One Theory or Many Theories of Educational Stratification?: An Empirical Analysis

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

September 21, 2009

This is a preliminary abstract of a work-in-progress submitted for consideration at the 2010 meetings of the Population Association of America. Nikolas Pharris-Ciurej can be contacted at nickpc@u.washington.edu.

One Theory or Many Theories of Educational Stratification?: An Empirical Analysis

ABSTRACT

This analysis uses data from the University of Washington Beyond High School Research Project to examine whether it is possible to develop a cumulative integrated theory of educational stratification. Although the leading theories of educational stratification (Wisconsin Model, the Capital Deficiency Model, Oppositional Culture, and Segmented Assimilation) are individuated in that they emphasize different key mechanisms, a great deal of conceptual overlap exists between these perspectives. This analysis empirically assesses the four leading theories to examine whether they operate as expected, and, based upon the empirical results, it will attempt to develop a synthetic unified theoretical perspective. Familial context and resources, encouragement to attend college from significant others, academic performance, and educational orientation appear to be predictors of college plans, enrollment and completion.

Extended Abstract

The later half of the twentieth century saw a dramatic increase in college enrollment signaling a major change in American society. In 1970 only 16% of young adults, ages 25 to 29, had completed a college degree, but, by 2007, roughly 30% of young adults had a college degree (Snyder et. al. 2008). Despite the overall increases in college completion, substantial racial/ethnic differences still exist in post-secondary enrollment and completion (Freeman and Fox, 2005; Kao and Thompson, 2003). As the receipt of a college degree is central to social mobility, the gap in college completion has been a major concern of both policy makers and social scientists. In an attempt to understand the reasons for the achievement gap, multiple theories of educational stratification have been posited. However, to date, no analysis has attempted to empirically examine whether the leading theories of educational attainment offer complementary or competing explanations.

As of 2007, roughly 61% of young Asian adults completed at least a bachelor's degree, while only 36% of white, 19% of African American, and 12% of Hispanic young adults had completed a similar level of schooling (U.S Census Bureau, Current Population Survey 2007). Clearly the magnitude of the racial/ethnic gap in college completion is non-trivial, particularly given that a college degree is often associated with a middle class life and the corresponding benefits. For example, the median yearly earnings for a college graduate are roughly $23,500 per year greater than those for a high school graduate ($56,118 compared to $32,862) (Crissey 2009). Further, it is likely that the wage gap between college recipients and non-recipients will increase over time (Cheeseman-Day and Newburger, 2002).

Given the salience of a college degree in the social mobility process and the magnitude of the racial/ethnic gap, social science researchers have posited numerous theoretical explanations for the overall process of educational attainment as well as the variation across ascriptive measures, such as race/ethnicity. Generally, empirical studies of the educational stratification process have focused on students' family of origin, school experiences socialization, significant others, and educational aspirations. However the leading theories of educational attainment emphasize differing combinations of these explanatory mechanisms. Traditionally, the theories that are most often utilized to explain racial/ethnic variation in educational attainment are the Wisconsin Model, the Capital Deficiency Model, Oppositional Culture, and Segmented Assimilation.

Succinctly, the Wisconsin Model argues that social class and socialization of the family of origin as the key predictors of educational attainment. As a child and young adult, the socio-economic status of one's family of origin operates through various factors such as academic ability, influence of significant others and educational aspirations to affect educational success. Ultimately, students from more advantaged families display higher levels of attainment (Sewell et al 1969; Sewell and Hauser 1972; Sewell, Hauser, Wolf 1980). The Capital Deficiency model explains how various forms of capital—human, financial, social, and cultural—work alone or, more often, in unison to promote educational attainment. Students with increased access to the various forms of capital have a marked advantage relative to students from homes with a capital deficit (e.g. Lareau, 2000, 2003; Massey et. al. 2003, Perriera et. al. 2006).

