

Asian American Pacific Islander College Choice: Literature Review

Stephanie T. X. Nguyen

Despite the fact that the Asian American Pacific Islander (AAPI) population is growing faster both nationally and within higher education, AAPIs are one of the most understudied racial groups in college-choice scholarship (Poon & Byrd, 2013; U.S. Census, 2016a). Guided by Hossler and Gallagher's (1987) three-phase college choice model, this literature review will synthesize AAPI research to inform strategic enrollment managers on what factors influence AAPI students on their college choice, address gaps in AAPI college choice literature, and suggest future directions in research.

Since the Civil Rights movement in the 1960s and 1970s, access and equity have been central goals of higher education institutions, resulting in an increase of college participation rates from all racial and ethnic groups (Hurtado, Inkelas, Briggs, & Rhee, 1997). The field of enrollment management focuses on creating strategies, practices, and perspectives that can help an institution more effectively achieve its mission and goals, which often include access and equity (Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2013). Strategic enrollment managers, particularly those in the admissions departments, are charged with increasing socioeconomic diversity and balancing complex cross-subsidies between and among different populations of students (Hossler & Kalsbeek, 2013). However, research has shown that there are vast differences, including socioeconomic, cultural, and academic factors, among recruiting major racial groups (Hurtado et al., 1997; Park & Hossler, 2015). Thus, strategic enrollment managers should understand how to recruit different students from ethnic and racial backgrounds, most specifically Asian American Pacific Islander (AAPI). This literature review aims to synthesize AAPI research to inform strategic enrollment managers on what factors influence AAPI students on their college choice through

Hossler and Gallagher's (1987) three-phase college choice model, address gaps in AAPI college choice literature, and suggest future directions in research.

Literature Review

The AAPI racial group consists of two distinct categories including Asian Americans and Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander. The U.S. Census Bureau had defined Asian Americans as people with origins in the Far East, Southeast Asian, and the Indian subcontinent (Hoeffel, Rastogi, Kim, & Shahid, 2012). Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islander (NHPI) include people with origins from Hawaii, Guam, Samoa, or other Pacific Islands (Hoeffel et al., 2012). In total, the U.S. Census has recognized 48 AAPI ethnic groups (CARE, 2008; 2010).

Compared to the total U.S. population, the AAPI population is growing faster both nationally and within higher education (Park & Hossler, 2015). On the national level, the AAPI community is the fastest growing racial group in the U.S., increasing four times faster than other racial groups (U.S. Census, 2016a). Currently, the AAPI population is 20.3 million (U.S. Census, 2016a), constituting about 5.6 percent of the U.S. population (U.S. Census, 2016b). By 2060, the AAPI racial group is expected to

double to over 47 million (WHIAAPI, 2016). Within this racial group, postsecondary enrollment has increased in the last 20 years (Park & Hossler, 2015), with an estimated 40% of AAPIs enrolled in higher education (Escueta & O'Brien, 1991).

Despite this tremendous growth, AAPIs are one of the most understudied racial groups in college-choice scholarship because of the model minority myth (Teranishi, Ceja, Antonio, Allen, & McDonough 2004; Kim & Gasman, 2011). Created in the 1960s by mainstream American media, the model minority myth generalizes all AAPI students as academic high-achievers and models for other racial groups to emulate (Wu, 2014). In higher education specifically, the model minority myth has perpetuated the assumption that a disproportionate amount of AAPI students enroll in highly selective, four-year institutions, and major in science, technology, engineering, and mathematic fields (CARE, 2010). This assumption has led to two critical issues in college choice literature. First, AAPI have either been coupled with white students due to their aggregate achievement status (Poon & Byrd, 2013) or rarely included in studies on the college choice processes of secondary school students (Teranishi, 2002). Second, the model minority myth has masked staggering academic disparities and college access rates within the AAPI group, yet little research has been done on disaggregated college choice outcomes for different AAPI ethnic groups (Teranishi et al., 2004).

As college-bound student populations are becoming increasingly diverse, there is a need to explain the differences in college choice among various racial and ethnic groups (Kim & Gasman, 2011). Even though the U.S. government defines all 48 AAPI ethnic groups within one racial group, there are more differences than there are

similarities in regards to historical, cultural, and sociological characteristics (CARE, 2008). Thus, continued research is needed to counter the model minority myth and to understand why different AAPI ethnic groups choose to go to college and what characteristics influence them in their college outcomes.

