Undocumented Immigrants in Higher Education: Assessing the Relationship Between State Tuition Policies and College Enrollment

Robert Bozick
Trey Miller
Mattheu Kaneshiro

RAND Corporation
Labor and Population Division

Proposal Prepared for the 2012 Annual Meetings of the Population Association of America

*This is a working draft. Please do not cite or quote without permission from the lead author. This project is supported by a grant from the Spencer Foundation. Please direct all correspondence regarding this manuscript to Robert Bozick, RAND Corporation, 1776 Main Street, Santa Monica CA 90407. rbozick@rand.org

Undocumented Immigrants in Higher Education:
Assessing the Relationship Between State Tuition Policies and College Enrollment

This paper examines state policies regarding in-state tuition eligibility for children of undocumented immigrants. Using legislative data on state policies spanning 1997-2010 we classify states as either accommodating or stringent with respect to their treatment of children of undocumented immigrants: accommodating states grant in-state tuition eligibility and stringent states deny in-state tuition eligibility. We then identify potential undocumented immigrants using probability assignment methods in two data sources: the Current Population Survey and the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002. Using interstate variation in eligibility requirements, we examine whether and how accommodating/stringent policies have affected college preparatory activities, high school graduation, and college enrollment of immigrant youth over the past 14 years.

Undocumented Immigrants in Higher Education:
Assessing the Relationship Between State Tuition Policies and College Enrollment

At the core of the American dream is the idea that anyone, regardless of background, can achieve success through hard work. In the country's infancy, this ethos helped spur massive waves of immigration, inviting entrants willing to sacrifice and persevere with a promise of opportunity. At the time, open immigration policies and public education were dually embraced, as they facilitated industrialization and urban development. During this era of expansion, schools served as a key portal, assimilating immigrant youth into the national culture while providing skills and training vital to their future mobility and economic prosperity.

Presently, however, these elements – open immigration policies and public education – which were once celebrated as core components of "American exceptionalism," face serious social and political challenges. With large numbers of undocumented immigrants crossing permeable borders; with fewer immigrants learning English and assimilating into the national culture; and with fears of internal job competition and terrorism; Americans are less supportive of immigration than they have ever been in the past (National Research Council, 1997). As a consequence, social welfare policies, such as public education and financial aid, have become less accommodating to immigrants and their families. Meanwhile, the financial cost to obtaining a college degree – arguably the most essential credential for occupational and economic mobility – has continued to soar (College Board, 2008). Together, these forces have

created a precarious situation for high school graduates who lack citizenship. In many states, undocumented immigrants are denied in-state tuition and financial aid; thus, potentially precluding solid footing on the "ladder of social mobility" that helped support generations of immigrants before them.

Unfortunately, if current trends persist, the situation will likely worsen. At present, the size of the immigrant population in the country continues to increase, tuition is skyrocketing, and the economic cost to forgoing college is higher than at any point in the history of the country. With these factors at play, undocumented immigrants will face tremendous hurdles to secure a better future for themselves and their families. Moreover, because many immigrant youth have limited English language proficiency and come from low-income families, policies that restrict their access to postsecondary education further inhibit their ability to become productive citizens and, as a result, place further strain on public resources.

Given such high stakes for a vulnerable contingent of the population, there is surprisingly little empirical information about the policies that directly bear on their ability to acquire postsecondary training. This is likely because there are few data sources that directly identify undocumented students. Two studies notable exceptions include Kaushal (2008) and Flores (2010). Both use data from the Current Population Survey to document that foreign-born non-citizen Latinos living in states with accommodating state policies are more likely to enroll in college than their peers living in states without such policies. Neither of these studies, however, look at how accommodating policies shape key college-going preparatory behaviors

(such as taking admission tests and filling out applications) and influence high school graduation; and neither look at the effects of stringent state policies. To our knowledge, there are currently no ongoing research projects that address these issues using national-level data. Therefore, as a means to inform policy makers, higher education administrators, educational practitioners, and other social scientists, this paper will assess whether state policies on legal residency – both accommodating and stringent – affect undocumented youth's decisions to take college admissions exams, apply to college, graduate from high school, and enroll in college. We plan to improve upon the work of Kaushal and Flores by employing methods to more accurately identify undocumented immigrants in the Current Population Survey.

