Racial/Ethnic Inequality in the College Completion Process: An Empirical Analysis

Nikolas D. Pharris-Ciurej,
Department of Sociology and Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology
University of Washington

September 16, 2010

This is a preliminary abstract of a work-in-progress submitted for consideration at the 2011 meetings of the Population Association of America. Nikolas Pharris-Ciurej can be contacted at nickpc@u.washington.edu.

Racial/Ethnic Inequality in the College Completion Process: An Empirical Analysis

ABSTRACT

This analysis uses data from the University of Washington Beyond High School Research Project to examine how racial/ethnic inequality develops across four of the key educational transitions in the college completion process: formation of college plans, college preparation, attendance, and completion. Also it examines whether a cumulative model of educational attainment can explain the racial/ethnic variation at each of these key points. Preliminary analyses indicate that African American, Native American, and Mexican youth are just as likely as their peers to have college plans. However, due to their disadvantaged family backgrounds, they are less likely to attend or complete college. Vietnamese, Korean, and Japanese & Chinese students receive increased levels of support from their significant others, which they are able to translate into increased levels of success at nearly all stages of the college completion process.

Extended Abstract

Since the 1950s the educational requirements necessary to obtain a middle class lifestyle have dramatically increased. During the middle of the twentieth century, the receipt of a high school degree was often sufficient to allow one to achieve the 'American Dream'. High school educated workers were often able to obtain well-paying jobs that allowed for home ownership, the financial stability to raise a family, and the ability to enjoy some middle class amenities.

However, over the past 50 years the structure of the economy has changed. Many of the skilled labor positions have disappeared and a premium is increasingly being placed on highly educated and skilled workers, making a college degree increasingly necessary for entry into a job that affords a middle class lifestyle (Day and Newburger, 2002). As the earnings of highly educated workers have increased (and with the loss of many skilled labor positions), the earnings gap between high school and college graduates has steadily grown from the 1950s, when it stood at $2,705, through the turn of the century. At present the earnings differential is $18,410[1]. Additionally college graduates are more likely to be in positions that offer greater opportunity for professional mobility and additional benefits, such as pension benefits and health insurance (Mishel et al. 2009; Institute for Higher Education Policy, 1998).

Although the receipt of a college degree is related to a host of advantageous outcomes, ranging from increased wealth to greater life expectancy, the likelihood of receiving a college degree varies considerably across racial/ethnic groups. For example, in 2009, 52% of Asian and 37% of white young adults, ages 25 to 29, have completed a college degree, while only 19% of African American and 12% of Hispanic young adults have done so. Overall, 31% of all young adults have completed a college degree (US Census Bureau, Educational Attainment in the United States: 2009, Table 1[2]).

Given the advantages associated with a college degree, it is important to understand why such significant levels of inequality exist across racial/ethnic groups. However, to fully understand

[1] Information about educational attainment and wage income was obtained from the 1950 and 2000 Public Use Microdata files, as made available by the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series Project at the Minnesota Population Center (Ruggles and Sobek 2001). The differences in wages are expressed in constant, 2000 dollars.
[2] Data downloaded on 5-15-2010 from: http://www.census.gov/population/www/socdemo/education/cps2009.html

racial/ethnic inequality in college completion, one must examine not only the correlates and levels of college completion, but also the likelihood that students from various racial/ethnic groups progress across the key educational transitions in the journey towards a college degree. It is quite possible that students from various racial/ethnic groups differ in their ability to successfully: form college plans, properly prepare to attend college, complete high school, enroll in college, and graduate from college. If a racial/ethnic disparity develops during one or more of these key educational transitions, it, obviously, impacts the racial/ethnic inequality in college completion.

Thus it is important that these educational transitions are not only conceptualized as discrete events, but also as a progression of steps that culminate in a college degree. One of the primary advantages of conceptualizing college completion as a series of sequential steps is that it allows for an examination of the changes in the racial/ethnic composition of the student population as students progress towards a Bachelor's degree. Specifically, one can examine the exact point(s) at which students from certain racial/ethnic groups are advantaged or disadvantaged in their ability to advance towards a college degree, allowing for a better understanding of how racial/ethnic inequality develops during students' high school and college careers.

Numerous analyses have examined the racial/ethnic achievement gap that exists across the key educational transitions in the college completion process: the formation of educational ambitions[3], college preparation[4], formation of college plans[5], high school graduation/dropping out of high school[6], college attendance[7], and college completion[8] (for a review of the literature see Kao and Thompson, 2003). These analyses are invaluable in that they provide an in-depth examination of how various background,

---

[3] e.g. Cheng and Starks, 2002; Goyette and Xie, 1999; Goldsmith 2004; Harris, 2006; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001; Tienda and Kao, 1995, 1998; Qian and Blair, 1999

[4] e.g. Ainsworth, 2002; Desmond and Turley, 2009; Hurtado et. al., 1997; Kao, 2001; Orr, 2003; Vigdor and Clotfeller, 2003

[5] e.g. Frost, 2007; Hauser & Anderson, 1991; Ingles & Dalton, 2008, Reynolds et. al., 2006; Sewell & Hauser, 1975

[6] e.g. Astone and McLanahan, 1994; Hirschman, 2001; Perriera et. al., 2006; Portes and Hao, 2004; Ream and Rumberger, 2008; Rumberger, 1987, 1995; Wojtkiewicz and Donato, 1995

[7] e.g. Glick and White, 2004; Greenman and Xie, 2007; Goldsmith, 2009; Harris, 2008; Keller and Tillman, 2008; Massey et. al. 2003

[8] e.g. Adelman, 1999, 2006; Anderson, 1981; Attewell et al. 2006; Bowen and Bok, 1998; Buchman and DiPrete, 2006; Ishanti, 2006

socialization and performance measures mediate the relationship between race/ethnicity and one of the key steps in the college completion process, which furthers our understanding of how inequality operates on a specific outcome. While the specific results (point estimates, level of significance, etc) vary across these studies, consistent relationships between the explanatory mechanisms and the outcome measures are apparent. Social class of family of origin, family structure, social capital, parental influences and parenting styles, peer influence, educational aspirations, academic performance, student actions, cultural capital, and attributes of the students' school and neighborhood all generally appear to play a role in describing some of the racial/ethnic achievement gap that exists in the college completion process.

However, a limitation of these analyses is that they are unable to document how inequality develops across students' educational careers, as they are focusing on one, or sometimes two, specific measures. Further when they include multiple outcome measures they rarely focus on the relationship between the outcomes, which would allow for an examination of the potentially changing nature and level of racial/ethnic inequality at these different points in the college completion process. Lastly, it is difficult to 'combine' the results from these various studies and obtain a more exact understanding for how racial/ethnic inequality develops in the college completion process, as the conceptual and empirical models, samples, and methods vary across by analysis, making direct comparisons very difficult.

The analytic framework developed by Mare to examine educational continuation decisions provides a methodological orientation to examine how the racial/ethnic achievement gap changes over time as students progress towards a college degree (Mare, 1980, 1981). However, relatively few analyses have attempted to model and examine the entire college completion process: formation of college plans, preparation to attend college, high school completion, college enrollment, and, college graduation. Further, when elements of the college completion process are analyzed only a few demographic and background measures tend to be employed as covariates. Nevertheless, numerous analyses have examined segments of the process in at least some capacity (e.g. Bauman, 1998; Breen and Jonsson 2000; Breen and Jonsson 2005; Brown and Hirshman, 2006; Lucas 2001; Mare, 1981; Sandefur et. al., 1999).

This analysis builds upon prior work by thoroughly examining the key educational transitions in the college completion process. Additionally, it will utilize longitudinal data from the University of Washington Beyond High School Project, as it contains numerous demographic, familial, school climate, social network, academic performance, and socialization measures that can be used to explain the educational inequality that exists across racial/ethnic groups in the key college completion transitions. Lastly, the UW-BHS data contains a wealth of racial/ethnic diversity, allowing for an analysis of 12 specific racial/ethnic groups.

Specifically, this analysis will draw upon Mare's analytic logic to examine the following questions: 1) Are there specific educational transitions in the progression to a college degree that disproportionately impede racial/ethnic minorities? 2) Can an integrated model of educational attainment explain the racial/ethnic variation that exists at the key points in the college completion process?

