# Nonparticipation in Extracurricular Activities among Immigrant Youth

February 18, 2011

Hua-Yu Sebastian Cherng, University of Pennsylvania[12]
Kristin Turney, University of Michigan[3]
Grace Kao, University of Pennsylvania

[1] Corresponding author, Department of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania, 3718 Locust Walk, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19104 USA,
cherng@gse.upenn.edu
[2] Cherng's time was supported by an Institute of Education Sciences Fellowship from the U.S. Department of Education, through Grant #R305B090015.
[3] Turney's work on this project was supported by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Health & Society Scholars Program.

# Nonparticipation in Extracurricular Activities among Immigrant Youth

**ABSTRACT**
Prior qualitative research suggests that immigrant youth are often disengaged in or unaware of opportunities in school. We use the Education Longitudinal Study (ELS:2002), a nationally representative sample of high school sophomores, to document racial/ethnic and immigrant differences in nonparticipation in school sports and clubs. Then, we explore the relationship between nonparticipation and academic expectations. We find that first-generation Hispanics are much more likely not to participate than either their same-race second- and third-generation counterparts or white third-generation youth. Similarly, first-generation Asian Americans experience more nonparticipation in sports compared to white third-generations, though first- and second-generation Asians are not disadvantaged in club nonparticipation. We also find that nonparticipation in tenth grade is negatively associated with years of expected educational attainment in twelfth grade. These findings suggest that a disproportionate number of immigrants experience isolation in high school, and that this isolation may be linked to less academic optimism.

Immigrant children and children of immigrants – those born in the United States with parents born abroad – comprise almost one in five children in the United States (Capps et al. 2005). Newcomers to the United States often experience great optimism and hope, and immigrant students have higher academic expectations compared to their native-born counterparts from similar backgrounds. A large body of literature finds these academic expectations and aspirations positively influence a variety of academic outcomes, including grade point average, high school completion, and college attendance (Kao and Tienda 1995; 1998; Sewell, Haller, and Portes 2008). To date, the large majority of research about academic expectations of immigrant youth considers relationships between scholastic measures and academic aspirations (Duran and Weffer 1992; Kao and Tienda 1998; Portes et al. 1978). However, much less research examines how informal interactions and the pursuit of nonacademic interests among high school students may be associated with academic expectations.

In addition, we know very little about variation in nonparticipation by nativity, and it is reasonable to assume that immigrant youth are more prone to nonparticipation than their native-born counterparts or the White majority. Not only do the foreign-born differ from the native-born by race, social class, and family structure, they are also characterized by a unique set of characteristics (Fuligni 1998). On the one hand, factors such as difficulty with English or familiarity with the complex U.S. education system may mean that immigrant youth participate in activities less than their native-born counterparts (Vernez and Abrahamse 1996). As such, we may expect to see generational differences in extracurricular activities, whereby those who are newest to the country are most prone to total nonparticipation than their second- or third-generation counterparts. On the other hand, xenophobia and increasing hostility toward

immigrants – as evidenced by recent legislation affecting immigration and immigrant students, such as Arizona's S.B.1070 (Archibold 2010) – may cause newcomers to feel marginalized and unwelcome in activities where more informal interaction occurs (Preston 2010). Therefore, previous studies that do not specifically look at generational effects (often referred to as *straight-line* assimilation by immigration scholars) may overlook some important differences in the adaptation of immigrant youth.

## BACKGROUND

### *Growth in Immigrants and Children of Immigrants*

Approximately 13.5 percent of the U.S. population is foreign-born. At least in sheer numbers, immigration into the United States in the 1990s and 2000s far surpassed that of any other decade in the nation's history. During the 1990s, between 14 million and 16 million immigrants entered the country, with 700,000 million to 1 million documented and 500,000 undocumented immigrants entering the United States every year (U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States 2001). In the early 2000s, the number of immigrants in the United States further increased by around 16 percent (American Community Survey Office and US Census Bureau 2009). Presently, the foreign-born population in the United States is estimated to be between 42 million and 43 million (U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, and U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics 2005; American Community Survey Office and US Census Bureau 2009).

The foreign-born population is also younger than the native-born population. In other words, youth with immigrant parents make up an increasingly larger share of the school-aged population. Specifically, children of immigrants account for approximately 25 percent of

children under the age of 18 (O'Hare 2004). In 2000, 11 million immigrant children and children of immigrants were enrolled in pre-kindergarten through twelfth grades. Of these, about three-quarters were native-born with mothers born outside the United States (second-generation immigrants) and one-quarter were foreign-born (first-generation immigrants). Three-quarters of children of immigrants were also Asian and Hispanic, with Hispanics comprising 53 percent of children of immigrants and 51 percent of foreign-born children and Asians comprising 18 percent of children of immigrants and 24 percent of foreign-born children. On average, immigrants have lower incomes than their native-born counterparts, and children of immigrants comprise 25 percent of all low-income children (Reardon-Anderson, Capps, and Fix 2002).

*Importance of Social Connections for Immigrant Students*

Models based on classical assimilation theory use socioeconomic characteristics of immigrants as the core empirical measures of assimilation (Alba & Nee 1997, in Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco 2005; Gordon 1964; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Rumbaut 1995). As such, discussion of immigrant youth mainly examines academic outcomes (Kao and Thompson 2003; Levels, Dronkers, and Kraaykamp 2008). Indeed, a substantial body of research examines how immigrant youth fare in the U.S. education system, with the majority of studies examining achievement outcomes such as tests (Fuligni 1998b; Vernez and Abrahamse 1996), academic investment (Kao and Tienda 1998), and perception of school climate (Stone and Han 2005). Much of this research shows that immigrant children, despite their lower family socioeconomic status, have advantaged educational outcomes at all ages. Also, students new to the United States have higher aspirations and expectations than their native-born counterparts, which is referred to as *immigrant optimism* (Goldenberg et al. 2001; Kao and Tienda 1998).

Another line of research describes schools as the primary setting where students are exposed to mainstream culture (Birman and Trickett 2001; Zhou 1997; Rumbaut 1995) and spend the majority of their time. Even outside of the immigration literature, schools have long been thought of as institutions of social reproduction (Bourdieu 1977). The fact that immigrant youth must attend school is what Gordon refers to as *structural assimilation*, the "large-scale entry into the cliques, clubs, and institutions of host society, on the primary group level" (Gordon 1964:71). Any subsequent assimilation, Gordon argues, is not possible without this primary exposure.

Though highly prescribed interactions in the classroom provide an opportunity for immigrant children to be exposed to mainstream culture, more meaningful contact may occur in informal settings such as extracurricular school activities. Nearly all high schools, for example, offer some opportunity for participation in school-sponsored events (Smith et al. 1995). Qualitative research has explored social interaction between students in schools, and much of this research argues that immigrant children are marginalized by the school community (Gitlin et al. 2003; Suarez-Orozco and Todorova 2003; Lee 2005; Zhou 1997). For instance, one study found that Asian immigrant students in the United States had difficulty making friends (Yu et al. 2002). However, little research has explored these questions with nationally representative data that allow for comparisons across race/ethnicity or generational status of students.