Oppositional Culture notes that, net of social class, lower levels of achievement for involuntary minority students (i.e. African American, Native American) are largely attributed to the anti-educational influence of friends and the mixed educational and occupational messages they receive from their parents, which lowers the student's outlook and orientation towards schooling, and ultimately leads to decreased levels of ambitions and attainment. Conversely, voluntary minorities are immigrant groups that came to the US on their own accord (e.g. Korean, Japanese, Chinese) and, using individuals in their country of origin as a referent point, have a positive outlook on the social mobility process despite any cultural differences that may exist between them and the white middle class. Voluntary minorities are advantaged in that they maintain a positive outlook on the educational process as they receive high levels of educational encouragement from friends and parents (Ogbu and Gibson, 1991; Ogbu, 1978, 1991).

Lastly, with the passage of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1965 there has been a large influx of immigrants to the US from Asia, Latin America and Africa. Segmented Assimilation was developed to account for the divergent assimilation trajectories of second generation youth from these regions. This perspective notes that the children of immigrants will assimilate into different segments of American society based upon the resources and knowledge made available to them by their family (i.e. presence of both parents, parental human capital), the co-ethnic community and their broader social context (i.e. racial discrimination, governmental policies/laws) (e.g. Portes and Zhou, 1993; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001).

Although these theoretical perspectives emphasize different key mechanisms, there is substantial conceptual overlap. For example they all emphasize the importance of economic and informational resources in the home, the student's educational orientation, and the influential role of significant others. Given the conceptual overlap, it is fair to question whether these theories are in fact complementary rather than competing explanations of educational attainment**.** In short, is the prior educational attainment research fractured because the multiple theoretical schools emphasize their unique attributes rather than their cumulative contributions to knowledge?

Although the Wisconsin Model, the Capital Deficiency Model, Oppositional Culture, and Segmented Assimilation are the leading theories of educational stratification, few empirical analyses have rigorously compared the extent to which these theories explain the racial/ethnic variation in college plans and attendance. Nor have prior research analyses, noting the conceptual overlap, attempted to develop a cumulative integrated theory of educational stratification. This analysis will draw upon the analytic approach Massey and colleagues used in their analysis of theories of international migration to assess the dominant educational stratification theories and develop an integrated theory of educational attainment (Massey et al 1994; Massey and Espinosa, 1997). Moreover, this analysis will empirically assess the four theories, examining whether they operate as hypothesized. Also, it will adjudicate between the mechanisms noted by each theory to determine which mechanisms best describe college plans, enrollment and graduation, which will allow for the development of a synthetic theory of educational stratification.

Specifically, this analysis examines the following questions: Which theoretical perspective—the Wisconsin Model, Capital Deficiency, Oppositional Culture, Segmented Assimilation—or key mechanisms best explain the college completion process as well as the racial/ethnic variation that exists in post-secondary outcomes? Is it possible to develop a cumulative integrated theory of educational attainment or are the perspectives incongruent?

This analysis will draw upon the rich racial/ethnic diversity available within the University of Washington Beyond High School Project (UW-BHS) to examine the formation of college plans and actual college enrollment and completion across 11 racial/ethnic groups. Although there are significant differences between pan-ethnic groups in respect to educational processes and outcomes, significant diversity exists within these general groupings (Goyette and Xie 1999; Hirschman 2001; Kao and Thompson 2004). Thus, to develop a cumulative integrated theory that explains racial/ethnic variation in educational attainment it is best to utilize data that allows for the disaggregation of pan-ethnic groups into more specific ethnicities.

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

Introduction:
--to be added

Literature Review
--Discuss each of the theories in depth, focusing on the key mechanisms within each perspective. Also, I will discuss in depth the prior analyses which have examined each of these perspectives.

Data:
The data used in our analyses come from the University of Washington Beyond High School Project (UW BHS), which is a study designed primarily to examine the transition from high school to college. The data were obtained from surveys of high school seniors[1] in multiple school districts in a large metropolitan area on the West Coast during the late Spring of 2000 and 2002 to 2005. The combined response rate for all years was roughly 75%. A total of 9,658 seniors[2] from twelve traditional high schools (9 public and 3 private) and numerous alternative site schools completed the survey which was administered within the schools, either in separate classrooms or in an auditorium setting[3]. The full questionnaire, which took about 45 minutes to an hour to complete, included a wide variety of items designed to measure the students' educational and occupational aspirations, expectations, and plans. In addition, information was gathered about student demographic characteristics, family background, extracurricular activities, support networks, attitudes, and beliefs.

