Abstract: Concern and research involving the overrepresentation of African American students in the category of mild intellectual disability (MID) has existed for over four decades. Yet, little research focuses exclusively on the disproportionate representation of African American students at the secondary level. This study analyzed the National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2) data using composition index and relative risk ratio approaches to explore the proportion of African American students in the disability category of MID at the secondary level. Additionally, logistic regression analyses were used to examine whether ethnicity predicted the likelihood of a student being identified as MID. African American students were overrepresented in the disability category of MID and logistic regression results indicated ethnicity predicted the likelihood of students having MID.

Decades of research document the disproportionality of African American students in the high-incidence category of mild intellectual disability (MID) (Artiles, 2003; Chinn & Hughes, 1987; Donovan & Cross, 2002; Hosp & Reschly, 2002, 2004; Skiba, Poloni-Straudinger, Gallini, Simmons, & Feggins-Azziz, 2006a; Waitoller, Artiles, & Cheney, 2010). In fact, concern regarding the overrepresentation of African American students in the category of MID dates back to Dunn’s (1968) classic article in which he discussed unequal representation patterns of students of low status backgrounds (i.e., African American, American Indians, Mexicans and Puerto Rican Americans) in classes for students considered ‘educable mentally retarded’ (Waitoller et al., 2010). Despite researchers’ extensive investigation on the issue of overrepresentation, the disproportionate number of African American students receiving special education services persists. The duration and consistency of findings in literature demonstrates the magnitude of this issue (Hosp & Reschly, 2004).

Overrepresentation occurs when the percentage of minority students in a disability category exceeds the percentage of these students in the total school-aged population (Zhang & Katsiyannis, 2002). The subjectivity of the determination of high-incidence disabilities makes these categories more susceptible to overrepresentation as opposed to low-incidence or severe disabilities (e.g., severe intellectual disability, deaf) (De Valenzuela, Cope-land, Qi, & Park, 2006; Elhoweris, Mutua, Alsheikh, & Holloway, 2005; Harry & Anderson, 1994; Millan & Reschly, 1998). Hence, the overrepresentation of African American students is more likely to occur in high-incidence disabilities, such as mild intellectual disability.

Overrepresentation can be the result of inappropriate referral, identification, or culturally biased tests. Previous researchers demonstrated these processes tend to be discriminatory and, too often, individuals completing the process lack cultural awareness (Harry & Anderson, 1994; Harry & Klingner, 2006; Oswald, Coutinho, Best, & Singh, 1999; Skiba et al., 2006b). Teachers do a vast majority of referrals and biased perceptions of students—intentional or unintentional—lead to more referrals of African American students than Caucasian students (Skiba et
Within the identification process, tests used for assessments are typically standardized on Caucasian Americans and reflect that particular cultural knowledge base. Hence, tests can be biased against students unfamiliar with the Caucasian American cultural knowledge base, such as African Americans (Artiles & Trent, 1994; Harry & Anderson, 1994; Harry & Klingner, 2006). Last, once the referral process is initiated, the likelihood of African American students being placed in special education increases significantly with 85% of all referrals of African American students resulting in special education placement, as compared to 70–74% of students as a whole (Gottlieb, Atler, Gottlieb, & Wishner, 1994; Millan & Reschly, 1998; Ysseldyke, Vanderwood, & Shriner, 1997).

The lack of cultural awareness on the part of individuals referring and identifying minority students for special education services is of particular concern as the literature suggests ethnicity predicts disability (Artiles & Trent, 1994; Chinn & Hughes, 1987; Skiba et al., 2006a; Zhang & Katsiyannis, 2002). In other words, African American students are more likely to be identified for special education services in the MID disability category (Gottlieb et al., 1994; Harry & Klingner, 2006). Oswald et al. (1999) examined the influence of economic and demographic factors on African American students’ identification in the MID disability category. African American students were overrepresented in the MID category and were 2.5 times more likely to be identified as MID compared to non-African American students.

