

Minority Talent Loss and the Texas Top 10% Law

Sunny Xinchun Niu

Princeton University

Teresa Sullivan

The University of Michigan

Marta Tienda

Princeton University

Direct all correspondence to Marta Tienda, Office of Population Research, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08540 (tienda@princeton.edu). Professor Tienda will share all data and coding information with those wishing to replicate the study.

This research was supported by grants from the Ford, Mellon, Hewlett and Spencer Foundations and NSF (GRANT # SES-0350990). We gratefully acknowledge institutional support from the Office of Population Research (NICHD Grant # R24 H0047879), and constructive comments from anonymous reviewers. The usual disclaimers apply.

1 February 2008

ABSTRACT

Objective: To examine how knowledge about the Texas top 10% law influences college enrollment decisions of high achieving students minority and nonminority students. *Data and Methods:* Using a representative survey of graduates from Texas public high schools in 2002, we compare self-reported and transcript-verified class rank and estimate probit models to assess the likelihood that top-ranked minority students know about the law. *Results:* Family socioeconomic status largely explains why highly ranked black and Hispanic students know less about the top 10% law than comparable whites, but parents' lack of fluency in English is a significant information barrier for college-bound, top 10% Hispanic students from predominantly minority high schools. Nearly one-fifth of college-oriented black and Hispanic top 10% seniors who did not know about the law failed to enroll anywhere. *Conclusion:* Inadequate information about the top 10% law undermines enrollment of talented minorities in higher education.

Minority Talent Loss and the Texas Top 10% Law

In a climate of continued opposition to the use of race preferences in college admissions, administrators have sought alternatives to diversify their campuses while complying with the protections of the Fourteenth Amendment. Following judicial and legislative bans on affirmative action in college admissions, public universities in California, Florida, Washington and Texas have used various strategies to increase minority representation. Of the three states that implemented percent plans, that of Texas is most generous because it guarantees automatic admission to *any* public Texas university to students who graduate in the top 10% of their high school class; because high schools are given autonomy in computing class rank; and because test scores and other achievement criteria are not considered for rank-qualified applicants.

Lauded as a race-neutral alternative to affirmative action, the Texas law initially gained wide support because admission would be based on merit rather than ascriptions, and because its provisions apply uniformly to all Texas high schools. At both the University of Texas at Austin (UT) and Texas A&M University (TAMU), the two public flagships, minority enrollment fell in the wake of the 1996 *Hopwood* decision, but began to rebound after the uniform admission law was fully in force. Yet whether and in what ways the new law contributed to this outcome is unclear because an admission guarantee can not, *ipso facto*, ensure enrollment of rank-eligible students. This is particularly so for black and Hispanic students, who are more likely than whites to attend high schools with low college-going traditions (Tienda and Niu, 2006a).

Failure of top 10% graduates to pursue post-secondary schooling constitutes loss of valuable talent in the context of an admission regime that *guarantees* admission to

rank-eligible students. Prior studies emphasize different aspects of talent loss, such as the percent of graduates who do not enroll in college within a designated time period (Plank and Jordan, 2001) or discrepancies between educational aspirations, expectations, and enrollment behavior (Hanson, 1994). Prior studies of talent loss concur that inadequate information about college opportunities (Hanson, 1994; Plank and Jordan, 2001; Hamrick and Hossler, 1996), poor guidance counseling (Bellessa-Frost, 2006; Long, 2004), and/or misinformation about the cost of college and availability of financial aid (Long, 2007; Avery and Kane, 2004; Vargas, 2004; Ikenberry and Hartle, 1998) are contributing factors.

Family socioeconomic status, but parental education in particular, is a powerful correlate of postsecondary enrollment. That parents who most need information about college opportunities are least likely to receive it compounds the extent of talent loss at the postsecondary level (Vargas, 2004). According to Tornatzky, and associates (2002), Hispanic parents who are not proficient in English are especially disadvantaged in their acquisition of college information because they have limited access to teaching and guidance staff and often need help deciphering written information from post-secondary institutions.

Under the top 10% admission regime, two critical selection processes influence the likelihood that black and Hispanic high school students will attend college. The first depends on achieving a grade point average that places them in the top decile of their senior class. High levels of school segregation in Texas ensure that some Hispanic and African-American students qualify for the admission guarantee, but they are less likely than white or Asian students to graduate in the top decile of their class even if they attend

minority dominated schools (Tienda and Niu, 2006b). A second selection mechanism results because minority and nonminority students attend schools with unequal college-going traditions, which implies different levels of knowledge about the top 10% law.