A large body of theoretical and empirical literature discusses factors (e.g., cultural explanations, socioeconomic status, parental expectations) associated with academic outcomes among immigrant children and children of immigrants. However, little work has explored behavior inside the school but outside the academic classroom. Immigrant children, for example, may be less likely than their native-born counterparts to participate in extracurricular activities

such as sports and clubs. Newcomers may not feel comfortable communicating in English with their peers, as English language is an important component of assimilation models (Gordon 1964; Portes and Rumbaut 2006). Those born in the United States may be more familiar with their surroundings and school norms. Additionally, immigrant youth may be preoccupied with earning income to contribute to the household or their parents may restrict their participation (Orellana 2001; Reese 2002).

Though little research has examined nonparticipation by immigrant status, prior research examines other demographic correlates of nonparticipation. For example, male students participate more in sports than their female counterparts, and females participate more in clubs (Eccles et al. 2003; Eccles and Barber 1999). Socioeconomic status also plays an important role in participation: schools that serve more disadvantaged populations generally offer fewer in-school activities than schools that serve more advantaged populations (Cohen et al. 2007; Cooper et al. 1999).

*Prior Research Linking Nonparticipation to Academic Expectations*

To our knowledge, little work examines the association between nonparticipation in extracurricular activities and academic expectations. It is certainly plausible to believe that nonparticipation may be associated with lower academic expectations. Students who do not participate in extracurricular activities are unable to pursue interests not covered in the classroom and miss out on opportunities to become more engaged with their schooling. Perhaps more significantly, students also miss out on opportunities to interact informally with their peers, which may be even more important for youth who are unfamiliar with mainstream culture. Moreover, as competition to get into college increasingly involves nonacademic indicators of

success, nonparticipation in extracurricular activities may hurt students' chances of pursuing education beyond high school (or at least may affect the kinds of schools to which they are admitted) (Cabrera and La Nasa 2001).

One early study found a positive correlation between participation in interscholastic athletics and college expectations among 785 male seniors in six urban high schools (Rehberg and Schafer 1968). Other work finds a similar association when adjusting for parental SES, parental academic encouragement, and student grade point average (GPA) (Spreitzer and Pugh 1973). More recent research comes to similar conclusions that students benefit from participation in extracurricular activities (Feldman and Matjasko 2005; Holland and Andre 1987). One study examined extracurricular participation and found that participation in non-sports extracurricular activities (such as music groups, student government, and variety of clubs) was consistently associated with both higher educational expectations and achievement (Guest and Schneider 2003). It may be that participation in certain types of activities is associated with better outcomes. Participation in school clubs, for example, is almost uniformly associated with positive academic outcomes (Eccles et al. 2003). Participation in these activities may also foster a sense of school community and academic commitment (Goodenow and Grady 1993).

*Research Questions*

Based on theoretical perspectives and the gaps in the existing empirical literature, we address two research questions in this paper: First, are first- and second-generation immigrant students, compared to White native-born counterparts, more likely to experience nonparticipation in school sports and clubs? Second, to what extent is nonparticipation associated with academic expectations?

## DATA, MEASURES, AND ANALYTIC STRATEGY

### *Data*

We use data from the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002 (ELS:2002), a longitudinal and nationally representative sample of sophomore high school students in 2002. Parents, teachers, and school administrators were also interviewed at baseline (administrators were also interviewed in the second wave). Researchers used a two-stage sample selection process. Schools were first selected proportional to their size. Second, approximately 26 students per school were selected from eligible schools. We use data from the baseline survey and the first follow-up in 2004, when most students were high school seniors. Overall, 13,119 students completed both surveys. The ELS:2002 provides a unique opportunity to answer our research questions, in that it oversamples Hispanic and Asian students, is nationally representative, and includes a variety of information about participation inside and out of school and about academic expectations (U.S. Dept. of Education, National Center for Education Statistics 2005).

The analytic sample for this paper includes 9,674 students. We restrict the sample to students who reported a racial/ethnic group and who had complete information on the mother's and child's country of birth, which excluded 1,823 from the sample. We also exclude Native American students (n = 130) because of our focus on generational status. Finally, students missing information on the three dependent variables – nonparticipation in sports, nonparticipation in clubs, and twelfth grade academic expectations – were also excluded from the analysis (n = 1,492 students).

### *Measures*

*Academic expectations*. In both tenth and twelfth grades, students were asked the following: “As things stand now, how far in school do you think you will get?” Response categories were as follows: less than high school graduation; high school graduation or GED only; attend or complete a two-year school course in a community or vocational school; attend college but not complete a four-year degree; graduate from college; obtain a Master's degree or equivalent; and obtain a Ph.D., M.D., or other advanced degree. We recoded these responses to reflect years of education (e.g., high school graduation or GED = 12 years; attend or complete a two-year school course in a community or vocational school = 14 years).

*Nonparticipation*. We measured nonparticipation by students’ responses to questions about their in-school sport and club participation at the baseline survey. Students were asked about their participation in the following intramural (competition between teams or students within the same school) and interscholastic (competition between teams from different schools) sports during their sophomore year: baseball; softball; basketball; football; soccer; other team sport; an individual sport (e.g., wrestling, gold, tennis); and cheerleading, pompon or drill team. Based on students’ responses to these questions, we constructed a dummy variable indicating nonparticipation in sports (1 = *student did not participate in intramural or interscholastic sport*, 0 = *student participated in at least one intramural or interscholastic sport*).

Additionally, students were asked if they participated in each of the following activities during their sophomore year: band, orchestra, chorus, choir; school play or musical; student government; National Honor Society (NHS) or other academic honor society; school yearbook, newspaper, literary magazine; service club; academic club; hobby club; vocational education club, and vocational student organization (e.g., DECA (a marketing and entrepreneurship club), VICA (a career and technical student club), FFA (an agricultural club), FHA (a family, career,

and community leadership club). Similar to the measure of nonparticipation in school sports, we constructed a dummy variable indicating nonparticipation in school clubs (1 = *student did not participate in school clubs*, 0 = *student participated in at least one club*).