College Choice: Student and Institutional Characteristics

To understand AAPI college-going outcomes, the college choice model is an important foundational framework (Poon & Byrd, 2013). Considerable study has focused on understanding college choice, the processes on how students make decisions about their college opportunities (Teranishi et al., 2004). College choice refers to students' decisions to a) attend higher education, b) attend a four-year institution, c) attend a selective institution, or d) attend a specific institution (Hossler, Braxton, & Coopersmith, 1989). Furthermore, students' college choice factors are rank ordered by their individual priorities and not necessarily by a university's prestige or its status as public versus private (Kim, 2004).

College choice research has identified numerous factors that influence the decision for choosing a specific institution. Han (2014) explained that student college-choice is determined by a combination of factors that are associated with student and institutional characteristics. Student characteristics include academic achievement, aspirations, and expectations (Chapman, 1981; Hossler & Gallagher, 1987). Socioeconomic status (SES), particularly family income and parents' educational background, also have a strong influence on the college selection process (Han, 2014). For institutional factors, cost, financial aid, location, and reputation were consistently identified as critical components for student college choice (Han,

2014). Other institutional factors such as major, program, and college environment are relevant to college choice as well (Chapman, 1981).

The College-Choice Conceptual Model

Since the 1960s, researchers have attempted to organize and conceptualize both the student and institutional characteristics into a college choice model using various approaches: economic, sociological, informational, and developmental (Park & Hossler, 2015). Though there are various college choice models (Chapman, 1981; Jackson, 1982; Litten, 1982; Hossler, Braxton, & Coopersmith, 1989), this paper uses Hossler and Gallagher's (1987) three-phase college choice because it successfully synthesizes and simplifies previous theoretical models. As a result, this model has been widely accepted as the foundation of empirical college choice studies (Park & Hossler, 2015).

At the same time, Hossler and Gallagher's (1987) model is complex in that it organizes and sequences both student and institutional factors that impact the decision-making process while considering multiple decision-makers such as students, parents, and school agents in the college choice process (Teranishi et al., 2004). Furthermore, it illustrates students' progress towards an increased understanding of their educational options while giving weight to the interaction between individual and organizational factors that influence students' college choice (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987).

Hossler and Gallagher's (1987) model is comprised of the predisposition, search, and choice phases. In the predisposition phase, students first develop their college aspirations, deciding whether they will go to college or take other status-attainment paths such as work or military service (Hossler &

Gallagher, 1987). If students choose to pursue the college pathway, the search phase begins. This phase is when students seek additional information on institutions, take entrance exams, and prioritize their college list (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987). The choice phase is when students apply to several institutions and enroll at a particular college based on personal and institutional characteristics (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987). Even though Hossler and Gallagher's (1987) conceptual model is general in nature, it can be used to help understand AAPI students' college choice through student and organizational factors.

Asian American and Pacific Islander College Choice

College-choice theory and models have helped scholars understand the process of college choice and have served as a conceptual framework for empirical studies (Park & Hossler, 2015). To date, a large body of college choice empirical studies have explored multiple factors influencing students' college choice, yet the exploration of sub-populations is a recent phenomenon (Park & Hossler, 2015). Organized by Hossler and Gallagher's (1987) three phases, the following sections of this paper summarize the AAPI college choice research.

Predisposition. Within this developmental phase, certain students' background characteristics, such as SES, parental expectations, and academic ability, have a positive correlation on whether or not they want to continue into higher education (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987). SES is one of the most important background characteristics that influence college choice. Parent income has a cumulative effect on students' college enrollment plans that begins in preschool and continues through secondary school (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987; Desjardins et al., 2006). Earlier

studies have concluded that high SES students across all racial groups are more likely to go to college than low SES students (Peters, 1977; Cabrera & La Nasa, 2001; Carnevale & Rose, 2003). As for AAPI students, Goyette and Xie (1999) found that background characteristics, particularly SES, explained most of the differences in college access rates among various AAPI ethnic groups (Goyette & Xie, 1999). Further, they found that Chinese, Japanese, and Korean students have higher college access rates compared to South Indians, Filipinos, Vietnamese, and other AAPI students (Goyette & Xie, 1999).

