DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 187   UD 013 206

AUTHOR   Fortune, Jim C.; Hutchinson, Thomas E.
TITLE   The Relationship Between Academic Disadvantagement
                and Socioeconomic Disadvantagement as .)orted by
                Teachers on a National Sample Basis.
PUB DATE   Sep 72
NOTE   25p.; paper presented at the American Psychological
                Association annual meeting, Honolulu, Hawaii,
                September 1972

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   Compensatory Education Programs; Disadvantaged Youth;
                *Economically Disadvantaged; Educational Background;
                *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Elementary School
                Students; Family Income; *National Surveys; Parental
                Background; Racial Differences; Sex Differences;
                *Socioeconomic Status; Student Participation;
                Unemployment; Welfare Recipients

ABSTRACT
                The assumption is often made that economically and
academically disadvantaged students constitute the same basic
population within disadvantaged schools. This paper seeks to
ascertain the relationship between these two target-group sectors and
to identify the overlap of academically disadvantaged pupils with the
other five prevalent target groups: (1) potential dropouts; (2)
emotionally or mentally handicapped students; (3) migrant pupils; (4)
neglected and delinquent pupils; and, (5) physically handicapped
pupils. The paper proposes to use a data bank from the national 1970
Evaluative Survey of Compensatory Education to entertain the
following four questions concerning the overlap between academic and
economic disadvantagement: (1) in what variables do children targeted
as academically disadvantaged differ from the overall population in
the eyes of their teachers? (2) in what variables do children
targeted as socioeconomically disadvantaged differ from the overall
population in the eyes of their teachers? (3) what is the overlap of
these two categories? Are academic disadvantagement and socioeconomic
disadvantagement highly related variables? and, (4) in relationship
to the target groups—academically disadvantaged pupils,
socioeconomically disadvantaged—what variables interact differently
for crosstabulation built upon these three categories and on the
estimated national population? (Author/JM)

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACADEMIC DISADVANTAGEMENT AND SOCIOECONOMIC DISADVANTAGEMENT AS REPORTED BY TEACHERS ON A NATIONAL SAMPLE BASIS

Jim C. Fortune, Educational Testing Service

Thomas E. Hutchinson, University of Massachusetts

Introduction

In April 1965, in response to the findings of the Presidential Task Force which documented the need for expanded compensatory education programs and the need to equalize educational opportunity, Congress passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title I of this act was the first federally-funded program ever directed toward addressing the broad educational problems of children from low income families. Title I represents the largest federal program, in both scope and amount of dollars, for compensatory education. In fact, Title I was described as being designed to "provide financial assistance . . . to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low income' families to expand and improve their educational programs . . . [to meet] the special needs of educationally deprived children."[1]

A second precedent set by Title I is the financial delivery system. The format of this delivery system is a mixture of formula and proposal. The first step is federal delivery to the various states, who in turn suballocate the funds to local educational agencies who provide special programs for the targeted children. Federal appropriations to the states are based in part upon the state's average per-pupil expenditure or the national average per-pupil expenditure, whichever is greater. An amount of funds is

---

[1]History of Title I ESEA. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, June 1969, p. 2.

given to each state in proportion to per-pupil expenditure for each economically disadvantaged child residing in the state. Economic disadvantagement was at first defined to be $2,000 per year as maximum family income. In 1968, this maximum was revised to $3,000 per year. However, current state practice is not uniform relative to use of the $3,000 criterion.. A second criterion of aid to dependent children was included as another avenue through which economically disadvantaged children could be defined.

The states then allocate Title I funds to local educational agencies (LEA) upon the submission and approval of a proposal for a special education program to aid academically disadvantaged children and upon a similar head count of economically disadvantaged children. Within each LEA, schools are identified as Title I-eligible relative to their proportion of economically disadvantaged pupils.

. The third precedent set by Title I is directly related to this duality of eligibility for participation. For a child to qualify for participation in Title I programs, he must (1) be deemed educationally disadvantaged as defined by the LEA professional and (2) be in a school which has a high concentration of economically disadvantaged children. This duality has led to much confusion about eligibilty and is precedent-setting in that the two criteria are applied first to institutional and secondly to individual characteristics.