Because many more students qualify for automatic admission than actually apply and enroll, top 10% graduates who know their class rank are better positioned to take advantage of the admission guarantee, assuming that they also know about the law's provisions. Presumably, high-achieving students who know about the top 10% law are more inclined to apply and enroll in a competitive, public four-year institution than their rank counterparts with more limited knowledge about the admission guarantee. We evaluate this proposition by examining the college destinations of rank-eligible Texas graduates. By focusing on rank-eligible students who stated their intentions to attend college following graduation, we show that parents' lack of fluency in English is a significant college barrier for high-achieving students who graduate from predominantly minority high schools, and that rank-eligible minority students with college aspirations are less likely than whites both to know about the law and to enroll in a post secondary institutions. This finding adds to the talent loss perspective by highlighting the joint influence of school segregation and parental English fluency in compounding information barriers that limit college access.

The next section describes the data, defines core variables and outlines the analytic strategy. After evaluating the consistency of self-reported and transcript-verified class rank, we evaluate the magnitude of minority talent loss by examining college enrollment among rank eligible students who know their class rank and who know a lot

about the law. The concluding section discusses the implications of the results for the success of the top 10% admissions policy.

Data and Methods

The empirical analyses are based on a representative sample of Texas public high school students who were surveyed during spring of 2002 using a paper and pencil in-class survey instrument (N=13,803). Importantly, this is the first cohort to have attended four years of high school with the top 10% law in effect: they were in the eighth grade when the law was passed and in the ninth grade when its provisions were fully in force. Thus, our respondents and their guidance counselors had four years to learn about the provisions of the law.

For cost reasons, the wave 2 survey is based on a random subsample of the baseline respondents (N=5,836), who were re-interviewed by phone in 2003. To guarantee the maximum possible precision for blacks and Asians, all baseline respondents from these groups were included in the longitudinal sample; proportionate samples of Hispanics and non-Hispanic whites were randomly drawn for the sample balance. The response rate for the wave 2 interviews was 70 percent, and sample weights for the follow-up interviews were recalibrated to the original population (see THEOP, 2004).

In addition to basic demographic, socioeconomic and standard tracking information, the baseline survey obtained self-reported information about grades, class rank, and future plans. Several items specifically tapped students' knowledge of the Texas top 10% law. Wave 2 interviews ascertained whether respondents actually enrolled

in college one year after high school graduation, and if so, where. Student-reported class rank, standardized test scores, and high school GPA were subjected to a transcript verification procedure, which was conducted by school administrators. Over 90 percent of student GPA and test scores were verified against high school transcripts.

Given the analytical objectives, we restrict our analyses to students who at the baseline interview claimed they ranked in the top decile of their class (N=1717). Because Wave 2 interviews were based on a random sample of the baseline, the longitudinal top 10% subsample includes 854 seniors, who either self-reported as top decile students or are so ranked based on transcripts. For the longitudinal top 10% subsample we evaluate consistency of rank and college destinations. Not all top-ranked students are college-bound; in fact, only 81 percent of them indicated that they preferred to attend a 4-year post-secondary institution, designated “college-oriented” in the analyses. Sample sizes for this subgroup are 1,393 and 689, respectively, for wave 1 and wave 2 respondents. Random missing data results in slight variation in the numbers of observations for specific analyses.

Key Variables

Three factors are key for understanding minority talent loss under the Texas top 10% law, namely: (1) *class rank*, which indicates whether students are eligible for automatic admission; (2) the *extent of knowledge* about the top 10% law, which influences students propensity to act on the guarantee; and (3) *high school ethno-racial composition*, which influences the likelihood that minority students qualify for the admission guarantee.

1. Class Rank

In Texas individual high schools decide how to calculate students' class rank. Respondents self-reported their class rank using a ten-category percentile distribution at the baseline interview; students who did not know their rank were asked for their best estimate. Because self-reported class rank and grades are biased upward, many researchers advise caution in their use (Kuncel, Crede and Thomas, 2005). The self-reported and transcript-verified class rank allows us to examine whether, and in what ways, students' understanding of their eligibility for automatic admission are related to their college destinations. Sensitivity analyses revealed that self-reported class rank does not bias the multivariate estimates, which are robust when verified rank is substituted for self-reported rank. Partly this reflects our focus on top decile students, among whom nearly 80 percent know their correct class standing. Therefore, the multivariate analyses about knowledge of the law (Table 2) are based on self-reported class rank in order to take advantage of the larger baseline sample.