**Impact of Overrepresentation**

The disproportionate representation of African American students receiving special education services for MID and the impact of disproportionality on African American students are two long-standing concerns in the field (Chinn & Hughes, 1987; Dunn, 1968; Harry & Anderson, 1994). For one, receipt of special education services is often permanent through students’ school years and typically related to a more restrictive placement (e.g., outside of general education classroom) (Polloway, Lubin, Smith, & Patton, 2010). In fact, African American students identified with MID spend more time outside the general education classroom compared to Caucasian students with MID (McDermott, Goldman, & Varenne, 2006; Reid & Knight, 2006). Restrictive placements may provide a less challenging and stimulating academic experience and leave African American students unprepared to progress educationally (Harry & Anderson, 1994; Hosp & Reschly, 2004).

Second, and equally problematic, are the negative postschool outcomes of students with MID. Compared to peers without disabilities, students with MID are more likely to drop out of school, less likely to access postsecondary education or obtain employment, and more likely to be incarcerated (Nietupski, McQuillen, Berg, Daugherty, & Hamre-Nietupski, 2001; Wagner, Newman, Cameto, Levine, & Garza, 2006). Students with disabilities who do not graduate from high school with a standard diploma are more apt to experience lifelong consequences such as incarceration and the inability to become economically self-sufficient (Gaumer-Erickson, Kleinhammer-Trapnell, & Thurlow, 2007). School completion is a legitimate concern for students with MID, as students with MID are more likely to receive nontraditional exit certificates rather than a standard diploma (Gaumer-Erickson et al., 2007; Polloway et al., 2010).

**Examining Overrepresentation at the Secondary Level**

Despite concerns about the disproportionate representation of African American students in high-incidence disability categories, few studies examine overrepresentation at the secondary level (exceptions include Edgar, 1987; Wagner & Davis, 2006). Secondary students are often overlooked in the disproportionality literature as most studies focus attention on students at the elementary level (Hosp & Reschly, 2004; Oswald et al., 1999). Thus, research is needed at the secondary level (e.g., seventh through twelfth grade) to determine whether African American students continue to experience the disproportionate representation occurring at the younger grades (e.g., Hosp & Reschly, 2004; Oswald et al., 1999). Therefore, this study examined disproportionality (i.e., risk of being identified and frequency of identification) within the category of MID at the secondary level to determine
whether ethnicity influenced the proportion of students identified with MID.

This study differs from previous studies in that it examines disproportionality at only the secondary level as opposed to the elementary and secondary level or just the elementary level (e.g., Hosp & Reschly, 2004; Skiba et al., 2006a; Zhang & Katsiyannis, 2002). To achieve the purposes of the study, National Longitudinal Transition Study-2 (NLTS2) data were analyzed. The authors sought to answer the following four research questions for students with MID: (a) given a population of students with disabilities, what are African American students’ risks of being identified with MID compared to the risk for non-African American students?, (b) given a population of students with disabilities, what are African American students’ risks of being identified with MID as compared to the risk for Caucasian students?, (c) to what extent are African American students over/under-represented in the MID disability category in comparison to their representation in the school-aged population?, and (d) does ethnicity predict whether students are more likely to have a primary disability of MID?

Method

Researchers focused on Wave 1 data from NLTS2 conducted by SRI International (SRI International, n.d.). In NLTS2, information was collected over a 10-year period from parents, youth, and schools (i.e., teachers and principals) to provide a national picture of the experiences and achievements of secondary students with disabilities as they transitioned into early adulthood (SRI International, n.d.). Information was collected over five (5) waves, beginning in 2001 and ending in 2009, and included six data collection mechanisms (parent/youth interview, student assessment, school characteristic survey, school program survey, transcripts, and general education teacher survey) (SRI International, n.d.). NLTS2 data were weighted to represent students nationally by creating population estimates (SRI International, 2000). Using a two-stage sampling process, a random sample of school districts was selected from the population of school districts and was stratified to represent different regions, sizes and levels of school district wealth (Wagner & Davis, 2006).

