

# The Effects of College Desegregation on Academic Achievement and Students' Social Interactions: Evidence from Turnstile Data

Tatiana Velasco Rodriguez\*

November, 2021

[Most recent version here](#)

## Abstract

How does the desegregation of elite schools impact academic achievement? And does desegregation affect students' interactions with different types of peers within their school? In this paper, I study a natural experiment at an elite university in Colombia where the number of low-income students tripled as a result of the introduction of the financial aid program *Ser Pilo Paga*. I exploit variation in changes in the percentage of low-income students across degree majors and within entry cohorts to measure the effects of exposure to desegregation on students' achievement. The average increase in the percentage of low-income peers –9.5 percentage points– had modest to null impacts on wealthy students' academic performance. I shed light on the mechanisms behind this lack of peer effects by studying changes in social interactions using data on students' co-movements across campus captured by turnstiles located at all entrances. Desegregation led to increased connections between wealthy and low-income students. At least half of the increase in interactions between wealthy and low-income students, however, is explained by interactions of wealthy students with low-income but high-achieving students. These results are consistent with a theoretical framework where students diversify their interactions primarily among students within similar academic achievement levels.

---

\*Teachers College, Columbia University. e-mail: tv2225@tc.columbia.edu.

I am grateful to my advisers Peter Bergman and Jordan Matsudaira for their guidance throughout this project. I also thank Sarah Cohodes, Alex Eble, Judith Scott-Clayton, Tomás Rodríguez-Barraquer and Román Andrés Zárate for their feedback and comments throughout different stages of this project. I am deeply indebted to Tomás Rodríguez-Barraquer for sharing his survey data on students' networks. This paper would not have been possible without the support of the staff at the university I study; I especially thank Yenni Constanza Amon, Claudia Meza and Carolina Salguero for their support in accessing the data. In addition, I am grateful for the comments of Maria José Álvarez, Catalina Franco, Elise Marifian, Angelo Mele, Isabela Munevar, Viviana Rodríguez, Fabio Sánchez, and the seminar participants at the NEUDC 2021, the 2020 AEFPP, and the 2020 APPAM Conferences, and the Economics and Education Research Seminar at Columbia University. Tito Andrés Gutierrez and Juan Ernesto Sánchez provided excellent research assistance. Funding for this project was generously provided by the NAEd/Spencer dissertation fellowship. All errors are my own.

# 1 Introduction

The segregation of students by socio-economic status, race, or ethnicity is a pervasive issue in education. At the post-secondary level, policymakers have implemented financial aid and affirmative action programs that foster access to selective institutions for low-income and underrepresented groups. Prior research has shown the positive impacts that attending selective institutions has on achievement and employment outcomes of students affected by these programs (Chetty et al., 2020; Hoekstra, 2009; Londoño-Velez, Rodriguez and Sanchez, 2020; Bleemer, 2021*b*; Black, Denning and Rothstein, 2020). One consequence of these policies is that they may exacerbate achievement gaps within institutions, particularly if benefited students struggle to perform as well as their classmates, leading to potentially negative peer effects (Arcidiacono, Lovenheim and Zhu, 2015). Moreover, researchers have found these changes in achievement composition may lead to segregation in social interactions between high- and low-performing students within a group (Carrell, Sacerdote and West, 2013). However, diversifying social interactions is desirable because it could improve the quality of employment particularly for low-income and minority students (Marmaros and Sacerdote, 2002; Zimmerman, 2019), and it can drive positive changes on students' pro-social preferences (Rao, 2019; Boisjoly et al., 2006). In this paper I ask, what are the effects of desegregation on academic achievement? And, can college desegregation diversify students' social interactions?

To answer this, I use a natural experiment at a large elite college in Colombia that experienced a sharp and unexpected increase in the enrollment of low-income students, caused by the introduction of a nationwide financial aid program known as *Ser Pilo Paga* (SPP). To measure social interactions, I assemble a novel database of over a hundred million records of students' movements across campus as recorded by turnstiles guarding all campus entrances. I develop a measure to identify which students socialize with one another based on how commonly I observed them entering and exiting campus buildings together, and I validate it against a survey where students listed their friends and acquaintances. I combine these data

with student-level records on course enrollment and academic achievement and persistence. I find that the increased exposure to low-income students significantly increases the interactions between wealthy and low-income peers, with no adverse effects on the achievement of the wealthy students.

In October of 2014, the Colombian government launched *Ser Pilo Paga*, a policy that targeted low-income students with outstanding academic achievement to promote their attendance to high-quality universities in the country. The program consisted of a loan that covered 100 percent of the tuition cost plus a small stipend for living expenses. The loan was forgiven upon completion of the degree. *Ser Pilo Paga* induced an influx in the number of low-income students enrolled at high-quality private universities in the country, closing the socio-economic enrollment gap among high achievers (Londoño-Velez, Rodriguez and Sanchez, 2020). This paper focuses on one large private university, where the number of low-income students enrolled tripled in the Spring of 2015 due to SPP, while leaving the number of wealthy students enrolled unaffected. Because of the short timing of the policy, universities and wealthy students had no time to adjust their application and admission criteria in ways driven by their preferences for low-income peers. As opposed to the U.S., in Colombia, individuals apply to a college and a major in that college, and students enroll directly in their major of application. Thus, the policy induced plausibly random variation in the share of low-income peers across majors and entry cohorts, which I use to capture wealthy students' exposure to low-income peers.

My empirical analysis leverages the plausibly random variation in the percentage of low-income peers within each major and entry cohort to capture the effects of exposure to low-income peers on students' achievement and social interactions. My analytic sample focuses on the entry cohorts right before and after the introduction of SPP (2014 vs. 2015). I conduct tests demonstrating my research design is robust to potential identification threats such as self-selection or crowding out of students from certain majors and entry cohorts, differences in exposure to low-income students due to courses compositions, and measurement error in

the turnstile-elicited social interaction outcomes.

I start by discussing the findings on the effects of exposure to desegregation on academic achievement and persistence in college. I find significantly positive yet modest impact of exposure on the number of credits attempted by the first and third terms of college (terms are equivalent to academic semesters), which did not persist to the sixth term. Moreover, I do not find impacts on GPA. The average increase in the percentage of low-income peers by major-cohort induced by SPP was 9.5 percentage points, which led to 0.02 and 0.1 more credits attempted by wealthy students by the first and third term, respectively. Both of these are equivalent to 0.04 standard deviations relative to the pre-SPP distribution. These effects are very small, considering one single course at Elite University averages three credits, and students are required to take about five courses each term. Regarding college persistence, I find a significantly positive but small impact on the probability of dropout of 0.2 percentage points – equivalent to 0.06 standard deviations relative to the pre-SPP dropout rate distribution. This impact does not match up with changes in the probability of graduation in eight terms (graduation on time), where there is no effect. Plus, I do not find evidence of differential impacts for students exposed to larger shares of low-income peers – i.e., at the top 25 percent of the distribution (equivalent to  $> 30$  percent of low-income peers), or evidence suggesting adverse peer effects due to the lower average achievement of low-income students.

My findings on the effects of exposure to desegregation indicate modest to null impacts on achievement and persistence. Such results could be explained by a lack of interactions between wealthy and low-income students. Wealthy and low-income students may be avoiding interactions with each other if they prefer to keep their interactions with others similar to themselves in their academic performance and socio-economic levels (a.k.a. *homophily*). However, exposure to larger shares of low-income peers should lead to more interactions with them by virtue of their increased presence in the group. Moreover, wealthy students may anticipate positive impacts on pro-social preferences and behaviors from diversifying

their social interactions (Rao, 2019; Boisjoly et al., 2006). The second part of my empirical analysis examines whether changes in exposure to the low-income changed the diversity of social interactions.

I examine the effect that the increased exposure to low-income peers had on the number of turnstile-elicited links between wealthy and low-income students and on the probability of a wealthy student forming a link with a low-income peer. A pair of students is linked if they co-move through the turnstiles in a time-window of three seconds or less, in the same direction (entering or exiting a building), and at least twice in a term.<sup>1</sup> Wealthy students have on average 5.2 links in their major and cohort and before SPP, only an average of 0.24 of those were with low-income peers, while almost 5 were with other wealthy peers. Overall, the probability of a link with a low-income was 0.19. The 9.5 percentage points increase in low-income peers led by SPP, increased the links between wealthy and low-income peers by 0.29 and increased the probability of a wealthy student having any link with a low-income by 0.07 points. This means the number of links with the low-income more than doubled (120 percent increase), while the probability of having any link with a low-income increased in 37 percent. Notably, the increased exposure to low-income peers led to reductions in the number and probability of links between wealthy students, albeit the size of the effects was small (0.08 and 0.005 standard deviations, respectively). Next, I examine the effect of exposure to low-income peers on the overall composition of wealthy students' social connections. The 9.5 percentage points increase in the percentage of low-income peers increases the percentage of links with the low-income in 6.8 percentage points (equivalent to 0.6 standard deviations on the pre-SPP cohort).

Importantly, I find large and significantly positive effects on the number and the probability of links with the low-income for students exposed to shares of low-income peers at the top 25 percent of the distribution, suggesting the positive impacts of exposure on the diversity of interactions between wealthy and low-income students persisted among the groups

---

<sup>1</sup>Appendix A describes the process through which I arrived to this definition and its limitations in terms of measurement error.

with the most considerable changes in the composition of students.

Results to this point indicate wealthy students have significantly more connections with low-income students, without having that affecting their academic achievement. One hypothesis explaining this is that wealthy students form links with low-income students whose academic performance matches or exceeds the performance of the wealthy students in the group. This would explain the positive impacts on the diversity of social interactions and a lack of negative effects on achievement. To test for this, I identify low-income students with an academic performance equal or above the average of the performance of wealthy students in the major and entry cohort, and estimate the effect that exposure to more low-income peers has on the number of interactions with the low-income high-achieving students. I find that about half on the increased number in interactions with low-income students are with students whose academic performance –as measured by their high school exit exam scores, and first term GPA and credits attempted, is at least equal to the average performance of wealthy students. That is, 0.15 of the 0.29 increase in links between wealthy and low-income students is with low-income students whose performance is above the average performance of the wealthy students in the major and entry cohort. These results suggest wealthy students are more likely to form links with low-income peers, if the latter are high achievers among the wealthy.

This study makes two contributions to the literature. First, my paper documents the causal impacts of desegregation on the academic achievement of privileged students at elite colleges. Other scholars have examined the effects of exposure to minorities on White and Asian students' performance finding somewhat conflicting results. Namely, Arcidiacono and Vigdor (2010) use quasi-random variation in the share of minority students across entry cohorts at selective U.S. colleges finding negative effects, and Bleemer (2021*a*) examines the impact of re-segregation (i.e., ending an affirmative action policy in California), on White and Asian students performance finding no effects. My findings contrast with Arcidiacono and Vigdor (2010) by showing that increases in the exposure to underrepresented students

at elite schools have no effect on the privileged students’ performance and, if anything, can lead to modest improvements in early outcomes. My results are also complementary to those of Bleemer (2021*a*) by showing that the opposite –inducing desegregation through financial aid policies targeted to the low-income, has no impact on the achievement of privileged students either. Moreover, my findings align with previous evidence from K–12 settings which have found no effect of desegregation policies on the academic achievement of students traditionally attending these institutions (Angrist and Lang, 2004; Dobbie and Fryer, 2014).<sup>2</sup>

Second, my study shows how students’ social interactions at elite colleges change at the outset of financial aid and affirmative action policies fostering desegregation. While prior research has consistently found positive impacts on the college attainment of under-represented students benefiting from financial aid and affirmative action programs (Bleemer, 2020; Chetty et al., 2020; Londoño-Vélez, Rodriguez and Sanchez, 2020; Mello, 2021), I provide novel evidence on how social interactions change under desegregation policies. Findings of Michelman, Price and Zimmerman (2020) and Zimmerman (2019) indicate low-income and minority students tend to not make part of privileged students’ social clubs even if they share the same college environment, which may explain the somewhat slower or lacking social mobility among low-income students attending elite institutions. My findings show social interactions between wealthy and low-income students do form in the outset of desegregation, which may have other positive ramifications in social mobility of low-income students and on pro-social behaviors of the wealthy ones (Rao, 2019; Boisjoly et al., 2006; Londoño-Vélez, 2020).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>Angrist and Lang (2004) studied the effect of a desegregation program in Boston on the academic achievement of the students traditionally attending the receiving schools, finding no significant impact; a similar study by Dobbie and Fryer (2014) focuses on students eligible to attend schools with high achieving peers and finds no impacts on the achievement of either group.

<sup>3</sup>My work is closely aligned to that of Londoño-Vélez (2020), who studied the effect of socio-economic diversity at an elite college in Colombia on students’ redistribute preferences. In this work, Londoño-Vélez finds positive impacts of exposure on wealthy students’ preferences - a result that seems to be related to more interactions with low-income peers. My work validates the latter finding while pointing out that the change in social interactions is relatively small.

