

Running head: GRADES AND TEST SCORES

Predicting College Success
with High School Grades and
Test Scores: Limitations
for Minority Students

John L. Hoffman

10849 Valley Home Avenue

Whittier, CA 90603-3040

(714) 720-4306

joyandjohn@myway.com

Katie E. Lowitzki

Azusa Pacific Univeristy

901 East Alost Avenue

Azusa, CA 91702

(626) 815-6000 x6146

klowitzki@apu.edu

Abstract

Using a sample of 522 students at a Lutheran university in the Southwestern United States, researchers examined differences in the predictive strength of high school grades and standardized test scores for student involvement, academic achievement, retention, and satisfaction. Findings indicate that high school grades are stronger predictors of success, while standardized test scores are weaker predictors of success for both racial and religious minority students. Implications for affirmative action practice and the use of standardized test scores in comprehensive review admissions decisions are discussed.

Predicting College Success with High School Grades and Test Scores:
Limitations for Minority Students

“It’s a wonderful, wonderful day—a victory for all of higher education, because what it means at its core is that affirmative action may still be used and the court's given us a road map to get there” (CNN, 2003). This was the response of Mary Sue Coleman, president of the University of Michigan, shortly following the Supreme Court’s rulings on *Grutter v. Bollinger* and *Gratz v. Bollinger*, the cases questioning the role of affirmative action in college admissions. Though the rulings supported broad definitions of academic merit that include such factors as race or gender, they also struck down the more rigid point system used by the University of Michigan with its undergraduate applicants. A few months after these rulings, the “comprehensive review” process used at the University of California, Berkeley came under fire as critics noted that Berkeley denied too many students with high SAT scores in favor of some with lower scores (Hebel, 2003; Hong, 2003). At issue throughout these cases are competing definitions of merit: one more narrowly focused on points (high school grades) and scores (SATs), and a second unable to use point systems, yet aiming to more broadly consider factors such as race and gender (affirmative action) or special talents and experiences with adversity (comprehensive review). In order to be successful, any roadmap to effective use of affirmative action or comprehensive review will need to gain a deeper understanding of the nuances of the relationships between standardized tests, high school grades, and college success.

Common arguments regarding standardized tests and students of color suggest that test bias presents an unfair disadvantage to students of color. However, recent studies suggest that differences in the predictive strength of test scores for academic achievement may be due to factors other than test bias (Fleming, 2002; Fleming & Garcia, 1998; Hoffman, 2002). The

authors of this study posit that such factors influence the ability of standardized tests to predict success not only for racial minority students, but also for religious minority students. The purpose of this study is to compare the predictive strength of high school grades, a measure of achievement, and standardized tests, a measure of aptitude and ability, for racial and religious cohorts of students attending a predominantly White Lutheran university.

Literature Review

A significant body of literature shows that both high school grade point averages (GPAs) and scores on standardized tests such as the SAT or the ACT are generally strong predictors of student success in college for students of all races (Astin, Korn, & Green, 1987; Fleming, 2002; Kim, 2002; Moffat, 1993; Ramist, Lewis, & McCamley-Jenkins, 1993; Tross, Harper, Osher, & Kneidinger, 2000; Waugh, Micceri, & Takalkar, 1994; Wolfe & Johnson, 1995; Zheng, Saunders, Shelley II, & Whalen, 2002). Several studies also suggest that high school grades are better predictors of success than standardized test scores (Hoffman, 2002; Munro, 1981; Zheng et. al, 2002). More recent efforts have aimed to dissect measures of success examining academic achievement, retention, and student satisfaction independently.

Academic Achievement

Several studies found that high school grades more accurately predict academic achievement than any other factor (Camara & Echternacht, 2000; Fleming, 2002; Fleming & Garcia, 1998; Hoffman, 2002; Munro, 1981; Tross et. al, 2000; Zheng et. al, 2002). Additional research demonstrates that standardized tests are related to academic achievement, though the relationship is not as strong as for high school GPA. The gap between the predictive strength of test scores and high school grades for academic achievement in college widens for several minority groups (Hoffman, 2002; Moffat, 1993; Nettles, Millett, & Ready, 2003). Moffat (1993), for example, found that the SAT was a valid predictor of achievement for White students

under age 30, but not for Black students or students over age 30. Nettles, Millett, and Ready (2003), after controlling for socioeconomic differences between Blacks and Whites, found that this gap narrowed significantly, though not completely. Fleming and Garcia's (1998) study of Black students at eight predominantly White institutions (PWIs) found a difference of only 1.8% in the variance of college grades between White and Black students admitted on the basis of aptitude tests. These differences in predictive strength may be due to differences in the environment after matriculation, not just differences in the tests. Though the variance is minimal, two recent studies show that test scores predict academic achievement better for Black students, especially Black men, who attend historically Black colleges and universities (HBCUs) (Fleming, 2002; Fleming & Garcia, 1998).

