

ABSTRACT

Title: DIFFERENCES AMONG LATINOS IN
ANTICIPATED COLLEGE EXPERIENCE AND
USE OF COLLEGE SERVICES BY COLLEGE
GENERATIONAL STATUS AND GENDER

Hugo Estuardo Nájera, Master of Arts, 2007

Directed By: Dr. Marylu K. McEwen
Department of Counseling and Personnel Services

This study was to determine whether differences in Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services exist between first-generation and continuing generation college Latino students, and between male and female Latino students. The University New Student Census was used to collect data. Items exploring short and long-term college expectations, and use of college services were selected as dependent variables and tested using two-way MANOVAs; ANOVAs were used to analyze significant main effects. A total of 211 Latino first-year entering freshmen responded to the instrument. Results indicated females and first-generation college students had a stronger expectation to use college services than male and continuing generation students. Males expected more than females to have the skills and knowledge to complete their semester goals, yet males indicated a stronger expectation to drop out and not complete a degree. Females expected to be more concerned over financing their college education than males.

DIFFERENCES AMONG LATINOS IN ANTICIPATED COLLEGE EXPERIENCE
AND USE OF COLLEGE SERVICES BY COLLEGE GENERATIONAL STATUS
AND GENDER

By

Hugo Estuardo Nájera

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Maryland, College Park, in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts
2007

Advisory Committee:
Associate Professor Marylu K. McEwen, Chair
Associate Professor Karen Kurotsuchi Inkelas
Professor William E. Sedlacek
Associate Professor Ana Patricia Rodriguez

© Copyright by
Hugo Estuardo Nájera
2007

Dedication

Esta tesis esta dedicado al las lagrimas, sacrificios, y apoyo de mi mamá, hermana, abuelos y primo. Yo tengo todo fe que nuestra lucha aqui no es para nada. La tesis tambien esta dedicado en recuerdo de mi Tia Menche, Tia Rosa, Tio Victor, y Tio Felipe.

+++

Esta tesis es tambien dedicado a Yamir, Luis, Vilma, Ryan, Dharma y Mia por haber estado conmigo para ayudarme sobre salir de mi momentos mas bajo.

Finalmente, esta tesis es dedicado a todos nosotros que veemos el mundo por como es, quienes luchan con esa sabiduria y a los que trabajan fuerte para mejorarlo. Para todos que no hablan este idioma y a los que no podemos alcanzar. Ustedes han sido mi inspiracion para lanzarme en esta viaje. Mi pasion es para ustedes.

+++

This thesis is also dedicated to Yamir, Luis, Vilma, Ryan, Dharma, and Mia for having been there when I hit my bottom and being there to pick me up.

Finally, this thesis is dedicated to all of us who see the world for what it is, who struggle with that knowledge, and work hard to make it better. To those who don't speak this language and we can't touch, you have been my inspiration to venture in this journey. My passion goes out to you. I did my best with this. I hope it helps.

Acknowledgments

I would like to acknowledge the support, guidance, and counsel of my thesis chair, Dr. Marylu K. McEwen. I am thankful and appreciative of your patience and ability to work with me through this process.

I would also like to thank my thesis committee for their support and insight.

I would like to thank all my colleagues, classmates, friends and allies at the University of Maryland. In particular I'd like to thank those who directly contributed to the thesis.

Finally, I'd like to thank all my students and members of the UMCP Latino community. I feel nothing but love and respect from all of you and I want you to know that I've been thinking of each of you as I wrote this thesis. All of you have been my strongest support and inspiration to keep me focused and steady.

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	ii
Acknowledgments.....	iii
List of Tables.....	vi
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
The Complexity of Latinidad.....	3
Latinidad and Education.....	5
Challenges Faced by Latinos in Higher Education.....	6
Cultural and Ideological Incongruity as a Source of the Problem.....	9
Purpose of Study.....	11
Definition of Terms.....	12
Latino or Latina.....	12
Anticipated College Experience.....	12
College Services.....	13
First-Generation College Student.....	14
Continuing Generation College Student.....	14
Significance of the Study.....	14
Summary.....	15
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	17
Anticipated College Experience.....	17
Studies Related to Anticipated College Experience Using Samples Not Analyzed by Race.....	18
Anticipated College Experience Using Samples Analyzed by Race.....	23
Anticipated College Experience and Latino Students.....	26
Summary.....	29
College Services.....	30
Research on College Services Using Samples Not Analyzed by Race... Research on College Services Analyzed by Race.....	31
Research on College Services and Latinos.....	34
Summary.....	36
First-Generation College Students.....	37
Differences Between First and Continuing Generation College Students.....	37
Comparisons in Persistence by College Generational Status.....	38
Comparisons in Experiences and Perceptions.....	39
Differences Within First-Generation College Students.....	42
Summary.....	44

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	46
Research Design.....	46
Hypotheses.....	47
Context of the Study.....	47
Sample.....	47
Instrument.....	51
Data Collection.....	54
Data Analysis.....	54
Summary.....	55
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....	56
Anticipated College Experience.....	56
Anticipated Use of College Services.....	61
Summary.....	65
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION.....	67
Interpretation of Research Findings.....	67
Limitations.....	76
Implications for Professional Practice.....	82
Suggestions for Future Research.....	88
APPENDIX A: UNIVERSITY NEW STUDENT CENSUS 2004.....	93
REFERENCES.....	113

List of Tables

Table		
1	Background Characteristics of 2004 University New Student Census Respondents	48
2	Items Selected for Anticipated College Experience Category	52
3	Items Selected for Anticipated Use of College Services Category	52
4	Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variance for Anticipated College Experience	57
5	Means and Standard Deviations for Anticipated College Experience by Gender	60
6	Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variance for Anticipated Use of College Services	62
7	Means and Standard Deviations for Anticipated Use of College Services by College Generational Status	64
8	Means and Standard Deviations for Anticipated Use of College Services by Gender	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

According to the U.S. Census, there are currently 35.2 million Latinos in the United States, comprising 12.5% of the total population (Ramirez, 2004). Since 1990, the Latino population increased by 61%, whereas the rest of the nation grew 13% (Ramirez). Cohn (2002) reported that many areas of the United States also experienced a hypergrowth of Latinos, where increases exceeded 300%. Looking deeper at these numbers reveals a unique population with complex identities and profound diversity.