Lastly, this paper also connects to the literature examining diversity in schooling settings and its effects on segregation in social networks. This research has examined the process under which friendships form in college settings and has relied on proxies of social interactions such as email exchanges (Marmaros and Sacerdote, 2006) or Facebook friendships (Baker, Mayer and Puller, 2011). Evidence coincides in that peers’ proximity and peers’ race are determinants of friendship formation. Namely, students assigned to the same dorm are more likely to be connected, but the chances are higher for same-race students.<sup>4</sup> My study uses a different dimension of proximity which is being in the same major and entry-cohort. My findings indicate that proximity through majors and cohorts group is determinant for students interactions. A related sub-stream of research has focused on measuring overall segregation in social interaction and on studying how policies can reduce within-group segregation in K-12 settings, finding no association between who students interact with and academic achievement (Echenique, Fryer and Kaufman, 2006), and finding non-linear responses in interactions to scenarios of minorities reallocation across schools (Mele, 2020).<sup>5</sup> My findings show consistently positive impacts on the diversity of interactions at the major-cohort level of exposure and show that changes in interactions through changes in exposure do not lead to impacts on academic achievement.

## 2 Background and Setting

In this paper, I examine the effect of a socio-economic desegregation policy on students’ academic achievement and social interactions. Specifically, I study the case of a large private

---

<sup>4</sup>Marmaros and Sacerdote (2006) examine how people form social networks with their peers. They use emails exchange data from students and find that first-year students form friendships with students in the proximity and are more likely to form friendships with peers of the same race. Baker, Mayer and Puller (2011) use data from Facebook and random dorm assignment at one college and finds exposure to different races via dorms leads to more diverse friendships.

<sup>5</sup>(Echenique, Fryer and Kaufman, 2006) measure within-school segregation as the extent to which students interact socially with other students from the same race. Mele (2017) develops a structural model of friendship formation among students, and Mele (2020) use it to simulate reallocation programs across schools and examine its impacts on within school friendship formation. His findings suggest that policies that reallocate students by parental income have less impact on racial segregation within schools.



university located in Bogotá, Colombia (from now on *Elite University*<sup>6</sup>), which in 2015 experienced a large and unexpected increase in the number of low-income students enrolled, while keeping the enrollment of relatively wealthy students constant. The increase was driven by *Ser Pilo Paga* (SPP) – a forgivable loan program for high-achieving low-income students who wished to attend a high-quality university. Importantly, the increased enrollment of low-income students varied across the thirty-one degree majors offered at Elite University. In my research design, I focus on relatively wealthy students and compare students from the entry cohorts before and after SPP (2014 vs. 2015). I use the change in the number of low-SES students across degree majors as the treatment. In this section, I explain the context of SPP and Elite University where the natural experiment took place.

Higher education in Colombia is strongly segregated by socio-economic background. High-quality private universities have exceedingly expensive tuition rates relative to average salaries in the country; supply of public university seats is stagnant; and financial aid is scant (Marta Ferreyra et al. 2017). These factors led students to sort across colleges by socio-economic status (Camacho, Messina and Uribe, 2017). SPP aimed to combat this segregation by providing low-income students a loan that covered tuition plus a small allowance for attending a high-quality accredited institution.<sup>7</sup> The loan was forgiven conditional on completion of the degree. Eligibility to SPP required that students were classified as poor under the governments' index of household wealth, and scored in the top ten percentile of the national high school exit exam SABER 11.<sup>8</sup> SPP awarded loans for new cohorts of students between 2015 and 2018 benefiting about 40,000 students nationwide. Previous research has

---

<sup>6</sup>This is a made-up name. I do not provide the real name of the university I study for confidentiality reasons.

<sup>7</sup>The high-quality accreditation is granted to higher education institutions by the National Council of Accreditation. It is granted after a detailed review from a panel formed by the Institution, the academic community, and the Council. By 2014, the year of the first round of SPP, 32 universities in Colombia had high-quality accreditation.

<sup>8</sup>The household's index of wealth is known as SISBEN and it is based on the census survey targeted to household previously screened as potentially poor. Londoño-Velez, Rodriguez and Sanchez (2020) provide more details about how SISBEN was used to screen SPP eligible students. SABER 11 is a requirement for all students in the country who are about to complete their high school education. The exam is applied twice a year, following the two academic calendar of schools in the country: January – November and August – June.

found SPP increased diversity at top private universities by making the selection mechanism based more on ability than on income (Londoño-Velez, Rodriguez and Sanchez, 2020).

The timing of SPP and the admission rules at Elite University set the conditions of the natural experiment I exploit in my research design. First, admissions to Elite University are open for the Spring and Fall term of each year and are determined by the applicant’s score in the SABER 11 standardized test. Students must apply to a degree major<sup>9</sup> and entry cohort for which admission officers had pre-determined a specific SABER 11 weighting formula<sup>10</sup> and cutoff score. Second, SPP was widely unexpected by students and higher education institutions. SPP was launched in October of 2014 and only students who had taken that October’s test were eligible. Candidates had to apply for enrollment in the following Spring of 2015, for which 10,000 forgivable loans were offered. Thus, students who traditionally applied to Elite University had very little time to change their application portfolio and university officers could not adjust the admission criteria to limit the influx of admitted and eventually enrolled students. As a result, the number of middle- and high-income students enrolled in 2015 remained similar to that from 2014, but the number of low-income students increased significantly.

Figure 1 depicts the first-term enrollment trends by socio-economic status (SES) at Elite University. Between 2012 and 2014, less than 150 first-term students came from low-SES backgrounds. Once the first cohort of SPP beneficiaries enrolled, the number of low-SES students tripled to 541, while the number of students from other socio-economic backgrounds remained almost the same. Figure 2 compares the number of low-SES students across majors, in the entry cohorts before and after SPP. Red bars depict the number of low-income students in the cohort right before SPP (i.e., 2014), whereas blue bars depict the number of low-income students in the first cohort of SPP (i.e., 2015). The variation in the

---

<sup>9</sup>As opposed to the U.S., applicants to higher education must apply to a major for degree as well to as a college.

<sup>10</sup>The SABER 11 is made of five modules which are given different weights depending on the major of application. For example, for admission to engineering majors, quantitative reasoning is assigned a higher weight than the social sciences module

number of low-SES students is important. Majors such as Business and Music experienced virtually no change in the number of low-SES students, while others like Civil Engineering or Psychology experienced a notable increase.

To examine whether SPP led to crowding out of wealthy students by new incoming low-income peers, I plot in the secondary axis of Figure 2 the percentage change in the number of wealthy students (i.e., Middle- and High-SES) in 2015, relative to the 2014 cohort, and for each major. If the increase in the number of low-income students across majors had led to crowding out of the wealthy students traditionally attending these programs, then the percentage change in the number of wealthy students should decrease as the number of low-income students increases. Similarly, majors with virtually no change in the number of low-income students should show no percentage change in the number of wealthy students. However, neither of those is the case. Visual inspection of Figure 2 shows that the percentage change in the number of wealthy students enrolled in each major from 2014 to 2015 is not associated with the increase in the number of low-income students.

### 3 Data

The data for this paper comes from two sources: administrative records from Elite University, and detailed records from turnstiles located in each of the 18 access points to Elite University campus.

*Elite University administrative records.* I use records from all students enrolled at Elite University between 2012 and 2018 which contained student-course level data on student characteristics (i.e. sex, age, mother’s education, High School ID), SABER 11 standardized test scores, SPP recipient status, selected degree major, entry cohort and term of enrollment. For each semester, I observe each of the courses in which the student is enrolled and their course GPA. More importantly, I observe the student’s household social strata indicator. This indicator has six categories which are used to provide homes with subsidies in utility

bills. Plus, it is also widely known in the country as a proxy of social status. I use the household social strata to classify students in three socio-economic status (SES): middle- and high-SES – which I will refer to as relatively wealthy students, and low-income students. low-income are students from strata one and two, middle-SES are students from strata three and four, and high-SES are students from strata five and six. Students benefiting from SPP mostly fall in the low-income category. As depicted in Figure 1, the majority of students at Elite University are classified as high- and middle-SES.

*Turnstile records.* I use records on student access and exits to Elite University campus to identify students’ social interactions. Elite University campus is guarded by turnstiles located at the 18 entrances to main buildings and campus areas. In order to enter or exit through any of these entrances students and university staff must tap their University ID. Security officers at Elite University provided me individual-level records of University ID taps on the turnstiles from February 1st, 2016 to November 1st, 2019. These records include student ID number, entrance, action (IN or OUT of campus), and the date, hour, minute and second of the tap. Figure 9 displays a heat map of the average frequency of student ID taps at each of the 18 entrances to campus by 20 minutes blocks and for each academic term since the Spring of 2016. Yellow cells and blue cells indicate peak and off-peak hours respectively. The figure documents the constant flow of students across the campus entrances throughout the day, with peak hours at times of class change as well as during lunch hours.

I define a pair of students as linked when their IDs are tapped at a turnstile in a time window of three seconds or less, in the same entrance and direction (either entering or exiting campus), and when I observed the same pair of IDs co-moving at least twice in a semester. Appendix A describes the data validation process for this definition.

*Sample.* My analytic sample consist of all the first-term students in the entry cohorts before and after SPP (i.e. Fall and Spring of 2014 and 2015). I search for their interactions during the 6th and 7th calendar semesters after their first-term of enrollment, and among students in the same entry-cohort and degree major. For example, I match students in the

entry cohort of Spring of 2014 with their interactions as captured by the turnstiles during the Fall of 2016 and the Spring of 2017. I merge administrative records and pairwise-level students' interactions data using the student ID number which is available in both data sources. My final sample consist of 5,955 students across 31 degree majors and 4 entry cohorts. This sample captures the universe of students enrolled in these majors and cohorts except for two majors (Government, and the Directed Studies major) which started after SPP.

*Student characteristics:* Table 1 provides descriptive statistics of wealthy and low-income students in the pre- and post-SPP entry cohorts (i.e., 2014 vs. 2015). I divide the sample between relatively wealthy students – that is, middle-SES and high-SES students, and low-income students, before and after the implementation of SPP (i.e., 2014 vs. 2015). The table includes the mean differences between low-income and wealthy students. In 2015, 81 percent of low-income students at Elite University were SPP recipients. About half of wealthy students are middle-SES students. In both cohorts, wealthy students are more likely to be females, are slightly older and with mothers more educated than low-income students. Also, wealthy students have higher SB11 test scores than low-income ones, and the gap increases and becomes statistically significant among the 2015 cohort. The gap in SB11 test scores between wealthy and low-income students was 0.10 standard deviations in 2014, but increased to 0.26 standard deviations in 2015.

Wealthy students have on average more links than low-income peers with others in their major and entry cohort (5.21 vs. 4.94 links in 2014), and the difference becomes statistically significant among the 2015 cohort (5.53 vs. 4.60 links). Before SPP, the number of links with other low-income students is statistically the same among wealthy and low-income students (0.24 vs. 0.35, respectively). But, in 2015, wealthy students have significantly fewer links with other low-income than their low-income peers (0.59 vs. 1.73, respectively). Importantly, wealthy students have on average more peers from high school enrolling at Elite University in their same cohort than low-income students in both pre- and post-SPP

cohorts (11.54 vs. 3.17 in the 2014 and 11.73 and 1.98 in the 2015). There are no statistically significant differences between the number of ID taps at the turnstiles of wealthy and low-income students for either the 2014 or the 2015 entry cohorts.

Table 1 also describes the average characteristics of the links of both wealthy and low-income students. The characteristics of the links of wealthy and low-income students were statistically the same among the students in the 2014 cohort, except for the share of links from the same high school, which is larger among wealthy students (0.04 vs. 0.01). But in the 2015 cohort, wealthy students exhibit a larger share of same-gender links than low-income students (0.51 vs. 0.45 links), and have a larger SB11 test score difference with their links (0.79 vs. 0.67). The latter suggest wealthy students enrolling in 2015 exhibit less diversity in their social interactions in terms of certain demographics, but more in terms of pre-college academic achievement, relative to the low-income peers.

*Students' academic achievement:* I characterize the differences in academic achievement between wealthy and low-income students in Figure 3 and Figure 4. For these figures, I take advantage to the administrative data availability and plot the trends in academic achievement across the entry cohorts starting with 2012. For each cohort, I plot the average achievement outcome among wealthy and low-income students, and include the estimated 95 percent confidence interval based on clustered standard errors at the major and entry cohort level. The red line separates the entry cohorts before the start of SPP (left side) and the cohorts entering during SPP (right side). Figure 3 displays performance indicators, mainly cumulative GPA and total credits attempted, whereas Figure 4 describes persistence (dropout rates and graduation). I label a student as a dropout if they do not show up as enrolled during two consecutive terms after their fifth term of college. Similarly, I label a student as graduated if they completed their degree in eight terms or less. At Elite university, this is considered as graduation on time for all their degrees except medicine.