Background

Historically, the American school system has sought to provide a safe port for immigrant youth – providing them opportunities to assimilate into the national culture and to acquire the skills and training necessary to succeed in the domestic labor market. The importance of schooling for immigrant youth was affirmed in the 1982 Supreme Court case Plyer v. Doe, which upheld that all children, regardless of legal status, are guaranteed a free public education from kindergarten through the 12th grade – thereby securing an avenue for acculturation and upward mobility for undocumented students. This provision, however, does not extend to postsecondary education, either for citizen or non-citizen students.

Although not guaranteed a free public college education, federal and most state laws do allow undocumented students to enroll, and postsecondary institutions are not required by federal law to collect applicants' legal status during admissions (Center for Policy Entrepreneurship, 2008). Undocumented students, however, encounter a range of barriers in their pursuit of higher education, including limited English proficiency, unfamiliarity with the university and/or financial aid system, and arguably most important: limited resources to handle the high cost of tuition. Native-born students (U.S. citizens and permanent residents) have a number of options to reduce the financial burden of college. Those who qualify as a resident in a particular state and meet the eligibility requirements for admission are granted in-state tuition, which is substantially less than the amount charged for their out-of-state peers. Additionally, native-born students are eligible for a range of federal loans, grants, and scholarships to help subsidize the total cost. A series of federal and state laws regulate access to these subsidies based on citizenship status.

At the federal level, the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA) prohibits states from granting in-state tuition to undocumented children, unless any out-of-state legal citizen is offered the same benefit. Additionally, this law requires states to provide the immigration status of students who apply for financial aid – which is in accord with the Higher Education Act of 1965 that excludes undocumented students from eligibility for federal financial aid programs such as Pell grants. Despite the relatively straightforward directives in the law, the lack of formal regulations for enforcement has

contributed to confusion and debate in its interpretation. For example, out-of-state students in both California and Kansas challenged the state for violating IIRIRA by granting undocumented students in-state tuition. The court determined that IIRIRA was not violated because students could receive in-state benefits in their home state (Russell, 2007). To provide clarity in the treatment of both citizen and undocumented students, bills such as the DREAM Act – which specify criteria through which undocumented youth can obtain permanent resident status and thus, legally work or enroll in college – have been introduced and subsequently, stalled.[1]

While the DREAM Act had been stirring around in Congress, and court challenges to IIRIRA have been raised and settled, a number of states have been proactive in dealing with the treatment of undocumented students. In 2001, Texas passed legislation granting undocumented students eligibility for in-state tuition if they graduate from high school, have lived in Texas at least three years prior to graduation, gain acceptance at in-state college or university, and submit an affidavit vowing to apply for legal status once they are eligible. California, Utah, and New York followed Texas' lead. As of today, 10 states have enacted legislation to allow unauthorized immigrant students in-state tuition benefits. In our study, we consider these states to have accommodating policies.

[1] The DREAM Act was incorporated into the 2010 National Defense Authorization Act and was filibustered on September 21, 2010.
[2] In 2010, South Carolina and Georgia enacted legislation that outright bans undocumented students from attending any state college or university. We will be unable to examine the effects of this legislation in this project due to their recency.
[3] There is no nationally representative individual-level data set that identifies undocumented respondents.

Table 1. State Laws Regarding In-State Tuition to Undocumented Immigrants

State	Year	Stringent	Accomodating	High School Requirement
Arizona	2006	X		NA
Alabama	2008	X		NA
California	2001		X	Three years
Colorado	2006	X		NA
Georgia	2006	X		NA
Illinois	2003		X	Three years
Kansas	2004		X	Three years
Nebraska	2006		X	Three years
New Mexico	2005		X	One year
New York	2002		X	Two years
Oklahoma	2003		X	Two years
Texas	2001		X	Three years
Utah	2002		X	Three years
Washington	2003		X	Three years

Source: Connecticut General Assembly and the Education Commission of the States

Not all states, however, have welcomed undocumented students into their system of higher education. On the contrary, Arizona, Colorado, and Georgia each passed legislation that restrict in-state tuition benefits, and Alabama outright banned admission to two-year colleges to undocumented students. In our study, we consider these four states to have stringent policies.[2] Table 1 lists the states that have enacted either accommodating or restrictive policies. For those states with accommodating policies, the required number of years of high school enrollment in the state to receive the benefit is also listed. The remaining states not listed in the table charge undocumented students out-of-state tuition fees, but do not restrict their ability to enroll in school.