Problem

The third precedent is the source of the problem to be dealt with in this paper. Since the beginning of Title I ESEA, eligibility for

participation has been a controversial issue. The structure of the law
says that the child who is eligible to particiapte is the child who can
be deemed academically disadvantaged and attends a school which has a high
concentration of children from low income families. Unfortunately, the
law has been misinterpreted by many as intended solely for children from
low income families.

Definitions of educational disadvantagement were not provided by
Congress and are very loosely defined in program operations. Even though
the state provides a criterion for economic disadvantagement, suitable
and operationally consistent criteria for educationally disadvantaged
children are still lacking.

Educationally disadvantaged children can be defined as those belonging
to one of the following target groups: (1) potential dropouts--persons
who are likely to leave school for any reason except death before gradua-
tion or completion of a program of studies, who have not attained age
18 and have not transferred to another school; (2) emotionally or
mentally handicapped students--mentally retarded, seriously emotionally
disturbed, or any other emotionally or mentally impaired children who,
by reason thereof, require special education and related special services;
(3) migrant pupils--children of migratory agricultural workers who have
moved with their families from one school district to another during the
past year in order that a parent or other member of the family might secure
employment in agriculture or in related food-processing activities;

(4) neglected and delinquent pupils-- pupils residing in an institution for

neglected and delinquent children; (5) physically handicapped pupils--

including hard-of-hearing, deaf, speech-impaired, visually handicapped,

crippled, or other health-impaired children who by reason thereof

require special education and related services; (6) academically dis-

advantaged pupils--pupils who cannot be described by any other target category

and who display such poor academic acheivement that their needs cannot be

met without special or supplementary instruction or services.

The assumption is often made that economically and academically

disadvantaged students consitute the same basic population within

disadvantaged schools. This represents a hypothesis which was perhaps

held by the legislators but cannot be inferred from the law. Economically

and academically pupils may not be the same. This paper seeks to ascertain

the relationship between these two target-group sectors and to identify

the overlap of academically disadvantaged pupils with the other five prevalent

target groups. The paper proposes to use a data bank from the national

1970 Evaluative Survey of Compensatory Education to entertain the following

four questions concerning the overlap between academic and economic dis-

advantagement: (1) In what variables do children targeted as academically

disadvantaged differ from the overall population in the eyes of their

teachers? (2) In what variables do children targeted as socioeconomically

disadvantaged differ from the overall population in the eyes of their

teachers? (3) What is the overlap of these two categories? Are academic

disadvantagement and socioeconomic disadvantagement highly related variables?

(4) In relationship to the target groups--academically disadvantaged pupils, socioeconomically disadvantaged--what variables interact differently for crosstabulation built upon these three categories and on the estimated national population?

The variables to be investigated here will consist of three categories: (1) general student characteristics, including common characteristics of the student and of the student's family; (2) problems identified by the teacher as those persisting in the student; and (3) teacher estimates or ratings of the student's behavior relative to the teacher's descriptions of the student.

Instrumentation

The data to be analyzed in dealing with the above questions were collected on the pupil form of the 1970 Survey of Compensatory Education. The 1970 Pupil-Centered Instrument (PCI) is one of two annual survey questionnaires jointly designated and administered by the Office of Education (Program Planning and Evaluation/Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education) and a cooperating group of cheif state officers often referred to as the Belmont Group. This Survey of Compensatory Education was designed to collect evaluative information concerning federal programming in compensatory education. The survey instrumentation was made up of four questionnaires designed by panels of consulting experts in early childhood education, educational sociology and psychology, and elementary education to elicit questions concerning characteristics of second, fourth, and sixth grade students, their teachers, the schools in which they teach, and the districts in which those schools are located.

In 1970 the four survey instruments were administered to a national
sample consisting of approximately 800 school districts, 2300 schools,
22,000 teachers and 34,000 elementary pupils. The pupil sample was a
multi-stage, quasi-random sample which consisted of a random sample of
districts selected at fixed probability ratios within the bounds of five
strata based upon their enrollment figures. Figure 1 is a display of the
estimated district population, sample, and return for 1969-1970.