Retention

Much of the early research addressing retention as a measure of success was based on Tinto's (1975, 1993) model of withdrawal, which considers the degree of fit between individual students and the college environment, as mediated by academic and social involvement. These studies simultaneously assessed the influence of high school grades and test scores on retention (Munro, 1981; Pascarella & Terenzini, 1983). Pascarella and Terenzini (1983) found that students' experiences after they arrive on a college's campus are more important than students' background characteristics when considering persistence; high school GPA and test scores had no direct influence on persistence. Munro (1981) came to a similar conclusion and suggested that pre-college characteristics including high school grades and test scores helped in predicting college integration for students, but did not have a direct effect on "dropout decisions" (p. 133). More recent research reflects inconclusive results on the relationship between high school grades and test scores with college retention. Astin, Tsui, and Avalos (1996) found that students with stronger high school GPAs and higher test scores are more likely to graduate. However, other

studies found only the influence of high school GPA to be statistically significant (Hoffman, 2002; Waugh et al., 1994).

More recent theories regarding minority student retention address the importance of positive validation experiences (Rendon, 1994; Rendon, Jalomo, & Nora, 2000; Saggio, 2003), especially when related to students' abilities to apply academic skills in unfamiliar and potentially unfriendly environments (Attinasi, 1989; Throgmorton, 1999; Tracey & Sedlacek, 1987). Such experiences may be related to the satisfaction of minority students.

Satisfaction.

Much of the relevant research addressing student satisfaction focuses on racial hardships minority students face when attending PWIs (Brown, 2000; Loo & Rolison, 1986; Schwitzer, Griffin, Ancis, & Thomas, 1999). Key challenges facing minority students include under-representation and a sense of alienation (Loo & Rolison, 1986; Schwitzer et. al, 1999). Brown's (2000) study researching the satisfaction of African American students at PWIs noted that both academic and social support from an institution play crucial roles in student satisfaction, and emotional support plays a more influential role for women than for men. Loo and Rolison (1986) found both academic and social support to be critical to satisfaction; their study assessing all races found that satisfaction with academics generally compensates for feelings of social isolation and under-representation experienced by minority students. Research by Hoffman (2002) indicated that satisfaction can be linked to patterns of cocurricular involvement, especially for non-majority students.

Involvement.

With few exceptions, recent studies suggest that student involvement positively mitigates the relationship of pre-college characteristics including high school GPAs and test scores with each of the above-noted measures of student success (Astin, 1993; Grayson, 1997; Hanson &

Swann, 1993; Hoffman, 2002; Kuh, 1993, 1995; MacKay & Kuh, 1994; Pritchard & Wilson, 2003; Rodriguez, Guido-DiBrito, Torres, & Talbot, 2000; Tross et. al, 2000). Additional literature considers differences in the level and influence of involvement for African Americans attending HBCUs as compared with PWIs. Several authors suggest that Black students become more involved, and thus more successful, at HBCUs (Allen, 1987; Wagener & Nettles, 1998). Other studies found the opposite to be true for students of color attending PWIs (Loo & Rolison, 1986). Involvement for students of color, especially those attending PWIs, seems to be especially influential on student success. Hoffman (2002) found that cocurricular involvement had a strong positive effect on academic achievement and retention for students of color. This study further found that cocurricular involvement had a negative relationship with student satisfaction for students of color, but leadership involvement for these same students had a strong, positive effect. Work by Sutton and Kimbough (2001) showed that involvement in Greek organizations for Black students attending PWIs was positively related with academic achievement.

Religious Differences.

Few studies have addressed the impact of religious differences on student success. Velez (1985) used extensive controls of pre-college characteristics, including religion, to study persistence to graduation and found that Jewish students were more likely to graduate than peers from other religious cohorts. Astin (1993) found that both Jewish and Roman Catholic students were more likely than their born-again Christian peers to complete a college degree. Research by Hoffman (2002) showed that high school GPAs were stronger predictors and test scores weaker predictors of academic achievement for non-Lutheran students attending a Lutheran university. This pattern matched the results for students of color attending the same predominantly White institution. Hoffman suggested that “prior achievement (high school grades) may be a stronger

predictor of success than ability (test scores) for students facing elements of intolerance in the university” (p. 735). While interesting results, the study used a small sample given the statistical tools employed.

Method

The purpose of this study was to gain a more nuanced understanding of the influence of various pre-college characteristics on student involvement and student success for various racial and religious cohorts of students. The researchers gave special attention to differences between measures of aptitude/ability (SAT scores) and prior achievement (high school grades) as predictors of college involvement and success. The researchers posed the following three hypotheses:

- 1) in the context of a predominantly White Lutheran university, differences in patterns of involvement and success between White students and students of color will be mirrored between Lutheran and non-Lutheran students;
- 2) measures of achievement such as high school grades will be stronger predictors of academic achievement for non-majority students, those facing higher levels of culture shock upon college entry; and
- 3) measures of ability and aptitude such as standardized tests will be stronger predictors of academic achievement for majority students, those facing low thresholds of culture shock upon college entry.