The cohort of wealthy and low-income students that enrolled Elite University at the outset of SPP (i.e., the 2015 entry cohort) exhibit significant achievement gaps, particularly

in their GPA and cumulative credits attempted, with low-income students having on average lower cumulative GPA and fewer attempted credits than their wealthy peers. For example, the GPA of pre-SPP cohorts is relatively constant and close to 3.85 for both wealthy and low-income students. But for the SPP cohort, the GPA of low-income students drops to 3.75 in their first term of college and to 3.6 by their third term of college, while the GPA of wealthy students remains the same. Regarding the cumulative number of credits attempted the pre-SPP cohorts of wealthy and low-income students have attempted on average 50 and 48 credits by the third term, respectively. But in the SPP cohort, low-income students have on average attempted 45.7 credits while wealthy students attempted the same number of credits. A course at Elite University usually bears 3 credits. This means that low-income students enrolling in 2015 had attempted on average at least one class less than their wealthy students peers by the third term of college, and with a cumulative GPA that is 0.25 below that of their wealthy peers. Nevertheless, the differences in achievement did not paired with differences in dropout or graduation rates, suggesting the relatively low achievement of low-income students did not translate in diminished persistence.<sup>11</sup>

## 4 Identification Strategy

In this paper, I use a difference-in-differences strategy to examine the impact of increased exposure to low-income students' academic achievement and social interactions. In particular, I focus on the impacts on wealthy students, and I exploit the variations in the percentage of low-income students enrolling in each cohort and across the different majors at Elite University. Specifically, I estimate:

$$Outcome_i^{mc} = \beta_l R_{mc}^l + \mathbf{X}_i' B + \beta_m + \beta_c + \varepsilon_{imc} \quad (1)$$

---

<sup>11</sup>Importantly, graduation rates in less than eight terms are very small at Elite University across all groups as many students tend to take extra semesters to course minor degrees or to double major with other degree. low-income students benefiting from SPP and other financial aid programs tend to be constrained in that they do not get financed for terms beyond those scheduled in their major curriculum, which explains their slightly higher likelihood of graduation.

In equation 1  $Outcome_i^{mc}$  represents either the academic achievement outcome of a relatively wealthy student  $i$  enrolled in majors  $m$  and entry cohort  $c$  or the number of links of the student with other low-income peers.  $R_{mc}^l$  is the percentage of low-income students in student  $i$  majors and entry cohort i.e.,  $R_{mc}^l = \frac{N_{mc}^l}{N_{mc}} * 100$  where  $N_{mc}^l$  is the number of low-income students and  $N_{mc}$  is the total number of students enrolled in student  $i$  major  $m$  and entry cohort  $c$ . Figure 2 describes the variation exploited for causal identification. Namely, the percentage of low-income students  $R_{mc}^l$  across majors  $m$  increased for the 2015 entry cohorts and relative to the 2014 entry cohorts at different rates across majors, without leading to crowding out of wealthy students. Equation 1 includes controls for student  $i$  characteristics that can determine the relation between the exposure to low-income students, and achievement and social interactions. Specifically,  $\mathbf{X}_i$  is a matrix of female indicators, age in years at the start of college, Mother's with no college education, SB11 score, and middle-SES indicators.  $\beta_m$  and  $\beta_c$  capture major and entry cohort fixed effects, which absorb unobserved variation common to majors and to entry cohorts, respectively. Finally,  $\varepsilon_{imc}$  represents robust standard errors clustered at the major and entry cohort levels. I estimate Equation 1 using Ordinary Least Squares.

Identification of  $\beta_l$  relies on three assumptions: in the absence of the treatment, the outcomes exhibit the same trends for the treated and control groups (i.e., the parallel trends assumptions), there is no self-selection in exposure to low-income students within major-cohorts groups of students (i.e., unobserved exposure effects), and the measurement error in the turnstile-elicited links do not contain non-random variation confounding the effect of exposure to the low-income (i.e., measurement error in turnstile-elicited interactions). Table 2 summarizes the identification challenges and the exercises I conducted to assess them. The table conducts to the Figures and Appendix sections in which I provide details of the analyses conducted.

The parallel-trends assumption implies that any differences in the outcomes of wealthy students across majors and within entry cohorts can be attributed only to changes in exposure



to low-income peers, thus ensuring causality. Violations to this assumption imply there is non-random allocation of wealthy students across majors and entry cohorts driven by the change in the percentage of low-income peers. Specifically, at the outset of SPP, wealthy students could have self-selected in majors and entry cohorts due to their preferences for low-income peers. Alternatively, the influx in low-income students could have crowded out wealthy ones. I examine the trends in the outcomes and student characteristics using an event study to test for this.<sup>12</sup> Results are displayed in Figure 5 for student characteristics, and in Figure 6 and 7 for student academic achievement and persistence indicators. The estimated effects are the same across all the pre- and post-SPP entry cohorts. Thus, the results suggest that the allocation of wealthy students across majors and cohorts did not change, and its relation with the percentage of low-income peers in the group did not change with SPP. Coupled with the tight timing of the policy, which gave Elite University no time to adjust admission criteria in ways that would crowd out students based on their eligibility for admission (see Figure 2), I conclude there is no evidence indicating the parallel-trends assumption is violated in this context.

The second source of bias deals with unobserved exposure to low-income peers due to the composition of first-term courses taken by each wealthy student in a major and cohort. Exposure to low-income students operates not only through majors and cohorts but also in the classroom. Several of the courses offered to first-term students are open to multiple majors, which may lead to variations in exposure to low-income peers not accounted for by my initial difference-in-differences research design. For example, students at all the Engineering, Economics, and Business programs must take Differential Calculus in their first term. As a result, students in Business majors –which had virtually no change in the number of low-income students enrolled, may take Calculus with low-income peers from

---

<sup>12</sup>Namely, I estimate the following equation for both outcomes and student characteristics:

$$Y_{imc} = \sum_{c=2012}^{c=C} \mu_{lC} R_{m,c=C}^l + \mathbf{X}_i' M + \mu_m + \mu_c + \varepsilon_{imc}$$

other majors, thus being exposed to low-income students in ways not accounted for by the entry cohort and major variation captured by  $R_{mc}^l$ . If students within the same major and entry cohort differentially self-select to take specific first-term courses based on preferences for low-income peers, the estimated  $\beta_l$  could be biased even after accounting for unobserved variation common to majors and cohorts. I test for the presence of this bias by exploiting the within major-cohort variation in the number of low-income students at each of the wealthy students' first term courses. To ensure exogeneity, I instrument the number of low-income peers by its predicted allocation across courses based on courses enrollment data from 2012 and 2013. Appendix B describes the methodological details and results from this test. Overall, I do not find evidence that student selection of first-term courses is biasing my Difference-in-Differences estimates.

The last bias concern is measurement error in the turnstile-elicited interactions and the risk of capturing random co-movements across the turnstiles, thus falsely depicting the effects of exposure to low-income on students' social interactions. If turnstile-elicited interactions partially capture true social interactions, then those need to be on average representative of true interactions and cannot be biased due to the potential random noise in the measurement error. Moreover, the rate of false-positives and false-negatives (i.e., the likelihood of defining a pair of students as linked when in fact they are not; and the likelihood of defining a pair as not linked when in fact they are, respectively) cannot be determined by the exposure to low-income students  $R_{mc}^l$ . My definition of students' social links accounts for these possibilities and aims to minimize the rate of false-positives and negatives. Specifically, I use secondary data on the survey-elicited social interactions among one major-cohort group at Elite University to obtain estimates of the rates of false-positives and false-negatives under alternative turnstile-elicited links definitions.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup>The survey was conducted online between December 7, 2017, and January 5, 2018, and elicited the network among 110 economics students from the 2017 fall cohort. The survey was conducted using Qualtrics. Students who completed the survey received a free lunch voucher for a recognized chain restaurant of the campus area. Cárdenas et al. (2019) provide a detail description of the survey. I am very grateful to Professor Tomás Rodríguez-Barraquer for providing me access to these data.

Appendix A provides details on the secondary data and the computation framework and procedures I use to assess measurement error. I find that turnstile-elicited links suffer a relatively large rate of false-negatives of approximately 60 percent, but a rate of false-positives below the 10 percent (see Table 7). To assess the extent to which measurement error can diminish the quality of the turnstile-elicited interactions, I compare the average characteristics of turnstile-elicited links with those from survey-elicited links and with those obtained under a simulated scenario of turnstile-elicited links formed at random. Turnstile-elicited links compare well with survey-elicited links, albeit the large false-negatives rate. More importantly, the characteristics of turnstile-elicited links are statistically the same as those from the survey links, but different to those that would be obtained if links were obtained purely at random (see Figure 8). I rationalize measurement error in a difference-in-difference 2x2 framework that follows Goodmann-Bacon (2019) and Cunningham (2021). If the measurement error is associated with the exposure to low-income students in ways unobserved by the researchers, then the observed Average Treatment on the Treated (ATT) effect may differ from the true ATT. I proxy measurement error with the number of ID taps on the turnstiles and the number of courses taken with turnstile-elicited links. I do not find evidence of the change in the percentage of low-income peers affecting any of these measures (see Table 9). In summary, I do not find evidence that measurement error in turnstile-elicited interactions bias my estimates on the impacts of exposure.

## 5 Results

Table 3 displays the estimated effect of the increased exposure to low-income peers on relatively wealthy students' academic achievement and persistence. Panel A displays OLS estimates of  $\beta_l$  for all the outcomes discussed in Figures 3 and 4. The size of the estimated effect on wealthy students' achievement is modest and not statistically different to zero for GPA and graduation outcomes. The point estimates for the number of credits attempted by

first and third terms and for dropout probability by the 5th term are positive and statistically significant, but the size of the point estimate is small relative to the standard deviation of the variables. Namely, I estimate 0.02 additional credits attempted by the first term and 0.3 credits by the third term (0.04 standard deviations), and an increase in dropout probability 0.2 percentage points (0.06 standard deviations) when evaluated at the mean change  $\Delta mu(R_{mc}^l)=9.5$  percentage points. Importantly, the estimated effect on dropout does not pair with impacts on graduation probability, which are estimated to be zero. These results suggest the increased exposure to low-income peers has if anything a positive yet small impact on the academic achievement of wealthy students, albeit a small negative effect on persistence which has not translated on impacts on graduation.

Prior literature has found non-linear effects of peers on academic achievement (Garlick, 2018; Zimmerman, 2003). Hence, Panel B of Table 3 estimates the effect of exposure when the increased percentage is at the top 25th percentile of the distribution (i.e., use a indicator equal to one when the percentage of low-income peers exceeds 30 percent). I do not find evidence of non-linear effects, which suggest even students in groups with the largest shares of peers are not affected in their academic achievement.

In summary, I do not find evidence that exposure to low-income peers has negative impacts on the academic achievement of wealthy students and if anything, I find suggestive evidence of a positive impact on the number of credits attempted, albeit a small yet significant impact on academic persistence as measured by dropout probability by the 5th term of college. Importantly, the measures of persistence are relatively premature, as by the time of the data collection only few students had started to graduated (for example, graduation in 8 terms –which is considered graduation on time, was only at the 7 percent among wealthy students). Plus, my measure of dropout considers only college-level dropout as I am unable to see whether these students are enrolled at a different university, meaning transfers to other universities cannot be ruled out. Overall, my findings speak to prior literature finding no effects of desegregation on receiving students achievement in K-12 settings (Angrist and

Lang, 2004), and contradict some of the findings from higher education settings (Arcidiacono and Vigdor, 2010).

Exposure to low-achievers could impact the performance of wealthy students, even after accounting for the percentage of low-income students in the group. For example, low-achievers could also exhibit disruptive behaviors impacting wealthy students (Carrell, Hoekstra and Kuka, 2018), and they could reduce the incentives of wealthy students to exert effort. Figure 3 showed low-income students brought by SPP have a significantly lower academic achievement than their wealthy peers. Moreover, Table 1 showed incoming low-income students had on average a lower performance than wealthy students even before enrolling in college, as shown by their average SB11 score. To test this, I expand Equation 1 by including average measures of achievement of low-income peers, namely their average achievement outcome and their average SABER 11 test score. Specifically, I estimate:

$$Y_i^{mc} = \eta_{l2} R_{mc}^l + \eta_{SB11} S\tilde{B}11_{mc} + \mathbf{X}_i' H_2 + \eta_{2m} + \eta_{2c} + u_{2imc} \quad (2)$$

$$Y_i^{mc} = \eta_{l1} R_{mc}^l + \eta_{\tilde{Y}} \tilde{Y}_{mc} + \mathbf{X}_i' H_1 + \eta_{1m} + \eta_{1c} + u_{1imc} \quad (3)$$

As coined in the peer effects and Linear-in-Means-Models literature (Manski, 1993; Moffitt, 2001), Equation 2 captures the exogenous effect of low-income prior achievement on wealthy students performance, and Equation 3 captures the endogenous effect of low-income performance on wealthy students' performance—that is, the relation between the outcome of low-income peers with those of wealthy peers. Specifically,  $S\tilde{B}11_{mc} = \frac{\sum_{j \neq i}^N [SB11_j | W_j=0]}{N_{mc}^l}$ , and  $\tilde{Y}_{mc} = \frac{\sum_{j \neq i}^N [Y_j | W_j=0]}{N_{mc}^l}$  where  $W_j = 0$  if the peer  $j$  in student  $i$  major  $m$  and entry cohort  $c$  is low-income, and  $N_{mc}^l$  is the number of low-income students in student  $i$  major and entry cohort. Estimates of  $\eta_{SB11}$  and  $\eta_{\tilde{Y}}$  capture whether low-income students' SB11 test scores and academic achievement explain wealthy students' performance.

