden's (1968) account, where faults catalogued included--slurring of words, omitting sounds as in the phrase, "hep yo sef" for "help your self"; and letter transposition as in "bofe" for both.

[4]Clift (1970) has also argued that Negro dialect involves a genuine grammar, and that many apparent mistakes in language are not sheer carelessness. Thus, according to the dialect, the phrase, "my mother, she be working", means she has worked in the past and is still working.

[5]The studies are summarized in Table 2, p. 45

while 63% of the institutions reported that they were not conducting any compensatory practices. About half of the institutions with compensatory practices were assisting fewer than 30 disadvantaged students, (the authors go on to state that in subsequent summer programs a number of these institutions involved groups of from 40 to 100 or more disadvantaged youths). Information on ethnicity was scanty but in reports from 131 institutions it appeared that the disadvantaged students assisted were mainly white in 60% of the institutions, mainly Negro in 27% and mainly Asian, American Indian, or Mexican-American in the remaining 13% of the institutions.

Regarding the extent of compensatory practices, although 224 schools reported such practices it was estimated that only about 50 of these had broad compensatory programs. As a general observation, the investigators stressed that while the interest in compensatory practice has increased, there has been little systematic evaluation.

In a later survey Egerton (1968) set out to determine what

> some of the predominantly white, four-year colleges and universities are doing to make higher education available to low-income and minority-group students who lack the credentials--but not the qualities--to succeed in college (p. 7).

Questionnaires were sent to 215 selected colleges and universities widely considered to be the ones most likely to have formal programs for high-risk students. Visits were made to a dozen campuses from Massachussetts to California, and telephone interviews were conducted with officials at 10 other institutions.

Seventy-five percent of the institutions queried responded. Fifty-three percent of those responding reported some measure of involvement in what could be called high risk activity, while the other seventy-six reported no involvement at all. Egerton estimates that no more than 20 or 25 of the institutions drew extensively from the array of possible resources for the disadvantaged. Recalling Gordon & Wilkerson's estimate of about 50 extensive programs out of a pool of 610, it can be seen that Egerton's proportion is very similar (20-25 out of 215).

It should be noted that throughout his report, Egerton uses the term "high risk" where others, attempting to describe the same sample, might simply have referred to the "disadvantaged." Egerton defines high risk students as those

> whose lack of money, low standardized test scores, erratic high school records and race/class/cultural characteristics, taken together, place them at a disadvantage in competition with the preponderant mass of students in the colleges they wish to enter. They are students who are seen as long-shot prospects for success, but who demonstrate some indefinable and unmeasurable quality--motivation, creativity, resilience, leadership, personality or whatever--which an admissions office might interpret as a sign of strength offsetting the customary indicators of probable success (p. 7).

The programs probed by Egerton, then, were expected to be involved with seriously disadvantaged youth, not merely those with a minor or easily overcome deficit; presumably those who would give a university more than a moment of hesitation before being admitted.

Sixty percent of the responding public institutions said they had no high risk programs of any sort; while two thirds of the private ones reported some involvement. The reasons for having high risk programs most frequently mentioned were: tradition of public service, a sense of social responsibility, the desire to have a diversity of races, classes, cultures and abilities in the student body. The reasons most often given for limited or no involvement were: lack of funds, enrollment pressures, political worries, fear of lowering standards and lack of faculty support.

Standardized tests, such as the SAT, were frequently cited as being "inadequate," or biased measurements of probable success for the high risk students. One reason for the inadequacy may lie in the lack of test-wiseness on the part of disadvantaged test takers. Plaut (1966), for example, has noted while testing high school blacks on the verbal section of the SCAT, that many would complete the first five or six items and if the seventh were difficult spend the remaining time working on that one item. This view finds support elsewhere, but also challengers. Dyer (1969) has referred to this controversy in his article in the Encyclopedia of Educational Research. He mentions Clark & Plotkin's estimate that SAT's fail to predict the college performance of Negro students but feels their findings "inconclusive and possibly misleading" (p. 40). The reasons for his judgment are not elaborated beyond the phrase, "a number of uncontrolled variables" (p. 40). Two unpublished studies are cited which use SAT and High School GPA combinations as predictors and find them adequate in predominantly Negro colleges (Roberts, 1962 and Stanley et al, 1966). The only other study cited was by Cleary (1966)

whose mixed results were critized by Dyer on sampling grounds. Negroes are as predictable as whites, writes Boney (1966); but tests have "tended to measure what students have learned rather than what they can learn" (p. 352), write Wisdom & Shaw (1969). Also, Brown and Russell (1964) have examined ACE test scores for 66 honor graduates at North Carolina College between 1954 and 1959. Fifty-eight would not have been admitted if the college had set the ACE cut-off point at the 50th percentile. In between both camps, Miller and O'Connor (1969) found "a positive relationship between the SAT and academic achievement for women, but not for men."

The issue is obscured by the failure to clearly separate out the predictor variables, SAT and high school GPA and to predict separately from them, rather than composites, as some have done. But in a larger sense, there is a more basic difficulty. If the SAT predicts well it means that high SAT scores should be considered in admitting any student, disadvantaged or otherwise. If the SAT predicts poorly, particularly for the disadvantaged, it may mean that some low scorers end up with reasonably high or at least adequate college GPA's and therefore the SAT should not be used as an admission standard. The real issue may lie elsewhere. Even if it were granted that the SAT is an effective predictor, it might only mean that with traditional admission requirements most blacks "will not make it" in college. And perhaps they might not, in a traditional college, with traditional curricula, with no special remedial services or summer preparation, etc. Perhaps those investigators who are wary of the SAT's effectiveness have lingered over data from colleges where special efforts have been made, and consequently some disadvantaged, with low SAT's, have succeeded where normally they might not have done so. Thus, it is important to consider what has been done, what could be done in any given educational setting which would help the slow learner overcome his initial impediment. When such efforts have been undertaken, and have been elaborated in a great many imaginative and diverse ways, it might then be appropriate to ask, can we, should we, is it still necessary to use the SAT as a predictive device? Until then, discussions about the special predicative efficacy of the SAT and other standardized tests for the disadvantaged, will continue to confound the properties of the test, abilities of the students, and characteristics of compensatory programs or the lack thereof.

A large part of Egerton's report was devoted to a detailed examination of some of the more prominent high risk programs. An extraction of some of the information contained in his survey now follows.

A) Programs in Public Institutions

Southern Illinois' branch campus in East St. Louis launched "the Experiment in Higher Education." which attempted to produce, in two calendar years, a group of students prepared to compete at the junior level on the main campuses of Southern Illinois University, or elsewhere. A typical student in the program was

> an unemployed 19-year old Negro male with a high school diploma and a 10th grade reading level,...(from)...a broken home...and where family income...amounted to $3,500 a year (p. 21).

The program relied on individual and small-group instruction in reading, writing and speaking, skill clinics, where remedial and compensatory work was done, programmed instruction and more conventional courses.

On the basis of test scores and high school GPA's, the counseling office had predicted that the group would make average grades of 2.2 (a very low D on the five-point grading system), that twenty-four students would be below D, and that only one student would receive a C or better. Of the 74 still in the program (26 dropped out), 65 have made averages above the figure predicted for them, 30 were at the C level, only 5 were below D.

Describing the program for the disadvantaged at the University of Wisconsin Egerton wrote:

> ...without lowering its standards, changing its requirements for degrees or even altering the rules for academic probation and dismissal, the university has accepted a group of students who were strangers to the campus culture and poor bets for success, and achieved a better retention record with them than with the freshman class as a whole. (p. 27)

There is some wavering however since

> plenty of problems remain. There is not yet enough evidence to conclude that most of these students will raise and keep their grades above the C level and go on to earn degrees (p. 27).

Egerton noted that "the state university system that appears to be 'getting with it' more than any other is California's (p. 28)." The Berkeley and Los Angeles campuses of the University of California have actively recruited low income students, have assisted them in getting admitted, giving them full financial support and have provided them with tutoring to enhance their chances for success.