*Race/ethnicity and immigrant status*. Race/ethnicity and immigrant status was represented by a series of dummy variables: White first-generation, White second-generation, White third-generation (reference category in the multivariate analyses), Black first-generation, and so on. Race/ethnicity was reported by students at the baseline survey, with response categories including the following: Asian American, Hispanic, Black, multiracial, and White. Both students and mothers were asked about their country of birth, and we use this information to ascertain student's generation status. Students are considered first-generation if they were not born in the United States. Students born in the United States with mothers born outside of the United States are considered second-generation. When students and mothers are born in the United States, they are designated third-generation.[4]

*Control variables*. Our multivariate analyses controlled for a number of individual- and school-level characteristics associated with the key variables. To begin with, a dummy variable indicated if the student was male. Family socioeconomic status (SES) was a composite indicator, provided by the ELS:2002 and based on five equally weighted components: father's education, mother's education, father's occupation, mother's occupation, and family income. We re-standardized this variable for our analytic sample so that it had a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of one. Respondent age at baseline was a continuous variable that ranges from fifteen to nineteen. A dummy variable indicated the respondent's parents are married or living in a marriage-like relationship, and number of siblings was a continuous variable that ranges from 0

[4] In our analyses, as with other studies on immigrant youth, we used mother's and not father's nativity to determine student's generation status. Mothers are children's primary caregivers in nearly all cases, and the data include more complete information on mother's birthplace than on father's birthplace.

to six (and includes, adoptive, step-, and half-siblings). We use factor analysis to create a measure of parental strictness. Students were asked about the frequency with which their parents limit privileges because of poor grades, require them to do work or chores, limit the amount of time watching TV or playing video games, and limit the amount of time going out with friends on a school night. Response categories included the following: never, rarely, sometimes, and often ($\alpha$= 0.65). We also included a dummy variable indicating if the respondent's teacher reported that a health problem impedes school performance, as well as a dummy variable indicating the respondent is employed. Finally, we controlled for student grade point average (GPA) at the baseline survey. Transcripts, along with information such as the grade scale, course grade weighting system (if applicable), and GPA formula, were collected and translated onto one scale that reflect weighted and unweighted averages.

We used principal reports of the availability of sports offerings in high schools. We controlled for the percentage of sports offered per school (the number of sports offered in a school for men and women, divided by the 19 possible sports listed). There was no similar information about high schools' club offerings. Only three (of 748) schools existed in the sample in which all students reported no participation in clubs, which was consistent with previous research showing club offerings are ubiquitous in U.S. high schools (Smith et al. 1995).

In the multivariate analyses that only focus on first-generation children, we controlled for English language ability and child's time spent in the United States. A dummy variable indicated the respondent ever participated in an ESL (English as a Second Language) program in high school, and child's time in the United States was a continuous variable ranging from 0 to sixteen.

*Analytic Strategy*

To begin with, in Table 2, we show descriptive statistics for our key variables by race/ethnicity and immigrant status. Of course, these differences by race/ethnicity and immigrant status may result from additional individual- or school-level characteristics. Thus, in Table 3, we use logistic regression models to estimate nonparticipation in sports and nonparticipation in clubs as a function of race/ethnicity and immigrant status. Models 1 and 3 include race/ethnicity and immigrant status, gender, and family socioeconomic status. Models 2 and 4 include the following: tenth grade GPA, parental strictness, current employment, if the student's health impedes school performance, age, number of siblings, parents' marital status, and proportion of school sports offered by the school.

Previewing the results slightly, we find first-generation immigrants are almost always likely to experience more nonparticipation than their third-generation White counterparts. Thus, in Table 4, we use logistic regression models to explore patterns of nonparticipation among first-generation immigrants. Model 1 estimates nonparticipation as a function of race, gender, and family SES. Model 2 includes the explanatory factors in Model 2 of Table 3 and two additional factors: English ability and the number of years students have been in the United States.

In the final stage of the analysis, we use ordinary least squared (OLS) regression models to estimate academic expectations in twelfth grade as a function of nonparticipation in tenth grade. Model 1 considers the unadjusted relationship between academic expectations in twelfth grade and nonparticipation in tenth grade, and Model 2 includes controls for race/ethnicity and immigrant status, gender, and family SES. Model 3 adjusts for the additional explanatory variables. Model 4 adjusts for tenth grade academic expectations, which allows us to examine the

association between nonparticipation and academic expectations in twelfth grade net of academic expectations in tenth grade.

All models take into account that students are clustered in schools and use robust standard errors and appropriate sample weights. Relatively few observations were missing data on the covariates, and we used regression-based imputation to account for missing data.

*Sample Description*

The unweighted data show that some racial/ethnic groups were oversampled. For example, about 9% of our unweighted analytic sample is Asian American, with first- and second-generation Hispanics each representing 4% of the total sample. Hispanics comprise 13% of the sample, with first- and second-generation Hispanics representing 3% and 4% of the entire sample, respectively. In total, about 29% of the population does not participation in any sport and 44% does not participate in any club. The average number of expected years of education is 16.55 (s.d. = 2.21) in twelfth grade and 16.95 (s.d. = 2.06) in tenth grade.

[Table 1 about here.]

## RESULTS

*Bivariate Relationship between Nonparticipation and Academic Expectations*

We first turn to descriptive statistics presented in Table 2. With respect to school sports, there is a clear pattern among Asian Americans, Hispanics, and Whites: Within their race/ethnic category, first-generation immigrants are the most likely to experience nonparticipation. For instance, more than half of first-generation Hispanics do not participate in any school sport, and less than one-third of their third-generation counterparts are nonparticipants. Most of these first-

and second-generation groups are also significantly different from third-generation Whites (where only one-fourth of students do not participate in any school sport). A similar pattern exists among Blacks, although nonparticipation in sports among first-generation Blacks is not statistically different from third-generation Whites. Multiracials also show a variation on the pattern, although given the non-specific race/ethnicity of this category, combined with the small number of first-generation individuals, the trends are difficult to interpret.

[Table 2 about here.]

With respect to nonparticipation in clubs, a similar pattern emerges for Hispanics and Whites, where the majority of students are nonparticipants in clubs (63% and 51%, respectively). A different pattern emerges for Asian Americans, however. Here, only about one-third of students do not participate in any clubs, the lowest of the three immigrant groups, which is also fewer than third-generation Whites.

*Nonparticipation in Extracurricular Activities as a Function of Race/Immigrant Status*

The descriptive findings show a persistent disadvantage for immigrant children and children of immigrants across most racial/ethnic groups. To examine whether these patterns persist when controlling for background factors, we estimate logistic regression models that predict nonparticipation in Table 3. Model 1 shows that first-generation students are much more likely not to participate in any sports compared to third-generation Whites. First-generation Asians have 67% higher odds of nonparticipation in any sport than third-generation Whites. First-generation Hispanics have almost twice the odds and first-generation Whites have 124% higher odds of experiencing nonparticipation. Second-generation Asians and Hispanics also have higher odds of nonparticipation, with Asians having more than twice the odds and Hispanics

having 38% higher odds. Moreover, compared to their second-generation counterparts, first-generation Hispanics and first-generation Whites experience more nonparticipation ($p < 0.05$, results not shown).

