

Appendix A: Respondent Characteristics

Pseudonym	Age	Class Year at Time of Interview	Gender	Type of High School	Study Classification
Nicole	19	Sophomore	Female	Public, Magnet	Doubly Disadvantaged
Lindon	21	Senior	Male	Public, Magnet	Doubly Disadvantaged
Susan	22	Junior	Female	Public	Doubly Disadvantaged
Robin	21	Junior	Female	Public	Doubly Disadvantaged
Amy	20	Junior	Female	Public	Doubly Disadvantaged
Steven	22	Junior	Male	Public	Doubly Disadvantaged
Anthony	21	Senior	Male	Public	Doubly Disadvantaged
Natalie	20	Sophomore	Female	Public	Doubly Disadvantaged
Rose	20	Junior	Female	Public	Doubly Disadvantaged
Marilyn	21	Senior	Female	Public, Magnet	Doubly Disadvantaged
Claire	20	Junior	Female	Private	Middle Class
Kennedy	19	Sophomore	Female	Public, Magnet	Middle Class
Regina	20	Junior	Female	Private	Middle Class
Athena	21	Junior	Female	Private	Middle Class
Sade	20	Junior	Female	Public	Middle Class
Adam	19	Sophomore	Male	Public	Middle Class
Aleshia	19	First Year	Female	Public	Middle Class
Santiago	21	Junior	Male	Private, Boarding	Middle Class
Malcolm	22	Senior	Male	Public	Middle Class
Moe	20	Sophomore	Male	Public	Middle Class
Krystal	20	Sophomore	Female	Private	Middle Class
Doctor	20	First Year	Male	Private, Boarding	Privileged Poor
David	18	First Year	Male	Private, Boarding	Privileged Poor
Bobbi	18	Sophomore	Female	Private	Privileged Poor
Sean	19	Sophomore	Male	Private	Privileged Poor
Monica	21	Senior	Female	Private	Privileged Poor
Sahara	20	Junior	Female	Private	Privileged Poor
Veronica	20	Sophomore	Female	Private	Privileged Poor
Gregory	19	Sophomore	Male	Private, Boarding	Privileged Poor
Lauren	22	Senior	Female	Private	Privileged Poor
Jaylen	21	Junior	Female	Private, Boarding	Privileged Poor
Michael	19	First Year	Male	Public	Privileged Poor
Idet	21	Junior	Male	Private	Privileged Poor
Sarah	20	Sophomore	Female	Private, Boarding	Privileged Poor
Stephanie	20	Junior	Female	Private	Privileged Poor

Appendix B: Discussion of Emergent Groups and Selection Bias

This examination limits its focus to matriculated students and their college processes. Although differences between the Privileged Poor and Doubly Disadvantaged arose inductively during the interview process, I take selection bias seriously. By virtue of being admitted to Midtown College, this population is highly selected upon. And this study examines a subsample of that population who earned admission to Midtown.

I cannot account or control for unobservable differences between the Privileged Poor and Doubly Disadvantaged. However, exploring qualitative accounts of and quantitative data on precollege experiences (family, neighborhood, school, immigration status) permits me to assess comparability on a number of key observables used for studying students' transitions to college and also important contextual variables examined by scholars studying the effect of segregation on students' college experiences (Massey et al. 2003). My stratification scheme for Midtown respondents and criteria for lower-income status in the National Longitudinal Survey of Freshman (NLSF) follow standard stratification schemes. Using these standard stratification schemes, I investigate if the Privileged Poor and Doubly Disadvantaged differed in their sense of belonging at Midtown and their engagement strategies therein.

Although limited by a small sample, my findings show that the Privileged Poor and Doubly Disadvantaged differ on college experiences but do not differ, in observable ways, in precollege orientations and social origins. The qualitative accounts between the two groups report greater similarities in parental strategies, resources, and familial cultural endowments. With the exception of four respondents (two in each group), both Privileged Poor and the Doubly Disadvantaged respondents report that they alone of their siblings attend college. Of the Privileged Poor, only one respondent reports a sibling being involved with a pipeline initiative. If more involved parents were the driving force behind the Privileged Poor's involvement, we would expect more siblings to be involved as well. However, this was not the case.

Based on interview data, affiliation with pipeline initiatives was not something that parents or students exclusively sought out. Instead, respondents report becoming aware of these programs in numerous ways: direct recruitment efforts of private schools or corporate-sponsored programs, parents' superior at work recommending programs or making known scholarship opportunities at private schools, and receiving material directly from different organizations. More generally, pipeline initiatives target academically gifted, lower-income minorities, and these groups, arguably, have equal chances of participation.¹ However, there may be a regional effect as there is a higher concentration of more established corporate-sponsored programs (e.g., Prep for Prep, Wight Foundation) in the Northeast, although national programs (e.g., A Better Chance) exist.² Furthermore, these programs have stronger connections to boarding and day schools in the region, schools which tend to send students to Ivy League and private, liberal arts colleges (Cookson and Persell 1991). As Midtown is one of the colleges with a long history with elite preparatory, day, and boarding schools, the numbers here may be higher than schools who do not have such a relationship.

The Doubly Disadvantaged, however, are not isolated from institutional support. The vast majority (60%) participated in scholarship programs and intensive, highly selective enrichment programs like Questbridge that guarantee admission into and specifically place students in small, liberal arts colleges or highly selective universities. The rest identified active counselors or mentors

¹ Privileged Poor constitute significant percentages for lower-income NLSF Asian (30%), Latino (27%), and white (21%) undergraduates.

² Of the 140 members of the 2011 class of Prep for Prep alumni, for example, 10 attend Yale University, 9 attend Wesleyan University, and 8 attend Amherst College.

helping them through the college application process. Like the Privileged Poor, they report various modes of introduction to these programs, from referral to direct communication via mailings. Enrichment programs focus on access to college and typically do not place students in different social environments. This organizational embeddedness accords with previous research showing that most lower-income students at elite schools enter with help from organizations aimed at college access (Stevens 2007).

Nevertheless, two key aspects of this project should not be overlooked. First, as Sampson (2012) argues, selection bias should not simply be an aspect of empirical research to be controlled away, but rather an important aspect of sociological inquiry in its own right. Understanding the social processes behind individuals selecting into different programs, institutions, and contexts (e.g., schools, communities) is apt for empirical investigation. Second, and more pertinent for the project at hand, previous research employing similar populations and stratification schemes overlook the Privileged Poor in their empirical investigations of the college experiences of undergraduates from lower-income backgrounds. They erroneously treat the Privileged Poor and Doubly Disadvantaged as a homogenous group. Consequently, these investigations improperly measure the effects of social class origin in the lives of lower-income undergraduates at the college level by ignoring the cultural and social contingencies of class marginality and culture shock. Given both the stark differences between the Privileged Poor and Doubly Disadvantaged, as well as the composition of both groups at elite colleges and universities, fully exploring and documenting the experiences and mobility outcomes of both these groups is important in its own right.

Works Cited

- Cookson, Peter, and Caroline Persell. 1991. "Race and Class in America's Elite Preparatory Boarding Schools: African Americans as the 'Outsiders Within'." *The Journal of Negro Education* 60(2):219–28.
- Sampson, Robert. 2012. *Great American City: Chicago and the Enduring Neighborhood Effect*. Chicago; London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Stevens, Mitchell. 2007. *Creating a Class: College Admissions and the Education of Elites*. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.