Of the 424 students reported to have entered the program, 17% had left, half of these for academic reasons. The comparable statistic for dropouts among all freshman at Berkeley is 25%. Seventy percent of the disadvantaged surviving the freshman year were all reported in good academic standing (C or better grades), with 30% on probation.

The University of Oregon reported on an enrollment of 130 disadvantaged students out of a total enrollment of 10,000 undergraduates. Among the disadvantaged, there was approximately an equal number of whites, Negroes, Indians and Mexicans. About half of the group dropped out or flunked out before the year was over. Dr. Pearl, the director, affirmed that the program had been only minimally effective, due to the institution's failure to properly prepare the students. In addition, many faculty members have resented the disadvantaged students and have not been trained to work with them. In some instances, there have been clashes between the faculty and directors of the high risk programs.

The University of Michigan enrolled 327 high risk students, 85% of whom were Negroes. The first year dropout flunkout rate was recorded at 45% compared to 20% for the freshman class at large. There was no offering of special classes or courses. The risk the university is willing to take is not great, since it indicated that it was seeking disadvantaged students who have "at least a B average high-school record and other indicators of probable success in college (p. 33)."

Virginia Polytechnic Institute in Blacksburg, "the only state university in the South reporting a high risk effort of any size" enrolled 49 students (two-thirds Negro) recruited through the university's own Upward Bound program and other sources. Although Egerton again uses his usual designation "high risk" here, it is questionable whether Virginia Polytechnic Institute's disadvantaged can be so described for

> "like Michigan and a number of other universities, Virginia Tech is trying to broaden the... makeup of its student body; it is not taking students so ill-prepared for college that they constitute a high risk for the institution (p. 35)."

The City University of New York's SEEK program was also reviewed by Egerton but his account of this program will not be given here since it will be covered at a later point.

Michigan State enrolled 66 Negroes who were considered a risk. Five students made all F's the first quarter; thirty-two were doing quite well, twenty-seven were merely "hanging on" and two had dropped out for personal reasons. By all standard predictions, these disadvantaged students would have ranked below the rest of the freshman class.

The University of Connecticut admitted twenty high-risk students (mostly Negroes). Their SAT scores were as much as 280 points below the class median. Their high school records were erratic, economically they were at the poverty level. But the desire was there and early results indicated that most would succeed.

B) <u>Programs in Private Institutions</u>

Antioch submitted information on 49 disadvantaged students admitted under what it calls the Program for Interracial Education. Only three of the 49 students had dropped out.

Wesleyan University has admitted both high risk and non-academically disadvantaged students consistent with its practice of reserving space for "special minority group admissions." In 1967, all 39 new students survived the first semester, five were on probation but none of the five was considered originally as being a real high risk. Despite these apparently good results "there is a reluctance at Wesleyan to make optimistic claims for the high risk program." One professor said that what he tried "simply didn't work out" and he saw the need for more adjustments.

Harvard has had a risk gamble program for over a decade. The University has noted the toughness, sparkle, resilience, flexibility and energy of their high-risk students. Eighty to eighty-five percent of them have graduated from their classes, almost as well as Harvard as a whole. Not knowing that they ranked 400 or 500 points below the SAT class norm, they still performed about as well as the others.

Mercer University, Georgia, reported having 48 disadvantaged students, with relaxed requirements in effect. The attrition rate is 18 to 20%, which is the same as the whole freshman class.

Cornell identified 160 students as disadvantaged (95% Negroes). Only five had dropped out, at the time of writing; no special courses were offered.

New York University took in 60 high risk students in 1965, only 15 of whom were still in attendance at the time of report. Although it was expected that the program would lead to the BA degree in five years, the program suffered the loss of three-quarters of its students half-way through the experimentation. Eleven dropouts were reported to have gone on to Southern Illinois University.

Northeastern University in Boston admitted twenty-five high risk students in a work-study program in 1963. Of the twenty-five students that year, 13 were expected to graduate. The group averaged 100 to 150 points below the class mean on the SAT. University officials regarded the program as highly successful mainly because of the work-study program.

Concluding his review of higher education for high risk students Egerton commented that the

> bright and able student who is too poor to afford college...is being sought by a growing number of colleges, but those whose past performance has been blunted by past discrimination and poverty represent a risk that very few colleges are willing to take (p. 49).

Hood (1969) presented a summary report on progress for the disadvantaged in New York State. One hundred sixty seven schools in New York State were contacted of which 134 reported back. Sixty-four percent of the colleges and universities reported programs for the disadvantaged. Forty-two of the programs served only high-risk students, fourteen served the average or better disadvantaged student and fourteen served both high-risk and better students. Since the preponderance of programs in New York State seemed to be willing to direct their efforts toward high-risk students, there appears to be a contradiction of Egerton's statement that few universities are concerned with frank high-risks, (assuming that the definition of high risk involves handicaps of equal severity in both reports).

An important question on Hood's questionnaire was: "Does the program appear to be fulfilling the function it was intended for? Fifty-one of the institutions responding to this question replied "Yes," one said "No," one said "yes and no."

In response to another question, ninety percent of those schools responding thought that the faculty accepted the program with similar percentages for administrators and other staff. Eighty-nine percent of the students in the program thought it was adequate, as did

seventy-nine percent of other students. The main reason schools gave for limited participation in programs for the disadvantaged was shortage of money.

In still another survey, a report by the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools (1968), contains 156 exhibits on programs for the disadvantaged. To mention just a few: Duquesne -- all disadvantaged students had completed their freshman year.

Barnard reported that while some of the special students were not doing better than C work, "an amazing number were doing extremely well." Parenthetically, one can wonder about the extent of Barnard's exultation and their definition of disparagement, since the "disadvantaged," paradoxically, have to present a very strong high school record which shows "marked achievement."

Colgate writes that "admission criteria are flexible, recognizing that standardized tests in particular are of doubtful validity for students with a disadvantaged background." The school speaks with enthusiasm but no measurements are given.

The most recent review of the literature on higher education for the disadvantaged (Monlouis 1970) cites no further surveys affording detailed information on specific experiences. Thus, reviews by Gordon (1967) and Williams (1969) are basically general commentaries. They supply no new data. Gordon's article also contains an annotated bibliography of some of the literature on the disadvantaged.

Extracting from Monlouis' review, Williams is mentioned as having concluded that

> (1) the educational deficiencies of high-risk students should not be concealed from them as later discovery... may cause hostility; (2) compensatory programs would be more effective if high-risk students were taught and housed with regular students, provided with sufficient funds...trained in money management, and allowed to earn part of their support; (3) the relationship between instructors and high-risk students needs to be more personal, and (4) counseling should be voluntary rather than mandatory (p. 2).

Subsequently, Gordon is cited as having noted that "high school academic averages combined with teacher estimates are equal to, or better than, test scores in predicting college achievement (p. 2)."

It is not clear from Monlouis or Gordon's original article exactly upon what data the statement above is based. The assertion follows, of course, the general attack on the use of standardized tests mentioned earlier. It may be noted that the phrase "predicting college achievement" may mean anything from subjective teacher evaluations, to first semester GPA's to, theoretically, four-year cumulative GPA's and graduation rates. On the latter, there is practically no information.

Whiting's (1968) many recommendations are listed next. These include

> outright grants rather than work or loan study packages,...guidance and direction that covers both personality and behavior problems... open...enrolling...and...efforts to produce the kind of teachers needed to work with the disadvantaged at the secondary level, (p. 2).

Finally, mention is made of Gordon & Thomas's forthcoming survey (previewed in Gordon & Thomas 1969) of disadvantaged students from approximately 3,000 U.S. institutions. This study will represent a great expansion of similar previous surveys by Gordon & Wilkerson, and Egerton, already discussed.

In addition to surveys and reviews of the literature, there are reports of individual college programs for the disadvantaged. Two of these, the SEEK and College Discovery Program will be considered first, in detail; the rest will then be presented in alphabetical order, by author.