Setting

The study was conducted at a private Lutheran university in the Southwest. The student body at this university is predominantly White (74.5%) and Lutheran (50.1%). Whereas the Lutheran majority among students is slight, it is accentuated in that 100% of the full-time faculty are members of the Lutheran church, and the church organization formally owns and operates the

university. As previously noted, a strong body of evidence demonstrates that students of color face unique and accentuated barriers when matriculating to PWIs (Allen, 1987; Attinasi, 1989; Desousa & Kuh, 1996; Flores, 1992; Loo & Rolison, 1986; Rendon, 1994; Throgmorton, 1999). In contrast, minimal research examines similar religious differences. Two key assessments performed by external professionals at this site support the thesis that non-Lutheran students also face unique challenges in this setting. In the first, Woon (1998) noted that “tension about religious differences was the most dominant sociocultural concern in almost every student focus group” (Woon, p. 7). A follow-up study conducted in 2003 found little change: “non-[Lutheran] members feel alienated or less-than-full participants in the [university] experience” (Yoshino, p. 7).

Sample and Data Collection

Eight hundred sixty-three full-time degree-seeking students completed the fall semester of 2000. Of these, high school GPAs or SAT scores were unavailable for 174 (20%) students, all transfers. Satisfaction data for an additional 167 students were also unavailable. The resulting sample of 522 (60.5%) was highly similar to the population as a whole with the singular exception of under-represented transfer students. Data for this sample were gathered by merging information from two sources into a single database. The researchers obtained data for race, religious affiliation, sex, residence, class, grades, and retention from university files. Satisfaction data were drawn from the Student Opinion Survey (SOS).

ACT SOS. The Evaluation and Survey Services (ESS) Department of ACT developed the SOS. The purpose of the survey is to “explore enrolled students’ perceptions of an institution’s programs, services, and environment” (ACT, 1998, p. 7). Nearly 50,000 students attending over 100 private colleges in 29 states complete the survey annually. Students at the study site complete the survey each year as a part of the spring semester registration process. The SOS is a

highly reliable instrument. A factor analysis study of the SOS revealed factor structures highly similar to groupings used in the instrument, thus providing evidence for the validity of item groupings and subsection scores (Valiga, 1990). Cronbach's alpha for the sample of 522 used in this study was 0.97.

Variables

Race. The researchers coded data for race in two ways. In the first set, students of color were coded as 0 and White students as 1 for the analysis of the entire sample. In the second set, the researchers categorically coded the following groups: Asian or Pacific Islander (0); African American (1); Latino (2); Other (3); Refused (4); and White (5). These groupings were taken from data collected using Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (IPEDS) categories.

Religion. Given the lack of religious body diversity at the setting, the researchers focused on differences between Christians of various denominations attending the predominantly Lutheran university. Religion was coded in the same way as race: the first set of data coded 0 for non-Lutheran students and 1 for Lutheran students, and the second set categorically coded students as Catholic (0), Lutheran (1), Non-Christian (2), Non-Denominational Christian (3), Other (4), or Mainline Protestant (5).

Sex. Sex was coded 0 for males and 1 for females.

Hours worked. Students self-reported the average number of hours worked per week in the *Student Opinion Survey*. The researchers coded responses in six categories: 0 (0), 1-10 (1), 11-20 (2), 21-30 (3), 31-40 (4), and more than 40 (5).

Aid. Students self-reported receipt of aid (yes or no) in the SOS. The researchers coded no responses as 0 and the yes responses as 1.

High school achievement. The researchers used students' high school grade point averages for this variable.

Ability. The researchers used composite SAT scores as the measure for student verbal and mathematical reasoning ability.

Housing. The researchers coded housing as a dichotomous variable distinguishing between students living off campus (0) and those living on campus (1). Per university policy, every student within this sample was required to live either with parents at home or in the residence halls.

Class. Class-level was coded 0 for first-year students, 1 for sophomores, 2 for juniors, and 3 for seniors.

Involvement. The researchers employed student self-reported use of services and activities as their measure of involvement.

College academic achievement. Academic achievement was a continuous latent variable with factor loadings for two measured variables: fall and spring term GPA.

Retention. This dichotomous variable was coded 0 for students who withdrew and 1 for students retained from fall-to-fall.

Satisfaction. Student satisfaction was a continuous latent variable with factor loadings from three sets of measured variables: one set for satisfaction with college services, one for satisfaction with the college environment, and one for overall satisfaction with the college in general.

Data Analysis


Figure 1 reflects the *a priori* path analysis model (the model developed from theory and research literature, not from statistical patterns in the current sample) tested in this study. This model utilizes the separation of academic and social involvement as suggested by Tinto (1975, 1993), but expands his definition of success to include academic achievement and satisfaction in addition to retention. The researchers used confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) to compare

naturally emerging structures within the data with the theoretical structures posited in the *a priori* model for the latent constructs of academic achievement and student satisfaction. The researchers then conducted several tests of fit for the overall measurement model. Because the chi-square is prone to falsely confirming model fit with smaller samples, the researchers used four fit indices to evaluate the measurement model. Hu and Bentler (1999) suggested the following cut off values for good models: Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) and Comparative Fit Index (CFI) values greater than .95, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) values less than .06, and standardized root mean square residuals (SRMR) of less than .08.