2. Knowledge of the Top Ten Percent Law

In the baseline interview students were asked, "how much have you heard about the Top 10% Rule (guaranteeing automatic admission to the top 10% of a high school class to Texas public colleges and universities)?" Response choices included none, a little, some and a lot. In the interest of parsimony, we focus on students who "know a lot" about the law, rather than the full spectrum of response options because diagnostic analyses reveal that "knowing a lot" discriminates clearly on a large range of outcomes.

3. School Ethnic Composition

The efficiency of the top 10% law in restoring campus diversity partly depends on the ethno-racial composition of schools (Tienda and Niu, 2006b). This indicator was

obtained from administrative data posted by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) and appended to individual records. Students were sorted into five strata using the percent white as a baseline referent: (1) predominantly white (more than 80% white); (2) majority white (60-80% white); (3) integrated (40-60% white); (4) majority minority (20-40% white); and (5) predominantly minority (less than 20% white).

Analytic Strategy

After evaluating race and ethnic variation in the consistency of self-reported and transcript verified class rank, we use probit regressions to estimate students' likelihood of knowing a lot about the top 10% law. The multivariate analyses control for parental education and home ownership, two covariates that index family socioeconomic status, or use of non-English language at home. In our sample, forty percent of baseline respondents reported speaking another language at home, but over 80 percent of Hispanics did so. Lastly, we relate minority talent loss to the lack of knowledge in class rank standing and the provisions of the top 10% law.

Because college-oriented students may actively seek out information about admission policies, we conduct parallel analyses on the subset of top decile students who indicated a 4-year institution as their first college preference, a group designated "college bound." Only about three-in-four black and Hispanic top 10% graduates identified a four-year institution as their first college preference, compared with 84 and 91 percent of white and Asian students, respectively.

Results

Knowledge of Class Rank

Knowledge of class standing is important because it signals students' awareness of their eligibility for automatic admission. Among top performing students, imprecise knowledge of their class standing is associated with postsecondary talent loss. While many students are only vaguely aware of their class rank, others know minute differences between themselves and their fellow students.

Using transcript-verified class rank for seniors included in Wave 2, Table 1 reports the consistency of self-reported and actual class rank. Over three-fourths of top-performing seniors accurately reported their class rank, and over-statements dominated under-statements by a ratio of approximately 3:1. Asian students were most likely to report their top decile rank accurately (85 percent did so) and blacks were least likely to do so (70 percent). About one in five white students misreported their top decile rank, with overstatements dominating understatements by a 6:1 ratio. Asian class rank response errors were about evenly distributed between over and understatements. Overstatements were twice as likely as understatements among high-achieving blacks and Hispanic students. Although college-oriented top decile students are more likely to know their class rank accurately, race and ethnic disparities persist.

(Table 1 about Here)

The highest response errors correspond to students attending predominately white schools, where grade competition is fierce. Only two-thirds of top performing students who attended predominately white schools accurately reported their top decile class rank, with virtually all response error consisting of overstatement. Surprisingly, students who

attended integrated and predominately minority high schools were most likely to know their actual class rank. High-ranking graduates from integrated schools who misstated their class standing were almost twice as likely to overstate as to understate their rank. Response error was more evenly divided between over and understatements for students from minority schools. The lower panel confirms that college-bound top 10% seniors more accurately report their class rank than all high-achieving seniors, but differential response errors by school ethnic composition persist.

Knowledge of Top 10% Law

Building on the talent loss perspective, we hypothesize that rank-eligible black and Hispanic students will be less likely to know about the top 10% law than their white and Asian rank counterparts, particularly if they attend high schools where minorities dominate the student population. We use probit models to estimate racial and ethnic differences in the likelihood of knowing a lot about the law. The top panel of Table 2 reports point estimates and marginal effects for all top 10% graduates and the subset among them who attended predominantly minority high schools. The lower panel focuses on the subset of top decile students designated college bound because they stated intentions to enroll in a 4-year post-secondary institution.