Of the 501 total school districts sampled, the second stage consisted of randomly selecting students in each district from each disability category to create population estimates using students sampled in each of the federal special education disability categories in use during 2001 (Javitz & Wagnner, 1990; SRI International, 2000; Wagner & Davis, 2006).

Participants

Our analysis focused on a subset of students in NLTS2 data. To be included in analyses students met the following conditions: (a) received special education services at the secondary level (e.g., grades 7 through 12) during the 2001–2002 academic year (i.e., Wave 1), and (b) identified as having a primary disability of mild intellectual disability (MID) by school personnel. The authors only focused on one high incidence category—MID—as historically African American students are believed to be overrepresented in this category nationally (Harry & Klingner, 2006).

A weighted sample of 58,766 students met these criteria (see Table 1 for participants’ gender, grade level, and income information). Of the weighted sample of students included in this investigation, African American students represented 47.0% of the MID category while Caucasian students represented 52.1%. Additionally, non-African American students, which included Caucasian as well as Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Island, American Indian/Alaska Native, Other/Multiple accounted for 53.0% of the MID category. The category of non-African American students included Caucasian students due to limitations with NLTS2 data in which categories with unweighted numbers lower than two cannot be reported.

Measures

Of the six data collection mechanisms used in NLTS2 (parent/youth interview, student assessment, school characteristic survey, school program survey, transcripts, and general education teacher survey), this analysis used data from the parent/youth interview and school program survey (SRI International, n.d.). The
TABLE 1

Characteristics of Students in Mild Intellectual Disability Category as a Percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>(n = 58,766)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Male</td>
<td>32.8 (5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Female</td>
<td>14.2 (4.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-African Male</td>
<td>24.8 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-African Female</td>
<td>28.2 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian American Male</td>
<td>24.8 (0.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian American Female</td>
<td>27.3 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Range, African American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>36.4 (6.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001–50,000</td>
<td>5.7 (5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001–75,000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than $75,000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Range, Non-African American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>21.4 (3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001–50,000</td>
<td>20.6 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001–75,000</td>
<td>2.7 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than $75,000</td>
<td>2.6 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Range, Caucasian</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $25,000</td>
<td>20.7 (3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,001–50,000</td>
<td>20.4 (1.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,001–75,000</td>
<td>2.7 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than $75,000</td>
<td>2.6 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eighth</td>
<td>30.5 (8.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth</td>
<td>18.5 (5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenth</td>
<td>21.5 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh</td>
<td>23.0 (5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twelfth</td>
<td>5.0 (2.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Non-African American included Caucasian, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Other/Multiple. All unweighted values below two were not reported. Not all respondents provided an answer to questions regarding household income and grade level. Income range percentages for African Americans in the MID category represents 89.6% of the total African American population. Income range percentages for non-African Americans in the MID category represents 89.3% of the total non-African American population. Income range percentages for Caucasians in the MID category represents 89.1% of the total Caucasian population. Grade level percentages for students in the MID category represents 98.3% of the total student population. Standard error values are in parentheses.

Within the larger NLTS2 project, the authors identified relevant variables from the school program survey and the parent/youth survey in Wave 1. These variables included students’ primary disability (npr1D2b), grade level (npr1A1), ethnicity (np1A3), gender (np1A1) and household income (income_range). We eliminated all non-relevant variables and cases in both databases to leave only students who had a primary disability of MID. We then merged the school program survey and parent/youth interview by cases.