FIGURE I

PROFILE OF FOUNDATION OF DISTRICT SAMPLE FOR THE
1970 SURVEY OF COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

Stratum and Enrollment	Population	Sample	Response
I 135,000 and over	13	13	11
II 35,000 - 134,999	100	73	69
III 9,000 - 34,999	714	116	90
IV 3,000 - 8,999	2,288	254	204
V 300 - 2,999	8,161	351	305
Totals:	11,276	807	679

Each district in the sample was asked to select a number of schools
participating and not participating in Title I. Once these schools had
been selected, principals were sent the school questionnaire and each.
second, fourth, and sixth grade teacher in each school was asked to fill
out a teacher questionnaire. Each teacher, relative to class size, was
asked to select a matrix-fixed sample of students in each of his homeroom
classes; i.e., if homeroom class enrollment was small the teacher would
fill out questionnaires on three students selected on a present random-

number basis. If class size was very large, the teacher would select up to five pupils in each class and complete student questionnaires on each of them. The results are weighted to provide national projections for grades 2, 4, and 6, with the sampling error estimated to be less than .05 given the 80% response which was acquired.

Procedures

A major variable was created from the questions dealing with teacher identification of academic disadvantagement and of socioeconomic disadvantagement. The population was divided into four groups: a group of both academically and socioeconomically disadvantaged children; a group of academically disadvantaged children only; a group of socioeconomically disadvantaged children only; and a group of children rated neither academically nor socioeconomically disadvantaged. This variable was called the Pupil Classification Variable and was used as one of the two variables in each of a series of crosstabulations.

The first crosstabulations presented are the Pupil Classification Variable with pupil grade, sex, race, and teacher estimates of attitude and ability. This class of variables is termed "pupil characteristics" variables and also includes background characteristics information concerning the pupil's family, such as employment of the parents, whether or not the parents receive welfare, and educational level of the head of the household.

In pursuit of operational definitions of disadvantagement, the paper also includes crosstabulations of the Pupil Classification Variable with the target group previously mentioned and with a series of 15

persistent problems also collected on the pupil instrument. The variables
included in the persistent problem category include: problems in mathe-
matics, reading, English, vision, hearing, speech, psychomotor, handicaps,
chronic diseases, mental retardation, social and emotional problems,
anti-social behavior, malnutrition, and family instability. The third
set of variables include behavioral ratings and income levels.

A Title I participation-nonparticipation variable will be crossed with
some of the variables of interest to see if participants differ from
nonparticipants.

Results

Pupil background charactersitics. Table I shows the breakdown of the
Pupil Classification Variable across Title I participation.

TABLE I

PUPIL CLASSIFICATION BY TITLE I PARTICIPATION

	Title I	Non-Title I	Row Total
Not Disadvantaged	1265139	7006754	8271893
Row %	15.29	84.71	78.68
Col %	60.68	83.13	
Tot %	12.04	66.64	
Economically Only	326701	534868	861569
Row %	37.92	62.08	8.20
Col %	15.67	6.34	
Tot %	3.11	5.09	
Academically Only	239560	568298	807858
Row %	29.67	70.33	7.68
Col %	11.49	6.74	
Tot %	2.28	5.40	
Both	253402	318252	571654
Row %	44.35	55.65	5.44
Col %	12.16	3.79	
Tot %	2.41	3.03	
Column Total	2084802	8428172	10512974
	19.83	80.16	100.00

The number of academically and socioeconomically disadvantaged children
seems surprisingly low, at least to this reviewer, and the overlap is indeed
low. Only 13.6% of the population have been identified as economically
disadvantaged and only 13.2% of the population have been identified as
academically disadvantaged. Approximately 78.7% of the population have
been identified as not belonging to either of the two target groups.
Of this 78.7%, 8.6% can be identified as belonging to other target groups
including migrant families, handicapped children, neglected-delinquent
children, and potential dropouts.

Seventy percent of the nation's population in grades 2, 4, and 6
are estimated as belonging to no target group related to ESEA Title I.
This percentage is surprisingly large and includes a relatively large number
of Title I participants not belonging to target groups. Twelve percent
of the total population have been identified as belonging to neither
academically nor socioeconomically disadvantaged target groups but still
participating in Title I. Of this 12%, only about 4% can be explained
as belonging to other target groups. Therefore, at least 8% of the total
population participates in Title I even though not identified as belonging
to any particular group membership. This constitutes over one-third of
the total number participating in Title I.