The College Discovery Program has been intensively analyzed in a series of reports by the College Discovery Program Research and Evaluation Unit of the City University of New York (Dispenzieri, Giniger & Friedman, 1968; Dispenzieri, Giniger & Weinheimer, 1968; Dispenzieri & Giniger, 1969a; Dispenzieri & Giniger, 1969b; Dispenzieri & Tormes, 1969; Dispenzieri, Weinheimer & Giniger, 1969; Dispenzieri, Giniger, Weinheimer, & Chase, 1970a; Dispenzieri, Giniger, Weinheimer, & Chase, 1970b).

The College Discovery Program was designed

> to provide higher education for socially disadvantaged students of intellectual promise whose high school scholastic averages, aptitude test scores and personal finances preclude admission under regular procedures to baccalaureate programs of the City University of New York (Dispenzieri & Giniger, 1969a, p. 1).

The Program's goal was to have students complete their first two years of college work at a community college and then to transfer to a senior college to complete their progress toward the baccalaureate degree. To assist the students, the Program utilized intensive remedial courses at the community colleges in the summer preceding entrance, and during the academic year, special counseling and financial assistance, and if necessary, tutoring during the freshman year.

The students were selected on the basis of nominations and evaluations from principals, letters of recommendation from teachers, high school transcripts and test records. Academic and economic criteria changed as the Program progressed, but in some years the applicant had to have completed at least 12 of the 16 high school credits normally required for college admission, and economically, an income of $1,700 per family member per year was used as a maximum cut-off point.

When the Program began in 1964, enrollments were taken at only two community colleges, Bronx and Queensborough, but the following year, students were also enrolled in Kingsborough, Manhattan and New York City community colleges. Staten Island Community College was added in 1968.

From 1964 to 1968, 2,325 students entered the College Discovery Program. Forty-five percent of these students were black, one-fourth were Puerto Rican, one-sixth were USA-born whites. The remainder were foreign-born blacks and whites, Spanish-speaking non-Puerto-Ricans and Asians. Slightly more than half were males. Two-thirds had academic high school diplomas, the remainder -- general, vocational, commercial and technical diplomas. The mean high school average was about 75.

In 1968, the Program was divided into two prongs. The Program in effect from 1964-67 was maintained as Prong I. Prong II students attended special curricula in high school to prepare them for college, following which they were guaranteed admission to a senior or community college of the City University of New York.

An analysis of the 1968 group showed background differences between the two prongs. Prong II earned many more academic diplomas than Prong I, but the 1968 Prong I group was markedly lower in the production of academic diplomas than College Discovery Program students in previous years. Prong I had also experienced major gains in female Puerto Rican and black enrollment. The authors believed that less whites were applying to Prong I because they thought it was predominantly a black and Puerto Rican program.

Prongs I and II considered together were compared with regular matriculants at the community colleges with respect to first semester GPA (Dispenzieri, Giniger, Weinheimer, & Chase, 1970a). The investigators found that "in almost all cases, performance of the regular matriculants was substantially superior" to that of College Discovery Program students. The GPA's of the Prong I students for the six colleges were, 1.88, 2.13, 1.56, 1.40, 1.89, and 1.41. Comparable first semester GPA's of regular students were all higher -- 2.01, 2.33, 2.12, 2.12, 2.10, 2.06, respectively. The overall Prong II GPA fell near the middle of the range of Prong I GPA's; there was thus no appreciable differences among the two College Discovery groups.

Unfortunately, aside from these statistics there appears to be no further comparisons of College Discovery with regular students. There are, instead, statements in the various reports, concerning absolute standing, i.e., dropout rates and GPA levels.

Thus we are told that twenty-three percent of the 1964 class and twenty-eight percent of the 1965 class completed community college by January, 1968, but are apparently not clearly informed about the comparable completion rate for regular students during that period. Presumably it would have been higher, if for no other reason than that the regular students take credits at a faster rate (Dispenzieri, Giniger, Weinheimer, & Chase, 1970a).

Eighty-eight percent of the community college graduates entered senior college by January, 1968, and several entered the military or took additional schooling. Ninety-four percent of those who entered senior college were still enrolled by spring, 1968. The mean senior college grade point average for 1964 College Discovery Program graduates was 2.46 (N=49) (between C and B); they earned 25.7 credits by January, 1968. The 1965 class had a mean senior college GPA of 1.91, (N=12) and earned a mean of about 12 credits by January, 1968. For both years combined, the GPA was 2.11.

It would have been useful to know what regular community college graduates obtained as a GPA for the same period as well as native juniors. Since the College Discovery graduates' GPA is around C or somewhat better, they cannot be said to be performing badly, however.

Attempts to analyze senior college data were undoubtedly limited by the small number of graduates who had entered senior college by 1969 or early 1970. In the near future, it might be expected that a larger pool of entering students will become available for comparisons.

ERIC

In April, 1966, after two years of the Program one half of the students had left. Questionnaires were sent out to both survivors and dropouts from the Program. One of the major findings was that dropouts tended to report family and personal problems more frequently than survivors.

One quarter of those who had left were in the military but it was not known whether they had been drafted. Among the other dropouts one half were attending school outside the Program, in most cases as part-time non-matriculants. A strong commitment to higher education was evident among both dropouts and survivors but especially survivors. Both groups were favorable to the Program, but sizeable proportions of the dropouts felt that their counsellors had not really understood their problems and had not really helped them. A majority of both felt that as a result of the Program they would be able to get a better job, understand national politics better, and give an intelligent talk on the problems of a foreign country. They also said that issues of right and wrong had become less clear-cut. The authors report that the sharpest difference between the survivors and the dropouts was in the number of hours they had studied per week while in school. The survivors reported studying much more than the dropouts.

Involved in the survey were 115 survivors and 116 dropouts. Of interest is the size of the return-rate; questionnaires were returned by 94 percent of the survivors and by 90 percent of the dropouts.

In April, 1969, there was a follow-up study of the 1965 entering class. This time there were 305 survivors, 224 dropouts. Seventy-eight percent of the survivors returned questionnaires, as did seventy-seven percent of the dropouts. Forty-three percent of the 529 students had dropped out, a better retention rate than the 1964 class. Schools vary. At NYC community college the withdrawal rate was similar to non-College Discovery Youth but at Bronx Community College it was much higher.

In addition to the College Discovery Program, the City University of New York sponsors the SEEK program, (mentioned by Egerton) which in many respects runs parallel to the former, but on the senior college rather than the junior college level.

> SEEK is an educational opportunity program offered by the City University of New York to high school graduates from poverty backgrounds. Students in SEEK have had inadequate academic training prior to college, and their initial college semesters are spent both remediatiating deficiencies and accumulating normal academic credits, (Dispenzieri, Giniger, Weinheimer & Chase, 1970b, p. 1).

SEEK has been described further by Berger (1968). An acronym for Search for Education, Elevation & Knowledge, the Program was first established at CCNY of the City University of New York in September, 1966, funded by the State Legislature and the City of New York. At the time of Berger's report there were 1,823 SEEK students, 1,544 full time. Ninety percent were Negro or Puerto Rican, mostly seventeen to twenty years of age. Some had been out of school for a few years, none met regular requirements. Only 11% had an academic high school diploma. For admission, they were required to have a 70 average in academic high school subjects, compared to an average of 85 for "regular" students. On the basis of placement tests they are assigned to classes reflecting their current level of achievement. Some go on with regular classes, but most have intensive remedial work in special SEEK classes which meet more hours that regular classes. Their work consists of a combination of college level and remedial work.

In the first term, SEEK students take at least one regular college course. For the first two years, they take courses fifteen to twenty hours a week for which there is no tuition fee. Books are free and needy students receive weekly stipends to cover expenses. There is also a residence hall for 100 students. SEEK students obtain matriculation status when they have amassed sixty credits with a C average, or thirty credits with a GPA of 2.75; or fifty credits with a GPA of 2.25. Once matriculated, the SEEK student is treated the same as a regular student.