[Table 3 about here.]

Model 2 adjusts for a host of characteristics that may be associated with immigrant status and nonparticipation. The odds ratios for racial/ethnic and immigrant categories decrease with the inclusion of these variables. Most notably, there is no statistically significant difference between second-generation Hispanics and third-generation Whites, although first-generation Hispanics still experience a disadvantage compared to the reference category. First- and second-generation Hispanics, however, are not statistically different from each other. Adjusting for these additional factors, third-generation Blacks and multiracials now have about 30% lower odds of nonparticipation in any sport. Moreover, though there is no statistical difference between first- and second-generation Asians, the difference between second- and third-generation Asians is marginally statistically significant ($p < 0.10$).

Model 3 estimates nonparticipation in clubs and the patterns are similar to those presented in Table 2. First-generation Hispanics and Whites have more than twice the odds of nonparticipation in any club as third-generation Whites and have the highest odds of nonparticipation in their racial/ethnic categories. However, second- and third-generation Hispanics also experience disadvantages, experiencing, respectively, 62% and 45% higher odds of nonparticipation. Diverging from this pattern are Asians, with second-generation Asians having 33% *lower* odds of total nonparticipation in clubs and with first- and third- generation Asians being similar to the reference group. Second-generation Blacks and multiracials also have greater odds of nonparticipation in any club.

Similar patterns emerge in Model 4, which adjusts for the same explanatory variables as Model 2 (except for school sports offering). Adjusting for these additional characteristics, third-generation Hispanics and third-generation Whites have similar odds of nonparticipation, and their first- and second-generation counterparts have also lower odds of nonparticipation in clubs. Additionally, first-generation Hispanics have significantly lower odds of nonparticipation than third-generation Hispanics (results not shown). Interestingly, there is also no significant difference between first- and second-generation Asians in this model, in that second-generation Asians no longer have lower odds of nonparticipation than third-generation Whites. First-generation Whites still experience similar odds of nonparticipation as in Model 3 and are still statistically different from both their second- and third-generation counterparts, and second-generation Blacks are no longer at a disadvantage compared to third-generation Whites.

Tenth grade GPA and parental strictness are significantly associated with nonparticipation in both sports and clubs, with a one-point increase in GPA being associated with 35% and 44% lower odds of nonparticipation in sports and clubs, respectively. More parental strictness is also associated with about 20% lower odds of nonparticipation in both activities. Current employment only matters in nonparticipation in sports, and is associated with 21% lower odds of nonparticipation. Interestingly, school sports offering is also significant: students who attend schools with greater sports offerings are more likely to experience nonparticipation. Other covariates operate as expected. For example, girls are more likely than boys not to participate in any sport and are less likely not to participate in any clubs. Moreover, students from higher-SES households are less likely to experience nonparticipation in both sports and clubs. Other explanatory factors are not statistically significant.

*Nonparticipation in Extracurricular Activities among First-Generation Adolescents*

The results thus far suggest that first-generation immigrants, compared to third-generation Whites, are more likely to experience nonparticipation. In Table 4, we restrict the sample to first-generation students to explore potential explanations for nonparticipation among this group. Model 1 shows that first-generation Asians, Hispanics, and Blacks experience similar odds of nonparticipation in sports than first-generation Whites. Multiracials have lower odds, although these students comprise a relatively small group (n = 36). Model 2 adjusts for the background characteristics accounted for in Table 3, as well as English language ability and years in the United States. Again, there is little difference in odds of nonparticipation by race, even with the inclusion of these variables. Contrary to expectations, both English ability and years in the United States are not significant predictors of nonparticipation in sports. The only significant explanatory factor is more school sports offering, which is associated with higher odds of nonparticipation.

[Table 4 about here.]

The next two models predict nonparticipation in clubs among first-generation adolescents. Model 3 shows that first-generation Asians have 50% lower odds of nonparticipation in clubs than first-generation Whites, which is in some ways similar to the story of second-generation Asians' advantage. However, the rest of the groups are no different from first-generation Whites, even when explanatory factors are included in Model 4. As in Model 2, English ability and years in the United States are not significant predictors of nonparticipation in clubs. Tenth grade GPA, however, is associated with lower odds of total nonparticipation in clubs.

*Academic Expectations as a Function of Nonparticipation in Extracurricular Activities*

Tables 3 and 4 show that, relative to their third-generation counterparts, many first- and second- generation students are at a disadvantage in terms of nonparticipation. Table 5 addresses the second research question: Is nonparticipation associated with twelfth grade educational expectations? Model 1, which considers the unadjusted relationship, provides some evidence that nonparticipation is associated with lower academic expectations. Nonparticipation in sports is associated with 0.62 fewer years of educational expectations ($p < 0.01$), and nonparticipation in clubs is associated with almost an entire year of educational expectations (-0.96, $p < 0.01$). Including the racial/ethnic-immigrant categories in Model 2 attenuates the association between nonparticipation and academic expectations, but nonparticipation in both sports and clubs is independently associated with lowered expectations. Consistent with prior literature, first- and second- generation immigrant groups have higher academic expectations than third-generation Whites. This relationship persists in Model 3, which adjusts for a host of demographic characteristics. Finally, in Model 4, we include a lagged indicator of academic expectations. In this final model, nonparticipation in any sport and nonparticipation in any club is strongly associated with academic expectations. Nonparticipation in sports is associated one-fourth of a year lower educational expectations ($p < 0.01$), and nonparticipation in clubs is associated with academic expectations that are one-third of a year lower ($p < 0.01$). The higher expectations of many first-generation immigrant groups, compared to third-generation Whites, decrease but generally do not completely attenuate. First-generation Hispanics, however, have similar

expectations as third-generation Whites. The R-squared in this final model is 0.34.[5] In supplemental analyses not presented, we found no differences in the association between nonparticipation and academic expectations by race/ethnicity and immigrant status.

[Table 5 about here.]

The additional covariates work as expected. In the final model, tenth grade GPA, parental strictness, and school sports offering are associated with more years of expected education, while age and number of siblings is associated with fewer years of expected education.

## DISCUSSION

The first goal of this paper was to document trends in nonparticipation in school sports and clubs for first-, second-, and third-generation high school students. We find that first-generation immigrant students are more likely to experience nonparticipation than their White native-born counterparts. Interestingly, first-generation Hispanics and Whites experience the highest odds of total nonparticipation in their respective racial/ethnic category, and are around twice as likely not to participate in any sport or any club. First- and second-generation Asians are more likely to experience nonparticipation in sports, but second-generation Asians are less likely to experience nonparticipation in clubs. Similarly, first-generation Asians are no different from third-generation Whites and, in the analysis of only first-generation students, we find Asians to be less likely than Whites to experience nonparticipation.