[2] In 2010, South Carolina and Georgia enacted legislation that outright bans undocumented students from attending any state college or university. We will be unable to examine the effects of this legislation in this project due to their recency.

Research Questions

In this paper, we will answer three key research questions:

1. To what extent do accommodating state higher education policies on legal residency encourage undocumented youth to prepare for college?
2. To what extent do accommodating state higher education policies on legal residency encourage undocumented youth to graduate from high school?
3. To what extent do accommodating (stringent) state higher education policies on legal residency encourage (inhibit) undocumented youth to enroll (from enrolling) in college?

The first two questions focus on behaviors of youth that put them in a position to make the transition from high school to college. Recent research finds that strict college enrollment requirements are associated with increases in the academic engagement of high school students, highlighting the ways that postsecondary policies affect behaviors at the secondary level (Domina, 2007). In this paper, we plan to assess whether similar processes occur when there are changes in immigrant residency policies. In our analysis, we focus on two preparatory behaviors that are typically requisite for enrolling in college: taking college admissions tests (such as the ACT or SAT) and applying for college. Additionally, we look at whether these policies encourage youth to complete high school – a pre-requisite for college enrollment. The third question addresses the core intent of the policy: postsecondary enrollment. We anticipate that in states that adopt accommodating immigrant residency

policies, undocumented youth will be more likely to prepare for college, graduate from high school, and enroll in college.

Data Sources

To answer our three research questions, we will analyze the Current Population Survey (CPS), a population-based survey, and the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS:2002), a school-based survey. For obvious ethical and legal reasons, government surveys like the CPS and ELS:2002 do not directly ask respondents their legal status. Therefore, neither survey can identify the undocumented population with certainty.[3] However, previous work has shown that it is possible to use predictive models to generate probable undocumented migrants, based on such factors as age at migration and receipt of government assistance (Camarota, 2004). We will employ this approach in this paper. Table 2 lists key characteristics of the two data sources.

In our analyses, our key independent variable will be the nativity and citizenship status of the sample members. Within each data set, we will identify three groups: native-born citizens, foreign-born citizens, and foreign-born non-citizens. Our key dependent variables will be college preparatory behaviors, high school graduation, and college enrollment. Below we describe each of the data sets, how we plan to ascertain nativity and citizenship status, and

[3] There is no nationally representative individual-level data set that identifies undocumented respondents. Therefore, we feel it is essential to make use of existing data sources such as the CPS and the ELS:2002 to begin an assessment of these policies, as without them there is little evidence to bear on their efficacy.

how we plan to create our dependent variables. We then briefly describe the control variables we intend to use in our multivariate models.

Table 2. Characteristics of the Current Population Survey (CPS) and the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS:2002)

	CPS	ELS:2002
Population	Non-institutionalized civilian population of the United States	10th grade students in the United States in the spring of 2002
Ability to estimate the effects of state policies	All policies enacted between 1994-2009	Only those policies enacted through 2003
Nativity information	Yes	Yes
Citizenship information	Yes	Can be inferred
College preparatory behaviors	No	Yes
High school graduation	No	Yes
College enrollment information	Yes	Yes

The CPS is a national monthly sample survey of approximately 60,000 households that provides a wide range of information on population characteristics and the state of the labor force. The U.S. Census Bureau, using a scientifically selected national sample with coverage in all 50 States and the District of Columbia, conducts the survey for the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). For our analysis, we plan to use data from the October survey because it is the only month when respondents are asked questions about their school enrollment. We use data starting in 1994, as that is the first year the CPS included questions on nativity. Using information tracing back this far allows us to explore enrollment patterns before and after the

passage of IIRIRA in 1996. We plan to use data up through 2010 because it is the most recent data available. Our analytic sample will include all persons between the ages of 18-24, the prime college-going ages.