English is taught as a second language; the student is encouraged to perceive his own dialect as a legitimate language system. A speech contest is reported where eight finalists were SEEK students and one SEEK student took second place. Berger submits that SEEK students, generally, are articulate and socially sophisticated.

In teaching English and Speech an interdepartmental approach is used; teachers of reading, speech and English use the same text.

"How does SEEK affect CCNY standards?" asks the author. It doesn't; the academically weak are separated from the rest of the student body. One hundred and ten students entered in September, 1965. Fifty-nine of this group were still in attendance. Ninety-one percent had earned at least a GPA of C, 18% a B, while they were enrolled for the most part with regularly matriculated day students.

Dispenzieri, Giniger, Weinheimer & Chase (1970b), compared the first semester performance of SEEK students and regular matriculants in the September, 1968 entering class. The data are based on 1,161 SEEK and 684 regular students. The SEEK and regular students were enrolled at the various centers of the City University of New York; Brooklyn, City, Hunter, Lehman, Queens and York colleges. In addition 362 students from University Center were included;

the Center has SEEK students only. The researchers found that in "almost all cases, performance of the regular matriculants was substantially superior to that of SEEK's, (p. 2)."

The superior first semester college GPA of regular students was evident in all institutions except Queens, where the SEEK GPA was slightly higher than regular students (2.76 vs. 2.62). The GPA's of the regular matriculants at the six colleges were C+ to B- (2.24 at York to 2.63 at City). It can be seen that Queens SEEK did very well indeed, better in fact, than regular students at any division of City University! At three other schools however, the SEEK GPA was below C (2.00). In evaluating grade differences, of course, it would be helpful to know whether the same grading standard has been applied in the teaching of the disadvantaged students. In the absence of information, one can only speculate as to whether instructors might not have been overly lenient.

Aside from the generally better first-semester performance of the regular students there is also evidence that they proceeded at a faster rate. Thus, the mean number of credits attempted by SEEK students ranged from 4.80 at City to 9.65 at Brooklyn, but regular matriculants enrolled almost uniformly in 14 or 15 credits, about twice as many as those enrolled in by SEEK's.

In view of the somewhat poorer performance of SEEK students, it is instructive to reflect on the responses to a questionnaire designed to elicit information of the college expectations of SEEK's and regular matriculants (Dispenzieri, Weinheimer & Giniger, 1969).

The questionnaire was administered to large samples of SEEK students and regular matriculants in senior college in the fall, 1968 entering class. It was found that both groups expected to engage in academically desirable study practices but SEEK's planned to study more. The regular students "seemed less concerned about preparing for courses and planned to rely more frequently on last-minute study (cramming), (p. v)." SEEK's also expected a closer faculty-student relationship and generally expected to find greater satisfaction in college. They also expected to get higher grades, but apparently this difference was not significant.

The reviewer is thus faced with an anomalous finding. SEEK's report more favorable expectations (which is prognostically hopeful) and receive poorer grades.[6] The authors do not elaborate

---

[6]Data for the College Discovery students reveal the same pattern. In a personal communication, Giniger (11/30/70) has indicated that further analyses of College Discovery data show interesting complications. Although the College Discovery students have higher expectation levels and lower grades than regular matriculants, <u>within</u> each group there is a positive relationship between expectation and grades. At present comparable data is not available for SEEK students.

on the possible reasons for this unsettling discrepancy. It is possible that SEEK's expectations are set too high in the first place, that their expectations are unrealistic, referrable to an intense drive of the disadvantaged to surmount a life of deprivation.

In this connection consider Antonovsky's (1967) study of ethnic differences in aspiration levels among elementary school students. He found that the aspirations of lower-class Negroes were relatively high, representing in some degree a disassociation from their actual position. This finding is borne out by Bayer & Boruch's (1969) study of black and white freshman entering four-year colleges. Black men were reported to have high expectations concerning their college future and black women more often expected to earn graduate degrees than did white women.

Returning to SEEK, it is also possible that as these overdrawn hopes come in to early contact with the demands of university life the contrast impairs a strong academic everyday performance. Or, it just may be that SEEK students are more conscious about "looking good." They claim they will study a great deal because they think that is what the examiner wishes to hear; the regular students, being more confident about their own ability express a more moderate or more reasonable inclination to study.

Finally, there exists the possibility that some of the regular students have actually "gotten by" in high school through cramming and general test-wiseness. It is not likely that many of the SEEK's have been successful with this tactic since their high school performance has been generally poor. The SEEK's, aware of their handicap may merely be emphasizing what they intuitively feel is the gateway to a success they never enjoyed in the secondary school -- hard work and a positive outlook toward the school experience. Some of the regular students on the other hand may be honestly reporting what has been actually reinforced for years, cramming and studying the last minute.

Gaier & Watts (1966) compared two colleges, one, MacCalester, a predominantly white church-related school and the other, Clark College, all Negro. The investigators sent out a questionnaire to 856 freshman in the two schools, 385 men, and 471 women. The instrument consisted of a set of paired comparisons, asking the student to indicate which member of each pair he considered most important, e.g., grades versus extra-curricular activities, grades versus spending time with friends. The Negro school attached more importance to grades in every comparison except one (concerning dating) where there was no difference in response.

Hawkins (1969) describes a speech program in an experimental college for the disadvantaged at Southern Illinois University. A greater than usual permissiveness characterized the program with respect to both the selection of topics and the modes of communication considered appropriate. The students were encouraged to communicate the meaning of the poems they read with their bodies -- with drum sticks rather than oral reading, behaving physically rather than verbally. The poorer students apparently liked the activities better than words. Also, with the use of film models, the students could learn by observing and imitating.

Hedegard & Brown (1969) offer data on the outlook and behavior of Negro and white freshman at a large public university. The white students comprised a random sample of white freshman who entered the university's liberal arts college in the fall of 1966. The Negro sample was randomly selected from students brought into the college as "disadvantaged minority group" students, who appeared capable of academic success, but who required educational assistance and financial aid. The investigators used four instruments: Peterson's College Student Questionnaire (part I); Pace's College and University Environment Scales (CUES), the Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI), and Brown, Kahn & O'Connor's Class of 1970 Questionnaire.

The Negro sample seemed to hold "more concrete, tangible, simplistic conceptions of the world" than the white sample, as if they "intended to use their education to acquire skills...necessary to deal with the world as a concrete...place (p. 135)." In this respect it is not surprising that their profiles resembled those of engineering and nursing students more than those of white liberal arts students.

Coupled with this practical orientation was a sense of detachment, "a reluctance to become involved with other people" -- an attempt to keep the self under tight control by bottling up impulses.

Of interest is the finding that the Negroes were <u>less</u> likely to say that luck accounted for the good and bad things that happened to them. This outcome is in distinct opposition to the widely held views of Lefcourt (1963), Battle & Rotter (1963), Coleman <u>et al.</u> (1966) and Gurin <u>et al.</u> (1969), who suggested that the disadvantaged minority student felt himself to be a victim of an impersonal fate over which he had little internal control.

Probably an important difference in the outlook of the two groups is expressed by divergent views of the "ideal teacher." The black students thought of the ideal teacher mainly as one who induced pride and accomplishment in the students while the whites tended to think of the ideal teacher as one who encouraged students to think of still unanswered questions. One wonders whether the

blacks, as a deprived group, and of lower past performance, may not mainly be interested in obtaining knowledge and competence per se, while the white group, perhaps more relaxed about overt signs of accomplishment now increasingly wants more attention paid to methods of inquiry, the search for "truth," etc.

Turning now from attitude to performance, the data in the Hedegard & Brown study is not extensive. The median Negro freshman grade was C, the median white freshman grade was B to B-. Although the Negroes, understandably, were less satisfied with their year than whites were, they persevered -- seventy-one per cent of them were reported by the authors to be in their junior year.