Table 4 displays the results of this analyses. Panel A displays results from estimating Equation 2. The estimates of  $\eta_{SB11}$  are different from zero in the case of first term credits

and for sixth term GPA, suggesting low-income peers' SB11 is positively associated with the number of credits attempted in the first term by wealthy students. However, the sign of the estimate inverts to negative in the sixth term. Panel B displays the results from 3. With the exception of first term credits attempted, the estimated  $\eta_{\bar{y}}$  is not different to zero for achievement and persistence outcomes. Overall, these results suggest the performance of low-income students has some relation with the number of credits attempted in the first term by wealthy students, but the effect disappears by subsequent terms. Specifically, SB11 test scores are positively associated with more credits attempted in the first term by wealthy students, by more credits attempted in the first term by low-income students has a negative association with those of wealthy students.

The estimated effects of exposure on the academic achievement of wealthy students may be small because of a lack of interactions between wealthy and low-income students. Findings from Carrell, Sacerdote and West (2013) suggest assignment of low-achieving students to groups can lead to segregation among high-achievers, which may have unintended consequences for both groups. Thus, if the low achievement of incoming low-income students leads to segregation across income groups, the potential impacts on academic achievement may be zero, and the effects other non-academic outcomes found by previous literature (Boisjoly et al., 2006; Rao, 2019) may be diminished or even absent. To test for this, I proceed to estimate the effects of exposure to low-income students on the diversity of social interactions of wealthy students.

Table 5 displays the results of estimating Equation 1 on wealthy students interactions with their peers. I measure three types of outcomes: the number of links of wealthy students with any of their peers, with other wealthy peers and with low-income peers in their major and entry cohort (Panel A); the probability of any link with wealthy or low-income peers (Panel B); and the proportion of links with low-income peers (Panel C). Panel A can be thought off as the impacts in the intensive margin i.e., the effect of exposure to low-income peers on the probability of an additional link, whereas panel B can be read as the impacts in

the extensive margin i.e., the effects of exposure on the probability of forming any link with low-income peers. Panel C can be read as the effects on friendships compositions relative to the size of low-income population in the group. Similar to the effects on achievement and persistence, Panel 1 of the table shows linear estimates following Equation 1, whereas Panel 2 shows non-linear estimates that compute the effects when exposure to low-income peers is at the top 25th percent of the distribution in 2015 (i.e., use a indicator equal to one when the percentage of low-income peers exceeds 30 percent).

Exposure to low-income peers has a positive impact on the diversity of interactions of wealthy peers. Focusing on Panel 1 of Table 5, I find that the average increase in the percentage of low-income peers (9.51 percentage points) augmented the number of links with low-income peers in 0.28 and reduced the number of links with other wealthy peers in 0.41 on average. Relative to the 2014 cohorts, this represents an 0.51 standard deviation (s.d.) increase in the number of links with low-income peers and an 0.08 s.d. decrease in the number of links with other wealthy peers. Importantly, the increased exposure to low-income peers did not affect the total number of links of wealthy students. Moreover, the estimated effects persist at the extensive margin. That is, the average increase in the percentage of low-income peers increased the probability of having a low-income link in 0.7 percentage points and decreased the probability of a link with another wealthy peer in 0.02 percentage points. Respectively, these are effects represent a 0.2 and 0.005 standard deviations change relative to the 2014 distribution. Lastly, I estimate the effect on the percentage of links with low-income students. A 9.5 percentage points increase in the percentage of low-income peers translates in a 6.8 percentage points increase in the percentage of links with the low-income. This is equivalent to a 0.6 s.d. effect relative to the outcomes of the 2014 cohorts.

The effects of exposure to low-income peers on the diversity of social interactions are significantly larger at the top 25th percentile of the distribution. Students who were exposed to shares of low-income peers over the 30 percent have 0.68 more low-income links, have an increase in the probability of having at least one low-income link of 1.2 percentage points,

and have an increase in the percentage of low-income links of 14.57 points. Hence, the positive effects on diversity of social interactions persist even for those students experiencing the largest exposure to low-income peers.

In summary, exposure to low-income students have significant and positive impacts on the diversity of social interactions of wealthy students, as measured by their number, probability and percentage of links with the low-income. Relative to the number of links from the pre-treatment period the effects are estimated to be about half standard deviation for the number and percentage of links with the low-income and 0.2 standard deviations for the probability of a link with a low-income. Importantly, my results are robust to alternative definitions of turnstile-elicited interactions as shown in Appendix C. Overall, these results are larger than those found by previous approaches in the literature that have measured the intensity of interactions across different race groups (Marmaros and Sacerdote (2006) and Boisjoly et al. (2006) find positive impacts on the intensity of interactions ranging between 0.06 and 0.35 standard deviations), but with the advantage that my definitions of social interactions account for the probability and the number of different links according to their socio-economic background.

## **6 The role of academic achievement in the diversity of social interactions**

In this section, I examine the role of academic performance in explaining the social interactions between wealthy and low-income students. To do so, I identify the low-income links of wealthy students whose performance is above the average of that of wealthy students in the major and entry cohort. My results suggest about half of the impact of exposure on the number of links with low-income peers is explained by links with high achievers. Plus, over 75 percent of the effect on the probability of interactions with low-incomes can be explained by the likelihood of interactions with high achieving low-income students.



Table 6 displays the results from this analysis. Similar to Table 5, I compute the effects of the changes in exposure to low-income students on the number and probability of a link with a low-income student who is also a high achiever in terms of: SB11 test scores, first term GPA, and total credits attempted in the first term. I consider a low-income student to be high achiever if their performance in the achievement variable is above the average of that of the wealthy students in their major and entry cohort. Theoretically, wealthy students would observe the performance of their low-income peers and compared it to that of their wealthy classmates in their major and cohort. If that performance is above average, then the wealthy student would anticipate no harm to their achievement or, if anything, a positive peer effect. Hence, favoring interactions with the low-income.

Focusing on Panel A of Table 6, I find that the average increase in exposure to low-income students of 9.5 percentage points led to 0.12 more links with low-income students with above average SB11 test scores, 0.15 more links with low-income students with above average first term GPA, and 0.20 more links with low-income students with above average credits attempted in the first term. Relative to the initial estimated effect of exposure on links with any low-income student of 0.28, the different measures of achievement explain 41 percent, 52 percent and 68 percent of the total effect, respectively. Importantly, the fact that 68 percent of the links with the low-income can be explained by the number of credits attempted maps well with the positive but modest impacts of exposure on credits attempted by wealthy students in their first and third terms of college. Notably, these results are suggestive of positive effects of diversifying interactions on the achievement of wealthy students.

Panel B of Table 6 displays the impacts on the probability of interaction with the low-income by the different achievement measures. Wealthy students exposed to an increase of low-income peers of 9.5 percentage points are 0.6 percentage points more likely to interact with a low-income student with above average SB11 achievement, and 0.6 percentage points and 0.76 percentage points more likely to interact with a low-income student with above

average first term GPA and credits attempted, respectively. Relative to the initial estimated impact of exposure on the likelihood of interaction with any low-income peer, I find that high achievement in terms of SB11 and GPA among low-income students explains 75 percent of the effect on the probability of interaction with any low-income student, and almost a 100 percent of the probability when achievement is measured in term of credits attempted in the first term. Coupled with the results on achievement, matching in terms of the number of credits attempted in the first term is a key driver of the diversity in social interactions driven by exposure.

## 7 Conclusions

In 2014, the Colombian government launched *Ser Pilo Paga* a financial aid program targeting low-income high-achieving students that provided a forgivable loan covering tuition plus a stipend for living expenses, so long as the eligible students attended high-quality selective universities in the country. The program triggered a sharp influx in the number of low-income students enrolling at elite institutions in 2015. I study the case of one Elite University in Colombia where the enrollment of low-income students tripled with SPP, but that maintains the number of wealthy students enrolling in the 2015 cohort. The policy induced a quasi-random variation in the percentage of low-income students at each major and entry cohort, which I exploit in a difference-in-differences design to answer: can exposure to desegregation at an elite college lead to more diverse social interactions? Could it do so without harming the achievement of students traditionally attending the institution?

I do not find evidence suggesting exposure to low-income students through desegregation policies have adverse impacts on the achievement of students at the receiving institutions, thus debating previous results by Arcidiacono and Vigdor (2010) and providing empirical evidence debating the predictions from the peer effects literature (Arcidiacono, Lovenheim and Zhu, 2015). Moreover, I find significantly positive yet minor impacts on early achieve-

ment as measured by the cumulative credits attempted by the first and third college terms. Importantly, I also find significantly positive impacts on dropout probability by the fifth term of college. However, my dropout measure is captured at the college level, and my data does not allow me to track these students at other institutions. Thus, transfer to other universities instead of total drop out of higher education cannot be ruled out.

Given that low-income students enrolling at the outset of SPP have significantly lower academic achievement relative to their wealthy peers, I also inspect for peer effects driven by exposure to low achievement, finding no evidence in this regard. Overall, my findings are aligned with those from Angrist and Lang (2004), and Dobbie and Fryer (2014) in that I do not find significant adverse impacts of desegregation on achievement. Importantly, my findings also contribute to the peer effects literature in higher education, which so far has found mixed results of achievement peer effects (Zimmerman, 2003; Garlick, 2018).

Lack of impacts on academic achievement from exposure to desegregation may be explained by lack of social interactions among wealthy and low-income students. Such behavior would be consistent with prior research suggesting changes in peer effects composition driven by incoming students with lower achievement may induce segregation within groups (Carrell, Sacerdote and West, 2013). Thus, I examine whether exposure to desegregation does induce more interactions between wealthy and low-income students. I find that the average increase in the percentage of low-income students induced significant socioeconomic desegregation in social interactions. The number of links between wealthy and low-income students increased by 0.28 (0.51 standard deviations relative to the pre-SPP entry cohort), and the overall probability of interaction between a wealthy and a low-income student increased by 0.7 percentage points (0.2 standard deviations relative to the pre-SPP entry cohort). Overall, this implies a 6.8 percentage points increase in the percentage of links that wealthy students have with low-income peers.

These findings contribute to the literature that examines the role of group membership in college in explaining employment and social mobility outcomes (Zimmerman, 2019;

Michelman, Price and Zimmerman, 2020; Marmaros and Sacerdote, 2002). Specifically, while membership to groups in college can be a proxy of social interactions, it is also confounded by other factors such as signaling value to the labor market. In that sense, this paper provides evidence on how social interactions work at elite colleges, using a robust measure of students interactions.

Lastly, I test theoretical predictions explaining that exposure increases the diversity of social interactions without harming academic achievement. Wealthy students may assess the achievement of low-income students relative to that of their wealthy peers to establish a link. If students segregate to avoid adverse peer effects (Carrell, Sacerdote and West, 2013), then students integrate if they do not perceive adverse impacts on their achievement. I find suggestive evidence supporting this hypothesis. At least half of the links with low-income students are with students whose average achievement is above that of the wealthy students in the group. Importantly, 68 of the effect on the number of links with low-income students is explained by links with high achievers in terms of attempted credits. These findings suggest that desegregation in social interactions is strongly driven by academic achievement and that low-income high-achieving students have a large advantage in achieving integration relative to other low-income students.

The results in this paper provide substantial evidence in favor of desegregation policies at the higher education level. Exposure to desegregated environments can lead to diversity in interactions without adverse effects on achievement. Desegregation in social interactions is important as it can nurture access to information and social and cultural capital, which can be determinant in the job market (Rivera, 2016). Future research should inquire whether the effects of desegregation can translate with impacts in the quality of employment of the low-income students benefiting from desegregation.

## References

- Angrist, Joshua D. and Jörn Steffen Pischke. 2009. *Mostly Harmless Econometrics: An Empiricist's Companion*. First edit ed. Princeton, NJ.: Princeton University Press.
- Angrist, Joshua D. and Kevin Lang. 2004. “Does school integration generate peer effects? Evidence from Boston’s metco program.” *American Economic Review* 94(5):1613–1634.
- Arcidiacono, Peter and Jacob L. Vigdor. 2010. “Does the river spill over? estimating the economic returns to attending a racially diverse college.” *Economic Inquiry* 48(3):537–557.
- Arcidiacono, Peter, Michael Lovenheim and Maria Zhu. 2015. “Affirmative Action in Undergraduate Education.” *Annual Review of Economics* 7(1):487–518.
- Baker, Sara, Adalbert Mayer and Steven L. Puller. 2011. “Do more diverse environments increase the diversity of subsequent interaction? Evidence from random dorm assignment.” *Economics Letters* 110(2):110–112.
- Black, Sandra E., Jeffrey T. Denning and Jesse Rothstein. 2020. “Winners and Losers? The Effect of Gaining and Losing Access to Selective Colleges on Education and Labor Market Outcomes.”
- Bleemer, Zachary. 2020. “Affirmative Action, Mismatch, and Economic Mobility after California’s Proposition 209.”
- Bleemer, Zachary. 2021a. “Affirmative Action, Mismatch, and Economic Mobility After California’s Proposition 209.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* (September):1–46.
- Bleemer, Zachary. 2021b. “Top Percent Policies and the Return to Postsecondary Selectivity.”
- Boisjoly, Johanne, Greg J. Duncan, Michael Kremer, Dan M. Levy and Jacque Eccles. 2006. “Empathy or antipathy? The impact of diversity.” *American Economic Review* 96(5):1890–1905.