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 was very short and focused, asking students to report on: (1) their high school graduation, (2) their post-graduation employment, and (3) their post-graduation school enrollment. The students were contacted via a combination of phone calls, email exchanges, and a web-based response system. Most students were contacted directly for the follow-up survey, but the information for some students was obtained from "proxies" such as parents, friends, or siblings. Of the 9,658 students surveyed in the spring of 2000 and 2002 to 2005 follow-up surveys were obtained from 8,885, which yields a follow-up response rate of 92%. The latter number represents the eligible sample for the sections of the analysis that examine correlates of college attendance study. It is slightly reduced in the analysis presented below, however, due to missing information for a small number of cases on the dependent variables.

Generally, missing data does not appear to be a problem, as data is missing for less than 5% of the sample across the independent variables measures. However, where necessary, we have used regression single imputation methods to imputed missing values for all independent variables, save the measures of race/ethnicity. This method, under the assumption that the data is missing at random, samples from the error distributions to maintain the natural variance of each variable and provides a predicted value for the missing data point. This method is superior to mean substitution (Allison 2002). Results were compared to analyses in which listwise deletion was employed and there were no significant differences in the

---

[1] The definition of what constitutes a senior can be somewhat ambiguous. For example, students that have nearly completed four years of high school, but have only enough credits to be classified as a junior and are not graduating in the spring of their fourth year are often identified as seniors. Also, students who have completed enough credits to be considered a senior but have been enrolled in high school for three years or less are considered seniors. There are other scenarios that can also lead to an unclear definition of what constitutes a senior. For the purpose of this analysis we define a senior as a student that plans to be eligible to attend a post secondary institution in the coming academic year.

[2] 120 of these observations were excluded from the analysis as the surveys were completed by exchange students, developmentally disabled students, students that completed the survey with random answers, or students whom we could not match to the school records.

[3] 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.

magnitude or statistical significance of the coefficients.

Variables

Outcomes: College Plans, Attendance, and Enrollment

The dependent variables utilized in this analysis attempt to capture students' college ambitions and college attendance. The least concrete measures of educational ambitions, college aspirations and expectations, are based upon questions which ask the student "How far would you LIKE to go in school?" and "Realistically speaking, how far do you THINK you will get in school?", respectively. Student responses are recoded into a dichotomy of aspiring /expecting to achieve at least a college degree or not. Roughly, 75% of students aspired to at least college degree, while 68% expected to obtain a college degree or greater.

A more concrete measure of educational ambitions is whether the student has college plans for the year after high school. Students were asked "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?" Students that reported college plans for the coming year were asked for the name and location of the top three college, professional, or technical schools that they planned on attending[4]. Students that reported plans to attend college and listed a college included in the 2005 Carnegie College classification were coded as having college plans. Overall, 80% of students had some college plans. I was able to differentiate between students with plans to attend a two year and a four year college; 24% of students planned on attending a two year college, while 56% had four year college plans.

Data on college enrollment one year after graduating from high school and college completion from the National Student Clearinghouse was used to construct the measures of educational attainment. The 2005 Carnegie classification of institutions of higher education was used to code the institutions that respondents attended[5]. In respect to enrollment one year post high school completion, schools were coded as 4-year degree granting institution, 2 year degree programs, or other post-secondary educational programs[6]. 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 students attended any college within one year after high school, while nearly 40% attended a four year college. As for college completion, 20% of students completed a baccalaureate within 5 years of high school graduation.

Ascriptive Measures

The construction of the race/ethnicity variable is based upon a matrix of questions that students answered about their racial/ethnic identity. Roughly 96% of student provided at least some information about their race/ethnicity. Two of the numerous race and ethnicity items included in the UWBHS are the Hispanicity and race questions used in the 2000 Census. Roughly four out of five students reported membership in only one racial/ethnic group. For the students that noted membership in multiple racial/ethnic groups, information from a question on primary racial or ethnic identity was used as a 'tie-

---

[4] Students that responded 'yes' to the question about continuing their education post-high school are considered to have college plans. A few students skipped the college plans question, but listed the school which they planned on attending, we considered these students to have college plans for the year following high school.