The good retention rate of the black disadvantaged students in the Hedegard & Brown study is supported by writers who emphasize the good retention rate of black students generally. Harrison (1959) found that black males in predominantly white colleges were less likely to drop out than white students in these colleges. Clark & Plotkin (1963) reported that only 10% of Negroes at integrated colleges failed to obtain a degree, whereas 40% of the whites fail to complete their education.

Clift (1969) has explained the apparent black motivation to complete college as due to their desire to avoid low status by falling back to join a non-specialized labor force.

Hofstra University's NOAH program was described, in its early stages by Hoffman (1966). NOAH stands for Negro Opportunities at Hofstra. It offers a pre-enrollment summer remedial program and continued remedial effort during the year. Hoffman's article centered on the summer remedial work and counseling which preceded the regular fall semester. There was no charge for the five week summer session and there was a full scholarship for the year. The eight high school graduates who had been located for the program had wanted to go to college but ordinarily would not have been accepted, in fact two had made applications and had been turned down. During the summer, two of the students showed great improvement in reading, one moving from the 18th to the 78th percentile; two stayed the same, the rest showed significant improvement.

In an unpublished study[7] a NOAH analysis was presented based on students who entered Hofstra from 1964 through 1968. Of the

[7] Lichtenstein & Berlind (1970), Hofstra University, Center for the Study of Higher Education.

98 students, 35 were designated as successful (six graduates and twenty-nine continuing students who had a cumulative GPA of 1.9 or better as of June, 1969); 17 were said to be questionable (continuing students who had a cumulative GPA under 1.9 as of June, 1969); and 46 were classified as unsuccessful (35 dropped by Hofstra and 11 voluntary withdrawals).

One of the surprising findings was that both males and females seemed to succeed at a slightly higher rate when they had SAT verbal scores under 400, a datum which could support the view held by some that the SAT is an especially poor predictor of college success for disadvantaged students.

Papalia & Homan (1970) refer to the State University of New York at Cortland's "Passport to College Program." Students were drawn from male applicants rejected for regular admission at Cortland during the 1966-67 academic year. The 33 students involved scored at acceptable levels on an aptitude test (State of New York Admission Examination) but their high school achievement was below the minimum GPA interval of 65-74. They had received strong endorsement from their school counselor. The Passport group enrolled in 13 semester hours the first semester, 15-16 hours the second semester, with no extracurricular activities of any kind in the first semester.

The students were compared to a group of regular students matched on the aptitude measure. That this group is not disadvantaged in the sense used in the present paper is reflected in the fact that they came from families of higher socioeconomic status than the regular students, but as the title of Papalia & Homan's article indicates, they were, nevertheless, <u>educationally</u> disadvantaged.

The main basis for program evaluation seems to be the retention rate, and it does not favor the disadvantaged. At the end of the year only nine of the 33 students in the Passport group were retained compared with much larger retention rates in the comparison group (23 out of 24) and among male freshman as a whole (233 out of 290). The investigators suggest that the reason for failure rested in the students' inability to learn fast enough, their uncertainty as to their goals and interest, their lack of maturity and their feeling that the teachers were against them. This last item, the feeling about the teachers, might be crucial in any case but decisive, if in fact it reflected the teacher's actual attitudes toward the students.

III. What Is Needed in Future Research on the Disadvantaged in College

The research cited has presented preliminary evaluations of programs for the disadvantaged in higher education. The general

view seems to be that many students with low test scores and low high school GPA's, coming from deprived economic backgrounds show promise of being able to perform at about average levels or slightly below in college, given the proper guidance, preparation and remedial work. There has been some indication that motivation among the disadvantaged is good, their college expectations are positive, their dropout rate as low or lower than regular students.

Existent research has not, however, been conclusive. There has been a paucity of data beyond freshman level assessment. There have been some program failures without adequate explanation of the reason for these failures, or indeed, the reason why some programs have failed while others have succeeded.

Little is known about how to implement or develop special teaching strategies for the college-aged disadvantaged, nor is there obvious agreement whether in fact there should be such a focus. Programs have differed from school to school; with some the emphasis has been on easy admission, and a "sink or swim" attitude afterwards, with others, there have been counseling efforts but no modifications of curricula, with still others, there have been special classes, special requirements, special rates of amassing credits. Since in these variations, other factors may vary as well; type of student selected, money available for assistance, etc., it may be difficult to specify the precise basis for success or failure in any given case.

A central question rests on the definition of the disadvantaged student, himself. How much of a risk did a university actually take in admitting its disadvantaged? The amount of risk has varied from schools setting practically no minimum standards to those which required a B average. Paradoxically, Egerton's survey deliberately, self-consciously, proposed a definition limited to high risk but included without explanation, schools with low-risk programs. It would thus seem fruitless to compare investigations where the academic preparation of the disadvantaged differed.

In this connection, Plaut (1966) admits that "there is a very large pool of students with little or no money and modest credentials who, when given the opportunity, have a good chance of success in college (p. 396)," but then goes on to say that some programs are aiming at persons with "no money and no credentials" and

> there is no evidence that students who have not been able to do high school work will be able to do college work, simply because they are given one or two summer sessions or modified curricula (p. 396).

In short, Plaut expresses a concern about dipping "too far down into the academic barrel."

On the other side of the ledger, one might argue that Plaut is correct regarding the current state of the evidence (however fuzzy that may be at present), but with improved pedagogy and insight into the psychology and needs of the disadvantaged, it is even theoretically possible for many of those who have done very poorly in high school to be lifted to a college level. More research is needed on the true limits of plasticity.

The question of limits, is of course at the heart of proposals for "open admissions" policies now being undertaken by the City University of New York (beginning with the Fall, 1970 semester). Some of the problems related to open admissions have been discussed by Newcomb (1970), who has raised the question of radical institutional reorganization to accommodate the needs of the new students. In this vein, Billings (cited by Cass, 1969) suggested that universities consider experimenting with arrangements where black and white students attend the same instruction in the technical courses, but go to separate colleges for the study of the humanities, taught with ethnic relevance.

The foregoing points to a need for well executed investigations which control for specifications of measured student ability and educational accomplishment, where the programs are similar with respect to standards and practices and where sufficient time periods have elapsed to properly assess longitudinal variations. Measurements should provide knowledge on such questions as the effect of differential pedagogical techniques, the extent of change in GPA, attrition levels and attitude modification.

Certainly, there needs to be a special emphasis on the role of the instructor, on the role of curricula in shaping the student's progress. Considerable work of this nature has been done on the lower educational levels (Fantini & Weinstein, 1968; Passow, Goldberg, and Tannenbaum, 1967; Tuckman & O'Brian, 1969) but there has been little systematic investigation of the college disadvantaged in this respect. Some of the techniques used at the lower levels might be modified for college use e.g. Caliguri's (1969) use of Berne's Game theory where groups of suspended or expelled Negro high school students played, in the course of their regular instruction, games such as "Whitey-the-Authority-Game" and the "If I Were White You Wouldn't Treat Me This Way-Game." One would hope to erase, of course, with such a technique, some of the emotional encumbrances standing in the way of the black's effective utilization of services in an "alien" predominantly white institution.

Some of the observations of teachers in the lower grades are also suggestive in formulating working hypotheses to evaluate possible college practices. Schwartz (1967), for example, has cited various strategies used by biased public school teachers to "keep the disadvantaged pupils down": fragmentation of instruction (not showing connections); disrespect; dishonest praise; demonstrating pettiness by attempting to instill a sense of guilt for trivial offenses, and overall, the teacher's gratification from the pupil's failure (a teacher who couldn't succeed tries to make others fail).

In a recent article, Brophy & Good (1970) have found that teachers of elementary school children "demanded better performance from those children for whom they had higher expectations and were more likely to praise such performance when it was elicited (p. 365)." Glassman (1970) cited research which indicated that Negro and white elementary school teachers evaluated Negro students differently. Negro teachers saw the Negro pupils as fun loving, happy, cooperative, energetic and ambitious whereas white teachers saw the students as talkative, lazy, fun-loving, high strung and frivolous.