While earlier empirical studies mostly compared AAPIs to other racial groups, Teranishi et al. (2004) examined how class and ethnicity impact the college-decision making process specifically among different AAPI ethnic sub-populations. A significant finding from this study was that students from different ethnic and SES backgrounds attended college at differential rates. In general, AAPIs in the highest income brackets were more likely to attend the most selective institutions than students in lower SES (Teranishi et al., 2004). However, college-attendance patterns emerged among ethnic groups controlling for SES. Chinese and Korean Americans had a higher representation in both four-year and selective institutions than Japanese and Southeast Asians from both the lowest and highest income bracket (Teranishi et al., 2004).

The attitudes of parents are also said to influence college choice. Conklin and Dailey (1981) reported a positive linear relationship between the amount of parental encouragement students receive to attend college and their college attendance. Compared to other racial groups, AAPI parents showed higher educational expectations (Hao & Bonstead-Bruns, 1998; Goyette & Xie, 1999) as well as higher

involvement in their children's academic studies (Kim & Gasman, 2011). Higher parental expectations and involvement might explain why AAPI students have higher academic expectations and achievement (Goyette & Xie, 1999). In comparison to other racial groups, AAPI students have the highest expectations for degree attainment (Hurtado et al., 1997). One possible reason that AAPI students and their families place significant emphasis on educational attainment is because college degree attainment is one of the only realistic pathways to upward mobility (Xie & Goyette, 2003; An, 2010).

Along with SES and parental expectations, academic ability has also been shown to positively correlate with college attendance (Hossler & Gallagher, 1987). In the predisposition phase, AAPI students are considered best prepared for college because they are more likely to take standardized tests on time and take college-prep coursework in high school (Escueta & O'Brien, 1991; Hurtado et al., 1997). Studies have indicated that because of their college preparation, AAPI students are 39% more likely than students from other racial groups to enter higher education immediately after high school and almost 43% of AAPIs expect to finish college (Escueta & O'Brien, 1991; Hurtado et al., 1997). Further, Kim and Gasman (2011) found that academically successful AAPI students value institutions with good academic reputations, prestige, and the academic and professional opportunities that colleges provide. AAPI students have also been found to consider future employment and transition to graduate programs as important factors when they select a college (Teranishi et al., 2004). Thus, AAPI academic ability is a driving factor when choosing a college (Hurtado et al., 1997).

Compared to all racial groups, AAPIs are believed to have higher academic

abilities (Escueta & O'Brien, 1991; Hsin & Xie, 2014; Musu-Gillette et al., 2016). Yet there are staggering academic disparities between ethnic groups. Though the mean score was found to be higher for AAPI standardized tests, AAPIs were found to have the widest distribution of scores that deviate from the average (CARE, 2008). The variation of test scores among AAPI ethnic groups can be explained by differences in social and cultural capital (CARE, 2008). In terms of high school completion within the AAPI group, Southeast Asian Americans have had a significant high school dropout rate, with 40% of Hmong, 38% of Laotian, and 35% of Cambodian student populations not completing high school (WHIAAPI, 2016a).

Search. During the search phase, high school students begin to seek out more information about colleges and universities. Aside from gathering information through static forms of communication such as print publications and web-surfing, students also rely on a network of external influences such as parents, siblings, peers, teachers, and educators (Kim & Gasman, 2011; Poon & Byrd, 2013; Han, 2014). Additionally, social networks are believed to play significant roles in AAPI college choice processes (Kim & Gasman, 2011). In general, AAPI students valued their parents' thoughts, feelings, and opinions in the college-decision process while still trying to balance their own aspirations (Kim & Gasman, 2011). However, certain AAPI ethnicities rely on different factors in the decision-making process. For instance, Poon and Byrd (2013) found that for East Asian Americans students (Chinese, Korean, and Japanese), college rankings were more important than being close to home. Filipino and Southeast Asian Americans were found to be more heavily influenced by their relatives' views and the proximity of colleges to home (Teranishi et al., 2004).

More so than other AAPI students, Filipino Americans identified that advice from teachers was important to them (Poon & Byrd, 2013).