The relationship between economic and academic disadvantagement
and participating Title I is not nearly as strong a relationship as
one might suppose. There is room to believe that the practice of identifying
academic and economic disadvantagement for Title I program participation
may suffer a large variance across the nation. Approximately 13.5% of the
total population are identified by the survey as economically and academically

disadvantaged but not participating in Title I. This population actually constitutes about 17% of the nonparticipants in Title I and constitutes a very large group of students not being served by ESEA Title I. Information does not permit the authors to determine whether this nonparticipation occurs through self-elimination or because of the unfortunate fact that large numbers of academically or economically disadvantaged children are located in schools or institutions not eligible for Title I participation.

Table II crosstabulates the distribution of the Pupil Classification Variable across grade level.

TABLE II
PUPIL CLASSIFICATION BY GRADE LEVEL

	2	4	6
Not Disadvantaged	2827295	2830363	2614235
Row %	34.18	34.22	31.60
Tot %	26.89	26.92	24.87
Economically Only	308977	285804	266788
Row %	35.87	33.17	30.97
Tot %	2.94	2.72	2.54
Academically Only	242612	278433	286813
Row %	30.04	34.47	35.50
Tot %	2.31	2.64	2.73
Both	175140	212140	184374
Row %	30.64	37.11	32.26
Tot %	1.66	2.02	1.76
Column Total	3554024	3606740	3352210
	33.81	34.31	31.89

In Table II it is shown that socioeconomically disadvantaged pupils and non-target group pupils have very similar distributions, which are proportional to sampling percentages across grade level. Therefore one could assume that grade level and socioeconomic disadvantagement are not associated. In the distribution of the academic disadvantaged children and in the distribution of the group of both academically and socioeconomically disadvantaged pupils across grade level, there appear to be some differences from the overall sampling distribution. Both of these groups appear larger in proportion in grades 4 and 6 and smaller in proportion in grade 2. Perhaps this observed relationship is due to the time factor, with the higher grades allowing greater opportunity for academic disadvantagement to appear. Breaking the overall population into subgroups by Title I participation and nonparticipation does not change the observed relationships.

Table III shows very similar breakdowns with pupil sex as the variable of interest. Even though there are slightly more males than females in the sample--50.94% to 48.38%, with 0.67%[1] being undetermined because of failure to respond to the questionnaire item--there are a few more females than expected in the non-target group and in the socioeconomically disadvantaged group--49.72% and 51.16%. The similarity of these figures suggests that there is no large difference in males and females in these two groups or in the overall sample. In the two groups which were created by using academic disadvantagement as a criterion (the academically disadvantaged only and the academic socioeconomically disadvantaged groups_, both show a marked discrepancy between males and females. About 62.35%

[1]70342, or 0.67%, did not identify sex

of the academically disadvantaged only group and 58.13% of the group

labeled both academically and socioeconomically disadvantaged are males.

TABLE III

PUPIL CLASSIFICATION BY SEX[1]

	Male	Female
Not Disadvantaged	4103353	4112698
Row %	49.60	49.72
Tot %	39.03	39.12
Economically Only	416214	440745
Row %	48.31	51.16
Tot %	3.96	4.19
Academically Only	503735	298839
Row %	62.35	36.99
Tot %	4.80	2.84
Both	332288	234759
Row %	58.13	41.07
Tot %	3.16	2.24
Column Total	5355590	5157383
	50.94	48.38

This fact could be a reflection of anti-male bias in the elementary schools,

could show the relationship of male identity characteristics to elementary

school goals, or could be explained by a combination of these or by other

alternative hypotheses. A Title I participation break does not create any

change in the profile in Table III.

Table IV crosstabulates the Pupil Classification Variable with

the race or minority group membership variable.