In perhaps one of the most pointed expositions on teaching the college disadvantaged, Morgan, (1970) documents some special techniques, including the use of "teacher-counselors," historical fiction and a programmed materials learning laboratory. Morgan also describes the ghetto youths' psychological climate -- defeatism, bitterness, insecurity -- suspicion -- the "beating the system" orientation.

> ...the colleges of this country are seen through suspicious and doubting eyes...These students believe that colleges do not appreciate their attendance, look at them and their culture disparagingly, and have little intention of being truly relevant to the needs of the black community. They insist that racist material be eliminated, that black people be viewed positively, and that the colleges cease expecting them to become models of white middle class behavior (p. 56).

It is true that the trouble begins long before the student is ready to entertain visions of college entrance. For,

> by all known criteria, the majority of...slum schools are failures... more than half of each age group fails to complete high school and five percent or fewer go on to...higher education...Adolescents depart from these schools ill-prepared to lead a satisfying, useful life or to participate successfully in the community (Gordon & Wilkerson, 1966, p. 4, citing Zacharias, 1964).

One could easily say, "let the high school straighten out the disadvantaged, it isn't the college's job," but the high school in turn could say, "look at the primary grades," and the latter, "look at the family," and so on in nauseous regression. Should not responsibility rest with all who can lend a hand, to correct the abuse wherever it can be attacked? Some kind of compensation at the college level; relaxed admissions, remedial practices, altered curricula, would seem within the college's scope, and so has it been interpreted by many institutions. Eventually, the disadvantaged student needs to be judged by the same criteria as others are judged but

> You do not...take a person who for years has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him up to the starting line of a race and say, 'You're free to compete with the others,' and justly believe that you have been completely fair (President Lyndon B. Johnson, as quoted by Howe, 1968, p. 4).

There is no doubt that the wish to help the disadvantaged exists. It is up to research to evaluate whether the desire is based on reasonable expectation, and whether current practice has done all it can to induce successful outcomes. The programs are relatively new, research necessarily in its early stages, but the harbingers of progress are in the air and the dove, while not nearly landed, at least has the earth in sight.

References

Antonovsky, Aaron. Aspirations, class and racial-ethnic membership. Journal of Negro Education, 1967, 36, 385-393.

Battle, Esther S., & Rotter, J.B. Children's feeling of personal control as related to social class and ethnic group. Journal of Personality, 1963, 31, 482-490.

Bayer, Alan E., & Boruch, Robert F. Black and white freshman entering four-year colleges. Educational Record, 1969, 50, 371-386.

Berger, Leslie. University programs for urban black and Puerto Rican youth. Educational Record, 1968, 49, 382-388.

Bexton, W.H., Heron, W., & Scott, T.H. Effects of decreased variation in the sensory environment. Canadian Journal of Psychology, 1954, 8, 70-76.

Billings, Thomas A. Upward Bound accomplishments. Phi Delta Kappan, 1968, 50, (October), 95-98.

Boney, J. Don. Predicting the academic achievement of secondary school Negro students. Personnel & Guidance Journal, 1966, 44, 700-703.

Boney, J. Don. Some dynamics of disadvantaged students in learning situations. Journal of Negro Education, 1967, 36, 315-319.

Brophy, Jere E., & Good, Thomas L. Teachers' communication of differential expectations for children's classroom performance: some behavioral data. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1970, 61, 365-374.

Brown, Cathy Willis. Upward Bound. Texas Outlook, 1967, 51, (April), 30-32.

Brown, Walter M., & Russell, Roger D. Limitations of admissions testing for the disadvantaged. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1964, 43, 301-304.

Bybee, Rodger. Upward Bound students in college earth science. Science Teacher, 1969, 36, (November), 40-42.

Caliguri, Joseph. Games disadvantaged children may play. School Counselor, 1969, 16, (May), 380-384.

Caplin, Morris D. The relationship between self concept and academic achievement. Journal of Experimental Education, 1969, 37, 13-16.

Cass, James. Can the university survive the black challenge? Saturday Review, 1969, 52, June 21, 68-74, 83-84.

Clark, Kenneth B., & Plotkin, Lawrence. The Negro student at integrated colleges. New York: National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro students, 1963.

Cleary, T.A. Test bias: validity of the Scholastic Aptitude Test for Negro and white students in integrated colleges. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1966.

Clift, Virgil A. Higher education of minority groups in the United States. Journal of Negro Education, 1969, 38, 291-302.

Clift, Virgil A. Further considerations in the education of the disadvantaged. Educational Forum, 1970, 34, 223-228.

Coleman, James S.; Campbell, Ernest O., Hobson, Carol J.; McPartland, James; Mood, Alexander M.; Weinfeld, Frederic; & York, Robert L. Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Davis, A., and Eels, K. Davis-Eells Games: Davis-Eels Test of General Intelligence or Problem-Solving Ability, Manual. Yonkers-on-Hudson, N.Y. World Book Co., 1953.

Davis, A., and Havighurst, R.J. Social class and color differences in child rearing. American Sociology Review, 1946, 11, 698-710.

Deutsch, Martin. The disadvantaged child and the learning process. In: A.H. Passow (Ed.); Education in depressed areas, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963, 163-180.

Dispenzieri, Angelo; & Giniger, Seymour. A comparison of the expectations and experiences of special program students and regular matriculants in the community colleges of the City University of New York. New York: The City University of New York, Research and Evaluation Unit, 1969(a).

Dispenzieri, Angelo; & Giniger, Seymour. The College Discovery Program: a synthesis of research. New York: College Discovery Program Research and Evaluation Unit, The City University of New York, 1969(b).

Dispenzieri, Angelo; Giniger, Seymour; & Friedman, Murray. A follow-up study of the experiences and reactions of the students in the first entering class of the College Discovery Program. New York: College Discovery Program Research and Evaluation Unit, The City University of New York, 1968.

Dispenzieri, Angelo; Giniger, Seymour; & Weinheimer, Sidney: Characteristics of the College Discovery Program students: 1964-1967. New York: College Discovery Program Research and Evaluation Unit, The City University of New York, 1968.

Dispenzieri, Angelo; Giniger, Seymour; Weinheimer, Sidney; & Chase, Jerry. First semester performance of College Discovery Program students and regular matriculants September 1968 entering class. New York: The City University of New York Research and Evaluation Unit, 1970(a).

Dispenzieri, Angelo; Giniger, Seymour; Weinheimer, Sidney; & Chase, Jerry. First semester performance of SEEK students and regular matriculants: September 1968 entering class. The City University of New York Research and Evaluation Unit, 1970(b).

Dispenzieri, Angelo; & Tormes, Yvonne M. A follow-up study of the experiences and reactions of students in the 1965 entering class of the College Discovery Program. The City University of New York Research and Evaluation Unit, 1969.

Dispenzieri, Angelo; Weinheimer, Sidney; and Giniger, Seymour. Expectations of SEEK students and regular matriculants in senior college: September 1968 entering class. New York: The City University of New York Research and Evaluation Unit, The City University of New York, 1969.

Dyer, Henry S. Admissions - college and university. In: Robert L. Ebel (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research, (fourth ed.) London: Macmillan, 1969; pp. 24-43.

Egerton, John. Higher education for "high risk" students. Atlanta: Southern Education Foundation, 1968.

Fantini, Mario D., & Weinstein, Gerald. The disadvantaged: challenge to education. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.

Gaier, Eugene L., & Watts, William A. Journal of Negro Education, 1966, 38, 342-350.

Glassman, Naftaly S. Teachers' low expectation levels of their culturally different students: a view from administration. Journal of Secondary Education, 1970, 45, 82-94.

Glickstein, Howard A. Federal educational programs and minority groups. Journal of Negro Education, 1969, 38, 303-314.

Goodman, Yetta Trachtman. The culturally deprived child: A study in stereotyping. Integrated Education, 1969, 7, (July-August), 58-63.

Gordon, Edmund W. The higher education of the disadvantaged. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, 1967.

Gordon, Edmund W., & Thomas, Charles L. Brief: a study on compensatory collegiate programs for minority group youth. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1969.