[Insert Figure 1 here]

After testing the model, the researchers analyzed it using structural equation modeling (SEM) with both latent and observed variables. SEM simultaneously regresses the measured and

Figure 1. The *a priori* path analysis model: influence of input items on measures of success as mediated by academic and social involvement. Standard practice presents directly measured variables in boxes and latent variables in ovals. Direct relationships are presented using straight arrows; simple correlations are presented using curved arrows.



latent variables in a path model. Thus, each of the involvement measures was simultaneously regressed using maximum likelihood estimation on each of the nine input variables. The three success measures were regressed on the nine input variables and the two involvement measures. The results revealed the influence of each of the inputs on the involvement measures, while statistically controlling for the effects of the others. The results further showed the influence of the inputs and the involvement measures on success while controlling for the influence of the other inputs and the involvement measures. SEM is stronger than standard regression techniques including stepwise and hierarchical regression because theory drives the introduction of statistical control into the model and indirect effects may be considered.

Results

Model Fit

The initial testing of the measurement models had weak results. However, modifications of the measurement model excluding the variables for receipt of financial aid and average number of hours work significantly improved model fit. This alteration may reflect weaknesses in these two measured variables. The Student Opinion Survey codes receipt of aid dichotomously, yes or no. Strong model fit considering the influence of aid may require measurement variables that consider the amount of aid received, different forms of aid packaging, and differences between receipt of need-based and merit-based aid. Measurement variables considering the average number of hours worked may need to consider differences between on-campus work (E.g. work study programs) and off-campus employment. Cohorts for which all four fit indices did not meet the minimum cut off values suggested by Hu and Bentler

Table 1
Evaluation of the Measurement Model – Fit Indices

Sample Cohort	N	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Accepted Cohorts					
Entire Sample	522	.99	.96	.05	.03
White Cohort	401	.99	.97	.04	.03
Students of Color	121	.99	.99	.03	.04
Lutheran Cohort	269	.99	.97	.04	.03
Non-Lutherans	253	.99	.99	.02	.03
Rejected Cohorts					
Latino Cohort	54	.94	.84	.08	.06
Catholic Cohort	52	.93	.90	.07	.05
Mainline Protestant	53	.96	.94	.07	.06
Non-Denominational	114	.95	.93	.00	.03

Note. Strong model fit is reflected by a) a CFI and TLI values greater than .95, b) a root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) of less than .06, and c) a standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) of less than .08.

(1999) were eliminated from final consideration. Poor fit for these models is likely the result of small sizes for the rejected cohorts. Table 1 reviews the CFA analysis for each of the cohorts tested using the revised model.

Influence on Student Involvement

Table 2 reviews the influence of the input characteristics on reported use of academic and social services. Several sets of results support the hypothesis that involvement and success differences between White students and students of color would be mirrored between Lutheran and non-Lutheran students. The influence of class-level on use of academic services was strong for students of color (.24) and non-Lutheran students (.18), but moderate for White students (.13) and statistically insignificant for Lutherans. Likewise, the influence of living in the residence halls on social involvement was significantly stronger for students of color (.53) and non-Lutherans (.41) than for White students (.35) and Lutherans (.33). The influence of living in the residence halls on academic involvement was strong for students of color (.31), but weak and significantly non-significant for White students. While not at a statistically significant level, the pattern is similar to that for Lutherans and non-Lutherans. Whereas these results provide moderate support for the shared experience of racial and religious minorities, the opposite pattern exists for the influence of high school grades on involvement. Here, the influence is strongest for White students and non-Lutherans, but weaker or statistically non-significant for students of color and Lutherans.

[Insert Table 2 here]

Influence on Student Success

Table 3 reviews the direct relationships of the input characteristics and involvement with

[Insert Table 3 here]

Table 2
Direct Influences on Success Measures

Variable	Entire Sample	Whites	Latinos	Lutherans	Non-Luth.
Race					
Acad. Inv.	-.02	--	--	.00	.03
Social Inv.	.00	--	--	-.02	.15*
Denomination					
Acad. Inv.	-.01	.01	-.15	--	--
Social Inv.	.08*	.13*	-.10	--	--
Sex					
Acad. Inv.	.07*	.05	.23*	.08	.05
Social Inv.	.00	.00	.13	-.05	.07
Residence					
Acad. Inv.	.08*	.04	.31*	.06	.10
Social Inv.	.37*	.35*	.53*	.33*	.41*
Class					
Acad. Inv.	.14*	.13*	.24*	.10	.18*
Social Inv.	.13*	.13*	.14	.16*	.10*
HS GPA					
Acad. Inv.	.14*	.17*	.06	.13*	.16*
Social Inv.	.12*	.13*	.01	.08	.16*
SAT					
Acad. Inv.	.03	.04	.07	.02	.05
Social Inv.	-.04	.03	-.07	-.04	.01

