Supplementary Online Appendix for Attainment"	"Socioeconomic Segregation,	Campus Social Context, and Disparities in Bachelor's Degree

Table A1: Examples of four-year colleges at the bottom and top social context deciles in 2004-5

Tuble 1111 Enumptes of roat year coneges at the bottom a	•		Average family	Median family	Average poverty rate at students'	Average Median household income at	% receiving
			income	income	home zip	students' home	federal
College name	State	Sector	on	on	code on	zip code on	grants or loans
College name Panel A: Examples of colleges ranked at the bottom social co		Sector	campus	campus	campus	campus	ioans
Allen University	South Carolina	Private non-profit	18668	15851	15	49461	74
Bryant & Stratton College-Parma	Ohio	Private for-profit	16307	13047	15	48774	96
Bryant & Stratton College-Richmond	Virginia	Private for-profit	16307	13047	15	48774	81
Cameron University	Oklahoma	Public	20844	18823	13	45647	41
Central State University	Ohio	Public	24185	20363	15	48898	77
CUNY Medgar Evers College	New York	Public	16137	14430	24	43304	69
Grambling State University	Louisiana	Public	24846	18869	19	44602	73
Humphreys University-Stockton and Modesto Campuses	California	Private non-profit	22824	17841	15	54714	69
Lindsey Wilson College	Kentucky	Private non-profit	26790	24341	16	38952	66
Mississippi Valley State University	Mississippi	Public	14926	13824	25	34675	84
Saint Augustine College	Illinois	Private non-profit	15389	14099	15	53401	82
The College of New Rochelle	New York	Private non-profit	17907	14980	26	41804	88
The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley	Texas	Public	21812	17298	31	35907	67
University of the Southwest	New Mexico	Private non-profit	29167	21283	17	45235	59
Panel B: Examples of colleges ranked at the top social conte	xt decile:	*					
Cedarville University	Ohio	Private non-profit	70233	66275	5	67472	42
Citadel Military College of South Carolina	South Carolina	Public	70361	66064	7	66737	15
Clemson University	South Carolina	Public	72304	68811	8	64586	12
College of William and Mary	Virginia	Public	83841	78587	5	83535	9
Delaware Valley University	Pennsylvania	Private non-profit	64661	62816	5	74768	26
Fairfield University	Connecticut	Private non-profit	98636	92887	4	93459	6
Hanover College	Indiana	Private non-profit	69666	65718	6	64886	22
Ithaca College	New York	Private non-profit	80047	73000	5	77434	17
Kettering University	Michigan	Private non-profit	68369	66766	6	70814	20
Presbyterian College	South Carolina	Private non-profit	74054	67382	8	62667	14
Providence College	Rhode Island	Private non-profit	91164	87019	5	83294	13
St Mary's College of Maryland	Maryland	Public	83733	82461	5	85887	12
University of San Francisco	California	Private non-profit	66880	56417	7	82473	22
Valparaiso University	Indiana	Private non-profit	68194	64510	5	72576	22

Sources: College Scorecard Data and IPEDS 2004-5.

Table A2: Coefficients from multinomial logit models predicting students' academic outcomes at four-year colleges.

Model name	Model 3 in Table 4:		Model 3a:		
Outcome (Base outcome: BA)	No degree	AA or lower	No degree	AA or lower	
Panel A: Students at 4-year Colleges					
Campus social context decile	12***	14***	14***	14***	
	(.03)	(.03)	(.027)	(.041)	
Student socioeconomic background (High SES=0):					
Low-SES students	.56***	.59**	.56***	.57**	
	(.16)	(.22)	(.16)	(.22)	
Mid-SES students	.42***	.52***	.42***	.52***	
	(.10)	(.15)	(.10)	(.15)	
Individual-level factors:					
Academic, demographic, attitudes and					
aspirations	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
College level factors:					
Admission competitiveness	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
College sector	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
College financial resources	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Student-faculty ratio	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
College size	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
College location	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Dorms capacity			Yes	Yes	
Tuition and fees			Yes	Yes	
% underrepresented minorities			Yes	Yes	
Constant	3.03***	2.11*	4.17***	2.93**	
	(.64)	(.99)	(.69)	(1.10)	
Observations	5,140		5,140		
BIC	1848519		1844073		

Sources: ELS 2002-2012 and College Scorecard Data

Notes: ** p<0.01, * p<0.05, + p<0.1. Robust standard errors in parentheses. Table 2 provides descriptions for individual and college level characteristics included in the models

Admission Competativeness Tuition and Fees Core Revenues per Student revenues (in \$ M) per student fees (in S.K.) 25th percentile ACT 30 40 50 60 70 Campus Social Context Rank 30 40 50 60 70 Campus Social Context Rank Campus Social Context Rank R squared=.3287 R squared=0.271 R squared=.0507 Geographic Spread Underrepresented Minorities 51 ⊣ 46 Dorm capacity as 90 of undergrad 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100 50 Campus Social Context Rank Campus Social Context Rank 5 6 9 10 R squared=.2207 R squared=.2646 Campus Social Context Decile

Figure A1: Campus Social Context by Selected College Charecteristics. Four-year colleges

Sources: College Scorecard Data and IPEDS

Notes: Trend line is a nonparametric locally weighted regression line.

Students at four-year colleges who aspired for BA in 2004 .99 Probability of BA Aspirations in 2006 .98 .97 .96 .95 .94 .93 .92 .91 .9 .89 .86 .85 2 3 10 **Campus Social Context Decile** Low-SES students Mid-SES Students High-SES Students

Figure A2: Adjusted probabilities of maintaining BA aspirations between 2004 and 2006, Students at four-year colleges who aspired for BA in 2004

Sources: ELS 2002-2012 and the College Scorecard Data

Notes: Based on logit models predicting educational aspirations in 2006 among students who aspired for BA in 2004 and attended college by 2005. Estimates adjust for all individual- and college- level factors detailed in Table 2 (except for aspirations in 2004) and are smoothed across three social context deciles.