[5] Information on the Carnegie classification of higher education institutions can be found at: http://www.carnegiefoundation.org/classifications/

[6] The institutional classification was based upon the highest degree offered by the institution (Associates or Baccalaureate) For the few schools which offered both Associates and Baccalaureate degrees, I coded these schools based upon which type of degree was more prevalent amongst all degree recipients. Lastly, I coded the small number schools without any form of accreditation and all special focus institutions as other post-secondary educational programs.

breaker' to determine the student's race/ethnic group[7]. A small percentage of multi-racial/ethnic students did not provide a primary racial/ethnic identity, so in these instances information on the student's ancestry was used in an attempt to identify the student's race/ethnicity[8]. In total, 104 multi-racial students did not provide a singular race/ethnicity as their primary race or as their ancestry[9]. Thus, these 104 students (~1% of the sample) were assigned to the racial category that their same-race/ethnicity multi-racial/ethnic peers most selected as their primary racial/ethnic identity[10]. For the 4% of students that did not provide any race/ethnicity information in the survey, racial/ethnic information from the school administrative records was used[11]. Ultimately, I was able to code students into 12 distinct racial/ethnic groups: white; African American; Native American; Other Asians[12]; Chinese and Japanese[13]; Korean; Cambodian; Vietnamese; Filipino; Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders (NHOPI)[14]; Other Hispanics[15]; and Mexican.

Whites are the largest racial/ethnic groups in the sample constituting 61% 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

---

[7] For example, if a student noted on the race question that they were white and African American and noted on the primary racial/ethnic identity question that they consider African American to be their primary race, they would be coded as African American.

[8] The ancestry question was used in lieu of primary identity for only 194 students. Also the first ancestry that a student listed was used as the student response.

[9] Often these students responded that they were 'mixed, 'American' or 'a lot of stuff'.

[10] For example, 203 students stated that they were African American and white on the race questions. Forty of these students stated that white was their primary race, 143 stated that black was their primary race, and 20 stated they did not have a single race/ethnicity primary identity. The 20 students were assigned a primary race of African American, as it was the modal response of a primary race for white and black students.

[11] There were 35 students for whom no race/ethnic data exists. These students were deleted from the analysis.

[12] Note that the 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 (e.g. Indonesian, Laotian). 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.

[13] 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.

[14] 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.

[15] 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.

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 45% of the sample, used as the referent group.

--Information for additional measures to be added later

Analysis
Preliminary tables included below.

Table 1. Percentile Distributions and Means for Ascriptive, Social, and Economic, Educational Experiences, and Educational Attainment for High School Seniors in in UW-BHS Sample

Ascriptive Measures:	Proportion/Mean	Std. Dev
Gender: Male	.45	--
Gender: Female	.55	--
Race/Ethnicity:		
White	.61	--
African American	.14	--
Native American	.01	--
Other Asian	.02	--
Cambodian	.03	--
Vietnamese	.03	--
Filipino	.03	--
Korean	.04	--
Japan & Chinese	.02	--
Native Hawaiian/Other Pac Isl	.02	--
Mexican	.03	--
Other Hispanic	.03	--
GENERATIONAL STATUS		
First Generation (Student born out of US)	.14	--
Second Gen. (At least one of parents born outside US)	.17	--
Third Gen. and higher (Student and parent born in US)	.69	--
Family Background Measures:		
Family Owns Home: Yes	.70	--
Parental Education (1 = LT HS to 5= Adv Degree)	2.88	1.58
Parental Occupational Code	64.69	23.86
Non-Intact Family Structure	.40	--
Individuals in Student's Life:		
Parental Encouragement	1.40	1.02
Friends Encouragement	.61	.68
Teacher Encourage	.77	.54
Mentor Encourage	.74	.61
Friends' College Plans	2.97	1.47
Student Has A Mentor They Can Consult (4 = Stongly Agree)	3.10	.73
Parents Know Students Friends/Friends' Parents	2.74	.75
Educational Orienation and Experiences:		
Aspires to Complete BA	.75	--
Perception of School	3.00	.85
Late Transfer/ School Based Social Capital	.01	1.00
Cumulative GPA (Self-Reported)	3.14	.68
Outcome Measures:		
College Plans	.80	--
Enrolled In College (within a year of HS graduation)	.70	--
Completed College (within 5 years of HS graduation)	.20	--
N of High School Seniors	9,658	
N of Follow-up Resondents	8,888	
N of Five Year Follow up	4,862	