This finding is consistent with a growing body of literature that documents the disadvantages faced by immigrant children in schools. Other researchers find that immigrant children and children of immigrants experience a wide range of experiences with respect to the

[5] This means that meaning this model now explains 28% more of the unexplained variance than model 1. This value was calculated by taking the percent change from the fraction of variance unexplained in Model 1 (1 – 0.07 = 0.93) and Model 4 (1 – 0.34 = 0.66).

educational system (Marks and Garcia-Coll 2011). For instance, indicators of assimilation are associated with more substance abuse and earlier age of sexual initiation (Greenman and Xie 2008). Some have speculated that the notion of the immigrant paradox, where children of immigrants have better outcomes than expected given their sociodemographic characteristics, may be more apparent in earlier cohorts of youth than most recent ones. Our findings add to a large and growing body of literature on immigrant students' experiences in schools. We extend this literature – most of which examines students' educational achievement or attainment – by exploring nonparticipation in extracurricular activities among immigrant youth.

One explanation for persistent immigrant nonparticipation may be that newcomers are socially excluded from activities. Given the current reception of many immigrant groups in the United States, it is reasonable to assume that discrimination against those newest to the country exists in schools as well. The stark contrast in club-nonparticipation perhaps suggests that, as a whole, Asians may be more knowledgeable about the college application process and prepare their resumes by participating in activities (Goyette and Xie 1999). This may also explain the high college enrollment rates of first- and second-generation Asian Americans (Snyder and Dillow 2009). Conversely, since Hispanic and White immigrant youth are disadvantaged in all activities, this may illustrate a lack of understanding of the complex college application process among these groups (Castellanos and Jones 2003).

Even though our main goal was to examine patterns of nonparticipation among different racial/ethnic-immigrant groups, we found additional factors that are associated with nonparticipation. Higher GPA and parental strictness are associated with lower odds of nonparticipation in both activities and current employment for nonparticipation in sports. Perhaps parents who are strict and students who work may know that participation is seen

favorably in the college application process. Family structure, age, and health are not associated with nonparticipation in either sports or clubs, nor are English language ability and years in the United States among first-generation immigrants. This finding is particularly surprising, given that language ability may be an initial barrier to interaction (Portes and Rumbaut 2006). Another measure that works in an unexpected direction is school sports offerings, which is associated with lower odds of nonparticipation.

With respect to our second research question, we found that nonparticipation is associated with lowered academic expectations in high school. This contributes not only to literature that shows a diverse set of academic outcomes among immigrants, such as being more prone to risky behavior (Greenman and Xie 2008), but also adds a level of nuance to our understanding of immigrant expectations. Nonparticipation is associated with academic expectations, although despite this, many immigrant groups still have brighter outlooks than native Whites.

Additionally, we find evidence of higher education expectations among all first- and second-generation immigrant groups, which is consistent with previous work on the expectations of immigrant youth (Kao and Tienda 1995; Portes et. al 1978). Multiracials are often the exception, likely due to the lack of information we have on their specific race/ethnicity. However, in the full model, which includes nonparticipation in any sport and in any clubs and other covariates, almost all advantages are diminished compared to previous models, and in some cases, completely eliminated. In other words, individuals who are nonparticipants – students who not only miss out on pursuing interests other than their academics, but also informal social interaction – have lowered expectations about their future.

Despite the clear patterns that emerge from our findings, there exist a number of caveats. First, a small number of students surveyed at the baseline wave did not participate in the follow-up wave. Additionally, the racial categories used in the analyses are crude. Only five categories represent a variety of ethnicities likely represented in the sample. A final limitation is the potential for omitted variable bias. These data do not include information on student's romantic relationships or mental health, two characteristics that are linked to both immigrant status, school engagement, and academic expectations (Bond et al. 2007; Finn 1993; Rubin 2009).

Notwithstanding these limitations, our findings provide convincing evidence of inequalities in nonparticipation and the association between nonparticipation and academic expectations. Given the stark differences in nonparticipation between foreign-born and native-born students, our findings suggest that high schools may not be equal opportunity socializers of students. These patterns suggest that newcomers are not only excluded from an ubiquitous aspect of schooling in the U.S., but also that nonparticipation in extracurricular activities is associated with lower academic expectations. Not only are these lower expectations an indicator of many future outcomes, but in the case of immigrant youth, they also point to less optimism about integration to their new home.

**REFERENCES**


American Community Survey Office, and US Census Bureau. 2009. "American Community Survey." http://www.census.gov/acs/www/ (Accessed February 18, 2011).

Archibold, Randal C. 2010. "Arizona Enacts Stringent Law on Immigration." *The New York Times*, April 23 http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/24/us/politics/24immig.html?_r=1 (Accessed February 16, 2011).

Birman, Dina, and Edison J. Trickett. 2001. "Cultural Transitions in First-Generation Immigrants." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 32:456 -477.

Bond, Lyndal et al. 2007. "Social and School Connectedness in Early Secondary School as Predictors of Late Teenage Substance Use, Mental Health, and Academic Outcomes." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 40.

Cabrera, A. F, and S. M La Nasa. 2001. "On the Path to College: Three Critical Tasks Facing Americas Disadvantaged." *Research in Higher Education* 42:119-149.

Castellanos, Jeanett, and Lee Jones. 2003. *The Majority in the Minority: Expanding the Representation of Latina/o Faculty, Administrators and Students in Higher Education*. Stylus Publishing, LLC.

Cohen, Deborah A., Stephanie L. Taylor, Michela Zonta, Katherine D. Vestal, and Mark A. Schuster. 2007. "Availability of High School Extracurricular Sports Programs and High-Risk Behaviors." *Journal of School Health* 77:80-86.

Cooper, Harris, Jeffrey C. Valentine, Barbara Nye, and James J. Lindsay. 1999. "Relationships Between Five After-School Activities and Academic Achievement." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 91:369-378.

Duran, Bernadine J., and Rafaela E. Weffer. 1992. "Immigrants' Aspirations, High School Process, and Academic Outcomes." *American Educational Research Journal* 29:163 -181.

Eccles, Jacquelynne S., and Bonnie L. Barber. 1999. "Student Council, Volunteering, Basketball, or Marching Band." *Journal of Adolescent Research* 14:10 -43.

Eccles, Jacquelynne S., Bonnie L. Barber, Margaret Stone, and James Hunt. 2003. "Extracurricular Activities and Adolescent Development." *Journal of Social Issues* 59:865-889.

Feldman, Amy F., and Jennifer L. Matjasko. 2005. "The Role of School-Based Extracurricular Activities in Adolescent Development: A Comprehensive Review and Future Directions." *Review of Educational Research* 75:159 -210.

Finn, Jeremy D. 1993. *School Engagement and Students at Risk*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Fuligni, Andrew J. 1998. "The Adjustment of Children From Immigrant Families." *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 7:99-103.