(Table 2 about here)

Compared with white top 10% graduates, comparably ranked black seniors are equally likely to know a lot about the top 10% law, but rank-eligible Hispanic seniors are 11 percentage points *less* likely to know as much about the law. Asian students who graduated in the top decile of their high school were consistently *more* likely to know

about the provisions of the law than comparably ranked whites, even when family socioeconomic status or home language use are taken into account.

Family background largely explains why top-ranked Hispanic students are significantly less likely than whites to report knowing a lot about the top 10% law (second column), but this average difference conceals another layer of inequality that undermines high-achieving Hispanic students' knowledge of the law, namely, school segregation. Top-ranked Hispanic graduates who attended predominantly minority high schools are 27 percentage points *less* likely to know a lot about the admission guarantee than similarly situated white students. Family socioeconomic status accounts for about 30 percent of the Hispanic-white knowledge gap among top ranked seniors, and inclusion of home language use in the baseline model (third column) reduces the knowledge gap only marginally.

Even among the more selective group of college-bound students, Hispanic seniors are less likely to know a lot about the provisions of the top 10% law than comparable white seniors (lower panel). Specifically, top-ranked black students aspiring to attend a 4-year college are as likely as college-bound whites to know a lot about the top 10% law, and similarly disposed Asian students are 17 percentage points *more* likely than whites to know a lot about the law. Yet, Hispanic students with 4-year college intentions are 7 percentage points *less* likely than their white counterparts to know a lot about the law—a statistically significant difference. Further, rank-eligible, college-bound Hispanic graduates from predominantly minority schools are 23 percentage points *less* likely than whites to know a lot about the top 10% law. Although family socioeconomic status reduces the knowledge gap between Hispanic and white college-bound top decile

students, results in column 3 reveal that their parents' limited proficiency in English is a major barrier to their knowledge of the law (Tornatzky, et al., 2002). It is worth noting that letters about the admission guarantee were sent to parents of graduating seniors under the signature of then Governor George W. Bush, but these were available only in English.

Minority Talent Loss: College Destinations of Top Decile Students

Our claim that information deficits—notably knowledge of the top 10% law and own class standing—relate to a postsecondary talent loss finds support in Table 3. The upper panel reports college destination by consistency of class rank among all top decile students and separately for college-oriented high-achieving black and Hispanic students; the lower panel reports corresponding results for knowledge of the top 10% law. These tabulations tell the same story from two angles: well informed students are more likely to enroll in a post secondary institution; to enroll in a 4-year institution; and to enroll at one of the public flagships. Students who lack information about the provisions of the law *and* their actual class rank are less likely to enroll at any postsecondary institution and more likely to enroll at a 2-year institution. In particular, top-ranked students with very limited knowledge of the law have a very low likelihood of enrolling at one of the public flagships, even though they would have been automatically admitted.

(Table 3 About Here)

High achieving students who are not enrolled in any postsecondary institution represent the most extreme talent loss, but the cascading of top 10% graduates to less selective institutions represents another dimension of talent loss that the uniform admission law sought to abate. About 11 percent of students who understate their class

rank, and 17 percent of those who overstate their rank do not enroll at any postsecondary institution after graduating from high school, compared with 5 percent of seniors who accurately state their class rank. Over a quarter of students who understate their rank matriculate at a 2-year college, another quarter of matriculate at a non-selective 4-year institution, but only 5 percent enroll at one of the public flagships, as compared with one-third of graduates who accurately report their rank. Approximately 17 percent of high school graduates who overstate their rank actually matriculate at one of the public flagships, while almost one-third of these students successfully enroll at another selective institution. Mostly these are students at the cusp of the 10% cutoff who otherwise should have strong academic credentials. Similar results obtain for college-oriented minority students, but a much higher proportion of black and Hispanic seniors who misstate their class rank enroll at a non-selective 4-year institution; moreover a lower share of them enroll at one of the flagships.