TABLE IV

PUPIL CLASSIFICATION BY RACE

	Indian	Black	Oriental	Spanish	None
Not Disadvantaged	29466	844566	88373	361779	6773952
Row %	0.35	10.21	1.07	4.38	81.89
Tot %	0.28	8.03	0.84	3.44	64.43
Economically Only	7686	380219	2511	123372	332888
Row %	0.89	44.13	0.29	14.32	38.64
Tot %	0.07	3.62	0.03	1.17	3.17
Academically Only	3130	205602	3121	51874	528728
Row %	0.38	25.45	0.39	6.43	65.45
Tot %	0.03	1.95	0.03	0.49	5.03
Both	7148	284862	1101	84046	186443
Row %	1.15	49.83	0.20	14.71	32.62
Tot %	0.07	2.71	0.01	0.80	1.78
Column Total	47430	1715249	95106	721071	7822011
	0.45	16.32	0.91	5.91	74.41

Table IV will first be discussed to ascertain any general relationships

between the two variables, race and the Pupil Classification Variable.

There are fewer American Indians, Blacks, and Spanish-surnamed pupils in

the non-target group than would be expected from the sample distribution

of these race categories. The Black discrepancy alone seems large enough

to note: only 10.21% of the sample are Blacks. There are more non-minority

group members (white) and Oriental students in this non-target than would
be expected from sample proportions. Again, only the non-minority group
appears worthy of note: 81.89% to 74.41%. Both Blacks and Spanish-surnamed
pupils are overrepresented in all three of the disadvantagement groups,
and the non-minority group is underrepresented in these three groups.
Overrepresentation and underrepresentation appear greater in groups using
socioeconomic disadvantagement as the criterion for membership than in
groups using only academic disadvantagement as the membership criterion.

The race crossbreaks are also subdivided by Title I participation-
nonparticipation. The relationships remain similar, but the Title I
participant group has fewer non-target group pupils across all racial
categories participating than either the composite table or the nonparti-
cipating group, indicating some targeting nonetheless. A peculiar
phenomenon can be observed across the participation-nonparticipation sub-
categories. There is a tendency for Blacks and Spanish-surnamed pupils
to have equally as much participation in economically disadvantaged subgroups
as in academically disadvantaged subgroups. This is not true for the
non-minority group, which suffers a drop in economic disadvantagement
participation. Hence, part of the criteria for participation for Blacks
and Spanish-surnamed pupils are apparently not extended to non-minority
group members. The academic disadvantagement grouping criteria seem to
apply to all races.

. Table V contains background information on the parents of children
in each of the four pupil classification groups. Pupils in the non-targeted
group, or the group identified by teachers as being neither academically

nor socioeconomically disadvantaged, have parents who are most likely employed, least likely to be on welfare, and have three-to-one odds of having high school educations. The percentage of children from families on welfare in this group is less than half the percentage of children from families on welfare estimated for the total population. The same phenomenon is observed in the case of employment.

TABLE V

PUPIL CLASSIFICATION BY PARENTAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

	On Welfare	Unemployed	No HS Education
Not Disadvantaged	237725	132324	2147441
% of category	2.87	1.60	25.96
% of children	2.26	1.25	20.44
Economically Only	248386	124172	676611
% of category	28.83	14.41	78.54
% of children	2.36	1.18	6.44
Academically Only	54242	31425	446055
% of category	6.72	3.89	55.22
% of children	0.52	0.30	4.24
Both	181474	98776	495340
% of catetory	31.75	17.28	86.65
% of children	1.72	0.94	4.71
Column Total	721287	386697	3765447

The number of children with parents not having a high school education is less in this group than would be expected from the total population estimates.

The socioeconomically disadvantaged group has a percentage of children with parents on welfare nearly 4.5 times that of the total population estimates: 28.82% to 6.86%. Unemployment also appears to be another prime related variable in economic disadvantagement. This group has 4 times as many unemployed parents (14.41%) as does the total population (3.68%). Lack of a high school education is a strong identifying factor for this group, since 78.54% of the group have heads-of-the-household not holding high school diplomas. Only 35.83% of the national estimate fails to hold high school diplomas. These variable relationships hold true in the group identified as both academically and socioeconomically disadvantaged. Of the children's families in this group, 31.75% are on welfare, 17.28% are unemployed, and 86.65% do not have high school educations.

The academically disadvantaged group has percentages similar to the total population in regard to families on welfare and unemployed parents. This group does have a larger proportion of parents failing to hold high school diplomas (55.22%) than is found in the total population (35.82%).