Gordon, Edmund W., & Wilkerson, Doxey A. Compensatory education for the disadvantaged. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Granowsky, Alvin. Upward Bound. New York State Education, 1969, 56, (March), 32-34.

Gurin, Patricia; Gurin, Gerald; Lao, Rosina C.; & Beattie, Muriel. Internal-external control in the motivational dynamics of Negro youth. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, No. 3, 29-53.

Harrison, E.C. Achievement motivation characteristics of Negro college freshman. Personnel & Guidance Journal, 1959, 38, 146-149.

Hawkins, Robert B. A speech program in an experimental college for the disadvantaged. Speech Teacher, 1969, 18, 115-119.

Hebb, D.O. The organization of behavior. N.Y.: Wiley, 1949.

Hedegard, James M., & Brown, Donald R. Encounters of some Negro and white freshman with a public university. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, No. 3, 131-144.

Herson, Phylics F. An assessment of changes in achievement motivation among Upward Bound participants at the University of Maryland. Journal of Negro Education, 1968, 37, 383-391.

Hoffmann, Randall W. Eight Negro students come to Hofstra. Improving college and university teaching, 1966, 14, (Winter), 48-51.

Hood, Wenford L. Higher education for the disadvantaged in New York State: A summary report of programs of higher education for the disadvantaged at colleges and universities in New York State. Plattsburgh, New York: State University of New York, College at Plattsburgh, 1969.

Hopkins, Delbert G. Upward Bound in action at Wayne State University. Washington, D.C.: American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1969.

Howe, Harold II. Preface. Harvard Educational Review, 1968, 38, 3-5.

Hunt, J. McV. The psychological basis for using pre-school enrichment as an antidote for cultural deprivation. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 209-248.

Hunt, David E., & Hardt, Robert H. Characterization of Upward Bound summer 1966; Characterization of Upward Bound academic year 1967; Characterization of Upward Bound 1967-1968. Syracuse, N.Y: Syracuse University Youth Development Center.

Hunt, David E., & Hardt, Robert H. The effect of Upward Bound programs on the attitudes, motivation, and academic achievement of Negro students. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, No. 3, 117-129.

Jordan, Daniel C. Upward Bound. Teachers College Journal, 1967(a), 38, (No. 1), 21-23.

Jordan, Daniel C. Evaluation. Teachers College Journal, 1967(b), 38, (No. 4), 182-185.

Karon, Bertram P. The Negro Personality. New York: Springer, 1958.

Lang, Melvin & Hopp, Laurence. Rutgers, the State University assessment of REAP-Upward Bound. New Brunswick, N.J: Rutgers University, 1967.

Lefcourt, Herbert M. Some empirical correlates of Negro identity. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University) Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1963, No. 64-6926.

LeShan, L.L. Time orientation and social class. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 589-592.

Mackler, Bernard, & Giddings, Morsley G. Cultural deprivation: A study in mythology. Teachers College Record, 1965, 66, 608-613.

McDill, Edward, L., McDill, Mary S.; & Sprehe, J. Timothy. Strategies for success in compensatory education: An appraisal of evaluation research. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.

McNemar, Q. A critical examination of the University of Iowa studies of environmental influences upon the IQ. Psychological Bulletin, 1940, 37, 63-92.

Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The disadvantaged student. Special collegiate programs: Admission financial aid, instruction, New York, 1968.

Miller, Doris Metzger, & O'Connor, Patricia. Achiever personality and academic success among disadvantaged college students. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, No. 3, 103-116.

Mischel, W. Preference for delayed reinforcement and social responsibility. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 1-7.

Monlouis, Wilma D. Higher education opportunities for high-risk disadvantaged students: A review of the literature. Currents '70, February, 1970 (No. 1): U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education; ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Morgan, Gordon D. The ghetto college student. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1970.

Newcomb, Theodore M. Open admissions: Before the deluge. Washington, D.C.; American Association

Papalia, Anthony S., & Homan, James. A passport to college for educationally disadvantaged students. New York State Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1970, 5, 11-16.

Passow, A. Harry, Goldberg, Miriam; & Tannenbaum, Abraham J. Education for the disadvantaged. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.

Pettigrew, T.F. A profile of the Negro American. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1964.

Piaget, J. The origins of intelligence in children (1st edition, 1936) New York: International University Press, 1952.

Plaut, Richard L. Plans for assisting Negro students to enter and to remain in college. Journal of Negro Education, 1966, 35, 393-399.

Posner, J. Evaluation of "successful" projects in compensatory education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, Office of Planning and Evaluation, (occasional paper No. 8), 1968.

Poussaint, Alvin F., & Atkinson, Carolyn O. Negro youth and psychological motivation. Journal of Negro Education, 1968, 37, 241-251.

Pruitt, Anne S. Black poor at white colleges personal growth goals. Journal of College Student Personnel, 1970, 11, 3-6.

Riess, Louis C. Project College-Bound; A financial assistance program for high school graduates attending the 1967 summer session. Pasadena City College, Pasadena, California, 1967.

Riessman, F. The culturally deprived child. New York: Harper & Row, 1962.

Roberts, S.O. Studies in identification of college potential. Nashville: Fisk University, 1962.

Rushmore, Mary Lee, & Scope, John C. Upward Bound at Hofstra University changes "No, I can't" to "Yes, I can." Journal of Reading, 1969, 13, (November), 119-122.

Schorr, A.L. The non-culture of poverty. American Journal of Ortho-psychiatry, 1964, 34, 907-912.

Schwartz, Sheila. Failure strategies and teachers of the disadvantaged. Teachers College Record, 1967, 68, 380-393.

Sears, R.R., Maccoby, E.E.; & Levin, H. Patterns of child rearing. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Shea, P. Upward Bound early progress, problems and promise in educational escape from poverty. Report to the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity, 1967.

Silverstein, Abraham. Upward Bound, 'exposure not enough.' Wisconsin Journal of Education, 1968, 101, 12-14.

Sinclair, Ward. Shoes don't matter when a bright kid is Upward Bound. Southern Education Report, 1968, 3, No. 6, 1-5.

Stanley, J.C. et al. Relative predictability of freshman grade-point averages from SAT scores in Negro and white southern colleges. Madison, Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin, Laboratory of Experimental Design, 1966.

Stewart, William A. On the use of Negro dialect in the teaching of reading. In: J.C. Baratz & R.W. Shuy (eds.). Teaching black children to read. Washington, D.C.: Center for applied linguistics, 1969, pps. 156-219.

Tuckman, Bruce W., & O'Brian, John L. Preparing to teach the disadvantaged. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

United States Department of Health, Education & Welfare, Office of Education. Headstart report. (Report to the advisory committee on Headstart), Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, March 7, 1969.

United States Department of Health, Education & Welfare, Office of Education. Title I Year II. The second annual report of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, school year 1966-1967. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, (no date).

Warden, Sandra A. The leftouts, disadvantaged children in heterogeneous schools. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1968.

Wellman, Beth L., Skeels, H.M.; & Skodak, Marie. Review of McNemar's critical examination of Iowa studies. Psychological Bulletin, 1940, 37, 93-111.

Whiting, Albert N. General university obligations to the disadvantaged student. Washington, D.C.: National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, 1968.

Williams, Robert L. What are we learning from current programs for disadvantaged students? Journal of Higher Education, 1969, 40, 274-285.

Wisdom, Paul E., & Shaw, Kenneth A. Black challenge to higher education. Educational Record, 1969, 50, 351-359.

Wolf, R.M. The identification and measurement of environmental process variables related to intelligence. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago), 1964.

Zingg, R.M. Feral man and extreme cases of isolation. American Journal of Psychology, 1940, 53, 487-517.