- Camacho, Adriana, Julián Messina and Juan Pablo Uribe. 2017. “The Expansion of Higher Education in Colombia: Bad Students or Bad Programs?”.  
**URL:** <http://economia.uniandes.edu.co>
- Cárdenas, Juan Camilo, Danisz Okulicz, Davide Pietrobon and Tomás Rodríguez. 2019. “Propensity to Trust and Network Formation.”.
- Carrell, Scott E., Bruce Sacerdote and James E. West. 2013. “From Natural Variation to Optimal Policy? The Importance of Endogenous Peer Group Formation.” *Econometrica* 81(3):855–882.
- Carrell, Scott E., Mark Hoekstra and Elira Kuka. 2018. “The long-run effects of disruptive peers.” *American Economic Review* 108(11):3377–3415.
- Chetty, Raj, John N Friedman, Emmanuel Saez, Nicholas Turner and Danny Yagan. 2020. “Income Segregation and Intergenerational Mobility Across Colleges in the United States.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics* pp. 1567–1633.
- Dobbie, Will and Roland G. Fryer. 2014. “The impact of attending a school with high-achieving peers: Evidence from the New York City exam schools.” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 6(3):58–75.
- Echenique, Federico, Roland G. Fryer and Alex Kaufman. 2006. “Is school segregation good or bad?” *American Economic Review* 96(2):265–269.
- Garlick, Robert. 2018. “Academic peer effects with different group assignment policies: Residential tracking versus random assignment.” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics* 10(3):345–369.
- Hoekstra, Mark. 2009. “The Effect of Attending the Flagship State University on Earnings: a Discontinuity-based Approach.” *The review of Economics and Statistics* 91(4):717–724.

- Londoño-Vélez, Juliana. 2020. “The Impact of Diversity on Distributive Perceptions and Preferences for Redistribution.”.
- Londoño-Velez, Juliana, Catherine Rodriguez and Fabio Sanchez. 2020. “Upstream and Downstream Impacts of College Merit-Based Financial Aid for Low-Income Students: Ser Pilo Paga in Colombia.” *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 12(2):193–227.
- Manski, Charles F. 1993. Identification of Endogenous Social Effects: The Reflection Problem. Technical Report 3.
- Marmaros, David and Bruce Sacerdote. 2002. “Peer and social networks in job search.” *European Economic Review* 46:870–879.  
**URL:** [www.elsevier.com/locate/econbase](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/econbase)
- Marmaros, David and Bruce Sacerdote. 2006. “How Do Friendships Form?” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121(1):79–119.
- Marta Ferreyra, María, Ciro Avitabile, Javier Botero Álvarez, Francisco Haimovich Paz and Sergio Urzúa. 2017. *At a Crossroads Higher Education in Latin America and the Caribbean Human Development*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank.
- Mele, Angelo. 2017. “A Structural Model of Dense Network Formation.” *Econometrica* 85(3):825–850.
- Mele, Angelo. 2020. “Does school desegregation promote diverse interactions ? An equilibrium model of segregation within schools.” *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 12(2).
- Mello, Ursula. 2021. “Centralized Admissions, Affirmative Action and Access of Low-income Students to Higher Education.” *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* forthcoming.

- Michelman, Valerie, Joseph Price and Seth D Zimmerman. 2020. “The Distribution of and Returns to Social Success at Elite Universities.”
- Moffitt, Robert A. 2001. Policy Interventions, Low-Level Equilibria, and Social Interactions. In *Social Dynamics*, ed. Steven Durlauf and Peyton Young. MIT Press.
- Rao, Gautam. 2019. “Familiarity Does Not Breed Contempt: Generosity, Discrimination and Diversity in Delhi Schools.” *American Economic Review* 109(3):774–809.
- Zimmerman, David J. 2003. “Peer effects in academic outcomes: Evidence from a natural experiment.” *Review of Economics and Statistics* 85(1):9–23.
- Zimmerman, Seth D. 2019. “Elite colleges and upward mobility to top jobs and top incomes.” *American Economic Review* 109(1):1–47.



# Tables

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics of Students' Characteristics

	2014 entry cohort				2015 entry cohort			
	Wealthy		Low-income		Wealthy		Low-income	
	Mean		Mean	Difference	Mean		Mean	Difference
<i>Peers composition</i>								
Prop. Of middle-SES	0.49		0.00	-0.49 ***	0.50		0.00	-0.50 ***
No. Of links	5.21		4.94	-0.27	5.53		4.60	-0.93 **
No. of low SES links	0.24		0.35	0.11 *	0.59		1.73	1.14 ***
<i>Student characteristics</i>								
Female	0.43		0.35	-0.09 **	0.46		0.41	-0.06
Age	17.59		17.24	-0.35 ***	17.59		17.14	-0.45 ***
Mother with no college degree	0.08		0.24	0.16 ***	0.09		0.40	0.32 ***
SB11 standardized test score	0.00		-0.09	-0.10	0.04		-0.22	-0.26 ***
SPP recipient	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.05		0.81	0.76 ***
Other scholarship recipient	0.07		0.37	0.30 ***	0.07		0.05	-0.02
Immigrant according to H.S.	0.23		0.35	0.12 **	0.23		0.56	0.33 ***
No. Of peers from H.S. in same cohort	11.54		3.17	-8.38 ***	11.73		1.98	-9.75 ***
<i>Turnstiles characteristics</i>								
Tot. ID taps in turnstiles in 6th and 7th terms	1340.19		1349.79	9.60	1239.93		1162.33	-77.61
<i>Links' characteristics</i>								
Age Difference	0.60		0.65	0.06	0.63		0.63	0.00
Same Gender	0.50		0.51	0.00	0.51		0.45	-0.05 **
Ave. No. Of courses w/links	1.49		1.37	-0.13	1.51		1.31	-0.20
SB11 difference	0.73		0.76	0.03	0.79		0.67	-0.12 **
Share of friends from same high school	0.04		0.01	-0.03 ***	0.04		0.00	-0.04 ***
No. Of majors	31		31		31		31	
No. Of students	2669		139		2609		538	
Individuals without links with their major-cohort	600		40		541		151	

*Notes:* This table displays descriptive statistics of the sample of students described in Section 3. Wealthy students comprise middle- and high-SES students. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ . P-values are based on t-test of the hypothesis that the difference in means between wealthy and low-income students is equal to zero. Standard errors were clustered at the major level.

Table 2: Identification Challenges in the Difference-in-Difference Research Design

Type of Bias	Source	Assessment	Conclusion
Non-parallel trends bias	<b>Selection of majors and entry cohorts changes with SPP</b>	Event study on outcomes and co-variates (see Figures 6, 7, and 5)	No evidence of bias.
	<b>Wealthy students are crowded out in the admission process by the low-income students recipients of SPP.</b>	Total number of seats to high-income students did not change (see Figure 2)	There is no correlation between the increased number of low-income students per program and cohort and the change in the number of wealthy students
Unobserved exposure effects	<b>Exposure to low-SES operates through courses, and many courses can be taken by students from multiple majors.</b>	Index capturing exposure to low-SES peers at the course level. I embed the index in a within major-cohort specification and use IV to ensure exogeneity (see Appendix B).	Course-level exposure does not distinctly affect outcomes for students within the same major and cohort
Measurement Error on the social interactions outcomes	<b>Turnstile-elicited interactions are the result of random movements</b>	Use data from a survey on social interactions among students from one major and entry cohort (see Appendix A - Tables 7 and 8).	The rate of false positives (i.e., turnstile-elicited interactions not captured by the survey) is below 10 percent
	<b>If false-negatives are non-random, there is bias in the turnstile-elicited links</b>	I use simulations to estimate how far from random are the turnstile-elicited links' characteristics, and how close the average characteristics of the turnstile-elicited links are to those of the survey-elicited links (see Appendix A - Figure 8).	Turnstile-elicited interactions capture links characteristics, albeit the number of interactions missing
	<b>Rate of false positives and negatives across majors and cohorts could be impacted by exposure to low-income peers</b>	Use proxies of measurement error to test for the effects of exposure using the Dif-in-Dif design (See Appendix A - Table 9).	I do not find evidence of an effect of exposure on measurement error rates.

*Notes:* This table describes the identification challenges of the Difference-in-Difference research design discussed in Equation 1.

Table 3: The Impact of Exposure to Desegregation on Academic Achievement and Persistence

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	1st term credits	1st term GPA	3rd term cum. Credits	3rd term cum. GPA	6th term cum. Credits	6th term cum. GPA	Dropout by 5th term	Graduated on time
A. OLS								
$R_{mc}^l$ : percentage of low-income peers	0.011* (0.006)	0.001 (0.001)	0.034** (0.017)	0.001 (0.001)	0.031 (0.031)	0.001 (0.001)	0.002** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)
B. Non-linear Effects								
$\mathbb{I}[\% \text{ of low-income peers} > 30\%]$	0.063 (0.174)	-0.021 (0.033)	0.277 (0.571)	0.002 (0.026)	-0.065 (0.815)	-0.004 (0.022)	0.028 (0.020)	-0.034 (0.029)
mu(Outcome)	15.64	3.863	49.39	3.822	100.9	3.859	0.122	0.0693
sd(Outcome)	2.949	0.449	8.496	0.378	16.22	0.344	0.327	0.254
<i>Treatment distribution in 2015</i>								
$\Delta \text{ mu}(R_{mc}^l)$					9.51 p. p.			
$\text{sd}(R_{mc}^l)$					12.98			
No. Students	5,278	5,274	4,895	4,895	4,507	4,507	5,278	5,278

Notes: This table displays the estimates from Equation 1 in Panel A., and the non-linear estimates in Panel B. % of low-income peers is calculated at the major-cohort levels.  $\mathbb{I}[\text{percentage of low-income peers} > 30\%]$  is an indicator function equal to one if the share of low-income peers in the major and cohort is greater than 30% i.e., over the 75th percentile of the distribution in the 2015 – Spring entry cohort. All estimations control for female indicators, age in year at the time of entry, SB11 standardized test score, mothers' has no college education indicator, indicator of middle-SES background according to the social strata indicator, and dummies for whether the student got an SPP loan. I address missing values by imputing missing values using the median value by major-cohort and by including an indicator equal to 1 if any of the covariates contains a missing value for the student  $i$ .  $\Delta \text{ mu}(R_{mc}^l)$  is the average increase in the percentage of low-income students from 2014 to 2015. All standard errors are clustered at the major-cohort level. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table 4: Endogenous and exogenous effects of low-income peers on wealthy students' achievement

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
	1st term credits	1st term GPA	3rd term cum. Credits	3rd term cum. GPA	6th term cum. Credits	6th term cum. GPA	Dropout by 5th term	Graduated on time
<i>A. Exogenous SB11</i>								
$R_{mc}^l$ : percentage of low-income peers	0.014** (0.005)	0.001 (0.001)	0.034** (0.017)	0.001 (0.001)	0.031 (0.032)	0.000 (0.001)	0.002** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)
$S\tilde{B}11_{mc}$	1.262*** (0.439)	-0.006 (0.052)	0.204 (1.027)	-0.085 (0.057)	-0.058 (2.415)	-0.119** (0.053)	-0.018 (0.046)	0.019 (0.044)
<i>B. Endogenous Achievement</i>								
$R_{mc}^l$ : percentage of low-income peers	0.013** (0.006)	0.001 (0.001)	0.033* (0.017)	0.001 (0.001)	0.030 (0.032)	0.001 (0.001)	0.002** (0.001)	-0.000 (0.001)
$\tilde{Y}_{mc}$	-0.015* (0.009)	-0.003 (0.005)	0.004 (0.007)	0.005 (0.005)	0.003 (0.008)	0.006 (0.004)	0.032 (0.045)	0.021 (0.028)
mu(Outcome)	15.64	3.866	49.43	3.825	100.9	3.862	0.121	0.0692
sd(Outcome)	2.939	0.448	8.469	0.377	16.19	0.344	0.326	0.254
No. Students	5,278	5,274	4,895	4,895	4,507	4,507	5,278	5,278

Notes: This table displays the estimates from Endogenous Peer Effects (Eq. 3) and Exogenous SB11 Effects (Eq. 2).  $N_{Pmc}$  is the proportion of low-income students in the major and entry cohort as treatment.  $S\tilde{B}11_{mc} = \frac{\sum_{j \neq i} [SB11_j | W_j = 0]}{N_{mc}^l}$ , and  $\tilde{Y}_{mc} = \frac{\sum_{j \neq i} [Y_j | W_j = 0]}{N_{mc}^l}$  where  $W_j = 0$  if the peer  $j$  in student  $i$  major  $m$  and entry cohort  $c$  is low-income, and  $N_{mc}^l$  is the number of low-income students in student  $i$  major and entry cohort. All regressions include the controls described in Equation 1. I address missing values by imputing missing values using the median value by major-cohort and by including an indicator equal to 1 if any of the covariates contains a missing value for the student  $i$ .  $\Delta \text{mu}(R_{mc}^l)$  is the average increase in the percentage of low-income students from 2014 to 2015. All standard errors are clustered at the major-cohort level. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table 5: The Impact of Exposure to Desegregation on The Links of Wealthy Students