ELS:2002 is a cohort study conducted by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES),which tracks the educational and developmental experiences of a nationally representative sample of approximately 15,360 students who were first interviewed about their school and home experiences when they were 10th-graders in 2002. Parents of the students were also interviewed, providing nativity information for themselves and their children. In the spring of 2004, when most were seniors, about 14,710 of the originally selected sample members participated in the first follow-up interview in which they were re-interviewed about their educational experiences and their plans for the future. These students were then followed up in 2006, when most sample members were out of high school for approximately two years. Unlike the CPS, ELS:2002 contains rich data on college-going preparation that help set students on the track to a smooth transition to postsecondary education. Because the states with stringent policies enacted their legislation after the ELS:2002 cohort had finished high school, all analyses using ELS:2002 will only focus on differences between sample members in states with no tuition policy and sample members in states with accommodating tuition policies.

Measuring Nativity and Citizenship. Starting in 1994, the CPS began including questions on nativity and citizenship. Respondents were first asked if they were native or foreign-born. Once the interviewer determined that the respondent was foreign-born, they then asked the respondent about their citizenship. Using this information, we can determine whether the respondent is a native-born citizen, a foreign-born citizen, or a foreign-born non-citizen. Both Flores (2010) and Kaushal (2008) use foreign-born non-citizens a proxy for undocumented immigrants. This proxy group contains both undocumented immigrants as well others who are legally in the United States; their inability discern between the two with certainty may upwardly bias their estimates. To reduce such bias, we will employ a predictive approach developed by Camarota (2004) whereby information on the respondents' household will be used to assign probabilities of being undocumented based on known properties of the undocumented population. For example, undocumented immigrants tend to be younger, recent migrants, less educated, and single. Further, undocumented immigrants cannot receive veterans' benefits, Social Security, or Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF). Therefore, we will use age, age at migration, education level, marital status, and benefits receipt information of the household head to predict whether the sample member is likely to be an undocumented immigrant. We will test the robustness of our findings when using this method compared with the full sample of foreign-born non-citizens.

During the ELS:2002 base-year, when students were in the 10th grade, one of their parents or guardians were interviewed. In this interview, the parent or guardian was asked to

identify their relationship to the respondent, their spouse/partner's relationship to the respondent (if they had a spouse/partner), and the nativity of all three. Unlike the CPS, there are no follow-up questions that ascertain citizenship. Instead, we make use of a question that asks parents of foreign-born students to identify the number of years prior to the base-year the student migrated to the United States. One of the requirements for naturalization is residence in the United States for a continuous period of five years after lawful admission. To parallel our analysis with the CPS data, we create the following categories: native-born students, foreign-born students residing in the United States five or more years (to approximate foreign-born citizens) and foreign-born students residing in the United States less than five years (to approximate foreign-born non-citizens).[4] Our analytical focus is on the third group: foreign-born students residing in the United States less than five years. We will exclude students who were born abroad, but whose parents were born in the United States, as they are likely to be legal citizens. We will employ a similar method to the one described above to probabilistically isolate the population of undocumented immigrants within the broader category of foreign-born non-citizens and test the robustness of our findings using alternate versions of this measurement approach.

Dependent Variables. ELS:2002 contains measures of college preparatory behaviors, high school graduation, and college enrollment. In the spring 2004 interview (12th grade), sample

[4] The five-year criteria will be adjusted to account for the additional two years of residence that will lapse between the base-year survey and the 12th grade when students are applying for college.