Table 2--Panel B. Odds-Ratios from a Logistic Regression of Ascriptive and Wisconsin Model Indicators on College Attendance with Robust Standard Errors. N=8,888

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5	
	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|
Female	**1.31**	**.00**	**1.40**	**.00**	1.06	.31	.91	.12	.94	.29
African American	**.73**	**.00**	.97	.72	**1.23**	**.01**	1.10	.26	1.03	.77
Native American	**.58**	**.00**	.90	.61	.99	.95	.93	.75	.94	.79
Other Asian	.92	.63	1.13	.51	1.18	.35	1.05	.81	1.05	.80
Cambodian	**.67**	**.01**	**1.65**	**.00**	**1.73**	**.00**	1.30	.13	1.28	.18
Vietnamese	**3.74**	**.00**	**8.08**	**.00**	**6.37**	**.00**	**4.59**	**.00**	**4.47**	**.00**
Filipino	1.23	.18	1.17	.34	1.24	.23	1.03	.87	.98	.90
Korean	**2.91**	**.00**	**3.03**	**.00**	**3.03**	**.00**	**2.36**	**.00**	**1.99**	**.00**
Japan-Chinese	**1.52**	**.04**	1.39	.13	1.17	.50	.97	.89	.90	.64
NHOPI	**.37**	**.00**	**.53**	**.00**	**.61**	**.01**	**.53**	**.00**	**.51**	**.00**
Mexican	**.46**	**.00**	.81	.12	.94	.64	.81	.17	.81	.16
Other Hispanic	**.61**	**.00**	**.73**	**.04**	.82	.23	*.73*	*.07*	.75	.11
First Generation	**.84**	**.03**	1.10	.29	1.02	.82	.91	.32	.96	.67
Second Generation	**1.19**	**.02**	**1.23**	**.01**	*1.18*	*.05*	1.15	.11	1.14	.15
Family Owns Home			**1.65**	**.00**	**1.55**	**.00**	**1.44**	**.00**	**1.45**	**.00**
Parental Education			**1.30**	**.00**	**1.25**	**.00**	**1.21**	**.00**	**1.18**	**.00**
Parental Occupation			**1.01**	**.00**	**1.01**	**.00**	**1.01**	**.00**	**1.01**	**.00**
Cumulative GPA					**2.83**	**.00**	**2.35**	**.00**	**2.14**	**.00**
Parental Encouragement							**1.52**	**.00**	**1.44**	**.00**
Friends Encouragement							**1.54**	**.00**	**1.43**	**.00**
Teacher Encourage							1.10	.14	1.06	.36
Mentor Encourage							**1.34**	**.00**	**1.26**	**.00**
Aspires to Complete BA									**2.74**	**.00**
BIC	-70,111		-70,781		-71,485		-72,263		-72,501	

Note: Logistic regression results from Panel A (college plans) and Panel C (college completion) will be included in the final draft of the paper.

Table 3--Panel B. Odds-Ratios from a Logistic Regression of Ascriptive and Capital Deficiency Indicators on College Attendance with Robust Standard Errors. N=8,888