In the construction of the final database for analysis, some original NLTS2 variables were used; however, some categorical variables were recoded. The variable regarding student ethnicity (np1A3) originally included six separate categories (e.g., Caucasian, African American, Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Other/Multiple) and we condensed it into three: African American, Caucasian, and non-African American (i.e., Hispanic, Asian/Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, Other/Multiple, and Caucasian). Another manipulated variable addressed students’ household income and consisted of 16 separate categories. This variable was condensed into four categories (e.g., less than $25,000; $25,001 to 50,000; $50,001 to 75,000; and greater than $75,000) by separating the categories into four quartiles.
Data Analysis

Using the complex samples option in SPSS to represent weighted national population estimates, descriptive analyses were run to obtain frequency data regarding participants’ ethnicity, household income, gender, and grade level. Weights were provided in the original NLTS2 databases and allowed for the estimates to represent population characteristics (see Javitz & Wagner, 2003; Wagner, Kutash, Duchnowski, & Epstein, 2005 for additional information relative to weighting the data). Risk index, relative risk ratio, and composition index approaches were used to examine the representativeness of participants in targeted categories. Finally, logistic regression analyses were conducted to identify whether ethnicity impacted the likelihood of participants having a primary disability of MID.

Risk index and relative risk ratio. Risk index (RI) and relative risk ratio (RR) approaches were used to answer research questions one and two regarding African American students’ risk of being identified compared to non-African American and Caucasian students (Skiba et al., 2008). “Risk” indicates the likelihood of a student from a target group being identified with a disability, or in this case the particular disability category of MID (Skiba et al., 2008; Westat, 2005). According to Westat, RI is computed by dividing the number of students from an ethnic group (e.g., African American) in a category (i.e., MID) by the total number of students from an ethnic group (e.g., African American), and then multiplying by 100. In order to obtain the best measure of disproportionality, a relative risk ratio (RR) must be computed which is done by dividing the RI for the target group (African American) by the RI for the comparison group (Caucasian or non-African American) (Westat, 2005). For example, the RI for the African American group divided by the RI for the Caucasian group will provide a RR for the African American group. A RR of 1.0 indicates no difference between target and comparison groups, while a RR greater than 1.0 indicates risk for the target group is greater than risk of the comparison group (i.e., target group is overrepresented). A RR less than 1.0 indicates risk for the target group is less than the risk for the comparison group (Skiba et al., 2008).

Composition index. To answer research question three regarding the extent to which African American students are overrepresented or underrepresented, a composition index (CI) was used as an alternate approach to measure the proportion of African American students in MID category compared to their representation in the school-aged population (Skiba et al., 2008). The CI was computed by dividing the number of students from an ethnic group (e.g., African American) in a category (e.g., MID) by the total number of students in that category (Westat, 2005). This percentage was compared to the ethnic group’s representation in the school-aged population. For the comparison of representativeness of African American students in the school-aged population, we used the Common Core of Data (CCD). CCD is the primary database on elementary and secondary education in the United States (Oswald et al., 1999). In 2001, African American students represented 7.42% of the school-aged population in grades 7 through 12 in all schools (i.e., public, private, and special) (U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, n.d.). Using the suggested 10% confidence interval around African American school-aged students (Chinn & Hughes, 1987), enrollment rates less than 6.68% would signify underrepresentation while rates exceeding 8.16% would signify overrepresentation of the African American group.

Logistic regression analyses. To answer research question four regarding whether ethnicity predicted the likelihood of students having MID, logistic regression analyses were conducted using SPSS. Researchers chose to only examine ethnicity because they felt it was the strongest and most significant predictor variable to examine when attempting to understand whether overrepresentation occurred for African American students at the secondary level as previous researchers suggested African American students are at high risk of receiving a disability label (Harry & Klingner, 2006). Logistic regression was most appropriate because it required the use of a binary outcome variable (i.e., MID vs. not MID) and predictor variables that could be continuous or categorical in nature (Huck, 2008). Two separate logistic regression analyses were conducted (i.e., African Americans
compared to Caucasians and African Americans compared to non-African Americans) due to limitations with NLTS2 database, as the ethnicity variable did not allow participants to be simultaneously coded into two categories (i.e., both Caucasian and non-African American). The outcome variable differed (MID vs. not MID), but the predictor variable (ethnicity) was the same for each logistic regression analysis. The effect of ethnicity on the odds of students having a primary disability of MID was estimated.