members were asked whether had taken the ACT/SAT and in the spring 2006 interview (approximately two years out of high school), sample members were asked whether they had applied to college. From these questions, we will create two binary variables. The first will be coded '1' if the student had taken the ACT/SAT and '0' if they had not. The second will be coded '1' if the student had applied to college and '0' if they had not. As part of the ELS:2002 data collection procedures, students' high school transcripts were abstracted. From their transcripts we will created a binary variable coded '1' if they had received a GED or a diploma '0' if they had not. Lastly, also in the spring 2006 interview, sample members were asked whether they had enrolled in college. From this question, we will create a binary variable coded '1' if the student had enrolled in college and '0' if they had not. We will use information from the CPS October educational supplement information to construct a binary variable coded '1' if ever enrolled in a postsecondary institution and '0' if never enrolled. The CPS does not contain information on college preparatory behaviors or high school graduation.[5]

Control Variables. Although the enactment of tuition policies creates exogenous policy variation for testing the effects of state policies on college preparatory behaviors and college enrollment, we plan to further isolate these effects by controlling for factors that are known to shape educational attainment to reduce the possibility that any associations we observe are

[5] The CPS does include information on educational attainment, but does not collect information on the date of high school graduation. Without this information, we cannot determine the timing of high school graduation relative to the enactment of state policies.

spurious. In both data sets, we plan to include individual and state-level controls. Individual-level controls in the CPS include gender, race-ethnicity, age, marital status and residence in an urban/suburban/rural area. Individual-level controls in ELS:2002 include gender, race-ethnicity, residence in an urban/suburban/rural area, standardized reading and math test scores, family income, parental education, and English proficiency.[6] State-level controls in both data sets include annual unemployment rate, average tuition costs, state affirmative action policies, and state-fixed effects. To preserve the variance-covariance structure of our analytic samples, we will use multiple imputation to deal with missing data.

Analytic Strategy

Main Analyses

First, we will assess the effect of state tuition policies on college preparatory behaviors, high school graduation, and college enrollment using ELS:2002.[7] Specifically we will estimate a logistic regression model of the following form:

(model 1) $$\log\left(\frac{\pi}{1-\pi}\right) = \alpha + \beta_1 ACOM_1 + \beta_2 FBC_2 + \beta_3 FBNC_3 + \beta_4 \mathbf{X}_4$$

[6] The CPS does not include measures of academic ability and English proficiency, key factors associated with college enrollment. These measures are included in ELS:2002. We do not control for age or marital status in ELS:2002. Because ELS:2002 is a cohort study, variation in age is negligible. In contrast to the CPS analysis which will include those between the ages of 18-24, ELS:2002 looks at the initial transition to college among graduating seniors – very few of whom are married at the time of high school exit.

[7] In all analyses of ELS:2002, we will apply Taylor series linearization methods to produce correct standard errors for samples that were drawn using a stratified cluster design.

In this model, π is the probability of the outcome, α is a constant, ACCOM is a binary variable coded '1' if the state in which the sample member resides has an accommodating tuition policy, FBC is a binary variable coded '1' if the sample member is a foreign-born citizen (FBC), FBNC is a binary variable coded '1' if the sample is a foreign-born non-citizen (FBNC), and X is a vector of control variables. FBC's and FBNC's will be compared with native-born citizens (the omitted reference category). The regression coefficients (β) will be converted into odds ratios indicating the change in the odds of preparing for college given a unit shift in an independent variable, holding all other variables constant. The associated t statistic of each β will indicate the statistical significance of the relationship between the independent variable and π.

We will estimate this model four times: once where π = the probability of having taken either the ACT or SAT, once where π = the probability of having applied to college, once where π = the probability of graduating from high school, and once where π = the probability of having enrolled in college. We anticipate that the parameter estimate (β_3) will indicate that FBNC's will be less likely than native-born citizens to prepare for college, graduate from high school, and to enroll in college. To test whether accommodating policies encourage undocumented youth to prepare for college, we will create two multiplicative interaction terms (ACCOM * FBC and ACCOM * FBNC) and enter them into the model.

(model 2) $$\log\left(\frac{\pi}{1-\pi}\right) = \alpha + \beta_1 ACOM_1 + \beta_2 FBC_2 + \beta_3 FBNC_3 + \beta_4 ACOM * FBC_4 + \beta_5 ACOM * FBNC_5 + \beta_6 \mathbf{X}_6$$

We anticipate that the negative effect of being a FBNC (β_3) will be attenuated when adding in the contingent effect of living in a state with an accommodating tuition policy ($\beta_3 + \beta_5$).

