



The Journal of Higher Education >

Volume 90, 2019 - Issue 6

1,571 | 13

Views | CrossRef citations to date | Altmetric

Articles

Postsecondary Education Impact on Intergenerational Income Mobility: Differences by Completion Status, Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and Type of Major

Marlena Creusere , Hengxia Zhao, Stephanie Bond Huie & David R. Troutman

Pages 915-939 | Received 04 Sep 2018, Accepted 04 Jan 2019, Published online: 31 Jan 2019

Cite this article <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2019.1565882>

Sample our
Education
Journals
**>> Sign in here to start your access
to the latest two volumes for 14 days**

Full Article

Figures & data

References

Citations

Metrics

Reprints & Permissions

Read this article

Share

ABSTRACT

This study examined intergenerational mobility among former students of The University of Texas System ($n = 98,199$) by comparing parental household income while the students were in college to students' income five years after exiting the system. The proportion of students who experienced upward mobility relative to their parents were estimated, using a combination of rank-rank slopes, transition matrices, and logistic regression. The results indicated that parental income and college completion are the most important of the studied factors in determining upward mobility. The majority of completers from the bottom two parental income quintiles displayed upward mobility within a few years of graduation, and among students from the bottom quintile, over half of noncompleters also had higher incomes relative to their parents.

Differences in mobility rates on the basis of gender, race/ethnicity, type of major, institution type, and financial aid type were also explored.

KEYWORDS:

Intergenerational mobility transition matrices rank-rank logistic regression education gender
race/ethnicity major

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Correction Statement

This article has been republished with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

Notes

1. Wage records for former students with a value of zero were also excluded, as the Texas Workforce Commission data did not allow determination of when these values represented true zero earnings versus missing data. Parental income did include zero adjusted gross income.
2. STEM majors were defined as programs in natural resources and conservation, engineering, biology and life sciences, health, physical sciences, computers, statistics, and mathematics.
3. Underrepresented minority (URM) students were defined as individuals who self-identified as African American (including multiracial), Hawaiian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or Native American. Non-underrepresented minority (Non-URM) students were self-identified as Asian or White.

People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by
13

Information for

Authors

R&D professionals

Editors

Librarians

Societies

Opportunities

Reprints and e-prints

Advertising solutions

Accelerated publication

Corporate access solutions

Open access

Overview

Open journals

Open Select

Dove Medical Press

F1000Research

Help and information

Help and contact

Newsroom

All journals

Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources
by email

 Sign me up

  

  

Copyright © 2026 Informa UK Limited Privacy policy Cookies Terms & conditions

Accessibility

 Taylor and Francis Group

Registered in England & Wales No. 01072954
5 Howick Place | London | SW1P 1WG