In describing the relationship of these variables to the Pupil Classification Variable, it can be concluded that education level of the head-of-the-household is the best predictor of the three and is related to both classification variables. This variable appears more related to socioeconomic disadvantagement, however, than to academic disadvantagement. Both unemployment and receipt of welfare are predictor variables of socioeconomic disadvantagement, but neither seem related to the academic criterion. These two variables, although related, are disappointing to an extent since so many of the children of welfare or unemployed parents

are members of the non-target group.

TABLE VI

PUPIL CLASSIFICATION BY POTENTIAL TO COMPLETE SCHOOL

	School Potential Attitude Poor	School Potential Ability Poor
Not Disadvantaged	593632	368624
% of category	7.17	4.47
% of children	5.66	3.50
Economically Only	279109	157366
% of category	32.39	18.28
% of children	2.66	1.50
Academically Only	382422	362666
% of category	47.33	49.90
% of children	3.64	3.45
Both	374479	318989
% of category	65.51	55.81
% of children	3.57	3.03
Column Total	1629642	1207645
	15.50	11.49

Table VI indicates that teachers' ratings of student potential to complete school, based upon both ability and attitude, are consistent and are related to both of the criterion variables—academic and socio-economic disadvantagement. Neither set of ratings, however, is related to the criterion variables in such a manner as to indicate that they are basic differentiating factors.

Tables VII and VIII show the crossbreaks of two variables which can
be hypothesized to be most directly related to the criteria reflected in
the Pupil Classification Variable. Table VII shows the relationship of
estimated minimum parental income to the group classifications. Economic
disadvantagement, previously defined by legislation, has as a criterion
a family income of less than $3,000 per year. Table VIII shows the rela-
tionships of reading proficiency to the group classifications. In this
case reading would be hypothesized as a major source of academic deficiency;
this hypothesis will be confirmed in Table X.

TABLE VII

PUPIL CLASSIFICATION BY MINIMUM INCOME

	Below 3000	3000-6000	6000-10000	Over 10000
Not Disadvantaged	911084	2646670	2535700	1837533
Row %	11.01	32.00	30.65	22.21
Tot %	8.67	25.18	24.12	17.43
Economically Only	489183	273311	44313	4279
Row %	56.78	31.72	5.14	0.50
Tot %	4.65	2.60	0.42	0.04
Academically Only	192252	336678	174318	64916
Row %	23.80	41.68	21.58	8.03
Tot %	1.83	3.21	1.65	0.62
Both	369946	157190	17917	1875
Row %	64.72	27.50	3.13	0.33
Tot %	3.52	1.49	0.17	0.01
Column Total	1962465	3413849	2772248	1908603
	18.67	32.47	26.37	18.15

TABLE VIII

PUPIL CLASSIFICATION BY READING PROFICIENCY

	CFB	NC-D	NC-N	CFW
Not Disadvantaged	4960961	876918	2189264	71261
Row %	59.98	10.60	26.46	0.86
Tot %	47.19	8.34	20.83	0.68
Economically Only	575911	161066	93436	14990
Row %	66.85	18.70	10.85	1.74
Tot %	5.48	1.53	0.89	0.14
Academically Only	469427	289274	13179	21615
Row %	58.11	35.80	1.64	2.67
Tot %	4.46	2.75	0.13	0.21
Both	322186	199789	13680	22321
Row %	56.36	34.94	2.39	3.91
Tot %	3.07	1.90	0.13	0.21
Column Total	6328485	1527047	2309359	130187
	60.20	14.52	21.96	1.24

The non-target group in Table VII has 11.01% of its members categorized as from families making less than $3,000 per year. The two groups which include socioeconomic disadvantagement as a criterion show a strong but not totally inclusive relationship to this income criterion. The socioeconomically disadvantaged only group has 56.78% of its members in this income bracket, and the group identified as both socioeconomically and academically disadvantaged has 64.72% of its members showing incomes below the $3,000 per year level. The group identified only as academically disadvantaged has only 23.80% under the $3,000 level. This occurence in the academically disadvantaged group and the number indicated in the non-target group could be considered as the difference between pure economics and social economics.