Hossler and Gallagher's (1987) model assumes that the search phase is when parents and students increasingly interact with higher education institutions. However, given that more than 42% of AAPI college students are first-generation (Saenz et al., 2007), most AAPI students found that their parents' limited knowledge about the American college process and English fluency prevented them from being involved as college-educated parents (Kim & Gasman, 2011; Poon & Byrd, 2013). In these cases, teachers and high school counselors played more significant roles in the college search process (Poon & Byrd, 2013).

Gender also plays a role in the search phase of college choice for AAPIs. Female AAPI students acknowledged that parents played important roles in their college choice while male students were less likely to name their parents as important influences (Poon & Byrd, 2013). Although some AAPI managed their college searches on their own, their decisions were collectively made with their parents and older siblings (Kim & Gasman, 2011). This finding shows that college choice may be more connected to gender and cultural differences than SES (Kim & Gasman, 2011).

Lastly, academic ability was found to play a significant role in determining the number of college applications that a student submits (Hurtado et al., 1997). Generally, students with higher SAT scores and GPAs were more likely to submit more applications across most racial and ethnic groups (Hurtadeo et al., 1997). Hurtadeo et al. (1997) has suggested that because of their higher expectations for college attainment and their academic ability, AAPI students apply to a higher number of colleges

compared to other racial groups (Hurtado et al., 1997). However, despite these high application rates, AAPIs were not found to be significantly more likely than white students to attend their first choice institution (Hurtado et al., 1997).

Choice. This final phase involves admission, college enrollment, and actual attendance. This phase enables students to narrow their college list and to determine which offers to accept and which offers to decline (Hossler & Gallagher, 1986). Once students apply, institutions decide on which students to admit, and the student must decide whether to accept the offer or attend another institution (Desjardin et al., 2006). The enrollment profile for AAPI students was found to be quite diverse and contrary to the stereotypes created by the model minority myth, which assumes AAPI students are only concentrated in selective, private four-year universities (CARE, 2008). In general, statistics have shown that AAPI students enroll primarily in public institutions (Escueta & O'Brien, 1991), and their enrollment is equally distributed in two-year and four-year institutions (CARE, 2008). In 1985, 41.7% of AAPIs were enrolled in a public two-year college while 41.8% were enrolled in a public four-year institution (CARE, 2010). However, AAPI enrollment in public two-year community colleges is said to be increasing at a faster rate than their enrollment in four-year institutions (CARE, 2008). Between 1990 and 2000, AAPI enrollment in public two-year colleges increased by 73.3%, compared to a 42.2% increase in public four-year colleges and a 53.4% increase in private four-year colleges (CARE, 2008). This increase in public two-year enrollment can be partially explained by SES and limited English-language ability within the AAPI community (CARE, 2008).

Certain ethnicities among the AAPI enrollment profile have had greater

representation and greater likelihood in attending specific types of institutions. For example, research has suggested that Chinese and Korean Americans have greater likelihood of being admitted in selective, four-year, private institutions because of certain behaviors and resources (Teranishi et al., 2004; Kim, 2014). Parental income, parental educational levels, and high school achievement are all believed to be strongly associated with a student attending more selective institution (Teranishi et al., 2004; Kim 2014). However, when controlling for SES, studies revealed that Chinese and Korean American students had greater representation in selective, private four-year institutions (Kim 2014; Park & Hossler, 2015). In contrast, some AAPI ethnic groups, especially Filipino and Southeast Asian Americans, were more likely to attend less selective colleges because of personal preferences of living closer to home or for lower tuition (Teranishi et al., 2004; Tran, 2012).

During the choice phase, students also decide whether to apply for financial aid to help defray the costs of attendance (Desjardins et al., 2006). Financial aid, at this phase, makes a difference and is particularly influential for AAPI students (Han, 2014; Kim, 2004; Poon & Byrd, 2013). However, while studies have demonstrated that economic factors have an effect in college enrollment, there is little scholarship on the financial challenges that AAPI students encounter due to the model minority stereotype that assumes that AAPI students do not need financial resources compared to their black and Latino counterparts (Museus & Buenavista, 2016). As a result, evolving literature and empirical studies often have contradictory findings concerning AAPI financial aid, parental contribution, and debt-sensitivity.