The extent of students' knowledge about the top 10% law is also associated with their college destinations. About one in four top 10% graduates who know nothing about the law do not enroll in a postsecondary institution after high school; another quarter enroll in a 2-year college, and only 2 percent actually matriculate at either UT or A&M. Comparable enrollment rates among seniors who know a lot about the uniform admission law are, respectively, 6, 10 and 40 percent. These college enrollment differentials according to knowledge of the law are also evident among college-oriented black and Hispanic top 10% graduates. Nearly one-fifth of those reported not knowing the law do not enroll in college after graduation and another one-fifth enroll at a non-selective 4-year college. Further, over one-third of college-aspiring minority students who know only a

little or some about the law matriculate at a non-selective 4-year institution.. This finding further underscores that the talent loss is most severe at the selective institutions, which is opposite of the law's intention.

Conclusion and Implications

Although the 2003 *Grutter* decision permits narrowly tailored consideration of race in college admissions, affirmative action remains a highly controversial issue in Texas and the nation. States that enacted legislative bans on race preferences, such as Washington, California, and more recently Michigan, continue seeking strategies that broaden college access to underrepresented minority groups. The top 10% law thus has important implications for public education systems beyond the state of Texas.

The empirical analyses illustrate how information constraints may limit college access to talented minority students who are eligible for automatic admission. Despite extensive outreach efforts to educate school administrators and guidance counselors about the provisions of the top 10% law, four years after the law was in force we find that Hispanic seniors who graduate in the top decile of their high school class *are less* likely than comparable white students to know a lot about the admission guarantee. College-oriented, high achieving Hispanic students who attend predominantly minority high schools are particularly disadvantaged because of their parents' lack of proficiency in English. Moreover, students' knowledge of their class rank and their understanding of the law is systematically related to their college destinations. Top decile students who accurately report their class rank or who know a lot about the law are more likely to enroll at one of the public flagships compared with students who lack such knowledge.

As Texas' college-age population becomes more diverse, a formidable loss of talent associated with information barriers could undermine the effectiveness of the top 10% law in diversifying college campuses.

This talent loss is troublesome in light of massive outreach efforts to inform students, counselors and parents about the law in order to broaden access to the public flagships. These include (1) development and use of a common state-wide college application for all public universities; (2) requiring all high schools to post a sign explaining the top ten percent law; (3) distribution of letters to parents informing them of their child's eligibility for automatic admission to any public institution and urging them to apply; (4) broad distribution of memoranda to high school counselors explaining rank eligibility and the additional requirements for college admission; and (5) establishment of need-based scholarship programs at the public flagships to encourage enrollment of rank-eligible students.

Many factors mitigate these outreach efforts. For example, high school counselors from high schools with low college going traditions are unlikely to steer academically inclined students to seek admission to the public flagships (Bellessa Frost, 2006; McDonough, 1997). Students who indicated they knew about the law also claimed that counselors were the single most important source of information, especially among minority groups. Nearly half of blacks and Hispanics, compared with about one-third of whites and Asians, reported that they learned about the law from their counselors. Distance is another significant deterrent to Hispanic enrollment at the public flagships. Compared with whites, Hispanic parents tend to prefer their children to live at home while attending college (López Turley, 2006), and thus may not actively seek out

information about access to colleges far away from home. Other studies have identified myriad barriers that limit college access, including misinformation about financial aid and the cost of college, both of which discourage talented minority from pursuing higher education (Long, 2007; 2004). In the context of the top 10% admission regime, this study shows how high-performing students' knowledge of the law and their own class rank is associated with their college destinations, including whether to pursue post-secondary schooling.

Although our empirical evidence is descriptive rather than causal, results showing that college-oriented black and Hispanic students who qualify for the admission guarantee but do not know about the law and do not pursue higher education are consistent with our claim that information barriers foment talent loss. Eliminating information gaps is but a first step toward reducing the share of rank-qualified, college-oriented who do not attend college in Texas and elsewhere. Our finding that Hispanic students face greater information constraints than blacks because of family language barriers also lends support to our claim about information gaps and talent loss. The geographic dispersal of the Hispanic population since 1990 combined with a burgeoning second generation, a large share of which has parents with low levels of education who are not proficient in English, broadens the significance of this finding beyond Texas.