In one instance, Latinos are homogenous as they are tied together through social, cultural, oppressive, and historical forces (Martinez, 2000). Torres (2004) argued that Latinos share a legacy of Spanish colonization and its cultural influence, a sense of community, and a strong family-focus. But, these commonalities “... often overshadow distinct immigration patterns, varying ethnic experiences, and research findings that are different for particular subgroups” (Torres, p. 6). Despite these similarities, Latinos are also an extremely varied group that transcends race, class, nationality, immigration status, language, and ethnicity (Jones-Correa & Leal, 1996). Torres explained that the unique histories and immigration patterns of Cuban Americans, Mexican Americans, as well as Central and South Americans is only one way to identify the diversity of Latinos. Demographically, 33.9% of Latinos are non-Mexican, followed by “other Hispanic,” followed by Puerto Ricans and Cuban Americans (Torres). Central Americans comprise 4.8% of all Latinos, with those from El Salvador and Guatemala comprising the largest of that subgroup (Torres). Forty percent of all Latinos were foreign born, the rest born in the

United States as citizens, which breaks the stereotype of Latinos as only foreigners (Ramirez, 2004). Suro (2002) noted that the population shifts come from the fast rise of “New Latinos,” subgroups (Dominicans, Salvadorans, South Americans) that are not from the earliest groups of Latinos (Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Mexican Americans). In fact, there are as many Dominicans and Salvadorans as there are Cubans, each around 1 million (Suro). Suro added that these groups bring social, educational, and cultural characteristics that differ from the traditional subgroups. Ramirez and de la Cruz (2002) reported that the largest and oldest Latino subgroups are concentrated in separate areas of the United States (Puerto Ricans in the Northeast, Mexicans in the Southwest, Cubans in the Southeast, Central Americans in the Mid-Atlantic). Yet, Latinos are also spreading across the country, moving to parts of the United States not normally associated with immigration such as the Midwest and the South (Schmidt, 2003).

The diversity found within the Latino population can be compared to the diversity found within the Black, Asian Pacific American, American Indian, or White communities. So why highlight the variety of Latino subgroups, histories, and contexts? In the following section, the concept of “Latinidad” will be introduced. Latinidad explains how social and cultural relationships are established between the numerous immigration patterns, races, nationalities, and other characteristics that make up Latino identity (J.M. Rodriguez, 2003). Latinidad attempts to develop older versions of multiple identity statuses such as double consciousness or biculturalism by arguing the co-existence of contradictory paradigms of categorization in the creation of a Latino identity. For instance, individuals’ identity can be shaped by their awareness of dichotomous view of race, as well as their awareness of multiple races co-existing within the same cultural

identity. In this way, Latinidad challenges traditional United States notions of classification and identity, which are rooted in the separatist boxing in of individuals based on singular characteristics such as race or gender (Martinez, 2000). This study attempts to take into account Latinidad as it explores Latino student experiences in college.

The Complexity of Latinidad

Latinidad simultaneously refers to the diverse hybrids of historical, cultural, social, racial, religious, legal status, generational, and geographic contexts that make up Latinos, as well as the conflicts in power, complexities, and contradictions found in these relationships (J.M. Rodriguez, 2003). Validova (2005) added that Latinos are a “hybrid of hybrids” (p. 310), as Indigenous, Spanish, and African cultures are also products of mixing of various ethnic and cultural groups. Latinidad is an important concept to consider as it is inclusive of concrete mixes and blends, and brings to attention psychological, cultural, and social implications as well. Latinidad provides a space to explore and consider how a wide range of socially oppositional forces (colonizer vs. colonized, Christian vs. pagan, and so forth) are consolidated within the personal, social, and cultural consciousness of Latinos. This complexity is important to consider when researching Latino experiences in institutions of higher education as it expands the parameters of Latino identity, justifying the heterogeneity of experiences and contexts.

Introducing Latinidades provides a new insight on how Latino identity currently challenges U.S. social constructions of race and categorization. For instance, Martinez (2000) noted that the presence of Latinos challenges traditional United States views of race relations as dichotomous and oppositional, as simply a Black (African American)

and White issue. The multiple races present among Latinos validates the experiences and issues of Latinos and questions the oppositional nature of dichotomy and the tendency to homogenize the experiences of people of color as the same. To illustrate, the National Survey of Latinos revealed that Latinos identify themselves as Black, White, and other races, even when considering Hispanic/Latino as options for racial identification (Pew Hispanic Center, 2002). Jones-Correa and Leal (1996) found that identifiers such as “Latino” or “Hispanic” are not used in a traditionally definitive, or final, manner, but as an elastic title that accommodates Latinos in different ways. “Latino ethnicity is neither simply instrumental nor cultural. Instead, Latino panethnicity is a complex phenomenon, differing not only by a range of demographic characteristics but also among those using panethnicity as a primary or secondary identification” (Jones-Correa, & Leal, p. 218). Quinones-Rosado (1998) and Castellanos and Jones (2003) documented the roots of “Latino” and “Hispanic” as terms prescribed by the United States government and seen as an act of oppression to the targeted group. Specifically, “Hispanic” was a term introduced by the Office of Budget and Management in 1998 (Rendon, 2003). Both terms trace their roots to Spain and Latin as their etymological origin, removing attention from Latinos’ African and Indigenous histories (Schmidt, 2003).