Museus and Buenavista (2016) have found that demographic factors such as

ethnicity shape students' access to resources and college opportunities. Specifically, AAPI students and their families demonstrated different perspectives around college financing than other racial groups (Cunningham & Santiago, 2008; Museus & Buenavista, 2016). In his study of the effect of financial aid on college-choice, Kim (2004) compared AAPI students with their white, black, and Latino counterparts. Compared to other racial groups, AAPI students showed a stronger tendency to attend their first choice of colleges when offered financial aid loans or a combination of loans and grants. This effect of financial aid is stronger for AAPI students because of their parents' perception on education. Compared to other parents from racial groups, it has been suggested that AAPI parents place more value on education and consider it a worthwhile investment in their children's future (Kim, 2004). Thus, regardless of family income, AAPI parents are believed to be more willing to take out several loans to pay for college, thereby demonstrating a relative lack of price-sensitivity to college tuition.

Kim's (2004) finding of AAPI parents' willingness to pay for college was verified by a study from the U.S. Department of Education that examined the differences in parents' intention to pay for college expenses by racial identity (Lippman et al., 2008). This study found that, after white students, AAPI students were the second highest racial group who reported that their parents were willing to pay for their college expenses (Lippman et al., 2008). However, certain ethnicities were found to be more price-sensitive than others. Southeast Asian and Filipino students have higher financial concerns than that of Chinese, Japanese, and Korean students (Teranishi et. al, 2004). Reasons for this ethnic difference can be connected to SES and rates of poverty between the ethnic groups.

More recent studies have contrasted Kim's (2004) finding on AAPI students' ability to attend their first-choice institution. In a study on financial barriers for AAPI college access, Museus and Buenavista (2016) found that 55% of AAPI student respondents were unable to attend their institution of choice. Approximately 70% of these respondents reported that their choice of institutions was limited by some way of financial constraints (Museus & Buenavista, 2016). Thus, these studies have suggested that regardless of income quartile, attendance patterns, and institutional types, AAPI students and their parents are price-sensitive and loan-averse (Cunningham & Santiago, 2008; Museus & Buenavista, 2016). Even if they had substantial unmet financial need, AAPI students had the lowest rates of borrowing than their white, black, and Latino counterparts (Cunningham & Santiago, 2008). Certain characteristics and cultural contexts might account for this higher rate of debt aversion, as AAPI parents reported a negative perception to debt and would often use alternative financing methods to minimize college debt (Cunningham & Santiago, 2008). For example, a common practice was for AAPI families to band together to financially support a student in college (Cunningham & Santiago, 2008). Other strategies that AAPI families commonly used to minimize college expenses included attending a lower cost institution, living with parents rather than on-campus, and working while in college (Cunningham & Santiago, 2008; Museus & Buenavista, 2016).

One of the largest barriers to college access and financial aid is the lack of information for the AAPI group. Compared to other racial groups, AAPI students were the second highest, after white students, to report that their parents had enough information about financial aid (Lippman et al., 2008). However, when disaggregating

by SES, a large segment of AAPI students, particularly historically lower income, reported not receiving adequate or reliable information and support about financial aid and college options in high school (Museus & Buenavista, 2016). For example, many AAPI students were unaware that grants and scholarships do not have to be paid back. This lack of understanding on the college application and financial aid process can be attributed to a number of factors, including lack of access to high-quality and fast technology, overly complex language used in college and financial aid applications, and their parents' limited English proficiency and understanding of the American college process (Museus & Buenavista, 2016).

Despite these racially comparative studies, the conflicting findings on AAPI perception on financial aid reveal two issues. First, AAPI students and their families' lives are far more complex than any racial stereotype suggests, and their financial decisions are interlaced with demographic, cultural, and structural factors. Second, their pathways to college enrollment are filled with many financial barriers, which indicates a need for more focused studies within this area.