Appendix 1: Summary of Upward Bound Programs Discussed*

Reference & Sample**	Findings
Billings (1968) (Descriptive; N=20)	Emphasized novel approaches in the teaching of Upward Bound.
Boney (1967) University of Illinois (?) (N.D.)	Participants had difficulty in speech and writing skills.
Brown (1967) Southwest State Teachers College (Comparison; N=120)	On the Survey of Study Habits and Attitudes, students went from the 65th to the 95th percentile after six weeks in the program. College upperclassmen successfully served as counselors.
Bybee (1969) Colorado State College (N.D.; N=18)	Upward Bound students did as well as regular college matriculants in a summer course in earth science as measured by scores on two standardized examinations: Psychological Corporation's comprehensive earth science examination and the Test in Understanding Science offered by Educational Testing Service.
Granowsky (1969) Marist College (?) (Descriptive)	Mechanically, the speech of the participants remained weak, but the author believed their motivation to read and write was enhanced. One-hundred per-cent of the first Upward Bound class placed in a college or other program of post-high school education.

*Not included in this summary are studies limited to general statements regarding Upward Bound, or statistical treatments of Upward Bound as a whole.

**Studies are listed as: N.D. = No Data
Descriptive = Single percentage data mostly
Comparison = Compares two or more groups
(?) = Sample size not given

ERIC

Reference & Sample	Findings
Herson (1968) University of Maryland (Comparison; N=30)	The Upward Bound participants were matched against a control group of 30 non-participants. In response to a questionnaire the Upward Bound group, following the program, appeared to be more willing to complete requirements for college.
Hopkins (1969) Wayne State University (Descriptive; N=150)	"Vast majority" of Upward Bound students go on to college and 75% of those who do so return for their sophomore year.
Jordan (1967a) Indiana State University (Upward Bound Instructors) (N.D.) (?)	Self-criticism session for Upward Bound instructors -- recognition that too much time was spent on criticisms of student appearance and behavior, too little on increasing rapport.
Jordan (1967b) Indiana State University (Comparison; N=80)	Gains were registered on the Differential Aptitude Test and a more favorable self-image following participation was indicated by the Dymond Adjustment Inventory.
Lang & Hopp (1967) Rutgers University (Comparison; N=1853)	Used nine change measures relating to such factors as motivation, self-evaluation and degree of internal control. Eight measures showed improvement at the end of the summer although five out of the eight measures on which improvement was demonstrated registered a decline during the remainder of the school year.
Middle States Association of Colleges & Secondary Schools (1968) (cites the experience of 156 institutions with the disadvantaged--including some references to Upward Bound) The College of St. Elizabeth (Descriptive; N=32)	Twenty-seven out of thirty-two Upward Bound graduates were admitted to college as compared with pre-program estimates of two to six college admissions from a group of this size.

Reference & Sample	Findings
Riess (1967) Pasadena City College (N.D.; N=40)	College bound disadvantaged youth were paid $1.40 an hour for class hours and related summer work.
Rushmore & Scope (1969) Hofstra University (N.D.; N=98)	Triggs Diagnostic Reading Test Survey showed that students did poorly in inference and higher comprehension skills. After Upward Bound, students were "seen to be reading more," although no supporting evidence is given.
Silverstein (1968) Wisconsin State University (N.D.; N=150+)	Teachers reported some progress--more work needed on fundamental communication skills. Some students indicated their need for approval from people who cared about their work.
Sinclair (1968) Bellarmine College and University of Louisville (N.D.; N=155)	Wrote that there were "significant changes in attitude and behavior," but no data are given.

Appendix 2: Summary of Programs for the Disadvantaged in College

Reference & Sample	Findings
Brown & Russell (1964) North Carolina College (Comparison; N=66)	Fifty-eight of sixty-six honor graduates would not have been admitted had the college set the ACE cut-off point at the fiftieth percentile.
Egerton (1968) (Survey of "High Risk" institutions)	
a. Southern Illinois (Descriptive; N=100)	At time of writing, of the 100 disadvantaged students originally admitted, 26 had dropped out; of the remaining 74, 65 had made averages above the figure predicted for them.

Reference & Sample	Findings
b. University of Wisconsin (Descriptive; N=60)	Better retention record than freshman class as a whole, although "there is not...enough evidence...that most...will... keep...above the C level..."
c. University of California (Descriptive; N=424)	Seventy per cent of the disadvantaged surviving the freshman year were reported as having achieved a C average or better.
d. University of Oregon (Descriptive; N=130)	Program considered only minimally effective due to the failure to properly prepare the students.
e. University of Michigan (Descriptive; N=327)	First year dropout rate was 45% compared to 20% rate for freshman class at large.
f. Michigan State (Descriptive; N=66)	Thirty-two were doing "quite well" but five students had made all F's. By standard predictions all of the students would have ranked at the bottom of the freshman class.
g. University of Connecticut (N.D.; N=20)	"Desire was there." Early results (not specified) indicated that "they will succeed."
h. Antioch (Descriptive; N=49)	Only three students had dropped out.
i. Wesleyan (Descriptive; N=39)	All students had survived first semester but there is still a reluctance "to make optimistic claims for the high risk program"
j. Harvard (Descriptive; N=200)	Although 400-500 points below SAT norm, graduated at almost the same rate as the non-disadvantaged (80-85%).
k. Mercer University (Descriptive; N=48)	Attrition same as whole freshman class (18 to 20%).

Reference & Sample	Findings
l. Cornell (Descriptive; N=160)	Only five had dropped out.
m. New York University (Descriptive; N=60)	Program suffered loss of three-quarters of its students half-way through the experimentation.
n. Northeastern University (Descriptive; N=25)	Thirteen of the group were expected to graduate, program at university considered "highly successful."
Middle States Association of Colleges & Secondary Schools (1968)	
Duquesne (Descriptive) (?)	All the disadvantaged had completed freshman year.
Barnard (N.D.; N=26)	An "amazing" number were doing extremely well. College appears to have been very selective in admitting applicants.
Colgate (N.D.) (?)	School speaks with enthusiasm, but no measurements are given.
College Discovery Program of the City University of New York (Dispenzieri et al., 1968-1970 (Comparison; N=2325)	Admitted disadvantaged to community colleges. First semester GPA of regular matriculants superior to CDP students. Following-up CDP graduates into senior college, the first year GPA was 2.46 for one class, the first-semester GPA was 2.11 for the succeeding class; in both instances an average above C.
SEEK Program of the City University of New York (Dispenzieri et al., 1968-1970) Also, Berger (1968) (Comparison; N=1845)	Senior college program for the disadvantaged. Berger reports on 59 students, 91% of whom had earned a GPA of at least C. In addition to the 59, 51 had dropped out. Dispenzieri et al., reported that the first-semester GPA of regular matriculants was superior to regular matriculants in all cases except one (Queens College). Some preliminary material on expectations was also given.

Reference & Sample	Findings
Gaier & Watts (1966) MacCalester and Clark College (Comparison; N=856)	Clark College, a Negro institution, attached more importance to grades in a series of questionnaire comparisons than MacCalester, a predominantly white college.
Hawkins (1969) (N.D.). (?)	Experimental program stressing activities, non-verbal communication was apparently better liked by the disadvantaged students.
Hedegard & Brown (1969) (Comparison; N=about 400)	In this study of regular white students and a group of disadvantaged blacks, it was found (based on responses to four instruments including, for example, the OPI) that the black sample was characterized by "more concrete...conceptions of the world" and a "reluctance to become involved with other people--to keep the self under tight control...." The median freshman grade for blacks was C, B to B- for whites.
Hoffman (1966) (Descriptive; N=8) Lichtenstein & Berlind (1970) (Comparison; N=98)	The NOAH program had a summer pre-college phase (Hoffman) and continued remedial work after acceptance at Hofstra (Lichtenstein & Berlind). Hoffman reported that six of the eight summer students showed significant reading improvement. Lichtenstein & Berlind reported that 35 of the 98 students could be designated as "successful" in their work at Hofstra.
Papalia & Homan (1970) State University of New York at Cortland (Comparison; N=33)	Retention rate of disadvantaged poorer (9 out of 33 retained) than a matched group of regular students (23 out of 24 retained).