In sum, the complexity of Latino demographics should naturally indicate that the views, understandings, and expectations of Latinos are just as varied. The needs of Latinos are a result of a multitude of background characteristics, social forces, and experiences. The overall boom of Latinos, along with the differences in social, cultural, economic, and educational differences among the various subpopulations, shows a complex and dynamic community. Current methods of research limit the ability to

implement this complex view of people in the current study. So, Latinidad ushers a new approach to exploring Latinos, prompting researchers to find new grouping methods to account for the multiplicity of identities found among Latinos, and a new rationale for possible misdirection or inconclusiveness in the study's results. By the very limitations of racism, social science research, and statistics, this study is limited in finding practical means of intersecting Latinidad and social science research, and considers Latinidad as a theoretical foundation for the study. Acknowledging Latinidad allows the reader to consider differences between groups even if the null hypotheses of the study are not rejected. How Latinidad challenges the parameters of social group categorization prompts researchers to consider new and innovative ways of studying Latinos.

Latinidad and Education

The diverse backgrounds of Latinos show the importance of understanding Latinidades in relation to educational patterns. Fry (2002) reported that U.S. born Latinos are four times as likely to be in school and not working than their immigrant peers. Half of foreign born and native-born students attend two-year institutions (Fry). Approximately two percent (2.2%) of native-born (second generation) students are enrolled in graduate studies, compared with 1.9% and 1.7% for first and third generation Latinos (Fry). Schmidt (2003) reported that foreign-born Latinos are less likely to enroll than U.S. born Latinos, where only 25% of foreign born attend college, in comparison to 40% of U.S. born high school graduates. Schmidt also argued that differences in education patterns and choices between foreign and native-born Latinos are a result of many factors beyond social constraint and discrimination such as language proficiency or immigrating to find full-time work rather than pursue a degree.

Looking at Latinos by nationality also reveals variance in educational patterns. Torres (2004) reported that South American immigrants are more likely to complete a college education, and Central American immigrants are least likely. Torres also reported that of all U.S. Latinos who begin their college career at two-year institutions, the largest subgroups are Central and South American students (41%) followed by Puerto Ricans or Cuban American (31% each). Torres stated that Cuban Americans have the highest percentage of high school graduates enrolled in higher education (41.7%), compared with 28% of Puerto Rican and 37.2% of Central and South American high school graduates. Fry (2002) reported that almost half of Mexican American undergraduates attend two-year institutions, compared to Puerto Ricans, where less than one-third attend. Cubans/Cuban-Americans have the highest rate of college enrollment (45%) and 90% of those enrolled attend full-time (Fry; Schmidt, 2003). Puerto Ricans and Mexicans/Mexican Americans have the lowest attendance, at 30% and 33% respectively (Schmidt).

The patterns of college enrollment, by national or immigrant status, run parallel to socioeconomic differences, where Cuban/Cuban Americans are better off than Puerto Rican and Mexican Americans, and also have larger enrollment patterns (Schmidt, 2003). First-generation Latino students are less likely to be enrolled in college than second or third generation Latinos (Torres, 2004). Also, 57% of Latinos attending college are women (Schmidt).

Challenges Faced by Latinos in Higher Education

Looking at some of the educational patterns and overall trends, most Latinos' experience in higher education reveals a tough journey. Fry (2002) reported that the U.S.

Department of Education considers part-time status a “risk factor” in completing a degree in either two or four year institutions, yet Latinos are more likely to work part-time, with 75% attending college full-time compared to 85% of African Americans and Whites. Also, 1.9% of Latino high school graduates attend graduate school, compared to 3% of African Americans and 3.8% of Whites (Fry). Finally, Nora (2003) reported, “While 47% of all minority students are enrolled in two-year institutions, Hispanics represent 36% of all community college enrollments and represent 56.4% of all Hispanics enrolled in college” (p. 49). Specifically, of all 18-24 year old college students, 44% of Latinos attend community college, as compared with 25% for Whites and African Americans (Fry). Community colleges offer several cultural and economic advantages that appeal to low-income, family centered communities (Fry). Even so, Latino students who begin their higher education at community colleges are more likely than Latinos who begin at four-year institutions to drop out and not finish their degree, as more than half of Latinos who start at a two-year institution never complete a degree (Fry).

It is mysterious how so many Latinos continue to lag in almost every aspect of the college experience, despite exhibiting an understanding of the importance and value of a college education more than Whites and just as much as Blacks (Pew Hispanic Center, 2004). Schmidt (2003) stated, “Overall, Hispanics are the least-educated major racial or ethnic group” (p. A8). Compared to other ethnic minority groups, Latinos are one of the lowest groups to attain degrees, 6.6% at two-year institutions and 4% at four-year institutions (Nora, 2003). Castellanos and Jones (2003) reported that, in 1992, only 57.3% of Latinos graduated high school, in comparison to 83.3% of Whites. By 1998, only 51% of Latinos had completed high school and attended some college, compared to

86% of Whites. The participation rates of Latinos in institutions of higher education have not changed; in 1995 the participation rate was 35% and just 36% twenty years earlier. Despite being the largest minority group in the United States, Latinos comprise only 4% of all college undergraduates (Castellanos & Jones). Llagas (2003) reported that only 10% of Latinos completed a bachelor's degree or higher in comparison to 34% of Whites and 18% of Blacks, with proportions of Latinos completing college not increasing since 1990. Transfer rates to four-year institutions may be as low as 10% (Nora). Citing the National Council on Educational Statistics, Castellanos and Jones reported that the struggles of Latinos go unnoticed due to the "revolving door syndrome," where "...the illusion of a stable set of students is created because the numbers remain constant. In fact, the Latino student dropout rate at U.S. four-year institutions and universities has exceeded 50% over the last few years" (Castellanos & Jones, p. 3). Castellanos and Jones also reported that Latino retention rates are lower than Whites and African Americans. Research has shown that background/cultural values, socioeconomic status, academic and acculturative stress, family support, congruity to campus culture and climate, and faculty mentorship are factors contributing to Latino student retention (Castellanos & Jones). These factors indicate a sense of displacement and incongruity with institutions of higher education.