The relationship of poverty to academic disadvantagement is apparent even in the academically disadvantaged only group. Income becomes an even better indicator of socioeconomic disadvantagement at the $6,000 income level. Only 4.15 % of the pupils identified in this category have parents earning more than $6,000 per year. The total population contains 44.52% having incomes greater than $6,000 per year.

Table VII indicates that the two groups having been identified as academically disadvantaged contain over 38% of the pupils not progressing satisfactorily in reading proficiency, in comparison to only 11.46% in the non-target group and 19.44% in the socioeconomically disadvantaged only group. Considering that these are teachers' ratings of student progress in reading proficiency, the largest percentages point even more strongly to the relationship. Test scores were too sparse to generate population estimates, but results run on the small sample of scores (approximatetly 5% of the data) are in the same direction, with slightly higher potential relationships.

Table IX shows the overlap of the academic and socioeconomic disadvantagement groups with other target groups. The horizontal dimension is formed by membership in other target groups included in the survey. As one can see, three of the other target groups are virtually too small for discussion. Of these three groups, the physically handicapped variable appears related to academic disadvantagement and the migrant and neglected-delinquent groups appear related to the socioeconomic criterion. However, as previously mentioned, target group sizes are very small in these three groups.

Both the non-Standard English speaking and emotionally handicapped
target groups are large enough for comment, but do not present any
startling results. The non-Standard English speaking variable does not
appear related to either of the two target group designators in question.
The emotionally handicapped group appears slightly related to the socio-
economic disadvantagement criterion and more directly related to the
academic disadvantagement standard. The relationships appear additive,
since the greatest percentage of overlap is in the group meeting both
criteria under discussion. This relationship holds true for the potential
dropout group, which appears very similar to the emotionally handicapped
variable. The academically gifted variable does not appear related to
socioeconomic disadvantagement and may in fact be inversely related to the
academically disadvantaged group, although 521 cases of overlap were iden-
tified.

Table X reports the frequency of reported persisting needs among the
four categories of the Pupil Classification Variable. Interestingly, all
groups seem to have members in each of the persisting needs categories;
however, some very definite relationships do exist. Persisting problems
in math, reading, and English language arts all appear as strong indicators
of academic disadvantagement, as would be expected. There is an 85% over-
lap between the group having reading as a problem and the academically
disadvantaged group. All three of these problem variables have a greater
relationship than would be expected by chance to socioeconomic disadvantagement
also. Social immaturity is a persisting problem which is also related to
academic disadvantagement and is somewhat related to socioeconomic disad-
vantagement. Both emotional problems and anti-social behavior as

persisting problems are related to each of the criteria of interest, but
not to a strong prediction level. Family instability appears to be more
related to socioeconomic disadvantagement, but is related to both. The
remaining persisting problems do not seem related to the two criterion variables
of interest.

Table XI reports the teachers' ratings of students on four forms of
behavior related to school goals: attentive behavior, disruptive behavior,
self-concept, and educational aspirations. All appear related to the two
criterion variables in similar manners, although more related to academic
than to socioeconomic disadvantagement. None of these relationships seem
to be of great interest, since problems in these areas are also prevalent
in the non-target group at a smaller percentage level.

TABLE IX

TARGET GROUP MEMBERSHIP

		Academic Gifted	Non-Eng Speaking	Potential Dropout	Emot-Men Handicap	Migrants	Negl & Delinq	Physical Handicap	Row Total
Not Disadvantaged		799839	254820	301749	232628	18267	77642	67279	8271894
	Row %	9.67	3.08	3.65	2.81	0.22	0.94	0.81	78.68
	Col %	96.55	57.68	31.88	45.92	31.01	32.97	64.74	
	Tot %	7.61	2.42	2.87	2.21	0.18	0.74	0.64	
Economically Only		26564	86077	150273	58182	17895	61056	10840	861565
	Row %	3.08	10.00	17.45	6.76	2.08	7.08	1.26	8.20
	Col %	3.21	19.48	15.83	11.48	30.38	25.93	10.43	
	Tot %	0.25	0.82	1.42	0.56	0.17	0.58	0.10	
Academically Only		521	31462	221461	110638	7100	24198	14770	807856
	Row %	0.01	3.90	27.41	13.70	0.85	2.99	2.83	7.68
	Col %	0.06	7.12	23.40	21.84	12.05	10.28	14.21	
	Tot %	0.00	0.30	2.11	1.05	0.06	0.23	0.14	
Both		1497	69452	273120	105136	15646	72594	11037	571652
	Row %	0.26	12.15	47.77	18.39	2.73	12.70	1.93	5.44
	Col %	0.17	15.72	28.85	20.75	26.56	30.83	10.62	
	Tot %	0.02	0.66	2.59	1.00	0.15	0.69	0.10	
Column Total		828421	441811	946603	506584	58908	235490	103926	10512967
		7.88	4.20	9.00	4.82	0.56	2.24	0.99	100.00