*p<.05

Table 3
Direct Influences on Success Measures

Variable	Entire Sample	Whites	Latinos	Lutherans	Non-Luth.
Race					
Acad. Ach.	-.13*	--	--	-.19*	-.06
Retention	-.08	--	--	-.02	.02
Satisfaction	.11*	--	--	.24*	.14*
Denomination					
Acad. Ach.	.01	.11*	-.07	--	--
Retention	.12*	.19*	.21*	--	--
Satisfaction	-.04	-.10	.08	-.01	-.04
Sex					
Acad. Ach.	.14*	.13*	.16	.19*	.06
Retention	-.02	-.04	.24*	-.01	-.03
Satisfaction	-.04	-.05	.27	-.01	-.04
Residence					
Acad. Ach.	-.01	-.03	.01	.03	-.05
Retention	-.02	.02	-.28*	-.08	.02
Satisfaction	.19*	.19*	.32*	.09	.28*
Class					
Acad. Ach.	.17*	.17*	.07	.18*	.16*
Retention	.18*	.16*	-.05	.18*	.19*
Satisfaction	.18*	.21*	.54*	.17*	.21*
HS GPA					
Acad. Ach.	.30*	.34*	.33*	.26*	.34*
Retention	.04	.03	.22*	.05	.03
Satisfaction	-.07	-.11*	-.04	-.10	-.05
SAT					
Acad. Ach.	.22*	.18*	.18*	.24*	.18*
Retention	.00	.00	.00	.04	-.03
Satisfaction	-.05	.08	-.32*	.10	-.11
Acad. Inv.					
Acad. Ach.	.11*	.08	-.03	.11*	.10
Retention	.00	.07	-.28	-.15*	.09
Satisfaction	.12*	.08	-.06	.06	.15
Social Inv.					
Acad. Ach.	-.08	-.06	-.03	-.09	-.07
Retention	.11*	.04	.31	.20*	.05
Satisfaction	-.04	-.03	.05	-.03	-.04

*p<.05

the three success measures. As with the influence on student involvement, the results provide moderate support for the hypothesis that involvement and success differences between White students and students of color would be mirrored between Lutheran and non-Lutheran students. The positive influence of living in the residence halls on satisfaction was significantly stronger for students of color (.32) and non-Lutherans (.28) than for their White (.19) and Lutheran (.09) peers. The relationship between high standardized test scores and satisfaction was actually negative for both students of color (-.32) and non-Lutherans (-.11), but positive for White students (.08) and Lutherans (.10). That said, only the first of these four values emerged at a statistically significant level.

Achievement. The results provide partial support for the second hypothesis of this study. When compared with the sample as a whole (.30), high school grades were a stronger predictor of academic achievement for students of color (.33) and non-Lutheran students (.34), but a weaker predictor of grades for Lutheran students (.26). The unexpected result was that high school grades also became a stronger predictor of academic achievement for White students (.34). High school grades served as a strong and statistically significant predictor of retention for students of color, but not for non-Lutherans or either of the majority cohorts. Interestingly, high school grades had a negative relationship with satisfaction for all cohorts. This negative relationship was stronger for White (-.11) and Lutheran students (0.10), though only the White value was statistically significant.

Aptitude/Ability. The relationship of SAT scores to academic achievement was weaker for students of color (.18) and non-Lutherans (.18) than for the sample as a whole (.22), but stronger for Lutheran students (.24). As with achievement, the predictive strength of SAT scores for White students (.18) more closely matched that of the non-majority students than of the Lutheran students. These results provide moderate support for the study's third hypothesis. An

interesting negative relationship between SAT scores and satisfaction emerged for students of color (-.32) and non-Lutherans, (-.11), though the latter value fell just short of being statistically significant at the $p < .05$ level. The values for both majority cohorts were positive, though not statistically significant.

Students of Color. There were several unique relationships that emerged solely for students of color. The strongest of these was a counter-intuitive negative relationship between living in the residence halls and retention (-.28). An additional negative indirect relationship between living in the residence halls and retention, as mediated by academic involvement (-.09), fell just short of the cut off for statistical significance. A second set of relationships showed that women of color were more likely to use academic services (.23) and persist from year to year (.24). The influence of class-level for students of color is also worthy of note. Whereas class-level had a strong, statistically significant influence on academic achievement and retention for each of the other three cohorts, the influence for students of color was statistically non-significant, and negative. The influence of class-level on satisfaction, however, was more than twice as strong for students of color (.54) than for any of the other cohorts.