From the context of Latino student experiences in college, Hurtado, Carter, and Spuler (1996) studied the sources of difficulty and factors in college adjustment and found that climate-related minority status stressors contributed more to student adjustment than typical transitional difficulties. Experiences of discrimination, racial and ethnic tension, and in-college experiences (and not background characteristics) were the

specific areas that created a depressing effect on college adjustment. Perceptions of a hostile racial climate also negatively affected Latino students' sense of belonging (Hurtado & Carter, 1997). The vast amount of literature exploring the negative experiences of Latinos on college campuses provides evidence of a struggle and antagonism.

Cultural and Ideological Incongruity as a Source of the Problem

One component of U.S. higher education attributed to the struggle Latinos face relates to a Eurocentric bias and oppressive U.S. social constructs. Schmidt (2003) cited the historical legacy of U.S. institutions working in the “Black White paradigm” (p. A8), which continues to leave Latinos underserved and removed from institutional discussions of race and equity. King (1995) argued that the source of the problem lies at the very beginning, where colleges and universities, drawing from European models, were designed and established with White male students in mind. Ideologies and values have been preserved in the academic curriculum and culture of colleges through the “objectification” of European and American knowledge. Making European forms of knowledge “objective” places all other forms of knowledge outside in the margin and inferior. Eurocentrism then takes on such a dominating position that it becomes a phenomenon addressed within Latino contexts. For instance, Ferdman and Gallegos (2001) and Torres (1999, 2003) present models of Latino identity development that include statuses where Latinos can identify with dominant White culture. Anzaldúa (1987) argues that identification with European culture is a form of identity loss, oppresses a culture, and makes Latinos victims of identity displacement due to living between various conflicting psychological, social, and historical legacies.

College environments are another component that plays into Latinos' struggle. Hurtado (1994b) made a strong connection about how a college's environment and historical legacy plays a role for Latino students in admissions selection processes. She noted that although certain processes and criteria have been modified and changed to accommodate the unique experiences of different communities, other criteria designed years ago with more homogenous populations (such as family legacy) remain untouched (Hurtado). In a qualitative study, Gonzalez (1999) found that various aspects of a college environment, specifically physical placement of buildings, symbols found around campus, and the amount of representation of one's particular culture, played a strong role in how a student feels connected to his or her college.

Finally, tools of practitioners such as foundational theories and research used to develop and analyze college students have also been critiqued for their inappropriateness and detriment to aid Latino students. Velasquez (1999) supports prior critiques of the ritual of separation from family as a necessary part of college adjustment found in Tinto's theory of persistence. Separation of parents as a function of development contradicts traditions and values of Latinos, who may be more family-centered. In addition, Velasquez pointed out that Tinto's theory focuses on behavioral measures, not students' perceptions, which again places a filter on how practitioners see college students. Hurtado (1994a) questioned that, for students to be adjusted, they must be familiar with the norms, values, and expectations that predominate on the campus. She argued that interaction with White students does not necessarily mean a positive adjustment, as interactions with Whites can be positive or negative for a marginalized individual.

Critiques have also been made of supposedly more objective means of understanding students, assessment and teaching styles. Sedlacek (2004) made a strong argument that many popular and widely used forms of student assessment, such as SAT tests and locally developed assessment tools in college, were designed with White students in mind and therefore suffer from not taking into account aspects of underserved student experiences, resulting in an unfair and inaccurate view of underserved groups. The rationale, sample, measures, validity, and reliability do not consider or measure the experiences and knowledge used by Latinos, women, African Americans, and other marginalized groups (Sedlacek). Sedlacek also argued that these assessment tools do not consider the issues of power and privilege that run through society. A related concern is about teaching styles. Mancuso-Edwards (1983) and Smith (1992) acknowledged that the appropriateness of pedagogies and methodology of teaching styles are limited to certain students and not to others, in particular Latino students and less traditional students.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the various expectations of Latino college students by testing for differences by college generational status and gender in anticipated college experience and anticipated use of college services. First-year entering freshmen attitudes were assessed prior to students' beginning their first semester of college. Two research questions guided this study:

1. Are there differences between Latinos who are first-generation college students and those who are continuing generation college students, and between males and females, in anticipated college experience?

2. Are there differences between Latinos who are first-generation college students and those who are continuing generation college students, and between males and females, in anticipated use of college services?

Definition of Terms

Latino or Latina: Latino and Latina refer to those who trace their cultural, family, or social roots to Latin American history, legacy, and culture. Latinos are seen as a hybrid of any varying combination of Spanish or Portuguese, African, and Indigenous American mixes. The use of the term Latino or Latina is very elastic as Latinos can identify themselves by nationality, or by use of terms such as “Hispano,” “Hispanic,” “Latin American,” “Mestizo,” “Chicano,” “Boriqua,” “Taino,” and so forth (Jones-Correa & Leal, 1996). These names reflect the individual’s own family legacy, geographic location, social status, class, or race. A special subgroup of note is found in the United States, specifically U.S. domestic Latinos, who are born in the United States but whose family originates in Latin America (Rendon, 2003). For purposes of this study, a strong emphasis is made to the reader to be conscious of how this complexity is hidden when using monolithic terms such as “Hispanic,” “Latina,” or “Latino.” These words are used throughout the text and are based on current social constructs and approaches that have influenced how researchers study and present identity-based populations.

Anticipated College Experience: Anticipated College Experience refers to students’ predispositions and expected college experiences before starting one’s college career. Anticipated College Experience includes both long-term and day-to-day expectations such as degree aspirations, financial concerns, adjustment to college, dropping out, social life, and so forth.