The analysis finds relatively consistent patterns of racial/ethnic inequality across the college completion process. Preliminary analyses indicate that African American, Native American, and Mexican youth are just as likely as their peers to have college plans. However, due to their disadvantaged family backgrounds, they are less likely to attend or complete college. Vietnamese, Korean, and Japanese & Chinese students receive increased levels of support from their significant others, which they are able to translate into increased levels of success, relative to their peers, at nearly all stages of the college completion process. Interestingly, Vietnamese and Korean, students despite displaying an advantage at earlier stages of the process, trail their white peers in completing college.

(Description of data and a few preliminary tables included below)

Introduction

--To be added.

Racial/Ethnic Inequality in the College Completion Process

--Discussion to be added.

Understanding the Racial/ Ethnic Achievement Gap: A Theoretical Framework

--To be added.

Data

The data used in this analysis come from the University of Washington Beyond High School Project (UWBHS), a longitudinal study designed to examine the transition from high school to college. The data were obtained from surveys of high school seniors in multiple school districts in a large metropolitan area on the West Coast during the Spring of 2000 and 2002 to 2005. A total of 9,658 seniors from twelve traditional high schools (9 public and 3 private) and numerous alternative site schools completed the survey, which was administered within the schools[9]. However, as college completion data is not available for the 2005 cohort (discussed below), this analysis only utilizes data from the 2000 and 2002 to 2004 cohorts which includes 7,231 interviewed high school seniors. In short, the survey asked questions about the students' high school experience, home life, and their educational and occupational ambitions.

A follow-up survey of students who participated in the in-school survey was conducted in the Spring of 2001 and 2003 to 2006. This survey asked students to report on their educational activities since completing high school. The follow-up survey response rate was 92% for all cohorts, and 91% for the 2000 and 2002 to 2004 cohorts[10]. Of the 7,231 students surveyed at the end of their senior year, 6,582 completed the follow-up. Additionally, in late 2008, data on students' college enrollment and completion was obtained from the National Student Clearinghouse (NSCH), a non-profit agency which tracks student enrollment and completion in more than 3,400 American post-secondary institutions[11]. The NSCH data allows for estimates of college completion within in four years of expected high school graduation for the students that participated in the in-school survey. Estimates of four year college graduation are available for all cohorts, save the 2005 cohort[12].

The univariate means and percentile distributions for measures used in the analysis are contained in table one for the sample of all students, students with college plans, and the sample of college enrollees. Additionally, table 2 displays the means and percentile distributions by pan-ethnic/racial group for the sample of all students[13].

Dependent Variables

Outcomes: College Preparation, Plans, Attendance, and Completion

This analysis uses a broad spectrum of measures to capture students' college preparation, concrete plans, and attainment. There are numerous measures one could utilize to indicate preparatory steps to attend college. However, for the purpose of this analysis, only one measure will be utilized—whether or not the student took a college entrance exam, such as the Scholastic Assessment Test (SAT) or

---

[9] Seniors from one public school district, with 5 comprehensive high schools and numerous alternative high schools, completed the survey in all years. An additional seven high schools (4 public and 3 private) were added to the study in 2003, so seniors from these seven schools completed the survey in 2003 and 2004.

[10] These cohorts completed the follow up in the spring of 2001 and 2003 to 2005.

[11] For more on the National Student Clearinghouse see: http://www.studentclearinghouse.org/about/default.htm.

[12] Estimates of college graduation in five and six years from the expected date of high school graduation are also available, but they are not used in this analysis. The rational for not using these outcome measures is that they are only available for a subset of the cohorts (five year: 2002 and 2003, six year: 2002), which would not allow for enough cases to comfortably estimate models stratified by race/ethnicity.

[13] Tables A1 and A2 contain the means and percentile distributions by pan-ethnic/racial group for the sample of students with college plans and the sample of students enrolled in college.

the American College Test (ACT)[14]. Sixty-two percent of all students took a college entrance exam. The college plans measure is based upon a question that asks, "Do you plan to go on to college or other additional schooling right after high school? That is, do you plan to continue your education this Fall?" Overall, 80% of all students have college plans for the year following high school.

Data on college enrollment from the one year follow up survey was used to create indicators of college enrollment. This analysis utilizes two measures of college enrollment: attendance at any college (two- or four-year vs. none or other program) and attendance at a four-year college (versus no college, two year college, and other program). Seventy percent of all students attended any college within one year after high school, while nearly 39% attended a four year college. Amongst the students with college plans, 80% enrolled in any college and 45% enrolled in a four year college. The National Student Clearinghouse data was used to construct a college completion indicator, noting whether students completed college within four years. Roughly 15% of all students finished college within four years. Completion rates increased to 18 and 22% for the samples of students with college plans and students enrolled in college, respectively.

Demographic Indictors

The construction of the race/ethnicity variable is based upon a matrix of questions that students answered about their racial/ethnic identity. The underlying rational in classifying students into specific racial/ethnic groups was to assign students to the racial/ethnic group with which they identified on the Census 2000 race questions and in the instances in which students noted membership in multiple racial/ethnic groups information from questions on the students primary racial or ethnic identity and/or ancestry was used as a 'tie-breaker' to assign the students to a specific group. Additionally, four percent of the sample did not provide any race/ethnic information in the survey, so racial/ethnic information from the school administrative records was used for these students.

Respondents are coded into 12 distinct racial/ethnic groups: white; African American; Native American; Other Asians[15]; Chinese and Japanese[16]; Korean; Cambodian; Vietnamese; Filipino; Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders (NHOPI)[17]; Other Hispanics[18]; and Mexican. Whites are the largest

---

[14] AsAa college entrance exam is required for nearly all four year colleges and universities, but it is not generally required for community or two-year colleges. However, as noted above, many of the college preparatory measures available better model the preparatory process to attend a four year college, not a two year college. Admittedly, this is a weak point in this analysis.

[15] Other Asian category serves as a residual category for ethnic groups that fall within the Asian racial classification used by the Census Bureau. This category includes students that noted an ethnic group that was not common enough to receive its own category. It also includes students that students that only define themselves by a pan-ethnic identity (e.g. Asian, Asian-American). Lastly, it includes multi-ethnic/racial students that refused to provide a singular primary ethnicity but whose same-race/ethnicity multi-racial/ethnic peers most selected a Pan-ethnic identity (e.g. Asian) as their primary racial/ethnic identity.

[16] I combined the students of Japanese and Chinese descent due to the small sample sizes for these groups. Overall, two groups are very common; however, a few differences exist. Students of Chinese descent are less likely to be 3rd generation or higher, there families are less likely to own the home they live in, they are slightly more likely to receive college encouragement from their friends, and they are more likely to have college plans.

[17] Note that the NHOPI Others category serves as a residual category for ethnic groups that fall within the Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander classification. This category includes students that noted an ethnic group that was not common enough to receive its own category (e.g. Samoan, Guamanian). It also includes students that students that only define themselves by a pan-ethnic identity. Lastly, it includes multi-ethnic/racial students that refused to provide a singular primary ethnicity but whose same-race/ethnicity multi-racial/ethnic peers most selected a Pan-ethnic identity as their primary racial/ethnic identity.

[18] Note that the Other Hispanic category serves as a residual category for ethnic groups that fall within the Hispanic classification used by the Census Bureau. This category includes students that noted an ethnic group that was not common enough to receive its own category (e.g. Puerto Rican, Panamanian). It also includes students that students that only define themselves by a pan-ethnic identity (e.g. Latino, Hispanic). Lastly, it includes multi-ethnic/racial students that refused to provide a singular primary ethnicity but whose same-race/ethnicity multi-racial/ethnic peers most selected a Pan-ethnic identity (e.g. Latino) as their primary racial/ethnic identity.

racial/ethnic groups in the sample constituting 60% of all students. African Americans, at 14%, are the second largest group, while Koreans are the third largest group at 4%. The remaining 9 racial/ethnic groups each consist of roughly 1 to 3% of the overall population.

Immigrant generational status is a demographic indicator that is also related to educational achievement. Second generation (child of immigrants) students, particularly those that are able to draw upon the social capital of their co-ethnic community while being simultaneously acculturated into aspects of US society, display higher levels of achievement than their first (immigrants) and third generation peers (Portes and Rumbaut, 2001). Generational status is coded as series of dummy variables, with third generation or higher serving as the referent. Nearly 70% of all students are third generation, with the balance of students almost evenly split between first and second generation. Gender is another demographic indicator, with males, who are 46% of the sample, used as the referent group. The distributions on the demographic indicators are relatively consistent as one moves from the sample of all students to the sample of college enrollees.