Future Directions on AAPI College Choice Research

With decades of research, the models of student choice have become richer in specification (Desjardin et al., 2006). College-choice models have been created to predict student behavior in choosing a particular school as a function of students' individual characteristics, perceptions, and preferences about the school (Desjardins et al., 2006). However, one of the most prevalent assumptions of Hossler and Gallagher's (1987) model is that the college search process is an individual endeavor rather than a collective decision. This

widely-accepted model thus reinforces the notion that students who are academically capable are also engaged and self-motivated to seek information about college. However, as Kim and Gasman (2011) have claimed, Hossler and Gallagher's (1987) model does not examine college choice processes outside the dominant culture and fails to consider cultural and familial influences. For example, Freeman's (2005) college-choice model reflected the important influences of family and culture through his study of African Americans' college-choice process (Kim & Gasman, 2011). Similar to their black peers, AAPI students also demonstrated some reliance on a network of external influences such as parents, siblings, peers, teachers, and educators (Teranishi et al., 2004; Kim & Gasman, 2011; Poon & Byrd, 2013; Han, 2014). Thus, future research on AAPI college choice should expand in theorizing and including cultural components within different racial groups and in examining the influence of students' family, peers, friends, and high school educators (Hurtado et al., 1997).

Another recommendation is the disaggregation of the AAPI racial group in the college choice scholarship (Teranishi et al., 2004; Kim & Gasman, 2011). The lack of disaggregated data is a key civil rights issue for the AAPI community because it prevents federal, state, and local governments from understanding the civil and social needs of specific AAPI communities (CARE 2008; 2010; WHIAAPI, 2016b). Most college choice studies have examined factors of choice between the four major racial groups: African American, Latino, Asians, and white (Peters, 1977; Hurtado et al., 1997; Hao & Bonstead-Bruns, 1998; Cabrera & La Nasa, 2001; Carnevale & Rose, 2003). Yet, all of these studies have treated the AAPI group as monolithic by assuming shared ethnic backgrounds and decision-making

processes. In the few studies that have examined ethnic differences within the AAPI group, subtle but important nuances between ethnicities were found. For instance, in a study examining the influence of social networks and SES, Southeast Asians and Filipinos were found to be more likely to remain closer to home because of family and finances while East Asian Americans were more likely to go further for college (Teranishi et al., 2004; Poon & Byrd, 2013).

Financial aid is also a field that needs disaggregated AAPI data, especially since cost is a major factor in AAPI college choice. Overall, the research has suggested that AAPIs are price-sensitive and loan-averse, but there is still evidence that each ethnicity responds to cost differently (Teranishi et al., 2004; Cunningham & Santiago, 2008). Additional studies are needed to explain why certain ethnicities respond to college costs differently, specifically in relation to SES, parental college attainment, and social network. In addition, research has revealed that many AAPI students, especially from historically underserved ethnic groups and lower SES, face invisible financial aid barriers to college access due to complex financial aid applications, lack of access to high-quality and fast technology, and hindered parental involvement because English is not spoken at home (Museus & Bonavista, 2016). Yet research also needs to address how early phases of college awareness and financial aid is developed and whether results hold across various AAPI ethnicities (Hurtado et al., 1997).

Along with the call for disaggregated data for AAPI ethnicities, all available empirical studies examining race and ethnicity have excluded NHPI students, who, as a group, have historically had one of the lowest rates of college-attainment compared to other AAPI ethnicities

(WHIAAPI, 2016b). Only 14% of Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders have at least a bachelor's degree, compared to 49% of the total AAPI population (WHIAAPI, 2016a). Excluding NHPI students from the discussion of college access raises the issue of invisibility of an entire ethnicity within the existing AAPI scholarship. Failing to examine NHPI college choice continues to mask the significant disparities in college attainment and access within a large racial group (CARE, 2008). Furthermore, their exclusion from scholarship prevents delivery of appropriate educational, financial, and academic policies and programs to ensure equitable access to college (CARE, 2010).

Finally, additional research is needed on AAPI college choice into two-year institutions. With 47.3% of all AAPI college students enrolled in community colleges, more data is needed to understand why they chose to attend a two-year versus a four-year institution (CARE, 2010; Kim & Gasman, 2011). Also, with evidence that different ethnicities demonstrate different levels of academic achievement, research should examine where academically weaker AAPI students go (Escueta & O'Brien, 1991). Are they more likely to attend four-year, two-year, for-profit or vocational institutions? Once AAPI students are enrolled in a post-secondary institution, Kim and Gasman (2011) have called for more research in the AAPI experiences at various higher education institutions such as public and private universities, small liberal arts colleges, online education programs, and for-profit organizations to explore possible differences in the college-choice processes of students whose experiences vary in terms of secondary school education, family structures, and college and career aspirations.