In this study I propose “outlook” as a more comprehensive and extended definition of “Anticipated College Experience” as it takes on a social cultural lens to see students’ anticipated experiences through their context, which considers the social, economic, and cultural status as factors in shaping their expectations. Presenting “outlook” would be more supportive of students from oppressed groups as it removes Eurocentric biases embedded in United States higher education. For instance, a student’s Anticipated College Experience can follow traditional collegiate values in which one expects to graduate in four years, live in a residence hall, and utilize an assortment of college services. On the other hand, a student can carry expectations that may find it necessary to stop out of college to work for a period of time, not participate in student organizations, or transfer to another institution. These expectations may not be favored by collegiate norms, but are seen as viable by students to meet their educational goal. Viewing students through this more person-centered approach challenges practitioners to consider a student’s own choices as measures of success, and not measures chosen only by colleges and universities. Due to a lack of research in this area, the study will limit itself to “Anticipated College Experience.” Further discussion of “Outlook” as a new construct will be presented in Chapter V.

College Services: College Services are services, functional areas, offices, and other interventions that are meant to assist students in academic and out-of-classroom experiences. Dungy (2003) cited over 30 functional areas including academic advising, student unions, dining and foods services, and disability support services. For this study, career counseling, personal counseling, study skills training, drug/alcohol counseling, and

student organization involvement were chosen as college services as these were the only functional areas identified in the instrument from which the data were drawn.

First Generation College Student: This category includes students for whom neither parent holds more than a high school diploma/GED.

Continuing Generation College Student: This category includes students for whom at least one parent holds a bachelor's degree, associate's degree, or technical certificate.

Sherlin (2002) showed empirical evidence indicating experiences and perceptions about college differ between first generation college students, students for whom at least one parent attended some college, and students for whom at least one parent holds a bachelor's degree. This study acknowledges these empirical differences, but will differ from Sherlin's study by testing for differences between students who report that neither parent has more than a high school diploma/GED, and students who report that at least one parent holds a postsecondary degree, as levels of college generational status. Students who report that either parent holds an associate's or bachelor's degree, or technical certificate are considered continuing generation college students.

Significance of the Study

The goal of this study is to gain a more comprehensive understanding of Latino college students by looking for differences in Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services among subpopulations. Such findings would encourage practitioners to design programs and services that take into account different behaviors and expectations among different Latino subpopulations that are based on less visible variables such as college generational status. Improved services become more

efficient and effective, not just in practical terms, but work to alleviate marginalization, negative perceptions of a campus climate, and a lack of sense of belonging. The study attempts to bridge the social and cultural to the practical, creating a direct connection to how racism, socioeconomic status, minority group status, and culture help shape students' behaviors and perceptions of college, manifested in their anticipated use of services and other forms of interaction with a college campus. Finally, the study introduces a highly unexplored area of the college experience through the proposed creation of an "Outlook" variable. The variable attempts to directly connect a student's social context to his or her decision-making, drawing attention to the journey of education from a student's perspective.

Summary

This chapter showed the complexity of race, class, social status, national origin, language, geographic location, and experiences of Latinos. Latinos can be placed inside a wide range of Latinidades, which shatter foundational lenses of group identification that misconstrue the unique roads underrepresented and non-White cultural groups take. Looking at Latinos solely through a U.S. racialized lens hides the parallels, differences, similarities, and unique qualities across the various subgroups. Latinos are not just heterogeneous by background characteristics, but through their worldviews, priorities, choices, and expectations of their experience. These different contexts may bring forth different objectives and struggles that define students' choices and behaviors such as choice of college, major, number of classes to take, their decision to stop out, and the amount of schooling they feel they need. As a group, Latinos may deal with common issues such as marginalization, a hostile campus climate, lack of campus resources, and

discrimination. Yet individuals may perceive, address, and navigate these issues in distinct ways, due to their unique Latinidad. U.S. institutions of higher education suffer to fully understand this simultaneous homogeneity/heterogeneity and address the struggles Latinos face in higher education.

In an attempt to expand the one-sided paradigm of studying higher education by focusing strictly on students, this study attempts to challenge readers to consider the values of U.S. higher education as a subjective product of context. Programs, policies, and services designed under the “old school” understandings of race and identification may not correspond to the desired outcomes of a student. Students who opt-out of college may have accomplished their academic goals, but may also be viewed as deviant, uneducated, or even ungrateful. In essence, there lies a difference between the values and outcomes of higher education and a college student. Practitioners and researchers must actively rework the design and process of investigating Latino college students. The need to follow legacy makes change difficult. But, one can look at these legacies through different lenses as a means of expanding knowledge about complex students.

One place to start is where the ideals, outcomes, and designs of a college directly interact with outlooks and predispositions of a student, through a college’s various resources and services. It is in the career center, counseling center, writing center, student union, student organization, and orientation weekend that the subjective designs of programs and services interact with the ideals of a Latino college student. Based on these challenges, the following study will attempt to explore how Latino heterogeneity plays out in students’ anticipated college experience and anticipated decisions made to utilize student services.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to determine whether differences in Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services exist between Latinos by college generational status and gender. Unfortunately, there is very little empirical literature to be found exploring either of these categories. Definitions of, as well as studies relating to, anticipated college experience, use of college services, gender, and college generational status are provided. This chapter will also focus on studies that look at anticipated college experiences and use of student services across racial groups (that include Latinos) as well as studies that focus on Latino college students as a group and by gender.