Gitlin, Andrew, Edward Buendía, Kristin Crosland, and Fode Doumbia. 2003. "The Production of Margin and Center: Welcoming–Unwelcoming of Immigrant Students." *American Educational Research Journal* 40:91 -122.

Goldenberg, Claude, Ronald Gallimore, Leslie Reese, and Helen Garnier. 2001. "Cause or Effect? A Longitudinal Study of Immigrant Latino Parents' Aspirations and Expectations, and Their Children's School Performance." *American Educational Research Journal* 38:547 -582.

Goodenow, Carol, and Kathleen E. Grady. 1993. "The Relationship of School Belonging and Friends' Values to Academic Motivation among Urban Adolescent Students." *Journal of Experimental Education* 62:60-71.

Gordon, Milton Myron. 1964. *Assimilation in American life: the role of race, religion, and national origins*. Oxford University Press US.

Goyette, Kimberly, and Yu Xie. 1999. "Educational Expectations of Asian American Youths: Determinants and Ethnic Differences." *Sociology of Education* 72:22-36.

Greenman, Emily, and Yu Xie. 2008. "Is Assimilation Theory Dead? The Effect of Assimilation on Adolescent Well-Being." *Social Science Research* 37:109-137.

Guest, Andrew, and Barbara Schneider. 2003. "Adolescents' Extracurricular Participation in Context: The Mediating Effects of Schools, Communities, and Identity." *Sociology of Education* 76:89-109.

Holland, Alyce, and Thomas Andre. 1987. "Participation in Extracurricular Activities in Secondary School: What Is Known, What Needs to Be Known?." *Review of Educational Research* 57:437 -466.

Jarvis, Peter. 2003. *Adult and Continuing Education: Adult education - Viewed from the Disciplines*. Taylor & Francis.

Kao, Grace, and Jennifer S. Thompson. 2003. "Racial and Ethnic Stratification in Educational Achievement and Attainment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 29:417-442.

Kao, Grace, and Marta Tienda. 1998. "Educational Aspirations of Minority Youth." *American Journal of Education* 106:349-84.

Kao, Grace, and Marta Tienda. 1995. "Optimism and Achievement: The Educational

Performance of Immigrant Youth." *Social Science Quarterly* 76:1-19.

Lee, S.J. 2005. *Up Against Whiteness: Race, School, and Immigrant Youth*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Levels, Mark, Jaap Dronkers, and Gerbert Kraaykamp. 2008. "Immigrant Children's Educational Achievement in Western Countries: Origin, Destination, and Community Effects on Mathematical Performance." *American Sociological Review* 73:835 -853.

Marks, Amy, and Cynthia Garcia-Coll. 2011. *Is Becoming an American a Developmental Risk?* Washington DC: American Psychological Association Books.

O'Hare, William P. 2004. *Trends in the Well-Being of America's Children. The American People series*. New York and Washington: Russell Sage Foundation and Population Reference Bureau.

Orellana, Marjorie Faulstich. 2001. "The Work Kids Do: Mexican and Central American Immigrant Children's Contributions to Households and Schools in California." *Harvard Educational Review* 71:366-89.

Portes, Alejandro, and Others. 1978. "Immigrant Aspirations." *Sociology of Education* 51:241-260.

Portes, Alejandro, and Rubén G. Rumbaut. 2006. *Immigrant America: a portrait*. University of California Press.

Preston, Julia. 2010. "More Hispanics Say Discrimination Is a Problem, Poll Finds." *The New York Times*, October 28 http://www.nytimes.com/2010/10/29/us/29pew.html (Accessed February 13, 2011).

Randolph Capps. 2005. "The New Demography of America's Schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act." http://www.urban.org/publications/311230.html (Accessed August 27, 2010).

Reardon-Anderson, Jane, Randolph Capps, and Michael E. Fix. 2002. "The Health and Well-Being of Children in Immigrant Families." http://www.urban.org/publications/310584.html (Accessed August 27, 2010).

Reese, Leslie. 2002. "Parental Strategies in Contrasting Cultural Settings: Families in Mexico and "El Norte"." *Anthropology Education Quarterly* 33:30-59.

Rehberg, R. A., and W. E. Schafer. 1968. "Participation in Interscholastic Athletics and College Expectations." *American Journal of Sociology* 73:732-740.

Rubin, Kenneth. 2009. *Handbook of Peer Interactions, Relationships, and Groups*. New York: Guilford Press.

Rumbaut, R.G. 1995. *The New Californians: Comparative Research Findings on the Educational Progress of Immigrant Children.* San Diego: University of California, Center for U.S.-Mexican Studies.

Sewell, William, Archibald Haller, and Alejandro Portes. 2008. "The Educational and Early Occupational Attainment Process." Pp. 516-528 in. Westview Press.

Smith, Thomas M., and others. 1995. *The Condition of Education, 1995.* U.S. Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents.

Snyder, Thomas D., and Sally A. Dillow. 2009. *Digest of Education Statistics, 2008*. Government Printing Office.

Spreitzer, Elmer, and Meredith Pugh. 1973. "Interscholastic Athletics and Educational Expectations." *Sociology of Education* 46:171-182.

Stone, Susan, and Meekyung Han. 2005. "Perceived School Environments, Perceived Discrimination, and School Performance among Children of Mexican Immigrants." *Children and Youth Services Review* 27:51-66.

Suárez-Orozco, Carola, and Irina L. G. Todorova. 2003. "The Social Worlds of Immigrant Youth." *New Directions for Youth Development* 2003:15-24.

Suárez-Orozco, Marcelo M., and Carola Suárez-Orozco. 2005. *The New Immigration: An Interdisciplinary Reader*. Routledge.

U.S. Census Bureau, Statistical Abstract of the United States. 2001. "The 2000 Statistical Abstract of the United States." (Accessed September 15, 2010).

U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, and U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 2005. *Current Population Survey 2004*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census [producer], 2005. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor].

U.S. Dept. of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. 2005. *Education Longitudinal Study (ELS), 2002: Base Year [Computer file]*. Washington, DC: U.S. Dept. of Education, National Center for Education Statistics [producer], 2004. Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [distributor],

Vernez, Georges, and Allan Abrahamse. 1996. *How Immigrants Fare in U.S. Education.* RAND.

Yu, Stella M., Zhihuan j. Huang, Renee H. Schwalberg, Mary D. Overpeck, and Michael D. Kogan. 2002. "Association of Language Spoken at Home with Health and School Issues Among Asian American Adolescents." *Journal of School Health* 72:192-198.

Zhou, Min. 1997. “Growing Up American: The Challenge Confronting Immigrant Children and Children of Immigrants.” *Annual Review of Sociology* 23:63-95.