References

- Avery, Christopher and Thomas Kane. 2004. "Student Perceptions of College Opportunities: The Boston COACH Program." Pp. 355-391 in C. M. Hoxby (ed.), *College Choices: The Economics of Where to Go, When to Go, and How to Pay for It*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bellessa Frost, Michelle. 2006. "Texas Students' Knowledge of University Admissions Policies and Standards: Do High School Counselors Matter?" Ph.D. Dissertation, Princeton University. http://theop.princeton.edu/reports/wp/students_knowledge.pdf
- Grutter v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 306, 328 (2003)
- Hanson, Sandra L. 1994. "Lost Talent: Unrealized Educational Aspirations and Expectations among U.S. Youths." *Sociology of Education* 67:159-83.
- Hamrick, Florence A. and Don Hossler. 1996. "Diverse Information-Gathering Methods in the Postsecondary Decision-Making Process." *The Review of Higher Education* 19:179-198.
- Hopwood v. Texas*, 78 F.3d 932 (5th Cir. 1996)
- Ikenberry, Stanley O. and Terry W. Hartle. 1998. *Too Little Knowledge is a Dangerous Thing*. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Kuncel, Nathan R., Crede, Marcus, & Thomas, Lisa. L. (2005). The validity of self-reported grade point averages, class ranks, and test scores: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(1), 63-82.
- Long, Bridget T. 2007. "The Contributions of Economics to the Study of College Access and Success." *Teachers College Record* (in press).
- Long, Bridget T. 2004. "The Role of Perceptions and Information in College Access: An Exploratory Review of the Literature and Possible Data Sources." Boston: The Education Resources Institute (TERI). www.Teri.org/pdf/research-studies/ResearchReport_Long.pdf.

- Long, Mark C. 2004. "Race and College Admissions: An Alternative to Affirmative Action." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(4):1020-1033.
- López Turley, Ruth N. 2006. "When Parents Want Children to Stay Home for College." *Research in Higher Education*, 47(7): 823-846.
- McDonough, Patricia. M. 1997. *Choosing colleges: How social class and schools structure opportunity*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Plank, Stephen B. and Will J. Jordan. 2001. "Effects of Information, Guidance and Actions on Postsecondary Destinations: A Study of Talent Loss." *American Educational Research Journal* 38:947-79.
- THEOP. 2004. Senior Wave 2 Survey Methodology Report.
http://texastop10.princeton.edu/surveys/senior_w2/senior_w2_methods_pu.pdf
- Tienda, Marta and Sunny Niu. 2006a. "Flagships, Feeders, and the Texas Top 10% Plan." *Journal of Higher Education* 77(4):712-739.
- Tienda, Marta and Sunny Niu. 2006b. "Capitalizing on Segregation, Pretending Neutrality: College Admissions and the Texas Top 10% Law." *American Law and Economics Review* 8(2): 312-346.
- Tornatzky, Louis G., Richard Cutler and Jongho Lee. 2002. *College Knowledge: What Latino Parents need to Know and Why they Don't Know It*. Clarmont, CA: The Tomás Rivera Institute.
- Vargas, Joel H. 2004. *College Knowledge: Addressing Information Barriers to College*. Boston: The Education Resources Institute (TERI).
- Walker, Bruce and Laverne, G. 2001. "Affirmative action and percent plans: What we learned in Texas." *The College Board Review*, 193:18-23.

**Table 1: Internal Consistency of Top 10% Status:
Texas Public High School Seniors in 2002 (Row Percent)**

	Accurate Rank	Understate Rank	Overstate Rank	N
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>				
All Top 10% Seniors				
White	79	3	18	394
Black	70	10	19	95
Hispanic	75	9	17	242
Asian	85	8	7	112
<i>Total^a</i>	78	6	17	843
College-Oriented Top 10% Seniors^b				
White	83	2	15	330
Black	78	12	10	79
Hispanic	78	8	14	173
Asian	86	6	8	99
<i>Total^a</i>	82	4	14	681
<i>School Ethnic Composition</i>				
All Top 10% Seniors				
Predominately White	66	2	32	96
Majority White	78	3	19	196
Integrated	81	7	13	188
Majority Minority	75	10	15	57
Predominately Minority	80	9	11	317
<i>Total^a</i>	77	6	17	854
College-Oriented Top 10% Seniors^b				
Predominately White	69	2	29	82
Majority White	81	3	16	171
Integrated	84	5	12	155
Majority Minority	87	2	11	36
Predominately Minority	85	7	8	245
<i>Total^a</i>	81	4	14	689

Source: Texas Higher Education Opportunity Project, Senior Wave Respondents.