Conclusion

Overall, research has moved towards understanding AAPI college choice as a whole and in comparison to the four other racial groups. Moreover, studies have examined the vast racial differences in terms of SES, academic ability, parental encouragement, and loan-to-debt aversion. In the college choice scholarship, Teranishi et al. (2004) was the only study found that attempted to disaggregate data among the different AAPI ethnicities. Since then, a few empirical studies have examined the college choice process of individual ethnicities (Kim, 2011; Kim, 2014; Tran, 2012), and some government and non-profit reports have disaggregated AAPI post-secondary enrollment trends (CARE 2008, 2010; Musu-Gillette et al., 2016). These recent studies signify a small shift towards

disaggregating data for AAPI ethnicities. However, AAPI college choice scholarship is a field that still represents the AAPI population through an aggregated lens. With the diversification of college-bound students and enrollment decisions relying more on data, it is necessary to understand the vast differences in immigration history, ethnicities, language complexities, and SES backgrounds of the AAPI population and how it affects college choice (CARE, 2010). Because the number of AAPI college enrollment is projected to increase dramatically in the next 20 years, strategic enrollment managers need accurate, disaggregated data that present real assets, needs, and challenges to recruit and retain AAPI students (Escueta & O'Brien, 1991; CARE 2010).

References

- An, B. P. (2010). The relations between race, family characteristics, and where students apply to college. *Social Science Research*, 39(2), 310-323.
- Cabrera, A. F., & La Nasa, S. M. (2001). On the path to college: Three critical tasks facing America's disadvantaged. *Research in Higher Education*, 42, 119-149.
- Carnevale, A. P., & Rose, S. J. (2003). *Socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity and selective college admissions*. New York: The Century Foundation.
- Chapman, D. W. (1981). A model of student college choice. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 52(5), 490-505.
- Cunningham, A. F., & Santiago, D. A. (2008). *Student aversion to borrowing: Who borrows and who doesn't*. Washington, DC: Institute for Higher Education Policy.
- Escueta, E., & O'Brien, E. (1991). *Asian Americans in higher education: Trends and issues*. (ACE Research Brief no. 2). Washington, DC: American Council on Education.
- Freeman, K. (2005). *African Americans and college choice: The influence of family and school*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Han, P. (2014). A literature review on college choice and marketing strategies for recruitment. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 43(2), 120-130. doi: 10.1111/fcsr.12091
- Hao, L., & Bonstead-Bruns, M. (1998). Parent-child differences in educational expectations and the academic achievement of immigrant and native students. *Sociology of Education*, 71(3), 175-198.
- Hoeffel, E. M., Rastogi, S., Kim, M. O., & Shahid, H. (2012). *The Asian population: 2010 Census brief*. U.S. Census: Washington, DC. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-11.pdf>