	A. Number of Links with:			B. Probability of a Link with:		C. Proportion of Links with:
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Any	Wealthy	Low Income	Wealthy	Low Income	Low Income
1. OLS						
$R_{mc}^l$ : % of low-income peers	-0.011 (0.016)	-0.043*** (0.016)	0.031*** (0.004)	-0.002** (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)	0.714*** (0.060)
2. Non-linear Effects						
$\mathbb{I}[\% \text{ of low-income peers} > 30\%]$	0.017 (0.495)	-0.667 (0.507)	0.684*** (0.131)	-0.043 (0.028)	0.117*** (0.038)	0.146*** (0.029)
<i>Pre-treatment statistics of the outcomes</i>						
mean	5.212	4.973	0.239	0.770	0.188	4.404
standard deviation	5.154	4.922	0.558	0.421	0.391	11.34
<i>Treatment distribution in 2015</i>						
$\Delta \mu(R_{mc}^l)$				9.51 p. p.		
$sd(R_{mc}^l)$				12.98		
No. Students	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278	4,137

*Notes:* This table displays the estimates from Equation 1 in Panel A., and the non-linear estimates in Panel B. Outcomes are based on a turnstile-elicited links based on time-windows of 3 seconds and at least two co-movements in a term. % of low-income peers is calculated at the major-cohort levels.  $\mathbb{I}[\% \text{ of low-income peers} > 30\%]$  is an indicator function equal to one if the share of low-income peers in the major and cohort is greater than 30% i.e., over the 75th percentile of the distribution in the 2015 – Spring entry cohort. All estimations control for female indicators, age in year at the time of entry, SB11 standardized test score, mothers' has no college education indicator, indicator of middle-SES background according to the social strata indicator, and dummies for whether the student got an SPP loan. I address missing values by imputing missing values using the median value by major-cohort and by including an indicator equal to 1 if any of the covariates contains a missing value for the student  $i$ .  $\Delta \mu(R_{mc}^l)$  is the average increase in the percentage of low-income students from 2014 to 2015. All standard errors are clustered at the major-cohort level. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .


Table 6: The Impact of Exposure on Links with the High-Performing Low-Income Students

	A. Number of Links with High Performers By:			B. Probability of a Link with High Performers By:		
	(1) SB11	(2) 1st Term GPA	(3) 1st Term Credits	(4) SB11	(5) 1st Term GPA	(6) 1st Term Credits
OLS						
<i>% of low-income peers</i>	0.013*** (0.003)	0.016*** (0.002)	0.021*** (0.003)	0.006*** (0.001)	0.006*** (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)
<i>Pre-treatment statistics of the outcomes</i>						
mean	0.0892	0.135	0.118	0.0798	0.111	0.102
standard Deviation	0.317	0.419	0.375	0.271	0.315	0.303
<i>Treatment distribution in 2015</i>						
Delta $\mu(R)$				9.51 p. p.		
sd(R)				12.98		
No. Students	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278

*Notes:* This table displays the estimates from Equation 1. Low-Income students are labeled as high achievers, when their performance is above the average of that of the wealthy students in their major and entry cohort. *% of low-income peers* is calculated at the major-cohort levels. All estimations control for female indicators, age in year at the time of entry, SB11 standardized test score, mothers' has no college education indicator, indicator of middle-SES background according to the social strata indicator, and dummies for whether the student got an SPP loan. I address missing values by imputing missing values using the median value by major-cohort and by including an indicator equal to 1 if any of the covariates contains a missing value for the student  $i$ .  $\Delta \mu(R_{mc}^l)$  is the average increase in the percentage of low-income students from 2014 to 2015. All standard errors are clustered at the major-cohort level. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

# Figures


Figure 1: Number of first term students by socio-economic status (SES)



*Notes:* This figure displays the total number of first-term students by socio-economic (SES) background. I add both spring and fall enrollment per year. Wealthy students are those from socio-economic strata 3 to 5, whereas low-income students are those from socio-economic strata 1 and 2.




Figure 2: Percentage of low-SES students by major and before and after SPP




*Notes:* This figure displays the percentage of low-SES students per major and entry cohort year. The secondary axis displays the percentage change in the number of wealthy students enrolled in the 2015 entry year relative to the 2014 year. Figures are calculated per year, by adding the total number of new students enrolled in each major and semester (i.e., fall and spring).

Figure 3: Average Cumulative GPA and Credits Attempted by Entry Cohort and Income group




*Notes:* These graphs display the point estimates of a cohort dummy from an OLS regression with no intercept where the dependent variable is the characteristic of the student. Each year entry cohort includes the entry cohorts of Spring and Fall of the respective calendar year. Wealthy students are those from socio-economic strata 3 to 5, whereas low-income students are those from socio-economic strata 1 and 2. Cluster standard errors at the major-cohort level. 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 4: Academic Persistence by Entry Cohort and Income group




*Notes:* These graphs display the point estimates of a cohort dummy from from an OLS regression with no intercept where the dependent variable is the characteristic of the student. Each year entry cohort includes the entry cohorts of Spring and Fall of the respective calendar year. Wealthy students are those from socio-economic strata 3 to 5, whereas low-income students are those from socio-economic strata 1 and 2. Cluster standard errors at the major-cohort level. 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 5: Variation in Students' Characteristics within Cohorts and Across majors




*Notes:* Point estimates of a cohort dummy interacted with the percentage of low-income students within a major and cohort from an OLS regression where the dependent variable is the characteristic of the students controlling for major of enrollment dummies. Each year entry cohort includes the entry cohorts of Spring and Fall of the respective calendar year. Wealthy students are those from socio-economic strata 3 to 5. Cluster standard errors at the major-cohort level. 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 6: Variation in Students' Achievement within Cohorts and Across Majors



*Notes:* Point estimates of a cohort dummy interacted with the percentage of low-income students within a major and cohort from an OLS regression where the dependent variable is the outcome of the student controlling for major of enrollment dummies. Estimations include the controls listed in Equation 1. Each year entry cohort includes the entry cohorts of Spring and Fall of the respective calendar year. Wealthy students are those from socio-economic strata 3 to 5. Cluster standard errors at the major-cohort level. 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 7: Variation in Students' Persistence within Cohorts and Across Majors



*Notes:* Point estimates of a cohort dummy interacted with the percentage of low-income students within a major and cohort from an OLS regression where the dependent variable is the outcome of the students controlling for major of enrollment dummies. Estimations include the controls listed in Equation 1. Each year entry cohort includes the entry cohorts of Spring and Fall of the respective calendar year. Wealthy students are those from socio-economic strata 3 to 5. Cluster standard errors at the major-cohort level. 95% confidence intervals.

## A Appendix: Turnstile–Elicited Interactions Data and Validation

*Validation of student links definition.* I define a time window and frequency thresholds by comparing turnstile-elicited with survey-elicited links among first-term undergraduate students of Economics from the fall of 2017 cohort. The survey was conducted online between December 7, 2017, and January 5, 2018, and elicited the network among 110 economics students from the 2017 fall cohort. The survey was conducted using Qualtrics. Students who completed the survey received a free lunch voucher for a recognized chain restaurant of the campus area. Cárdenas et al. (2019) provide a detail description of the survey.<sup>14</sup>. The survey inquired about two types of links: friendships and acquaintances. Table 7 shows the results of the comparison. The time windows tested in Table 7 were selected based on in-person observations to different entrances. The observations of entrances to campus were conducted between August 26th and 30th of 2019. Because there are multiple turnstiles at each entrance, students walking together can essentially tap their IDs simultaneously using different scanners, thus the short time–windows. I select a time–window and a frequency criterion by minimizing the sum of the type II and type I measurement errors; that is, the number of unmatched survey-elicited links over the total number of survey links, and the number of unmatched turnstile-elicited links over the total number of survey links. For the purposes of this test, I assume the true number of links to which the type I and II errors refer are those captured by the survey.

To illustrate how to interpret the results in Table 7, I ask the reader to focus on the time window of three seconds and the acquaintances survey links. The numbers in bold indicate the combinations of time-windows and frequencies that minimize the sum of type I and II errors, for each type of link. Thus, the frequency with which I should observe two student IDs tapped on a turnstile entrance so that it resembles an acquaintances link should be minimum twice in the semester. Under that rule, the likelihood of Type I error or false positives - i.e. the likelihood of defining a pair of students as linked when according to the survey they are not, is 11 percent. Conversely, the likelihood of a Type II error or false negative - i.e., the likelihood of not identifying a pair of students as acquaintances when according to the survey they are, is 62 percent. While a five-seconds and three times in the term criteria would yield a lower sum of errors, it would do so by leaving one student from the 110 in the sample without turnstile-based links information –an omission I want to avoid. Notice that the acquaintances criteria has a lower threshold in terms of the frequency of the co-movements in the semester than the friendship criteria. I chose to use the acquaintances

---

<sup>14</sup>I am very grateful to Professor Tomás Rodríguez-Barraquer for providing access to these data.

instead of the friendship criteria because it allows me to identify social interactions that students did not identify as friendships in the first term of college, but that may eventually evolve as such.

The results in Table 7 indicate that under the baseline definition, it is highly likely that the turnstiles-elicited links capture survey-like links. However, an important share of survey links may not be captured by the turnstiles. This is an issue to the extent that those I do capture are not representative of the survey-elicited links. To assess this, I compare whether turnstile-elicited links plausibly reflect survey-elicited network characteristics. Results are displayed in Figure 8. The goal of this exercise is to estimate how far from random are the turnstile-elicited links' characteristics, and how close the average characteristics of the links are to those of the survey-elicited links. The computation proceeds as follows: I use the acquaintances minimizing criteria from Table 7 for each of the time windows and randomly assign the number of turnstile-elicited links under that criteria to the 110 students in the sample. Then, I compute the average of the following network individual attributes: age difference, number of courses students are taking together, GPA difference, degree or number of links, and local clustering. I conduct this procedure 1000 times and plot the distribution of the characteristics. I include the average value I observe for the turnstile- and survey-elicited links with its 95 percent confidence interval. I find statistically significant support indicating turnstile-elicited network characteristics resemble closely those of the friendship and acquaintances networks elicited by the survey, and are not the result of random links formation.

The validity of the turnstiles-elicited interactions could be susceptible to the hours of the day during which co-movements are captured. Co-movements captured around lunch hours could be more susceptible to false negatives, whereas co-movements captured at other times may be less susceptible to false positives. I test the extent to which this is an issue by replicating the comparison with the survey-elicited interactions from Table 7 but for co-movements happening around lunch-time hours (from 11:40 am to 2:20 pm) with co-movements at other times. The results are displayed in Table 8. For simplicity, I focus on Acquaintances links and on the two and three-seconds windows. As expected, co-movements captured during lunch-time are more susceptible to false negatives than co-movements captured off lunch-time. Similarly, co-movements captured at lunch-time are less susceptible to false positives than those captured at other times. However, the sum of error rates is much higher at either times than that obtained when using all times pooled together as presented in Table 7. These results suggest searching for co-movements at any time of the day is more reliable in terms of reducing measurement error than to focus on co-movements happening at specific times of the day.