Familial Resources and Background

A few of the most important predictors of educational attainment are the financial and informational resources made available in the family of origin. Familial resources are operationalized as a factor score, which is based upon measures of maternal education, paternal education, whether or not the family owns the home in which they live, paternal occupational socioeconomic status, and maternal occupational socioeconomic status[19]. The factor score explains 58% of the cumulative shared variance between the familial resource measures, indicating that it is adequately capturing the notion of familial resources. As one may expect, the average value on the SES indicator increases from -.03, in the sample of all students, to .12, in the sample of college enrollees. Additionally, table 2 notes that racial/ethnic variation exists in SES scores, as whites tend to have the highest scores while Asians and Hispanics have the lowest.

Youth that live with both of their biological/adoptive parents have access to greater resources and increased levels of social capital, allowing them to complete high school and attend college at higher rates than students from disrupted families, (Astone and McLanahan, 1991, 1994; Hauser and Sweeney, 1997; Peters and Mullis, 1997). Family structure is coded as a dummy variable to differentiate between students from intact families, 59% of all students, and non-intact families, 41% of all students. The proportion of students from non-intact families decreases to 38% in the sample of students with college plans and, ultimately, to 34% for the sample of students enrolled in college. As for the racial/ethnic variation, African American youth are most likely to come from a non-intact family and Asians are least likely.

Social Capital

Social capital is represented by two distinct measures which attempt to capture the social capital available to the student in school ('school based social capital') and out of school ('community based social capital'). A dummy variable indicating whether the student transferred schools during the last two years of high school is included as an indicator of school based social capital (1 'transferred', 0 'did not transfer'). An indicator of community based capital is the index of questions which asses the extent to which student's parents know their friends and the parents of their friends. In short, this is a measure of community solidarity and integration, which is very similar to Coleman's conceptualization of social capital (1988). The multiple indicators attempt to capture the two main contexts in which students can utilize their social capital—school and their community. The average levels of social capital are greatest amongst the sample of college enrollees and lowest amongst the sample of all students. Additionally, minimal racial/ethnic variation exists with white students displaying a slight advantage in levels of social capital.

Encouragement from Significant Others

Two measures are included to tap encouragement from significant others. The first is based upon a series of questions that ask the student 'what do you think your [lists the specific significant other] thinks is the most important thing for you to do after high school?' The student is able to select a response

[19] A discussion of each of the variables used to create the factor score is available in the Appendix

from the following list of answers: 1) 'go to college', 2) 'enter a trade, vocational school, or work apprenticeship program', 3) 'enter military service', 4) 'get a job', 5) 'get married', 6) 'I don't know', and, for the maternal and paternal question, 7) Does not apply (no [female/]male parent/guardian).Responses were coded such that 'go to college' received a value of '1', while 'I don't know', and, for the maternal and paternal question, 'Does not apply' received a value of '0'. All other responses were coded as '-1'. The measures were summed to form a single index of encouragement from significant others to attend college. The average score is 3.40 amongst all students, but it increases to 3.92 and 4.17 amongst students with college plans and students in college, respectively.

As the peer group plays an influential role during adolescents, the second measure is designed to capture the manner in which friends effect students' educational trajectory. Friends are able to influence students through their interactions with the student (definers) as well as through their own actions, which the student can attempt to emulate (models) (Coleman, 1961 Parsons, 1963; Kemper, 1968). The aforementioned index contains friends encouragement as a component, so it captures the 'defining' influence of the students peer group. To capture the 'modeling' influence of peers an additional measure is included. Respondents were asked what proportion of their friends had plans to attend a four year college and they were able to choose from the following responses: 'none or some', 'less than half', 'more than half', 'most or all', or 'don't know'. The responses were then coded on a scale of 1 to 5, with higher values indicating a greater proportion of the student's friends having four year college plans [20]. Combined, these measures illustrate the student's perceptions of what they think the most important people in their life think they should do in the coming year—the year after high school.

As with the encouragement index, the proportion of students with college plans was highest amongst the sample of students in college (3.28) and lowest amongst the sample of all students (2.92). For both measures the levels of encouragement are highest amongst students of Asian descent and lowest amongst Hispanic and Native American/NHOPI students.

Cultural Capital

In an educational context, cultural capital is often defined as the values and attitudes that promote increased educational ambitions, engagement, hard work, and perseverance. Cultural capital is operationalized as two separate indicators. The first is a binary variable that is based upon a question which asks "How far would you like to go in school?" and the student is able to select one of seven levels of schooling, ranging from less than a high school degree to an advanced degree, and the responses are coded to indicate whether the student aspires to a college degree or higher. The second is based upon students' responses to the question "how well I do in school is an important part of who I am as a person". These indicators successfully tap the educational ambition and engagement components of cultural capital, but they do not capture the element of cultural capital associated with knowledge of certain norms and customs that allow for greater success in certain middle class social niches, such as education (Lareau, 1989, 2003; Farkas, 1996). Levels of cultural capital increase as one moves from the sample of all students to the sample of students enrolled in college. For example, the proportion of students that aspire to college increases from .75 to .87. In regards to the racial/ethnic variation, the levels of cultural capital are lowest amongst Hispanic and Native American/NHOPI students.

Academic Performance and Parenting Styles

The relationship between student academic performance and educational success has been well established. Unsurprisingly, students with higher levels of performance in high school are more likely to graduate from high school and attend college (Heck and Mahoe, 2006; Rumberger and Larson, 1998; Rumberger, 1995). Self-reported cumulative grade point average (GPA) is included in the analysis as a measure of academic performance. Amongst all students the average GPA is 3.13, though it is higher

[20] The response categories 'none or some' and 'don't know' were combined and coded as '1'. Students that responded 'don't know' were included with the 'none or some' group as they, by not knowing their friends college plans, do not appear to have a group of friends that is modeling a college orientated behavior. Additionally, the students that responded 'don't know' and 'none or some' have very similar mean values on a host outcome.

amongst students with college plans (3.22) and the sample of students in college (3.31). Lastly, table 2 notes that Asians and white students report higher GPA's than their peers.

Racial/Ethnic Variation in the Steps Towards A College Degree: Bivariate Patterns

Panel A of Table 3 displays the proportion of students by race/ethnicity with college ambitions, plans, preparation, attendance (any college and four year college), and, eventual, attainment. Across these measures, which indicate the path towards a college degree, some relatively stable patterns emerge. One of the most striking patterns is that students of Asian descent, particularly Vietnamese, Korean, and Japanese & Chinese students, tend to display an advantage relative to their peers on all measures, save college attendance. Excluding Japanese & Chinese students, students of Asian descent appear to finish college at the same rate as their peers. Despite the high levels of success amongst students of Asian descent, one Asian ethnic group does not follow the aforementioned pattern: Cambodian students. Although the likelihood of college plans amongst Cambodian students is relatively high, they are less likely than their peers to have taken preparatory steps, attended or completed college.

Another pattern is the lower level of ambitions, preparation, and attainment amongst students of Native American, NHOPI, and Hispanic descent. Across all indicators, these three groups of students consistently display lower levels of ambitions, plans, preparation, attendance and attainment than their peers. Similarly, African American students trail their peers, at key points on the path towards a college degree, but not to the extent of the three aforementioned groups. African American students are disadvantaged in their ability to actuate their plans and preparation, as they have lower than average rates of college attendance and completion.

As the path towards a college degree is a semi-sequential process, it is instructive to understand if certain steps in the process are more or less difficult for some students to complete. In an attempt to model to the progression of students from one step to the next, a series of transition ratios were estimated for each of the racial/ethnic groups, as well as the pan-ethnic/racial categories. The transition ratios, which draw upon the logic of Parity Progression Ratios, are a ratio of the proportion of students that have completed a step in the college completion process relative to the proportion of students that have completed the sequentially prior step. For example, the plans/ambitions ratio is the ratio of the proportion of students with college plans (.82) by the proportion of students with college ambitions (.71), which is 1.16 (.82/.71)[21]. Analyzing transition ratios is beneficial in that they illustrate students' ability (or lack thereof) to advance across the key transitions in their pursuit of a college degree[22].