Results

Risk Index (RI) and Relative Risk Ratio (RR)

Risk indices were calculated for African American (RI = 10.4%), Caucasian (RI = 3.3%), and non-African American (RI = 2.7%) students. The RR for the African American group and Caucasian comparison group was 3.15; in other words, African American students were 3.15 times more likely to have a primary disability of MID compared to Caucasian students. Similarly, the RR for the African American group and non-African American group was 3.85; suggesting African American students were 3.85 times more likely to have a primary disability of MID compared to non-African American students.

Composition Index (CI)

Using NLTS2 data, African American students represented 47.0% of students with a primary disability of MID. The number of African American students enrolled in all schools in grades seven through twelve was 7.42% (U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, n.d.), indicating African American students were overrepresented in the category of MID.

Logistic Regression Analysis

The results of logistic regression analyses revealed ethnicity significantly predicted whether students had a primary disability of MID. The odds ratio indicated African American students were 4.36 times more likely of having a primary disability of MID compared to non-African Americans and 9.10 times more likely compared to Caucasian students (see Table 2 for a summary of logistic regression results).

Discussion

This study examined the NLTS2 to determine the representativeness of secondary-aged African American students identified as having MID as their primary disability as well as analyzed data to examine whether ethnicity predicted secondary students' likelihood of having a primary disability of MID. Findings determined African American students were overrepresented in MID. Additionally, ethnicity predicted students having a primary disability of MID.

Throughout all analyses a connection was found between secondary African American students and the category of MID. The logistic regression analyses indicate African American students are more likely to have a primary disability of MID compared to non-African American students and Caucasian students. Using the CI, African American students were grossly overrepresented at the secondary level compared to their representation in the school-aged population (47.0% vs. 7.42%). Results of RR support the overrepresentation

TABLE 2
Summary of Logistic Regression Analyses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE(B)</th>
<th>exp(B)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American vs. Caucasian*</td>
<td>2.209*</td>
<td>0.585</td>
<td>9.107</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American vs. Non-African American*</td>
<td>1.1474*</td>
<td>0.354</td>
<td>4.366</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: exp (B) = exponentiated B, a = the estimated parameter was set to zero because this is the reference category. p < 0.05
finding (i.e., 10.4% for African Americans vs. 3.3% for Caucasians and 2.7% for non-African Americans). Findings from this study suggest disproportionality in the MID category continues to be a problem for African American students despite decades of research and attention (Artiles, Kozleski, Trent, Osher, & Ortiz, 2010; Donovan & Cross, 2002; Dunn, 1968).

Disproportionality in the MID category is problematic if these students are not receiving what they need in terms of educational programming (Nietupski et al., 2001). Special education can be considered a protective or a risk factor (Donovan & Cross, 2002). African American students placed in the MID disability category may actually be receiving educational support necessary to help them succeed in high school; however, researchers document this is frequently not the case. The efficacy of special education services has been contested for many years due to the problematic outcomes of the special education system (e.g., achievement level, dropout rate, poor postschool outcomes) (Artiles & Bal, 2008; Harry & Anderson, 1994; Polloway et al., 2010).

Concern also exists that African Americans with MID receive low-quality instruction and experience more segregated education settings than Caucasians with MID (Polloway et al., 2010). Students placed in segregated settings may be denied access to the general education curriculum and receiving services that do not meet their learning needs, which can further exacerbate poor postschool outcomes, such as decreased opportunities for employment, as well as in-school success (Hosp & Reschly, 2002; McDermott et al., 2006; Nietupski et al., 2001; Polloway et al., 2010; Reid & Knight, 2006; Skiba et al., 2006a; Waitoller et al., 2010). The negative postschool outcomes associated with African American students with MID (e.g., school completion, postschool economic and occupational attainment, access to college)—both those correctly and wrongly identified, indicate a need for an increased commitment to successful school completion for these students (Artiles & Bal, 2008; Polloway et al., 2010). Particular attention should be given to methods to improve African American students with MID postschool success, such as access to meaningful employment and postsecondary education. One such strategy is the use of a functional curriculum as it has the potential to improve students with MID in school success as well as postschool outcomes (Bouck, 2004; Bouck & Flanagan, 2010).