Anticipated College Experience

Anticipated college experience refers to a student's anticipated day-to-day and long-term college experience before beginning college. As more non-traditional students arrive with educational goals that are based on their personal and family values, as well as influences by the larger society, expectations that may differ from a "traditional" collegiate route are introduced to institutions of higher education. Minority status, immigrant status, gender, family characteristics, and socioeconomic status are just some of the factors that could possibly shape expectations such as the amount of coursework a student will carry during one's time in college, educational goal (if different from traditional goal of attaining a degree), enrollment status each semester, use of campus resources, level of priority of higher education among other personal priorities,

expectation of dropping out, stopping out, or opting out, and work status. These expectations can range from traditional, where one completes a degree within the socially expected time frame and participates in traditional experiences of a college student, to untraditional, where a student may stop-out for a while, reenter much later than expected, and even opt-out after personal educational goals have been met. How much a student's expectations of the college experience differ from the assumptions embedded in college policies, programs, and values could potentially affect how positive or negative one's experience could be. As little literature frames anticipated student experiences on a person-centered cultural and social background, elements of "outlook" will be drawn from studies of various interests and areas such as degree attainment, educational aspirations, and student expectations and satisfaction surveys.

Studies Related to Anticipated College Experience Using Samples Not Analyzed by Race

Students arrive with unique cultural characteristics and outlooks of the college experience that reflect their socioeconomic status, level of power and privilege, and identities. It is important to identify what these anticipated experiences are, and then seek out the factors that influence these predispositions. Unfortunately, little attention has been placed on exploring the anticipated college experience of students as most studies are designed around traditional frameworks of college outcomes, so little room is allowed for exploring the variety of dispositions that may exist. The literature presented below did not analyze samples by race.

Quinonez and Sedlacek (1997) conducted a study that identified expectations, attitudes, and perceptions of the college experience of incoming freshmen prior to beginning their first semester. The study used results from a university-wide instrument

given to entering freshmen at a large mid-Atlantic institution that sought to identify respondents' attitudes and expectations to various aspects of the college experience such as their purpose to attend, adjustment to college, jobs, academic issues, and so forth. For educational aspirations, 40% of the participants expected to gain only a bachelor's degree; an additional 15% wanted to get into graduate school. Job prospects was another area of interest; 26% indicated they enrolled in school to get a better job, yet 15% of students who participated in the study said they would leave school if an opportunity for a good job arose. Regarding financial concerns, 35% of students intended to work during the school year. Furthermore, 19% indicated that staying in school was dependent on working at least part-time. About 40% said that funding education was a concern. Finally, in regards to retention issues, 2% were sure they would stop-out temporarily, and 6% were uncertain if they needed to stop-out or not. Overall, 35% of incoming freshmen indicated that they would not leave and get the degree. Unfortunately, Quinonez and Sedlacek did not analyze the sample by race, even though there were large differences in the percentage of identified racial/ethnic groups who responded to the study, making it difficult to compare across groups. Whites comprised 64% of all respondents, while African Americans and Asian Pacific Americans represented 14% and 12% of the sample, and Latinos comprised only 5%. Differences in anticipated college experience among subgroups were not analyzed. Overall, concern about finances and job prospects shaped anticipated experiences during college.

Widdows and Hilton (1990) used a business approach of viewing students as consumers to assess the effectiveness of marketing college services by using a customer survey. Two instruments were distributed to incoming freshmen; a pre-enrollment survey

was given six weeks prior to the commencement of their academic career and a post-enrollment survey was given eight weeks after classes began. Students were asked to rate their satisfaction of environmental, academic, and out of classroom functions of a college campus. Out of classroom functions included financial aid availability, social activities, and athletic facilities, as well as housing, religious, and employment opportunities. Widdows and Hilton calculated satisfaction mean scores for each functional area and noted differences between them as evidence of change in satisfaction. The biggest changes in satisfaction related to academic reputation and social activities, where students became negatively satisfied with the former and more satisfied with the latter. The study's approach in looking at specific functions within environmental, academic, and out of classroom functions before and after entering school provides a good template in using student expectations to learn about the effectiveness of college services. Even so, not analyzing the sample by race and other background characteristics, tracking the use of services, or identifying experiences of participants while in the college environment provided a limited portrait of the respondents. The study did not explore connections between students' experiences, or expectations, and satisfaction of services.

Outlook traces the root of a student's anticipated college experience to the student's cultural or social context. Not only is it important to know what students expect, but the social or cultural factors that may shape predispositions. Connecting a student's context with expectations of the college experience may reveal patterns, or variations of patterns, associated with particular expectations, which may not be immediately visible to researchers and practitioners if they rely solely on the norms and values of United States higher education. Power and privilege, socioeconomic status, and other less visible

factors may create commonalities among student populations that transcend traditional forms of categorization such as race or ethnicity. Unfortunately, since little research has been dedicated to learning about the outlook of college experience, making connections between predispositions and their influences is difficult.

Hoyt and Winn (2004) studied differences among dropouts, stop-outs, opt-outs, and transfer-outs, revealing that background characteristics are associated with different journeys students undergo in their college career. There were over 300 participants in the study, which took place at a large, predominantly White, open enrollment state college. The participants were identified through the office of institutional research and were sent surveys asking about their reasons for not returning. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) and *t*-tests were used across all three groups to examine differences in background characteristics and reasons for leaving. Hoyt and Winn were not able to find significant differences for transfer-outs, but found significant differences in decision-making and background characteristics between dropouts, stop-outs, and opt-outs, indicating that shared influences and concerns of student subgroups foster common paths and outlooks. For instance, dropouts and stop-outs were more likely to have children and be older than transfer-outs. Yet, dropouts tended to have more children and cited family responsibility as a reason for leaving more frequently than stop-outs. On the other hand, stop-outs were more likely, in comparison to other subgroups, to cite finances as the primary reason for not returning. Over half of stop-outs in the study worked full-time and attend school part-time. In addition, stop-outs tended to have more conflicts between jobs and college than transfer-outs. These findings reveal that variation of patterns and outlooks exist within the overall population of nonreturning students. For dropouts, there may be strong

intentions to pursue higher education, but personal and financial obligations may bring aspirations of a degree to a halt, whereas stop-outs seem to carry an intention of carrying out job prospects and seeking higher education. Hoyt and Winn's study introduces the possibility certain social characteristics or contexts may feature particular college journey patterns. These patterns reveal populations bound together by similar social experiences that can be treated and studied as legitimate groups.