Table 7: Survey– and Turnstile–elicited links comparison

<i>Time window</i>	A. two seconds					B. three seconds					C. Five seconds				
<i>Frequency</i>	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	One	Two	Three	Four	Five
<i>1. Turnstiles</i>															
No. Of dyads	868	368	235	180	148	1209	509	314	251	198	1906	898	552	401	315
No. of students	110	110	108	107	105	110	110	109	108	107	110	110	109	108	108
<i>2. Are friends</i>															
<i>Dyads</i>	505					505					505				
Survey & Turnstiles															
Matched	342	256	201	165	140	389	305	248	215	179	433	368	337	295	263
False Negatives (Type II)	0.32	0.49	0.60	0.67	0.72	0.23	0.40	0.51	0.57	0.65	0.14	0.27	0.33	0.42	0.48
False Positives (Type I)	1.04	0.22	0.07	0.03	0.02	1.62	0.40	0.13	0.07	0.04	2.92	1.05	0.43	0.21	0.10
<i>Sum</i>	1.36	0.71	<b>0.67</b>	0.70	0.74	1.85	0.80	<b>0.64</b>	0.65	0.68	3.06	1.32	0.76	0.63	<b>0.58</b>
<i>3. Acquaintances</i>															
<i>Dyads</i>	1033					1033					1033				
Survey & Turnstiles															
Matched	497	311	219	174	144	606	391	284	235	191	734	537	425	348	293
False Negatives (Type II)	0.52	0.70	0.79	0.83	0.86	0.41	0.62	0.73	0.77	0.82	0.29	0.48	0.59	0.66	0.72
False Positives (Type I)	0.36	0.06	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.58	0.11	0.03	0.02	0.01	1.13	0.35	0.12	0.05	0.02
<i>Sum</i>	0.88	<b>0.75</b>	0.80	0.84	0.86	1.00	<b>0.74</b>	0.75	0.79	0.82	1.42	0.83	<b>0.71</b>	0.71	0.74


*Notes:* N students = 110. Number of links possible  $(N*(N-1))/2 = 5995$ . Survey sample consist of economics undergrads from the August 2017 cohort. 113 students surveyed. One student did not report information and two do not show enrolled as of 2017-2. The survey asked each student who among the 113 students were an Acquaintance, and among those, who was considered a friend. Type II error rate is the share of links in survey that were not found in turnstiles-based links. Type I error is the links in turnstiles that were not matched with the links in survey, over the total links in survey

Table 8: Survey– and Turnstile–Elicited Links Comparison During and Off Lunch Time

<i>Time window</i>	A. Two seconds						B. Three seconds					
<i>Type</i>	11:40 am to 2:20 pm			Other times			11:40 am to 2:20 pm			Other times		
<i>Frequency</i>	One	Two	Three	One	Two	Three	One	Two	Three	One	Two	Three
<i>1. Turnstiles</i>												
No. Of dyads	397	159	100	654	272	172	554	213	135	893	376	233
No. of students	110	109	103	110	110	105	110	109	106	110	110	106
<i>2. Acquaintances</i>												
<i>Dyads</i>	<i>1033</i>						<i>1033</i>					
Survey & Turnstiles												
Matched	255	143	93	411	236	162	321	180	123	494	308	214
False Negatives (Type II)	0.75	0.86	0.91	0.60	0.77	0.84	0.69	0.83	0.88	0.52	0.70	0.79
False Positives (Type I)	0.14	0.02	0.01	0.24	0.03	0.01	0.23	0.03	0.01	0.39	0.07	0.02
<i>Sum</i>	<i>0.89</i>	<b><i>0.88</i></b>	<i>0.92</i>	<i>0.84</i>	<b><i>0.81</i></b>	<i>0.85</i>	<i>0.91</i>	<b><i>0.86</i></b>	<i>0.89</i>	<i>0.91</i>	<b><i>0.77</i></b>	<i>0.81</i>

*Notes:* N students = 110. Number of links possible  $(N*(N-1))/2 = 5995$ . Survey sample consist of economics undergrads from the August 2017 cohort. 113 students surveyed. One student did not report information and two do not show enrolled as of 2017-2. The survey asked each student who among the 113 students were an Acquaintance, and among those, who was considered a friend. Type II error rate is the share of links in survey that were not found in turnstiles-based links. Type I error is the links in turnstiles that were not matched with the links in survey, over the total links in survey.

Figure 8: Comparison against randomly generated distribution



*Notes:* Turnstile-elicited links matched with the survey are randomly assigned in 1000 draws among 110 students forming all possible 5595 dyads. Confidence intervals of 95% confidence are presented. Matches for 2 seconds - 2 times window: 368 links. Matches for 3 seconds - 2 times window: 368 links. Matches for 5 seconds - 3 times window: 552 links.

*Measurement Error in Difference-in-Difference Framework:* To build understanding about the role of measurement error in social interactions, I build on a potential outcomes framework in a 2x2 Difference-in-Difference research design as coined by Goodman-Bacon (2019) and discussed by Cunningham (2021). Define  $t$  as a treated group (i.e., a group with a large  $R_{mc}^l$ ), and  $u$  as an untreated group:

$$\hat{\alpha}_P^{2x2} = (E[L_t|Post] - E[L_t|Pre]) - (E[L_u|Post] - E[L_u|Pre]) \quad (4)$$

In Equation 4, the estimated  $\hat{\alpha}_P^{2x2}$  is written as the difference between the expected post- and pre-treatment value of the outcome  $L$  on the treated group  $t$  ( $E[L_t|Post] - E[L_t|Pre]$ ), minus the difference between the expected post- and pre-treatment value of the outcome  $L$  on the untreated group  $u$  ( $E[L_u|Post] - E[L_u|Pre]$ ). Equation 4 can be re-written in potential outcomes terms. Define  $L^0$  as the potential outcome had no treatment be assigned and  $L^1$  as the potential outcome had the treatment be assigned. Hence, the estimated  $\hat{\alpha}_P^{2x2}$  can be re-written as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\alpha}_P^{2x2} &= \underbrace{E[L_t^1|Post] - E[L_t^0|Post]}_{\text{ATT}} \\
&+ \underbrace{(E[L_t^0|Post] - E[L_t^0|Pre]) + (E[L_u^0|Post] - E[L_u^0|Pre])}_{\text{Treatment counterfactual}} \\
&\quad \underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{\text{non-parallel trend bias}=0}
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Equation 5 implies  $\hat{\alpha}_P^{2x2}$  is made of the Average Treatment Effect on the Treated (ATT), which is the difference between the expected values of the outcome  $L$  on the post-treatment period and on the treated group  $t$  had the treated group received and not received the treatment, plus the non-parallel trend bias. The non-parallel trend bias is the difference in the potential outcomes for the treated and untreated group had no treatment be assigned to any group. I showed in Section 4 that there is no evidence of non-parallel trends bias. But, if the measurement error is associated with the treatment in ways unobserved by the researcher, then the estimated ATT based on the observed outcome may differ from the true ATT which I aim to estimate.

To fix ideas, define the number of links I aim to measure  $L^{true} = L^{obs} - L^{F(+)} + L^{F(-)}$ . That is, true links can be defined as the number of observed links  $L^{obs}$  minus the turnstile-elicited links which are false positives  $L^{F(+)}$ , plus the number of true links which were not captured by the turnstile-elicited measure  $L^{F(-)}$  i.e., the false negatives. Then, the ATT I aim to estimate is:

$$ATT^{estimated} = E[L_t^{1,True}|Post] - E[L_t^{0,True}|Post] \tag{6}$$

Replacing  $L_t^{1,True}$  and  $L_t^{0,True}$  for their equivalent based on observed  $L$ , and doing some re-arrangement of terms I get:

$$\begin{aligned}
ATT^{estimated} &= E[L_t^{1,obs} - L_t^{1,F(+)} + L_t^{1,F(-)}|Post] - E[L_t^{0,obs} - L_t^{0,F(+)} + L_t^{0,F(-)}|Post] \\
&= \underbrace{E[L_k^{1,obs}|Post] - E[L_k^{0,obs}|Post]}_{\text{Observed ATT}} + \\
&\quad \underbrace{E[L_t^{1,F(-)} - L_t^{1,F(+)}|Post] - E[L_t^{0,F(-)} - L_t^{0,F(+)}|Post]}_{\text{Measurement Error Bias}}
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Thus, the estimated ATT can be re-written as the ATT based on the observed outcome  $L^{obs}$ , plus a measurement error bias, which can be described as the ATT on  $L^{F(-)}$  minus ATT on

the  $L^{F(+)}$ :

$$ATT^{estimated} = ATT^{obs} + \underbrace{E[L_t^{1,F(-)} - L_t^{0,F(-)} | Post]}_{ATT \text{ on } F(-)} - \underbrace{E[L_t^{1,F(+)} - L_t^{0,F(+)} | Post]}_{ATT \text{ on } F(+)} \quad (8)$$

Equation 8 implies that if the treatment has no impact on  $L^{F(-)}$  or  $L^{F(+)}$  among the treated, then  $ATT^{estimated} = ATT^{obs}$ . In what follows, I discuss and test this implication in the context of my research design.

Ideally, I would have data on measurement error variables  $L^{F(-)}$  and  $L^{F(+)}$  across different majors and cohorts, in such a way that I can use variation in the treatment  $R_{mc}^l$  to assess its effects. Since I do not have data of that nature, I rely on proxy variables that can help me assess the extent to which the treatment  $R_{mc}^l$  may lead to measurement error in turnstile-elicited interactions. I use two variables to assess measurement error. First, the total number of ID taps at the turnstiles for each student. Second, I use the number of courses with turnstile-elicited links. I measure both proxies for the same terms I measure interactions (i.e., sixth and seventh terms after first enrollment).

Intuitively, if the treatment leads to more ID taps on the turnstiles the chances of capturing false positives  $L^{F(+)}$  on the treated group increases. Similarly, if the treatment leads to fewer ID taps, the chances of missing true links  $L^{F(-)}$  on the treated group increases. Likewise, treatment  $N_{Pmc}$  associated with a higher number of classes taken with the turnstile-elicited links may indicate higher chances of false positives  $L^{F(+)}$ . Classes in the sixth and seventh terms may be more diverse due to the treatment, but social interactions captured may be the product of chance. That is, wealthy students attending courses with other low-SES peers and coinciding in co-movements at the entrances, without that implying a true social interaction.


Table 9 displays the results of regressing  $R_{mc}^l$  on the measurement error proxies, under each time-window considered. The estimation follows the same structure as that of Equation 1 but using the proxy variables in the left-hand side. I do not find statistically significant evidence of a change in the number of ID taps at the turnstiles or in the number of courses with turnstile-elicited links due to exposure to low-income peers. Coupled with the previous results, I conclude there is no evidence to claim measurement error biases the estimated effects of exposure to low-income peers on students interactions or academic achievement.

Table 9: ATT on Measurement Error Proxies

	No. of courses with peers interacted			
	ID taps	2 seconds	3 seconds	5 seconds
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Percentage of low-income peers</i>	-4.162 (2.621)	0.003 (0.007)	-0.001 (0.007)	0.000 (0.007)
Mu(Outcome)	1340	2.006	2.059	2.084
SD(Outcome)	1017	2.466	2.515	2.538

*Notes:* Results from estimating Equation ?? using measurement error proxies in the left-hand side. "ID taps" is the total number of ID taps of each students, either to enter or exit campus, in the sixth and seventh terms after first enrollment. "No. of courses with peers interacted" is the total number of courses the student took with the peers I defined as a turnstile-elicited link. All estimations include fixed effects by major and entry cohort as well as the covariates described for Equation ?. All standard errors are clustered at the major-cohort level. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Figure 9: Flow of students by entrance - term and hour according to turnstiles



*Notes:* Average number of taps per day, entrance and 20 minutes blocks. Taps include INs and OUT of the building. Each term has approximately 75 weekdays

## B Exposure to low-income in first-term courses

Exposure to low-income students operates not only through majors and cohorts but also in the classroom. Several of the courses offered to first-term students are open to multiple majors and offer multiple sections, which may lead to variations in exposure to low-income peers not accounted for by my initial difference-in-difference research design. For example, students at all the Engineering, Economics, and Business programs are required to take Differential Calculus in their first term. As a result, students in Business majors –which had virtually no change in the number of low-income students enrolled, may take Calculus with low-income peers from other majors, thus being exposed to low-income students in ways not accounted for by the entry cohort and major variation captured by Equation 1. Since this is the case for several other mandatory first term courses, the aggregated number of low-income peers a student may have in all their first-term courses may be much different than that captured by the major-cohort exposure utilized in the difference-in-difference strategy described so far.

To test for this source of bias, I exploit changes in the number of low-income peers wealthy students have throughout their first term courses and within majors and cohorts. In contrast to the difference-in-difference approach discussed this far, this design which does not rely on the quasi-random allocation of low-income students across majors and entry-cohorts, but on the change in low-income peers across all courses taken by a student and conditional on within major and entry cohort common shocks. To ensure the causal identification of the effects of individual-level exposure, I instrument the exposure to low-income peers across courses with its predicted number based on historical data on courses composition. I use the instrument to capture the exogenous variation in the size of exposure to low-income peers in first-term courses, had the distribution of low-income students not changed with the outset of SPP. This design allows me to assess the importance of individual level variations in exposure to low-income peers in explaining achievement and social interactions.

Equation 9 describes the specification I use to capture the effects of courses-based exposure to low-income peers.  $Y_i^{mc}$  represent the outcome of the relatively wealthy student  $i$  in a major and entry cohort group  $mc$ . The estimand of interest is  $\rho_l$ , which captures the response on the outcome to changes in the number of low-income peers  $IN_{imc}^l$ . Exposure to low-income peers may be driven by unobserved non-random aspects which are common to students in the same major and entry-cohort and which are related to academic achievement and may lead to differences in student friendships (number of courses required in the first term, size of courses, number of elective courses required, etc.). Thus, I include a major plus entry-cohort fixed effect  $\rho_{mc}$  which absorbs non-observed variation common to students



within each of these groups.


$$Y_i^{mc} = \rho_l IN_{imc}^l + \rho_N N_{imc}^s + \rho_s S_{imc} + \mathbf{X}_i' P + \rho_{mc} + v_{imc} \quad (9)$$

Importantly, SPP changed the number of low-income peers by increasing the total number of students enrolled. To account for the change in the number of peers, I control for the total number of course peers across all courses the student took in their first term  $N_{imc}^s$ . This variable is computed like  $IN_{imc}^l$ , but without restricting the count by student SES background. Exposure to peers is also relative to the number of classes each student is taking each term. Hence, I include as a control the number of courses taking in the first term of enrollment by student  $i$  ( $S_{imc}$ ). Thus, random variation comes only through the number of low-income peers across courses and not through the change in class or cohort size. This approach is similar to that in Angrist and Lang (2004) and rationalizes the endogenous variation through the number of low-income peers and conditional on the total number of peers. I condition my estimates on student characteristics represented by the  $\mathbf{X}_i$  and discussed for Equation 1. Lastly,  $v_{imc}$  represented the error term which is clustered at the major and entry-cohort level. Since overall courses selection in the first term may be driven by non-random unobserved preferences for peers, particularly in the SPP outset, I instrument  $N_{imc}^s$  with the predicted number of course-level peers.