**Table 1: Unweighted Descriptive Statistics for Variables Used in the Analysis**

| Variable | Mean / Proportion | Standard Deviation |
|---|---|---|
| Female | 0.51 | |
| Family socioeconomic status (SES) | 0.00 | 1.00 |
| Race/Ethnicity and immigrant status | | |
| First–generation Asian | 0.04 | |
| Second–generation Asian | 0.04 | |
| Third–generation Asian | 0.01 | |
| First–generation Hispanic | 0.03 | |
| Second–generation Hispanic | 0.04 | |
| Third–generation Hispanic | 0.06 | |
| First–generation Black | 0.00 | |
| Second–generation Black | 0.01 | |
| Third–generation Black | 0.10 | |
| First–generation Multiracial | 0.00 | |
| Second–generation Multiracial | 0.01 | |
| Third–generation Multiracial | 0.03 | |
| First–generation White | 0.01 | |
| Second–generation White | 0.02 | |
| Third–generation White | 0.58 | |
| Percentage of school sports offered | 0.51 | 0.14 |
| Tenth grade GPA | 2.80 | 0.79 |
| Parental strictness | 2.72 | 0.69 |
| Currently employed | 0.24 | |
| Health impedes school performance | 0.09 | |
| Age | 16.42 | 0.58 |
| Number of siblings | 2.25 | 1.44 |
| Parents married | 0.80 | |
| English ability (first-generation only) | 0.29 | 0.45 |
| Years in United States (first-generation only) | 8.76 | 4.63 |
| Does not participate in any sport | 0.29 | |
| Does not participate in any club | 0.44 | |
| Twelfth grade academic expectations (years) | 16.55 | 2.21 |
| Tenth grade academic expectations (years) | 16.95 | 2.06 |
| N | 9674 | |

*Note:* Descriptives for English ability and years in the United States only for first-generation students (n = 870).

**Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Key Variables by Race/Ethnicity-Immigrant Groups**

| | Asian | | | Hispanic | | | Black | | | Multiracial | | | White | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 1st | 2nd | 3rd | 1st | 2nd | 3rd |
| Sample | 379 | 408 | 63 | 311 | 426 | 557 | 45 | 76 | 1009 | 36 | 76 | 330 | 99 | 185 | 5595 |
| Does not participate in any sport | 0.46** (0.50) | 0.43** (0.50) | 0.27 (0.45) | 0.52** (0.50) | 0.39** (0.49) | 0.32** (0.47) | 0.36 (0.48) | 0.36* (0.48) | 0.29** (0.46) | 0.25 (0.44) | 0.34 (0.48) | 0.25 (0.43) | 0.35* (0.48) | 0.26 (0.44) | 0.25 (0.43) |
| Does not participate in any club | 0.39 (0.49) | 0.36* (0.48) | 0.46 (0.50) | 0.63** (0.48) | 0.59** (0.49) | 0.55** (0.50) | 0.51 (0.51) | 0.50 (0.50) | 0.50** (0.50) | 0.36 (0.49) | 0.51 (0.50) | 0.44 (0.50) | 0.51* (0.50) | 0.41 (0.49) | 0.41 (0.50) |
| Twelfth grade academic expectations (years) | 17.07** (2.34) | 17.22** (2.08) | 17.27** (1.94) | 15.80** (2.43) | 16.15** (2.33) | 16.13** (2.28) | 17.38** (2.37) | 17.63** (2.11) | 16.50 (2.30) | 17.22 (2.21) | 16.79 (1.88) | 16.20** (2.25) | 17.62** (2.11) | 16.87* (2.12) | 16.54 (2.14) |
| Tenth grade academic expectations (in years) | 17.22* (2.10) | 17.48** (1.91) | 17.56* (1.67) | 16.43** (2.07) | 16.84 (2.22) | 16.45** (2.21) | 17.59* (1.97) | 17.66** (1.96) | 16.89 (2.14) | 17.92** (1.66) | 17.19 (1.94) | 16.80 (2.18) | 17.42* (2.25) | 17.06 (1.99) | 16.95 (2.00) |

*Note:* ** p<0.01, * p<0.05 denotes value is statistically different from third generation white

**Table 3: Odds Ratios Estimating Nonparticipation in Intramural and Interscholastic Sports and Clubs**

| | Nonparticipation in sports | | Nonparticipation in clubs | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Female | 1.32** | 1.48** | 0.41** | 0.46** |
| | (0.07) | (0.08) | (0.02) | (0.03) |
| Family socioeconomic status (SES) | 0.69** | 0.73** | 0.72** | 0.83** |
| | (0.02) | (0.03) | (0.02) | (0.03) |
| *Race/Ethnicity-Immigration* | | | | |
| First–generation Asian | 1.67** | 1.58** | 0.95 | 1.10 |
| | (0.26) | (0.25) | (0.14) | (0.17) |
| Second–generation Asian | 2.10** | 1.99** | 0.67** | 0.75 |
| | (0.32) | (0.31) | (0.10) | (0.11) |
| Third–generation Asian | 1.11 | 0.94 | 1.70 | 1.83 |
| | (0.45) | (0.40) | (0.58) | (0.61) |
| First–generation Hispanic | 1.97** | 1.52** | 2.09** | 1.90** |
| | (0.30) | (0.24) | (0.30) | (0.29) |
| Second–generation Hispanic | 1.38* | 1.17 | 1.62** | 1.53** |
| | (0.21) | (0.18) | (0.23) | (0.22) |
| Third–generation Hispanic | 1.22 | 0.99 | 1.45** | 1.19 |
| | (0.16) | (0.12) | (0.17) | (0.14) |
| First–generation Black | 1.56 | 1.48 | 1.44 | 1.49 |
| | (0.48) | (0.52) | (0.61) | (0.59) |
| Second–generation Black | 1.74 | 1.44 | 2.15* | 1.77 |
| | (0.59) | (0.46) | (0.66) | (0.54) |
| Third–generation Black | 0.90 | 0.72** | 1.14 | 0.88 |
| | (0.09) | (0.07) | (0.11) | (0.09) |
| First–generation Multiracial | 0.60 | 0.55 | 0.68 | 0.65 |
| | (0.29) | (0.28) | (0.30) | (0.28) |
| Second–generation Multiracial | 1.55 | 1.38 | 1.99* | 1.98* |
| | (0.50) | (0.47) | (0.58) | (0.57) |
| Third–generation Multiracial | 0.85 | 0.69* | 1.15 | 0.97 |
| | (0.15) | (0.12) | (0.17) | (0.14) |
| First–generation White | 2.24** | 2.06* | 2.04* | 2.14** |
| | (0.67) | (0.67) | (0.57) | (0.61) |
| Second–generation White | 1.06 | 0.92 | 1.02 | 0.96 |
| | (0.23) | (0.21) | (0.21) | (0.20) |
| Third–generation White | — | — | — | — |
| (reference category) | — | — | — | — |
| Tenth grade GPA | | 0.65** | | 0.56** |
| | | (0.03) | | (0.02) |
| Parental strictness | | 0.81** | | 0.84** |
| | | (0.03) | | (0.03) |
| Currently employed | | 0.79** | | 0.96 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | (0.06) | | (0.06) |
| Health impedes school performance | | 0.89 | | 0.91 |
| | | (0.17) | | (0.17) |
| Age | | 1.04 | | 0.97 |
| | | (0.05) | | (0.05) |
| Number of siblings | | 1.04 | | 1.00 |
| | | (0.02) | | (0.02) |
| Parents married | | 0.89 | | 0.93 |
| | | (0.07) | | (0.06) |
| School sports offering | | 1.02** | | |
| | | (0.00) | | |
| Observations | 9,674 | 9,674 | 9,674 | 9,674 |