- Hossler, D., Braxton, J., & Coopersmith, G. (1989). Understanding student college choice. *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research*, 5, 231-288.
- Hossler, D., & Gallagher, K. S. (1987). Studying student college choice: a three-phase model and the implications for policymakers. *College & University*, 62, 207-221.
- Hossler, D., & Kalsbeek, D. (2013). Enrollment management and managing enrollments: Revisiting the context for institutional strategy. *Strategic Enrollment Management Quarterly*, 1(1), 5-25.
- Hsin, A., & Xie, Y. (2014). Explaining Asian Americans' academic advantage over whites. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(23), 8416-8421. Retrieved from <http://www.pnas.org/content/111/23/8416.full.pdf>
- Jackson, G. (1982). Public efficiency and private choice in higher education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 4(2), 237-247.
- Kim, D. (2004) The effect of financial aid on students' college choice: Differences by racial groups. *Research in Higher Education*, 45(43). doi:10.1023/B:RIHE.0000010046.57597.43
- Kim, D. (2011). The pursuit of elite high schools and colleges among second-generation Korean Americans. *Development and Society*, 40(2), 225-259.
- Kim, E. (2014). When social class meets ethnicity: College-going experiences of Chinese and Korean immigrant students. *The Review of Higher Education*, 37(3), 321-348. doi:10.1353/rhe.2014.0015
- Kim, J. K., & Gasman, M. (2011). In search of a "good" college: First and second generation Asian American students describe their college choice process. *Journal of College Student Development*, 52(6), 706-728.
- Lippman, L., Guzman, L., Dombrowski, K., Kinukawa, A., Shwalb, R., Trends, C., & Tice, P. (2008). Parent expectations and planning for college. Statistical analysis report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institution of Education Sciences.
- Litten, L. (1982). Different strokes in the applicant pool: Some refinements in the model of student choice. *Journal of Higher Education*, 4, 383-402.
- Museus, S., & Buenavista, T. L. (2016). Invisible financial barriers to college access for Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. Washington, DC: Asian and Pacific Islander American Scholarship Fund. Retrieved from http://www.apiasf.org/research/ARC_Report_2016.pdf.
- Musu-Gillette, L., Robinson, J., McFarland, J., KewalRamani, A., Zhang, A., & Wilkinson-Flicker, S. (2016). Status and trends in the education of racial and ethnic groups 2016. NCES 2016-17. National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED567806>
- National Commission on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders Research in Education [CARE]. (2008). *Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders facts not fiction: Setting the record straight*. New York: Author. Retrieved from http://www.apiasf.org/research/2008_CARE_Report.pdf
- National Commission on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders Research in Education [CARE]. (2010). *Federal higher education policy priorities and the Asian American and Pacific Islander community*. New York: Author. Retrieved from http://www.apiasf.org/research/2010_CARE_report.pdf
- Park, E., & Hossler, D. (2015). Understanding student college choice. In D. Hossler & B. Bontrager (Eds.), *Handbook of strategic enrollment management* (pp. 49-78) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Petters, W. B. (1977). Fulfillment of short-term educational plans and continuance in education. National longitudinal study of high school seniors. Washington, DC: National Center for Educational Statistics.
- Poon, O., & Byrd, A. (2013). Beyond tiger mom anxiety: Ethnic, gender and generational differences in Asian American college access and choices. *Journal of College Admission*. Retrieved from http://ecommons.luc.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1077&context=education_facpubs
- Saenz, V. B., Hurtado, S., Barrera, D., Wolf, D., & Yeung, F. (2007). *First in my family: A profile of first generation college students at four-year institutions since 1971*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Higher Education Research Institute.
- Teranishi, R. T. (2002). Asian Pacific Americans and critical race theory: An examination of school racial climate. *Equity and Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 144-154.
- Teranishi, R. T., Ceja, M., Antonio, A. L., Allen, W. R., & McDonough, P. M. (2004). The college-choice process for Asian Pacific Americans: Ethnicity and socioeconomic class in context. *The Review of Higher Education*, 27(4), 527-551.
- Teranishi, R., Lok, L., & Nguyen, B. M. D. (2013). *iCount: A Data Quality Movement for Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in higher education*. New York: National Commission on Asian American and Pacific Islander Research in Education (CARE). Retrieved from http://aapip.org/files/publication/files/2013_icount_report.pdf
- Tran, H. (2012). *Factors that influence college choice and pathways among Vietnamese American high school students (Doctoral Dissertation)*. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations Publishing. (<http://search.proquest.com/docview/1040980697>).
- U.S. Census Bureau (2016a). *Facts for features: Asian/Pacific American heritage month: May 2016*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/about/partners/cic/resources/data-links/asian.html>
- U.S. Census Bureau (2016b). *Quick facts: United States*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045215/00>.
- White House Initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders (WHIAAPI). (2016a). *Critical Issues Facing Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders*. Retrieved from <https://www.whitehouse.gov/administration/eop/aapi/data/critical-issues>.
- White House Initiative on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. (2016b). *Data and statistics on Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders*. Retrieved from <http://sites.ed.gov/aapi/data-and-statistics/>
- Wu, E. D. (2014). *The color of success: Asian Americans and the origins of the model minority*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Xie, Y., & Goyette, K. (1999). Educational experiences of Asian American youths: Determinants and ethnic differences. *Sociology of Education*, 72(1), 22-36.
- Xie, Y., & Goyette, K. (2003). Social mobility and the educational choices of Asian Americans. *Social Science Research*, 32(3), 467-498.