Note: Accurate: both self-reported & verified rank in top 10%

Understate: self-reported not top 10% rank, verified rank in top 10%

Overstate: self-reported top 10%, verified rank not

a: Total row percents and counts based on distribution by school segregation strata differs slightly from those based on distribution by race/ethnicity due to missing data.

b: College-oriented seniors are defined as those who specified a 4-year college as 1st preference.

**Table 2: Probit Coefficients:
Knowledge of the Top 10% Law among Top10% Texas Public High school Seniors in 2002
(s.e. in parenthesis)**

	Base			Base+Family SES			Base+Other Language					
	Coef.	(s.e.)	Marginal Effect	Coef.	(s.e.)	Marginal Effect	Coef.	(s.e.)	Marginal Effect			
All Top 10% Seniors (n=1717)												
Black	0.01	(.120)	0.00	0.13	(.124)	0.05	0.03	(.121)	0.01			
Hispanic	-0.29	(.071)	***	-0.11	(.083)	0.00	-0.08	(.104)	-0.03			
Asian	0.37	(.108)	***	0.13	0.50	(.113)	***	0.17	0.60	(.137)	***	0.20
Top 10% Seniors in Predominately Minority Schools (n=554)												
Black	-0.50	(.226)	*	-0.20	-0.41	(.233)	-0.16	-0.52	(.226)	*	-0.21	
Hispanic	-0.72	(.191)	***	-0.27	-0.47	(.203)	*	-0.18	-0.44	(.231)	*	-0.17
Asian	-0.16	(.236)		-0.06	-0.01	(.244)		-0.00	0.12	(.262)		0.05
College-Oriented Top 10% Seniors (n=1393)												
Black	0.19	(.139)		0.06	0.25	(.146)	0.08	0.22	(.140)		0.07	
Hispanic	-0.20	(.083)	**	-0.07	0.01	(.095)	0.00	0.05	(.120)		0.02	
Asian	0.56	(.127)	***	0.17	0.67	(.132)	***	0.20	0.85	(.163)	***	0.24
College-Oriented Top 10% Seniors in Predominately Minority Schools (n=428)												
Black	-0.37	(.259)		-0.14	-0.32	(.266)	-0.12	-0.40	(.260)		-0.15	
Hispanic	-0.64	(.219)	**	-0.23	-0.47	(.233)	*	-0.17	-0.24	(.256)		-0.09
Asian	0.06	(.273)		0.02	0.20	(.284)	0.07	0.53	(.314)		0.18	

Source: Texas Higher Education Opportunity Project, Senior Wave 1 Data.

***: p<0.001, **: p<0.01, *: p<0.05

**Table 3: Talent Loss by Consistency of Top 10% Status and Knowledge of the Top 10% Law:
Top Decile Texas Public High School Seniors in 2002 (Row Percent)**

	College Enrollment						N	Col. %
	Not Enrolled	2 Year	Non/Less Selective	Flagships	Other Selective			
Consistency of Reporting Top 10% Rank								
All Top10% Seniors								
Accurate rank	5	12	16	33	35	671	77	
Understate rank	11	26	24	5	33	54	6	
Overstate rank	17	26	12	17	29	128	17	
<i>Total</i>	8	15	15	28	34	853	100	
College-Oriented Black and Hispanic top 10% seniors								
Accurate rank	4	7	20	34	36	202	78	
Understate rank	4	13	46	2	36	22	9	
Overstate rank	21	12	21	10	36	28	13	
<i>Total</i>	6	8	22	28	36	252	100	
Knowledge of the Top 10% Law								
All Top10% Seniors								
None	24	27	11	2	36	54	6	
A Little	10	26	27	4	34	104	12	
Some	7	18	20	20	35	177	20	
A Lot	6	10	12	40	33	504	61	
<i>Total</i>	8	15	16	28	34	839	100	
College-Oriented Black and Hispanic top 10% seniors								
None	17	9	21	13	40	15	3	
A Little	3	17	35	0	45	28	11	
Some	6	17	35	16	25	50	18	
A Lot	6	4	16	37	37	159	68	
<i>Total</i>	6	8	22	28	36	252	100	

Source: Texas Higher Education Opportunity Project, Senior Wave 1 & 2 Data.

Note: Accurate: both self-reported & verified rank in top 10%

Understate: self-reported not top 10% rank, verified rank in top 10%

Overstate: self-reported top 10%, verified rank not