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4		Model 5		Model 6	
	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|
Female	**1.31**	**.00**	**1.36**	**.00**	**1.37**	**.00**	**1.27**	**.00**	**1.19**	**.00**	**1.25**	**.00**
African American	**.73**	**.00**	.90	.15	**.86**	**.03**	**.75**	**.00**	**.67**	**.00**	*.87*	*.08*
Native American	**.58**	**.00**	**.67**	**.04**	.84	.37	**.63**	**.01**	*.68*	*.05*	1.00	1.00
Other Asian	.92	.63	1.03	.85	1.05	.77	1.04	.84	.92	.65	1.15	.46
Cambodian	**.67**	**.01**	.84	.25	**1.51**	**.01**	**.70**	**.02**	**.72**	**.05**	**1.40**	**.06**
Vietnamese	**3.74**	**.00**	**4.56**	**.00**	**7.44**	**.00**	**4.08**	**.00**	**3.60**	**.00**	**6.54**	**.00**
Filipino	1.23	.18	1.22	.23	1.19	.29	1.24	.17	1.08	.65	1.04	.82
Korean	**2.91**	**.00**	**3.03**	**.00**	**2.99**	**.00**	**3.05**	**.00**	**2.12**	**.00**	**2.27**	**.00**
Japan-Chinese	**1.52**	**.04**	*1.42*	*.09*	*1.45*	*.09*	*1.50*	*.05*	1.19	.42	1.11	.65
NHOPI	**.37**	**.00**	**.43**	**.00**	**.48**	**.00**	**.38**	**.00**	**.34**	**.00**	**.46**	**.00**
Mexican	**.46**	**.00**	**.52**	**.00**	*.78*	*.06*	**.48**	**.00**	**.49**	**.00**	*.78*	*.08*
Other Hispanic	**.61**	**.00**	**.68**	**.01**	**.69**	**.02**	**.64**	**.00**	**.64**	**.01**	.75	.10
First Generation	**.84**	**.03**	.95	.53	1.02	.78	.91	.26	.88	.15	1.14	.19
Second Generation	**1.19**	**.02**	**1.17**	**.04**	*1.25*	*.01*	**1.19**	**.02**	**1.12**	**.14**	**1.16**	**.08**
Family Owns Home			**2.11**	**.00**							**1.55**	**.00**
Parental Education					**1.33**	**.00**					**1.23**	**.00**
Parental Occupation					**1.01**	**.00**					**1.01**	**.00**
Parents Know Students Friends							**.76**	**.00**			**.86**	**.00**
Student Has Adult They Can Consult							1.01	.75			.95	.21
Transferred Last 2 Years of HS							**.51**	**.00**			**.55**	**.00**
Aspires To Complete BA									**5.96**	**.00**	**4.84**	**.00**
Perception of School									**1.22**	**.00**	**1.26**	**.00**
BIC	-70,111		-70,298		-70,709		-70,261		-71,266		-71,699	

Note: Logistic regression results from Panel A (college plans) and Panel C (college completion) will be included in the final draft of the paper.

Table 4--Panel B. Odds-Ratios from a Logistic Regression of Ascriptive and Oppositional Culture Indicators on College Attendance with Robust Standard Errors. N=8,888

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|
Female	**1.31**	**.00**	**1.40**	**.00**	*1.11*	*.06*	**1.12**	**.04**
African American	**.73**	**.00**	.97	.72	.94	.48	.90	.19
Native American	**.58**	**.00**	.90	.61	.86	.49	.88	.56
Other Asian	.92	.63	1.13	.51	.98	.93	.99	.98
Cambodian	**.67**	**.01**	**1.65**	**.00**	1.22	.25	1.20	.30
Vietnamese	**3.74**	**.00**	**8.08**	**.00**	**4.92**	**.00**	**4.72**	**.00**
Filipino	1.23	.18	1.17	.34	.93	.68	.90	.54
Korean	**2.91**	**.00**	**3.03**	**.00**	**2.07**	**.00**	**1.78**	**.00**
Japan-Chinese	**1.52**	**.04**	1.39	.13	.94	.77	.88	.58
NHOPI	**.37**	**.00**	**.53**	**.00**	**.46**	**.00**	**.45**	**.00**
Mexican	**.46**	**.00**	.81	.12	.78	.10	.78	.09
Other Hispanic	**.61**	**.00**	**.73**	**.04**	**.66**	**.02**	**.68**	**.04**
First Generation	**.84**	**.03**	1.10	.29	.98	.80	1.01	.89
Second Generation	**1.19**	**.02**	**1.23**	**.01**	*1.17*	*.07*	1.15	.11
Family Owns Home			**1.65**	**.00**	**1.38**	**.00**	**1.41**	**.00**
Parental Education			**1.30**	**.00**	**1.20**	**.00**	**1.17**	**.00**
Parental Occupation			**1.01**	**.00**	**1.01**	**.00**	**1.01**	**.00**
Parental Encouragement					**1.70**	**.00**	**1.57**	**.00**
Friends' Encouragement					**1.59**	**.00**	**1.46**	**.00**
Friends' College Plans					**1.32**	**.00**	**1.25**	**.00**
Aspires to Complete BA							**2.96**	**.00**
Perception of School							1.08	.15
BIC	-70,111		-70,781		-72,006		-72,290	

Note: Logistic regression results from Panel A (college plans) and Panel C (college completion) will be included in the final draft of the paper.