Discussion

The results of this study provide moderate support for each hypothesis, though further investigation is clearly necessary. The experience of students of color and non-Lutheran students at this institution is similar in several instances, most notably in the connection between living on campus and involvement, and in terms of several relationships with the satisfaction outcome measure. For non-majority students, those likely facing greater culture shock because of race or religion, high school grades became stronger predictors while test scores became weaker predictors of academic achievement when compared with the entire sample and with the Lutheran cohort. Interestingly, these relationships for the White cohort more closely mirrored

those of the non-majority cohorts than of Lutherans. Furthermore, the experience of students of color is unique in many ways and not entirely analogous to that of non-Lutherans.

Several researchers, notably Throgmorton (1999) and Tracey and Sedlacek (1987), have suggested that the key to success for students of color is finding means to apply academic skills in unfriendly environments. Attinasi (1989) posited that involvement at a university for Mexican American students is important, not for its integrative properties, but in that it assists students in “developing specific strategies for negotiating the physical, social, and cognitive/academic geographies” of the university (p. 267). Stated another way, the more foreign the cultural geography of a college or university to a potential student, the more important it is to have a cultural roadmap. Additionally, several theorists suggest that validation by significant others is vital for students of color trying to find and create their own way (Rendon, 1994; Rendon, Jalomo, & Nora, 2000; Saggio, 2003). Such validation experiences may positively influence satisfaction. Given the results of this study, it may be that prior achievements, as measured by high school grades, coupled with satisfying validation experiences better enable non-majority students to find and create their own way than do their natural abilities or aptitudes, as measured by standardized tests. Recent studies demonstrating that standardized tests are stronger predictors of academic achievement for Black students who attend HBCUs (Fleming, 2002; Fleming & Garcia, 1998) support this thesis. In settings where students of color are not the minority and where it is reasonable to believe that matriculation does not present a significant level of culture shock, standardized tests become stronger predictors of academic achievement.

The potential impact of this thesis on the use of standardized tests in admissions decisions is significant. For any institution that aims to diversify its student body—whether from a current position of being predominantly White, predominantly Black, or predominantly Lutheran—the use of standardized tests may be counterproductive. Given that large numbers of prospective

students symbolically equate success on standardized tests with merit for acceptance, de-emphasizing or eliminating consideration of test scores is a politically sensitive move on the part of colleges and universities. Further, as standardized tests are strong predictors of success for some students, the researchers in this study would not necessarily or categorically recommend eliminating their use in all settings. Instead, colleges and universities may need to do a better job of educating constituents about the multiple sets of factors that must be balanced in determining merit and shaping student bodies. Indeed, this may become a core component of the roadmap to more effective use of affirmative action or comprehensive review programs.

Further Investigation. The methodology of this study is neither sufficiently strong to generalize the results to students attending dissimilar institutions such as community colleges or public universities, nor to other minority groups such as students with disabilities or gays and lesbians. However, support for the underlying thesis of the study should warrant similar studies in different settings and with broader sets of students. Whereas religious difference may not be as stark a cultural difference at public institutions as it is at faith-based institutions, neither should it be quickly dismissed. Schlosser and Sedlacek (2003) note that, though religiously pluralistic, most public universities build their academic calendar around the Christian calendar of holidays, thus privileging some students and not others. Muslim students, for example, will need to create unique roadmaps to navigate the terrain of their education while honoring the holidays of their faith, a task not required of their Christian peers. Given this cultural difference along with others, do high school grades become stronger predictors of success than standardized tests for Muslim students? This question is worth investigating.

The strong relationship between living on campus with both student involvement and student satisfaction is also worthy of note for access-minded institutions, especially in light of the counter-intuitive negative relationship between living on campus and persistence for students of

color. Strong positive relationships for students living on campus equate to strong negative relationships for students who commute. Given shifting trends toward larger numbers of commuting students, simply creating policies that require or encourage students to live on campus will not suffice. This is especially true as the cost of such residency can be a barrier to attendance for many students. Instead, colleges and universities may need to explore what it is about living on campus that aids students in navigating their journeys to academic success, and how can this knowledge be applied in programs tailored for commuting students.

Limitations. Several limitations to this study warrant specific mention. Data for several variables were self-reported. Many researchers have questioned the validity of such data. Pace (1985) suggests that self-reported data are generally valid if a) the requested information is known to the student, b) questions are clear, and c) students believe the questions are worthy of a serious response. The self-reported data used in this study meet each of these criteria. As involvement is a key means by which students learn and become successful in college, more sophisticated measures of student involvement should be used in future studies. This study measured involvement simply with self-reported use of services and did not address either frequency of use or engagement while using services. Given the weakness of this involvement measure, inputs accounted for little of the variance in use of services.

Given model fit limitations, the researchers did not consider the influence of financial aid or the amount of time spent working outside the university. Numerous researchers note the importance of including such measures in statistical models (Cabrera, Nora, & Castaneda, 1992; Hanson & Swann, 1993), especially models exploring the unique influence of pre-college and institutional factors on the retention of students of color (Nora, 1990).