Conclusions and Implications

Findings from this study highlight the issue of overrepresentation at the secondary level among African American students—particularly when considering students with MID, a problem still existing over 40 years after Dunn (1968) raised the issue (Artiles et al., 2010; Waitoller et al., 2010). One potential solution to the issue of disproportionality is training school professionals to be culturally competent (Cartledge & Kourea, 2008). Schools have become increasingly diverse, but the same cannot be said for teachers (e.g., Caucasian women of Anglo-European origin) (Case & Hemmings, 2005). Many school professionals lack knowledge about the cultural experience of African Americans students (Cartledge & Kourea, 2008). Training school professionals to be culturally competent would permit them to be better equipped to work with a broad range of students from different cultures with varying disabilities. Additionally, training school professionals to be culturally competent could result in fewer inappropriate referrals of African American students to special education and, consequently, reduce their overrepresentation (Artiles, Harry, Reschly, & Chinn, 2002; Valles, 1998).

Another potential solution is re-evaluating the assessment and identification process. The assessment and identification process has been the focus of many researchers as this process may possibly contribute to the disproportionate number of African American students in special education (Skiba et al., 2006b). Often, in the identification process, tests used for assessments are typically standardized on Caucasian Americans and reflect that particular cultural knowledge base (Artiles & Trent, 1994; Harry & Anderson, 1994; Harry & Klingner, 2006). One way to circumvent this issue is to implement assessments that focus more closely on instruction and classroom practice, such as performance-based measures or curriculum-based measures.
(Donovan & Cross, 2002). By implementing assessments that are more academically meaningful, the potential bias experienced by those unfamiliar with standardized assessments will be reduced and may result in the determination of fewer students eligible for special education services (Donovan & Cross, 2002).

Limitations and Future Directions

A few limitations are identified in this study. One limitation is the number of logistic regressions. Due to limitations with NLTS2 data, we were unable to conduct one single logistic regression comparing all ethnic groups. Thus, there is some redundancy in the two logistic regressions because they are comparing similar populations (i.e., Caucasian and non-African American—which included Caucasians). Future research should examine the identification of other racial/ethnic groups (i.e., non-African American) as there is the potential for these groups to be over/under-represented as well. This would also remove the issue of redundancy in the logistic regressions and strengthen the findings of the study.

Another limitation is the use of ethnicity as the only predictor variable. Although research suggests ethnicity predicts disability (e.g., Artiles & Trent, 1994; Chinn & Hughes, 1987; Skiba et al., 2006a; Zhang & Katsiyannis, 2002), previous research also suggests correlations between income and ethnicity and their effect of predicting disability (Artiles, 2003; Artiles & Trent, 1994; Gottlieb et al., 1994). Future research should examine a range of factors that may impact disability identification (e.g., academic achievement, parental educational status, socio-economic status, suspension rates, postschool outcomes) as further analysis of these variables may strengthen the results of the study.

Additional research is needed regarding disproportionality at the secondary level considering students with MID as well as other high incidence disabilities categories, such as emotional/behavior disorders. There is a lack of research addressing disproportionality issues at the secondary level; most studies focus attention on students at the elementary level (Hosp & Reschly, 2004; Oswald et al., 1999). Future research should longitudinally examine the school experiences of students identified with MID beginning at the elementary level and follow these students into the secondary level. A longitudinal study would provide evidence of the disproportionality issues that exist at the secondary level. Moreover, this type of study would provide some insight into how disproportionality initiates at the elementary level and culminates at the secondary level.
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