TABLE XI

PUPIL CLASSIFICATION BY RATINGS OF BEHAVIOR

	Attentive Behavior	Distruptive Behavior	Self-Concept	Educational Aspirations
Not Disadvantaged	1528727	1198479	1273451	1308503
% of category	18.48	14.50	15.39	15.82
% of children	14.54	11.40	12.11	12.45
Economically Only	228458	177352	245811	297930
% of category	26.52	20.58	28.66	34.58
% of children	2.17	1.69	2.35	2.83
Academically Only	350905	224740	305394	392444
% of category	43.44	27.82	37.80	48.57
% of children	3.35	2.15	2.91	3.74
Both	253645	165303	253407	322224
% of category	44.01	28.92	44.33	56.37
% of children	2.40	1.56	2.41	3.07
Column Total	2359735	1765874	2079063	2321101
	22.45	16.80	19.77	22.08

TABLE X

PUPIL CLASSIFICATION BY PERSISTING PROBLEMS

	Math	Reading	English	Poor Vision	Poor Hearing	Speech Def.	Psycho-Motor Def.	Physical Handicap	Chronic Disease	Mentally Retarded	Socially Immature	Emotional Problems	Anti-Social Behavior	Malnutrition	Family Instab.	Total
Disadvantaged	1110356	1386326	821838	184725	75941	240486	80248	48415	7:941	39846	812616	681277	308688	11453	627037	8271894
% of category	13.42	16.76	9.93	2.23	0.91	2.91	0.97	0.59	0.94	0.48	9.83	8.24	3.73	0.15	7.58	78.68
% of children	10.56	13.18	7.82	1.76	0.72	2.29	0.76	0.45	0.74	0.38	7.73	6.48	2.94	0.10	5.97	
...emically Only	241706	324627	229485	41759	13062	39020	12819	6711	1:292	17069	160987	161161	86840	25731	208759	861565
% of category	28.04	37.68	26.63	4.84	1.52	4.53	1.48	0.77	.54	1.59	18.69	18.70	10.08	2.99	34.67	8.20
% of children	2.30	3.09	2.17	0.39	0.12	0.37	0.12	0.07	0.12	0.17	1.54	1.54	0.91	0.24	2.84	
...emically Only	567616	700402	549844	44805	18230	70187	36894	10395	1:753	58749	201891	155414	78369	7893	142607	807856
% of category	70.26	86.70	68.06	5.54	2.25	8.69	4.57	1.29	.64	7.27	24.99	19.23	9.70	0.99	17.65	7.68
% of children	5.40	6.66	5.23	0.43	0.17	0.67	0.35	0.09	0.12	0.55	1.93	1.48	0.75	0.08	1.35	
	409799	475187	413168	35875	11176	45371	177 6427		1601	59120	169922	153354	90197	34634	240270	571652
% of category	71.69	83.13	72.27	6.28	1.96	7.94	3.11	1.12	1.50	10.35	29.72	26.83	15.78	6.07	42.04	5.44
% of children	3.90	4.51	3.93	0.33	0.11	0.43	0.17	0.06	(-.08)	0.56	1.62	1.45	0.85	0.33	2.21	
Totals	2329677	2886542	2014335	307164	118409	395046	147731	71904	113087	174784	1345416	1151206	564094	79771	1308673	10512967
	22.16	27.46	19.17	2.92	1.12	3.76	1.41	0.68	1.07	1.66	12.80	10.94	5.37	0.76	12.45	100.00