*Note:* All models weighted to account for sampling design. Standard errors in parentheses.
** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

**Table 4: Odds Ratios Estimating Nonparticipation in Intramural and Interscholastic Sports and Clubs Among First-Generation Youth**

| | Nonparticipation in sports | | Nonparticipation in clubs | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
| Female | 1.62* | 1.61* | 0.63* | 0.70 |
| | (0.32) | (0.32) | (0.12) | (0.14) |
| Family socioeconomic status (SES) | 0.81* | 0.78* | 0.76** | 0.81* |
| | (0.08) | (0.08) | (0.07) | (0.08) |
| *Race/Ethnicity-Immigration* | | | | |
| Asian | 0.80 | 0.75 | 0.50* | 0.51* |
| | (0.24) | (0.23) | (0.16) | (0.16) |
| Hispanic | 1.05 | 1.09 | 1.05 | 0.87 |
| | (0.34) | (0.35) | (0.34) | (0.28) |
| Black | 0.78 | 1.00 | 0.76 | 0.69 |
| | (0.32) | (0.42) | (0.37) | (0.33) |
| Multiracial | 0.28* | 0.31* | 0.38 | 0.37 |
| | (0.14) | (0.15) | (0.21) | (0.21) |
| White (reference category) | — | — | — | — |
| | — | — | — | — |
| English ability (ESL) | | 0.90 | | 1.41 |
| | | (0.21) | | (0.33) |
| Years in the United States | | 1.00 | | 1.01 |
| | | (0.02) | | (0.02) |
| Tenth grade GPA | | 0.99 | | 0.69** |
| | | (0.14) | | (0.09) |
| Parental strictness | | 1.08 | | 0.95 |
| | | (0.15) | | (0.14) |
| Currently employed | | 0.77 | | 1.33 |
| | | (0.20) | | (0.36) |
| Health impedes school performance | | 1.65 | | 0.36 |
| | | (1.75) | | (0.41) |
| Age | | 0.93 | | 1.01 |
| | | (0.12) | | (0.12) |
| Number of siblings | | 1.07 | | 1.00 |
| | | (0.06) | | (0.06) |
| Parents married | | 1.34 | | 0.98 |
| | | (0.35) | | (0.23) |
| School sports offering | | 1.05** | | |
| | | (0.01) | | |
| N | 870 | 870 | 870 | 870 | 870 |

*Note:* All models weighted to account for sampling design. Standard errors in parentheses.
** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.

**Table 5: OLS Regression Models Estimating Twelfth Grade Academic Expectations as a Function of Nonparticipation in Sports and Clubs**

| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nonparticipation in any sport | -0.62** | -0.49** | -0.34** | -0.25** |
| | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.05) |
| Nonparticipation in any club | -0.96** | -0.66** | -0.44** | -0.32** |
| | (0.06) | (0.06) | (0.05) | (0.05) |
| Female | | 0.57** | 0.36** | 0.19** |
| | | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.05) |
| Family socioeconomic status (SES) | | 0.70** | 0.46** | 0.33** |
| | | (0.03) | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| *Race/Ethnicity-Immigration* | | | | |
| First–generation Asian | | 1.01** | 0.73** | 0.56** |
| | | (0.17) | (0.15) | (0.14) |
| Second–generation Asian | | 0.83** | 0.52** | 0.35** |
| | | (0.12) | (0.11) | (0.11) |
| Third–generation Asian | | 0.39 | 0.11 | -0.02 |
| | | (0.28) | (0.31) | (0.32) |
| First–generation Hispanic | | 0.32* | 0.37* | 0.25 |
| | | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.13) |
| Second–generation Hispanic | | 0.51** | 0.53** | 0.35** |
| | | (0.15) | (0.13) | (0.12) |
| Third–generation Hispanic | | 0.00 | 0.29* | 0.31** |
| | | (0.13) | (0.13) | (0.11) |
| First–generation Black | | 1.59** | 1.61** | 1.19** |
| | | (0.34) | (0.36) | (0.34) |
| Second–generation Black | | 1.30** | 1.60** | 1.27** |
| | | (0.33) | (0.32) | (0.33) |
| Third–generation Black | | 0.49** | 0.87** | 0.66** |
| | | (0.09) | (0.09) | (0.09) |
| First–generation Multiracial | | 0.87 | 0.95* | 0.46 |
| | | (0.48) | (0.46) | (0.46) |
| Second–generation Multiracial | | 0.66 | 0.62 | 0.45 |
| | | (0.37) | (0.38) | (0.38) |
| Third–generation Multiracial | | -0.11 | 0.11 | 0.04 |
| | | (0.14) | (0.13) | (0.12) |
| First–generation White | | 1.44** | 1.28** | 1.03** |
| | | (0.25) | (0.25) | (0.21) |
| Second–generation White | | 0.32 | 0.33 | 0.30 |
| | | (0.21) | (0.20) | (0.19) |
| Tenth grade GPA | | | 0.81** | 0.57** |
| | | | (0.04) | (0.04) |
| Parental strictness | | | 0.09* | 0.02 |
| | | | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Currently employed | | | -0.04 | -0.04 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | (0.06) | (0.06) |
| Health impedes school performance | | | 0.20 | 0.18 |
| | | | (0.19) | (0.20) |
| Age | | | -0.17** | -0.13** |
| | | | (0.05) | (0.04) |
| Number of siblings | | | -0.05** | -0.05** |
| | | | (0.02) | (0.02) |
| Parents married | | | -0.03 | -0.01 |
| | | | (0.06) | (0.06) |
| School sports offering | | | 0.01** | 0.01** |
| | | | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Tenth grade academic expectation | | | | 0.36** |
| | | | | (0.01) |
| Constant | 17.00** | 16.38** | 15.90** | 10.31** |
| | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.81) | (0.79) |
| N | 9,674 | 9,674 | 9,674 | 9,674 |
| R-squared | 0.07 | 0.17 | 0.25 | 0.34 |

*Note:* All models weighted to account for sampling design. Standard errors in parentheses.
** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$.