For the sample as a whole, it appears that the initial transitions in the process—converting ambitions into preparation and preparation into college plans—are relatively easy for students, as the transition ratios are relatively high. Additionally, students are relatively successful at actuating plans to attend college, as the transition ratios are a respectable .86 and .48[23]. The point at which students appear to have the most difficulty is finishing college once they have enrolled, as the ratios are for both students attending any college and students at a four year college are relatively low (.24 and .42, respectively).

An examination of the transition ratios for the specific racial/ethnic groups reveals that variation exists in the specific racial/ethnic groups' ability to progress towards a college degree. While the racial/ethnic differences are not as pronounced as those noted in Panel A, some relatively consistent patterns emerge. One of the interesting patterns involves the traditionally disadvantaged minority groups—African American, Native American, NHOPI, and Hispanic students. Students from these

---

[21] If this process were truly a sequential process the transition ratios would always have a value ranging from 1.0 to 0. However given that this process is not completely sequential—for example, students can attend a community college without taking a college entrance exam, the preparatory step measure—it is possible that some of the values will be greater than 1.0.

[22] Smaller transition ratio values indicate that students were less successful in making the transition from one state to the next, while larger values indicate an easier transition.

[23] This estimate is artificially low, as the denominator includes all students with college plan including those with plans to attend a two year college.

racial/ethnic groups were able to transition across the initial steps in the college completion process at a rate greater than or equal to their white peers. However, once the transition to college attendance and completion are analyzed these groups display transition ratios that are much lower than their peers.

Asians, as a pan-ethnic group, display transition ratios that closely track those of their white peers. The one deviation is the transition from college attendance to completion, for which Asians are less successful than white students. Within the Asian pan-ethnic grouping there is considerable diversity. Japanese and Chinese students display above average transition ratios for the entire process, save the transition from college preparation to college plans. Korean and, to a lesser extent, Vietnamese students display relatively high transition ratios at all points except for the final transition, completing college. The above average transition ratios for these specific ethnic groups are remarkable when accounting for the fact that an overwhelming proportion of these student populations pursued the path to a college degree. There is one exception to the general pattern noted for Asian students. The transition ratios for Cambodian students more closely approximated the trajectory displayed by the traditionally disadvantaged minorities.

The proportions and transition ratios displayed in table 2 provide some insight into the racial/ethnic variation that exists in the college completion process. For example, it is apparent that many of the Asian ethnic groups display consistently high levels of ambitions, preparation and attainment, while the traditionally disadvantage minorities tend to lag their peers. However, while these bivariate patterns can describe the inequality in the college completion process, they can not provide an explanation. Thus, the next section of the analysis draws upon a multivariate logistic regression framework in an attempt to determine why racial/ethnic variation exists at crucial points in the college completion process.

Explaining Racial/Ethnic Inequality in the Path to a College Degree: A Multivariate Analysis
--To be discussed

Table 4. Odds-Ratios from a Logistic Regression of Ascriptive, Family Context, Socialization, and Academic Performance Indicators on College Preparation (Taken/Planning to Take College Entrance Exam) with Robust Standard Errors.

Table 5. Odds-Ratios from a Logistic Regression of Ascriptive, Family Context, Socialization, and Academic Performance Indicators on College Plans with Robust Standard Errors.

Table 6. Odds-Ratios from a Logistic Regression of Ascriptive, Family Context, Socialization, and Academic Performance Indicators on College Attendance Amongst Seniors with College Plans with Robust Standard Errors.

Table 7. Odds-Ratios from a Logistic Regression of Ascriptive, Family Context, Socialization, and Academic Performance Indicators on College Graduation (w/in Four Years of HS Graduation) Amongst Seniors that Attended College with Robust Standard Errors.

Table 1. Percentile Distributions and Means for Ascriptive, Social, and Economic, Educational Experiences, and Educational Attainment or all High School Seniors, Seniors with College Plans and Seniors in College One Year Post-HS.

	All Students		Students w/ Plans		Students in College	
Ascriptive Measures:	Proportion/Mean	S.D.	Proportion/Mean	S.D.	Proportion/Mean	S.D
Gender: Male	.46	--	.43	--	.43	--
Gender: Female	.54	--	.57	--	.57	--
Race/Ethnicity:						
White	.60	--	.59	--	.63	--
African American	.14	--	.14	--	.12	--
Native American	.01	--	.01	--	.01	--
Other Asian	.02	--	.02	--	.02	--
Cambodian	.03	--	.03	--	.03	--
Vietnamese	.03	--	.04	--	.04	--
Filipino	.03	--	.03	--	.03	--
Korean	.04	--	.04	--	.05	--
Japan & Chinese	.02	--	.02	--	.02	--
Native Hawaiian/Other Pac Isl	.02	--	.02	--	.01	--
Mexican	.02	--	.02	--	.02	--
Other Hispanic	.03	--	.03	--	.02	--
GENERATIONAL STATUS						
First Generation (Student born out of US)	.15	--	.16	--	.15	--
Second Generation.	.16	--	.17	--	.17	--
Third Gen.& higher (Student & parent born in US)	.69	--	.67	--	.67	--
Family Background Measures:						
SES Factor	-.03	(.90)	.02	(.91)	.12	(.90)
Non-Intact Family Structure	.41	--	.38	--	.34	--
Social Capital:						
Late Transfer/ School Based Social Capital	.12	--	.10	--	.09	--
Parents Know Students Friends/Friends' Parents	2.26	(.74)	2.22	(.74)	2.20	(.73)
Encouragement from Significant Others:						
Parental Encouragement	1.38	(1.03)	1.57	(.85)	1.68	(.74)
Friends Encouragement	.61	(.69)	.71	(.60)	.77	(.54)
Teacher Encouragement	.76	(.55)	.84	(.45)	.87	(.40)
Mentor Encouragement	.73	(.62)	.83	(.50)	.87	(.43)
Additive Index of Received Encouragement	3.40	(2.47)	3.92	(1.92)	4.17	(1.65)
Friends' College Plans	2.92	(1.46)	3.10	(1.44)	3.28	(1.42)
Cultural Capital:						
Aspires to Complete a College Degree	.75	--	.81	--	.87	--
Doing Well in School is Important (High is Yes)	3.00	(.85)	3.05	(.82)	3.06	(.82)
Academic Performance:						
Cumulative GPA (Self-Reported)	3.13	(.68)	3.22	(.63)	3.31	(.58)
Outcome Measures:						
College Preparation--College Entrance Exam	.62		NA		NA	
College Plans	.80	--	NA	--	NA	--
Enrolled In Any College (w/in a year of HS grad)	.69	--	.79	--	NA	--
Enrolled in 4 Year College (w/in a year of HS grad)	.38	--	.45	--	.55	--
Completed College within 4 years of HS graduation	.15	--	.18	--	.22	--
N of High School Seniors	7,231		5,795		4,573	
N of Follow-up Resondents	6,582		5,385		4,573	

Table 2. Percentile Distribution, Means, and Standard Errors for Ascriptive, Social, and Economic, Educational Experiences, and Educational Attainment Indicators for the UWBHS sample by Race/Ethnicity.

