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ABSTRACT

Mexican American and Anglo American senior high school students participated in an original questionnaire designed to examine ethnic and gender differences regarding their intentions to go to college. The questionnaire was based on seven scales thought to be associated with educational participation for Mexican American students including language barriers, cultural socialization, cultural deprivation, assessment/stereotyping/segregation (tracking), student/teacher (counselor) interaction, parent involvement/role models and assimilation/acculturation. A 2x2x2 analysis of variance (sex x ethnicity x intention to go to college) compiled with each of the seven scales resulted in significant main effects for sex of the student on the assessment/stereotyping/segregation (tracking) scale. Additional significant main effects were found for the intention to attend college and cultural socialization, parental involvement/role models, and assimilation/acculturation. Differences based on ethnicity were not supported. Implications and limitations of the study are discussed.
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UNDERSTANDING THE VARIABLES THAT INFLUENCE INTENTIONS TO ATTEND COLLEGE FOR MEXICAN AMERICAN AND ANGLO AMERICAN SENIORS

Hispanic Americans continue to be underrepresented in higher educational institutions. A report sponsored by the Hispanic Policy Development Project (HPDP) of Washington, D.C., entitled, "Make Something Happen: A Report on Secondary Schooling for Hispanics" (1984) was issued in the December 12, 1984 edition of Education Week. According to a California State University memorandum, this report not only received front page coverage in the Los Angeles Times, but was also referenced in the December 13, 1984 issue of the New York Times and is set for future coverage by Time Magazine (Aveilhe, 1984). It appears that for the past year, the National Commission on Secondary Schooling for Hispanics (NCSSH), a program of the HPDP, surveyed schools in five major cities with high Hispanic concentrations, spoke with local and state legislators, principals, teachers, counselors, parents, and students; assessed reports on the U.S. public educational status; and analyzed data on education statistics pertaining to Hispanics. "Make Something Happen" was the culmination of that investigation.

Important aspects and special problems continuing to
confront Hispanics in the nation's public schools were revealed: Among the findings included:

* 40 percent of all Hispanic students who leave school do so before reaching the tenth grade
* Few Hispanics who drop out ever return to school and even fewer ever enter college
* 25 percent of Hispanics who enter high school are over-age
* Over two thirds of all Hispanics attend schools with student bodies that are more than 50 percent minorities
* Hispanic males work more hours per week while attending school than do members of any other group and are more likely than Anglo or Black males to hold full-time jobs while attending school
* 76 percent of the Hispanics who took the High School and Beyond achievement tests scored in the bottom half of the national test results
* 35 percent of Hispanic students are in the vocational educational track rather than in the academic track, but the majority of them are not in schools that provide state-of-the-art training
* 40 percent of Hispanic students are in a general education track as opposed to a strong academic course of study
* Only four percent of Hispanic high school students take three or more years of Spanish
*45 percent of Mexican American and Puerto Rican students who enter school never finish.

In a 1970 National study, 43 percent of the nation's Hispanics had not graduated from high school by the age of 20, indeed, throughout the nation the Hispanic drop out rate was double that of Anglos and Blacks (Anderson, 1984). Anderson indicates that since the Civil Rights Movement of the 1960's and 1970's, improvement in Hispanic education has leveled, or declined. At that time much attention had been focused on the staggering drop out rate of Hispanic secondary school students. Presently it appears that not much has changed in the last two decades concerning Hispanic educational attainment.

Since then, much research has been generated in an attempt to shed light on the issue; most of it attributing the drop out rate to student variables (including laziness, lack of motivation, low ability, etc.); yet very little has been of any use to deter or combat the situation. In this decade, the major educational concern regarding Hispanics is their lack of representation/participation in higher education. Carter (1979) indicates, however, that until one can fully understand the political, institutional, social and individual factors as to why young Hispanics do not complete a high school education, the reasons behind their low representation in higher education shall not be made obvious.
In reviewing the literature, certain variables appeared most salient as contributing factors to the probable success and/or failure of the Hispanic student graduating from high school and enrolling in college. These variables include:

1. language barriers
2. cultural socialization
3. cultural deprivation
4. assessment/stereotyping/segregation (or tracking)
5. student/teacher (counselor) interaction
6. parent involvement/role models
7. assimilation/acculturation

These variables will be reviewed as they apply to the educational experience of Hispanics of Mexican descent (Mexican Americans). However, since the literature often does not distinguish Mexican Americans from other Hispanic groups, it will periodically be necessary to use the word Hispanic or Chicano/Chicana in order to remain in accordance with the literature. Nevertheless, for the most part, the following information shall refer specifically to Mexican Americans.

**Language Barriers**

Part I of the Report of the Commission on Hispanic Underrepresentation issued by the California State University revealed that in California, Hispanics comprise 26 percent of the total public school population. In kindergarten, 34 percent of all children in California are
Hispanic. As recently as 1982, 33 percent of all Hispanics in public schools were classified as "limited English proficient", including 72 percent in grades k-6 (Martinez, 1984). Mexican Americans were identified as the most disadvantaged group of all. Indeed a study indicates that for every 100 children entering kindergarten and continuing on to completion of a 4 year college degree, only five Mexican Americans will complete compared to 24 Anglo Americans (Ovando, 1977). The Spanish language has been held as a major contributing factor to the lack of educational attainment by the Mexican American.

For years it has been postulated that the English language is the most important acculturation facilitator since it is needed to convey and make use of information (Melville, 1980). In his book, The Predictors of Academic Achievement of Mexican Americans, Clifford (1970) writes that for Mexican Americans, speaking Spanish is a hindrance; specifically, that the use of the language actually keeps Mexican Americans from advancement. He asserts that Mexican Americans use Spanish as a persistent symbol and instrument of isolation which, consequently contributes to retardation in educational and occupational achievement.

Gordon, Schwortz, Wenkert, and Nasatir (1968) similarly concur that the English language is a facilitator to acculturation and that if Mexican American children continue
to speak Spanish, they will not profit as well from formal instruction because of translation and interpretation problems. In the Education of Richard Rodriguez, Rodriguez (1982) stresses the need for Mexican Americans to squelch the Spanish language in order to gain the fruits of the dominant society. Indeed, there exist data which indicate a correlation between the use of the English language as a primary language and high educational aspirations and attainment among Mexican American college graduates (Hoyes, 1971; Melville, 1980).

Nevertheless it appears that language per se is not the absolute issue. Robert, Rogers and Galvan (1978) assert that language is only a handicap when it is restricted only to one or another context. Specifically, they believe that a person needs to learn at least one language and must be able to use that language in any context or situation. Unfortunately, the Mexican American has not been free to do this either at home or at school. Thus, the imposition of a restriction during this development is what produces a handicap not the language per se. As a result, many Mexican Americans do not master either English or Spanish; instead, they learn a mixture of the two languages. Yet, from the beginning of their educational experience, Mexican Americans are penalized for not being able to speak and understand fluent English.

Within the educational institutions, one common penalty
imposed on the Mexican American for not having a high command of the English language is in the form of low scores on achievement tests. For example, Robert et al., (1978) indicate that in the Wechsler's Intelligence Scale for Children, unilinguals as a group, score higher while bilinguals, as a group, score lower in verbal tests. As a result, many bilinguals have been misguided, misclassified and even misjudged as to their learning abilities. Others dispute the belief that English speaking students are necessarily at a greater educational advantage than bilingual students. For example, Vasquez (1982) proposes that bilingual students are basically well adjusted students comfortable in both languages. Lange and Padilla (1969) found indicators from a sample of high achieving Mexican American bilingual students that these high achieving students may have been better able to interact reliably and effectively with both their native and the dominant cultures, were better adjusted, and tended to be more successful than a comparison group that only spoke the English language. Thus, it appeared that identification with their ethnic group was, in fact, a necessary factor to success and psychological adjustment.

Robert et al., (1978) advise that if Mexican American students are to participate in the educational institutions of this nation, Spanish speaking children must be allowed to speak Spanish, yet encouraged to speak English in the
classroom. They suggest that it is possible that children would speak more English on a voluntary basis if they were not coerced into it. It appears possible as well that if Spanish continues to appear inferior (as the prohibition of the language implies) students will continue to speak it out of protest or denial. While teaching of vocabulary and the English language is the responsibility of the public schools, Robert et al. propose that this process needs to be responsibly and sensitively done in an environment of complete acceptance rather than in an atmosphere of "making over" the student. In summary, it appears that an educator's responsibility to a Mexican American student's progress in the acquisition of the English language is to add an English language dimension to a student's ability rather than to replace the Spanish language with English.