What can be a challenge to exploring outlook is the fluidity of individuals changing their outlooks over time. McCormick (1997) investigated how expectations of students changed after four years from graduating high school and found that half of graduating high school students who intended to get a bachelor's degree changed their expectations. Placement within the education pipeline seems to be a contributing factor to the change in expectations. In McCormick's study, 45% of students who intended to receive a bachelor's degree started at a community college. Yet, chances of receiving a bachelor's degree for these students were 60% lower than those who started at a four-year institution. Delayed entry and part-time status had a negative effect on college expectations. Finally, McCormick found that students who had high expectations, but did not go immediately to school or who stopped out, were likely to reenter postsecondary education. Identifying subpopulations based on college outlook can be difficult due to the elusiveness and changing expectations of college students, yet there are significant forces that create these groups. The advantage of McCormick's study for understanding outlook was its ability to include students who attended community colleges as part of the larger pipeline of seeking higher education. In addition, there is evidence that students who do not follow a traditional collegiate path may find it more

difficult to complete their academic goals. The following section will look more closely at outlook of college experience for particular subpopulations.

Anticipated College Experience Using Samples Analyzed by Race

Due to the lack of literature exploring Anticipated College Experience, studies that explore students' educational aspirations, decision to attend, and enrollment patterns serve as sources for understanding Anticipated College Experience. Studies looking across racial and ethnic groups have focused primarily on aspirations and outcomes without including expectations and interaction with college environments and functions. Even less literature acknowledges differences within racial groups.

Perna (2000) explored differences in decisions to attend four-year institutions among Black, Latinos, and Whites. According to the findings of Perna's study, Latinos and African Americans have more information about college available to them, and receive more help in the college application process. But, lower levels of social, cultural, and financial capital play a strong role in the lack of enrollment in four-year institutions. Specifically, African Americans and Latinos have less parental involvement in the college process than Whites, despite level of education of their parents. In addition, parents of African Americans and Latinos in the study tended to have lower levels of education than Whites. Perna's study expanded on prior research as it controlled for variables of social and cultural capital, which included expected future income, educational expectations, and financial aid. After controlling for social and cultural capital, it was revealed that Latinos are just as likely as Whites to enroll in college. Perna chose not to include respondents from the National Educational Longitudinal Study who decided to enroll at a two-year institution. Perna argued that students who decide to enroll

at a two-year institution carried criteria and factors too distinct from those who decided to enroll at a four-year institution. Lanni (1992) conducted a similar study, but explored behaviors and objectives of African Americans, Whites, Asian Pacific Americans, and Latinos at a two-year institution. According to the findings of Lanni's study, African Americans intended to receive a degree from a community college more than any other group. Yet, 80% of African Americans attended part-time, versus 58% of Latinos who attended full-time. Finally, 78% of all African Americans reported financial independence, whereas 75% of Latinos in the study reported financial dependence.

More complex studies across racial and ethnic groups have revealed differences in college behaviors and decisions based on less visible identities such as socioeconomic status, gender, and U.S. generation status. Akerhielm, Berger, Hooker, and Wise (1998) compared enrollment patterns of low, middle, and high income Latinos, African Americans, and Native American students. Across all groups, students in the bottom and middle-income groups, with high test scores, were more likely to be working and combining academics two years after graduating high school, or not attending any form of postsecondary education at all. Top test and top income students expected to only take academic classes, or not attend any form of postsecondary education. Bottom income students of any race were dispersed in postsecondary behaviors, with an even distribution of students intending to just work, attend some college, go for a two-year or bachelor's degree, or graduate degree. Students in middle and high-income brackets aspired to bachelor and graduate level education. Overall, Akerhielm et al. found that Native Americans, African Americans, and Latinos were least likely to attend any form of postsecondary education. But, when socioeconomic status and other factors were

controlled, there were no significant differences in postsecondary education attendance based on race.

In comparing Latinos, African Americans, and Whites in their influences in college predispositions, Hamrick and Stage (2000) found differences between Latinos and Latinas. The study tested a causal model of college predisposition, determining if mentoring, community activities, and other variables made an impact in college predispositions for minority and low-income students. Using a chi-square goodness of fit test, Latinos were the only group with a poor model fit. Goodness of fit was then established after researchers split the data between males and females, which was not the case for African Americans, Whites, and Asian Pacific Americans. The difference was that for Latinas, having one college-educated parent, parents' expectations, and grades had direct effects to predispositions to college. For Latinos, grades, parents' expectations, and community involvement only indirectly affected college predispositions. For all Latino and Latina participants, family income had an effect on college predispositions, and not level of parent education. These findings highlight the importance of looking within Latino populations. In the case of Hamrick and Stage's study, gender showed a complexity of contexts among Latinos.

One area worthy of note is generational status in the United States and college predispositions and behaviors. Both Akerhielm et al. (1998) and Kaufman, Chavez, and Lauen (1999) did not find any significant differences in college predispositions and enrollment patterns across Latino generational status in the United States. Kaufman et al. investigated differences between Asian Pacific Americans and Latinos in terms of educational outcomes across generational status. They found that Asian Pacific

Americans and Latinos did not differ expecting to earn a college degree. Further investigation revealed that first and second generation Asian Pacific American parents had obtained higher levels of education than first and second generation Latino parents.