A final limitation is that transfer students were significantly underrepresented in this study. Whereas universities generally make greater use of transcripts from previous colleges

when considering transfer admission, many colleges and universities use high school grades and standardized test scores as well. Transfer students may actually face greater culture shock given the lack of orientation programs to assist in the transition from one institution to another.

Conclusion

In the preface of their seminal work, *The Shape of the River*, Bowen and Bok (1998) critique the common metaphor of the admissions pipeline:

This image is misleading, with its connotation of a smooth, well defined, and well understood passage. It is more helpful to think of the nurturing of talent as a process akin to moving down a winding river, with rock-strewn rapids and slow channels, muddy at times and clear at others (p. xxi).

Successful navigation requires accurate maps, often maps that are created along the way as much as they are defined by those who led the way. This is especially tricky for students engaging institutional cultures quite unlike their own. For these students, prior achievement seems to be a key to successful navigation. However, standardized tests continue to hold great symbolic power in determining which students merit access to this journey. Thus, another roadmap is needed—one guiding those institutions charting the unfamiliar waters of affirmative action and comprehensive review in admissions practice. In June, 2003, the Supreme Court began to sketch a map to and through these waters. Simple formulas and point systems will not suffice. In light of this study and the work of others, neither will simple methods of comparing test scores.

References

- ACT. (1998). *Postsecondary user's guide* (8th ed.). Iowa City, IA: Author.
- Allen, W. (1987). Black colleges vs. white colleges: The fork in the road for black students. *Change*, 19(3), 28-34.
- Astin, A. W. (1993). *What matters in college? Four critical years revisited*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Astin A. W., Korn W., & Green, K. (1987, Winter). Retaining and satisfying students. *Educational Record*, 68(1), 36-42.
- Astin, A., Tsui, L., & Avalos, J. (1996). Degree attainment at American colleges and universities: Effect of race, gender, and institutional type. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.
- Attinasi, L. C., Jr. (1989). Mexican Americans' perceptions of university attendance and the implications for freshman year persistence. *Journal of Higher Education*, 60(3), 247-277.
- Bowen, W. G., & Bok, D. (1998). *The shape of the river: Long-term consequences of considering race in college and university admissions*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Brown, T. L. (2000). Gender differences in African American students' satisfaction with college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 41(5), 479-487.
- Cabrera, A. F., Nora, A., & Castaneda, M. B. (1992). The role of finances in the persistence process: A structural model. *Research in Higher Education*, 33(4), 571-593.
- Camara, W. J., & Echternacht, G. (2000). The SAT I and high school grades: Utility in predicting success in college. *The College Board Research Notes*, RN-10, 1-12.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Sociological Methods and Research*, 1, 245-276.

CNN. (2003, June 23). *Narrow use of affirmative action preserved in college admissions.*

Retrieved June 23, 2003, from

<http://www.cnn.com/2003/LAW/06/23/scotus.affirmative.action/index.html>

DeSousa, D. J., & Kuh, G. D. (1996). Does institutional racial composition make a difference in what Black students gain from college? *Journal of College Student Development, 37*(3), 257-267.

Fleming, J. (2002). Who will succeed in college? When the SAT predicts Black students' performance. *The Review of Higher Education, 25*(3), 281-296.

Fleming, J., & Garcia, N. (1998). Are standardized tests fair to African Americans? Predictive validity of the SAT in Black and White institutions. *Journal of Higher Education, 69*(5), 471-495.

Flores, J. L. (1992, April). *Persisting Hispanic American college students: Characteristics that lead to baccalaureate degree completion.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 345 609)

Grayson, J. P. (1997). Academic achievement of first-generation students in a Canadian university. *Research in Higher Education, 38*(6), 659-76.

Hanson, G. R., & Swann, D. M. (1993). Using multiple program impact analysis to document institutional effectiveness. *Research in Higher Education, 34*(1), 71-94.

Hebel, S. (2003, Oct. 17). U. of California to review admissions in wake of critical report. *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Retrieved October 28, 2003, from <http://chronicle.com/prm/weekly/v50/i08/08a02901.htm>.

- Hoffman, J. L. (2002). The impact of student cocurricular involvement on student success: Racial and religious differences. *The Journal of College Student Development, 43*(5), 712-739.
- Hong, P. Y. (2003, Oct. 25). Faculty, rights advocates defend UC Berkeley admissions policies. *The Los Angeles Times*.
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indices in covariance structure analysis: Conventional versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*, 1-55.
- Kim, M. M. (2002). Historically Black vs. White institutions: Academic development among Black students. *The Review of Higher Education, 25*(4), 385-407.
- Kuh, G. D. (1993). In their own words: What students learn outside the classroom. *American Educational Research Journal, 30*(2), 277-304.
- Kuh, G. D. (1995). The other curriculum: Out-of-class experiences associated with student learning and personal development. *Journal of Higher Education, 66*(2), 123-155.
- Loo, C. M., & Rolison, G. (1986). Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominantly White university. *Journal of Higher Education, 57*(1), 58-77.
- Mackay, K. A., & Kuh, G. D. (1994). A comparison of student effort and educational gains of Caucasian and African-American students at predominantly White colleges and universities. *Journal of College Student Development, 35*(3), 217-233.
- Moffat, G. K. (1993, February). The validity of the SAT as a predictor of grade point average for nontraditional college students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Clearwater Beach, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 356 252)
- Munro, B. H. (1981). Dropouts from higher education: Path analysis of a national sample. *American Educational Research Journal, 18*(2), 133-141.