**Cultural Socialization**

Cultural socialization refers to the cultural environmental experience of the child, including the socialization customs, values, and traditions of that culture. One salient variable of the Mexican American culture is the size of the family. In 1978, Mexican Americans as a group averaged 5 or more children per family compared to 3.5 for Black Americans and 2.5 for Anglo Americans. In the same year, Mexican Americans were the youngest group in the U.S. with a mean age of 21.3 years compared to 30.6 years for Anglo Americans. Additionally,
ninety-one percent of all Mexican Americans reside in the states of California, New Mexico, Arizona, Texas, Illinois, and Colorado (Webster, 1981).

Probably due in part to the size of their families, Mexican Americans are a close knit group and value cooperativeness (Kagan, 1981; Reyes, 1957). Ramirez (1976) indicates that individuals in a traditional Mexican American community are inclined to openness, sharing, warmth, and commitment to mutual dependence. High value is placed on interacting/interpersonal skills as well as on one's sensitivity to the feelings and needs of others. Close personal ties with one another are encouraged. Children are brought up to have feelings of obligation to the family. The traditional language spoken at home is Spanish and children are expected to use it in keeping with tradition (Cardinas, 1971; Rayes, 1957).

Most important to this study is that data supports that Mexican Americans, as a group, do value education (Arciniega, 1984; Hernandez, 1970). Carter (1979) indicates that Mexican Americans recognize that a good education is a prerequisite to upward mobility. For example, in a 1979 report of California State University's preliminary findings on Hispanic participation in post secondary education, it was found that fifty-three percent of students attending a 2-year college were Hispanic, compared to 33 percent Anglos. However, while it appears that they are a motivated
college bound population, Hispanics are the least prepared to succeed in a 4 year college program, therefore the least likely to transfer from a 2-year college to a 4-year college (Arciniega, 1984).

Other studies indicate a correlation between a successful Mexican American student and the level of education of the student's parents. The higher the parent's education the more likely the student will attain a high school education. Indeed, on a general basis, family support appears to be an important determining factor in educational attainment of the Mexican American (Carter, 1979).

Additionally, children in a more dualistic community are found to be more assimilated to the Anglo norm than traditionally raised children (Kagan, 1981). This evidence appears to indicate that the less traditionally brought up the Mexican American child, the more readily he/she is able to adapt to the dominant society (implying an absence of cultural conflict). Thus, while it appears that Mexican Americans recognize that education is a prerequisite for success in this country, it nevertheless appears that somehow the foundation for educational success, in part, falls between the cracks of the expectations of their cultural socialization and those of their assimilation.

**Cultural Deprivation**

Robert et al. (1978) defines cultural deprivation as:
"those conditions which deprive children of the experiences or cultural patterns in the home such as travel, reading materials, television, radio and other things that are necessary for the types of learning characteristic of the schools and the larger society" (p. 8).

Such a description appears to correctly characterize many Mexican American students since a great part of the Mexican American population is from the lowest socio-economic level (Chang, 1957; Gandara, 1982; Wells, 1980) Economic factors are often a salient cause of the Mexican American high school dropout rate. For example, Chang (1957) lists a few of the common economic-related variables known to cause Mexican American students to drop out of school:

1) poverty/need for employment
2) lack of appropriate clothing
3) poor health
4) unstable employment/moving from one district to another
5) needed at home (babysit etc.)

However, economic conditions are just one aspect of the deprivation variables. Chang also offers a list of social and cultural factors as well including:

1) poor parental control
2) children feeling inferior and rejected at school
3) lack of motivating environmental stimuli
4) inadequate assimilation
5) poor teacher treatment
6) lack of legal compensatory attendance enforcement
7) emotional and social handicaps

However, Vasquez (1982) asserts that while Mexican Americans have only a limited opportunity to expose themselves to dominant cultural and intellectual resources, and thus can be properly considered educationally disadvantaged; he cautions that the disadvantage should not be construed as arising from the Mexican culture per se, but instead to lack of resources.

In addition, Clifford (1970) observes that students of the Mexican American culture are also at a disadvantage educationally because school life is not an extension of home life for the student. He speculates that a language barrier could be a reason for this, i.e., for example, he believes it is possible that students and parents are not able to comfortably share both languages, thus are not able to discuss academic activities; another speculation is that the parents simply are not able to relate with the student in an academic context since many are uneducated. Finally, he points out that since family size is larger for the Mexican American family, it is likely that there is less of an opportunity for individual child-parent interaction.

Furthermore, Robert et al. (1978) indicate that
Mexican American students may be culturally disadvantaged because of a poor bicultural experience; that is, one culture in school and another culture at home. As a result, it is not uncommon for some students to develop emotional and behavioral problems because they are not able to integrate home and school experience. Chang (1957) particularly calls our attention in noting that these problems are in addition to the normal, inevitable developmental problems of maturing. Under these circumstances it is not difficult to find that Mexican Americans have more stress compared to Anglo Americans (Webster, 1981). Thus, it appears that Mexican Americans are not only educationally, culturally, and socially handicapped but emotionally and developmentally handicapped as well.

Wells (1980) indicates, however, that the most damaging deprivation of all has been the one imposed by the members of the dominant society (as a group) on Mexican Americans (as a group) for not conforming to Americanism. For example, Mexican Americans have continuously been encouraged to downplay their ethnic origins in public, i.e., speak English, assimilate and conform accordingly; yet Mexican Americans continue to be referred to as foreigners and "outsiders." Wells indicates that this negative stereotyping by the dominant society has made it difficult for Mexican Americans to correct economic and educational
barriers particularly by withholding important resources (public resources and/or jobs) thereby perpetuating the status quo. Unfortunately for Mexican Americans there continues to exist among the dominant society, the tendency to discriminate against the poor, those with dark skin, and non-English speakers (Arciniega, 1984). Regretfully it appears that this extends to educator's discriminatory tendencies.

In summary, the Mexican American students experience discrimination, poverty, rejection and frustration in their overall environment which probably contributes to high delinquency and drop out rate. Compound this situation with the apathy of the southwest states in enforcing the mandatory school attendance laws and there begins to emerge a glimpse of some of the probable dynamics behind the high Mexican American dropout rate.

Assessment/Labels and Stereotyping

In several studies, it has been found that on a national basis, Mexican Americans, as a group, continuously score lower than Anglo Americans in all aspects of achievement tests and at all levels (Arciniega, 1984; Clifford, 1970; Frazier & De Blassie, 1977; Gordon et al., 1968). Additionally, it appears that the use of achievement tests for bilingual students have generally not been considered a satisfactory method of predicting school achievement for Mexican Americans. Furthermore, it is believed that I.Q.
and achievement tests do not necessarily tap native intellectual endowment, but instead the environmental experience of a student (Gordon et al., 1968; Robert et al., 1978). Finally, it is believed that standardized tests are heavily influenced by SES, disparity of educational quality, and teacher stereotypes (Gomez, 1973).

It appears evident that schools are basically designed to educate middle class unilinguals—thus, achievement measurements are designed for such a population (Goldman, 1976; Hepner, 1970; Robert et al., 1978). Anglo Americans inevitably get better scores because they fit and make up the 'norm' (Hepner, 1970). Thus, by implication, it is apparent that the use of these measurements are not offering every student an equal opportunity to demonstrate his/her educational ability. This inequality has undoubtedly lead many bilinguals to be misjudged, misclassified and mislabeled. Specifically, achievement test have failed to consider inadequacies of the child which are associated with language and cultural transitional difficulties (Robert et al., 1978).

Even so, educators continue to classify students according to disabilities (as measured by performance). For example, due to the lack of appropriate performance by the Mexican American student, it is not uncommon that the educator may request 'special' testing of a student. If the student cannot perform according to the norm, he/she is
likely to be confirmed officially inadequate and inappropriately labeled accordingly (Robert et al., 1978). In the past, many Mexican American students have been labeled retarded as a result of low I.Q. scores, low reading ability, and for speaking Spanish (Rayes, 1957). Thus, Robert et al. indicate that with the new label as an additional handicap, it is probable that the student may find it too difficult to achieve normal progress and eventually feels compelled to drop out of school. It appears that under these circumstances, achievement tests are not only invalid and inappropriate but, may represent a menacing deterrent to low-scoring Mexican American students' educational aspirations.

In a similar situation, the tests appear a mere rational which is simply used to justify the practice of 'tracking' of groups of Mexican Americans. That is, since the low scoring students are found inadequate, or deviated from the 'norm', Mexican Americans are tracked or lead out of college preparatory courses by their counselors and teachers and instead tracked into general or vocational courses (Arciniega, 1984). Thus, when the otherwise potentially successful Mexican American students seek higher education, they find that their basic study skills are lacking or inadequate (Vasquez, 1982). For example: A) Hispanics made up only 11.5 percent of CSU first-time freshmen in 1983, while Hispanics represent 26 percent of the public school
population and B) After seven years in CSU schools, 45 percent of Anglo students earn a degree compared to 24 percent of Mexican Americans and 21 percent blacks (Anderson, 1984).

On the other hand, some educators believe that Mexican Americans generate their own educational problems; indeed, some educators believe that the Mexican culture is the problem! Hernandez (1970) notes that emphasis has been placed on special classes geared to change the student; not to change teaching, not to change society, not to enforce attendance laws, not to change principles or practices; special classes have been geared to change the student. This rational reflects the cultural determinist point of view, a view in which the Mexican American child is thought to be deficient, thus requiring special school programs geared to correct this. This view attributes the problem concerning lack of educational achievement of Mexican American students to psychological variables of the students rather than to social, legal, or institutional variables (Carter, 1979).

Other stereotypical assumptions concerning Mexican American students include such generalizations as: A) females are passive; their main goal is to get married and have a family (Cabrera, 1963; Melville, 1980; Mora & Castillo, 1980); while, if not compliant, males are thought to lack respect of authority due to reinforced machismo
at home (Chang, 1957). B) Mexican American students, as a group, are more dependent on the teachers, need more guidance, and are significantly more passive than Anglo American students (Hepner, 1970). (Implicitly, this appears to deem Mexican Americans less attractive.) It also appears that Mexican American students tend to help each other during class (possibly an extension of their culture's cooperative socialization process) thus causing themselves to get into trouble for "cheating." (Indeed, this helping situation would not be difficult to imagine when one considers the variable levels of English proficiency that any given classroom of Mexican American students may contain.) C) Additionally, the student may even be a victim of discrimination due to the very identification label he/she identifies with or calls himself/herself. For example, in a 1981 study Fairchild and Cozens found that names trigger mental images of "cognitive schemes" in a person. In turn, these names affect the direction of attitude (and behavior) of the person evaluating the label; their study revealed that the word "Chicano/Chicana" elicited negative connotations (and negative perceptions) while the word Mexican American elicited positive connotations (and positive perceptions). Fairchild et al., indicate that this stereotype reaction (particularly in the form of discriminating behavior) may negatively affect the self-esteem of the individual or group in question.
D) Finally, that Mexican Americans do not value education. Some social scientists affirm that Mexican Americans do not value education, are a lazy people, and that their friends lead them to evil. Indeed there exists published scientific evidence in support of this position (Hernandez, 1970). These members of the scientific community, and supporters of the cultural determinist view, have attempted to systematically validate this point of view regarding Mexican Americans via scientific research. There appears little doubt that the preceding variables profoundly affect the Mexican American educational experience (and attainment).

It is apparent that Mexican Americans' lack of opportunity for educational attainment started from their earliest educational experience, both individually and as a group (Webster, 1981). Webster notes that in the 1940's, Mexican Americans were treated condescendingly in universities. Secondly, they were not expected to do as well in the universities as the Anglo students. And finally, they were not allowed to join sororities or fraternities. Research indicates that overall, teachers still continue to expect lower levels of achievement from Mexican American students (Carter, 1979; Gordon et al., 1968; Robert et al., 1978).

Recently, however, there exists an enlightened view that Mexican Americans, as a group, are not responsible for their
lack of representation in education. Cardenas (1971) asserts that a major barrier to acculturation is the lack of reinforcement of the school experience by the educational system. Cardenas describes the school as a laboratory of perpetual failure for the Mexican American. Additionally, he warns that cultural ostracism for Mexican Americans is inevitable if as students they are not prepared for mainstreaming. He recommends nationwide reform for Mexican American students which are segregated into special programs (the very programs which will demand and expect less from these students) because they are not able to compete with an inflexible pattern of schooling designed for middle class Anglo students (Hepner, 1970). Finally, Cardinas (1971) emphasizes that under the guise of these programs, not only does the educational system encourage segregation, but also deprives the Mexican American students from a comparable education to which the Anglo pupil is allowed to experience.

Indeed, throughout the literature a pattern appears to emerge which suggests that Mexican American students are better off without special education classes which are designed to make them over and/or track them. Instead, several studies indicate a correlation between successful Mexican American students and the level of school segregation; the more segregated the school, the higher the grades and degree of educational attainment of the Mexican
American (Carter, 1979; Gorden et al., 1968; Romero, 1977; Vasquez, 1982). By implication this would expose the Mexican American to the same educational opportunities as his/her Anglo counterpart.

In conclusion, it does not appear functional nor appropriate to perpetually focus only on student variables while leaving the school programs and procedures untouched (Hepner, 1970). It does seem appropriate, however, that practice of assessment be instrumentally used to pinpoint possible educational weaknesses in the Mexican American student, instead of as an instrument to classify or label; specifically, Robert et al. (1978) recommend that evaluation tests be used by educators to discover the level at which a student may be functioning in order to effectively guide him/her.

Furthermore, it appears appropriate that the tests be explained to all students in a responsible, sensitive, and unthreatening manner. Most important, it appears appropriate that educators formally familiarize themselves with the special needs and cultural handicaps of their pupils (to help eliminate stereotypical judgments) and adjust their curriculum accordingly. Indeed, Hernandez (1970) appropriately submits her concern regarding the abuse of scientific inquiry (research in the guise of science) by the professional community in order to perpetuate stereotypical beliefs. Specifically, she warns that under
this guise, there exists the danger that opinion may be taken for fact. Hernandez cautions researchers and educators to be aware of such scientific bias. Cardenas (1971) also cautions that many individual Mexican American studies are transitory, superficial and situational and often used to reinforce preconceived notions.

Student/Teacher(Counselor) Interaction

Dwight (1978) asserts that faculty members are the most likely element in aiding or hindering a student from feeling comfortable or at home with an educational institution. Ovando (1977) points out that counselor and teacher interaction with students is, in fact, a positive predictor of Mexican American students' higher educational aspirations thus, indicating that teacher/counselor influence contributes to educational attainment. Unfortunately, Carter (1979) indicates that not only do educators not exploit this advantage, but on the contrary, finds that educators instead demand minimal performance from Mexican American students. Consequently, he believes that this lack of expectation to perform is a prime contributor to lack of educational performance and attainment of Mexican Americans.

For example, in a limited study, Stella (1974) found that teachers favored interaction with Anglo students as compared to Mexican American students. In the same study, it was also found that the Mexican American students were not as actively involved in classroom activities as Anglo
students. Finally, it was found that educators directed significantly more questions to Anglo children rather than Mexican American children 17 percent of the time. Overall, studies point to the negative teacher/student interaction experience, negative teacher attitude and low expectancies as major factors to low Mexican American achievement (Arciniega, 1984).

A similar study indicates that for the sake of efficiency individuals tend to categorize objects, groups, and concepts as a single unit, i.e., stereotype. Specifically, instead of considering each individual independent of others, the individual is systematically categorized according to some preconceived cognition. In a 1981 study, Casas and Others found that this was exactly what a group of educational counselors were found to be practicing. It was discovered that the group of counselors had a constellation of stereotypes for Mexican Americans and a separate constellation of stereotypes for Anglos and Asians. Casas et al. propose that such stereotyping affects how counselors process additional information about ethnics which may prevent the access of important information which reflect incorrect stereotypical concepts. Thus, while it may seem efficient to categorize, it can have detrimental repercussions for the group in question.

It appears that such stereotyping is a contemporary occurrence. For example, on September 23, 1984 the Los
Angeles Times released an article entitled: "Schools Seek Fair Share of College-Bound: Certain Campuses Seem to Flunk at Guiding Seniors." The article indicated that there appears to exist a salient discrepancy on the number of high school college bound students between similar schools in a southern California area. While it is understood that affluent high schools usually do better at sending their seniors to college, it was apparent in this study that economic reasons alone were not able to explain the differences among the roughly similar high schools. A closer inquiry indicated that a determining factor of college-bound students turned out to be teacher/counselor attitudes. For example, at the schools which produced more college-bound students than might be expected, school officials indicated that they aggressively encouraged their students to take college preparatory class, learn about financial aid, and apply early to colleges and universities. Indeed, some school officials considered it a matter of pride to produce college-bound students. However, the schools that did not prepare its students for higher education attributed this failure to lack of interest and motivation, truancy, and dropout rate of the students (including lack of parental participation). Nevertheless, college officials were convinced that the difference reflects teacher/counselor attitudes; they maintain that a positive attitude towards college is partly shaped by a
responsible school staff which takes pride in sending their students to college.

Thus, it appears that educators and counselors are in a key position to participate effectively in reversing the status of Mexican American educational attainment. For example, Ysidro (1963) recommends that educators consider Mexican American students in light of personality theory as presented by Combs, Maslow, Rogers and Kelly. He indicates specifically, that it would be helpful if classrooms could be a creative and pleasant atmosphere for learning; including a safe and secure atmosphere for speaking Spanish.

In addition, it may also be helpful if teachers would expose and familiarize themselves to the Mexican American students' environment for some time in order to gain insight into their experience (Chang, 1957; Hepner, 1970;). Ovando (1977) cautions, however, that while he considers it necessary for teachers to sensitize themselves to cultural differences, they should conversely, guard against overlooking the commonalities. Specifically, Chang (1957) suggests that it would be helpful to teachers if institutions developed cultural awareness programs for its personnel in schools where large members of minorities attend.

For example, it appears important that teachers be absolutely conscious not to provoke Mexican American student reaction (by implicative attitudes & expectation), but
should instead exploit the personal contact approach which is more in keeping with this population's socialization processes. Teachers and parents both are very influential to Mexican American students in reference to their academic aspirations; it appears that the expectations of others play an important role for this population as it does to others (Vasquez, 1982). Additionally, it appears of vital urgency that educators provide positive educational experiences for Mexican Americans soon in order to curb the disproportional representation of Spanish surnamed students which declines dramatically the higher the level of education (Lopez, 1976; Robert et al., 1978).

**Parent Involvement/Role Models**

It also appears evident that the lack of educational attainment and representation of Mexican American students in the high schools and colleges may be due to the lack of appropriate social learning by this population. I refer to the theoretical tenet of Albert Bandura's learning theory, which I find useful, instrumental and convincing in understanding the complexities of learning and personality development in Mexican Americans. Bandura (1965) notes that as infants we primarily learn by observation. First we observe and learn from our caretaker and then we expand our learning to the observation of significant others and of the greater environment (society).

Unfortunately, Mexican Americans, as a group, are not
usually exposed to many (if any) Mexican Americans in pursuit of higher education or professional careers. Teachers, nurses, counselors, etc., with which Mexican American students typically interact are likely to be non-Mexican American. It is this situation which appears to contribute a serious disadvantage for Mexican Americans during the development of social (role) learning.

According to Bandura, effective social learning requires both adequate generalizations and sharp discrimination. The implications are that we possess the power to select our life direction if we can be convinced that others just like ourselves are doing what we would like to do. The inducement to this learning process, however, is identification. Bandura (1965) suggests that we are most influenced by models which are same-sexed, peer models, models with high status and/or valued in our society, models from our own reference group and finally, models that have something we want. During our developmental years, it is this fine discrimination level which is the most influential whether we are conscious of it or not. Unfortunately, it appears that this type of vicarious learning can be detrimental if one is deprived from an appropriate range of models. It appears that Mexican Americans experience such a limitation.

For example, Dollard and Miller (1941) assert that during the socialization process individuals from groups are
likely to be punished (via guilt, ridicule, lack of support, etc.) for deviating too far in behavior from the rest of their reference group. Results in a study by Mindel (1980) concerning the extended famililism among Texan, urban, Mexican Americans, Anglos and Blacks inferred that Mexican Americans showed the highest level of extended famililism while Anglos showed the least. To Mexican Americans this translates into additional pressure to perpetuate his/her traditional role. Thus, it appears that Mexican Americans watch, identify, and imitate their significant models and subsequently internalize the pattern of their role models as their aspirational and optional reality. Indeed, Mexican Americans, as do other ethnic groups, depend heavily on parents and peers as role models (Hepner, 1970).

For example, Mexican American females still continue to be heavily influenced by their significant models such as mothers, sisters, aunts, etc., who generally get married, have children and work at unskilled jobs (Gonzales, 1982). With this type of socialization, pressure, and absence of other options, Gonzales indicates that there is little wonder many Mexican American females have not chosen to stay in school and pursue higher education and/or careers.

Furthermore, in the absence of appropriate role models, it is possible that Mexican Americans internalize that higher education and career aspiration options do not apply to them. They may unconsciously deduce that they are too
dumb, not supposed to want or do anything else, or that Mexican Americans simply are not invited to pursue the options shared by the larger society. In summary, it appears that the lack of exposure to diversified role models, may very well be a variable which contributes to Mexican American lack of educational attainment. In addition one can speculate that this is probably a typical situation for all groups of the lower socio-economic level.

In our society it is generally believed that parents play a vital role in establishing motivation of academic achievement in their children. This is true of Mexican American parents as well. For example, Cardinas (1971) notes that Mexican American fathers are very influential in mainstreaming or alienating their children from the dominant culture. Other studies (Carter, 1979; Gandara, 1982; Vasquez, 1982) indicate that Mexican American mothers are very influential in encouraging educational attainment. Additionally, Vasquez (1982) observes a correlation between successful Mexican American students and hard working parents, regardless of parental educational attainment.

Nevertheless, the literature indicates that overall, Mexican American parents do not participate in the academic matters of their children. Indeed, while parents purport to support their children's educational aspiration, the support is not manifest in concrete involvement. For example, in a 1977 study, Ovando found that although a group of Mexican
Americans students perceived that their parents wanted them to succeed educationally, the support was not manifest in the form of active follow-up, i.e., participating in student academic activities.

It appears however, that part of this lack of parent-student academic interaction may be due to language barriers. That is, many parents do not speak or understand English and/or are not able to read it, thus are not able to effectively communicate or help their children (Cardinas, 1971; Clifford, 1970; Hepner, 1970). Additionally, Mexican American parental aspiration is conveyed more clearly for and consciously for males than for females (Gandara, 1982). Equally detrimental is that it appears that Mexican American parents do not consistently support special programs designed to help their children gain academic achievement (Chang, 1957).

Finally, it appears important that students feel comfortable in their educational institutions. For example, it appears reasonable that if institutions want to attract and keep minorities, they should accommodate with the composition of the faculty, staff, and counselors i.e., role models. It makes sense that more minorities (role models) would attract, influence, and invite more minorities into classrooms (Roper, 1978). This is especially important since professionals serve not only as role models and as agents of change but as an extended support system as well
(Romero, 1977).

Indeed, it appears possible that if appropriate models which Mexican American students and their parents could identify and interact with, as well as be influenced by were available for this population, perhaps parental academic participation would increase. Conversely, perhaps the Mexican American high school attrition rate would decrease. In conclusion, it may be possible that one reason Mexican Americans have not been successful in educational institutions is that the institutions have failed to provide appropriate influence. Additionally, there appears to exist a need to educate parents about the options available to their children and encourage their participation in supporting their children's education.

Acculturation/Assimilation

Berry (1976) defines assimilation as: the notion of giving up a traditional culture and moving into the larger society's culture. Cohen (1958) defines assimilation as the process in which the immigrant or alien loses the modes of behavior previously acquired in another society and gradually takes the ways of the new society. He defines an assimilationist as a member of an ethnic minority who by attitude or ideology aspires toward personal or group assimilation.

Herskovits (1958), however, defines assimilation as the process of transforming aspects of a conquered or engulfed
culture into a status of relative adjustment to the form of the ruling culture (note that his is a more radical definition implying lesser or no choice for the assimilationist).

Berry (1976) defines integration (acculturation) as retaining both a traditional culture and pulling together with the larger society. Cohen (1972) is somewhat more ambiguous in his definition of acculturation i.e., "comprehends those phenomena which results when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact with changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups" (p. 63).

Herskovits (1958) believes acculturation may be taken to refer to the ways in which some cultural aspect is taken into a culture and adjusted and fitted into it. This definition implies some relative cultural equality between the giving and receiving cultures. In addition, Hoyes (1971) identifies acculturation as referring specifically to social participation, language orientation, and attitudes toward certain achievement values of the dominant group. It appears that within this definition one may take it to understand that assimilation is taken only to the extent that it may serve to the advantage of achievement without subtracting from or compromising the individual's culture or values. Having given several definitions of both assimilation and acculturation it appears evident that,
within the context of educational institutions of our nation, educators may have, consciously or unconsciously, thwarted the spirit of educational aspirations of Mexican Americans by trying to assimilate rather than trying to acculturate this population.

The schools are the nation's socialization agents which seek to educate and assimilate Mexican American students (Hepner, 1970). Hernandez (1970) notes, however, that in the nation's schools, Angloism is the measuring ruling stick of educational attainment. She indicates that in this context Americanized is equivalent to Angloized, which (in this context) is to uplift oneself. Indeed, Hoyes (1971) asserts that identification with the higher achievement values of the more socially privileged group implies an increase in concrete facilitation for achievement such as greater opportunities for education, occupational variability and mobility. However, he finds that for Mexican Americans, as a group, there exists a consistent relation of level of aspiration, acculturation (specifically a command of the English language), and socio-economic status. Indeed, Schwartz (1968) directly indicates that the successful Mexican American students are those that have internalized the dominant values.

For example, Rodriguez (1978), himself a Mexican American, believes that Mexican Americans ought to embrace assimilation. He believes that assimilation is the way to
education and that education is what gave him a public identity (that is, removed him from a minority status); for example, he asserts that one is a minority only to a degree and that if one does not completely assimilate, he/she is a minority by choice.

Specifically, Rodriguez believes that lack of assimilation by minorities is what causes race to replace class as the most important way of organizing American society. Thus, he maintains that education and assimilation offer Mexican Americans escape from minority status. Rodriguez himself is a model assimilationist (Cohen, 1958). Ironically enough, however, Rodriguez considers himself a comic victim of assimilation because he is no longer able to communicate with his parents at their level or in their language (due to his total assimilation), which he claims not to mind considering his gains. Rodriguez apparently believes that Mexican Americans have to completely disown his/her own values and culture and embrace the dominant one in order to gain success; a view which appears to throw out the babe with the bath water.

Lopez (1976) notes that by avoiding close scrutiny of existing practices and not questioning basic premises, educational institutions have been able to maintain their status quo, i.e., to project the image of a responsive and progressive institution (in helping Mexican Americans to acculturate) through the creation of special programs. He
emphasizes that counseling services, academic support programs and instructional special programs usually are not incorporated (and validated) as part of the regular institutional programs, but instead rely on 'special program' status which is vulnerable to cutbacks. Additionally, in spite of the programs, the pool of graduating Mexican American students is not larger in either absolute or relative terms (indicating that the student's needs are not being met).

Hernandez (1970), however, bitterly opposes the traditional depiction of Mexican Americans as ahistoric individuals in need of a complete psychological, cultural, and personality metamorphosis. It is apparent that what Mexican Americans need is educational pluralism; that is, what is needed is to modify the existing curriculum to accommodate the needs of different pupils of different background and cultures instead of ignoring and/or disregarding their special needs (Hepner, 1970). Such insensitivity appears to be in large scale. For example, after a lengthy study by the U.S. Civil Service Commission, it was concluded that: "...findings of this report reflect more than inadequacies regarding the specific conditions and practices examined. They reflect a systematic failure of the educational process which ignores the needs of Chicano students but which also suppresses their culture and stifles their hopes and ambitions" (Webster, 1981, p. 67).
An additional difficulty for Mexican Americans is that there appears to exist within these people an ambivalence as to how much they are willing to participate within the dominant culture without feeling that they are betraying their own traditional values. It appears that many Mexican Americans believe that to embrace the fruits of the dominant society is equivalent to betrayal of their own culture. For example, Chang (1957) observed in her study of Mexican Americans that many of them equated any degree of assimilation as a rejection of their heritage. This does not appear completely inappropriate since they are continuously discouraged from speaking their language and encouraged to downplay their ethnic origins (Wells, 1980).

Additionally, Wells indicates that while the dominant society expects Mexican Americans to help themselves, they do not have the resources nor are able to obtain them; they come to realize that they have a negative public image. Many become bitter or confused; in their various shades of color ranging from fair Spanish to conspicuous Indian characteristics, they wonder whether they are American or Mexican; whether Mexican American is part of America or apart from America, knowing only for sure that they are received differently from the preferred dominant group, thus, come to resist Americanism (Rayes, 1957).

There apparently exists a basic need for Chicano Study programs and centers which would include recruitment and
admission of Chicano students; recruiting and hiring of Chicano faculty, administration, and staff; formal study of Chicano history and culture (for students and educators) and support programs in order to equalize educational opportunities for Mexican Americans (Webster, 1981). It appears of imminent importance that institutions recognize and act on the development of effective acculturation programs for Mexican American students if their educational attainment status is to be corrected.

Clifford (1980) cites four important facilitating factors of acculturation for Mexican American students:

1) Attitudinal facilitators - readiness to adapt (willingness to learn about dominant culture) with the desire to better themselves

2) Cognitive facilitators - a) the most important being the English language (to make use of and get information) and b) educational level (which correlates with class status and aspirations)

3) Behavioral facilitators - which are social integration and employment

4) Agency & relation - which are a form of resources whereby one can receive help (information) and assistance.

Gomez (1973) includes parental academic participation as
well. Yet Kagan (1981) notes that while cultural values and behavior patterns historically evolve in response to the ecological demands of the environment, Mexican Americans appear to suffer from culture lag; that is, many are raised for an environment that no longer exists, which results in a maladjusted or nonfunctional upbringing. Gordon et al., (1968) indicate, nevertheless, that it is the schools' responsibility to educate and compensate for the Mexican American's initial disadvantage.

Yet in spite of all their individual handicaps and institutional disadvantages, successful Mexican American students are motivated in a way that cannot be accounted for scientifically. It was found in studies of educational values of Anglo American and Mexican American college students that both groups valued education equally regardless of cultural background, and that both groups were concerned with obtaining marketable skills and equally strive for a good quality of life (Aiken, 1979; Ovando, 1977). The difference is that there continues to exist an unnecessary hardship for Mexican Americans since they do not have access to public and private resources and/or jobs, or equal opportunities for a quality education (Wells, 1980).

Overall, it appears that the lack of representation in educational attainment of the Mexican American is not the result of an isolated variable, but in fact, due to both a number of separate variables and overlapping variables. For
example, it cannot be isolated to a) student variables, b) parent variables, c) socialization variables, d) teacher variables, or institutional variables, but instead a complex interaction which includes all of these. In addition, it appears to be a perpetual phenomenon; that is, it appears that the situation is ongoing and does not improve. Indeed, the status of Mexican American educational attainment has continued with the same problem of low representation for two and three decades.

What is certain, however, is that educational attainment for Mexican Americans is conspicuously low while the number of Mexican Americans continues to grow. For example it is estimated that by the year 2000, Mexican Americans will be the majority population in California (Mexican American students are the majority in the Los Angeles school district already). Thus, it appears imperative that all levels of educational institutions reevaluate and revise their curriculum in relation to the student body needs. Otherwise, not only will a great source of brain power be wasted, but the nation will directly feel the consequence of this neglect (Arciniega, 1984). Hopefully, the Hispanic Policy Development Project (HPDP) will "Make Something Happen" very soon.


Purpose of Research

The purpose of the present research is to investigate how Mexican American and Anglo American male and female students compare in their responses to a questionnaire designed to assess a relationship between the seven variables discussed and the students' intention to attend college.

Based on the assumption that language barriers, cultural socialization, cultural deprivation, assessment/stereotyping/segregation (tracking), student/teacher (counselor) interaction, parent involvement/role models and assimilation/acculturation are all variables associated with Mexican American students' educational participation, it is hypothesized that Mexican American students, as a group and females, as a group, will emerge as the groups least likely to indicate an intention to go to college, implicating ethnicity and sex of a student as related variables to the student's decision to go to college.

Also included in the questionnaire are several open ended questions which have been designed to elicit responses from the students at an individual and personal level. It is expected that ethnic and gender differences will appear most salient at this level. Specifically it is expected that the open ended questions will further corroborate the statistical analysis.
METHODS

Subjects. The subjects were 57 Mexican American (M=30, F=27) and 53 Anglo American (M=28, F=25) high school seniors from two local high schools in San Bernardino County. The target schools were selected because of their approximately equal ratio of Mexican American and Anglo American students. Although all students in selected classrooms participated in the survey, only questionnaires in which the student indicated his/her ethnicity as either Mexican American or Anglo American were used for analysis.

Materials. Materials in this project included a 103-question originally prepared questionnaire. The basic orientation of the questionnaire was to elicit subjective attitudes associated with the seven scales under investigation from the students. Out of 103 questions, 40 questions were designed in a Likert scale fashion, others required positive, negative, and/or neutral responses, with the remainder requiring fill-in responses. A copy of the questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

Procedure. Before the questionnaire was administered to the students, the principals of each of the two high schools were personally contacted by the experimenter. The experimenter explained the purpose of the study and the proposed procedure. It was agreed that the experimenter would visit three senior classrooms (in each school) at an appointed schedule to distribute the questionnaire.
Additionally it was agreed that the classes selected would be academically homogeneous, such as all seniors are required to fulfill, rather than elective or college preparatory classes. In every class an exam or a quiz was postponed in order to afford time for the questionnaire, as well as to motivate participation.

As soon as the students were settled in class the teacher informed the students of the change in schedule for the day and the experimenter was introduced as a graduate student from a local university conducting a survey for a master's thesis. The experimenter explained the requirement regarding the student's voluntary cooperation in completing the questionnaire followed by directions to carefully read every question and respond to it accordingly. The students were assured that the questionnaire was strictly subjective such that there were no 'right' or 'wrong' answers. The experimenter then summarized the procedure of filling out and collecting the questionnaires. The students were asked to put off any questions pertaining to the purpose of the questionnaire for a later time; however, inquiries regarding the questions on the questionnaire, such as requesting clarification, were encouraged at any time.

The questionnaires were then passed out to all students as were No. 2 pencils (upon request) to fill out the questionnaires. Students were instructed to complete the whole questionnaire as accurately as possible, reminded to
refrain from identifying themselves personally in any way, and to put their questionnaire in a cardboard box located in front of the classroom when completed. Students were given approximately 40 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

When the procedure of the questionnaires was complete and the questionnaires collected, the students were informed that the study was basically a survey to attempt to discover which students intended to go to college and which did not and how these two groups differed. Students were asked not to discuss the survey with other students for the remainder of the day.
RESULTS

Scale Items

The following seven scales were analyzed using a 2x2x2 analyses of variance (ethnicity x sex x intention to attend college):  

1) language barriers  
2) cultural socialization  
3) cultural deprivation  
4) assessment/stereotyping/segregation (tracking)  
5) student/teacher (counselor) interaction  
6) parent involvement/role models  
7) assimilation/acculturation  

Each scale was constructed by summing student responses on a number of questions that were designed to reflect a particular variable. A complete listing of the questions which were included in each scale is presented in Appendix B.  

The reliability of each scale was assessed with reliability coefficients. Reliability coefficients for each scale, corresponding F values, and significant levels for the main effects of each analysis are presented in Table 1.
Table 1

**Significant Results/Reliability Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Alpha+</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Collgo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>language barriers</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>2.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural socialization</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>2.767</td>
<td>3.681</td>
<td>4.074*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural deprivation</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assess/ster/segregation</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>5.677*</td>
<td>1.499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student/teacher (c) int.</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>2.363</td>
<td>3.187</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parent inv/role models</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>2.666</td>
<td>5.609*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assimilation/acculturation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>32.211*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant main effects, \( p < 0.05 \).
+ Chronbach's alpha reliability coefficient.
++ Too few cases to compute.
Table 2

**Intensions to Go to College (Ethnicity x Sex)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mexican Americans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anglo Americans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As evident in Table 1, and contrary to expectations, ethnicity failed to obtain significant levels in any of the seven scales. Similarly, ethnicity x sex of student failed to discriminate between students' response to go to college (Table 2). Thus, this analysis failed to establish an association between the ethnicity of a student and his/her responses in any of the seven scales.

The sex of the student, however, obtained a statistically significant main effect on the assessment/stereotype/segregation (tracking) variable, \( F(1,78), p<.02 \). As predicted, females scored higher on this scale than males. The mean score for females on this scale was 17.77; the mean score for males was 15.69. These results indicate a relationship between the sex of the student and the type of educational assessment he/she will receive. In particular, that females are more likely to be stereotypically assessed and tracked into general educational or vocational programs than are males. Sex of the student failed to achieve significant levels for the remaining six scales.

The intent to go to college obtained statistically significant main effects in the cultural socialization \( F(1,78), p<.05 \), parent involvement/role models \( F(1,78), p<.02 \), and assimilation/acculturation \( F(1,78), p<.001 \) scales. Overall, the students who indicated an intent to go to college scored higher on these scales than students with
no intention to go to college indicating that greater cultural socialization, parent involvement/role models, and assimilation/acculturation are associated variables with the intention to attend college for all students. The mean scores for those indicating an intention to attend college and those students indicating no intention to attend college are presented in Table 3.

Best scale results, as indicated by Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficients included the following scales: 1) parent involvement, 2) language barriers, 3) student/teacher (counselor) interaction and 4) cultural socialization, respectively.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cultural socialization</td>
<td>88.46</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parent involvement/role models</td>
<td>64.37</td>
<td>56.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assimilation/acculturation</td>
<td>71.27</td>
<td>64.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Ended Question Results

Tables 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 summarize student responses for the open ended questions on the questionnaire. The summarized results of these responses (as calculated in percentages) are presented in respect to sex and ethnicity of the groups.

Table 4

Responses to open-ended questions (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question no.</th>
<th>Mexican American</th>
<th>Anglo American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Favorite class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) Class you do best in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.E.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electives</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Responses to open-ended questions (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question no.</th>
<th>Mexican American</th>
<th>Anglo American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) Best aspect of school (select 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>everything</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>learning</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Least favorite aspect of school (select 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>class</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>study</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) College plan to attend</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUSB</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBVC</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

Responses to open-ended questions (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question no.</th>
<th>Mexican American</th>
<th>Anglo American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79) Receive newspaper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

81) Future jobs (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mexican American</th>
<th>Anglo American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automobiles</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus Admin</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychologist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reg. Nurse</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7

**Responses to open-ended questions (in %)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question no.</th>
<th>Mexican American</th>
<th>Anglo American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82) Reasons for absenteeism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needed at home</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no clothing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unhappy progress</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>illness</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear of punishment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family problems</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83) Free time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cars</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>go out</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>party</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>read</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sports</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

Responses to open-ended questions (in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question no.</th>
<th>Mexican American</th>
<th>Anglo American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84) Favorite music (own)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heavy metal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new wave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rock</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>soul</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variety</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85) Favorite music (parents)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elevator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexican</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oldies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>variety</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question no.</td>
<td>Mexican American</td>
<td>Anglo American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>86) Out-of-school plans</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college &amp; work</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>military</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trade school</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>92) Spend spare time</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>friends</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family &amp; friends</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

Based on seven scales assumed to be related to Mexican American students' educational participation (Bandura, 1965; Cardinas, 1971; Chang, 1957; Clifford, 1970; Gomez, 1973; Hoyes, 1971; Ovando, 1977; Webster, 1981) the present study, was designed to examine gender and ethnic differences with regards to students' intention to go to college. The scales constructed for the study included 1) language barriers, 2) cultural socialization, 3) cultural deprivation, 4) assessment/stereotyping/segregation (tracking), 5) student/teacher (counselor) interaction, 6) parent involvement/role models and 7) assimilation/acculturation.

Most unexpectedly, ethnicity of the student failed to appear significantly associated with students' intention to attend college in any of the seven scales for either males or females in this study. Indeed, the results in this study conflict with the report sponsored by the Hispanic Policy Development (1984) which revealed that forty percent (40%) of all Hispanic students who leave school, do so before reaching the tenth grade and forty-five percent (45%) of Mexican Americans and Puerto Rican students who enter school never finish as well as with Anderson's (1984) assertions that throughout the nation the drop out rate for Hispanics is double that of Anglos and Blacks. Thus, if one assumes that these statistics reflect reality, it appears that the students who participated in the present study were not
representative of the overall Mexican American student body but instead a select subgroup. Specifically, these students appear to be the fifty to sixty percent of Mexican Americans who do successfully complete high school.

As expected however, sex of the student obtained a significant main effect on the assessment/stereotype/segregation (tracking) scale indicating a significantly higher mean score for females than for males. This analysis supports the hypothesis that females, indeed, are more likely to be stereotypically assessed and tracked into general education or vocational classes than are males thus, are educationally less prepared to go to college. Indeed, Miranda and Enriquez (1979) indicate that differences in women's educational attainment continues to be strikingly lower than those for males (and lowest of all for Chicanas). For example, Chicano males are three times as likely to complete four or more years of college than are Chicanas; Anglo women are five and one half more likely and Anglo men are nine times more likely to complete four or more years of college than are Chicanas. However, the results in the present study failed to support sex of student differences in the remaining six scales.

Finally, considering the apparent success of the students in this study, it is reasonable and appropriate that significant levels were also obtained on the intention to go to college and the cultural socialization, parent
involvement/role models, and the assimilation/acculturation scales irrespective of sex or ethnicity of the student. These results appear to support assumptions regarding the positive relationship between education and individual socialization. Indeed, Carter (1979) readily emphasizes the important relationship between the Mexican American student's level of educational attainment and the parent's level of educational attainment as well as the importance of familial support. Additionally, Kagan's (1981) assumption that the more assimilated to the Anglo norm a Mexican American becomes, the more he/she is able to blend into the dominant society appears equally valid. Apparently, the Mexican American students in this study learned to appreciate the value of an education and were provided with significant parental support and role models such that they internalized aspirations to complete their education to a similar degree as their Anglo counterparts thus reflect no ethnic or sex of student differences.

However, contrary to the assumptions of other researchers (Clifford, 1970; Chang, 1957; Gomez, 1973; Ovando, 1973), no significant effects were obtained for the intent to attend college and the remaining four scales. It appears that the Mexican American students who participated in this study were among those who overcame the debilitating aspects of language barriers, social deprivation, assessment/stereotyping/segregation (tracking), and
Tables 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8, which summarize the students' responses to the open ended questions, are difficult to interpret; however, overall responses within those tables generally appear to suggest sex of student as well as ethnic response differences.

Ethnic differences to several of the open ended questions appeared evident; for example, responses to questions 17 (favorite class) and 18 (class students does best in), in table 3, suggest that Anglo American students selected class subjects more congruent with intentions to go to college (English & physics) as compared to Mexican American students (English & electives/general education). Additionally, responses to questions 23 (selection of college), 79 (receive newspapers), and 81 (future jobs) in tables 4 and 5 also support this general drift. For example, not only did Anglo American students select from a wider range of selections in actual responses (listed more colleges, newspapers, and future occupations), but they also included in their selections colleges, newspapers and professions associated with higher status and prestige than did the Mexican American students.

Finally, questions 82 (reasons for absenteeism), 84 (favorite student music), and 85 (favorite parental music) in tables 6 and 7 also appear to reflect ethnic differences. For example, responses to question 18 (reasons
for absenteeism), clearly identify Mexican Americans as reporting substantially more absenteeism for reasons other than illness than the Anglo American group. Finally, the data from questions 85 and 85 (selection of personal and parental music preference) suggests differences in cultural assimilation between the two groups.

Additionally, several responses appeared to reveal sex of student differences. For example, responses to questions 20 (best aspect of school), 82 (reasons for absenteeism), 86 (out of school plans), and 92 (spend spare time) from tables 4, 6, and 8 appear to support sex of student differences, indicating that females respond in a qualitatively different manner than males to questions designed to differentiate between students who have plans to go to college and students who do not. Specifically, females appear more social, stay home more often for reasons other than illness, indicate greater college aspirations, and (to a lesser degree) spend more of their spare time with their families than males. Furthermore, responses to questions 82, 86, and 92 identify Mexican American female responses as the responses most unique of all. Specifically, the Mexican American females report substantially more absenteeism for reasons other than illness than any other group; are the only group to indicate intentions to enroll in trade schools; and the group which spends the least time with friends and the most time with their families than any other
Indeed, Sanchez and Martinez-Cruz (1977) indicate that although progress (however slow) towards Mexican American women's educational attainment is forthcoming, it appears that the Chicana is nevertheless primarily obligated to her family.

Thus, while these speculations are inconclusive, it appears that they at least suggest ethnic and sex of student differences. One can speculate that perhaps the students were able to respond more spontaneously to the open ended questions rather than the structured questions. Specifically it is possible that the students filled in these questions in a more personal manner rather than responding from restrictive options.

While the overall study did not produce the expected statistical results from the questionnaire in terms of significant results between ethnicity of the student and the seven scales, nor between sex of the student and six of the seven scales, and resulted in only three significant main effects between the intention to go to college and three of the seven scales, this does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that sex and ethnicity are not associated variables with a students expressed intention to go to college. There are other issues and limitations to this study including the student sample, the quality of the scale, the size of the survey, and the ever-present response bias to consider.
A basic issue is that of the sample population in this study. Originally, the measures used in this study to assess differences between ethnicity, sex of the student, and the intention to go to college were conceptualized to be used on a representative sample of high school students rather than only on seniors. Thus, one can speculate that the student sample may have biased the results. On the other hand, while this study may not have provided the expected between group differences, it did provide implications of similarities between the two groups. For example, it is possible that the high school seniors in this study share more similarities than differences. If this is so, perhaps it is appropriate to speculate that the limitations once thought to be associated with lack of educational attainment and aspirations to go to college for Mexican Americans is changing. Perhaps students and institutions are changing, indeed, perhaps these similarities indicate that something is happening.

A basic limitation however, concerns the quality of the scale, i.e., there appeared to exist discrepancies between the responses in the survey in which the student simply had to indicate a level of agreement or disagreement response as compared to a personal response to the open ended questions. This gives one basis to speculate that in spite of the face value of the questionnaire (i.e., the assumption
that the questionnaire is truly measuring sex x ethnicity x intention to go to college differences among the seven scales), parts of the questionnaire may indeed, not be reliably measuring what it was designed to measure. The inconsistencies between the open ended responses and the structured responses may furthermore indicate that this type of mixed measure is inappropriate. Perhaps future research will help establish which method is the most appropriate for similar investigations.

A second limitation is that the questionnaire was fifteen pages long and included one hundred and one (101) questions. It may be possible that the length of the questionnaire could have affected the student's attitude towards filling it out. It is equally possible that students did not take as much time to consider each question as seriously as the experimenter had hoped, but instead raced through it in order to get it over with; several students skipped questions which the experimenter can only speculate that students did not have time to finish or did not hold their interest.

Finally it is possible that students responded to questions in the questionnaire in a socially desirable fashion (response bias). Kaplan (1982) indicates that some persons have a tendency to say good things about themselves, or respond in such a way that they perceive will be approved of by the experimenter, regardless of the accuracy. Thus it
is impossible to ascertain whether the students were sincere in their responses or not (i.e., the students may have been trying to seek approval of the experimenter by affirmatively indicating an intention to go to college regardless of their true intentions). It should also be noted, that even if a student indicates an intention to go to college he or she may or may not actually enroll. It should also be noted, however that this particular limitation (response bias) may pertain to any survey, irrespective of the sample population or the subject under investigation.

In conclusion, it appears that the present study may have detected more sex by ethnic differences between students with intentions attend to college and students with no intention to attend college had a more representative sample of students been used and if a shorter questionnaire been developed; it is equally important however, not to underestimate the similarities between the two groups (i.e., the lack of differences) and their implications. The results, the limitations, and the implications of this study should serve as basis for consideration in future research.
APPENDIX A

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE
Student Questionnaire

1) date:________
2) age:___
3) grade:___
4) male(M)/female(F):___
5) ethnicity (check one)
   Anglo American ___
   Black American ___
   Hispanic American ___
   Mexican American ___
   Other (please specify) ________________

6) Which language do you primarily speak at home (check one)?
   English ___
   Spanish ___
   English and Spanish equally ___
   Other (please specify) ______

7) Which language do your parents primarily speak at home (check one)?
   English ___
   Spanish ___
   English and Spanish equally ___
   Other (please specify) ______
8) Which language do other members of household primarily speak at home (check one)?
   English 
   Spanish 
   English and Spanish equally 
   Other (please specify) 

9) Which is the primary language you speak with your friends and peers (check one)?
   English 
   Spanish 
   English and Spanish equally 
   Other (please specify) 

10) How many members are in your family (include parents, brother(s) and sister(s))? 

11) How many people live in your home? 

12) How many years have you lived in the United States? 

13) How many years have you attended schools in California? 

14) Do you plan to finish high school?
   Yes No Don't know 

15) Would you remain in school if it was not required by law? Yes No Don't know
16) Please fill in your class schedule and the type of class (type of class: 1=college prep class, 2=vocational class, 3=general education class, 4=don't know).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>period 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17) Which is your favorite class? ________________

18) In which class do you do best? ________________

19) How many school activities are you involved in (for example, student government, band, sports, drill team, clubs, etc.)?