Next, we will assess the relationship between state tuition policies and college enrollment using with CPS data. Using the CPS data, we will modify model 1 & two to generate a fixed-effects panel regression model with the following form:

(model 3) $$\log\left(\frac{\pi}{1-\pi}\right) = \alpha + \beta_1 IIRIRA_1 + \beta_2 ACCOM_2 + \beta_3 STRINGENT_3 + \beta_4 FBC_4 + \beta_5 FBNC_5 + \beta_6 \mathbf{X}_6 + \sum_{1}^{s-1} STATE_{(t)} + \sum_{1}^{t-1} YEAR_{(s)}$$

In the model, π is the probability of enrolling in college and α is a constant. IIRIRA is a binary variable coded '1' if the observations are from sample members between 1997 and 2009 after IIRIRA was passed and '0' if the observations are from sample members between 1994 and 1996, before IIRIRA was passed. Though not the central focus of this project, including these variables will allow us to assess whether there are differences in enrollment rates before and after the passage of IIRIRA – a key piece of national legislation that set the stage for the enactment of both accommodating and stringent state-level policies. ACCOM is a binary variable coded '1' if the state in which the sample member resides has an accommodating tuition policy in the observed year, STRINGENT is a binary variable coded '1' if the state in

which the sample member resides has a stringent tuition policy in the observed year, FBC is a binary variable coded '1' if the sample member is a foreign-born citizen (FBC), FBNC is a binary variable coded '1' if the sample is a foreign-born non-citizen (FBNC), and X is a vector of control variables.

$STATE_{(t)}$ and $YEAR_{(s)}$ are state and year fixed effects, respectively, where s = state and t = time. The state fixed effects conceptually account for all aspects of states that remain constant over time but vary across states. The year fixed effects conceptually account for all aspects of years that are constant across states but vary over time. We include these fixed effects because it is not possible to explicitly measure all aspects of particular states or of particular years that might bias our estimate of the relationship between state tuition policies and college enrollment. We plan to use the least-squares dummy-variable approach, in which dummy variables are introduced for each of s-1 states and for each of t-1 years.[8]

We anticipate that the parameter estimate (β_3) will indicate that FBNC's will be less likely than native-born citizens to prepare for college. To test whether accommodating policies encourage undocumented youth to prepare for college, we will create four multiplicative interaction terms (ACCOM * FBC, ACCOM * FBNC, STRINGENT * FBC, and STRINGENT * FBNC) and enter them into the model.

[8] If statistical power for estimating our key interactions is attenuated due to limited degrees of freedom, we will omit the state fixed-effects.

(model 4)
$$\log\left(\frac{\pi}{1-\pi}\right) = \alpha + \beta_1 IIRIRA_1 + \beta_2 ACCOM_2 + \beta_3 STRINGENT_3$$
$$+\beta_4 FBC_4 + \beta_5 FBNC_5 + \beta_6 \mathbf{X}_6 + \sum_1^{s-1} STATE_{(t)} + \sum_1^{t-1} YEAR_{(s)}$$
$$+\beta_7 ACCOM * FBC_7 + \beta_8 ACCOM * FBNC_8$$
$$+\beta_9 STRINGENT * FBC_9 + \beta_{10} STRINGENT * FBNC_{10}$$

We anticipate that the negative effect of being a FBNC (β_5) will be attenuated when adding in the contingent effect of living in a state with an accommodating tuition policy ($\beta_5 + \beta_8$). Conversely, we anticipate that the negative effect of being a FBNC (β_5) will be amplified when adding in the contingent effect of living in a state with a stringent tuition policy ($\beta_5 + \beta_{10}$).[9]

Supplemental Analyses

In addition to estimating the models described above, we will conduct a number of supplemental analyses to ascertain the robustness and sensitivity of our results. First, we will test whether the years since the enactment of the policy matters beyond the identification of the year in which the policy was first enacted. We anticipate that due to language barriers and closed social networks, it will take some time for the news of these policy changes to penetrate

[9] While we do not anticipate that intra-state variation in policies will selectively affect immigrants' decisions to migrate to states with accommodating policies, we will explore whether there are changes in migration in the years following the passage of these policies. To the extent possible, we will try to control for any selective migration so that our parameter estimates for the enactment of the policies are not biased.

into immigrant neighborhoods and families. Therefore, we expect the effects of accommodating policies to be stronger the longer the policy has been in place.