Table 5--Panel B. Odds-Ratios from a Logistic Regression of Ascriptive and Segmented Assimilation Indicators on College Attendance with Robust Standard Errors. N=8,888

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	P>|z|
Female	**1.31**	**.00**	**1.42**	**.00**	**1.29**	**.00**
African American	**.73**	**.00**	1.06	.49	1.06	.44
Native American	**.58**	**.00**	.93	.73	.97	.90
Other Asian	.92	.63	1.15	.44	1.17	.40
Cambodian	**.67**	**.01**	**1.55**	**.01**	**1.47**	**.02**
Vietnamese	**3.74**	**.00**	**7.52**	**.00**	**6.41**	**.00**
Filipino	1.23	.18	1.19	.29	1.05	.76
Korean	**2.91**	**.00**	**3.08**	**.00**	**2.59**	**.00**
Japan-Chinese	**1.52**	**.04**	1.40	.13	1.09	.71
NHOPI	**.37**	**.00**	**.52**	**.00**	**.53**	**.00**
Mexican	**.46**	**.00**	.81	.11	*.88*	*.37*
Other Hispanic	**.61**	**.00**	*.74*	*.06*	*.73*	*.06*
First Generation	**.84**	**.03**	1.02	.79	1.09	.34
Second Generation	**1.19**	**.02**	**1.21**	**.02**	*1.17*	*.06*
Family Owns Home			**1.51**	**.00**	**1.31**	**.00**
Parental Education			**1.29**	**.00**	**1.23**	**.00**
Parental Occupation			**1.01**	**.00**	**1.01**	**.00**
Non-Intact Family			**.66**	**.00**	**.73**	**.00**
Parents Know Students Friends					**.92**	**.02**
Student Has Adult They Can Consult					1.00	.94
Transferred Last 2 Years of HS					**.61**	**.00**
Friends' College Plans					**1.45**	**.00**
BIC	-70,111		-70,838		-71,296	

Note: Logistic regression results from Panel A (college plans) and Panel C (college completion) will be included in the final draft of the paper.

Table 6. Ascriptive, Wisconsin Model, Capital Deficiency, Oppositional Culture, and Segmented Assimilation									
	College Plans			College Enrollment			College Completion		
	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	P>|z|	Odds Ratio	Std. Err.	P>|z|
Ascriptive Indicators:									
Female	**1.44**	**.09**	**.00**	.95	.06	.42	1.07	.09	.47
African American	**1.20**	**.11**	**.04**	1.10	.09	.25	.92	.13	.55
Native American	1.22	.30	.41	.98	.21	.91	.54	.23	.15
Other Asian	1.07	.21	.73	1.09	.21	.66	.78	.26	.46
Cambodian	**2.55**	**.60**	**.00**	1.18	.21	.35	1.22	.35	.48
Vietnamese	**3.00**	**.74**	**.00**	**4.16**	**.95**	**.00**	.92	.23	.74
Filipino	1.14	.24	.54	.95	.18	.80	*.63*	*.17*	*.08*
Korean	**1.64**	**.35**	**.02**	**1.90**	**.37**	**.00**	.92	.22	.72
Japan-Chinese	1.58	.48	.14	.83	.20	.45	.67	.22	.23
NHOPI	.74	.14	.11	**.53**	**.10**	**.00**	**.21**	**.13**	**.01**
Mexican	.98	.16	.91	.86	.13	.32	.89	.26	.69
Other Hispanic	.88	.16	.49	.76	.14	.14	.60	.19	.11
First Generation	.94	.10	.53	.93	.09	.47	.81	.13	.18
Second Generation	**1.23**	**.12**	**.04**	1.09	.10	.36	1.15	.15	.28
Family Background:									
Family Owns Home	**1.17**	**.08**	**.02**	**1.33**	**.09**	**.00**	**1.37**	**.15**	**.00**
Parental Education	*1.04*	*.02*	*.07*	**1.16**	**.03**	**.00**	**1.15**	**.04**	**.00**
Parental Occupation	**1.00**	**.00**	**.00**	**1.01**	**.00**	**.00**	*1.00*	*.00*	*.09*
Non-Intact Family	**.86**	**.05**	**.02**	**.76**	**.05**	**.00**	*.85*	*.08*	*.07*
Important Individuals:									
Parental Encouragement	**1.43**	**.05**	**.00**	**1.41**	**.05**	**.00**	**1.27**	**.09**	**.00**
Friends Encouragement	**1.27**	**.06**	**.00**	**1.36**	**.07**	**.00**	**1.27**	**.13**	**.02**
Teacher Encourage	1.07	.07	.28	1.06	.07	.35	1.09	.15	.55
Mentor Encourage	**1.38**	**.07**	**.00**	**1.26**	**.07**	**.00**	**1.38**	**.18**	**.02**
Friends' College Plans	**1.13**	**.03**	**.00**	**1.19**	**.03**	**.00**	**1.28**	**.04**	**.00**
Edu Orientation & Experiences:									
Aspires to Complete BA	**2.00**	**.14**	**.00**	**2.56**	**.17**	**.00**	**4.19**	**.79**	**.00**
Perception of School	**1.14**	**.04**	**.00**	.99	.04	.86	1.07	.06	.20
Parents Know Friends	1.04	.04	.35	.98	.04	.69	.93	.06	.26
Adult in Life to Consult	.96	.04	.34	**.92**	**.04**	**.05**	**.87**	**.05**	**.02**
Transferred Late in HS	**1.12**	**.03**	**.00**	**1.13**	**.03**	**.00**	**1.18**	**.05**	**.00**
Cumulative GPA	**1.48**	**.07**	**.00**	**2.05**	**.10**	**.00**	**4.66**	**.45**	**.00**
BIC'	-79,219			-72,563			-37,483		
N=	9,488			8,888			4,862		