I measure the exposure to low-income peers of each student  $IN_{imc}^P$  by counting the number of low-income students enrolled in each course each term, and by adding it for all courses taken by a student in their first term of college. For example, if a student is taking five courses in their first term and each course has four low-income students, then the value of the index for this students is twenty. This means I do not discount for repeated students. Rather, if the same low-income student shows up in multiple courses, I count them in as many courses as they show up as a way to incorporate the intensity of that exposure into my index. Figure 10 describes the change in the distribution of the index among relatively wealthy students in the entry cohorts before and after SPP. The values of the index change dramatically from the pre- to the post-SPP cohorts. The values of the index are all below 100 for the 2014 cohorts, and 75 percent of students do not have more than 34 low-income peers in their first term courses. In 2015, 25 percent of students have at least 148 low-income peers in their first term courses, with some students having over 300 low-income peers. Notwithstanding, the variation in the index should be considered in light of the identification strategy, which exploits the variation taking place within majors and entry cohorts.

Identification of the effect of exposure is challenged by students selecting in courses in ways associated with achievement or socializing preferences and not accounted by the research design. In particular, SPP students in the 2015 entry cohort were more likely to

Figure 10: Course-Level Exposure Index to low-income Peers in the First Term of Enrollment



*Notes:* This figure plots the distribution of the course-level exposure to low-income peers in the first term index. The plot follows the standard display of 75th percentile, median and 25th percentile references.

enroll in their courses late in the spring semester, as their overall enrollment process in the University was delayed due to the tight timing of the program, and relative to the traditional timing of wealthy students. As a result, low-income students may end up disproportionately allocated in certain courses of low-demand by other wealthy peers.

Since individual course-level exposure can be associated with unobserved non-random variation in the assignment of students to courses with the outset of SPP, I instrument it with the predicted allocation of low-income students to first term courses based on historical information from 2012 and 2013 course-level enrollment. Ultimately, I will test the effects of first-term course-level exposure to low-income peers on wealthy students achievement and social interactions using an instrumental variables approach that allows me to isolate exogenous variation in courses' socio-economic composition, in a Two Stage Least Square Fixed-Effects setting.

*Computation of a Predicted Course-Level Exposure to low-income Peers:* I use University data on course-level enrollment from 2012 and 2013 to estimate a distribution of low-income students across courses and to predict the number of low-income students in each course of the 2014 and 2015 cohort, had the distribution of low-income students not changed due to the outset of SPP. I computed the predicted distribution of low-income students as follows:

1. I keep the enrollment information for all courses offered between 2012 and 2013, one year before the start of SPP in 2015.
2. I keep the information only for students in their first-term of enrollment. I do this because I care about the allocation of incoming students across courses, and not about the allocation of other continuing students.
3. For each course –including all its sections and terms offered, I count the number of first-term low-income students enrolled.
4. I calculate the percentage distribution of first-term low-income students across all courses. I do this by dividing the number of low-income students in each course over the sum of low-income students across all courses. Doing so ensures that the sum of the percentage distribution of low-income students across courses adds to one.
5. Using the course-level data on first-term courses of the 2014 and 2015 entry cohorts, I match the distribution of low-income students per course computed in step 4. using the course ID information.
6. I predict the allocation of first-term students on those courses by multiplying the number of low-income students in each entry cohort with the estimated percentage distribution of the course.
7. For each student, I add the predicted allocation of low-income peers in their first term courses. This gives the predicted index of exposure to low-income peers in the first term courses, had the allocation of low-income students not changed with SPP.

The instrument show a high relevance as stated by the first-stage estimates displayed in Tables 10 and 11 which display the estimated effects on number of links and academic achievement. Specifically, the point estimate of the first stage is statistically significant with a 99 percent confidence, indicate a positive relation and a sizable point estimate. Following Angrist and Pischke (2009), these tables also include the F-test of Excluded Instruments which is above 20 across all specifications, which rejects the null hypothesis of a weak instrument.

Table 10: Effect of Courses-level Exposure to low-income Peers on Wealthy Students' Friendships

	2 - seconds window			3 - seconds window			5 - seconds window		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
	Any	Wealthy	Low SES	Any	Wealthy	Low SES	Any	Wealthy	Low SES
<i>2SLS</i>									
<i>IN<sub>imc</sub></i>	0.001 (0.018)	-0.002 (0.015)	0.003 (0.006)	0.007 (0.024)	-0.001 (0.019)	0.008 (0.008)	0.014 (0.025)	0.003 (0.020)	0.011 (0.008)
<i>First Stage</i>									
<i>Predicted IN<sub>imc</sub></i>	0.460*** (0.102)			0.460*** (0.102)			0.460*** (0.102)		
<i>F-test excluded instruments</i>	20.28	20.28	20.28	20.28	20.28	20.28	20.28	20.28	20.28
<i>Reduced Form</i>									
<i>Predicted IN<sub>imc</sub></i>	0.001 (0.009)	-0.001 (0.007)	0.002 (0.003)	0.003 (0.011)	-0.000 (0.009)	0.004 (0.004)	0.006 (0.012)	0.001 (0.009)	0.005 (0.004)
<i>OLS</i>									
<i>IN<sub>imc</sub></i>	-0.000 (0.003)	-0.002 (0.002)	0.002 (0.001)	-0.000 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.003)	0.003** (0.001)	0.001 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.003)	0.003* (0.002)
<i>Pre-treatment statistics</i>									
mu(No. of friends)	4.085	3.892	0.193	5.212	4.973	0.239	5.002	4.771	0.231
sd(No. of friends)	4.213	4.019	0.494	5.154	4.922	0.558	5.040	4.816	0.548
sd( <i>IN<sub>imc</sub></i> )	34.31	34.31	34.31	34.31	34.31	34.31	34.31	34.31	34.31
sd(predicted)	7.231	7.231	7.231	7.231	7.231	7.231	7.231	7.231	7.231
No. Students	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278

*Notes:* This table displays the estimates from Equation 9. All estimates include fixed effects by major-cohort. *IN<sub>imc</sub>* is a measure of individual-level exposure to low-income peers in the first term of college based on the courses students take in that term. The computation of *IN<sub>imc</sub>* and the predicted *IN<sub>imc</sub>* used as instrument is described in Appendix B. All standard errors are clustered at the major-cohort level. \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01.

Table 11: Effect of Courses-Level Exposure to low-income Peers on Wealthy Students' Achievement

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	6th term cum. Cred- its	6th term cum. GPA	7th term cum. Cred- its	7th term cum. GPA	Graduated in 8 term	Graduated in 9 terms
<i>2SLS</i>						
<i>IN<sub>imc</sub></i>	0.023 (0.071)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.003 (0.079)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.002 (0.002)	0.001 (0.002)
<i>First Stage</i>						
<i>Predicted IN<sub>imc</sub></i>	0.511*** (0.110)	0.511*** (0.110)	0.533*** (0.112)	0.533*** (0.112)	0.460*** (0.102)	0.574*** (0.102)
<i>F-test excluded instruments</i>	21.74	21.74	22.52	22.52	20.28	31.92
<i>Reduced Form</i>						
<i>Predicted IN<sub>imc</sub></i>	0.012 (0.036)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.002 (0.043)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	0.000 (0.001)
<i>OLS</i>						
<i>IN<sub>imc</sub></i>	-0.033*** (0.012)	-0.001** (0.000)	-0.043*** (0.013)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)
<i>Pre-treatment statistics</i>						
mu(Y)	100.9	3.859	116.6	3.870	0.0693	0.228
sd(Y)	16.22	0.344	18.95	0.340	0.254	0.420
sd( <i>IN<sub>imc</sub></i> )	34.31	34.31	34.31	34.31	34.31	34.31
sd(predicted <i>IN<sub>imc</sub></i> )	7.231	7.231	7.231	7.231	7.231	7.231
No. Students	4,507	4,507	4,447	4,447	5,278	4,027

*Notes:* This table displays the estimates from Equation 9. All estimates include fixed effects by major-cohort. *IN<sub>imc</sub>* is a measure of individual-level exposure to low-income peers in the first term of college based on the courses students take in that term. The computation of *IN<sub>imc</sub>* and the predicted *IN<sub>imc</sub>* used as instrument is described in Appendix B. All standard errors are clustered at the major-cohort level. \* p < 0.10, \*\* p < 0.05, \*\*\* p < 0.01.

## C Appendix: Effects of Exposure on Social Interactions Under Alternative Definitions of Turnstile-elicited Links

Table 12: The Impact of Exposure to Desegregation on the Links of Wealthy Students - 2 seconds windows

	A. Number of Links			B. Probability of a Link with		C. Proportion of Links
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Link with:	Any	Wealthy	Low Income	Wealthy	Low Income	Low Income
<i>OLS</i>						
% of low-income peers	-0.013 (0.013)	-0.036*** (0.013)	0.023*** (0.003)	-0.003** (0.001)	0.007*** (0.001)	0.707*** (0.070)
B. Non-linear Effects						
$\mathbb{I}[\% \text{ of low-income peers} > 30\%]$	-0.097 (0.412)	-0.568 (0.440)	0.470*** (0.100)	-0.042 (0.037)	0.111*** (0.032)	15.659*** (3.045)
<i>Pre-treatment statistics of the Outcomes</i>						
mean	4.085	3.892	0.193	0.736	0.157	4.330
standard deviation	4.213	4.019	0.494	0.441	0.364	11.51
<i>Treatment distribution in 2015</i>						
$\Delta \mu(R_{mc}^l)$				9.51 p. p.		
$sd(R_{mc}^l)$				12.98		
No. Students	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278	3,979

*Notes:* This table displays the estimates from Equation 1 in Panel A., and the non-linear estimates in Panel B. Outcomes are based on a turnstile-elicited links based on time-windows of 2 seconds and at least two co-movements in a term. % of low-income peers is calculated at the major-cohort levels.  $\mathbb{I}[\% \text{ of low-income peers} > 30\%]$  is an indicator function equal to one if the share of low-income peers in the major and cohort is greater than 30% i.e., over the 75th percentile of the distribution in the 2015 – Spring entry cohort. All estimations control for female indicators, age in year at the time of entry, SB11 standardized test score, mothers' has no college education indicator, indicator of middle-SES background according to the social strata indicator, and dummies for whether the student got an SPP loan. I address missing values by including an indicator equal to 1 if any of the covariates contains a missing value for the student  $i$ . All standard errors are clustered at the major-cohort level. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .

Table 13: The Impact of Exposure to Desegregation on the Links of Wealthy Students - 5 Seconds windows

	A. Number of Links			B. Probability of a Link with		C. Proportion of Links
L <sub>inc</sub> with:	(1) Any	(2) Wealthy	(3) Low Income	(3) Wealthy	(4) Low Income	(5) Low Income
<i>OLS</i>						
% of low-income peers	-0.010 (0.017)	-0.043*** (0.016)	0.033*** (0.004)	-0.002** (0.001)	0.008*** (0.001)	0.706*** (0.050)
B. Non-linear Effects						
ℙ[% of low-income peers > 30%]	-0.001 (0.515)	-0.775 (0.497)	0.774*** (0.144)	-0.045 (0.029)	0.118*** (0.038)	15.699*** (2.610)
<i>Pre-treatment statistics</i>						
mu(Outcome)	5.002	4.771	0.231	0.752	0.180	4.386
sd(Outcome)	5.040	4.816	0.548	0.432	0.384	11.14
<i>Treatment distribution in 2015</i>						
Δ mu( $R_{mc}^l$ )				9.51 p. p.		
sd( $R_{mc}^l$ )				12.98		
No. Students	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278	5,278	4,063

*Notes:* This table displays the estimates from Equation 1 in Panel A., and the non-linear estimates in Panel B. Outcomes are based on a turnstile-elicited links based on time-windows of 5 seconds and at least two co-movements in a term. % of low-income peers is calculated at the major-cohort levels. ℙ[% of low-income peers > 30%] is an indicator function equal to one if the share of low-income peers in the major and cohort is greater than 30% i.e., over the 75th percentile of the distribution in the 2015 – Spring entry cohort. All estimations control for female indicators, age in year at the time of entry, SB11 standardized test score, mothers' has no college education indicator, indicator of middle-SES background according to the social strata indicator, and dummies for whether the student got an SPP loan. I address missing values by including an indicator equal to 1 if any of the covariates contains a missing value for the student  $i$ . All standard errors are clustered at the major-cohort level. \*  $p < 0.10$ , \*\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .