



1985

A Comparative Survey Of Chicano And Anglo Community College Students

Jose Luis Hurtado
University of the Pacific

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hurtado, Jose Luis. (1985). *A Comparative Survey Of Chicano And Anglo Community College Students*. University of the Pacific, Dissertation. https://scholarlycommons.pacific.edu/uop_etds/3215

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University of the Pacific Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [mgibney@pacific.edu](mailto:m gibney@pacific.edu).

A COMPARATIVE SURVEY OF CHICANO AND ANGLO
COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENTS

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the School of Education
University of the Pacific

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Jose Luis Hurtado

January 1985

JOSE HURTADO

June 18, 1985

Copyright ©

This dissertation, written and submitted by

Jose Luis Hurtado

is approved for recommendation to the Committee
on Graduate Studies, University of the Pacific

Dean of the School or Department Chairman:

Loy B. Hawley

Dissertation Committee:

José Anskal

Chairman

Mari E. Levin

J. Juan Carranza

Guides F. Rodriguez

Edward Portuna

Dated

2/1/85

Abstract of Dissertation

Objective: The purpose of the study was to examine the social and cultural characteristics of successful and unsuccessful Mexican American community college students and compare them to successful and unsuccessful Anglo American community college students. The objective of this study was to collect data on ten independent variables that consistently appeared in the review of literature and were suspected of affecting the success of students in the California College system.

Procedures: The major research question of this study was exploratory in nature in that it looked at possible factors which might affect the success or failure of Chicano students. A total sample of 260 community college students was surveyed at two Bay Area community colleges.

Results: The research found that not all ten independent variables studied were as important in determining the key elements of academic success for Anglo or Chicano community college students. In particular, family structure, socioeconomic status, peer group support, and academic self-concept showed a strong relationship to the success of these community college students. In addition, there were six other variables, parental support, career goals, college staff support, sex roles, acculturation, and world view which were not found to be as critical to the academic success of community college students.

Conclusions: The first critical success factor was the family structure of these students and the data showed it was one of the most important factors in whether or not they succeeded in community college. The data implied that Chicano successful students come from families with more traditional/authoritarian structure. The second key success factor in this research was the socioeconomic status of the student. The data revealed that regardless of the type of job held by their parents, economically disadvantaged Chicano students were much more likely to be successful in college. The third significant independent variable in this research was the peer group support of these students. Most importantly, the data revealed that those students who have a strong network of peer group support are more likely to do well in college. The fourth significant independent variable to be examined was the academic self-concept of these students. The data concluded that college success can be determined in part from the view that a student has of himself in the classroom setting.

Recommendations: This research suggests that a more extensive orientation of all community college staff is needed to sensitize them to the varied cultural background of their student population.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere and honest appreciation to Dr. Fred Muskal for his patience, support and encouragement throughout the dissertation process.

This author also wishes to thank the other members of his committee for their support and recommendations. These committee members include Dr. Ted Pohlman, Dr. Andres Rodriguez, Dr. Mari G. Irvin, and Dr. Elihu Carranza.

The author is also indebted to Dr. Hector Cordova and Dr. Lois Locci for their expertise in editing and refining the final project.

Finally, the author is wholeheartedly grateful to his wife for her utmost support as well as immeasurable hours on typing the dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER I	1
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	9
LIMITATIONS.	11
METHODOLOGY.	11
DATA COLLECTION.	12
DEFINITION OF TERMS.	12
SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY.	14
CHAPTER II.	17
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	17
Aspiration.	22
Achievement	25
Review of the Literature on Chicanos in Higher Education.	29
Critical Variables Influencing Mexican American Student Achievement and Aspiration Levels.	35
Socioeconomic Status.	35
Acculturation	40
World View.	47

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
Parental Support.	52
Peer Group Support.	57
Career Aspirations.	62
Level of College Staff Support.	65
Family Structure.	70
Sex Roles	73
Academic Self-Concept	81
Overall Summary of Review of Literature.	86
 CHAPTER III	 88
RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY.	88
Demographic Characteristics of Chicano/ Mexican American Population in the United States	89
Sample Description.	92
Description of Community College Sites	94
Instrument.	95
Data Collection Procedures.	98
Research Questions.	100
Statistical Procedures.	100
Summary and Overview.	101
 CHAPTER IV.	 103
STATISTICAL FINDINGS	103
Procedures for the Acceptance or Rejection of Independent Variables.	104
Family Structure.	106
Summary of Family Structure Data.	114
Socioeconomic Status.	114
Summary of Socioeconomic Status Data.	121
Career Goals.	122
Summary of Career Goal Data	130

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(continued)

	Page
Parental Support.	131
Summary of Parental Support Data.	132
Peer Group Support.	135
Summary of Peer Group Data.	139
Academic Self Concept	143
Summary of Academic Self Concept.	148
College Staff Support	151
Results of College Staff Support.	153
Sex Roles	154
Results of Sex Role Data.	161
Acculturation	162
Summary of Acculturation Data.	168
World View.	169
Summary of World View Data.	177
SUMMARY OF CHAPTER IV.	180
CHAPTER V	181
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	181
Summary	182
Conclusions	192
Implications of the Research for Community College Counselors.	198 202
Recommendations	206
Further Areas of Research	210
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	219

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Family Structure in Percentage.	109
1.1	Student Family Structure in Ethnicity, in Percentage.	110
1.2	Successful Students by Ethnicity and Family Structure, in Percentage.	110
2.	Ethnicity and Marital Status of Parents, in Percentage.	112
2.1	Student Success and Marital Status of Parents, in Percentage	113
2.2	Chicano Students' Success and Marital Status of Parents, in Percentage	113
3.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Family Socioeconomic Status, in Percentage.	116
3.1	Student Success and Socioeconomic Status, in Percentage.	117
3.2	Chicano Students' Success and Socioeconomic Status, in Percentage.	117
4.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Standard of Living, in Percentage	119
4.1	Student's Socioeconomic Status by Ethnicity, in Percentage.	120
5.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Career Information, by Percentages.	124
5.1	Students' Career Goals by Ethnicity, in Percentage	125
5.2	Successful Students by Ethnicity and Career Goals, in Percentage	125

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

Table		Page
6.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Attainment of Career Goals in Percentage.	127
6.1	Student Career Goals by Ethnicity, in Percentage	128
6.2	Student Success and Career Goals, in Percentage	128
6.3	Successful Students by Ethnicity and Career Goals, in Percentage	129
6.4	Anglo Students by Success and Career Goals, in Percentage.	129
7.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Parental Support, in Percentages	133
7.1	Chicano Student Success and Parental Support, in Percentage.	134
8.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Peer Group Support, in Percentage . .	137
8.1	Students' Peer Group Support by Ethnicity, in Percentage.	138
8.2	Successful Students by Ethnicity and Peer Group Influence, in Percentage .	138
9.	Student Success by Ethnicity and College Friends Graduating, in Percentage.	140
9.1	Chicano Student Success and Peer Group Support, in Percentage.	141
9.2	Student Success and Peer Group Support, in Percentage	142
10.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Student's Academic Status in Percentage.	145

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

Table		Page
10.1	Student Success and Academic Self-Concept by Ethnicity, in Percentage.	146
10.2	Successful Students, by Ethnicity and Academic Self-Concept, in Percentage.	147
11.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Level of College Decision in Percentage	149
11.1	Successful Students' Level of College Decision and Academic Self-Concept by Ethnicity, in Percentage	150
12.	Student Success by Ethnicity and College Staff Support in Percentage	152
13.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Sex Roles and Career Aspiration in Percentage.	155
13.1	Success Students and Sex Role Bias by Ethnicity, in Percentage	156
13.2	Anglo Students by Success and Sex Role Bias, in Percentage.	156
13.3	Chicano Students by Success and Societal Sex Roles, in Percentage	157
14.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Sex Roles and Societal Demands in Percentage	159
14.1	Successful Students and Sex Roles and Societal Demands by Ethnicity, in Percentage	160
14.2	Chicano Students by Success and Societal Demands, in Percentage	160
15.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Home Language in Percentage	163

LIST OF TABLES
(continued)

Table		Page
15.1	Student Success by Ethnicity and Home Language (Spanish vs. English), in Percentage	164
16.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Parental Value, in Percentage	166
16.1	Successful Students by Ethnicity and Parental Values in Percentage	167
16.2	Chicano Students by Success and Parental Values, in Percentage	167
17.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Attributed Reason for Poor Performance, in Percentage	171
17.1	All Students by success and Reason for Poor Performance, in Percentage	172
17.2	Chicano Students by Success and Reason for Poor Performance, in Percentage	173
18.	Successful and Unsuccessful Students by Ethnicity and World View/Fatalism in Percentage	175
18.1	Successful Students by Ethnicity and Future Plans, in Percentage	176
19.	Student Success by Ethnicity and Desire to Change, in Percentage	178
19.1	Students' Desire to Change, by Success, in Percentage	179

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Mexican Americans are the second largest and the fastest growing minority group in the United States. According to the latest government census figures, there are approximately 10-12 million Mexican Americans in the Southwest (1980 U.S. Census Bureau). The largest concentration is in California, where Mexican Americans constitute some 4 million residents, or, 18% of the population. They are the single largest minority population in California, and are equal to almost twice the size of that state's Black population. The rapidly increasing Hispanic birth rate and widespread undocumented immigration has resulted in the Mexican American population of the five Southwestern states of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and California, to range anywhere from 15% to 40% of the total population of each state.

As a group, Mexican Americans differ markedly from the dominant American society on a number of important demographic characteristics including family size, occupational level, socioeconomic status, and

educational achievement. In particular, despite progress by the younger generation, an extraordinary educational gap exists between Mexican American children and other White and non-White children. This gap is reflected especially by the low proportion of Mexican Americans completing high school or attending college. For example, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1971) reported that in California 36% of the Mexican Americans have dropped out by grade 12 because of low school holding power.

A more recent report on the condition of education for Hispanic Americans presented by the National Center for Educational Statistics (1979) showed little or no progress in school retention (high school completion). The data indicated that Hispanics aged 14-19 were twice as likely not to have completed high school as Whites in the same age bracket. From 1972-78 the attrition rates for Whites remained remarkably constant at about 8 percent, while that for Hispanics varied between 15 and 19 percent. Examination of the 1978 data shows that the disparity between White and Hispanic students in this regard became more pronounced with increasing age. The percentage of dropouts increased steadily, particularly between ages 16 and 18. The figures for Whites tend to level off, while those for Hispanics continue to rise gradually.

The relatively low educational attainment of Mexican Americans stands out as perhaps the most important social problem facing members of this ethnic cultural group. As of 1980, Mexican Americans 25 years and over throughout the Southwest had completed far fewer years of school than both Anglo Americans and Blacks (National Center for Educational Studies, 1979). Mexican Americans growing up in the Southwest also drop out of school sooner and, on the whole, have a higher school attrition rate before high school graduation than either Anglo Americans or Blacks.

Furthermore, the low level of educational achievement among Mexican American youth in American society represents a continuing social and political problem. Hernandez (1969) reported that Southwestern Mexican American leaders cite lack of education as the greatest barrier to group participation in government, and lack of success in the labor market. In fact, the lack of educational achievement and aspiration among Chicano students is augmented when there is an acute feeling of lack of opportunity both in education and in occupations within the home environment.

While most of the arguments about what happens to Mexican Americans in the public school system have now become redundant, there has been little research on the Mexican American student who does make it through the

traditional American educational system and manages to achieve a college education. There is a great deal of generalization and lack of practical information about the college aspirations of Chicano students. The little research that is available has had a tendency to emphasize the sociological, cultural, and psychological factors that have limited these aspirations. This lack of data has done little to aid educators in both understanding Chicano students and assisting them in effectively socializing and educating them. As a result of this lack of data, Chicano students have been misperceived by educators. These misperceptions have contributed to an inferior education as demonstrated by the low reading and math scores, and low retention rates which result in disproportionately fewer college students (Ovando, 1977).

This lack of understanding and these misperceptions have led to ineffective educational interaction between community college counselors, teachers, and Chicano students. As a result, educators have been interacting with Chicano students from a misinformed perspective. This has limited Anglo educators' ability to assist Chicano community college students in their educational, occupational, and social growth.

The answers to the question of why Mexican American students are not pursuing higher education are varied and

often controversial. There are two major contrasting schools of thought regarding the causes of the bleak educational status of Chicanos. The basic position of one of these schools focused on what has been termed a cultural deprivation model. The second has been termed a revisionist model. With respect to the cultural deprivation model, the majority of researchers placed emphasis on the disadvantaged nature of Mexican American life. The motivation, life style, family structure and culture of Mexican American students were interpreted by these researchers as not only deficient, but also as the cause of Mexican American students' lack of achievement.

Among the best known educational and social scientists who reinforced the perspective that Chicanos were largely to blame for their educational failures were Hellyer (1966), Kluckhorn (1961), Samora (1966), Jensen (1961), and Burma (1954). The Mexican American's lack of social mobility and economic advancement has typically been explained by these social scientists as a result of a fatalistic approach to life and a distinctly inferior cultural values. The socioeconomically subordinate status of the Mexican American in the Southwest has been recognized by these researchers as further causing his poor showing in education. They

suggest that the low socioeconomic status and educational achievement of Mexican Americans are the natural order of things. Moreover, they imply that Mexican Americans are doomed by their genetic or cultural inheritance to occupy second class citizenship. The promoters of this cultural deprivation model argue that Mexican American children

fail in school due to the inadequate, inappropriate and foreign socialization offered in their home or barrio.

These researchers contend that Mexican Americans do poorly in school and society precisely because "~~they are so obviously Mexican~~" (Carter, 1970).

*it is ok
why you crossed
out.*

These same educational researchers have written for many years that students from lower socioeconomic groups are often ill prepared for the learning process and the behavioral requirements of the classroom. They have found that there are various differences in the kinds of socialization process that these students have experienced as contrasted with the middle class child. The overall consensus of these researchers is that Mexican American students have a deficient culture and social class background which can only be overcome if extensive efforts are made to 'compensate' or remedy their deficiencies.

4/15/02

In contrast, revisionist researchers have reported more recently that it was the schools and colleges themselves which have contributed to the Mexican American

student's educational problem. These researchers asserted that educational institutions have been ill prepared to handle the unique problems of Mexican American students. These vocal critics of the poor quality of education that Mexican American students have experienced include McWilliams (1949), Carter (1970), Ramirez & Castaneda (1973), and Sanchez (1940). They feel that this major problem of poor education for Chicanos is largely based on poor communication between Anglo educators and Chicano students caused by differences in culture and social class. As a result of this poor communication many Anglo educators' attitudes towards Chicano students became negative. Poor communication on the part of Anglo educators has led to further problems of scapegoating or projecting negative feelings onto Mexican American students.

According to this revisionist model, middle class Anglo educators largely come from a background where their experiences, values, attitudes, aspirations, and failures are significantly different from Mexican Americans. This causes these educators to perceive Chicanos negatively, and to develop educational strategies and approaches in the light of their own background. Middle class Anglo educators frequently bring preconceived and faulty notions about Mexican American students to their educational

setting. These expectations presuppose limits on the intelligence and abilities of Mexican American students. This often creates a self-fulfilling prophecy that reinforces failure in Chicano students. It is this same negative attitude by college staff towards Chicano students that often perpetuates their failure in education.

Regardless of whatever future research may prove to be the actual causes, the lack of educational achievement by Mexican American students has led to the fact that Mexican American students in general have been unable to develop to their full educational potential. It seems more likely that this lack of educational achievement may have many different causes, including the fact that Mexican American students may have been, as Albert Ellis calls it, 'propagandized' during their early years to hold fast to certain beliefs, doctrines, and dogma which seriously compromise their career and educational alternatives. Their freedom may be constricted by social stereotyping which they themselves have come to accept.

The California Community Colleges offer one of the few promising means by which to overcome previous limitations on the educational achievement of Mexican American students. The reasons for this fact can be attributed to: (a) low tuition charges, (b) lack of rigid

entrance requirements, (c) proximity to home (residence), (d) availability of financial aid, (e) attractiveness of student services, including counseling and tutoring, and (f) good variety of two year vocational programs.

Of all the post secondary institutions, the community colleges are the most accessible. This accessibility has probably contributed to a higher percentage of Hispanics attending two year colleges than four year colleges. However, even the high level of Chicano enrollment in California community colleges which as of 1982 was 11.4% is not proportionate to that of the total Chicano population of the state, which is 18%.

This study will attempt to deal not only with the sociological, psychological and cultural factors that affect the aspirations of Chicano community college students, but will also explore the socioeconomic and institutional barriers. These institutional barriers may include such factors as lack of financial aid or lack of faculty sensitivity.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

There is a severe underrepresentation of Mexican Americans in higher education in relationship to their population in the Southwestern United States. The problem of the underrepresentation of Chicano students in higher

education is a highly complex and significant concern. The probable causes of this underrepresentation are controversial, but it is clear that there are many interlocking social, economic, and political forces responsible for the poor educational attainment of Chicano students.

The purpose of this study is to compare and contrast selected variables of successful and unsuccessful Mexican American and Anglo students at the community college level. In order to accomplish this goal the study will describe the following variables which affect Mexican American and Anglo community college students:

1. Family structure
2. Socioeconomic status
3. Acculturation level
4. Sex roles
5. Level of support by college teachers and counselors
6. Career goals
7. Level of parental support
8. Amount of peer group support
9. World view
10. Academic self concept

LIMITATIONS

Several limitations of this study are:

1. Because this study deals with Chicano and Anglo community college students in only two colleges, the results may not be generalizable to other levels of higher education.

2. The use of a self-reporting instrument which asked students to express their perceptions on selected variables may also lessen the precision of this study.

3. The number of non-respondents to this study's instrument may present difficulty in establishing an accurate profile of the unsuccessful student population.

METHODOLOGY

The questionnaire method will be used to obtain the relevant data from the sample of two hundred and sixty Chicano and Anglo community college students. The successful student sub-sample will consist of one hundred Chicano and one hundred Anglo sophomore students who are in two different community colleges and desire to transfer to a four year college. The colleges sampled will include one from an urban and one from a suburban setting. In addition, the unsuccessful sub-sample will include thirty Chicano students and thirty Anglo students.

DATA COLLECTION

The questionnaire will be issued to individual students in order to survey this sample. The results will be processed through Statistical Package for the Social Sciences to achieve maximum analysis of the data. The findings will be presented in as clear and factual as manner as possible.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Successful Student - Community college student who has achieved sophomore standing (40 quarter units) and who lists his/her major as reflecting a transfer option to a four year school.

Unsuccessful Student - Former community college student who desired to transfer to a four year school, but who has dropped out for over one quarter at time and/or, students who were on academic probationary status.

Anglo American Student - Students who self identifies on college application as Anglo or White ethnic background.

Chicano/Mexican American - Students who self identifies as Mexican American/Hispanic ethnic background.

Institutional Barriers to College Success - Factors or variables that inhibit success for non-traditional students at the college level. These factors could include negative attitudes, beliefs, and expectations held

by college staff towards minority students. They could also include more evident and structured means by which institutions deter the success of non-traditional student on their campus. The latter may include entrance examinations, financial restrictions, lack of cultural sensitivity, etc.

Aspiration - Individual orientation to a certain goal. Desire to strive for certain status positions in the social structure which are available through achievement rather than through conscription.

Acculturation - This term as used in this study refers to the process by which the Chicano/Mexican American is affected by the Anglo or dominant culture in regards to his/her value orientations, concepts, roles, and expectations.

World View - As used in this study, world view refers to beliefs, attitudes, and values that a person holds about himself/herself and his/her relationship to the rest of society.

Academic Self Concept - This term is used in this study to denote how a student feels about his/her educational goals and academic endeavors. It refers specifically to how a person perceives himself/herself as a student.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

There is a great need for a better understanding of the reasons why Mexican American students have not succeeded in the educational, social, and economic system of this country. Counselors and teachers could use such information as examined in this study to assist Mexican American students in developing to their fullest potential. In fact, it seems that a more accurate understanding by counselors and teachers about the values and lifestyles of Mexican American students would enable them to better assist these students in the planning of their academic and career goals. Findings from this study might also aid teachers and counselors in placing students in classes, or to develop courses wherein the teaching method used would be the most compatible with student's needs, thereby creating optimal learning conditions.

Various prominent researchers on the Mexican American community state that, in view of the unfulfilled educational performance of Mexican American children in general, it is important to identify groups of students within this population who attain high educational achievement levels in order to explore possible reasons for their success. If these patterns of intergroup variations in academic achievement can be identified and correlated with other variables, valuable insights may be

gained into the reasons why Mexican Americans succeed or fail in school.

Another compelling reason for this type of research is that it may provide professional educators with a different perspective that may help rid them of generalized and stereotypic thinking about Chicanos. It is hoped that through this reeducation process, the educators could use such newly gained knowledge about the characteristics of successful Mexican American college students to enhance their teaching and counseling effectiveness with Mexican American students. A profile of the variables related to successful Chicano community college students may also provide strong role models for other aspiring Mexican American students to imitate.

The significance of the study becomes even more critical as population data in California show that this state will have a majority Third World population by the end of this decade. The largest ethnic minority of this Third World population will be Mexican American. Finally, as this nation slowly continues to move towards an acceptance of multiculturalism, it is hoped that the findings of this study will contribute towards better understanding and appreciation of all ethnic groups.

Chapter II will present a review of literature on four major areas: (a) General background on the status of

education of Mexican Americans; (b) Review of two key concepts in this study, Aspirations and Achievement; (c) Selected works related to Chicanos in higher education; (d) Review of the literature on ten key independent variables.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of the literature is presented in four sections. The first section provides a general background on the status of education of Mexican Americans. The second section includes a review of two key concepts in this study: aspiration and achievement. The third section includes selected works related to Chicanos in higher education. The fourth section includes selected reviews related to the following variables: socioeconomic status; acculturation; world view; parental support; peer support; career aspirations; school staff support; family structure; sex roles; and academic self-concept. The concepts of aspiration and achievement are the unifying themes in all four sections.

Status of Education of Mexican Americans

According to Moore (1970), the history of Mexican Americans is unlike that of any other American minority group. She states that the only close parallel lies with the American Indian, yet there are only a few similarities. As with the American Indians, some early

Mexican settlers of what is now the Southwest, became a minority, not by immigration or slavery, but by conquest. The early history of Mexican Americans is the history of how they became subordinate people. The Southwest has had a long history of ethnic isolation and segregation of Mexican Americans. Even though segregation probably never has been required by statute in any of the five Southwestern states, it has been practiced not only in the schools of the region, but also in many other aspects of life as well.

Although there have been Mexicans in what is now called the United States for over 300 years, the majority of Mexican Americans have emigrated to the United States (documented and undocumented) since the Mexican Revolution of 1910. They have come in large numbers to work as laborers, attracted largely by high wages, and to flee economic and political deprivation. Mexican Americans make up America's latest great wave of immigrants, who have learned a hard lesson: latecomers start at the bottom. Nearly 27% of Mexican American families in the United States earn less than \$7,000 a year, whereas only 16.6% of non-Hispanic families fare as badly (Time, March 1979).

Even though Mexican Americans have a long history in the Southwest, upward mobility and acculturation has not

been inevitable for them. Geography provides one good reason for this fact. The Rio Grande is not a physical or a psychological barrier like the ocean Europeans crossed. Unlike Europeans or Asians, who cut themselves off from their homeland when they come to the United States, Mexican immigrants can always go home if things do not work out for them in the United States. Even if they do not return, they can rekindle close ties to their culture and language by crossing the invisible 1,200 mile border between Mexico and the United States. McWilliams (1949) believes that psychologically and culturally, many Mexicans have never emigrated to the Southwest but have returned in many cases for the second, third, fourth, or fifth time.

In a work by the U.S. Civil Rights (1971) Commission, the ethnically mixed community of the Southwest is described as a social hierarchy. This hierarchy is structured with Anglos on the top and Mexican Americans on the bottom. One scholar who reviewed the literature of the past 40 years on Mexican Americans in California described this hierarchy as having a caste-like social structure in which Anglos have always been on top of the hierarchy and the Mexican American population has been isolated on the bottom. Prior to the Second World War, Mexican Americans in Southern California frequently were

refused housing in Anglo neighborhoods, forced to attend de facto segregated schools, excluded from certain public facilities (such as restaurants and swimming pools) and denied employment because of their ethnic background. Post World War II social changes, as well as the civil rights advancements of the 1960s have improved the legal status of Mexican Americans with respect to these educational, economic, and residential segregation issues.

Historically, many of these families have come to the United States from the most rural, traditional, and low income areas of Mexico (Samora, 1971). But the vast majority of Mexican American families now live in urban centers. Most of these immigrants continue to live in poverty, but of an urban nature. They also are faced with racial discrimination, which was not part of their experience in Mexico. Additionally, they must learn to cope with the language handicap in order to survive in a far more technically advanced society than the one which they left.

Murillo (1971) states it is not widely known that Chicanos are not homogeneous. Indeed, on the contrary, they are quite heterogeneous. Yet researchers and educators unfortunately continue to group Chicanos as a whole. Instead with respect to cultural orientation, the Mexican American population should be more accurately

viewed along a continuum with traditional Mexican culture at one end and contemporary Anglo culture at the other. Some Chicanos identify more closely with the Mexican culture end of the continuum and others with the contemporary Anglo cultural end. Thus, Mexican Americans do not deserve simple generalizations, whether they come from the popular press or from scholars.

Historically, the American Southwest bore the imprint of Mexico long before the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo sealed the United States conquest of the region in 1848. Only in the last generation have Mexican Americans emerged as a large influential minority in this country. The future of the Southwest is being shaped by 10 to 12 million Hispanics in the five Southwestern states as well as by untold millions of undocumented immigrants. These undocumented immigrants were not counted in the 1980 census but nonetheless remain a permanent presence in the Southwest. In addition, there are also social researchers who predict that Hispanics will surpass the nation's Black population by the late 1990s.

A thorough understanding of the general background information that was just reviewed greatly facilitates proper comprehension of the educational problems of Chicanos. The background information revealed the effects of many historical factors on the educational

opportunities for Mexican American students. If any viable educational solutions are to be developed, these solutions must take the total and unique historical and cultural background of Chicanos into consideration. In conclusion, most social researchers agree that although Chicanos have made some socioeconomic advances in this country especially since World War II, they still are the poorest and least educated group of people in this nation.

Aspiration

Most of the research on levels of aspiration has been conducted among members of the dominant group in American society. There is, to be sure, a small number of researchers who have investigated differentials in levels of social aspiration among members of certain minority groups. One example of this type of research is the study among Negro students completed by Smith (1969). Generally speaking, however, these types of studies have been very limited.

The literature bearing on the concept of aspiration is extensive in regards to research on the dominant group in society. Based upon the review of literature on aspiration, it can be said that the study of levels of occupational and educational aspiration among members of

minorities in the United States has been largely neglected. What is needed is further research studies in which the concept of aspiration is applied to minority groups.

The study of differential levels of aspiration within ethnic groups, however, presents an added problem. This is the problem of the cultural dimension involved. Some writers claim that the culture variable can be regarded simply as another variable on the same theoretical level, such as education and socioeconomic status. Other researchers claim aspiration should be considered as an empirical question and that accordingly, the relationship between cultural factors and levels of aspiration be investigated empirically.

Certain factors suggest more caution in the interpretation of findings on aspirations. One such factor is the role of the family in the process of development of social aspiration. In the process of development of social aspiration, how a family looks at success has been found to be of great importance. For example, Kahl (1961) discovered that youth from families willing and able to support and encourage them had higher levels of aspiration. This means that the family has a very important role in the process of crystallization of aspirations of young people and functions also as an important supporting structure.

It should be pointed out, however, that family support, economic goals and morality are not strictly a matter of neglect or support on the part of parents. Even when this type of support exists, it may not be sufficient unless the family in general and the parents in particular have a sufficient amount of cultural and social know-how to be effective in guiding, helping and supporting the aspirations of their children.

In this regard, the observations of De Hoyos (1977) indicate that Mexican American families do not seem to possess a sufficient amount of such cultural and social know-how. It appears that their acculturation has emphasized mostly those external, more tangible aspects of the culture, and has not included many aspects of the life style of members of the dominant group.

The review of literature on aspirations suggests that a critical need exists for more data on how aspiration level affects Mexican American students. It also implies that Mexican American families have a wide range of aspiration levels, and, therefore, that the heterogeneity of Mexican American students should be taken into consideration when systematically studying them.

Achievement

Achievement is related to the sociocultural origin of the student and to the sociocultural context in which he is educated (Maehr, 1974). The plaintiffs in Brown v Brown of Education of Topeka (1954) were obviously cognizant of this fact. The Coleman Report (1966) documented on a grand scale just how important and pervasive these differences are. It also added one other critical insight; by highlighting the school's capacity to narrow the differences in achievement among social and cultural groups, the report called attention to the wider social and cultural context in which teaching and learning occur. Educators, according to the report, cannot ignore the social and cultural backgrounds of children. The home is critical in the educational process, and what happens outside the school grounds is equally, if not more, important than what happens within.

Personal achievement does not occur in isolation. Similar to other behaviors, in achievement an individual is responding to the norms, values, and expectations of the groups that are significant in his world at a given moment. Achievement therefore changes as group membership changes. Most teachers are aware of this at a very functional level.

More often than not, the lack of motivation on the part of ghetto children is a function of membership in certain groups. The expectations, rules, rewards, sanctions, and aspirations of peers are critical in determining how children approach achievement situations. Pettigrew (1967) points out that integration is important precisely because it establishes new and different social relationships and new groups with which the student can compare himself.

In a very real sense socialization within a social group influences personal goals as well as ways to achieve goals. The effect of group norms is clearly an important variable in achievement. Another major factor influencing achievement is an individual's need to achieve as defined within the roots of family environment.

Stendler (1950), in a study of parental attitudes of first graders, found achievement to be related to parents' aspirations for children as well as the amount of assistance given to children, in preparing for school. Sears and Lewin (1957), in studies of preschool children, indicate that the level of rewards and expectations established by parents influences the level of goals set by the child. Kahl (1953) explored the influence of families on high school students in order to account for different aspirations regarding college. He found that

boys whose parents were discontented about their own status encouraged their sons to use education as a means of social mobility.

In several studies, researchers have addressed the issues of values and attitudes of students, parents, and school personnel as they related to ethnicity and educational practice. Schwartz (1971) emphasized that ethnicity must be defined by variables in addition to simple nationality labels. Her study compared Mexican Americans and Anglo secondary school age children. She found high expectations of school attendance for both groups, but a higher generalized faith in mankind and more optimistic orientation toward the future among Anglos than among Mexican Americans. Schwartz believed these attitudes were also related to achievement. More important, she showed that within the Mexican American group these attitudes were not distributed evenly, and that Mexican American pupils of higher socioeconomic status were more similar to Anglos than Mexican American students from low income backgrounds.

Evans and Anderson (1973), while not examining variations within the Mexican American group as did Schwartz, found that stereotypes about this group held by educators and used to explain their relation to failure are seriously in error. They found that Mexican American

students, in comparison to Anglos, did have lower self-concepts of ability, experienced less democratic parental independence training, had fatalistic present time orientation, had a lower striving orientation and lower educational aspirations. However, simple minded linkages to school attitudes do not work. The Mexican American students were also found to come from homes where education was valued and stressed. Parental encouragement of schooling was linked to values and experiences which the authors attribute to a culture of poverty.

Madsen and Kagan (1973) report on a study of experimental situations in a small Mexican town and among Anglos in Los Angeles. Mothers of both groups rewarded their children for success, but Mexican mothers encouraged their child who failed more often than did Anglo mothers. Overall, Anglo mothers chose higher and more difficult achievement goals for their children.

The critical idea that this review on achievement proposes is that many Mexican American parents do indeed want their children to go to college. However, the Mexican American students' potential to achieve is blocked because their parents often lack the financial fees, as well as the necessary information to properly counsel and motivate them.

Review of the Literature on Chicanos
in Higher Education

In reviewing the literature on the educational problems of Mexican American students, it is clear that there is an abundance of research concentrating on the educational problems of Mexican Americans in grades K-12 of the public school system. However, very little has been done on the educational experiences of Mexican American college students.

The research on educational and career aspirations of Chicano students is limited, but there is substantial evidence indicating that Chicano students do not benefit from educational opportunities as much as other members of society. Researchers have focused on the psychological and cultural attributes of Chicanos which contribute to lowered educational achievement levels (Palomares & Cumins, 1968). Other researchers (DeBlassie, 1968; Carter, 1970) have emphasized the institutional barriers that restrict the motivation and opportunities for Mexican American students.

However, Ovando (1977) indicates that only recently did colleges faculties become aware of the special needs of minority students. He states that in recent years the trend has been for institutions to become involved in the special training and recruitment of minority groups. Yet much of the emphasis has been on understanding the unique

cultural traits of the various groups. While the author agrees it is important to understand the concept of cultural differences, he insists this alone is not enough to deal effectively with the educational problems of minorities.

Supplementary to Ovando's work is that of Martinez (1975), who completed research on retention at one California State University. She found that the majority of college dropouts had very negative educational experiences. Among these negative experiences were the students' beliefs that they had little or no contact with professors, and that few professors took personal interest in them. Also, most students found their time in classes wasted, uninteresting, and extremely depersonalized. These students stated that their most crucial problems in college were inadequate guidance, lack of financial resources, irrelevant curriculum, inappropriate teaching methods and bureaucratic procedures.

Garcia (1974) also looked at academic performance. He compared dropout rates among Mexican American and Anglo community college students. Garcia reported that Mexican American students in the sample did not appear to be concerned with programming periods, cut off dates, availability of classes, prerequisites, teacher expertise, and graduation requirements. In short, they lacked

knowledge of school procedures, which led to their high dropout rates.

In the same general category of research, Cardenas (1974) addressed the issue of equality of educational opportunity as it concerned access to higher education for Mexican Americans in Colorado. The problem was diagnosed through a review of literature and an examination of three special access programs in San Antonio high schools. He concluded that the problem of underrepresentation in colleges and universities is complex, and that there are many interlocking, social, economic, and political factors affecting educational results.

The broad purpose of an investigation by J. A. Martinez (1978) was to shed some light upon the life experiences of Mexican Americans when confronted by the opportunity to pursue post secondary education in a community college. He concluded that the typology of alleged road blocks to higher education for Mexican American students only partially existed in the life experiences of his sample population. In addition, he found that only lack of financial resources was a significant roadblock to the pursuit of post secondary education. Thus, according to J. Martinez, the other claims of educational barriers were not truly critical in

keeping Mexican American students from educational achievement.

Only a few researchers, such as Collymore (1971), have attempted to determine the educational aspirations and needs of Chicano community college students. Collymore analyzed the college and career aspiration differences and similarities among selected Chicano and Black community college students. This research study was particularly noteworthy because it culminated in a set of normative guidelines developed to help the total college staff to interact more effectively with non-white community college students.

In addition, there have been other research studies in which attitudes and expectations of Chicano community college students were measured. Most of these other studies focused on specific careers or vocational programs. Payton (1976) examined the attitudes and expectations of Mexican American criminal justice students in a two-dimensional comparison design. He first studied Anglo students majoring in administration of justice and then compared them to Mexican American students majoring in administration of justice. Payton suggest that Mexican American students should not be placed in one simple category regarding attitudes and expectations, since they are not a homogeneous group. He concluded, however, that

Mexican American students have more idealistic expectations than their Anglo counterparts. Other differences are that Mexican American students are more suspicious of the establishment, and often suffer from a conflict of loyalty between the strict demands of their chosen occupation and the mistrust of their ethnic group. Payton cites the lack of communication skills among Mexican Americans as the key barrier to success in college and careers.

Gares (1974) took a different tack as he investigated the occupational counseling given to Mexican and Anglo American students upon entering the community college. His major findings were that Mexican and Anglo students differentially perceived counselor recommendations to study for specific occupations. These perceptions limited the educational and career alternatives of Mexican Americans. He concluded that when Anglos and Chicanos are given recommendations by counselors to train for specific occupations, Chicano students, unlike Anglo students, are likely to resign themselves to only those limited choices that the counselor recommends.

Hernandez (1973) examined college advisement practices in high schools as perceived by Mexican American high school students and their parents. In contrast to previous research, he found that Mexican American

students and parents had a more positive attitude toward advisement and school counselors than Anglo American students. He also felt that Mexican American high school students did not lack motivation. Instead, Mexican American students post-high school plans were more well defined than those of Anglo American students. In summary, Hernandez felt that this counseling process for Mexican American students positively affected their familiarization with the educational process.

Orientations toward educational attainment were investigated in a study by Juarez and Kulesky (1965). Mexican American and Anglo boys in economically depressed areas in Texas were found to have similar educational goals. A detailed analysis of the data revealed that Anglo boys tended to express high educational goals more frequently than their Mexican American counterparts. More Anglo boys expressed desire to go to college and graduate school than Mexican American students. The Anglo group also had higher educational expectations in comparison to the lower aspirations of Mexican American students.

The review of literature on Chicanos in higher education thus far reveals that there is still a need for more research on Chicanos in higher education focused specifically on aspiration. Other important works in the review of literature reviewed in the next section focus on

those variables critical to the development of this study.

Critical Variables Influencing Mexican American Student Achievement and Aspiration Levels

Ten critical variables were selected from a review of literature on Mexican Americans as well as from suggestions from experts in the fields of counseling and ethnic studies. These variables are socioeconomic status; acculturation; world view; parental support; peer support; career aspirations; school staff support; family structure; sex roles; and academic self-concept. Each will be considered separately for assessing its respective impact or influence on the success or failure of Mexican American students.

Socioeconomic Status

Mexican Americans rank at the bottom or near the bottom on nearly every measure of socioeconomic status. The 1978 U.S. Census Bureau research data show that nearly 50% of Mexican Americans in the Southwest live below the official governmental poverty level. Most Chicanos historically have been relegated to the most menial and hazardous jobs in this country. They survive as manual laborers, and large percentages work in canneries, fieldwork, mining, construction, and domestic work. In many parts of the Southwest, unemployment for Chicanos is

double that of Anglos. Mention should also be made of the extensive racism and prejudice which has helped to suppress the economic conditions of Chicanos. In total, the insecure conditions of employment in low paying jobs and the often seasonal work have relegated most Chicanos to the lowest socioeconomic class in this nation.

Since Mexican American students belong to the lowest socioeconomic structure, they are faced not only with bias for being poor, but also confronted by the prejudice and ignorance of educators for being culturally different. The overall effect of these cultural and class prejudices is to reinforce negative stereotypes of Chicanos by naive or racist educators. A vicious cycle of preconceived notions about the inferiority of poor people places further limits on the education of these students.

Several authors have contended that the schools function to perpetuate the status quo in society. An interesting finding by Rist (1973) was that the overall patterns of why children in low income schools do poorly is that, although teachers are technically competent in their subject matter, they generally are ignorant of how socioeconomic structure and cultural backgrounds may affect the learning process. Rist contends that these low income schools reflect larger societal processes. They are organized to reward the kinds of activities and

interests which are characteristic of middle class and upper income students and to ignore or negate the contributions of lower class students. In so doing, Rist believes that these schools function to legitimize and perpetuate the larger society's inequality and injustice.

Weinberg (1977) asserted that schools have been and remain intellectual proving grounds and that they replenish society's occupational needs. Schools, according to Weinberg, are called upon to produce what society defines as its needs. Furthermore, he states that the sorting done by our schools has to do with something other than talent and merit. He believes that schools instead serve to certify the status of the privileged and keep the oppressed in the dismal darkness of apathy and defeat.

Often times there is a general feeling of hostility towards schools among Mexican Americans because they feel that school and society have served to keep the Mexican American in his place. Many Mexican Americans also believe that the motivation for this inequality is to supply the Southwest with a pool of cheap unskilled labor. Carter (1970) supports the idea that the schools, reflecting the parent society, unconsciously develop policies and practices and promote conditions that discourage academic achievement and encourage dropping

out. The net effect of these educational practices and policies has been to limit Mexican Americans achievement in schools. The following research studies are a collection of works on how low socioeconomic status specifically operates to limit Mexican American students' achievement.

Cuellar (1970) found that Mexican Americans hold the poorest jobs inside most broad occupational classifications. Even where representation is equal, Cuellar found that Mexican Americans received lower pay for similar work than their Anglo peers. Moreover, jobs that depended entirely upon the Mexican American community commanded relatively lower wages than those for Anglo counterparts.

Ten Houten et al., (1971), found that family socioeconomic status is the strongest determinant affecting college plans of students. Children of higher social class origins are more apt to aspire to go to college, make concrete plans and actualize these plans than are children of low socioeconomic status. Ten Houten also found a high correlation between socioeconomic status and college aspirations persists even when controlling for related variables, such as sex, measured intelligence, and neighborhood status.

Sewell and Kahl (1963) have shown through their extensive research that parental encouragement of college attendance is an intervening variable between family, socioeconomic status and college plans. In other words a high level of parental encouragement can overcome obstacles of low socioeconomic status and family characteristics.

Kahl and Borden (1953) have concurred that family status only indirectly affects college plans. They indicated that children from high social class backgrounds were more apt to have parents who encouraged and even expected their children to go to college. They also found that parental stress on college, in turn, made it more probable that children would go to college. This increased probability was due to the fact that children responded to parental aspirations as well as to the influence of socioeconomic status.

More support for the pervasive influence of family background factors on subsequent school achievement was provided by the Coleman Report (1966). One of the major conclusions of this major study on the equality of educational opportunity was that the largest proportion of variation in achievement among students who attended different schools was not due to differences in school programs, staff, and facilities. Rather, the differences

were a consequence of variations in the background of children when they first entered school. Moreover, Coleman's data demonstrate that children from various ethnic groups not only enter the school at a measureable disadvantage, but also that the disadvantages become more pronounced as they progress through school.

The review of literature on socioeconomic status strongly suggests the importance of the financial stability of the students' parents on his future educational success.

Acculturation

Benedict (1959) stated that the desire to grasp the meaning of a culture as a whole compels one to consider descriptions of standardized behavior merely as a first step leading to understanding other behavior. Benedict advocates the need for seeing a person as he exists within the individual framework of his own culture and how this affects his learning and perceptions.

It is a difficult task for educators to communicate or establish good rapport even when teaching students from backgrounds similar to their own. However, the task becomes even more difficult in a crosscultural, multiracial setting. Educators, like everyone else, perceive and behave according to their own cultural patterns.

Consequently, it is hardly surprising that educators frequently misinterpret the behavior and/or language of student whose cultural background they do not share.

According to Gibson and Arvizu (1977):

...in order for any teacher to understand the behavior of students from diverse cultural background, he must be sensitive to the fact that not all children are socialized in the same manner from culture to culture. The systems of discipline are different. The teacher who has knowledge and understanding of the other cultural system can better judge where the standards or goal perceptions set by the school and by himself, coincide or conflict with students from divergent cultures (p. 110).

Gibson and Arvizu also emphasized the fact there is a great variation of cultural task and linguistic skills among Chicanos. They recommended educators learn to perceive these subtle cultural and linguistic distinctions.

Until recently, few researchers have addressed the impact of language and culture of Mexican American students on their learning process in school. Saville-Troike (1976) has reported:

...most Chicanos can be identified by a common language (Spanish), certain values, religious preference (Catholicism), and specific cultural or traditional mores. The latter will most often include a preference for personal contact and individualized attention (personalism). The educator should also be aware of the varying rates of acculturation among Chicanos which can often be inferred from the degree of commitment to cultural variables, such as language, diet, and traditional values (p. 64).

Ramirez and Castaneda (1974) state that Anglo educators should also know that the Chicano's cultural values often conflict with those taught in the American school system. In particular, the Mexican American family, says Castanada, is more authoritarian than that of Anglos and teaches the child to be loyal and respectful of the family. Also, boys learn sexually defined roles which may conflict with classroom methods and, in particular, female teachers. Girls in traditional families are taught to be modest, and this also conflicts with rules in school that require clothing changes for physical education. Finally, Mexican Americans are often rebuffed by the lack of "personalism" in the business-like manner of many educators and teachers.

Also according to Ramirez and Castaneda, social scientists have long been concerned with the plight of the bicultural person in our society. They have described him as a person caught between the merciless demands of two cultures. His inability to comply with the requirements of both groups results in a failure to establish an identity followed by disorientation and stress.

Furthermore, Ramirez and Castaneda found that values and socialization styles determine or affect development of cognitive style, and, which in turn affect the learning potential of children. They also state that differences

which parallel those seen in socialization practices also may be seen in several areas of behavior, such as learning, incentive, motivation, human relations, and communication styles. Thus, they contend cultural aspects play a role on how the learner will learn in classrooms due to the social and cultural patterns and values that he brings with him and how these are regarded at school.

In his work on Mexican Americans in South Texas, Madsen (1964) uncovered evidence of a similar conflict. He found that the Mexican American is, on the one hand, being pressured by the Anglos to abandon his folk culture; and on the other, he is being encouraged by some of the members of his group to ignore the Anglos and retain the old ways. Madsen wrote that the Mexican Americans of the Rio Grande Valley were being faced with a difficult and almost impossible choice between conforming or not conforming with the Anglo world.

Furthermore, Madsen contends that Mexican American students have extremely negative attitudes about school due to conflicts in cultural values. Many of these children come from barrios, where they adopt a system of beliefs and role coping behavior which is far removed from Anglo middle class values and roles. In addition, they learn to model themselves after Mexican Americans who are often critical of Anglo ways.

The research of both Madsen and Ramirez and Castaneda suggests that, since the bicultural individual is constantly forced to choose between his loyalty to two different groups, he is constantly under stress. Conflicting values in an individual may give rise to an uncomfortable sense of insecurity and instability. The bicultural man, then, in his desire for stability, searches for ways which will reduce his discomfort. Many times his solutions are costly in that they may lead to emotional and mental problems.

The authors of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1972) study examined the degree to which schools in the Southwest were succeeding in educating their students, particularly minority students. They pinpointed the issue of assimilation and sketched the conflict between the emphasis of Anglo culture and language in the schools and detected a distinct Mexican American cultural pattern. They found three aspects of cultural exclusion practiced in the schools very damaging to the success of Mexican American students in education: 1) exclusion of the Spanish language, 2) exclusion of the Mexican cultural heritage; 3) exclusion of the Mexican American community from full participation in school affairs.

Most educational researchers have failed to note the cumulative negative effect of this clash in home and

school values. Instead, they have stubbornly insisted that the culturally different child be molded into an image suitable for the American educational system. Advocates of multicultural education believe that a more effective system would be to tailor the school curriculum to better meet the needs of children from different cultures.

Carter (1970) found that there was very little deliberate negative reaction to students by Anglo educators, but many mistakes were made due to a misunderstanding of Chicano culture. Carter re-emphasized that bicultural problems faced by many Mexican American students often have bilingual problems as their basis. Language usage is an important characteristic that differentiates the Mexican American family from other ethnic groups. Spanish is the most extensive and persistent foreign language spoken in the United States.

Mexican American children tend to speak Spanish as their first language, and learn English at school. It is not yet clear what impact such language bifurcation has upon personality and cognitive development. In early studies, language dominance, fluency or preferences were measured. Since these studies were confined to such isolated factors, they were inevitably inadequate. Recent studies of multivariate measurements of language skills

appear more promising but they are yet far from clarifying these questions.

In general many researchers have pointed out that Mexican American communities that are closer to the Mexican border, more rural in character, and ethnically homogeneous with strong attachments to Mexico, tend to have residents who are more traditional. Children from these communities tend to be those students who are the lower achievers in the public school system.

Hernandez (1969) believes that it is necessary to keep in mind that acculturation greatly affects a Mexican American student's attitudes towards education. To the Mexican American of minimal acculturation, school is hardly an extension of the home. This fact often leads to school-parent value conflicts which hinder the student's progress through the educational system. Despite such conflicts, the goals of both the parents and school (that is, to develop a good education for the child) are often congruent. However, the actual process of achieving these goals is often misunderstood or regarded as somewhat alien, and, therefore counter productive.

The review of literature on acculturation as it affects Mexican American students intimates that the unique language and customs of Chicanos greatly affect their overall perspective on education. Also, the review

suggests that the clash of values between home and school forms the basis for much of the Mexican American student's educational problems.

World View

Another key variable affecting the educational achievement of Mexican American students is their world view. World view is defined as an organization of images which each person has about himself in the world. These images develop over time from the reflected appraisals of others around him. They stem originally from interaction within the family, which is the first context in which children see themselves. After the family, school plays the most decisive role in the development of self concept, because children spend a great portion of their formative years in school.

Children discover who they are as a consequence of experiences. The kinds of responses that children receive from peers and teachers, and their own reactions to instructional material, will positively or negatively influence their self-concept. Children's self-images are affected by the manner in which teachers relate to them, decide what is expected of them, and by the success children experience with subjects. The manner in which

textbooks portray members of their cultural group also affects their developing world view.

The ability to identify with others is an important factor in developing a world view. Each individual develops from being self-centered in infancy to including others as part of the self in adulthood. During this socialization process, children develop feelings of belonging, which schools may nurture by utilizing and developing the particular language and experiences which are part of a child's first sense of identity.

Identification with other people is more difficult to achieve if the child's language and cultural experiences are rejected in the school.

According to Murillo (1976), perhaps the most detrimental and frequently occurring effect of all is the confusion and loss of self-identification. Murillo believes that this confusion results from attempts to live in a bicultural world. One of the greatest challenges of any developing individual is that of finding himself, or knowing what he is and who he is. This is the well known identity crisis. This crisis, which ordinarily intensifies during adolescence, is difficult enough to face under usual circumstances. However, the problem can be greatly magnified for the bicultural youth who, on almost every side, finds himself and his teachers in

conflict. He needs only look at himself and his Anglo counterpart to notice the differences in skin, color, manner of behavior, neighborhood and economic position. It is no wonder that he may at times be confused or temporarily lose his sense of identity.

The identity problems of Mexican Americans are not limited to the color of his skin, values, or economic situation. Often of even greater importance is the constant attempt by the dominant Anglo society to pressure and humiliate Mexican American students into giving up the Spanish language and Mexican culture. Many Mexican American educators feel that the lack of Mexican history in U.S. history textbooks, the forcible suppression of the Spanish language in the classroom and playground, and the inability of Anglo educators to motivate Chicano youth have served to severely lessen the self-respect of Mexican American children.

Other social researchers believe that Mexican American students also have felt, and constantly been made aware, that they were not acceptable unless they would shed many of their native habits and language. As a result, many Mexican American students have attempted to flee the barrio in order to raise their standard of living. For those Mexican Americans who are not willing to part with their customs and language, this often has

meant relegation to a poor job, inferior educational experiences, and social ostracism.

On the other hand, Carter (1968) disagrees with those authors who believe Mexican American students have a negative self-concept. He attacks theories that Mexican American children have negative self-concepts as a group. Instead, he states that, although Mexican American students know the stereotype of Mexican Americans, they seem to maintain a positive view of themselves against the onslaught of the beliefs of Anglos. He strongly suggests that the supposed negative self-image of Mexican Americans is, in reality, the Anglo's own stereotype of Chicanos. Anglos, he states, tend to think of Mexican Americans in negative ways, and conclude that Mexican American students see themselves in the same light.

It is generally acknowledged that a positive self-concept enhances the degree of school success. Van Koughnett and Smith (1969) agreed with this idea. They state that, a person needs to have positive attitudes toward himself in order to have school success. Therefore, it may be concluded that school behaviors are determined in part by the view that the child has of himself. Their findings suggest that students from Spanish speaking backgrounds appear to have less

confidence in their ability to fulfill their parental and school expectations than those from Anglo backgrounds.

Haddox (1970) indicated that there was widespread acceptance by educators of negative stereotypes for Spanish speaking youngsters. He stated that these young people are characterized as tradition-dominated, non-competitive, submissive, conformist, apathetic, fatalistic, and lazy.

Furthermore, sociometric tests conducted by Parsons (1966) disclosed that Mexican American children came to share the view constantly held up to them that the Anglos were "smarter". Parsons further stated that when the Mexican American child was repeatedly told that he was "dumb," he began to behave in that pattern.

The review of literature revealed that the concept of world view is critical to this research, because it helps define how any student looks at his environment. Thus, students' outlooks on education are important determinants in defining their goals and ambitions. The literature on world view shows that there are definite contradictions on how educational researchers' interpret the personal attitudes of Mexican American students. This review of literature suggests that too many researchers have stereotyped all Mexican American students as having a negative world view. In contrast, certain researchers

state that such a negative stereotype of Mexican American students is untrue and that Mexican American students have been the victims of these faulty generalizations. In summary, much more detailed and accurate data than is presently available is needed before any reliable conclusions can be developed.

Parental Support

An individual's need to achieve is a major factor influencing achievement. Needs are rooted and shaped within an individual's family environment. McClelland (1953) concludes that high achievement motivation develops in cultures and in families where there is an emphasis on the independent development of the individual. In contrast, low achievement motivation is associated with families in which the child is dependent heavily on his parents.

McClelland's conclusion is borne out by the results of other researchers. Stendler (1950), in a study of parental attitudes of first graders, found achievement to be related to parent's aspirations for the child and the amount of assistance given to the child in preparing for school. Sears and Lewin (1957), studying preschool children, indicated that the level of rewards and

expectations established by parents influenced the level of goals set by the child.

Coopersmith's (1967) eight-year study indicated that the important factors related to high self-esteem were the closeness of the relationship between the child and his parents, as well as the type of control or discipline employed by the parents. Coopersmith also reported that youngsters with high esteem set higher standards for themselves and came closer to achieving these standards than did youngsters with low self-esteem.

Additional evidence of the family influence on self-concept of ability is provided by several other studies. Jourard and Remy (1955) demonstrated that self appraisal by children was highly related to their perception of their parents' perceptions of them. They also found that the levels of children's aspiration, their frustration, their ideational independence from their parents, and the maturity of their personalities were all related to the children's perceptions of their parents' valuation of them. Brookover and Thomas (1964) also found that self-concept of ability was related significantly to perceived evaluation of significant others, notably parents.

Carter (1970) found that school achievement for Mexican American students is closely related to social class and home background. Such measures of school

achievement as standardized scores and GPA were reliable indicators, regardless of the criterion used to judge socioeconomic status. Students whose parents had more education, income and higher status jobs generally performed well in school, regardless of ethnic background. Carter emphasizes the fact that the more the child's home is like what the school expects, the better he will achieve. Similarly, the more home support the child receives, the higher the achievement level.

The staff of the U.S. Office of Education (1973) corroborated Carter's findings in a series of reports on the educational status of Mexican American students in the Southwest. Their analysis of the Coleman Report regarding Mexican Americans concluded that family background is most important for school achievement. Furthermore, this series of reports concluded that the importance of the association of family background with achievement does not diminish over the school years.

In the Mexican American Study Project (1965) it was found that a number of factors related to the home were associated with achievement. These same home factors in varying degrees, related to the school achievement of both Anglos and Mexican Americans. Gordon, one of the Mexican American Study Project researchers, felt that the mother's aspirations and values regarding education was

one of special importance to Mexican American students. The consensus of the authors was that the level of acculturation in the home greatly influences the academic success of Mexican American children.

According to Anderson and Johnson (1968), there appears to be little difference between Mexican American families and other families with respect to the amount of emphasis on education children experience at home. This finding is in contradiction to earlier notions that Mexican American families place little emphasis on formal education. Moreover, no significant differences in the amount of parental emphasis on obtaining good grades in school, completing high school, and ultimately attending college among four generations of Mexican American families were found among Anglo and Mexican American families.

Furthermore, Anderson and Johnson found that while the child's desire to complete high school and attend college appear to be related to the parents' educational aspirations for their children, the child's own desire to compete and to achieve in school appears to be somewhat independent of his parent's desires in this respect. In addition, those Mexican American children studied revealed a significantly high desire to succeed in school and attain high grades. These children experience the same high

degree of encouragement and assistance at home as do their classmates. The findings strongly suggest that the failure of many Mexican American children is the result of inadequate educational programs rather than a consequence of low levels of aspirations on the part of parents and children, as many researchers on Mexican American students have maintained.

In summary, it was demonstrated that the review of literature on the variables of parental support on Mexican American students within their respective families was heavily weighted towards a cultural deprivation model. This cultural deprivation model is characterized by an interpretation of Mexican American students' lack of educational achievement as directly attributable to the inability of their parents to provide a home environment which fostered educational motivation. It was further demonstrated that some recent researchers have challenged the cultural deprivation model as inaccurate. Instead, these recent researchers contend that many Mexican American parents do in fact support the educational goals of their children. Since there is a divergence of opinions among researchers on this critical variable, it is all the more important that further research be conducted on this variable.

Peer Group Support

Social researchers typically become interested in peer group behavior when that behavior conflicts significantly with another group, such as the family. This conflict occurs frequently, particularly in societies such as our own. Bronfenbrenner (1970), for example, has pointed out that parents in the United States tend to have less interaction with their children than do parents in other countries, such as the U.S.S.R. Because children in the U.S. are isolated from adults, peer groups have greater significance for children and are more likely to present discrepant cultural frameworks. The "generation gap" shows that the family is not the only reference group of significance. Peer reference groups can be as critical in determining behavior and achievement as the family, the school, or even the child's aptitude. Parents and teachers may hope for scholarship, but a peer group that values athletic accomplishment to the exclusion of scholarship wins over many high school youngsters.

Juvenile delinquency and drop out rates in school are astronomical for much of the youth in inner city ghettos and barrios. The schools' attempt to make students conform to a society that negates their very existence is at least part of the reason for such rebellion. In this regard, Bronfenbrenner states that the increasing

alienation from adults by adolescents has resulted in an increased reliance on peers and, correspondingly, an increase in juvenile delinquency. Among poor kids, who very often feel stigmatized and powerless and whose range of alternatives is limited, there is even a stronger attraction for peer group interaction than among more affluent kids. Often times, the great appeal of gangs to lower class youngsters is due in part to the fact that society has labeled them as losers. Therefore, only within the small realm of their gang peers do they feel that they are important.

Researchers who adhere to the "cultural deprivation" model contend that the self-concepts of juvenile delinquents, especially lower class kids, are usually negative due to comparisons of themselves as inferior to the general society. Also their parents in many cases have socialized them in a critical and intolerant manner. These types of socialization and child rearing patterns instill frustration, impatience, and often hostility in the child. As a result, these children are very likely to react in a physically aggressive manner. This often leads to illegal action against a society they see as unfair, uncaring, and hostile.

In a very real sense, a social group tells a person what goals to strive for as well as how to attain these

goals. The effect of such norms is clearly an important variable in any achieving situation. More often than not, the "lack of motivation" on the part of the ghetto or barrio child is a function of his membership in certain groups. The expectations, rules, rewards, sanctions, and aspirations of his peers are critical in determining how he will approach achievement situations.

Groups of persons behaving together over a period of time evolve their own normative structures, that is, their accepted and approved ways of doing things. The more one group is isolated from another, the higher the probability that different norms, values, and expectations will evolve. In a school which is heavily segregated, there is little opportunity for cross fertilization of values and ideas.

Manuel Ramirez III (1968) believes that an identity crisis in Mexican American adolescents promotes the importance of peer groups among Chicanos. He states that social scientists have long been concerned with the plight of the bicultural person in our society. They have described the bicultural person as caught between the often irreconcilable demands of two cultures. The resultant inability to comply with the requirements of both groups makes it difficult to develop consistency in an identity, which in turn, produces disorientation and

stress. The bicultural individual, such as Mexican American students who chooses to go to college, faces so much frustration in having to choose so often between loyalties, and under such difficult conditions, that he usually attempts to resolve any conflicts by choosing one group and rejecting the other. Time and again, research has shown that the group selected in such situations is the dominant Anglo culture, and also that acculturation to Anglo values and norms occurs at the expense of the Mexican culture.

According to Moore (1978), a discussion of peer group support among young Chicanos can never be complete without examining the persistence and influence of Chicano gangs. Her research corroborates the importance of gang membership for many alienated and suspicious Chicano youths. Since the early 1920s, Chicano urban problems in the Southwest have centered around welfare, drugs, and persistent youth street gangs. Since Anglo-based aspirations normally are denigrated in these barrios, it is no wonder that education among gang members is frowned upon and ridiculed.

Ten Houten (1968) found the peer aspirations of Mexican American boys are the strongest and most valuable predictors in determining college plans. Interestingly enough, this research also suggests that Mexican American

students with college plans are more independent from their parents and manifest lower self-esteem than Mexican Americans with no college plans.

De Hoyos (1961), however, contradicts Ten Houten. He found that both midwestern Latinos and non-Latinos indicated that their friends' anti-college attitudes would not have an effect on their own college aspirations. In other words, they reported that their friends' opinions would not affect their own college decisions. The overall important finding in his research, regarding peer influence, however, was that Latino students were no more likely to be influenced by friends than non-Latinos.

Related to the concept of peer group influence is Farias' (1970) study on Mexican American values. In that study, Farias described how Mexican Americans values and identity with family and peer groups are all interwoven. Loyalty to one's ethnic group is often based on competitive values, and Mexican American students often are forced to choose between home and school values. Furthermore, a Mexican American student who does not fit in with his Mexican American peer group often is mocked or shunned.

The review of literature on peer group support points out that some researchers feel that group influences are greater among the poor than among other classes. This was

true especially among Chicano youths due to the perceived needs for collective strength to fight prejudice and racism. Another group of researchers believe that belonging to a certain gang or clique is often times just a form of physical and social survival in the barrio for young Chicanos. Yet other researchers state that peer group support is a key variable because of the high Mexican American dropout and juvenile delinquency rates among teenagers.

In summary, the review of literature on the peer group support variable reveals that there are diverse interpretations of this variable by researchers. Despite this diversity, this research is important, because it highlights the need for more research in order to develop a greater understanding of variables affecting the adolescence period of Chicanos.

Career Aspirations

Gilmore (1973) states that as the world of work becomes increasingly complex, a person's ability to see alternatives and make appropriate decisions becomes increasingly important. The minority student from a culturally different or economically disadvantaged background is very likely to lack the skills necessary to make career/life planning decisions, and to seek information about career possibilities.

Lower class adolescents typically have low career aspirations. The impact of social class on career choice was revealed by a comprehensive study by Little (1967) who studied all the graduating seniors in Wisconsin's public and private high schools. At the time of graduation, students were asked to note the occupations they hoped to enter. The choices were later compared to the jobs they actually attained. Students who were in the lower third of their graduating class in socioeconomic status had significantly lower aspirations than those in the middle and upper thirds. In addition, the later actual job attainments of the lower class students were quite close to their expectations.

Simpson (1962) found that high school students, regardless of social class, were likely to seek higher education and higher level careers if their parents so urged them. However, they were unlikely to do so if their parents were neutral or negative about preparation for a career. Lower class parents who drop out of school and are later unable to find satisfying jobs, or any jobs at all, are less likely to urge their children to go to college than are upper class parents who have discovered the employment value of a college degree first hand.

Kahl (1953) states that for the most part, lower class adolescents experience and look forward to jobs,

not careers. They will value individualism and take an active stance toward the world and their future in it. However, lower middle class adolescents and their parents are likely to see the future in terms of the security, stability, and respectability that jobs bring rather than in terms of opportunities for development, intrinsic satisfaction, and self-actualization. Among most Chicanos, employment is valued primarily as a means of providing goods and services that lead to satisfaction in the extended family.

In a comparison study, Lineon (1965) investigated the educational and occupational aspirations of Anglo, Spanish, and Negro high school students. Although he found a high percentage of youth of all three ethnic backgrounds had high levels of aspiration, Spanish American students had the lowest levels of aspiration. Further he found that Spanish American girls were oriented toward vocational and clerical jobs requiring less than a college education.

Shiarishi (1975) examined the effects of a career guidance project on the level of occupational aspirations of bilingual/bicultural adolescents. The experimental treatment utilized various group and individual modeling techniques. On the basis of her findings, she concluded that career guidance projects did have an effect on raising occupational aspirations. In addition she found

that girls' occupational aspirations levels were affected more by guidance than boys' occupational aspirations.

Rainwater (1966) holds that young Chicanos in general are likely to have a passive and even fatalistic attitude in a survival-oriented economy. Chicano youths, according to Rainwater, have few opportunities to learn that active, individual efforts might pay off in the long run. Therefore, their career goals are often shortsighted.

The review of literature on career aspirations suggested that the low career expectations of Mexican American students can be explained partially by their poor educational attainment. Many of these researchers state that Mexican American students who have had a long history of failure in school understandably are reluctant to risk further failure by working towards a remote and seemingly impossible career goal. Some of the studies reviewed stated that there was a vicious cycle of failure which curtailed the career aspirations of many Mexican American students. This cycle of low career aspirations affecting low educational attainment is even more important when it is understood in context with the other interrelated variables studied in this research.

Level of College Staff Support

The nature of the interaction established between the student and his teacher is related to a number of

variables that have been discussed earlier in this study. Various social researchers have investigated the area of teacher-student relationships. In particular, Malpass (1953) measured the degree of favorableness of students' perceptions of teachers, classmates, discipline, achievement, and school environment at the elementary level. He found that students' favorable perceptions of teachers and achievement goals correlated highly with grades.

Davidson and Lang (1960) studied the relationship between students' perceptions of their teachers' attitudes toward them and their own self-image, academic achievement, and classroom behavior. Students' self perceptions were found to be similar to their perceptions of teachers' feelings toward them. Also, the more favorable the child's perception of his teacher's feelings, the higher the achievement rating.

Ryan (1960) conducted a major study of teacher characteristics and related these characteristics to pupil behavior. He found, for example, that pupils were more responsible and participated more in classes where the teacher was highly original and adaptable in his relationship to students.

The impact of teacher expectation was explored in the research of Rosenthal and Jacobson (1970). They argued

that inadequate school performance of many students from poor backgrounds was due to low expectations on the part of teachers. Teachers, they stated, communicated low performance goals to low income students who then internalized and reflected these low achievement goals.

In a review on teachers' expectations, Carl Braun (1976) summarized research on self-fulfilling prophecy. He explained the conflicting evidence in this area as an interaction of several variables that teachers face in the classroom. His findings suggested that teachers need to be highly aware of their own feelings and biases in order to eliminate the negative impact of teacher expectations on students.

The 1976 report by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights on the differences in teacher interaction with Mexican American and Anglo students reported gross disparities in teacher-student interaction in the schools of the Southwest. In this report it was shown that many educators were failing to involve Mexican American children as active participants in the classroom to the same extent as they involved Anglo children. Further, differences in language and culture may partly explain, but cannot justify, these disparities in classroom interactions.

It has only been in the last fifteen years that researchers have focused on the effects of college environments on recruitment, retention, and attrition of students. Previous to student affirmative action and equal opportunity programs, there was little or no special tutoring, counseling or financial aid programs on community college campuses. Instead, the college staff was never treated as one of the key variables affecting student performance and, thereby retention. Ifferts' (1957) survey, however, prompted a reevaluation of this assumption, and subsequent research has provided considerable evidence that the college environment plays a major role in determining the persistence or withdrawal of enrolled students. He further emphasized that the college environment rather than the inadequacies of the students themselves, should be given more emphasis in attrition studies.

Hannah (1969) and Slocum (1956) have shown that college dropouts were more dissatisfied with their relationships with professors than were students who persisted. Also, these researchers stated that the quality of the relationship between a student and his or her professors is of crucial importance in determining their satisfaction with the total institution. Hannah and Slocum go on to emphasize that a positive interaction

between students and teachers facilitates the development of a healthy attitude toward learning and toward college in general.

Roueche's (1968) study on attrition for nontraditional students shows that the community colleges studied are failing in their ability to meet the academic needs of their students. Roueche defined nontraditional students as those students who did not previously attend college until special programs were developed to meet their needs. Roueche further elaborated that community colleges have often not been able to accept the fact that most nontraditional students do not possess the verbal or math skills to succeed at this level. He blamed the faculty at community colleges for not adequately adapting their teaching styles to motivate or to meet the needs of these students adequately.

The review of literature on faculty support for Mexican American students describes the lack of college staff support and services for all minority students. The general consensus of this review of literature is that retention rates of Mexican American college students could be aided greatly if there was a better relationship between college staff and Mexican American students. The review found that this critical teacher-student interaction should be of greater consideration in planning retention

strategies for all community college students. In the final analysis the research contends that it is the responsibility of these colleges and faculty to orient their programs and instruction to meet the special educational needs of nontraditional students.

Family Structure

Family structure in industrial and urban societies has undergone a transition from a patriarchal pattern to one considered egalitarian. Social scientists have viewed family structural patterns as reflecting the social and economic organization of society. Accordingly, power relationships within the family are considered to be dependent upon economic roles within the larger society (McLaughlin, 1973). Although this interpretation of changes in traditional family structural patterns is widely accepted, changes in ethnic or minority family structure are viewed somewhat differently. This difference in view is based on cultural values as the primary factor, rather than social and economic organization.

Prior to the social research of the 1960s, the authoritarian Mexican-American family was viewed as a product of the traditional Mexican culture in which a macho male was dominant. The idea of male superiority was

heavily emphasized in the literature. The father was seen as having full authority over his wife and children, and all major decisions were his responsibility. Wives were described as passive, submissive, and dependent upon their husbands.

An example of a work which has influenced attitudes and contributed to the perpetuation of inaccurate stereotypes of the Chicano family is Madsen's (1960) anthropological study of Mexican Americans of South Texas. It portrays the Chicana as weak, submissive, and overly respectful of her husband. Mexican American society is viewed as male-dominated in general. Madsen writes "the Mexican American wife who irritates her husband may be beaten. Some wives assert that they are grateful for punishment at the hands of their husbands for such concern with shortcomings indicates profound love" (p. 261). This study, used in many colleges and universities as an authoritative source, advances a number of erroneous conceptions about Chicanas.

Studies conducted in the last twenty years, however, dispute the rigidity of patriarchy in Mexican American families (Grebler, Moore, & Guzman, 1970). Changes in this traditional family structure have been attributed to acculturation or to the acquisition of the predominant values in the United States about familial roles. Tharp,

Meadow, Lenhoff, and Satterfield (1968), for example, believe that social scientists have long assumed that the process of acculturation operates with widespread and profound effects on the minority ethnic group family. While this portrayal has typified ethnic families in general, it has assigned to great a role to the influence of cultural factors in shaping family patterns of Mexican Americans. This view of the family creates conceptual problems because it invites the idea that certain patterns are derivative of beliefs and values passed on from generation to generation, rather than to social and economic conditions. Such a portrayal of the family also implies that egalitarian marital roles and ethnic family patterns are mutually exclusive (Alvarez & Bean, 1976).

According to Arroyo (1973) Mexican American families are usually divided into two types. One is the patriarchal-traditional type whose structure is determined by Mexican cultural values. The second is a comparatively modern type which is more egalitarian in structure. This second type is created when larger society's values supersede the Mexican cultural values, and, as a result, erode the traditional authority of husband/father in family decision making. Mexican American families whose structure departs from the traditional patriarchy are often characterized by outside employment of wives. This

phenomenon is perhaps one of the key influences in modernization of the Mexican American family, but has so far not inspired any systematic study. With increasing numbers of Mexican American women entering the labor force, the relationship between wife's employment and family roles can no longer be overlooked.

In summary, this review of literature reveals that, while some progress has been made on understanding the Mexican American family structure, what writers on the subject have failed to do is the kind of in depth research that would reveal the nature and multiple modes of parent-teacher-student interactions. One group of researchers implies that Mexican American students do poorly in an educational setting, because they allege that the Mexican American family structure does not foster educational mobility and success. Another group of researchers defends the Mexican American family structure, but cite cultural and communication differences as the key variables affecting the lack of educational success. Overall, the review of literature on family structure shows how important this variable is to the educational success of Mexican American college students.

Sex Roles

Every culture establishes acceptable and unacceptable patterns of behavior and psychological standards for the

sexes, and these sex-role standards are imposed at an early age (Schell & Silber, 1968). Sex roles are inevitably interwoven with the status that society attaches to each role. Male dominance was one of the earliest bases of discrimination among human beings, presumably because survival among hunting and gathering tribes depended on the ability to move about unencumbered by childbearing and nursing.

The superiority of the male sex role has been perpetuated by incorporating it into the customs, laws, and socialization practices of successive generations. In most societies, whether an ancient, primitive, or modern, the prestige of the task determines whether it is assigned to males or to females. Women have generally been treated as if they were members of a minority group, and there are some parallels between traditional treatment of women and the treatment of Blacks and Chicanos in American society.

Children learn these status differences early. While they are growing up, both sexes generally prefer the male role with its freedom, authority, and power (J. Kagan, 1964). As a boy grows, he discovers that society has decided his vocational role as primary and his role as spouse and parent as secondary; the reverse is true for a girl. To fulfill these social roles, boys are likely to be reared to achieve and girls are likely to be reared to

nurture others. Thus, as soon as children enter early childhood, almost all societies foster achievement and self-reliance in boys and obedience, nurturance, and responsibility in girls.

In particular within the old traditional Chicano family, the role of men and women are definitely structured. In this regard, men are encouraged to rule their families and women were taught to be obedient to their husbands. A direct result of this type of traditional structured family was that Mexican women were not encouraged to compete in society. Today, most families in Mexico as well as Mexican American families no longer adhere to these archaic traditions. The differences between male and female roles in Mexican American families can no longer be looked at in a simplified and fixed conceptual manner but instead must be studied in light of today's varied social and economic reality.

Many young Mexican American researchers feel that while some research has been done on the Mexican American woman, the existing literature on the sex role of the Chicana gives a distorted and inaccurate image. Much of the small body of knowledge which exists on the Chicana has been collected by Anglo writers who have lacked sufficient understanding and sensitivity to the culture

of Mexican Americans to portray the Chicana accurately. This research has had dysfunctional consequences for the Chicana, because it perpetuates false and stereotypical images of the role and function of women within the Chicano community.

In large measure, this early research on the Chicana reflects the general societal values, which, lacking counter-images of the Chicano, tend toward unquestioning acceptance of prevailing myths about the Chicana. For instance, educational, health, welfare and law enforcement institutions often have utilized these distorted pictures in developing programs to respond to the needs of the Chicana. By relying on these incorrect stereotypes, these institutions and related service organizations inevitably are misguided and misinformed. This approach has contributed to both the relegation of Chicanas to a position of passivity and subservience and to barring them effectively from a full and creative role in society.

The institutions of family, school, and church socialize all women, but the impact of these institutions reflect a different reality for Chicanas. For the Chicana, the family evokes three levels of concern and commitment. She is concerned first with the family nucleus for which she feels direct responsibility as mother, wife, sister, or daughter. Second, she is

committed to an extended family, which encompasses grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins, godparents, and nieces. Third, she is concerned about the progress and betterment of La Raza, her people, through her involvement in Mexican American social action projects. The Chicana's role within the family is in constant evolution. She relates not only as a wife and mother, but also as granddaughter, daughter, sister, aunt, worker, confidante, and sometimes political activist (Hernandez, 1980).

The Mexican woman has been stereotyped as gentle, mild, intuitive, maternal, self-denying, self-sacrificing, and faithful. In summary, she has been placed in the same passive role attributed to all Spanish speaking people. Simoniello (1981) states that, until recently, much of the literature tended to support such cultural stereotypes. She contends that women, children, and ethnic minorities in our culture have been taught that assertive behavior is the province of the white adult male. For the Mexican woman, self-realization is a double dilemma at best. Mexican women have found that they have had to confront not only an externally imposed system of racial domination but also a system of sexual domination within their own culture.

Rigid sex-role stereotyping, portraying women as mothers cheerfully baking cookies and cleaning house all

day while fathers work in offices, is damaging for all women. For Chicanas, the damage is compounded by the fact that the "mothers" in the media stereotypes are almost always middle-class white women. Chicanas have borne the brunt of the educational system's self-fulfilling prophecies. Role models in the schools for Chicanas are seldom teachers, principals, or school-board members, but more often service workers in cafeterias. They have been traditionally counseled or tracked into vocational classes, such as cosmetology and clerical skills, because the school system operates under this misconception that these are what they are most interested in and for which they are best suited.

Although the total experience of Chicanas is distinct from that of other women, they share many of the same patterns of gender, class, and race oppression. Moreover, Chicanas share many of the same economic and social patterns as other working-class groups. Distinctions are to be found by elaborating specifics rather than by noting patterns. Contrary to the image of the Chicana who stays at home as a baby and tortilla maker, the 1970 California census indicated that 49 percent of all Chicanas over eighteen years of age were in the work force. During the peak child-bearing years, between twenty and thirty-one, 56 percent of all chicanas are workers. In California, 53

percent of Chicanas are employed as domestic workers or in service industries and factories; thus they are relegated to the lowest status and lowest paying jobs (U.S. Census Bureau, 1978).

In the last two decades, the United States experienced two major related movements, the Civil Rights and the Women's movements. Both movements irrevocably have changed the nature of the American society. One important indicator of these critical social changes is that Black Americans and White middle class women have achieved great strides as post-baccalaureate professionals in positions not held traditionally by members of these groups. Chicanas, on the other hand, have been grossly underrepresented in post secondary institutions in the last fifteen to twenty years, and college attendance statistics corroborate this pattern.

Nieto-Gomes de Lazarin (1973) reviews the problems and societal pressures Chicanas face in attaining an education. Prejudices encountered by Chicanas in a "closed educational system" include programming for motherhood and dependence, as well as sex and race discrimination in employment. The author believes that these societal problems, pressures, and prejudices experienced by Chicanas throughout their socialization provide for adjustment problems as they enter into a

college campus. Lazarin contends that understanding the experiences of the Chicana student is imperative if educators are to help educate them.

In looking at the overall statistics on student enrollment and degrees conferred in the California post-secondary institutions between 1975 and 1979, the comparative data between males and females indicates an increase in the number of women in general pursuing a college education (California Post Secondary Education Commission, 1980). This increase among women appears to have had some impact for Chicanas as well, although not in dramatic numbers. The proportion of undergraduate women enrolled in California public institutions has increased steadily since fall, 1975.

Presently, with respect to formal education, Chicanas still lag substantially behind all women. The median years of school completed by all adult women 25 years and over was 12.4 years. For Chicanas in the same age range, school years completed were 8.6. Interestingly enough, the gap narrows in the younger age groups. For example, in the 20-24 age range, women in general completed 12.8 years compared to Chicanas who completed 12.2 years. Among teenagers 14 to 17 years old, the median years of school completed were 10.3 for women in general and 9.7 for Chicanas (U.S. Census Bureau, 1978).

In comparison to Anglo female students, attending college was often the first experience out of the home environment for Chicanos. For many Chicanas, college also was their first confrontation with predominantly non-Mexican surroundings. Since the majority of these women were the first in their families to leave home, the psychological and familial pressures were great. Up until very recently, college attendance was considered an unorthodox act in relationship to the expectations of women in their culture. Even now, many Chicanas still have a difficult time in convincing their parents that they should be allowed to attend college in order to succeed in today's job market.

This review of literature on sex roles shows that it is a particularly important variable because there have been special obstacles experienced by Chicanas who have chosen to pursue their college education.

Academic Self-Concept

Academic self-concept is used by many educational researchers to denote how a student feels about his educational goals and academic endeavors. Academic self-concept is analogous to but separate from a student's self-concept, or world view. Self concept or world view is used to refer to a student's general feelings towards

his total environment, whereas academic self-concept is used to refer specifically to a person's perceptions of himself as a student. Students with a poor academic self-concept often feel that they are not as smart as other students and not as able to succeed as their peers. Their feelings of inferiority start a vicious cycle of failure, which often becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Von Koughnett and Smith (1969) have stated that a student needs to have a positive view of himself in order for positive functioning to occur in the classroom. It may be concluded, therefore, that a person's self-concept is directly related to his educational success.

Numerous studies in contemporary research stress the importance of self concept, or the composite of an individual's beliefs about one's self. Coopersmith (1959) states that a student's pattern of attitudes regarding his values, abilities, goals and personal worth influences both his perception and behavior. Self-concept is considered a crucial component of personality affecting an individual's relationship to himself and to others. Moon (1980), as well as many other educational researchers, have stated that a significant relationship exist between self concept and school success.

Griffin (1980) states that community college students with a poor academic self-concept typically delay in

undertaking study or other academic activities. Such students have problems setting priorities and working towards the attainment of specific goals. Students with poor academic self-concepts also are likely to have such unfavorable attitudes related to their education as failure to accept educational objectives, ineffective time management, and poor study habits.

Griffin who contends that these low educational achievers also manifest an external locus of control orientation. These types of students do not believe that their attitudes related to studying and participating in other school activities have significant effects on their abilities to succeed in school. They feel that success or failure results from forces external to themselves, such as fate, luck, and the whim of powerful others like teachers, counselors, and administrators. In short, they feel they do not have personal control of their academic future.

Haddox (1970) has stated that unfortunately there is widespread acceptance by educators of negative stereotypes for Spanish speaking students and that these stereotypes reinforce these students' negative academic self concepts. He found that Mexican American students often internalized the belief that Anglos were smarter students than they. He suggested that the negative academic self concept of

Chicanos is a result of Anglo's negative views of Chicanos.

Coleman (1966) stated that children from various ethnic groups not only entered school at a disadvantage, but also that this disadvantage became more pronounced as they progressed through school. His research indicated that a minority child's self-concept was lower than that of Anglos and suffered greatly through the schooling process. The cumulative effect of this negative educational experience becomes a formidable educational deficit leading to high attrition and poor educational attainment. Hale (1972) concurred with Coleman's findings. Also, he felt that the longer the Chicano child stayed in school, the more he lost his feeling of self-worth.

DeHoyo's (1977) research showed that the clarity of vision and the perceptions of costs and benefits emerged as very important variables in the academic self-concept of high school students in general. College aspiring students had a higher clarity of vision than the non college aspiring students.

Regarding the perceptions of the costs and benefits of a college education, DeHoyos found that college plans did not seem to vary according to the ethnicity. That is, the ethnic student college aspiring saw greater benefits to be gained from college than the non college aspiring

student. DeHoyo's research on midwestern Latinos shows the ethnicity in that particular setting was not a critical variable for the college aspirations of the Latino students in his study.

In general, most researchers on Chicano education agree that the potential Mexican American college student is one who has a strong academic self-concept. He also appears to be the individual who indicates an understanding of the socioeconomic and political structure in which he lives and who perceives high benefits from college attendance. The descriptive characteristics of the aspiring Mexican American college student could include understanding of the position that one occupies within the pluralistic framework of American society and, on the basis of this understanding, a comprehension of the tools and strategies needed to achieve success. Succinctly stated, this aspiring Chicano college student differs from other Chicanos in that he has decided that a higher education represents the best vehicle for his social and economic advancement.

The review of the literature on this critical variable points out the importance of academic self-concept on the educational success of students. Significant research findings included the negative effect on school attainment of poor academic self-concept and its self fulfilling

nature. The overall relevance to this study is that unless a Chicano student has a strong academic self-concept he is not likely to succeed in a college setting.

Overall Summary of Review of Literature

The overall review of the literature demonstrates the need for more research on each of the ten variables selected for this study. The research studies which were reviewed point out the need for a better understanding of how these variables interact and impact on the educational success of Mexican American students.

The need to understand Mexican American students within the context of their cultural and historical background was the first topic area to be reviewed. Next, came the review of literature on the concepts of aspiration and achievement and how they affect the educational success of Mexican American students. The studies reviewed on aspiration indicated Mexican American families manifested a much wider range of attitudes towards educational aspirations than was previously understood. The critical findings of studies of achievement as related to Mexican American students was that Mexican American parents support their children's educational achievement, but lacked the sophistication and knowledge to advise their children properly.

The significant finding from the review of literature on the other key variables was that they all interact to various degrees to create the conditions whereby Mexican American students have high drop out rates, widespread delinquency, and low socioeconomic class status. In conclusion, while there was no single variable found among those found in the reievew of literature which suggested a direct cause-effect relationship to the educational achievement of Mexican American students each variable looked to have signficiant impact on this lack of academic success.

Furthermore, although no single variable was found to have a direct cause-effect relationship to the educational achievement of Mexican American students. The research design of this study was structured to determine which individual or comibnation of variables were most significant in predicting the educational success of Mexican American community college students.

Chapter III is concerned with the research design and methodology of this study. It consists of a discription of the population, sample, and procedures for collection of data, survey instrument, and the statistical method used in interpreting the survey data.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

This chapter presents the research design developed to collect data on variables that affect the success of Chicanos in the community college system. The goal of this study was to compare and contrast the social and cultural characteristics of successful and unsuccessful Mexican American students with Anglo American community college students. The design of this research was developed largely from a review of the literature on key concepts in this study. These key concepts include the independent variables in this study, which were designated as: acculturation, sex roles, family structure, socioeconomic status, career goals, level of college staff support, level of peer group support, level of parental support, world view, and academic self-concept.

The first section of this chapter analyzes the demographic characteristic of the Mexican American population. Next, the sample description and the selection process used are discussed. The third section of this chapter, describes the community college sites from which this sample was selected. In addition, the

fourth section describes the instrument used in this survey method of research. The fifth section contains the procedures utilized in the collection of the data. A description of the statistical method used to analyze the relevant data in this study constitutes the final section of this chapter.

Demographic Characteristics of Chicano/Mexican American Population in the United States

The fundamental finding of the National Commission on Secondary Schooling for Hispanics (1984) is that a shocking proportion of this generation of Hispanic youths is being wasted. They believe that the damage inflicted on young Hispanics today threatens society tomorrow. In addition, educational researchers agree that the school failure rate among Chicanos is staggering. They feel that this factor forbodes a crisis of major proportions where Chicanos constitute a large proportion of the population.

As a group, Hispanics are the most undereducated of all Americans. Only 40% have completed high school vs. 46% of Blacks and 67% of Whites. In urban barrios the Mexican American dropout rate has frequently reached 85%. This attrition begins in junior high school and continues through the high school years. In higher education, research shows those Mexican American students who did make it to this level, did increase in absolute

numbers and proportions between the 1960's and 1970's. The proportions have since stabilized at about 12-13 percent and few gains have been made since the mid 1970's (Digest of Educational Statistics, 1983).

The recent Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund Suit (1981) charged that although the majority of minority students entering college in California are largely bound for community colleges, the overwhelming majority of Black and Chicano community will not succeed beyond this level. Community college will thus be the end of most Chicano and Black student educational careers. Very few will transfer to the state colleges and almost none to University of California campuses. They cite figures that show that between 1975 and 1981 approximately 26,000 students graduated from California high schools. White students in 1981 constituted 68.8% of all high school graduates with Black and Chicano totalling 8.2% and 15.7%, respectively. Likewise, Hispanics contributed 16.7% of all first time freshmen from California high schools enrolled at the community college in 1981, but only 6% and 10.6% of first time freshmen at University of California and California State University colleges.

The special role that community colleges play in providing access to minority students, and in particular

Chicano students has gone largely unnoticed by educators and researchers. Among the Chicano students who enrolled in higher education after high school, eighty percent of them enrolled in California Community colleges. For minority and disadvantaged students, community colleges are the "gatekeepers" of higher education. They are the institutions responsible for introducing large numbers of minority students to senior baccalureate schools. One unfortunate reality that cannot go unnoticed is that Chicano students are enrolled in that segment of higher education in which the fewest students persist, i.e., community colleges. These statistics should underline the critical role that community colleges play the educating Chicano students. The final report of the commission on the higher education of minority (1982) found that the single most important factor contributing to the severe underrepresentation of Chicanos was their extremely high rate of attrition from secondary school. The second most important factor was their greater than average attrition from community colleges.

In particular, the last two decades have seen a dramatic increase in the population of Chicano/Mexican Americans in California. Presently the Mexican American population is measured at 18-20% in California. The sheer growing numbers of this group guarantee that they will

play a greater role in shaping this nation's future political and educational policies.

Sample Description

The target population was drawn from two community colleges with a total sample of one hundred and thirty students at each college. Each community college's sample consisted of fifty Chicano and fifty Anglo community college students who were in sophomore standing and desired to transfer to a four year college. Also the sample consisted of 15 Anglo American and 15 Mexican American on each campus who were designated as unsuccessful community college students because they had dropped out of college or who were on probationary status.

The size of the sample was overall 57% female and 43% male. In particular, the Chicano successful group was 67% female and 33% male. Also the Chicano unsuccessful group was 52% female and 48% male. The Anglo successful group was 53% male and 47% female. In contrast, the Anglo unsuccessful group was 38% male and 62% female. These figures coincide with statewide demographics of community college enrollment. It should be noted that the balance of the successful student sample (200) versus the unsuccessful student sample (60) developed largely due to the difficulty and extensive time necessary in contacting

"former" unsuccessful community college students mainly through a mailing process.

Since one of the purposes of this study was to compare and contrast variables such as socioeconomic status and levels of acculturation of community college students, it was decided to choose two distinctly different socioeconomic and sociocultural settings for this research study. Ohlone College was chosen because of its suburban and middle economic setting. In contrast, Chabot College was selected because of its urban and lower economic setting.

The total sample of 260 students were administered the questionnaire on an individual basis. Selection of the sample was done on a voluntary basis for those students meeting the desired criteria. The criteria for the sample was that a student in the successful group be listed as a transfer major and achieved sophomore standing (45 quarter units or more) with at least a passing G.P.A. of 2.00. The unsuccessful students were designated as those students who were listed as transfer majors who had dropped out of college or whose G.P.A. was below a 2.00.

The selection of the sample for this study was done on a similar basis at both Ohlone college and Chabot college. At both campuses permission was granted to obtain a computerized list of students who met the

"successful and unsuccessful criteria." Students were then randomly selected from each list to the point of obtaining the necessary size of sample for each subcategory. This research study conformed to the use of the local campus coding of ethnicity so that this worked very well, since both Chabot and Ohlone colleges identified the ethnic and racial background of their respective student populations by self-identification responses on registration forms. Once the actual selection of the sample from the eligible pool of names drawn from the computerized lists was done, the cooperation of faculty was solicited in order to contact respondents for the questionnaire.

Description of Community College Sites

The two community colleges from which samples were chosen represent two separate socioeconomic and cultural settings. Although there are significant differences between Ohlone and Chabot's sizes and demographic characteristics, the two colleges are representative of the larger California community college system.

The highly industrial city of Hayward, California is the principal city within Chabot college's service area. The ages of the students selected in the sample from Chabot ranged from seventeen to sixty. Socioeconomically, they mainly represented blue collar/industrial and service employees. The number of students at Chabot college is

over 16,000. The percentage of the Hispanic constituency is 9%, and there are also large percentages of Blacks (8.6%) and Asians (9%) creating a highly visible multi-cultural setting. Chabot college reveals a wide range of career options, with a strong emphasis on blue collar, technical and apprenticeship programs.

The Fremont-Newark service area of Ohlone college is principally a middle class and suburban community. The average age of students in general at Ohlone College is 26.5, but also ranges like Chabot, from seventeen to over sixty. Employment figures on Fremont-Newark residents show a large percentage of middle management and electronic-technical workers. The total student enrollment at Ohlone is 9,000, with a Hispanic and Black make-up of 8.4% and 2.1% respectively. Ohlone College, like Chabot, offers both transfer and occupational programs with an emphasis on business and technical fields which are geared to the white collar worker.

Instrument:

The nature of the study was such that a form of descriptive research or survey was found to be the most appropriate method of gathering data from a large number of individuals. The questionnaire survey method was chosen in order to best 'sample' or evaluate specific

variables about the current status of Mexican American community college students.

The process for the development of the questionnaire involved selecting items from several sources which were based on the assumptions defined by the research question (page 99). Next a search of several related questionnaires provided many questionnaire items for critique and selection for the purposes used in this research study. Other items were developed from related literature. Some items were suggested by experts in the field of education and by other professionals working with the Chicano community.

These items were then scrutinized by a panel of experts. This panel of experts helped establish the face validity of the questionnaire. The panel included one professional educator who was involved with Mexican American students at each of the community colleges where the study was completed. It also included a University of the Pacific professor and a knowledgeable community representative from each of two college communities researched. This panel helped review the questionnaire for clarity and effectiveness. The panel was very helpful in pointing out any discrepancies between the main research question and the questionnaire items. Finally the panel helped in editing the language of the items and

was also useful in putting the questionnaire into a more complete and meaningful package.

The survey questionnaire consisted of 56 items that were thought to be critical to the study. The first eight questions dealt with general information about the student's age, sex, marital status, etc. Next, the questionnaire was divided up into ten subcategories of three to five questions apiece, which refer directly to the ten key variables studied in this research.

The questionnaire was pilot tested on a group of twelve Ohlone students. A substantial amount of information was gained from interviews with these twelve students. For example these interviews pinpointed items that were not appropriate for this group as well as items that elicited improper responses. The results of this pilot test helped to refine the questionnaire and to shape the research design.

Next, a larger pilot test was administered to thirty successful and unsuccessful Cabrillo Community College students. Interviews with these students were then conducted to provide opportunity for the respondents to react and suggest changes to the questionnaire items. Overall, reactions to the questionnaire subsequently went through several more revisions, and finally developed into two alternate forms: one for the successful student

and one for the unsuccessful student. Both forms of the questionnaire took students approximately twenty minutes to complete and contained all the same essential items. They differ only in that the version used for the unsuccessful students was phrased partially in the past tense.

Data Collection Procedures

Initially, permission on each campus was sought in order to implement the study by contacting the appropriate Deans of Student Services. It was also necessary to write an official letter of purpose so that each college administrator could clear the study with their legal counsel. This process also included persuading the Dean of Student Services on each campus that there would be no human experimentation in this study. Furthermore, there was great care taken to make sure that there were no breaches of student confidentiality on the data collected. Finally, the researcher had to convince all parties involved of the value of the research to the college. After the college administrators were able to see the value of the study they were extremely cooperative. This overall cooperation helped achieve the goal of developing an accurate and helpful picture of the Chicano and Anglo students on each campus.

The actual process of administering all the questionnaires was done by the researcher. Key members of the college faculties at Ohlone and Chabot community colleges were instrumental in contacting and locating the students selected for the sample. Uniform instructions for the questionnaire were issued to each student, and extra care was taken to make sure that all participants involved understood the procedures. The successful students were all tested in a classroom setting, whereas the unsuccessful students were largely handled through a mailing process.

In order to collect the necessary data from the unsuccessful students, an alternate form of the questionnaire with uniform instructions and a pre-paid envelope was mailed. The students were asked to respond as soon as possible. Students who did not respond within two weeks were sent a second questionnaire with an additional plea for responding with phone follow-ups for non respondents. When no response was made to one further follow-up, another random selection from the computerized list was made. The same process was followed until the necessary size of sample was obtained.

Research Question:

Statistical Procedures

The main research question of this study was: is there a significant difference of the ten sociocultural variables on the success of Chicano and Anglo community college students. The nature of this study was exploratory in that it looked at possible factors developed largely from the literature that affected the success of these Chicano and Anglo community college students.

The statistical treatment of the data was processed through the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) at the University of Pacific computer center. Scoring of the questionnaire was completed through a series of instructions in the SPSS package. The analysis of the data was done through several programs in the SPSS package which allowed for manipulation and calculation of the data and for sufficient print-out details.

The data was analyzed first in terms of frequency distribution of responses to the ten independent variables studied. The computerized data on the ten independent variables then was crosstabulated in accordance with the research design to determine the significance of the data. Crosstabulation was chosen because it was the most applicable statistical method for this type of survey

research. The next stage in the treatment of the data was the use of the statistical technique known as Chi Square. Chi Square was chosen as a means of answering questions about data in the form of frequencies rather than as scores or measurements along some scale. Chi Square techniques enabled the researcher to see whether or not frequencies observed in the sample deviated significantly from some theoretical or some expected population of frequencies. Chi Square was thought to be a good choice for this particular study because it works well on general information or dynamics based on non-parametric statistics. Finally, Chi Square is often used in similar exploratory studies where the researcher is searching out probable cause of a problem. The .05 level of significance was used for statistical treatment.

Summary and Overview

Chapter III described the general characteristics of the Mexican American population. Secondly, it discussed the research design of this study as well as the methodology that was used. It also examined the sample and the college sites on which the data was gathered. Next, it reviewed the manner in which the data was treated and analyzed.

Chapter IV will discuss the analysis of the data that was collected. Chapter V will discuss the findings and conclusions of this study.

CHAPTER IV

STATISTICAL FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to measure the effects of social and cultural variables on the success or failure of Anglo and Chicano community college students. Two hundred and sixty community college students responded to 56 items derived from the literature. The students were enrolled in two community colleges, each representing different socioeconomic and cultural settings.

The independent variables were grouped into the following categories: Family structure; Socioeconomic status; Career goals; Parental support; Peer group support; College staff support; Academic self-concept; Sex roles; Acculturation; and World view. Ethnicity (Anglo and Chicano) was the pivotal independent variable which related to the purpose of this study and which served to organize the discussion in this chapter. It should be noted that gender was also examined as a separate variable and that the results were reported when pertinent.

The dependent variable was success in community college. The research question was: Is there a significant relationship between social and cultural

variables and success of Anglo and Chicano community college students. Successful students were defined as students who were enrolled in Ohlone College or Chabot College and who desired to transfer to a four-year college. In addition, they were those students who were maintaining a cumulative GPA of 2.00 or above and had already completed 45 units or more. Unsuccessful students were defined as students who were enrolled in Ohlone or Chabot College and who desired to transfer to a four-year college but were either failing to maintain a GPA of 2.00 or had dropped out of college.

Procedures for the Acceptance or Rejection of Independent Variables

The procedures involved in determining the significance of a particular variable were largely based on the relationship of these categories to the main research question of this study. As a convention for this study the term "nonsignificant" was used to denote a relationship that was not statistically significant at the .05 level, but fell within the .10 level. This procedure was used to identify secondary areas which might prove useful to community college counselors. This process screening involved a two stage operation. First, an examination of all the major research tables which looked at the independent variable combined with

ethnicity in relationship to success were structured to analyze each of the individual survey questions. These tables were closely examined to check first the frequency distribution of the data and subsequently the Chi Square scores at the .05 level of significance as well as any patterns in the data. Secondly, there was an examination of the six specific sets of subtables, including: 1) Chicano students vs. Anglo students, (ethnicity); 2) Successful students vs. unsuccessful students; 3) Anglo successful students vs. Anglo unsuccessful students; 4) Chicano successful students vs. Chicano unsuccessful students; 5) Successful Chicano students vs. successful Anglo students; 6) Unsuccessful Chicano students vs. unsuccessful Anglo students. Next, there was a review of the Chi Square scores of these subtables at .05 level of significance in order to see patterns and identify further items which might suggest a relationship to the academic success of these community college students.

In order to better explain this process, the table in Figure 1 presents a conceptual scheme which shows the main relationship between the two primary variables. Success A & B (successful vs. unsuccessful) Ethnicity; C & D (Chicanos vs. Anglos). Also the four internal relationship of (1-3) Chicano successful vs. Chicano unsuccessful; (2-4) Anglo successful vs. Anglo

unsuccessful; (1-2) Chicano successful vs. Anglo successful; (3-4) Chicano unsuccessful vs. Anglo unsuccessful.

The main goal of this examination was to scrutinize the data to see if the significant relationships were maintained when the data was compared in different situations. Finally the process involved an examination of apparently nonsignificant relationships that might in fact be hiding significant relationships.

The results from the survey questions are presented in this chapter in a manner organized so that each variable was examined individually to judge its significance to the main research question of this study. Specifically, the goal of this research question was to examine these social and cultural variables and determine if they were related to academic success.

Family Structure

The review of the literature identified family structure as a likely variable which may help explain academic success in community college. The family structure variable was measured specifically in questions 9, 10, 11, and 14. It should be noted that the problem of inconsistency in the placement of responses in questions 9 and 10 was overlooked in developing the questions but this

Figure I

	Ethnicity	
	<u>C</u> Chicano	<u>D</u> Anglo
<u>A</u> (S) Successful	1	2
<hr/>		
<u>B</u> (U) Unsuccessful	3	4

Success

Broad Categories

- (I) (A-B) Successful vs. Unsuccessful students
- (II) (C-D) Chicano vs. Anglo students

Internal Categories

- (III) (1-3) Chicano successful vs. Chicano unsuccessful
- (IV) (2-4) Anglo successful vs. Anglo unsuccessful
- (V) (1-2) Chicano successful vs. Anglo successful
- (VI) (3-4) Chicano unsuccessful vs. Anglo unsuccessful

problem was corrected when the data were redefined and plotted into the computer. They were:

9. The following best describes your family structure: (Table 1)
 - a. Authoritarian/traditional
 - b. Democratic/modern egalitarian
 - c. Combination of both a & b
10. The communication process in your home can best be described as:
 - a. One way/parents do all the talking
 - b. Two way/both parents and children communicate
 - c. No communication
11. Which parent makes all the major decisions in your home?
 - a. Father
 - b. Mother
 - c. Both
14. Are your parents: (Table 2)
 - a. Both living together
 - b. Divorced
 - c. Separated
 - d. Father deceased
 - e. Mother deceased

A Chi Square of $X^2 = 13.25$, $df = 6$, $p = .04$ in Table 1 suggested that family structure was related to success.

Table 1
 Student Success by Ethnicity and
 Family Structure in Percentage

Ethnicity/Success	Authoritarian		Combination		Democratic		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	39.3	38	45.4	44	15.5	15	38.6	97
Chicano Unsuccessful	33.3	9	40.7	11	25.9	7	10.8	27
Anglo Successful	22.2	22	44.4	44	33.3	33	39.4	99
Anglo Unsuccessful	17.9	5	53.6	15	28.6	8	11.2	28
Total	29.5	74	45.4	114	25.1	63	100.0	251

$\chi^2 = 13.25, df = 6, p = < .04$

Question #9. The following best describes your family structure:

- a. Authoritarian/Traditional
- b. Democratic/Modern Egalitarian
- c. Combination of both a & b

Table 1.1
Student Family Structure in Ethnicity,
in Percentage

	Authoritarian		Combination		Democratic		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano	37.9	47	44.4	55	17.7	22	49.4	124
Anglo	21.3	27	46.5	59	32.3	41	50.6	127
Total	29.5	74	45.4	114	25.1	63	100.0	251

$\chi^2 = 12.48, \underline{df} = 2, \underline{p} = < .01$

Table 1.2
Successful Students by Ethnicity and
Family Structure, in Percentage

	Authoritarian		Combination		Democratic		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	39.2	38	45.4	44	15.5	15	49.5	97
Anglo Successful	22.2	22	44.5	44	33.3	33	50.5	99
Total	30.6	60	44.9	88	24.5	48	100.0	196

$\chi^2 = 11.0, \underline{df} = 2, \underline{p} = < .004$

suggested a significant relationship between authoritarian and democratic family structures and success for both successful and unsuccessful Anglo and Chicano students. But, Table 1.1 and 1.2 indicated that family structure differences were correlated to the ethnicity of students and did not affect their success in college. Overall, despite a significant relationship in the main Table 1, family structure is not a good predictor of success in question 9. In summary, in Question 9 the fact that successful and Chicano unsuccessful students were found more frequently in authoritarian family structure and Anglo represented more in democratic family structure is clearly a result of ethnicity.

In Table 2, a Chi Square of $X^2 = 27.48$, $df = 2$, $p = .007$ suggested that the marital status of parents were related to success, even when ethnicity was controlled. Next, Table 2.2 looked at the marital status of parents of only Chicano students and still found that marital status predicted success. In review, the data on Question 14 showed that marital status affects success, even when controlling for ethnicity.

Finally, there was an unusually high percentage of unsuccessful Chicano students (14%) and Anglo unsuccessful students (21%) who listed their fathers as deceased. This is an unanticipated finding, but one which may prove useful to community college counselors.

Table 2

Student Success

Ethnicity and Marital Status of Parents, in Percentages

Ethnicity/ Success	Living Together		Divorced		Separated		Father Deceased		Mother Deceased		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano												
Successful	66.3	66	16.8	17	6.9	7	8.9	9	1.0	1	39.5	100
Chicano												
Unsuccessful	51.9	14	7.4	2	0.0	0	40.7	11	0.0	0	10.5	27
Anglo												
Successful	64.6	64	23.2	23	3.0	3	9.1	9	0.0	0	38.7	99
Anglo												
Unsuccessful	58.6	17	17.2	5	3.4	1	20.7	6	0.0	0	11.3	29
Total	63.3	161	18.4	47	4.3	11	13.7	35	0.4	1	100.0	255

$\chi^2 = 27.48, df = 12, p = < .07$

Question #14: Are your parents:

1. Both living together
2. Divorced
3. Separated
4. Father deceased
5. Mother deceased

Table 2.1
Student Success and Marital Status
of Parents, in Percentage

	Living Together		Divorced		Separated		Father Deceased		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Successful	65.8	131	20.1	40	5.0	10	9.1	18	77.7	199
Unsuccessful	56.1	32	12.3	7	1.8	1	29.8	17	22.3	57
Total	63.6	163	18.4	47	4.3	11	13.7	35	100.0	256

$\chi^2 = 17.56, df = 3, p = < .002$

Table 2.2
Chicano Students' Success and
Marital Status of Parents, in Percentage

	Living Together		Divorced		Separated		Father Deceased		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	66	66	17	17	7	7	9	9	78.7	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	51.9	14	7.4	2	0	0	40.7	11	21.3	27
Total	63.8	81	15.0	19	5.5	7	15.7	20	100.0	127

$\chi^2 = 17.93, df = 3, p = < .001$

Summary of Family Structure Data

The results of Question 9 (Table 1) show that the correlation value of family structure was based on ethnicity. Next, Question 10 concluded there was no significant relationship between the communication process in the home and academic success. The results of Question 11 found that the major decision maker in the home was not related to college success. Finally, Question 14 (Table 2) found that the marital status of parents was a strong predictor of success, even when controlling for ethnicity. In conclusion, it seems that the stability of the marital status of the students' parents was associated with their college success. In contrast, the type of family structure, or mode of communication process, and major decision maker in the family were not significant in affecting student success.

Socioeconomic Status

The second key independent variable surveyed was the socioeconomic status of the students. The socioeconomic variable was composed of questions 12, 13, 15, 16, and 17:

12. In the home in which you grew up, which of the following best describes the type of job the head of the family held.
 1. Unemployed or underemployed (seasonal)
 2. Unskilled, or formal training needed
 3. Semi-skilled, some formal training needed
 4. Managerial, considerable experience or schooling needed

13. Check one occupation for the head of household.
 1. Industry
 2. Business
 3. Health related
 4. Government (civil service)
 5. Education
 6. Agriculture
 7. Military
 8. Other

15. Generally, which one of the following best describes your family situation? (Table 3)
 1. Poor, it's a struggle just to make ends meet
 2. Semi-poor, sometimes we have enough, sometimes we don't
 3. Adequate, we have the necessities but must be careful
 4. Comfortably well off, and can afford most things
 5. Very well off, rich or affluent

Table 3
 Student Success
 by Ethnicity and Family Socioeconomic Status,
 in Percentage

Ethnicity/ Success	Poor		Non Poor		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	15	15	85	85	39.2	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	48	13	52	14	10.6	27
Anglo Successful	22	22	78	78	38.8	99
Anglo Unsuccessful	24	7	76	22	11.4	29
Total	22	57	78	199	100.0	255

$\chi^2 = 13.56, df = 3, p = < .01$

This table was collapsed from 5 to 2 categories so that 1 = poor and 2 = non poor.

Question #15. Generally, which one of the following best describes your family's situation?

1. Poor, it's a struggle just to make ends meet
2. Semi-poor, sometimes we have enough, sometimes we don't
3. Adequate, we have the necessities but must be careful
4. Comfortably well off, we can afford most things
5. Very well off, rich or affluent

Table 3.1
Student Success and
Socioeconomic Status, in Percentage

	Poor		Semi Poor		Adequate		Well Off		Rich		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Successful	7.5	15	11.1	22	42.2	84	36.7	73	2.5	5	77.7	199
Unsuccessful	14.0	8	21.1	12	28.1	16	36.8	21	0	0	22.3	57
Total	9.0	23	13.3	34	39.1	100	36.7	94	2.0	5	100.0	256

$\chi^2 = 9.12, df = 4, p = < .06$

Table 3.2
Chicano Students' Success and
Socioeconomic Status, in Percentage

	Poor		Semi Poor		Adequate		Well Off		Rich		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	6.0	6	9.0	9	48.0	48	35.0	35	2.0	2	78.7	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	18.5	5	29.6	8	33.3	9	18.5	5	0.0	0	21.3	27
Total	8.7	11	13.4	17	44.9	57	31.5	40	1.6	2	100.0	127

$\chi^2 = 14.0, df = 4, p = < .007$

16. According to the present standard of living in the United States, as a whole, in which economic groups would your family be considered?
(Table 4)

1. Below average
2. Average
3. Somewhat above average
4. Much higher than average

17. Does your mother:

1. Have a full-time job outside the home
2. Have a part-time job outside the home
3. Have no job outside the home
4. Other

In Table 3, a Chi Square of $\chi^2 = 13.56$, $df = 3$, $p = .01$ found that the socioeconomic status of the family was significantly related to college success. In particular, Table 3 found that unsuccessful Chicano students stated they were much poorer than all other students. Even when controlling for ethnicity (Table 3.1), socioeconomic status still was a significant factor correlated to academic success. Next, in Table 3.2 the data on Chicano successful and unsuccessful students reaffirmed that socioeconomic status was related to college success. In review, the research found that socioeconomic status was a significant factor in affecting the success of Anglo and Chicano community college students and that successful

Table 4
 Student Success by Ethnicity and
 Standard of Living, in Percentage

Ethnicity/ Success	Below Average		Average		Above Average		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	17	17	62	62	21	21	39.7	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	27	7	65	17	8	2	10.3	26
Anglo Successful	13	13	47	48	39	39	39.3	99
Anglo Unsuccessful	11	3	52	14	42	10	10.7	27
Total	16	40	55	14	29	72	100.0	252

$\chi^2 = 15.78, df = 6, p = < .01$

This table was collapsed from 4 to 3 categories so that 1 = below average, 2 = average, 3 & 4 = above average.

Question #16. According to the present standard of living in the United States, as a whole, in which economic groups would your family be considered?

1. Below average
2. Average
3. Somewhat above average
4. Much higher than average

Table 4.1
 Student's Socioeconomic Status
 by Ethnicity, in Percentage

	Below Average		Average		Above Average		Much Above Average		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano	19.0	24	62.7	79	15.9	20	2.4	3	50.0	126
Anglo	12.7	16	48.4	61	33.3	42	5.6	7	50.0	126
Total	15.9	40	55.6	140	24.6	62	3.9	10	100.0	252

$\chi^2 = 13.32, df = 3, p = < .01$

students tend to be better off economically than unsuccessful students. Finally, the data in Table 3.2 implied that poverty has a much greater impact on the college success of Chicano students than Anglo students.

A Chi Square of $X^2 = 15.78$, $df = 6$, $p = .01$ in Table 4 suggested that socioeconomic status predicted success. But, Table 4.1 showed that these economic differences were related more to ethnicity than to success. In other words, Anglos, more often than Chicano students, listed themselves as belonging to a family in an above average economic group. Therefore the data in question 16 implies that family socioeconomic status was not associated with academic success.

Summary of Socioeconomic Status Data

The results of Questions 12 and 13 were not significant but they did suggest that the specific type of job held by the head of household was distinguishable between Anglos and Chicanos. Indirectly this may have been a factor in relation to how it affected the overall financial status of the students' families. Next, Question 15 showed a significant relationship between the socioeconomic status of students and success in community colleges.

In Question 16 (Table 4), a similar item on socioeconomic status did not prove to be significant when controlled for ethnicity. Although these items, Questions 15 and 16 were similar in content, many respondents apparently interpreted these questions in a contrasting manner. The differences in responses to Question 15 and 16 may be largely accounted for on the basis of the different language and cultural backgrounds of the sample and how they interpreted these items.

Finally, the data in Question 15 (Table 3) demonstrated that socioeconomic status was related to a student's ability to succeed in college. Overall, the data showed that Anglo students' parents were better off economically and this factor helped their children to do better than Chicano students in college.

Career Goals

Next, the career goals of the students were measured in Questions 18 through 22.

18. Of all the subjects you took in school, which one did you like the most?
 1. Math related
 2. Science related
 3. Humanities
 4. Business
 5. Social Sciences

19. What job or career did you think about going into?
 1. Business related
 2. Medical related
 3. Engineering and Math related
 4. Social sciences

20. What attracted you to this job?
 1. Money
 2. Status
 3. Knowledge or experience with job
 4. Social reward
 5. Other

21. Did you feel you have enough information about jobs available to make a decision about your future? (Table 5)
 1. A lot of information
 2. Some information
 3. Little information
 4. None

22. How likely do you think it is that you will be able to get the job you want since you did not finish your college degree? (Table 6)
 1. Very likely
 2. Somewhat likely
 3. Somewhat unlikely
 4. Very unlikely

In Table 5, the Chi square $X^2 = 21.12$, $df = 9$,
 $p = .02$ showed a significant relationship between

Table 5
 Student Success by Ethnicity
 and Career Information, by Percentages

Ethnicity/ Success	Lots of Information		Some Information		Little Information		None		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano										
Successful	16.0	16	61.0	61	21.0	21	2.0	2	39.7	100
Chicano										
Unsuccessful	18.5	5	48.1	13	33.3	9	0.0	0	10.7	27
Anglo										
Successful	37.0	37	47.0	47	12.0	12	2.0	2	38.9	98
Anglo										
Unsuccessful	25.9	7	44.4	12	22.2	6	7.4	2	10.7	27
Total	25.6	65	52.4	133	18.9	48	2.4	6	100.0	252

$\chi^2 = 21.12, df = 9, p = < .02$

Question 21: Do you feel you have enough information about jobs available to make a decision about your future?

1. A lot of information
2. Some information
3. Little information
4. None

Table 5.1
Students' Career Goals by
Ethnicity, in Percentage

	Lots of Information		Some Information		Little Information		No Information		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano	16.5	21	58.3	74	23.6	30	1.6	2	50.0	127
Anglo	34.6	44	46.5	59	14.2	18	3.1	4	50.0	127
Total	25.6	65	52.4	133	18.9	48	2.4	6	100.0	254

$\chi^2 = 13.48$, $df = 3$, $p = < .01$

Table 5.2
Successful Students by Ethnicity and
Career Goals, in Percentage

	Lots of Information		Some Information		Little Information		No Information		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	16.0	16	61.0	61	21.0	21	2.0	2	50.5	100
Anglo Successful	37.0	37	47.0	47	12.0	12	2.0	2	49.5	98
Total	26.8	53	54.5	108	16.7	22	2.0	4	100.0	198

$\chi^2 = 12.56$, $df = 3$, $p = < .01$

information about career goals and student success. The data also showed that Anglo students had a greater amount of information than Chicano students about careers. But, Table 5.1 indicated that these differences in students' level of knowledge about careers varied more by ethnicity and thus did not affect community college success. In summary, Question 21 showed that although Anglo students have a greater amount of career information than Chicano students, that this factor, when controlled for ethnicity, was not a good predictor of college success.

In Table 6, the Chi square $X^2 = 24.30$, $df = 9$, $p = .004$, presented evidence that a student's feelings about his/her likelihood to get a desired job after college graduation was related to college success. In Table 6.1 which concentrated on the ethnicity of students, this significant relationship between student confidence in attaining career goals and college success was also corroborated. Furthermore, this relationship continued to be substantiated in Table 6.2, when all students were separated into categories of successful and unsuccessful students.

Table 6.3 found a significance level of $p < .02$ when the data was organized to study only successful students. Table 6.4 showed only Anglo successful vs. Anglo unsuccessful students and still found that a student's

Table 6
 Student Success by Ethnicity and
 Attainment of Career Goals in Percentage

Ethnicity/ Success	Very Likely		Somewhat Likely		Somewhat Unlikely		Very Unlikely		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	27.6	27	42.9	42	18.4	18	11.2	11	39.0	98
Chicano Unsuccessful	22.2	6	63.0	17	7.4	2	7.4	2	10.8	27
Anglo Successful	44.3	43	28.9	28	16.5	16	10.3	10	38.6	97
Anglo Unsuccessful	27.6	8	31.0	9	10.3	3	31.0	9	11.6	29
Total	33.5	84	38.2	96	15.5	39	12.7	32	100.0	251

$\chi^2 = 24.30, df = 9, p = < .004$

Question 22: How likely do you think it is that you will be able to get the job you want when you finish your college degree?

1. Very likely
2. Somewhat likely
3. Somewhat unlikely
4. Very unlikely

Table 6.1
Student Career Goals by Ethnicity,
in Percentage

	Very Likely		Somewhat Likely		Somewhat Unlikely		Very Much Unlikely		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano	26.4	33	47.2	59	16	20	10.4	13	49.8	125
Anglo	40.5	51	29.4	37	15.1	19	15.1	19	50.2	126
Total	33.5	84	38.2	96	15.5	39	12.8	32	100.0	251

$\chi^2 = 10.05, df = 3, p = < .02$

Table 6.2
Student Success and Career Goals,
in Percentage

	Very Likely		Somewhat Likely		Somewhat Unlikely		Very Much Unlikely		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Successful	35.9	70	35.9	70	17.4	34	10.8	21	77.4	195
Unsuccessful	24.6	14	45.6	26	8.8	5	21.1	12	22.6	57
Total	33.3	84	38.1	96	15.5	39	13.1	33	100.0	252

$\chi^2 = 8.50, df = 3, p < .04$

Table 6.3
 Successful Students by Ethnicity and
 Career Goals, in Percentage

	Very Likely		Somewhat Likely		Somewhat Unlikely		Very Much Unlikely		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano										
Successful	27.6	27	42.9	42	18.4	18	11.2	11	50.3	98
Anglo										
Successful	44.3	43	28.9	28	16.5	16	10.3	10	49.7	97
Total	35.9	70	35.9	70	17.4	34	10.8	21	100.0	195

$\chi^2 = 6.62, df = 3, p = < .09$

Table 6.4
 Anglo Students by Success and
 Career Goals, in Percentage

	Very Likely		Somewhat Likely		Somewhat Unlikely		Very Much Unlikely		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Anglo										
Successful	44.3	43	28.9	28	16.5	16	10.3	10	77.0	97
Anglo										
Unsuccessful	27.6	8	31.0	9	10.3	3	31.0	9	23.0	29
Total	40.5	51	29.4	37	15.1	19	15.1	19	100.0	126

$\chi^2 = 8.50, df = 3, p = < .04$

career goals affect his/her college success. It should be noted that a similar table comparing only Chicano students did not prove significant. In conclusion, the ability to see future career goals seemed to be more important to the college success of Anglo than Chicano community college students.

Summary of Career Goal Data

In this section, there were three questions (18, 19 and 20) which attempted to pinpoint how the subject and career choices of Anglo and Chicano students were related to academic success. An overall review of these items showed that these relationships were not statistically significant. When examining career goals in terms of gender, the data showed unsuccessful Chicano students both male and female tended to choose the academic fields of humanities and social science. In particular, when only comparing Chicano students, male Chicano successful and unsuccessful students chose science, mathematics and engineering careers. On the other hand, Chicana females, successful and unsuccessful, were both heavily represented in business. Finally, it should be noted, Chicana unsuccessful females were not as well represented in the science fields, and Chicano unsuccessful students did not choose business careers. Furthermore, Question 21 initially seemed to be significant, but when ethnicity was

controlled, the level of career information no longer proved to be related to college success. Finally Question 22 looked at student feelings about the likelihood of getting desired jobs in future and found this factor to be significant for all Anglo students, but not for Chicano students.

Parental Support

The parental support received by these students was surveyed in Question 23 through 26.

23. How much education have your parents wanted you to get?
 1. Leave before finishing high school
 2. Finish high school
 3. Attend college
 4. Don't know

24. When do you first remember your parents talking about the possibility of your going to college? (Table 7)
 1. When I was in grade school
 2. When I was in junior high
 3. When I was in high school
 4. It has always been assumed that I would go to college.

25. What do your parents consider to be satisfactory grades for you?

1. Barely passing grades
2. Average grades
3. Above average grades
4. The highest grades in class
5. They don't really care much

26. Have your parents been able to financially support your educational goals?

1. Substantially
2. Somewhat
3. Not at all

In Table 7, the Chi Square $X^2 = 19.50$, $df = 12$, $p = .08$ suggested a weak relationship of parental support to college success. In general, the data confirmed the notion that parents believe that a college education was important for their children's futures. Specifically, there were slightly more Chicano students who stated their parents never discussed college than Anglo students. But, Table 7.1 did not substantiate the significance of the relationship of parental support to college success when the data were organized to survey only Chicano students.

Summary of Parental Support Data

The results of Question 23 were not statistically significant. In Question 25 the research showed that

Table 7

Student Success by Ethnicity and Parental Support, in Percentages

	Elementary		Junior High		High School		Assumed to go to college		Never Discussed		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	22.0	22	18.0	18	11.0	11	28.0	28	21.0	21	39.2	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	26.9	7	15.4	4	19.2	5	3.8	1	34.6	9	10.2	26
Anglo Successful	23.0	23	29.0	11	11.0	11	22.0	22	15.0	15	39.2	100
Anglo Unsuccessful	27.6	8	10.3	3	6.9	2	37.9	11	17.2	5	11.4	29
Total	23.5	60	21.2	54	11.4	29	24.3	62	19.6	50	100.0	255

$\chi^2 = 19.50$, $df = 12$, $p = < .08$ (non significant)

Question 24: When do you first remember your parents talking about the possibility of you going to college?

1. When I was in grade school
2. When I was in junior high
3. When I was in high school
4. It has always been assumed that I would go to college
5. We never discussed it

Table 7.1

Chicano Student Success and Parental Support, in Percentage

	In Grade School		Junior High		High School		Assumed College		Never Discussed		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	22.0	22	18.0	18	11.0	11	28.0	28	21.0	21	79.4	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	26.9	7	15.4	4	19.2	5	3.8	1	34.6	9	20.6	26
Total	23.0	29	17.5	22	12.7	16	23.0	29	23.8	30	100.0	126

$\chi^2 = 8.24$, df = 4, p = < .08 (not significant at .05)

student grades are not critical to parents and therefore not related to the academic success of these students. Question 26 suggested that although financial support was substantially lower for unsuccessful students, that overall this factor for all groups was not significant. Finally, in Question 24 (Table 8) parental support was not shown to be significant to academic success for all groups.

Peer Group Support

The peer group support of the students was measured in Questions 27 through 30.

27. Among your friends in high school, how many supported your plans to go to college? (Table 8)
 1. All of them
 2. Most of them
 3. About half of them
 4. A few of them

28. Do you have any friends who are presently in college or who have gone to college?
 1. Yes a lot
 2. Yes, a few
 3. None

29. Among your friends, in community college, how many think they will finish community college? (Table 9)

1. All of them
2. Most of them
3. About half of them
4. A few of them
5. None

30. Suppose your friends were against the idea of going to college. How much influence would their opinions have had on your decision to go to college?

1. A lot of influence
2. Some influence
3. Very little influence
4. None

In Table 8, the Chi square $X^2 = 11.66$, $df = 3$, $p = .01$ suggested that peer group support affected community college success. In particular, the data showed Anglos to have more supportive friends than Chicanos. But Table 8.1 and 8.2 indicated the peer group support differences were based on ethnicity and thus not necessarily correlated to college success. In summary, although Chicano students in question 27 seemed to have fewer friends in high school who supported their plans to go to college than Anglo students this factor did not help explain college success.

In Table 9, the Chi square $X^2 = 16.60$, $df = 3$, $p = .001$ indicated that having supportive friends in college was

Table 8
 Student Success by Ethnicity and
 Peer Group Support in Percentage

Ethnicity/Success	Most		Few		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	65.0	65	35.0	34	40.9	99
Chicano Unsuccessful	58.0	14	42.0	10	9.9	24
Anglo Successful	81.0	83	19.0	10	38.4	93
Anglo Unsuccessful	69.0	18	31.0	8	10.7	26
Total	71.0	172	29.0	70	100.0	242

$\chi^2 = 11.66, df = 3, p = < .01$

This table was collapsed from 4 to 2 categories so that most = 1,2 and few = 3, 4.

Question 27: Among your friends in high school, how many supported your plans to go to college?

1. All of them
2. Most of them
3. About half of them
4. A few of them

Table 8.1
Students' Peer Group Support by
Ethnicity, in Percentage

	All of Them		Most of Them		Half of Them		A Few of Them		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano	29.3	36	35.0	43	13.0	16	22.8	28	50.8	123
Anglo	47.9	57	30.3	36	10.1	12	11.8	14	49.2	119
Total	38.4	93	32.6	79	11.6	28	17.4	42	100.0	242

$\chi^2 = 10.54$, $df = 3$, $p = < .02$

Table 8.2
Successful Students by Ethnicity and
Peer Group Influence, in Percentage

	All of Them		Most of Them		Half of Them		A Few of Them		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	31.3	31	34.3	34	13.1	13	21.2	21	51.6	99
Anglo Successful	50.5	47	30.1	28	8.6	8	10.8	10	48.4	93
Total	40.6	78	32.3	62	10.9	21	16.2	31	100.0	192

$\chi^2 = 8.78$, $df = 3$, $p = < .03$

related to community college success. In addition, Table 9.1 also showed supportive friends had a significant effect on college success when controlling for ethnicity. Moreover, Table 9.2 examined only successful students and still found that supportive friends were significantly related to student success in community college. It should be noted that the group with the least amount of friends in college who expected to graduate were the unsuccessful students. This factor may help explain this group's lack of success in college.

Summary of Peer Group Data

The results of items 27 through 30 relating to peer group influence reaffirm the importance of peer group support for all students. In particular, the evidence suggested that having friends in college who are supportive (Table 8) and who believe they can be successful (Table 9) can help create an effective support system which can help these students meet their educational goals.

Finally in looking at gender differences in peer group support, the data showed no substantial sex related differences. Specifically, female Chicanas, both successful and unsuccessful, seemed to be slightly more optimistic than Chicano males, in believing that their peers would complete community college. (Total Chicana females, 85% versus total Chicano males, 71%).

Table 9
 Student Success by Ethnicity and College
 Friends Graduating in Percentage

Ethnicity/ Success	Most		Few		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano						
Successful	64.0	63	36.0	36	39.4	99
Chicano						
Unsuccessful	35.0	9	65.0	17	10.4	26
Anglo						
Successful	70.0	75	24.0	24	39.4	99
Anglo						
Unsuccessful	56.0	15	44.0	12	10.8	27
Total	65.0	162	35.0	89	100.0	251

$\chi^2 = 16.60$, $df = 3$, $p = < .001$

This table was collapsed from 5 to 2 categories so that 1 and 2 = most and 3, 4 and 5 = few.

Question 29: Among your friends in community college, how many think they will finish community college?

1. All of them
2. Most of them
3. About half of them
4. A few of them
5. None

Table 9.1

Chicano Student Success and Peer Group Support, in Percentage

	All of Them		Most of Them		Half of Them		A Few of Them		None of Them		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	18.2	18	45.5	45	18.2	18	12.1	12	6.1	6	79.2	99
Chicano Unsuccessful	11.5	3	23.1	6	38.5	10	23.1	6	3.8	1	20.8	26
Total	16.8	21	40.8	51	22.4	28	14.4	18	5.6	7	100.0	125

$$\chi^2 = 8.75, \text{ df} = 4, p = < .07$$

Table 9.2

Student Success and Peer Group Support, in Percentage

	All of Them		Most of Them		Half of Them		A Few of Them		None of Them		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Successful	24.2	48	45.5	90	16.2	32	10.1	20	4.0	8	78.6	198
Unsuccessful	14.8	8	31.5	17	29.6	16	18.5	10	5.6	3	21.4	54
Total	22.2	56	42.5	107	19.0	48	11.9	30	4.4	11	100.0	252

$$\chi^2 = 10.44, \text{ df} = 4, p = < .03$$

Academic Self Concept

The level of academic self concept was surveyed in
Question 36 through 41.

36. How difficult were community college studies for
you?

1. Very difficult
2. Somewhat difficult
3. Somewhat easy
4. Very easy
5. Some easy - some hard

37. Which one thing did you like most about college?

1. The studies
2. Friends
3. The teachers
4. Counselors
5. Nothing

38. Which one thing did you like least about
college?

1. Studies
2. Other students
3. Teachers
4. Counselors
5. Other
6. Nothing

39. How did you consider yourself as compared to most students? (Table 10)
1. An excellent student
 2. A good student
 3. An average student
 4. A below average student
 5. A very poor student
40. How accurately did your school grades reflect your ability?
1. My grades are lower than my real ability
 2. My grades accurately reflect my real ability
 3. My grades are higher than my real ability
41. When did you first start thinking seriously about going to college? (Table 11)
1. Junior high school
 2. Freshman year
 3. Sophomore year
 4. Junior year
 5. Senior year
 6. Always assumed that I would go
 7. Don't remember
 8. After high school

The data in Table 10 showed a Chi square of $\chi^2 = 13.75$, $df = 6$, $p = .05$ which found that the students' assumed academic status was significantly related to community college success. In general, the data indicated that Anglo successful students were much more confident

Table 10
 Student Success by Ethnicity and Student's
 Academic Status in Percentage

Ethnicity/ Success	Excellent/Good		Average Grades		Below Average Poor Grades		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	42.0	42	51.0	51	7.0	7	39.1	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	37.0	10	56.0	15	8.0	2	10.5	27
Anglo Successful	64.0	64	30.0	30	6.0	6	39.1	100
Anglo Unsuccessful	41.0	12	48.0	14	11.0	3	11.3	29
Total	50.0	128	43.0	110	7.0	18	100.0	256

$\chi^2 = 13.75$, $df = 6$, $p = < .05$

This table was collapsed from 5 to 3 categories so that 1,2 = excellent/good, 3 = average, and 4,5 = below average/poor grades.

Question 39: How did you consider yourself as compared to meet students?

1. An excellent student
2. A good student
3. An average student
4. A below average student
5. A very poor student

Table 10.1

Student Success and Academic Self-Concept by Ethnicity, in Percentage

	Excellent		Good		Average		Below		Poor		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano	8.0	10	33.3	42	52.4	66	6.3	8	0.0	0	49.6	126
Anglo	17.2	22	42.2	54	34.4	44	3.1	4	3.1	4	50.4	128
Total	12.6	32	37.8	96	43.3	110	4.7	12	1.6	4	100.0	254

$\chi^2 = 15.72, df = 4, p = < .01$

Table 10.2

Successful Students, by Ethnicity and Academic Self-Concept,
in Percentage

	Excellent		Good		Average		Below		Poor		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	7.1	7	35.4	35	51.5	51	6.0	6	0.0	0	50.0	99
Anglo Successful	18.2	18	46.5	46	30.3	30	2.0	2	3.0	3	50.0	99
Total	12.6	25	40.9	81	40.9	81	4.0	8	1.6	3	100.0	198

$\chi^2 = 16.78, df = 4, p = < .01$

about their ability to succeed in the classroom than all other groups. In Table 10.1 these differences in academic self-concept were shown to be based on ethnicity rather than academic success. Furthermore, Table 10.2 also indicated that a student's academic self-concept varied by ethnicity, not success.

The results of Table 11 present evidence to show the relationship between early college decisions and community college success. The data showed a Chi square $X^2 = 10.59$, $df = 12$, $p = .10$ which is not significant (.05 standard). Table 11.1 suggested that there was significance in early college decision and college success. Table 11.2 more clearly indicates that successful community college students made their decision to attend college earlier than unsuccessful students. Finally, the data showed the earlier the decision was made to attend college (junior and senior high - vs. post high school) the more likely that these Chicano and Anglo successful students would do well in community college.

Summary of Academic Self Concept

In this areas many items initially suggested a relationship between academic self-concept and educational success. A further examination of the data confirmed that this relationship disappeared when ethnicity was

Table 11

Student Success by Ethnicity and Level of College

Decision in Percentage

	Junior High School		High School		After High School		Don't Remember		Always Assume		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	21.0	22	32.0	32	5.0	5	16.0	16	27.0	25	39.2	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	11.5	3	36.0	10	11.5	3	27.0	7	11.5	3	10.3	26
Anglo Successful	29.0	29	38.0	38	1.0	1	23.0	23	9.0	9	59.2	100
Anglo Unsuccessful	20.0	6	30.0	9	34.0	1	24.0	7	21.0	6	11.3	29
Total	24.0	60	35.0	89	4.0	10	21.0	53	21.0	43	100.0	255

$\chi^2 = 19.59$, $df = 12$, $p = < .10$ (not significant at .05)

Question 41: When did you first start thinking seriously about going to college?

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Junior High school | 5. Senior year |
| 2. Freshman year | 6. Always assumed that I would go |
| 3. Sophomore year | 7. Don't remember |
| 4. Junior year | 8. After high school |

Table 11.1

Successful Students' Level of College Decision and Academic Self-Concept by Ethnicity,
in Percentage

	Junior High School		Freshman Year		Sophomore Year		Junior Year		Senior Year		Assumed I would		Don't Remember		After High School		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	21.8	22	8.9	9	6.9	7	5.9	6	10.0	10	25.7	26	15.8	16	5.0	5	50.2	101
Anglo Successful	29.0	29	8.0	8	11.0	11	12.0	12	7.0	7	9.0	9	23.0	23	1.0	1	49.8	100
Total	25.4	51	8.5	17	9.0	18	9.0	18	8.5	17	17.4	35	19.4	39	3.0	6	100.0	201

$\chi^2 = 16.61$, $df = 7$, $p = < .02$

controlled. However, Table 11.1 and 11.2 did substantiate a strong relationship of early college decisions to community college success for successful Anglo and Chicano students.

College Staff Support

The level of college staff support was measured in Questions 31 through 35.

31. How do you think that most of your college teachers/counselors treat you?
 1. Better than most students
 2. About the same as other students
 3. Worse than other students
32. How helpful do you feel counselors were at this community college?
 1. Never helpful
 2. Usually helpful
 3. Sometimes helpful
 4. Always helpful
33. How helpful do you feel teachers were at this community college?
 1. Never helpful
 2. Usually helpful
 3. Sometimes helpful
 4. Always helpful

Table 12

Student Success by Ethnicity and College

Staff Support in Percentage

	Substantial		Medium		Insufficient		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano								
Successful	45.8	44	42.7	41	8.3	8	38.6	93
Chicano								
Unsuccessful	51.9	14	33.3	9	14.8	4	10.8	27
Anglo								
Successful	49.0	48	41.8	41	8.2	8	39.4	97
Anglo								
Unsuccessful	39.3	11	46.4	13	14.3	4	11.2	28
Total	47.0	117	41.8	104	9.6	24	100.0	245

$\chi^2 = 2.92$, $df = 6$, $p = < .95$ (not significant at .05)

Question 35: Do you feel that enough information and support were made available to you in order for you to succeed at this college?

1. Substantial amount
2. Mediocre amount
3. Insufficient amount

34. In your period of study at this community college, what aspects of college life caused you the most problems?
1. Financial problems
 2. Poor teaching methods
 3. Poor counseling
35. Do you feel that enough information and support were made available to you in order for you to succeed at this college? (Table 12)
1. Substantial amount
 2. Mediocre amount
 3. Insufficient amount

In Table 12, a Chi square of $X^2 = 2.96$, $df = 6$, $p = .95$ showed no relationship between college staff support and community college success. In summary, the survey showed that most students felt enough information and support were made available in order to succeed in community colleges. Finally, the data indicated that in general, most students felt they received a lot of help from community college staff.

Results of College Staff Support

The data in Question 31 through 35 noted that the level of support from teachers and counselors as well as information given to students was substantial for all students. The only exception were Chicano unsuccessful students who felt only 'somewhat' less support from the

college staff. Overall the research suggests that both Anglo and Chicano students felt they were treated fairly by community college staff.

Sex Roles

The sex role bias of the sample was measured in Questions 42 through 46.

42. Do you feel that your sex has affected your career aspiration? (Table 13)
 1. Very much so
 2. Somewhat
 3. Not at all
43. Did your parents let your sex affect their support of your educational goals?
 1. Very much so
 2. Somewhat
 3. Not at all
44. Do you feel that there are strong sex role barriers to certain non-traditional occupational choices for men and women?
 1. Very much so
 2. Somewhat
 3. Not at all
45. Has sex role stereotyping affected your personal educational and career goals?
 1. Very much so
 2. Somewhat
 3. Not at all

Table 13
 Student Success by Ethnicity and Sex Roles
 and Career Aspiration in Percentages

Ethnicity/ Success	Very Much		Somewhat		Not at all		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	9.0	9	14.0	14	75.0	75	39.7	98
Chicano Unsuccessful	0.0	0	19.2	5	80.8	21	10.5	21
Anglo Successful	8.1	8	33.3	33	55.6	55	38.9	96
Anglo Unsuccessful	10.3	3	6.9	2	75.9	22	10.9	27
Total	7.9	20	21.3	54	68.1	173	100.0	247

$\chi^2 = 18.42, \underline{df} = 6, p = < .01$

Question 42: Do you feel that your sex has affected your career aspiration?

- a. Very much so
- b. Somewhat
- c. Not at all

Table 13.1
 Successful Students and Sex Role
 Bias by Ethnicity, in Percentage

	Very Much %	So n	Somewhat %	n	Not at All %	All n	Total %	N
Chicano Successful	9.2	9	14.3	14	76.5	75	50.5	98
Anglo Successful	8.3	8	34.4	33	57.3	55	49.5	96
Total	8.8	17	24.2	47	67.0	130	100.0	194

$\chi^2 = 10.80, df = 2, p = < .01$

Table 13.2
 Anglo Students by Success and
 Sex Role Bias, in Percentage

	Very Much %	So n	Somewhat %	n	Not at All %	All n	Total %	N
Anglo Successful	8.3	8	34.4	33	57.3	55	78.0	96
Anglo Unsuccessful	11.1	3	7.4	2	81.5	22	22.0	27
Total	8.9	11	28.5	35	62.6	77	100.0	123

$\chi^2 = 7.54, df = 2, p = < .02$

Table 13.3

Chicano Students by Success and Societal

Sex Roles in Percentage

	Very Much		Somewhat		Not at All		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	9.0	9	63.0	63	28.0	28	100.0	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	22.0	6	33.0	9	44.0	12	100.0	27
Total	12.0	15	72.0	57	31.0	40	100.0	127

$$\chi^2 = 8.27, \text{ df} = 2, p = < .02$$

46. Do you feel that society places more demands on your sex? (Table 14)

1. Very much so
2. Somewhat
3. Not at all

Table 13 indicated a Chi square $X^2 = 18.42$, $df = 6$, $p = .01$. Most students did not feel their gender had affected their career aspirations, which in turn did not affect their educational success. In particular, only Anglo successful students stated more often that they were 'very' or 'somewhat' affected by sex bias. Table 13.1 maintained the same relationship as Table 13 whereby sex role bias was seen by successful Chicano and Anglo students as unrelated to college success. Next Table 13.2 showed the Anglo successful students thought they were more affected by sex role bias. Table 13.3 showed that when ethnicity was controlled, Anglo students seemed more affected by sex role bias, which in turn they felt affected their educational success. In summary, the data indicated that sex role bias is more evident among Anglo successful students and is seen as less critical for all other groups.

In Table 14 the Chi square $X^2 = 13.72$, $df = 6$, $p = .05$ showed that how a student felt about society's demands on their gender was only slightly related to his/her educational progress in community college. The data noted

Table 14
 Student Success by Ethnicity and Sex Roles
 and Societal Demands in Percentage

Ethnicity/ Success	Very Much		Somewhat		Not at All		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	9.0	9	63.0	63	28.0	28	39.4	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	22.2	6	33.3	9	44.4	12	10.6	27
Anglo Successful	24.2	24	48.5	48	27.3	27	39.0	99
Anglo Unsuccessful	17.9	5	50.0	14	32.1	9	11.0	28
Total	17.3	44	52.8	134	29.9	76	100.0	254

$\chi^2 = 13.72, df = 6, p = < .05$

Question 46: Do you feel that society places more demands on your sex?

- a. Very much so
- b. Somewhat
- c. Not at all

Table 14.1

Successful Students and Sex Roles and Societal
Demands by Ethnicity, in Percentage

	Very Much		Somewhat		Not at All		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	9.0	9	63.0	63	28.0	28	50.3	100
Anglo Successful	24.2	24	48.5	48	27.3	27	49.7	99
Total	16.6	33	55.8	111	27.6	55	100.0	199

$$X^2 = 8.27, \text{ df} = 2, p = < .02$$

Table 14.2

Chicano Students by Success and Societal
Demands, in Percentage

	Very Much		Somewhat		Not at All		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	9.0	9	63.0	63	28.0	28	78.7	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	22.2	6	33.3	9	44.4	12	21.3	27
Total	11.8	15	56.7	72	31.5	40	100.0	127

$$X^2 = 8.27, \text{ df} = 2, p = < .02$$

that most students were in the 'Somewhat' category, but it also singled out Chicano unsuccessful students and Anglo successful students as groups who felt society placed more demands on their sex. Table 14.1 showed only slightly stronger beliefs by Anglo successful students about society placing demands on them based on their sex. Next, Table 14.2 examined the impact of societal demands on sex role and found them to be insignificant. In summary, this data revealed that most students felt they were only "somewhat", affected by sexual bias.

Results of Sex Role Data:

The key finding of Questions 42 through 46 is that sex role bias existed minimally in all groups of students, but was felt slightly stronger by Anglo successful and Chicano unsuccessful students. However, more Chicano successful students than unsuccessful students felt at least some societal pressure based on gender. The majority of students (Questions 42, 43) did not allow their own or their parental feelings about sexual bias to affect their educational goals. Sex role stereotyping and gender barriers (Questions 43, 44, 45) were also seen to only minimally affect these community college student's career goals.

Regarding gender differences in connection with sex roles, the data showed that male/female results were

remarkably similar. In particular, in Question 46, 13% of Chicano males and 11.1% of Chicana females felt that society had placed strong sex role demands on them. Furthermore, 51.1% of Chicano males and 60% of Chicana females felt "somewhat affected" by societal sexual demands. Finally 35.5% of Chicano males and 28.4% of Chicana females felt no societal sexual demands whatsoever.

On the other hand, the pattern for Anglos shows that 15.8% male and 29% females felt strongly about societal sexual demands. Also, 54% Anglo males and 44% Anglo females felt "somewhat affected" by societal sexual demands. Finally, 30% of Anglo males and 28% of Anglo females felt no societal demands. Overall, the data showed that Anglo females felt societal sexual demands more so than Anglo males.

Acculturation

The acculturation level of these students was surveyed in Questions 47 through 51.

47. Were your parents born in the United States?

1. Yes
2. No, one parent was born in the U.S.

Table 15

Student Success by Ethnicity and Home Language in
Percentage

Ethnicity/ Success	Spanish		English		Both		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	44.6	45	28.7	29	26.7	26	31.8	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	22.2	6	44.4	12	33.3	9	100.0	27
Anglo Successful	0.0	0	88.8	87	8.2	8	37.9	95
Anglos Unsuccessful	0.0	0	96.6	28	0.0	0	11.1	28
Total	20.0	51	62.1	156	17.5	43	100.0	251

$$X^2 = 11.591, \text{ df} = 6, p = < .001$$

Question 49: In what language do your parents most often speak to you?

- a. Spanish
- b. English
- c. Both

Table 15.1

Student Success by Ethnicity and Home Language
(Spanish vs. English) in Percentage

	Spanish		English		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	61.0	45	39.0	29	80.4	74
Chicano Unsuccessful	33.3	6	66.6	12	19.5	18
Total	55.4	51	44.5	41	100.0	92

$\chi^2 = 4.42, df = 1, p = < .05 (3.841)$

(This table was restructured to eliminate "both" category)

48. When you are with your friends, in what language do you mostly speak to them?

1. Spanish
2. English
3. Both

49. In what language do your parents most often speak to you? (Table 15)

1. Spanish
2. English
3. Both

50. Check on which best describes your group of friends.

1. Mostly from Spanish-speaking background
2. About half from Spanish-speaking background
3. Less than half from Spanish-speaking background
4. Most English speaking
5. All English speaking

51. Do you feel that your family promotes the traditional Anglo values of American Society? (Table 16)

1. Completely
2. Minimally
3. Not at all

Table 15 shows a Chi square of $X^2 = 11.59$, df = 6, p = .001. The data revealed that the particular language spoken at home is strongly related to ethnicity.

Furthermore, Table 15 implied that a greater proportion

Table 16
 Student Success by Ethnicity and Parental
 Value, in Percentage

	Completely %	n	Minimally %	n	Not at All %	n	Total %	N
Chicano Successful	35.0	35	56.0	56	9.0	9	39.7	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	30.8	8	38.5	10	26.9	7	10.3	25
Anglo Successful	12.2	12	28.6	28	54.1	53	38.9	93
Anglo Unsuccessful	0.0	0	53.6	15	42.9	12	11.1	27
Total	21.8	55	43.3	109	32.1	81	100.0	245

$\chi^2 = 60.90, df = 6, p = < .001$

Question 51: Do you feel that your family promotes the traditional Anglo values of American society?

- a. Completely
- b. Minimally
- c. Not at All

Table 16.1
 Successful Students by Ethnicity
 and Parental Values in Percentage

	Completely		Minimally		Not at All		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	35.0	35	56.0	56	9.0	9	50.5	100
Anglo Successful	12.2	12	28.6	28	54.1	53	49.5	98
Total	23.7	47	42.4	84	31.3	62	100.0	198

$\chi^2 = 51.63, df = 2, p = < .001$

Table 16.2
 Chicano Students by Success and
 Parental Values, in Percentage

	Completely		Minimally		Not at All		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	35.0	35	56.0	56	9.0	9	79.4	100
Chicano Unsuccessful	30.8	8	38.5	10	26.9	7	20.6	25
Total	34.1	43	52.4	66	12.7	16	100.0	125

$\chi^2 = 10.39, df = 3, p = < .02$

of Chicano successful students spoke Spanish at home and this factor led to greater community college success. Table 15.1 showed that Chicano successful students reported Spanish spoken at home more frequently than did Chicano unsuccessful students. In summary, the language spoken at home significantly affected the college success of Chicano students.

The data on Table 16 showed a Chi square score of $\chi^2 = 60.90$, $df = 6$, $p = .001$. The research showed Anglo successful and unsuccessful students had a very high proportion of students whose parents did not promote traditional Anglo values. In particular, there were 54% Anglo successful vs. 43% Anglo unsuccessful who stated their parents did not adhere to traditional Anglo values. Table 16.1 reported that Anglo successful parents values did not adhere to American values. Table 16.2 reported a successful level of difference between parents of successful and unsuccessful Chicano students in promoting traditional Anglo values. In conclusion, the data depicts Anglo parents as not promoting traditional Anglo values but this data may be due to misunderstanding of the intent of the question.

Summary of Acculturation Data

In Question 47 the data seems to imply that most students misunderstood the question because most Anglo

listed parents as not being born in the United States and Chicano responded just the opposite. Questions 48, 49 and 50 simply point out that there were more Anglo students who stated they had parents and friends who spoke only English, whereas Chicano students had parents and more friends who spoke Spanish. In looking at gender data regarding acculturation, the results showed that Chicana females seemed to be represented slightly stronger in groups with Spanish-speaking family and friends, as well as with families whose values were more traditionally Mexican. For example, in Question 50, Chicana females had 53% in group with Spanish-speaking friends versus 46% of Chicano males. In conclusion, the data in Question 50 and 51 implied that more successful Chicanos came from a more traditional or unacculturated background where their parents spoke Spanish and had traditional Mexican values.

World View

The world view variable was measured in Questions 52 through 54.

52. If I did poorly in college it's because:
(Table 17)

1. I did not study hard enough
2. The work was too hard
3. It was bad luck
4. Nobody helped me

5. The teachers did not teach me
6. My job took too much time
53. Making plans for the future is not very important because plans hardly ever work out anyway. (Table 18)
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Disagree
 4. Strongly disagree
54. If a person is not successful in life it is his own fault.
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Disagree
 4. Strongly disagree
55. Even with a good education, a person like me will have a tough time getting the job he/she wants.
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Disagree
 4. Strongly disagree
56. If I could change, I would be someone different. (Table 19)
 1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Disagree
 4. Strongly disagree

Table 17

Student Success by Ethnicity and Attributed Reason for Poor Performance,
in Percentage

Ethnicity/ Success	Did Not Study Hard		Work was too hard		Bad Luck		Nobody helped		Teacher not teach well		Job took much time		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	88.3	83	0.0	0	1.1	1	1.1	1	1.1	1	8.5	8	39.3	94
Chicano Unsuccessful	66.7	16	8.3	2	8.3	2	0.0	0	12.5	3	4.2	1	10.0	24
Anglo Successful	73.4	69	2.1	2	1.1	1	3.2	3	4.2	4	16.0	15	39.3	94
Anglo Unsuccessful	88.9	24	3.7	1	3.7	1	0.0	0	0.0	0	3.7	1	11.3	27
Total	80.3	192	2.1	5	2.1	5	1.7	4	3.3	8	10.5	25	100.0	239

$\chi^2 = 30.74$, $df = 15$, $p = < .01$

Question 52: If I did poorly in college it's because:

1. I did not study hard enough
2. The work was too hard
3. It was bad luck
4. Nobody helped me
5. The teachers did not teach well
6. My job took too much time

Table 17.1

All Students by Success and Reason for Poor Performance,
in Percentage

	Did Not Study		Work Too Hard		Bad Luck		Nobody Helped Me		Teachers Not Teach		Job Takes Too Much Time		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Successful	80.9	152	1.1	2	1.1	2	2.1	4	2.7	5	12.1	23	78.3	188
Unsuccessful	78.8	40	5.8	3	5.8	3	0.0	0	5.8	3	3.8	2	21.7	52
Total	80.4	193	2.1	5	2.1	5	1.7	4	3.3	8	10.4	25	100.0	240

$\chi^2 = 13.72, df = 5, p = < .02 (13.388)$

Table 17.2

Chicano Students by Success and Reason for Poor Performance
in Percentage

	Did Not Study		Work Too Hard		Bad Luck		Nobody Helped Me		Teachers Not Teach		Job Takes Too Much Time		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	88.3	83	0.0	0	1.1	1	1.1	1	1.1	1	8.5	8	79.7	94
Chicano Unsuccessful	66.7	16	8.3	2	8.3	2	0.0	0	12.5	3	4.2	1	20.3	24
Total	83.9	99	1.7	2	2.5	3	0.8	1	3.4	4	7.6	9	100.0	118

$$\chi^2 = 20.98, \text{ df} = 5, p = < .0008$$

Table 17, the $X^2 = 30.74$, $df = 15$, $p = .01$, indicated that a student's reasons for poor performance was related to his/her academic success in community college. In particular, the data showed that the greatest majority of students (66% - 89%) realized that not studying was the chief cause of poor grades. Furthermore, Table 17.1 showed that not studying was significantly related to whether a student was successful or unsuccessful in community college. Finally, Table 17.2 looked only at Chicano students and further deduced that recognition of poor academic work was related to community college success. The consensus of this data was that there is a significant relationship between students who believe that good studying habits affect academic success more so than other less probable reasons for both successful and unsuccessful Anglo and Chicano students.

The data on Table 18 showed a Chi square $X^2 = 20.54$, $df = 12$, $p = .04$. There was no relationship between making plans for the future and academic success. In particular, the great majority of students felt that making plans for the future was not important. Table 18.1 also showed that successful students also agreed that making plans for the future was worthless. In looking at gender differences regarding the world view of these students, 95% of Anglo males agreed that making plans for

Table 18

Successful and Unsuccessful Students by Ethnicity and World View/Fatalism
in Percentage

Ethnicity/Success	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	35.1	34	52.6	51	11.3	11	1.0	1	39.4	97
Chicano Unsuccessful	48.1	13	40.7	11	7.4	2	3.7	1	12.0	27
Anglo Successful	52.1	50	43.8	42	2.1	2	2.1	2	39.0	96
Anglo Unsuccessful	46.2	12	38.5	10	7.7	2	3.8	1	10.0	25
Total	44.3	109	46.3	114	6.9	17	2.0	5	100.0	245

$$\chi^2 = 20.54, df = 12, p = < .04$$

Question 53: Making plans for the future is not very important because plans hardly work out anyway.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly disagree

Table 18.1

Successful Students by Ethnicity and Future Plans, in Percentage

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	35.1	34	52.6	51	11.3	11	1.0	1	50.3	97
Anglo Successful	52.1	50	43.8	42	2.1	2	2.1	2	49.7	96
Total	43.5	84	48.2	93	6.7	13	1.6	3	100.0	193

$$\chi^2 = 10.48, \text{ df} = 3, p = < .02$$

the future was not important versus 92% of Anglo females. In contrast, 93% of Chicano males versus 72% Chicana females agree with this statement. In particular, it appears that the successful Chicana female disagrees a little less than other groups with the belief that making future plans is worthwhile. *He* In summary, the research seems to be saying that all students agree making plans for the future is not a worthwhile task. ✓

The research on Table 19 showed a $X^2 = 12.21$, $df = 3$, $p = .01$, which indicated a strong relationship between students' desires to change and their ability to succeed in community college. Overall, the data in Table 19 found that most students agreed with the statement that if possible they would like to change. Table 19.1 looked at successful and unsuccessful students and found their desire to change was related to academic success.

Summary of World View Data

The data gathered in Questions 52 through 56 concluded most students realized that poor grades were mainly caused by not enough studying or having a job (Question 52). Second, Question 53 did not show making plans for the future was worthwhile. Third, Questions 54 and 55 found that students views on the world or their views on the effect of education or on landing future jobs

Table 19
 Student Success by Ethnicity and
 Desire to Change, in Percentage

Ethnicity/ Success	Agree		Disagree		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	N
Chicano Successful	85.0	82	15.0	14	39.0	96
Chicano Unsuccessful	67.0	18	33.0	9	11.0	27
Anglo Successful	72.0	71	28.0	25	39.0	96
Anglo Unsuccessful	55.0	15	45.0	12	11.0	27
Total	76.0	186	24.0	60	100.0	246

$\chi^2 = 12.21, df = 3, p = < .01$

Question 56: If I could change, I would be someone different.

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Disagree
4. Strongly Disagree

Table 19.1

Students' Desire to Change, by Success, in Percentage

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Disagree		Strongly Disagree		Total	
	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	N
Successful	42.2	81	37.5	72	14.1	27	6.3	12	77.7	192
Unsuccessful	32.7	18	27.3	15	25.5	14	14.5	8	22.3	55
Total	40.1	99	35.2	87	16.6	41	8.1	20	100.0	247

$$\chi^2 = 9.20, \text{ df} = 3, p = < .03$$

were not significantly related to academic success. The final item (Question 56) looked at students' desires to change and found most would like to be someone different but this feeling was strongest for Chicano students.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER IV

Chapter IV presented the results of the survey and analyzed the data pertinent to this research. The results showed that four of the independent variables including; family structure, socioeconomic status, peer support, and academic self concept seemed to be related to the academic success of community college students. Secondly, the data also suggested that six other independent variables studied; career choice, parental support, college staff support, sex roles, acculturation and world view showed very little relationship to community college success. In general, the research depicted some strong contrasts between social and cultural as well as demographic characteristics of successful and unsuccessful Anglo and Chicano community college students.

Chapter V will present the conclusions, implications and recommendations of this study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study examined the social and cultural characteristics of successful and unsuccessful Mexican American community college students and compared them to successful and unsuccessful Anglo American community college students. It was undertaken in order to develop a descriptive profile of the Mexican American student who succeeds in the California Community College system. The purpose of the study was to collect data on ten independent variables that consistently appeared in the review of literature and were suspected of affecting the success of Chicanos in the California College system. This research was intended to help community college students by gathering data that would help educators to better teach and counsel these students.

This chapter is divided into five major sections. The first section presents a summary of the study. The next section discusses the conclusions and implications regarding the data in Chapter IV. Third, this section examines the research in relationship to how it affects the role of community college counselors. The fourth

section offers recommendations based on the overall findings of this study. The final section suggests implications for future research.

Summary

The research showed that not all ten independent variables studied were important in determining the key elements of academic success for Anglo or Chicano community college students. In particular, family structure, socioeconomic status, peer group support, and academic self concept showed a significant relationship to the success of these community college students.

In addition, there were four other variables, parental support, career goals, acculturation and world view--which met the less stringent level of $< .10$ as in their relationship to the academic success of community college students. In addition, sex roles of college staff support were shown to be of very little statistical significance when looking at variables effecting community college success.

This research examined of gender differences in all ten variables and found that they were not statistically significant, but the results were reported where they were thought to be of interest. Overall, this data substantiates the concept that one cannot isolate one indicator that adequately predicts academic success.

However, this research gathered valuable information which could help in preparing a profile of successful Chicano students. This successful student profile could be used to identify key groups to target for educational support services. In addition, the examination of this data could also provide a more accurate portrait of successful Chicano students, which should be helpful to all educators working with this group.

The first critical success factor was the family structure of these students and the data shows it is one of the most important factors in whether or not they succeeded in community college. The data implied that Chicano successful students come from families with more traditional/authoritarian structure. In effect, Chicano successful students seem to belong to those families with a stable cultural tradition. In general, the survey suggests that successful Chicano students do not come from broken families but instead most often belonged to a strong family structure.

In contrast those families of unsuccessful students tend to have one way communication systems, with one parent, primarily the father, making the major decisions. This research is consistent with DeHoyo's findings that many Chicano unsuccessful students fail in their attempt to succeed in college because they have developed so few

communication skills in the home. The study also indicated that successful Chicano students tend to be less Anglo-American oriented and still heavily immersed in Mexican family traditions. The data intimated that students from a transitional Mexican American family or culturally marginal family might be lost in the assimilation process and thus not have a stable base from which to succeed.

The second key success factor in this research was the socioeconomic status of the student and his/her family. The data revealed that the importance of the specific nature of the job that the head of the household maintained was only relevant in relationship to how it affected the family's total socioeconomic status. The research data showed that a greater percentage of parents of Chicano successful and unsuccessful students were involved in seasonal, semi-skilled or unskilled type work when compared to Anglo parents. Furthermore, substantially more Chicano unsuccessful student parents worked in industry, agriculture and other low paying work categories than Anglo parents. In summary, regardless of the type of job held by their parents, economically well off Chicano students were much more likely to be successful in college.

Another aspect of the family's socioeconomic status

researched was whether or not a student's mother worked outside the home. The data indicated that more successful and unsuccessful Chicano students' mothers held a full time or part time job than all Anglo students' mothers. Since there was no apparent effect that working mothers had on Chicano students' success, this data may challenge the assumption that working mothers may hinder support. In stead, it appears this factor offers positive economic support which, in turn, will help these students succeed in college.

The third significant independent variable to be researched was the peer group support of these students. Most importantly, the data revealed that those students who have a strong network of peer group support are more likely to do well in college. Furthermore, the data suggests that successful students are most often those students who develop a positive support system to see through the ups and downs of attending college. In this regard, Anglo students, in general, rated themselves highest in this area and Chicano unsuccessful the lowest. Specifically, having a group of friends who are in college or who have attended college was also found to be a critical factor for successful college students. In addition to a peer group support system, having positive role models within the peer group seems to be a

real indication of future college success for all students.

As expected, the data revealed that Chicano unsuccessful students are poorest in all areas of positive peer group support, including friends in college and college peers who expect to graduate. Chicano successful students seem to do better; however, both groups of Chicanos rank below Anglo successful students in this key area. In conclusion, the data indicated that the impact of a strong positive peer group relationship begins before high school and continues throughout the college career of most successful students.

The fourth significant independent variable to be examined was the academic self-concept of these students. The majority of items in this variable show only small differences between successful and unsuccessful students. However, key contrasts do appear more specifically when students were asked how difficult studies were for them. As expected, the unsuccessful students tended to find academics more difficult than successful students. Also, successful students tended to see themselves as stronger (excellent/good) students than unsuccessful students.

A higher percentage of Chicano unsuccessful students seemed to believe studies were easier than Chicano successful students. But, Chicano unsuccessful students were highest in the category of least liking the academic

aspect of college. These somewhat contradictory findings suggest that Chicano unsuccessful students are often unclear about the real level of their academic ability and this fact may affect their scholastic status in the classroom. In summary, both categories of Chicano students felt they were only average students and that their grades were lower than their real ability, when compared to successful Anglo students.

Although the data revealed that parental support, career goals, college staff support, sex roles, acculturation and world view did not have as strong statistical relationship to community college success, these items may be helpful in describing possible secondary factors which might have some impact on academic success. A review of the data on these nonsignificant independent variables is warranted because the results provide useful information from percentage differences.

The first nonsignificant independent variable was the career goals of these students. In particular, Chicano students seem to have less information available about future educational goals and careers. Consequently, the survey suggests that Anglo successful students are much more knowledgeable about future careers and educational objectives. Correspondingly, there was also sufficient

data to show that Anglo students felt that they were more likely to get the job they wanted upon completion of their college degree.

The survey indicated that knowlege of or experience with a career, as well as social rewards, were much more important to the career choices of Chicano students than that of Anglo students. It seems apparent that a serious problem for many Chicano students in limiting their career opportunity is that unlike many Anglo students they have no tangible experience with many career areas. Also, they have never had any interaction with representatives in these fields who might act in the form of role models and create the opportunity to more directly involve Chicano students in considering more varied career fields. Careers leading to money and status were much more attractive to Anglo students, whether they had experience or not. This data also showed greater Anglo interest in careers in the higher paying fields of business and engineering, whereas Chicanos were more interested in the lower paying field of social sciences and humanities.

In looking at the data on career goals in relationship to gender, the results showed that Chicano unsuccessful students, male and females, tended to equally choose careers in academic subjects related to the

humanities. But specifically, male successful and unsuccessful Chicano students chose science, engineering, math and medically related careers. Contrastingly, only Chicana female successful students indicated science as their favorite academic and career area. However, both Chicana female successful and unsuccessful students were represented strongly in business-related careers.

The critical factor in this data about career goals may be that many Chicano students seem to be saying that they lacked appropriate information about education and careers in order to make a wise decision about their future goals. Overall, the research showed that there were a substantial amount of Chicano unsuccessful students who were very confident about getting desired jobs in the future. But, due to their apparent lack of success, this data may, in fact, imply that many of these Chicano unsuccessful students are very unrealistic about achieving their future career goals.

Parental support was the second nonsignificant variable studied. In general the data showed that most parents wanted only average grades for their children in community college. But, it should be noted that slightly more parents of Chicano successful students than all other categories of students wanted above average grades for their children. Also, a higher percentage of Chicano

successful students parents discussed college before junior or senior high school. In contrast, the parents of Chicano unsuccessful students were the highest group in the sample who never discussed college. Parental financial support was also much weaker for the Chicano unsuccessful group than all other categories. Finally, the research showed tht for Chicano and Anglo successful students exhibited only slightly stronger levels of parental support for their educational goals than Chicano and Anglo unsuccessful students.

The third nonsignificant variable was college staff support. These items show that only a few more Anglo successful and unsuccessful students felt they were better treated by teachers or counselors. The major problem for Chicano students was listed as financial, whereas, for Anglo students poor counseling and teaching were more critical. The only group which felt dissatisfied by college staff support was Chicano unsuccessful students. Overall, the data suggested that both Anglo and Chicano students felt that the level of college staff support was equal and that they were treated fairly in community colleges.

The research on sex roles was the fourth nonsignificant variable to be examined, and it revealed that very few students see strong sex role barriers to

their educational or vocational success. Nevertheless, Anglo students and Anglo parents tended to be more aware of sex role bias and societal demands. Correspondingly, a greater amount of Chicanos were only "somewhat" affected by sex role bias or stereotyping. The data did not show that sex role bias had greatly affected the success of any of these college students.

Acculturation was the next nonsignificant variable to be examined. The research suggests that the importance of acculturation was related to how it affected the stability of the family structure. The data showed that more Chicano successful students were found to have Spanish speaking parents and friends, as well as families with traditional Mexican values, than Chicano unsuccessful students. One may infer that Chicano successful students are positively affected by their stable traditional family background and friends in forming a strong family base to succeed in college. The data also suggested that the process of acculturation is a somewhat negative factor for Chicano students, especially when they may be caught in an unstable transitional period of changing from one culture to another. This transitional period may be critical to many successful Chicano students who seem to be lingering when they drop out or otherwise fail in their educational or career endeavors.

It is important to note that Chicana females more often came from a background of Spanish-speaking friends, as well as, their families being Spanish-speaking with more traditional values. These factors may be of merit in their success in a community college, but could hamper their transfer to a four-year college. As the review of literature suggested, Chicano families are often unwilling to allow their daughters to attend college, which often requires them to leave home.

The final independent variable to be examined and found to be statistically nonsignificant was the world view of these students. First, over seventy percent of all students recognized that poor grades were a result of not studying. This means that most of these students took personal responsibility for their academic success. It should be noted that the group scoring the lowest in this area was Chicano unsuccessful students. This data also indicated one reason that many Chicano unsuccessful students may fail is because they are unable to take personal responsibility for their academic success. Finally, the data implied that successful Chicano students have realized that a good education can equal a good job and are willing to actively work towards that goal.

Conclusions

There is considerable literature on family structure

that helps support the findings of this study. In particular, research by Murillo (1971), Ramirez and Castaneda (1974), repeatedly describes the Mexican American family as a closely knit unit which fosters obedience and respect in children for their elders. In addition, they state in the dominant family pattern among Mexican American families, the husband and father tend to have a great deal of authority and receive respect from all members. The overall conclusion of this study is consistent with the literature reviewed in Chapter II: Mexican American families are a strong source of personal communication and support for family members. Furthermore, this data is in agreement with the many researchers who contend that family members function as a great resource and support system for all types of emotional and material help.

A summary of the literature on family structure parallels this study's findings that the traditional Mexican American family structure develops in Mexican American students a strong sense of identity and loyalty to the family. Also, this personal identity in Mexican American families is closely linked to the family, in which a sense of need to achieve for the family is often developed early in the child. The implication for educators is to build on this strong family attachment by

getting Mexican American parents more involved in the academic process of their children. At the community college level, counselors need to inform Mexican American parents of the progress and potential of their children, as well as, the career alternatives available to them.

Finally, this research concurs with Ybarra (1983), who found that the Mexican culture is no different than any other culture in how much it values education. She stated that if in the past it seemed that Mexican parents did not support education, it was largely because they lacked the appropriate information or background to properly support education for their children. Instead, as this research further documents, educators should know it is not Mexican family structure or culture, but economic necessity and lack of information that works hand-in-hand to deter Chicanos from entering higher education.

The second key independent variable, socioeconomic status, substantiates previous data that adequate finances can also help to salvage many Chicano unsuccessful students. These students often listed financial problems as one of their prime areas of concern. This factor is corroborated by Martinez's research, which concluded that one of the greatest roadblocks to higher education for Mexican American students was the lack of financial resources.

Ten Houten, et al. (1968), also found that family socioeconomic status, almost without exception, directly affected the college plans of students. Children of higher social class origins are more apt to aspire to go to college, make concrete plans and actualize these plans than are children of low socioeconomic status. Ten Houten's findings noted that a high correlation of socioeconomic status to college aspirations persisted even when related variables such as sex, measured intelligence and neighborhood status were controlled.

In conclusion, the results of this study concur with the summary of related literature in suggesting that for low socioeconomic Chicano students the lack of financial aid can be a serious blow to their educational and career goals.

The third significant variable in this research was peer group support. The present research findings offers substantial data to support the impact of peer group on academic success. Pettigrew's (1967) data supports this research on peer influence. He stated that more often than not, the lack of motivation on the part of the ghetto child is a function of his membership in certain groups. It is these expectations, rules, rewards, sanctions, and aspirations that are critical in determining how he will approach achievement situations. Maehr's (1974) work also

suggests that achievement does not occur in isolation from the individuals around us who we see as significant. Furthermore, he wrote that achievement level often changes as group membership changes.

These data bolster Brofenbrenner's (1958) research, which contended that peer reference groups were as critical in determining behavior and achievement as the family or school. Parents and teachers may hope for scholarships, but a peer group that values other accomplishments to the exclusion of scholarship wins out many a Chicano student.

Finally, the data suggest there is a great need for Chicano students to be exposed to a college environment in which they can establish new and different social relationships. The data on peer group support also could be used to encourage a great amount of recruitment and matriculation of Chicano students into more varied fields. Furthermore, this research also reinforces the concept of drop-in centers where Chicano students and other minority groups could congregate in order to develop a stronger sense of belonging. In conclusion, it is hoped that the college experience could lead to the development of a supportive peer group system which would help keep more Chicano students on campus.

The final independent variable to be discussed was the academic self concept of these students. The data reinforced the literature in this area, especially works by Von Koughnett and Smith (1969). They contended that these students need to have a positive view of themselves in order to succeed in a class. The present research suggested that Chicano students feel only as good about their academic self concept as do Anglo unsuccessful students.

Other researchers like Hernandez (1973) presented similar evidence that Mexican American students college plans are less defined than Anglo students. He believed that this fact was not due to a lack of motivation, but more so, to a lack of a strong self image and familiarization with the educational process.

Chicano students need to be taught to take more personal responsibility for their academic failure or success. Since many Chicano students chose careers in areas related to the social sciences with an emphasis on social reward than money, it would seem logical to involve them in a program with experience in these areas. Another appropriate possibility would be for teachers and counselors to enlist the aid of positive role models from the community to interact with Chicano students.

It is important for educators to keep in mind that a student's self image or academic self concept is directly affected by the manner in which teachers and counselors relate to them, and by the success they experience with their academic subjects. Von Koughnett and Smith (1969) agree that a positive academic self concept enhances the degree of school success. Therefore it could be concluded that college success can be determined in part by the view that a student has of himself in the classroom setting. These findings imply that Chicano students need help in developing more positive attitudes towards themselves in order to succeed in college.

Implications of the Research for Community College Counselors

The independent variables of family structure, socioeconomic status, peer group support, and academic self concept are critical to the educational success of Chicano students and have direct application to college counseling. The research also shows that parental support, sex roles, college staff support, acculturation, career goals and world view are not as important to college success for Chicano students. This data may help community college counselors by providing them with information to help identify possible problem areas for Chicano students.

The community college counselor can effectively use this research in the performance of his role of a community college counselor. According to Belkins (1978), the three main functions of a community college counselor are to: (1) develop the personal freedom of clients through individual and group counseling, (2) help bridge the gap for students between college and society, (3) assist students to explore their educational and career goals.

The community college counselor's primary responsibility is to develop the personal freedom of his clients. A community college counselor helps students to attain this freedom by improving their socialization skills, knowledge, self insight, and understanding of others. In particular, for counselors working with Chicano students, this research suggests that they should be aware of and integrate into their counseling philosophy and strategies the special importance of family structure in the overall goal setting of Chicano students. Counselors should also remember that involving Chicano families is very important to successfully counseling Chicano students. If the family of Chicano students cannot participate in counseling then, it is imperative that the views and opinions of the family be discussed because they greatly influence the student. It should be a major part

of the counselor's role to work towards a greater involvement of the Chicano family in the educational process.

The second function for college counselors is to bridge the gap between the individual and the society in which he lives by helping the two to function harmoniously. The key to good counseling is to offer each student the opportunity to benefit from all that the community college has to offer. According to the present research, community college counselors should work for more financial aid to limit the negative impact of poverty on many Chicano community college students. Also, community college counselors need to make their counseling relevant to the particular needs of Chicano students. In this regard, counselors need to be more aware of their own biases toward Chicano students. They should also know how these feelings impact the academic self concept and in particular impair the educational and career goals of many Chicano students.

A good counselor should also recognize the importance of peer group support upon many Chicano students and how it affects their ability to fit into a college lifestyle. Making peer group support a positive influence can best be accomplished by counselors providing Chicano role models, supporting ethnic studies programs, resource centers,

Chicano clubs, etc. which in total can help in making college campuses much more attractive to these students.

The third function of college counseling is to assist the student to explore the educational and career goals available to him/her. In particular, counselors could help Chicano students deal with their feelings of social isolation and alienation on most community college campuses. In order to be more responsive to this problem, community college counselors must begin to help remove any barriers to the full participation of these Chicano students in college life. A closer examination of testing services, financial aid, recruitment and retention programs, etc. to see how effective they are on Chicano students should be a high priority item to rid the campus of possible barriers to Chicano students' educational goals.

Since a major emphasis of any good counseling is always to assist students in making future educational plans and executing a plan of study which appropriately reflects the students interest and motivation, it is imperative that counselors keep in mind and learn from research like this study about the educational status of Chicano students. In this regard, it would greatly aid counselors to develop a research base of knowledge as well

as a real sensitivity to the unique assets and problems of Chicano students.

This data also implies that effective counseling strategies for Chicano students can only be accomplished if counselors are willing to investigate how adequately their counseling services which include recruitment, appraisal, retention, referral and advising affect low income Chicano students. In effect, such an examination would investigate how well community colleges provide enriching experiences that enable poor Chicano students to develop to their full potential. This data suggest that in order for counselors to be truly effective with Chicano students, they must learn more about Chicano lifestyle and social values. The typical counselor training program has insufficient opportunity in training experiences that help counselors to actively examine and readjust their ethnic sensitivity towards Chicano students. These factors mean that most counselors will have to objectively look at their own counseling style and see if in fact they are not turning off Chicano students.

Recommendations

This research has explored some critical areas that were well documented in the literature review regarding the academic success of Chicano students. The data suggests certain specific areas of remediation including a

greater effort by community college staff to better understand and appreciate the cultural diversity of their students. In this regard, a more extensive orientation of all community college staff is needed to sensitize them to the varied cultural background of their student population. Also, it is important for community college staff to initiate a more sincere and knowledgeable approach to the teaching and counseling of Chicano students.

Furthermore, community college staff member should strengthen their efforts to help underprepared Chicano students to improve their study habits and develop basic skills. There is the need for Chicano students to participate in reading and math programs that will develop the skills and competence to eventually succeed in college. This effort could best be accomplished by placing a much greater emphasis in the areas of tutoring, developmental courses, and academic counseling of remedial students.

In addition this research corroborated the impact of peer group influence could be greatly enhanced by providing positive group interaction in drop-in or resource centers whereby Chicano students could meet for social and educational exchanges. This research on peer group influence reinforces the importance of a positive network

of friends in determining college plans. This study suggests that Mexican American students often look to their friends or peer group pressure for sources of inspiration for their career and educational goals.

The initiation of greater, community involvement in the planning of Chicano recruitment and retention strategies would also be helpful. In this regard a greater level of support of such programs as ethnic studies, bilingual education, and EOP would also help community awareness and participation.

It should be noted that a particular problem area for Chicano students was the lack of funds needed to succeed in college. Community colleges should renew their efforts to expand financial aid to many more needy Chicano students. This factor would allow more Chicano students to concentrate on their studies and not to have to work during the academic school year.

The data on career goals infers that Chicano students need more information about jobs and careers in order to better succeed in their chosen field. There is also substantial research literature which shows that the representation of Mexican Americans are still very low in many career areas, especially those needing a professional or technical background. Furthermore, as the research literature corroborates the fact is that most Mexican

American students still tend to major in the fields of humanities and social sciences and avoid the area of engineering, mathematics as well as the physical and biological sciences.

The key to aiding Chicanos meet their career goal is a multifaceted proposal, but it should involve educating Chicano students about all possible employment alternatives in the complexities of the current and future technological world of work. In addition, they should be taught how to actively seek out information about career life planning decisions and to seek some exposure to various careers. Furthermore, Chicano students need to be educated to the fact that in order to overcome previous educational and career obstacles, they need to be taught career planning information, decision making skills, resume writing, and employment job search strategies.

In the area of cultural variables which were found to be significant to college success, it is imperative that the entire college staff become more effective in recognizing and supporting the inherent talents that many Chicano students bring to the classroom. In this regard, bilingualism should be promoted as a positive factor. Also, many Chicano students need the opportunity to find out about their language and cultural heritage through ethnic studies programs in order to overcome the stigma

that American society has placed on them for being Chicanos.

Successful Student Profile

An overall profile of Chicano students would indicate that four variables were very significant to their academic success. These would include: stable traditional family structure, adequate financial status (SES), a strong peer group support network and an academic self concept which promotes early college decision making. It would also include substantial career goal data and vocational information. In addition, it would also consist of the promotion of individual responsibility of students for their academic success. Finally, this profile would note that sex role bias and college staff support are not as important to the success of community college students.

Further Areas of Research

The major outcome of this research still leaves unanswered many problem areas about the success of Chicano community college students. It should be noted that this study showed the association of ten subcultural variables to the college success of Chicano community college students. Also, the results of this particular study did not develop a formula for predicting college success.

What the data did suggest is that certain of these sociocultural variables were mor important than others to academic success of Chicano and Anglo community college students. Specifically the first area of future research should include an investigation into the lack of statistical significance for the six independent variables i.e. parental support, college staff support, sex role, career goals, acculturation, and world view that were identified in Chapter II. Our knowledge of these independent variables is still insufficient to claim that they have no effect. Therefore, there is still cause to investigate these variables further.

Secondly, the whole area of minority student isolation in community colleges needs to be examined. In particular, the role of community college staff in eliminating alienating factors on campus need to be studied. Also, the effectiveness of resource centers and support groups for minority students community college matriculation has to be further investigated.

In this regard, another area of research suggested by this data is the role of community college counselors in breaking down institutional and individual barriers for a community college education for Chicano students. The full area of support services including recruitment, advising, retention, financial aids, etc. needs to be

explored to see if in fact creates or eliminates obstacles that promote the educational goals of Chicano students.

Another probable area of research would be the development of a Chicano student "success" profile. This profile could be used by counselors to effectively assess the background and skills of Chicano students. If possible, some sort of scale (e.g., Sompá) might be used to evaluate this group.

Another area of research that would be worthwhile would be to use this same research design and questionnaire on Chicano high school students and compare them with the present data. Furthermore, this same research design could be extended to include Chicanos in the 4 year college system. Finally, since the successful student sample among Chicanos was 67% female and 33% male, this research might be especially interesting to see which gender and educational patterns may occur from high school to community colleges as well as to four year schools among Chicano students.

It should be noted that this research also did not look at I.Q. scores, placement exam scores (S.A.T. and A.C.T.) or any other psychological tests (self concept scales, career tests, world view tests, etc.). These tools could be used in combination with this questionnaire to further augment this area of research on Chicanos.

A final area of potential research would be to examine how different counseling and teaching styles impact on Chicano community college students, as well as whether or not Anglo or Chicano staff are currently more effective in educating Chicano students.

In conclusion, each of these recommendations should help clear up unanswered questions about Chicano students. Also, it should help promote a more comprehensive process of researching data about Chicano students could result in a more effective and sensitive approach to the education of Chicano students.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alvarez, D. & Bean F. D. "The Mexican American Family." C. H. Mindel and R. W. Habenstein (Editors), Ethnic Families in America. New York: 1976.

Anderson, James G., & Johnson, William H. Sociocultural Determinants of Achievement Among Mexican American Students. Las Cruces, New Mexico: New Mexico State University, 1968.

Arciniega, Tomas & Brischetto, Robert. "A Look at Educator's Perspectives on the Chicano Student," Ghosts in the Barrio, ed. Ralph Polbano. San Rafael, CA: Leswing Press, 1973.

Arroyo, L.E. "Industrial and Occupational Distribution of Chicano Workers," Atzlan, 1973, 4, 343-360.

Aslin, Alexander. Final Report of the Commissions on the Higher Education of Minorities (Higher Education Research Institute, Inc.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bars Pub., 1982.

Baker, John T. Retention of Community College Students - A Strategy for the 80's, Nova University, 1980. (Unpublished Dissertation)

Belkins, Gary. Practical Counseling in the Schools. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., Pub., 1975.

Benedict, Ruth. Patterns of Culture. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1959.

Bordua, David J. "Educational Aspirations and Parental Stress on Collge." Social Forces 38:262-269, 1960.

Braun, Carl. "Teacher Expectations: Sociopsychological Dynamics." Review of Educational Research 46(2):185-213, 1976.

Bronfenbrenner, Urie. "Socialization and Social Class through time and space." In E. F. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb and E. L. Hartley (editors), Readings in Social Psychology, 3rd edition, New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1958.

- Brookover, W. & Thomas, S. "Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement." Sociology of Education 38: 271-278, 1962.
- Burma, John H. Mexican Americans in the United States. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, Canfield Press, 1970.
- California Post Secondary Education Commission. Post Secondary Education in California Information Digest. Sacramento: California Post Secondary Education Commission, 1980.
- Cantu, Oscar F. "An Interview with Lea Ybarra." Raza Alumni Club Newsletter. California: University of California, Berkeley, 1983.
- Cardenas, Issac. Equality of Educational Opportunity: A Descriptive Study on Mexican American Access to Higher Education. University of Massachusetts, 1974.
- Carter, Thomas. Mexican Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect. New York College Entrance Examination Board, 1970, p. 56.
- Coleman, J. S., et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1966.
- Collymore, Raymond Quintin. A Survey of the Educational Aspirations and Cultural Needs of the Negro and Mexican American Student in Two Community Colleges in the State of Colorado. University of Colorado, 1971.
- Coopersmith, S. The Antecedents of Self Esteem. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1959.
- Cuellar, A., & Moore, J. W. Mexican Americans. New York: Prentice Hall, 1970.
- Davidson, Helen H. & Lang, Gerhard. "Children's Perceptions of Their Teacher's Feelings Towards Them Related to Self Perception, School Achievement and Behavior." Journal of Experimental Education, XXIX:107-118, 1960.
- DeBlassie, Richard R. Self Concept: A Comparison of Spanish-American, Negro, and Anglo Adolescents, Cross Ethnic, Sex, and Socioeconomic variables. Las Cruces, New Mexico: New Mexico State University, 1968.

- DeHoyos, Arturo. Occupational and Educational Levels of Aspiration of Mexican American Youth. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Microfilms, 1961.
- Demos, George. "Attributes of the Mexican Americans and Anglo American Groups Towards Education." American Educational Review, 1962.
- Digest of Educational Statistics (1983).
- Ellis, Albert. Growth Through Reason. Syracuse, New York: Baker and Taylor Co., 1971.
- Evans, E. A. "A Study of Sociocultural Characteristics of Mexican American and Anglo American Junior High School Students and the Relationship of these Characteristics to Achievement" (ERIC Document 039999, 1970).
- Farias, Hector, Jr. "Mexican American Values and Attitudes Towards Education." Phi Delta Kappan, 602-604, 1971.
- Garcia, Ernesto Lucero. A Comparative Study of Community College Mexican American and Anglo American Graduates and Dropouts. Los Angeles: University of California, 1974.
- Gares, Vaughn Dale. A Comparative Investigation of the Occupational Counseling Given to Mexican American and Anglo American Students Upon Entering the Community College. United States International University, 1974.
- Gibson, M. & Aruizu, S. Demystifying the Concept Culture: Methodological Tools and Techniqies. Sacramento: California State University, Cross Cultural Research Center, 1977. (Monographs I and II)
- Gilbert, Fontelle. "Minorities and Community Colleges Data and Discourse." Washington, D. C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, One DuPont Circle, 1979.
- Gilmore, I. "Parents Participation in the Guidance Program." Clearing House, 47:86, 1972.
- Grant, Vance & Eiken, Leo. "Digest of Educational Statistics, 1982." National Center for Educational Statistics, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D. C., 1982. U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1980, Census of Population and Housing, 1980, Washington, D. C., 1980.

- Grebler, Leo. The Schooling Gap: Signs of Progress.
Los Angeles: University of California, 1967.
- Griffin, John M. "Unachieving Students in Community Colleges: Common Personality and Biographical Characteristics." (Monograph)
- Haddox, J. Los Chicanos, AnAwakening People.
El Paso, Texas: Western Press, 1970.
- Hale, J. "Effects of Image Enhancement Indoctrination on the Self Concept and Occupational Aspiration Level and Scholastic Achievement of Mexican-American Model Neighborhood Area Students." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, East Texas State University, 1972.
- Hannah, W., "Withdrawal from College." Journal of College Student Personnel 10:397-402, 1969.
- Heller, Celia. Mexican American Youth, Forgotten Youth at the Crossroads. New York: Random House, 1966.
- Hernandez, John L. The Perception of Students and Parents Toward College Advisement with Implications for Mexican Americans. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1973.
- Hernandez, Patricia. "Lives of Chicana Activists: The Chicano Student Movement (A Case Study)." In Mexican Women in the United States, Struggles Past and Present. Magdalena Mora and Adelaida Del Castillo (editors). Los Angeles: Chicano Studies Research Center, 1980.
- Hymen, H. H. "The Value System of Different Classes: A Social Psychological Contribution to the Analysis of Stratification." In Reinhard, Bendix and Lipset (editors), Class Status and Power. New York: The Free Press, 1953.
- Iffert, R. E. "The Retention and Withdrawal of College Students." Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office (Bulletin 1958, #1), 1957.
- Jensen, Arthur R. "How Much Can We Boost I.Q. and Scholastic Achievement." Harvard Educational Review 39:1-123, 1969.

- Jourard, Sidney & Remy, Richard. "Perceived Parental Attitudes, the Self and Security." Journal of Consulting Psychology XXV, 1954.
- Juarez, R. Z. & Kulesky, W.P. "Ethnic Group Identity and Orientation Towards Educational Attainment: A Comparison of Mexican and Anglo Boys." ERIC, 4:76, 1969.
- Kagan, S. & Madsen, M.C. "Cooperation and Competition of Mexican American and Anglo American Children of Two Ages Under Two Instructional Sets." Developmental Psychology 5:32-39, 1971.
- Kahl, J. A. The American Class Structure. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.
- Kluckhorn, Florence. Variations in Value Orientations. New York: Harper, Rowe, Peterson, 1961.
- Little, J. R. "The Occupation of Non-College Youth." American Educational Research Journal 4:147-153, 1967.
- Madsen, William. The Mexican American of South Texas. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Maehr, Martin R. Sociocultural Origins of Achievement. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1974.
- Malpass, Leslie F. "Some Relations Between Students' Perceptions of School and Their Achievement." Journal of Educational Psychology XLIV:475-482, 1953.
- Martinez, John W. Individual and Institutions: Mexican Americans in a Community College. Austin: University of Texas, 1978.
- Martinez, Yaya. De Luna. A Five Year Study of Chicano Educational Opportunity Program Students at a California State University. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1976.
- Mayoske, G.W. "Educational Achievements Among Mexican Americans: A Special Report from the Educational Opportunities Survey." Integrated Education, 6:32-36, 1968.

- McClelland, D. C., Atkinson, J. W., Clark, R. A., and Lowell, E. L. The Achieving Motives. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1953.
- McLaughlin, V. P. "Patterns of Work and Family Organization." In T. K. Pablo and R. J. Kolbery (editors), The Family in History, New York: Harper and Row, 1973.
- McWilliams, Carey. North from Mexico: The Spanish Speaking People of the United States. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1949.
- Moon, M. "Teacher Counselor Cooperation, Building Self Concept and Confidence in Children." School Counselor 17:364-365, 1970.
- Moore, Joan. Homeboys. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1978.
- Moore, Joan, Grebler, Leo, & Guzman, Ralph. The Mexican American People. New York: Free Press, 1970.
- Murillo, Nathan. Chicano-Social and Psychological Perspectives. 2nd Edition, St. Louis: C. V. Mosley Co., 1976.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. "The Condition of Education for Hispanic Americans." Lulac National Education Service, 1979.
- Nieto-Gomez de Lazarin, Anna. "The Chicana Perspective for Education." Encuentro Femenil 1(1), 1973.
- Olivas, Miguel. "The Dilemma of Success Minorities in Two Year Colleges." Washington Post, 25-27, 1979.
- Ortega, Phillip and Marta, Sotomayor. Chicanos and Concepts of Language. San Jose, CA: Marbel Associates, 1974.
- Ovando, Carlos Julio. Factors Influencing High School Latino Students' Aspirations to go to College: The Urban Midwest. San Francisco, CA: R & E Associates, 1977.
- Palomares, U. & Cumins, E. Assessment of Rural Mexican American Pupils, Preschool and Grades One Thru Six. Sacramento, CA: California State Report of Education, 1968.

Payton, George Terrance. The Measurement of Attitudes and Expectations of Mexican American Students Preparing for Criminal Justice Careers in a Community College Setting. Los Angeles: University of Southern California, 1976.

Pettigrew, t. Soical-Evaluation Theory: Convergences and Applications. In D. Levine (editor), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation. Nebraska: Lincoln of Nebraska Press, 1967.

Ramirez, Manuel. "Value Conflicts Experienced by Mexican American Students." (ERIC Document 058 829, 1968).

Ramirez, Manuel & Alfredo Castaneda. Bicultural Democracy, Bicognitive Development and Eduation. New York: Academic Press, 1974.

Rist, Ray C. The Urban School: A Factory for Failure, A Study of Eduation in American Society. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1973.

Rosen, B. C. "The Achievement Syndrome: A Psycho Cultural Dimension of Social Stratification." American Sociological Review, 21:203-211, 1956.

Rosenthal, Robert & Jacobson, Lenore F. Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Hages and Brie, 1970.

Roueche, John E. "Research Studies of the Junior College Dropout." ERIC ED013 659, October 1967.

Ryans, David G. "Some Relationships Between Pupil Behavior and Certain Teacher Characteristics." Journal of Educational Psychology L11 (1961), 82-90; David G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers, Their Description, Comparison and Appraisal. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Samora, Julian. La Raza: Forgotten Americans. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1966.

Sanchez, George I. Forgotten People, A Study of New Mexicans. Alburquerque: C. Horn, 1940.

Saville-Troiike, Muriel. "Linguistic Base for Bilingual Education." National Dissemination and Assessment Center. Los Angeles: UCLA, 1976.

- Schwartz, D. Affectivity Orientations and Academic Achievements of Mexican American Youth. Doctoral dissertation, University of California. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University Microfilms, 1967. No. 68-7483.
- Sears, P. S. & Lewin H. "Levels of Aspiration in Preschool Children." Child Development, 28:317-326, 1957.
- Sewell, Wm. H., Haller, Archibald, & Strauss, Murray. "Social Status and Educational and Occupational Aspirations." American Sociological Review, 22:67-73, 1957.
- Simonieello, Katrina. "On Investigating the Attitudes Towards Achievement and Success in Eight Professional U.S. Mexican Women." Atzlan, 12(1):131-137, 1981.
- Simpson, R. L. "Parental Influence, Anticipatory Socialization and Social Mobility." American Sociological Review, 27:517-522, 1962.
- Slocum, W. L. "Social Factors in Academic Mortality." College and University, 32:53-64, 1956.
- Smith, P. C. Achievement Related Motives in Children. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1969.
- Stendler, C. B. "Social Class Differences in Parental Attitudes Towards School at Grade Level." Child Development, 22:37-46, 1950.
- Super, D. E. Career Education and the Meaning of Work. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1976.
- Tharp, R. G., Meadow, A., Lendhoff, S. & Satterfield, D. "Changes in Marriage Roles Accompanying the Acculturation of the Mexican American Wife." Journal of Marriage and Family, 1968.
- Time Magazine, 112(116), October 16, 1970.
- U. S. Commission on Civil Rights (April, 1971), "Ethnic Isolation of Mexican Americans in Public Schools of the Southwest." Report I, Mexican American Education Study Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. Mexican American. Mexican American Education Study. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

- U. S. Commission on Civil Rights. "Teachers and Students Differences in Teacher Interaction with Mexican American and Anglo Students." Report V, March 1973.
- U. S. Bureau Census of Population. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1982.
- U. S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports. "Persons of Spanish Origin in the U. S., March 1978.
- Van Koughnett, B. & Smith, M. "Enhancing the Self Concept in the School." American Educational Research Journal, 6:31-45, 1969.
- Vera, Ron. "The Deteriorating Transfer Function of California Community Colleges, Its Impact on Hispanic Success to Higher Education." San Francisco, CA: Mexican Legal Defense and Educational Fund, 1981.
- Weinberg, Meyer. A Chance to Learn: A History of Race and Education in the United States. New York and London: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- Wolf, Richard M. The Identification and Measurement of Environmental Variables Related to Intelligence. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1964.

APPENDIX A

PROFILE

APPENDIX A

Profile

Chicano Successful Student

Chicano Unsuccessful Student

- | | |
|---|--|
| A.) Socioeconomic Status-adequately well off | 1. Socioeconomic Status - poor/semi-poor |
| B.) Traditional/Authoritarian family background | 2. Less traditional and little more modern family background (Marginal or transitional in acculturation process) |
| C.) Married parents stable-family structure | 3. More divorced/separated or deceased parents |
| D.) More mothers with no job | 4. More mothers working full-time |
| E.) More realistic about Career | 5. Less realistic about career aspiration |
| F.) Parents deceased early in educational career of student | 6. Parents never discussed college or discussed college much later |
| G.) Greater peer group support in college | 7. Less peer group support before college |
| H.) Greater peer group network in college | 8. Less peer group support network in college |
| I.) Higher personal responsibility for grades and academics | 9. Less personal responsibility for poor grades |

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B

STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE

1. How old are you?
 1. 17 - 19 yrs.
 2. 20 - 24 yrs.
 3. 25 - 29 yrs.
 4. 30 older
2. What is your sex?
 1. male
 2. female
3. Which group do you identify with?
 1. Anglo
 2. Mexican American/Chicano
 3. Other
4. What is your marital status?
 1. Single
 2. Married
 3. Divorced/Separated
 4. Widowed
5. How many children do you have?
 1. No children
 2. 1 Child
 3. 2-3 Children
 4. 4 or more
6. What is your position in your family?
 1. Only child
 2. Youngest child
 3. Middle child
 4. Oldest child
7. How many brothers and sisters do you have? (Include stepbrothers & stepsisters living with your family).
 1. None
 2. One
 3. Two
 4. Three
 5. Four
 6. Five or more
8. Do you have any brothers or sisters going to college, or who have gone to college?
 1. Yes, one
 2. Yes, two or more
 3. No, none have gone
 4. I have no older brothers or sisters
9. The following best describes your family structure:
 - a. Authoritarian/Traditional
 - b. Democratic/Modern egalitarian
 - c. Combination of both A & B
10. The communication process in your family can best be described as:
 - a. One way -- parents do all the talking
 - b. Two way -- both parents and children communicate
 - c. No communication
11. Which parent makes all the major decisions in your family?
 - a. Father
 - b. Mother
 - c. Both

12. In the home in which you grew up, which of the following best describes the type of job the head of the family held. (Please check one)
1. Unemployed or underemployed (seasonal)
 2. Unskilled, no formal training needed
 3. Semi-skilled, some formal training needed
 4. Managerial, considerable experience or schooling needed
13. Check one occupation for the head of household.
1. Industry
 2. Business
 3. Health related
 4. Government (civil service)
 5. Education
 6. Agriculture
 7. Military
 8. Other
14. Are your parents:
1. Both living together
 2. Divorced
 3. Separated
 4. Father deceased
 4. Mother deceased
15. Generally, which one of the following best describes your family's situation? (Please check one)
1. Poor, it's a struggle just to make ends meet
 2. Semi-poor, sometimes we have enough, sometimes we don't.
 3. Adequate, we have the necessities but must be careful
 4. Comfortably well off, we can afford most things
 5. Very well off, rich or affluent
16. According to the present standard of living in the United States, as a whole, in which economic groups would your family be considered? (Please check one)
1. Below average
 2. Average
 3. Somewhat above average
 4. Much higher than average
17. Does your mother:
1. Have a full-time job outside the home
 2. Have a part-time job outside the home
 3. Have no job outside the home
 4. Other
18. Of all the subjects you took in school, which one did you like the most?
1. Math related
 2. Science related
 3. Humanities
 4. Business
 5. Social Sciences
19. What job or career do you think about going into? (Please check one)
1. Business related
 2. Medical related
 3. Engineering & Math related
 4. Business
 5. Social Sciences
20. What attracts you to this job?
1. Money
 2. Status
 3. Knowledge or experience with job
 4. Social reward
 4. Other
21. Do you feel you have enough information about jobs available to make a decision about your future? (Please check one)
1. A lot of information
 2. Some information
 3. Little information
 4. None

22. How likely do you think it is that you will be able to get the job you want when you finish your college degree? (Please check one)
1. Very likely
 2. Somewhat likely
 3. Somewhat unlikely
 4. Very unlikely
23. How much education have your parents wanted you to get? (Please check one)
1. Leave before finishing high school
 2. Finish high school
 3. Attend college
 4. Don't know
24. When do you first remember your parents talking about the possibility of you going to college? (Please check one)
1. When I was in grade school
 2. When I was in junior high
 3. When I was in high school
 4. It has always been assumed that I would go to college
 5. We never discussed it
25. What do your parents consider to be satisfactory grades for you? (Please check one)
1. Barely passing grades
 2. Average grades
 3. Above average grades
 4. The highest grades in the class
 5. They don't really care much
26. Have your parents been able to financially support your educational goals?
1. Substantially
 2. Somewhat
 3. Not at all
7. Among your friends in high school, how many supported your plans to go to college? (Please check one)
1. All of them
 2. Most of them
 3. About half of them
 4. A few of them
28. Do you have any friends who are presently in college or who have gone to college?
1. Yes, a lot
 2. Yes, a few
 3. None
29. Among your friends in community college, how many think they will finish community college? (Please check one)
1. All of them
 2. Most of them
 3. About half of them
 4. A few of them
 5. None
30. Suppose your friends were against the idea of going to college. How much influence would their opinions have had on your decision to go to college? (Please check one)
1. A lot of influence
 2. Some influence
 3. Very little influence
 4. None
31. How do you think that most of your college teachers/counselors treat you? (Please check one)
1. Better than most students
 2. About the same as other students
 3. Worse than other students

32. How helpful do you feel counselors are at this community college? (Please check one)
1. Never helpful
 2. Usually helpful
 3. Sometimes helpful
 4. Always helpful
33. How helpful do you feel teachers are at this community college? (Please check one)
1. Never helpful
 2. Usually helpful
 3. Sometimes helpful
 4. Always helpful
34. In your period of study at this community college, what aspects of college life cause you the most problems? (Please check one)
1. Financial problems
 2. Poor teaching methods
 3. Poor counseling
35. Do you feel that enough information and support were made available to you in order for you to succeed at this college? (Please check one)
1. Substantial amount
 2. Mediocre amount
 3. Insufficient amount
36. How difficult are community college studies for you? (Please check one).
1. Very difficult
 2. Somewhat difficult
 3. Somewhat easy
 4. Very easy
 5. Some easy-some hard
37. Which one thing do you like most about college?
1. The studies
 2. Friends
 3. The teachers
 4. Counselor
 5. Nothing
38. Which one thing do you like least about college?
1. Studies
 2. Other students
 3. Teachers
 4. Counselor
 5. Other
 6. Nothing
39. How do you consider yourself as compared to most students?
1. An excellent student
 2. A good student
 3. An average student
 4. A below average student
 5. A very poor student
40. How accurately do your school grades reflect your ability? (Please check one)
1. My grades are lower than my real ability
 2. My grades accurately reflect my real ability
 3. My grades are higher than my real ability
41. When did you first start thinking seriously about going to college?
1. Junior high school
 2. Freshman year
 3. Sophomore year
 4. Junior year
 5. Senior year
 6. Always assumed that I would go
 7. Don't remember
 8. After high school

42. Do you feel that your sex has affected your career aspiration?
 a. Very much so b. Somewhat c. Not at all
43. Did your parents let your sex affect their support of your educational goals?
 a. Very much so b. Somewhat c. Not at all
44. Do you feel that there are strong sex role barriers to certain non-traditional occupational choices for men and women?
 a. Very much so b. Somewhat c. Not at all
45. Has sex role stereotyping affected your personal educational and career goals?
 a. Very much so b. Somewhat c. Not at all
46. Do you feel that society places more demands on your sex?
 a. Very much so b. Somewhat c. Not at all
47. Were your parents born in the United States?
 1. Yes 2. No One parent was born in the U.S.
48. When you are with your friends, in what language do you mostly speak to them?
 a. Spanish
 b. English
 c. Both
49. In what language do your parents most often speak to you?
 a. Spanish
 b. English
 c. Both
50. Check on which best describes your group of friends.
 1. Mostly from Spanish-speaking background 2. About half from Spanish-speaking background 3. Less than half from Spanish-speaking background 4. Most English speaking 5. All English speaking
51. Do you feel that your family promotes the traditional Anglo values of American society?
 a. Completely
 b. Minimally
 c. Not at all

52. If I do poorly in college it's because: (Check the one most important)
1. I did not study hard enough
 2. The work was too hard
 3. It was bad luck
 4. Nobody helped me
 5. The teachers did not teach well
 6. My job took too much time
53. Making plans for the future is not very important because plans hardly ever work out anyway. (Please check one)
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Disagree
 4. Strongly disagree
54. If a person is not successful in life it is his own fault. (Please check one)
1. Strongly Agree
 2. Agree
 3. Disagree
 4. Strongly disagree
55. Even with a good education, a person like me will have a tough time getting the job she/he wants. (Please check one)
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Disagree
 4. Strongly disagree
56. If I could change, I would be someone different. (Please check one)
1. Strongly agree
 2. Agree
 3. Disagree
 4. Strongly disagree

APPENDIX C

LETTERS OF INQUIRY



APPENDIX C

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Anne Golseth

From: José Hurtado *JH*

Date: February 18, 1983

Subject: Dissertation Project

I am presently completing my Ed.D. at the University of the Pacific. The final dissertation project involved a research study to be completed at two community colleges. I have chosen Chabot and Ohlone Colleges for this study because of their distinctly different socioeconomic and cultural setting.

The research project is a survey process and involves a questionnaire to be filled out by 130 students on each campus. The design of this study is structured to analyze the social and cultural characteristics of "successful" and "unsuccessful" Mexican American students at the community college level. This data will be compared and contrasted with "successful" and "unsuccessful" Anglo American students.

A copy of the research methodology is attached which explains all the logistics of the study. Also, a copy of the questionnaire is included. I believe that the results/outcome of this research will provide critical information for community college counselors of both Anglo and Mexican American students.

ru



MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. Anne Golseth
From: José Hurtado *JH*
Date: February 28, 1983

Subject: Dissertation Project

- A. Purpose of the Study - The purpose of this study is to analyze the social and cultural characteristics of successful and unsuccessful Mexican American community college students and to compare them with successful and unsuccessful Anglo American community college students.
- B. Procedures - A total sample of 130 Ohlone students will be administered a questionnaire on an individual basis. Selection of the sample will be done on a voluntary basis for those students meeting the desired criteria. The 100 successful students will be issued the questionnaire in the counseling center or in designated classrooms. The 30 unsuccessful students will largely be contacted through a mailing process.
- C. Students will be contacted on an individual basis and asked to fill out the questionnaire which takes 15-20 minutes. The questionnaires will be returned to this researcher and the data processed at the University of the Pacific computer center.
- D. Timeline - Questionnaire will be issued in the month of March and all data collected by April 15, 1983.
- E. Value to College - The data collected will be valuable in developing a better understanding of both Chicano and Anglo community college students. Also, it will help Ohlone College teachers and counselors to better aid their students in succeeding in college by developing a much more accurate and helpful picture of these students.
- F. There will be minimal use of college records. (Mainly to develop a list of unsuccessful students.)

Memo to Dr. Golseth

Feb. 28, 1983

Page 2

- G. No other use of college resources will be necessary. This researcher will provide his own supplies, clerical and mailing costs. The work of compiling the data will be done on this researcher's own personal time and not college time.
- H. There will be no use of human subject in this project beyond the questionnaire process.

ru

Fremont-Newark
Community College
District



March 23, 1983

Dear Student:

The enclosed questionnaire is being sent to some former college students. The information that you supply will be extremely valuable to aid in the retention process at Ohlone College.

Current and accurate feedback information from former students is an excellent means of determining to what extent Ohlone College is providing realistic educational support programs.

Please take a few minutes to complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope by April 10, 1983.

Thank you for your assistance in this endeavor.

Sincerely,

Jose L. Hurtado
José L. Hurtado
Counselor

JLH:ru
encl

43600 Mission Blvd.
P.O. Box 3909
Fremont, CA 94539