Second, we will experiment with conditioning our sample on high school eligibility requirements set forth by the states. To provide the most accurate estimate of the effect of the state policies, it is necessary to isolate the analytic sample to those eligible to attend college. One of the key criteria of the policies is that undocumented youth attend high school for a specified number of years (see Table 1). For those living in states that enacted tuition policies, we further restrict our sample to those who meet these requirements.

Third, we will test whether these policies affect the enrollment of the native-born population. There is concern among immigration opponents that accommodating policies will "steal spots" that should be filled by citizens. We will examine whether the native-born are less (more) likely to enroll in states that have accommodating (stringent) policies toward undocumented youth.

Lastly, we will examine (to the extent that statistical power will allow) whether there are differences among different areas of origin. Flores (2010) and Kaushal (2008) focus only on Latinos, which though pertinent in that Latinos are the largest immigrant group, it limits our understanding of how different groups respond to these policies. For example, Asian immigrants – which account for a quarter of the foreign-born in the United States (Larsen, 2004) – tend to perform better in school, have greater levels of parental support for academics, and relatively more economic resources than Latino immigrants (Portes & Rumbaut, 2001).

Therefore, Asian immigrants might be particularly affected by such policies as they are (probability-wise), more likely to pursue higher education and have the supports and resources to do so. Additionally, new research finds that recent Black immigrants are much more likely to attend college than their U.S. born Black peers (Bennett & Lutz, 2009) These inter-group differences underscore important questions of how effective policies are in influencing the behaviors of immigrant groups that have varying experiences and levels of resources.

Preparation for the PAA Annual Meetings

This project was recently awarded support through a grant from the Spencer Foundation. The authors have procured the requisite data and have begun data analyses. A complete paper in accordance with the analytic plan presented above will be available in time for the annual meetings in May.

References

Bennett, P.R. & Lutz, A. (2009). How African American is the net black advantage? Differences in college attendance between whites, immigrant and native blacks. Sociology of Education, 82(1), 70-100.

Camarota, S.A. (2004). The high cost of cheap labor: Illegal immigration and the federal budget. Washington, DC: The Center for Immigration Studies.

Center for Policy Entrepreneurship. (2008). Tuition equity legislation: Investing in Colorado high school graduates through equal opportunity to postsecondary education. (Prepared for the Higher Education Access Alliance). Denver, CO: Keaton, E.A.

College Board (2008). Trends in college pricing. Washington, DC: The College Board.

Domina, T. (2007). Higher education policy as secondary school reform: Texas public schools after Hopwood. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 29(3), 200-217.

Flores, S. M. (2010). State "Dream Acts": The effect of in-state resident tuition policies on the college enrollment of undocumented Latino students in the United States. The Review of Higher Education.

Kaushal, N. (2008). In-state tuition for the undocumented: Education effects on Mexican young adults. Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, 27(4). 771-792.

Larsen, L.J. (2004). The foreign-born population in the United States: 2003. (U.S. Census Bureau. Current Population Reports, 20-551). Washington DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Research Council. (1997). The new Americans: Economic, demographic and fiscal effects of immigration. Washington, DC: The National Academy Press.

Portes, A. & Rumbaut, R.G. (2001). Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Raftery, A.E. (1995). Bayesian model selection in social research. Pp. 111-64 in Sociological Methodology, edited by P.V. Marsden. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

Russel, A. (2007). In-state tuition for undocumented immigrants: States' rights and educational opportunity. Washington, DC: American Association of State College and Universities. Retrieved April 2, 2009, from http://www.aascu.org/policy_matters/in-state_tuition.htm