References

Allison, Paul D. 2002. *Missing Data.* Sage University Papers Series on Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences, 07-136. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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.

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

Freeman, C., and Fox, M. 2005. *Status and Trends in the Education of American Indians and Alaska Natives* (NCES 2005-108). U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

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

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

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

Lareau, Annette. 1987. "Parent Involvement and Achievement in High School: The Importance of Cultural Capital." *Sociology of Education* 60: 73-85.

Lareau, Annette. 2000. *Home Advantage: Social Class and Parental Interventions in Elementary Education.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Press.

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

Massey, Douglas and Kristin E. Espinosa. 1997. "What's Driving Mexico-U.S. Migration? A Theoretical, Empirical, and Policy Analysis" *American Journal of Sociology* 102:939-999.

Massey, Douglas, Joaquin Arango, Graeme Hugo, Ali Kouauci, Adela Pellegrino, and J. Edward Taylor. 1994. "An Evaluation of International Migration Theory: The North American Case" *Population Development Review.*20:699-751.

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.

Ogbu, John U. 1978. *Minority Education and Caste* New York: Academic Press.

Ogbu, John U. 1991. "Minority Responses and School Experiences." *The Journal of Psychohistory* 18: 433-456.

Ogbu, John U. 1991. Immigrant and Involuntary Minorities in Comparative Perspective. In *Minority Status and Schooling.* Editor: Gibson and Ogbu. Pgs 3-33. New York: New Press.

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

Portes, Alejandro, Patricia Fernandez-Kelly, and William J. Haller. 2005. "Segmented Assimilation on the Ground: The new Second Generation in Early Adulthood." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28:1000-1040

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

Portes, Alejandro and Min Zhou. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants," *Annals of the American Political and Social Sciences*. 530 (November):74-96.

Sewell, William H., Archibald O. Haller, and Alejandro Portes. 1969. "The Education and Early Occupational Attainment Process". *American Sociological Review* 34:82-92.

Sewell, William and Robert Hauser. 1972. "Causes and Consequences of Higher Education: Models of the Status Attainment Process." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics* 54: 851-861

Sewell, William, Robert Hauser, and Wendy C. Wolf. 1980. "Sex, Schooling, and Occupational Status." *American Journal of Sociology* 86:551-583.

Snyder, T.D., Dillow, S.A., and Hoffman, C.M. 2008. *Digest of Education Statistics 2007* (NCES 2008 022). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.