- Nettles, M. T., Catherine, C. M., & Ready, D. D. (2003). Attacking the African American-White achievement gap on college admissions tests. *Brookings Papers on Education Policy*, 215-238.
- Nora, A. (1990). Campus-based aid programs as determinants of retention among Hispanic community college students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 61(3), 312-331.
- Pace, C. R. (1985). *The credibility of student self-reports*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, The Center for the Study of Evaluation, Graduate School of Education.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1983). Predicting voluntary freshman year persistence/withdrawal behavior in a residential university: A path analysis validation of Tinto's model. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75(2), 215-226.
- Pritchard, M. E., & Wilson, G. S. (2003). Using emotional and social factors to predict student success. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44(1), 18-28.
- Ramist, L., Lewis, C., & McCamley-Jenkins, L. (1993). *Student group differences in predicting college grades: Sex, language and ethnic groups*. College Board Research Report No. 93-1. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.
- Rendón, L.I. (1994). Validating culturally diverse students: Toward a new model of learning and student development. *Innovative Higher Education* 19 (1), 33-51.
- Rendón, L.I., Jalomo, R.E., & Nora, A. (2000). Theoretical consideration in the study of minority student retention in higher education. In J. Braxton (Ed.) *Rethinking the departure puzzle: New theory and research on college student retention* (pp. 127-156). Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Rodriguez, A. L., Guido-DiBrito, F., Torres, V., & Talbot, D. (2000). Latina college students: Issues and challenges for the 21st century. *NASPA Journal*, 37(3), 511-527.

- Saggio, J. J. (2003). Validation and its impact upon institutional choice and post-first year persistence of American Indian/Alaska Native students at a Bible college. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Association for the Study of Higher Education. Portland, OR.
- Schlosser, L. Z., & Sedlacek, W. E. (2003). Christian privilege and respect for religious diversity: Religious holidays on campus. *About Campus*, 7(6), 31-32.
- Schwitzer, A. M., Griffin, O. T., Ancis, J. R., & Thomas, C. R. (1999). Social adjustment experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 77, 189-197.
- St. John, E. P., Hu, S., Simmons, A. B., & Musoba, G. D. (2001). Aptitude vs. merit: What matters in persistence. *The Review of Higher Education*, 24(2), 131-152.
- Sutton, E. M., & Kimbrough, W. M. (2001). Trends in Black student involvement. *NASPA Journal*, 39(1), 30-40.
- Throgmorton, D. W. (1999). *Perceptions and persistence: Experiences of first-year African American and Chicano/Latino students at the University of California, Irvine*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California.
- Tinto, V. (1975). Dropout from higher education: A theoretical synthesis of recent research. *Review of Educational Research*, 45(1), 89-125.
- Tinto, V. (1993). *Leaving college: Rethinking the causes and cures of student attrition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Tracey, T. J., & Sedlacek, W. E. (1987). A comparison of white and black student academic success using noncognitive variables: A LISREL analysis. *Research in Higher Education*, 27(4), 333-348.

- Tross, S. A., Harper, J. P., Osher, L. W., & Kneidinger, L. M. (2000). Not just the usual cast of characteristics: Using personality to predict college student performance and retention. *Journal of College Student Development, 41*(3), 323-334.
- Valiga, M. J. (1990). *Assessing the reliability of questionnaires and survey instruments using generalizability theory*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa, Iowa City.
- Velez, W. (1985). Finishing college: The effects of college type. *Sociology of Education, 58*(3) 191-200.
- Wagener, U., & Nettles, M. T. (1998). It takes a community to educate students. *Change 30*(2), 18-25.
- Waugh, G., Micceri, T., & Takalkar, P. (1994, June). *Using ethnicity, SAT/ACT scores, and high school GPA to predict retention and graduation rates*. Paper presented at FAIR Conference, Orlando, FL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 453 704)
- Wolfe, R. N., & Johnson S. D. (1995). Personality as a predictor of college performance. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 55*(2), 177-185.
- Woon, T. L. (1998). *The great commission in the 21st century: Progress and prospects for sociocultural responsiveness at Concordia University*. Irvine, California: Concordia University.
- Yoshino, K. F. (2003). *Concordia University assessing sociocultural responsiveness: Observations and recommendations*. Irvine, California: Concordia University.
- Zheng, J. L., Saunders, K. P., Shelley II, M. C., & Whalen, D. F. (2002). Predictors of academic success for freshmen residence hall students. *Journal of College Student Development, 43* (2), 267-283.