1234567 or more

20) Which aspect of school do you like best (pick 2):

- ___ sports       ___ teacher(s)
- ___ social activities ___ class(s)
- ___ friends       ___ learning
- ___ study         ___ clubs
- ___ breaks        ___ I like everything

Other (please specify) __________________________

21) Which aspect of school do you like least (pick 2):

- ___ sports
- ___ teacher(s)
- ___ social activities
- ___ class(s)
- ___ friends
- ___ learning
- ___ study
- ___ clubs
- ___ breaks
- ___ don't like anything

Other (please specify) ____________________________

22) Do you plan to go to college? (check one)

a) no ___  c) considering it ___

b) yes ___  d) not for a while ___

23) If you were to go to college in California, which college would you select? ____________________________

24) Do you know the difference between a college prep course and a non-college prep course?

yes ___  no ___

25) Have any of your teachers and/or counselors tried to encourage you to take a college prep course?

yes ___  no ___

26) Has a counselor and/or teacher asked you if you would consider an overall college prep program?

yes ___  no ___

27) Has a counselor or teacher ever told you to forget about going to college? yes ___  no ___

If yes, explain ________________________________
28) Has a counselor ever told you that you were best suited for vocational classes? no ____ yes ____

29) Who gives you the most encouragement to get an education:
   a) dad ____  
   b) mom ____  
   c) brother ____  
   d) sister ____  
   e) myself ____  
   f) other ____________  
   g) friend ____  
   h) teacher ____  
   i) counselor ____  
   j) relative ____  
   k) no one ____

30) What kind of grades do you usually receive?
   a) excellent ____  
   b) above average ____  
   c) average ____  
   d) below average ____  
   e) barely passing ____  
   f) failing ____

31) Has your father graduated from high school?  
    no ____ yes ____ don't know ____

32) Has your father graduated from college?  
    no ____ yes ____ don't know ____

33) Has your mother graduated from high school?  
    no ____ yes ____ don't know ____

34) Has your mother graduated from college?  
    no ____ yes ____ don't know ____

35) Have any other members of your immediate family (brothers, or sisters) graduated from high school? no ____ yes ____ don't know ____
36) Have any other members of your immediate family graduated from college? yes no don't know
37) Do you have any school-age brothers or sisters who work? yes no
38) If you wanted to go to college, do you know how to apply i.e., where to go for forms, inquire about entrance exams, inquire about financial aid, where to go for help and information, etc.? yes no
39) Have you ever stayed home from school to take care of your brother(s) or sister(s)? yes no
40) Providing for the family is the responsibility of father ___
    mother ___
    eldest child ___
    whole family ___
    other (specify) ______________
**) Rate how much you agree or disagree with the following questions:

1 = strongly disagree  7 = agree completely

41) When at home, I am required to help take care of my brother(s) and sister(s).
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

42) In school and at home, I usually decide about how I spend my time.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

43) I understand English fluently.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

44) When at home I am required to share my clothes, records, books, and games with other members of my family.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

45) I would rather cooperate with team members on a class project than work on it independently.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

46) I believe that a college education is absolutely necessary to making a good living.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

47) Overall I think students should be able to help each other out with their school work both in class and out of class.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
**) Rate how much you agree or disagree with the following questions:
l=strongly disagree 7=agree completely

48) I speak English fluently.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

49) I feel as if my teachers spend most of their time trying to mold me into what they think a student ought to be like, rather than contributing to my individual development.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

50) My parents agree with my choice(s) of future occupation or job.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

51) Overall the class work I have been expected to do at my school has been hard for me.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

52) My mother reads fluent English.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

53) My father reads fluent English.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7

54) I believe that teachers and administrators always understand and are sensitive to the problems of all students in my school.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
**) Rate how much you agree or disagree with the following questions:
1=strongly disagree     7=agree completely

55) I feel as if my teachers and/or counselors care about my educational progress.
    1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__

56) Education is an important part of my future.
    1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__

57) My cultural heritage is very important to me (for example, customs, traditions, language, music, etc.).
    1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__

58) I feel as if my ethnicity is an advantage to me.
    1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__

59) I always contribute to class discussion.
    1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__

60) I always complete classwork assignments.
    1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__

61) I always attend my classes.
    1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__

62) If I had the opportunity I would definitely go to college.
    1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__

63) My parent(s) would not object to my quitting school and going to work if my job was a good steady job.
    1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__
**) Rate how much you agree or disagree with the following questions:

1=strongly disagree 7=agree completely

64) Most of my counselor/teacher contacts are about academic issues, i.e., class schedules, homework assignments, school related activities, etc.
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5____ 6____ 7____

65) Most of my counselor/teacher contacts are about behavior issues, i.e., truency, disruptions, fights, trouble, etc.
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5____ 6____ 7____

66) My counselors and teachers show me that they care about me.
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5____ 6____ 7____

67) I think that all students are treated equally (fairly) by all the school staff.
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5____ 6____ 7____

68) My parents strongly encourage an education for me.
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5____ 6____ 7____

69) My parents keep in touch with my teachers and counselors.
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5____ 6____ 7____

70) My parents keep a close eye on my grades.
   1____ 2____ 3____ 4____ 5____ 6____ 7____
**) Rate how much you agree or disagree with the following questions:
   1=strongly disagree  7=agree completely

71) I believe that an education is as important to females as it is to males.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

72) My parents show me by rewards, encouragement, lectures, recognition, etc., that they want me to get good grades in school.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

73) Overall, education is more important for males.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

74) Overall, education is more important for females.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

75) My parents get involved in my educational decisions (help pick out my classes, subjects, check out my teachers, follow my progress, etc.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

76) I always inform my parents about the various choices I have in selecting my schedule.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7

77) I think that when I leave high school, I will be able to succeed in any college of my choice.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7
**) Rate how much you agree or disagree with the following questions:

1=strongly disagree    7=agree completely

78) I get the feeling that my teachers, counselors, and parents would like me to get through high school as smoothly and quickly as possible, with as little trouble as possible regardless of my grades.

1  2__  3__  4__  5__  6__  7__

79) Do you get the newspaper? yes__ no__

80) If so, what is the name of the newspaper?

________________________(if not, leave blank).

81) List three jobs that you are considering for your future.

________________________

________________________

________________________

82) Check each reason for absenteeism that you have used since September 1984.

___needed at home

___no clothing

___unhappiness about school progress

___illness

___fear of punishment at school

___trouble in family
83) List three things you like to do in your spare time.

____________________
____________________
____________________

84) What type of music do you enjoy?

____________________

85) What type of music do your parents enjoy?

____________________

86) What is your favorite TV show?

____________________

87) Would you prefer to settle down and get married when you get out of high school or would you prefer to go to college?

____ get married
____ go to college
____ both
____ neither

88) Would your family prefer that you settle down and get married when you get out of high school or would they prefer that you go to college?

____ get married
____ go to college
____ both
____ neither
89) What do you plan to do when you leave high school?

____________________________________________________________________

90) How would you rate your overall school experience?

1=very negative    7=very positive

1___ 2___ 3___ 4___ 5___ 6___ 7___

91) How much money do you get to spend on clothes, records, movies, etc., in a month?

less than $10___

$10 - $20___

$21 - $30___

more than $30___

92) When not in school, do you spend most of your spare time with friends or with family members?

____________________________________________________________________

93) How many schools have you attended?

1___ 2___ 3___ 4___ 5___ 6___ 7 or more___

94) Do you have any school-age brothers or sisters who work but do not go to school? yes___ no___

95) If you work, do you give more than half (50%) of your check to your parents? yes___ no___

96) In the home that you live, are you

buying___

renting___

guests___

don't know___

other (specify)________________________
89) What do you plan to do when you leave high school?

_____________________________________________________________________

90) How would you rate your overall school experience?

1=very negative    7=very positive

1   2 3   4   5   6   7

91) How much money do you get to spend on clothes, records, movies, etc., in a month?

less than $10__
$10 - $20__
$21 - $30__
more than $30__

92) When not in school, do you spend most of your spare time with friends or with family members?

_____________________________________________________________________

93) How many schools have you attended?

1   2 3   4   5   6   7 or more__

94) Do you have any school-age brothers or sisters who work but do not go to school? yes____ no____

95) If you work, do you give more than half (50%) of your check to your parents? yes____ no____

96) In the home that you live, are you

buying____
renting____
guests____
don't know____
other (specify)______________________________
97) Would your parents approve of your leaving home and living in the dorms while you worked on your education? yes no don't know

98) What economic class would you say your family belongs to?
   upper class__
   middle class__
   lower class__
   poor class__

99) That you know of, how many of your friends are going to college (check one: 0=none 8=all)?
   0__ 1__ 2__ 3__ 4__ 5__ 6__ 7__ 8__

100) Since September 1984, how often have you spoken with your counselor?
   ___ I have not spoken to him/her
   ___ once
   ___ 2-3 times
   ___ about once a month
   ___ about once a week
   ___ more often than once a week

101) Are you employed? yes no
APPENDIX B

VARIABLE SCALE SUMMARY
Scale Summary

Each of the seven scales was constructed by summing student responses on a number of questions which were designed to reflect each of the following seven variables:

1 = language barriers
2 = cultural socialization
3 = cultural deprivation
4 = assessment/stereotyping/segregation (tracking)
5 = student/teacher (counselor) interaction
6 = parent involvement/role models
7 = assimilation/acculturation

Table 10 reflects a summary of the questions from the questionnaire which were summed for each of the seven scales.
Table 10

Questions Loading on Each Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ques. no.</th>
<th>Scale No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
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