	White		African American		Asian		Hispanic		Native Am./NHOPI	
Ascriptive Measures:	Proportion/ Mean	Std. Dev.	Proportion/ Mean	Std. Dev.	Proportion/ Mean	Std. Dev.	Proportion/ Mean	Std. Dev.	Proportion/ Mean	Std. Dev.
Gender: Male	.46	--	.44	--	.47	--	.45	--	.41	--
Gender: Female	.54	--	.56	--	.53	--	.56	--	.59	--
GENERATIONAL STATUS										
First Generation	.06	--	.08	--	.51	--	.29	--	.10	--
Second Generation	.09	--	.10	--	.39	--	.29	--	.26	--
Third Gen. & higher	.85	--	.82	--	.10	--	.42	--	.64	--
Family Background Measures:										
SES Factor	.18	(.76)	-.12	(.65)	-.49	(1.25)	-.54	(1.05)	-.33	(.61)
Non-Intact Family Structure	.38	(.49)	.65	(.48)	.30	(.46)	.42	(.49)	.45	(.50)
Social Capital:										
Late Transfer/ School Based Social Capital	.10	--	.17	--	.12		.20	--	.17	--
Parents Know Students Friends/Friends' Parents	2.22	(.74)	2.21	(.77)	2.41	(.72)	2.33	(.73)	2.32	(.78)
Encouragement from Significant Others:										
Parental Encouragement	1.38	(1.04)	1.25	(1.03)	1.57	(.88)	1.24	(1.10)	1.16	(1.18)
Friends Encouragement	.60	(.69)	.57	(.72)	.75	(.58)	.51	(.75)	.42	(.82)
Teacher Encouragement	.74	(.57)	.79	(.51)	.84	(.43)	.79	(.54)	.68	(.67)
Mentor Encouragement	.70	(.64)	.74	(.63)	.84	(.49)	.72	(.64)	.63	(.74)
Additive Index of Encouragement	3.34	(2.59)	3.28	(2.38)	3.96	(1.83)	3.18	(2.49)	2.76	(2.96)
Friends' College Plans	2.97	(1.45)	2.66	(1.41)	3.18	(1.46)	2.53	(1.50)	2.54	(1.41)
Cultural Capital:										
Aspires to Complete a College Degree	.75	--	.75	--	.80	--	.65	--	.63	--
Doing Well in School is Important to Student	2.91	(.86)	3.09	(.83)	3.15	(.79)	3.13	(.83)	3.12	(.82)
Academic Performance:										
Cumulative GPA (Self-Reported)	3.18	(.67)	2.89	(.67)	3.24	(.64)	2.98	(.71)	3.00	(.67)
Outcome Measures:										
College Preparation--College Entrance Exam	.63	--	.57	--	.66	--	.47	--	.49	--
College Plans	.79	--	.78	--	.89	--	.74	--	.70	--
Enrolled In Any College	.71	--	.64	--	.78	--	.56	--	.50	--
Enrolled in a Four Year College	.40	--	.32	--	.42	--	.28	--	.22	--
Completed College in 4 years	.17	--	.08	--	.14	--	.08	--	.04	--
N of High School Seniors	4,349		1,032		1,188		421		241	
N of Follow-up Resondents	4,042		855		1,099		363		223	

Table 3. Proportions and Transition Ratios for College Ambitions, Plans, Preparation, and Attainment for all Students and by Race/Ethnicity. (N = 5,802[A])

Panel A: Proportion of Students with College Ambitions, Plans, Preparation, and Attainment.

	College Ambitions	Preparation: Took SAT/ACT	College Plans	Attend College: Any School	Attend College: Four Yr School	Finish College in Four Years
Total	**.71**	**.65**	**.82**	**.71**	**.40**	**.17**
White	.72	.66	.81	.72	.42	.20
African American	.69	.60	.81	.65	.32	.10
Native American	.61	.51	.74	.57	.26	.08
Asian (all groups)	.76	.69	.90	.79	.44	.16
Other Asian	.70	.60	.82	.73	.33	.15
Cambodian	.55	.53	.90	.65	.27	.08
Vietnamese	.81	.65	.94	.92	.37	.13
Filipino	.74	.65	.86	.75	.37	.16
Korean	.87	.85	.92	.85	.63	.18
Japanese & Chinese	.83	.84	.91	.80	.64	.31
NHOPI	.50	.52	.68	.46	.23	.02
Hispanic (all groups)	.60	.51	.79	.58	.31	.09
Mexican	.68	.61	.83	.63	.37	.08
Other Hispanic	.55	.45	.77	.55	.27	.10

Panel B: Transition Ratios for College Ambitions, Plans, Preparation, and Attainment.

	Preparation/ Ambitions	Plans/ Preparation	Attend College/ Plans	Attend Four Yr./ Plans	Finish College/ Attend College	Finish College/ Attend Four Yr.
Total	**.91**	**1.28**	**.86**	**.48**	**.24**	**.42**
White	.92	1.23	.88	.51	.27	.47
African American	.87	1.36	.80	.39	.15	.30
Native American	.83	1.44	.77	.35	.14	.30
Asian (all groups)	.91	1.31	.88	.49	.20	.36
Other Asian	.86	1.38	.89	.40	.21	.46
Cambodian	.97	1.69	.73	.30	.12	.28
Vietnamese	.81	1.44	.98	.40	.15	.36
Filipino	.87	1.33	.87	.43	.21	.44
Korean	.97	1.09	.92	.68	.21	.29
Japanese & Chinese	1.01	1.09	.88	.71	.38	.48
NHOPI	1.05	1.31	.67	.33	.04	.08
Hispanic (all groups)	.85	1.55	.74	.39	.16	.30
Mexican	.89	1.37	.76	.44	.13	.22
Other Hispanic	.81	1.72	.72	.35	.18	.37

Notes:

[A] The sample only includes the 2000, 2002 to 2004 cohort, as four year college completion data is not available for the 2005 cohort. Additionally, cases with missing data on any of the educational measures were excluded.

Table 4. Odds-Ratios from a Logistic Regression of Ascriptive, Family Context, Socialization, and Academic Performance Indicators on College Preparation (Taken/Planning to Take College Entrance Exam) with Robust Standard Errors. (N= 6,936)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
Ascriptive Measures	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|
Female	**1.27**	**.00**	**1.33**	**.00**	**1.28**	**.00**	.99	.85	.96	.53	**.80**	**.00**
Male (Referent)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
African American	**.78**	**.00**	1.08	.30	1.10	.22	1.11	.22	1.04	.67	***1.38***	***.00***
Native American	**.47**	**.00**	.73	.13	.76	.19	.81	.36	.78	.31	.77	.30
Other Asian	*.73*	*.07*	.88	.54	.97	.87	.80	.29	.78	.24	.83	.40
Cambodian	**.57**	**.00**	**1.90**	**.00**	**1.95**	**.00**	1.24	.29	1.06	.79	1.18	.44
Vietnamese	1.25	.16	**2.55**	**.00**	**2.57**	**.00**	1.28	.20	1.07	.73	.90	.62
Filipino	.96	.83	.94	.73	.93	.69	*.69*	*.05*	**.67**	**.04**	.73	.12
Korean	**2.72**	**.00**	**2.87**	**.00**	**2.97**	**.00**	**2.11**	**.00**	**1.79**	**.00**	**2.02**	**.00**
Japanese & Chinese	**2.36**	**.00**	**2.57**	**.00**	**2.50**	**.00**	*1.61*	*.10*	1.41	.21	1.32	.33
NHOPI	**.57**	**.00**	.77	.18	.78	.19	.82	.38	.86	.51	1.13	.62
Mexican	**.40**	**.00**	**.72**	**.03**	**.73**	**.05**	**.66**	**.02**	**.63**	**.01**	*.72*	*.08*
Other Hispanic	*.75*	*.08*	.93	.68	.99	.93	.96	.85	.97	.87	1.10	.67
White (Referent)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
First Generation	**.79**	**.01**	.95	.57	1.02	.87	.94	.58	.94	.57	.90	.35
Second Generation	**1.32**	**.00**	**1.37**	**.00**	**1.38**	**.00**	**1.36**	**.00**	**1.29**	**.01**	**1.28**	**.02**
Third Generation plus (Referent)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Familial Context												
SES			**2.14**	**.00**	**2.11**	**.00**	**1.71**	**.00**	**1.59**	**.00**	**1.52**	**.00**
Intact Family (Referent)			--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Non-intact Family			**.59**	**.00**	**.62**	**.00**	**.72**	**.00**	**.70**	**.00**	**.73**	**.00**
Social Captial												
Parents Know Students Friends					**.88**	**.00**	**1.10**	**.02**	**1.10**	**.04**	*1.09*	*.05*
Student Has Adult They Can Consult					**1.12**	**.00**	*1.07*	*.09*	1.03	.47	1.02	.64
Transferred Last 2 Years of HS					**.55**	**.00**	**.64**	**.00**	**.59**	**.00**	**.59**	**.00**
Significant Others Encouragement												
Index of Encouragement from SOs							**1.34**	**.00**	**1.24**	**.00**	**1.21**	**.00**
Friend's College Plans							**1.50**	**.00**	**1.42**	**.00**	**1.34**	**.00**
Cultural Capital												
Aspires To Finish College									**4.46**	**.00**	**3.93**	**.00**
Schoolwork is Important to Student									**1.21**	**.00**	.98	.63
Academic Performance												
Grade Point Average											**2.70**	**.00**
BIC	-52,184		-52,806		-52,864		-53,965		-54,414		-54,759	

Table 5. Odds-Ratios from a Logistic Regression of Ascriptive, Family Context, Socialization, and Academic Performance Indicators on College Plans with Robust Standard Errors. (N= 7,107)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
Ascriptive Measures	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|
Female	**1.89**	**.00**	**1.96**	**.00**	**1.90**	**.00**	**1.55**	**.00**	**1.51**	**.00**	**1.41**	**.00**
Male (Referent)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
African American	.95	.56	**1.24**	**.02**	**1.25**	**.02**	1.15	.16	1.08	.44	*1.19*	*.09*
Native American	.74	.19	1.01	.98	1.07	.77	1.29	.37	1.28	.38	1.27	.40
Other Asian	1.02	.93	1.27	.30	1.38	.16	1.14	.57	1.09	.72	1.12	.61
Cambodian	**1.95**	**.00**	**5.00**	**.00**	**4.94**	**.00**	**3.00**	**.00**	**2.88**	**.00**	**2.98**	**.00**
Vietnamese	**3.87**	**.00**	**6.19**	**.00**	**6.36**	**.00**	**3.40**	**.00**	**3.25**	**.00**	**3.06**	**.00**
Filipino	1.38	.14	1.36	.18	1.34	.19	1.12	.63	1.08	.76	1.12	.65
Korean	**2.44**	**.00**	**2.43**	**.00**	**2.51**	**.00**	**1.73**	**.03**	*1.56*	*.06*	**1.61**	**.05**
Japanese & Chinese	**2.50**	**.01**	**2.53**	**.01**	**2.48**	**.01**	1.63	.17	1.49	.25	1.48	.27
NHOPI	**.48**	**.00**	**.57**	**.01**	**.58**	**.01**	**.60**	**.02**	**.58**	**.01**	**.63**	**.03**
Mexican	**.69**	**.02**	1.08	.64	1.15	.43	1.04	.84	1.02	.92	1.08	.71
Other Hispanic	*.73*	*.09*	.89	.52	.93	.70	.88	.55	.87	.54	.93	.73
White (Referent)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
First Generation	.93	.47	1.05	.65	1.13	.29	.97	.77	.95	.68	.94	.59
Second Generation	**1.40**	**.00**	**1.42**	**.00**	**1.43**	**.00**	**1.39**	**.01**	**1.33**	**.01**	**1.32**	**.02**
Third Generation plus (Referent)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Familial Context												
SES			**1.63**	**.00**	**1.58**	**.00**	**1.26**	**.00**	**1.21**	**.00**	**1.18**	**.00**
Intact Family (Referent)			--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Non-intact Family			**.62**	**.00**	**.67**	**.00**	**.75**	**.00**	**.76**	**.00**	**.78**	**.00**
Social Captial												
Parents Know Students Friends					**.81**	**.00**	.94	.20	.95	.24	.95	.26
Student Has Adult They Can Consult					1.05	1	1.00	.96	.97	.50	.96	.45
Transferred Last 2 Years of HS					**.56**	**.00**	**.67**	**.00**	**.64**	**.00**	**.64**	**.00**
Significant Others Encouragement												
Index of Encouragement from SOs							**1.35**	**.00**	**1.29**	**.00**	**1.28**	**.00**
Friend's College Plans							**1.25**	**.00**	**1.20**	**.00**	**1.17**	**.00**
Cultural Capital												
Aspires To Finish College									**2.17**	**.00**	**2.01**	**.00**
Schoolwork is Important to Student									**1.22**	**.00**	**1.12**	**.01**
Academic Performance												
Grade Point Average											**1.44**	**.00**
BIC	-55,980		-56,198		-56,251		-57,084		-57,197		-57,233	

Table 6. Odds-Ratios from a Logistic Regression of Ascriptive, Family Context, Socialization, and Academic PerformanceIndicators on College Attendance Amongst Seniors with College Plans with Robust Standard Errors. (N= 5,385)

Panel A. Odds Ratios from Logtistic Regression on Attended College (Two or Four Year)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
Ascriptive Measures	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|
Female	1.11	.14	**1.16**	**.04**	*1.14*	*.07*	.99	.85	.97	.69	.86	.06
Male (Referent)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
African American	**.56**	**.00**	**.76**	**.01**	**.77**	**.01**	**.77**	**.02**	**.72**	**.00**	.88	.27
Native American	**.51**	**.01**	.76	.32	.81	.44	.86	.64	.82	.53	.82	.50
Other Asian	.86	.54	1.07	.81	1.13	.66	.87	.61	.83	.46	.87	.59
Cambodian	**.48**	**.00**	1.39	.18	1.38	.20	.95	.84	.89	.63	.97	.91
Vietnamese	**3.25**	**.00**	**6.29**	**.00**	**6.25**	**.00**	**3.88**	**.00**	**3.62**	**.00**	**3.20**	**.00**
Filipino	**.65**	**.04**	**.64**	**.04**	**.62**	**.03**	**.49**	**.00**	**.48**	**.00**	**.52**	**.01**
Korean	**1.92**	**.01**	**1.99**	**.00**	**2.05**	**.00**	1.51	.11	1.27	.34	1.39	.21
Japanese & Chinese	1.14	.66	1.14	.69	1.11	.75	.71	.28	.62	.12	*.58*	*.09*
NHOPI	**.30**	**.00**	**.39**	**.00**	**.39**	**.00**	**.36**	**.00**	**.33**	**.00**	**.42**	**.00**
Mexican	**.33**	**.00**	**.57**	**.00**	**.58**	**.00**	**.55**	**.00**	**.54**	**.00**	**.61**	**.01**
Other Hispanic	**.52**	**.00**	**.59**	**.02**	**.61**	**.03**	*.62*	*.05*	*.64*	*.08*	.73	.24
White (Referent)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
First Generation	.88	.26	1.05	.72	1.12	.39	1.06	.68	1.09	.54	1.06	.69
Second Generation	**1.35**	**.01**	**1.42**	**.00**	**1.44**	**.00**	**1.47**	**.00**	**1.43**	**.00**	**1.41**	**.01**
Third Generation plus (Referent)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Familial Context												
SES			**1.85**	**.00**	**1.82**	**.00**	**1.54**	**.00**	**1.46**	**.00**	**1.39**	**.00**
Intact Family (Referent)			--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Non-intact Family			**.62**	**.00**	**.65**	**.00**	**.71**	**.00**	**.69**	**.00**	**.72**	**.00**
Social Captial												
Parents Know Students Friends					**.86**	**.00**	1.01	.80	1.00	.99	.99	.85
Student Has Adult They Can Consult					1.02	.71	.95	.36	.91	.11	.91	.10
Transferred Last 2 Years of HS					**.63**	**.00**	**.71**	**.00**	**.68**	**.00**	**.67**	**.00**
Significant Others Encouragement												
Index of Encouragement from SOs							**1.31**	**.00**	**1.24**	**.00**	**1.22**	**.00**
Friend's College Plans							**1.38**	**.00**	**1.31**	**.00**	**1.25**	**.00**
Cultural Capital												
Aspires To Finish College									**2.90**	**.00**	**2.55**	**.00**
Schoolwork is Important to Student									**1.15**	**.00**	.96	.47
Academic Performance												
Grade Point Average											**2.18**	**.00**
BIC	-40,834		-41,065		-41,069		-41,512		-41,644		-41,776	

Table 6 (Cont.) Panel B. Odds Ratios from Logtistic Regression on Attended a Four Year College

Ascriptive Measures	Model 1 e^B	Model 1 P>|z|	Model 2 e^B	Model 2 P>|z|	Model 3 e^B	Model 3 P>|z|	Model 4 e^B	Model 4 P>|z|	Model 5 e^B	Model 5 P>|z|	Model 6 e^B	Model 6 P>|z|
Female	**1.13**	**.03**	**1.21**	**.00**	**1.18**	**.01**	.98	.77	.95	.43	**.75**	**.00**
Male (Referent)												
African American	**.63**	**.00**	.90	.25	.90	.26	1.02	.87	.95	.63	**1.49**	**.00**
Native American	**.46**	**.00**	.74	.24	.77	.33	.90	.70	.89	.69	.99	.97
Other Asian	**.67**	**.05**	.76	.20	.81	.32	*.68*	*.09*	*.65*	*.07*	.72	.17
Cambodian	**.46**	**.00**	1.37	.15	1.42	.11	1.20	.39	1.04	.88	1.26	.33
Vietnamese	.94	.69	**1.96**	**.00**	**1.97**	**.00**	1.31	.18	1.05	.83	.86	.48
Filipino	**.67**	**.03**	**.65**	**.03**	**.63**	**.02**	**.50**	**.00**	**.49**	**.00**	**.54**	**.01**
Korean	**2.22**	**.00**	**2.45**	**.00**	**2.58**	**.00**	**2.02**	**.00**	**1.67**	**.01**	**1.92**	**.00**
Japanese & Chinese	**2.42**	**.00**	**2.53**	**.00**	**2.47**	**.00**	**1.80**	**.02**	*1.55*	*.08*	1.47	.18
NHOPI	**.46**	**.00**	.69	.14	.67	.13	.72	.23	.67	.15	1.06	.84
Mexican	**.48**	**.00**	.91	.61	.90	.61	.98	.95	.98	.93	1.21	.48
Other Hispanic	.83	.33	.97	.87	1.02	.93	1.07	.78	1.12	.68	1.30	.38
White (Referent)												
First Generation	**.65**	**.00**	**.78**	**.02**	.85	.13	*.81*	*.07*	.84	.18	*.80*	*.08*
Second Generation	*1.16*	*.09*	**1.24**	**.02**	**1.26**	**.01**	**1.26**	**.03**	**1.24**	**.04**	*1.21*	*.10*
Third Generation plus (Referent)												
Familial Context												
SES			**2.14**	**.00**	**2.13**	**.00**	**1.73**	**.00**	**1.64**	**.00**	**1.55**	**.00**
Intact Family (referent)												
Non-intact Family			**.65**	**.00**	**.67**	**.00**	**.78**	**.00**	**.76**	**.00**	**.79**	**.00**
Social Captial												
Parents Know Students Friends					**.92**	**.05**	**1.14**	**.01**	**1.15**	**.00**	**1.12**	**.02**
Student Has Adult They Can Consult					**1.17**	**.00**	**1.11**	**.03**	1.06	.24	1.07	.20
Transferred Last 2 Years of HS					**.49**	**.00**	**.54**	**.00**	**.51**	**.00**	**.50**	**.00**
Significant Others Encouragement												
Index of Encouragement from Sos							**1.41**	**.00**	**1.32**	**.00**	**1.28**	**.00**
Friend's College Plans							**1.65**	**.00**	**1.57**	**.00**	**1.50**	**.00**
Cultural Capital												
Aspires To Finish College									**11.10**	**.00**	**9.78**	**.00**
Schoolwork is Important to Student									**1.29**	**.00**	.96	.34
Academic Performance												
Grade Point Average											**4.42**	**.00**
BIC	-38,909		-39,379		-39,419		-40,228		-40,630		-41,069	

Table 7. Odds-Ratios from a Logistic Regression of Ascriptive, Family Context, Socialization, and Academic Performance Indicators on College Graduation (w/in Four Years of HS Graduation) Amongst Seniors that Attended College with Robust Standard Errors. (N= 4,573)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
Ascriptive Measures	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|	e^B	P>|z|
Female	**1.60**	**.00**	**1.68**	**.00**	**1.66**	**.00**	**1.50**	**.00**	**1.40**	**.00**	**1.20**	**.03**
Male (Referent)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
African American	**.45**	**.00**	**.58**	**.00**	**.58**	**.00**	**.62**	**.00**	**.59**	**.00**	.82	.19
Native American	**.44**	**.04**	.60	.21	.61	.21	.69	.34	.73	.44	.71	.39
Other Asian	.72	.21	.77	.33	.78	.38	.75	.30	.71	.24	.78	.40
Cambodian	**.33**	**.00**	.61	.14	.62	.15	**.51**	**.05**	**.43**	**.02**	**.45**	**.02**
Vietnamese	**.61**	**.03**	.91	.70	.92	.73	.70	.14	**.61**	**.05**	**.51**	**.01**
Filipino	.75	.23	.74	.22	.73	.19	*.66*	*.09*	**.62**	**.05**	*.66*	*.10*
Korean	.80	.25	.81	.28	.82	.30	*.69*	*.06*	**.61**	**.01**	**.59**	**.01**
Japanese & Chinese	**1.73**	**.02**	**1.67**	**.04**	**1.66**	**.04**	1.35	.24	1.19	.50	1.09	.74
NHOPI	**.10**	**.00**	**.13**	**.01**	**.13**	**.01**	**.13**	**.01**	**.12**	**.00**	**.15**	**.01**
Mexican	**.57**	**.03**	.77	.31	.77	.32	.75	.28	.72	.25	.84	.54
Other Hispanic	**.41**	**.01**	**.44**	**.01**	**.45**	**.01**	**.43**	**.01**	**.41**	**.01**	**.43**	**.01**
White (Referent)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
First Generation	**.72**	**.02**	.81	.13	.84	.22	.84	.22	.85	.29	.87	.36
Second Generation	1.16	.17	*1.22*	*.07*	*1.23*	*.05*	*1.21*	*.10*	1.19	.13	1.17	.19
Third Generation plus (Referent)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Familial Context												
SES			**1.51**	**.00**	**1.51**	**.00**	**1.29**	**.00**	**1.27**	**.00**	**1.19**	**.00**
Intact Family (Referent)			--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Non-intact Family			**.69**	**.00**	**.70**	**.00**	**.77**	**.00**	**.77**	**.00**	**.80**	**.01**
Social Captial												
Parents Know Students Friends					.94	.22	1.06	.31	1.08	.15	1.06	.31
Student Has Adult They Can Consult					1.03	.56	.98	.74	.94	.26	.93	.20
Transferred Last 2 Years of HS					**.72**	**.03**	.81	.16	.81	.16	.80	.15
Significant Others Encouragement												
Index of Encouragement from SOs							**1.22**	**.00**	**1.15**	**.00**	**1.10**	**.01**
Friend's College Plans							**1.37**	**.00**	**1.32**	**.00**	**1.26**	**.00**
Cultural Capital												
Aspires To Finish College									**6.18**	**.00**	**5.04**	**.00**
Schoolwork is Important to Student									**1.41**	**.00**	*1.09*	*.10*
Academic Performance												
Grade Point Average											**4.31**	**.00**
BIC	-33,696		-33,790		-33,772		-33,939		-34,059		-34,282	

References

Adelman, Clifford. 1999. *Answers in the Tool Box: Academic Intensity, Attendance Patterns and Bachelor's Degree Attainment.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education

Adelman, Clifford. 2006. *The Tool Box Revisited: Paths to Degree Completion From High School Through College.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education

Ainsworth-Darnell, James W. 2002. "Why Does It Take a Village? The Mediation of Neighborhood Effects on Educational Achievement." *Social Forces* 81: 117-152.

Anderson, Kristine L. 1981. "Post-High School Experiences and College Attrition" *Sociology of Education*, 54:1-15.

Astone, Nan Marie and Sara S. McLanahan. 1994. "Family Structure, Residential Mobility, and School Dropout: A Research Note". *Demography* 31(4):575-584.

Astone, Nan Marie and Sara S. McLanahan. 1991. "Family Structure, Parental Practices and High School Completion." *American Sociological Review* 56(3):309-32.

Attewell, Paul, David Lavin, Thurston Domina, and Tania Levey. 2006. "New Evidence on College Remediation" *Journal of Higher Education* 77:886-924.

Bauman, Kurt. 1998. "Schools, Markets, and Family in the History of African American Education." *American Journal of Education*,106, 500- 531

Bozick, Robert and Stefanie DeLuca. 2005. "Better Late than Never? Delayed Enrollment in the High School to College Transition" *Social Forces* 84:527-550.

Breen, Richard. and Jan. O. Jonsson. 2000. "Analyzing educational careers: A multinomial transition model." *American Sociological Review* 65:754–772.

Breen, Richard. and Jan.. Jonsson. 2005. "Inequality of Opportunity in Comparative Perspective: Recent Research on Educational Attainment and Social Mobility." *Annual Review of Sociology* 31:223–43.

Brown, Susan K. and Charles Hirschman. 2006. "The End of Affirmative Action in Washington State and Its Impact on the Transition from High School to College." *Sociology of Education* 79:106-130.

Buchman, Claudia and Thomas A. DiPrete. 2006 "The Growing Female Advantage in College Completion: The Role of Family Background and Academic Achievement" *American Sociological Review* 71:515-541.

Cheeseman-Day, Jennifer and Eric Newburger. 2002. "The Big Payoff: Educational Attainment and Synthetic Estimates of Work-Life Earnings." *Current Population Reports*, P23; No. 210. Washington, D.C. Census Bureau.

Cheng, Simon and Brian Starks. 2002. "Racial Differences in the Effects of Significant Others on Students' Educational Expectations." *Sociology of Education* 75: 306-327.

Coleman, James S. 1961. *The Adolescent Society.* New York: Glencoe Press.

Coleman, James S. 1988. "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital." *American Journal of*

Sociology. 94: S95-S120

Crissey, Sarah R. 2009. "Educational Attainment in the United States: 2007" *Current Population Reports*, P20; No. 560. Washington, D.C. Census Bureau.

Desmond, Matthew and Ruth N. López Turley. 2009 "The Role of Familism in Explaining the Hispanic-White College Application Gap" *Social Problems,* 56: 311-334

Farkas, George, Christy Lleras, and Steve Maczuga. 2002. "Does Oppositional Culture Exist in Minority and Poverty Peer Groups?" *American Sociological Review* 67: 148-

Frost, Michelle Bellessa. 2007. "Texas Students' College Expectations: Does High School Racial Composition Matter?" *Sociology of Education*, 80:43-66.

Glick, Jennifer E. and Michael. J. White. 2004. "Post-secondary school participation of immigrant and native youth: the role of familial resources and educational expectations." *Social Science Research*: 33:272-299.

Goldsmith, Pat Antonio. 2004. "Schools Racial Mix Student's Optimism, and the Black-White and Latino-White Achievement Gap." *Sociology of Education* 77:12

Goldsmith, Pat Rubio. 2009. "Schools or Neighborhoods or Both? Race and Ethnic Segregation and Educational Attainment" *Social Forces* 87: 1913-1942.

Goyette, Kim andYu Xie. 1999. "Educational Expectations of Asian American Youths: Determinants and Ethnic Differences." *Sociology of Education* 72:22-36

Greenman, Emily, and Yu Xie. 2007. "Is assimilation theory dead? The effect of assimilation on adolescent well-being." *Social Science Research* 37:109-137.

Harris, Angel. 2006. "I (Don't) Hate School: Revisiting Oppositional Culture Theory of Black's Resistance to Schooling." *Sociology of Education* 85:797-834.

Harris, Angel. 2008. "Optimism in the Face of Despair: Black-White Differences in Beliefs about School as a Means for Upward Social Mobility." Social Science Quarterly 89(3):608-630.

Hauser, Robert M. and Megan M. Sweeney. 1997. "Does Poverty in Adolescence Affect the Life Chances of High School Graduates?" Pp. 541-595 in *Consequences of Growing Up Poor*, edited by J. Brooks-Gunn and G. Duncan. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Heck, Ronald H and Rochelle Mahoe. 2006. "Student Transitions to High School and Persistence: Highlighting the Influences of Social Divisions and School Contingencies" *American Journal of Education* 112:418-446.

Hirschman, Charles. 2001. "The Educational Enrollment of Immigrant Youth: A Test of the Segmented-Assimilation Hypothesis" *Demography* 38: 317-336.

Hurtado, Sylvia, Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas, Charlotte Briggs and Byung-Shik Rhee. 1997. "Differences in College Access and Choice among Racial/Ethnic Groups: Identifying Continuing Barriers." *Research in Higher Education* 38:43-75

Ingels, S.J., and Dalton, B.W. 2008. *Trends Among High School Seniors, 1972–2004*. National Center for Education Statistics, Institute for Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.

Institute for Higher Education Policy. 1998. Reaping the Benefits: Defining the Public and Private Value of Going to College. The New Millennium Project on Higher Education Costs, Pricing, and Productivity. Washington, DC: Author.

Ishanti, Terry J. 2006. "Studying Attrition and Degree Completion Behavior among First-Generation College Students in the United States" *Journal of Higher Education* 77:861-865.

Kao, Grace. 2001. "Race and Ethnic Differences in Peer Influences on Educational Achievement." In *The Problem of the Century: Racial Stratification in the U.S. at the Millennium*. (Edited by Douglas Massey and Elijah Anderson). Pp. 437-460. New York: Russell Sage.

Kao, Grace and Marta Tienda. 1995. "Optimism and Achievement: The Educational Performance of Immigrant Youth". *Social Science Quarterly* 76: 1-19.

Kao, Grace and Marta Tienda. 1998. "Educational Aspirations among Minority Youth." *American Journal of Education.* 106: 349-384.

Kao, Grace and Jennifer S.Thompson. 2003. "Race and Ethnic Stratification in Educational Achievement and Attainment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:417-442.

Keller, Ursula and Kathryn Harker Tillman. 2008. "Post-Secondary Educational Attainment of Immigrant and Native Youth" *Social Forces* 87(1):121-152.

Kemper, Theodore. 1968. "Reference Groups, Socialization and Achievement." *American Sociological Review.* 33:31-45

Lareau, Annette. 1989 (2nd edition 2000). *Home Advantage: Social Class and Parental Involvement in Elementary Education.* Oxford: Roman and Litchfield.

Lareau, Annette. 2003. *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Lucas, S. R. 2001. "Effectively maintained inequality: Education transitions, track mobility, and social background effects." *American Journal of Sociology* 106:1642–1690.

Mare, Robert D. 1980. "Social Background and School Continuation Decisions." *Journal of the American Statistical Association.* 75:295-305

Mare, Robert D. 1980. "Change and Stability in Educational Stratification." *American Sociological Review* 46:72–87.

Massey, Douglas, Camille Charles, Garvey Lundy, and Mary J. Fischer. 2003. *The Source of the River: The Origins, Aspirations, and Values of Freshmen at America's Elite Colleges and Universities*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Mishel, Lawrence, Jared Bernstein, and Heidi Shierholz. 2009. *The State of Working America 2008/2009.* Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

Orr, Amy J. “Black-White Differences in Achievement: The Importance of Wealth.” *Sociology of Education* 76(4):281-304.

Parsons, Talcott. 1963. “On the Concept of Influence” *Public Opinion Quarterly*. 27: 37-62.

Perreira, Krista M., Harris, Kathleen Mullan, Lee, Dohoon. 2006 “Making It in America: High School Completion among Immigrant Youth.” *Demography* 43(3): 511-536.

Portes, Alejandro and Lingxin Hao. 2004. “The Schooling of Children of Immigrants: Contextual Effects of the Educational Attainment of the Second Generation.” Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 101 (No 33): 11910-11927.

Portes, Alejandro and Ruben Rumbaut. 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Reynolds, John, Michael Stewart, Ryan MacDonald and Lacey Sischo. 2006. “Have Adolescents Become Too Ambitious? High School Seniors' Educational and Occupational Plans, 1976 to 2000.” *Social Problems,* 53:186-206

Qian, Zhenchao and Sampson Lee Blair. 1999. “Racial/Ethnic Differences in Educational Aspirations of High School Seniors.” *Sociological Perspectives* 42: 605-625

Ream, Robert K. and Russell W. Rumberger. 2008. ”Student engagement, peer social capital, and school dropout among Mexican American and non-Latino White students.” *Sociology of Education* 81:109-139

Ruggles, Steven and Matthew Sobek. 2001. User’s Guide: Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 2.0. Minneapolis: Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota.

Rumberger, Russell W. 1987. "High School Dropouts: A Review of Issues and Evidence." *Review of Educational Research* 57(2):101-121.

Rumberger, Russell W. 1995. "Dropping Out of Middle School: A Multilevel Analysis of Students and Schools." *American Educational Research Journal* 32(3):583-625.

Rumberger, Russell W and Katherine A. Larson. 1998. "Student Mobility and the Increased Risk of High School Dropout." *American Journal of Education* 107:1-35.

Sandefur, Gary, Ann Meier, and Pedro Hernandez. 1999. “Families, Social Capital, and Educational Continuation.” University of Wisconsin, Center for Demography and Ecology, Working Paper No. 99-19.

Sewell, William and Robert Hauser. 1975. *Education, Occupation, and Earnings.* New York: Academic Press

Vigdor, Jacob and Charles Clotfelter. 2003. “Retaking the SAT” *Journal of Human Resources* 38:1-33.

Wojtkiewicz, Roger A. and Katharine M. Donato. 1995. “Hispanic Educational Attainment: The Effects of Family Background and Nativity.” *Social Forces* 74:559-574.