Anticipated College Experience and Latino Students

Very little literature specifically explores the variation of Latino college students in Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services. Fuertes and Sedlacek (1990) conducted one of the few studies that explored the attitudes and expectations of the college experience of Latino students prior to beginning college. Latinos in the study indicated they attend college for very practical reasons, choosing to go to college based on geographic location and for future vocational and job opportunities. Only 22% of those surveyed indicated they chose to attend college for collegiate reasons such as learning through social interaction and involvement in extracurricular activities (Fuertes & Sedlacek). Over half of Latino students admitted that the college in which the study took place was their first choice. Despite these seemingly practical and determined goals, Fuertes and Sedlacek also found that only 26% of Latinos said they would not drop out of college, the rest finding it feasible or possible to drop out. Latino students seem to have very practical reasons for attending college, yet why do so many Latinos feel a need to drop out? Longerbeam, Sedlacek, and Alatorre (2004) found that Latinos anticipated that their reason to leave college would be financial. In addition, Longerbeam et al. observed that Latinos were significantly more likely to work, work longer hours, and stop-out due to financial reasons. When asked why they work, participants responded that it was to take care of family and personal obligations. And, Latinos said they worked primarily to send money home. Perna (2000b) found the

influence of finances in college decisions, where an increase in tuition at a two-year institution made it more likely for Latinos to enroll in a four-year institution instead. Perna also found that higher income, parental involvement, and taking an advanced level math class related to enrollment at a four-year institution. Ultimately, these considerations play a role in certain predispositions and choices such as a particular college due to geographic location, taking particular courses to improve job prospects, or dropping out. Financial concerns also complement the very practical choices and future expectations made by Latino college students. None of the above studies included gender as part of their analysis or research focus, providing a potential gap in viewing Latino student contexts complexly.

From the previous paragraph, the choices and expectations made by Latinos are reflective of the personal and social demands made on them by larger social forces (family, finances, and so forth.). For instance, working long hours might force Latinos to deviate from the traditional roles and expectations of traditional college students (going away to college, being a full-time student, and so on.). The concern lies in that students who do not fall into the traditional roles of the college experience (or attend college for the traditional reasons) go through barriers and struggles that are not addressed by institutions of higher education. Flores (1992) conducted a study exploring differences in the social and personal issues of Latinos who persisted through college and those who did not. She found that students who did not persist were affected more by social strains than persisters. Specifically, Flores found that students who did not persist had less family support, money, and proficiency in speaking and writing in Spanish. Non-persisters also had less integration of support and values through faculty, staff, and institutional

interaction. Finally, non-persisters spent less time in college dormitories, had more issues with adjustment, and tended to have more conflict between job and college. There were no significant differences in neighborhood type, high school grades, and institutional commitment. Therefore, Latino college students with fewer collegiate experiences, due to social strains, were non-persisters. Flores did not indicate students' reasons for leaving, so it cannot be determined if non-persisters left college out of choice or not. Even though Flores's study focused on persistence through a four-year span, with no attention to the educational aspirations of the participants, using a lens that considers a student's outlook of college experience can indicate how social factors are associated with different types of student journeys.

Finally, Lopez (1996) found that Latinos in high school who are enrolled in vocational programs tended to have lower social capital at home and at school. Similarly, studies by Fuentres and Sedlacek (1990) and Flores (1992), which profiled Latino students and the characteristics of non-persisters, found that different college experiences (persisters vs. non-persisters, vocational vs. collegiate) also carried different social value and privilege. Overall, Latinos seem to attend college for reasons that differ from a traditional collegiate framework. They also deal with social and cultural issues that shape their choices to be more vocational and practical. Even though these choices seem reasonable and logical, the different routes Latinos may take result in an increased struggle with persistence. Since little attention has been made to exploring the roads students travel to reach their educational goals, no explanations have been presented to answer if Latinos are choosing to leave, intend to complete their degrees, or are forced to

leave. The bottom line is that unique factors affect Latinos' college journeys and Anticipated College Experience.

Summary

Studies that looked at services and expectations using homogeneous samples provided lenses and methodologies that collect student anticipated experiences prior to beginning college. Such an approach allows practitioners to know changing student needs. Studies looking across groups give specific information about each racial/ethnic group, but have also revealed that differences such as gender or socioeconomic status may have a stronger effect on one racial/ethnic group than others. Studies across race that reveal unique characteristics of a particular group should challenge researchers to investigate within group differences.

The few studies on Latino students and Anticipated College Experience reveal that characteristics such as socioeconomic status, gender, and career aspirations can shape the decisions and choices students make during their college career. As noted by Fuertes and Sedlacek (1990), students are entering college for practical reasons, in addition to collegiate experiences, and carry an obligation to deal with aspects of their lives not found in the college campus. Family obligations, finances, and U.S. generational status are just a few less visible factors that influence how many times a student will stop-out, a student's overall length of time in college, and amount of coursework to handle. Very little literature considers a full range of predispositions, interaction with college functions and environments, and aspirations and goals that shape an overall outlook.

Most research limits itself by relying on paradigms such as a collegiate lens and race and ethnicity as valid means of identifying subgroups. But the issues are deeper, as

students who follow a different path tend to struggle staying in college. Considering these subtle, yet important, journeys in the design, marketing, and programming of college resources helps to create inclusive and effective services. The following section will look closely at how college services are perceived by students and practitioners, as a means of drawing a connection to the cultural and social chasms between Latino students and the spaces where their perceptions of the college environment are formed.

College Services

Studies looking at the overall expectations of college students' use of services can be an important window for colleges and universities to understand perceptions and needs of their student populations which have been formed prior to interacting with any college offices or services. As hypothesized earlier, these predispositions come about as a result of various social forces shaping a student's needs in college, so coupling the two frameworks of students' outlook with Anticipated Use of College Services may provide a student-centered approach to assessing student use of college functions. So far, the major issues addressed in the area of college services have been primarily focused on student satisfaction towards particular services and differences among various subpopulations in their perceptions and attitudes towards services. Literature that specifically explores Latinos and college services is framed under the more popular topics of underserved populations such as retention, persistence, adjustment, and sense of belonging. Studies that utilize large populations such as incoming freshmen or look at college students as a whole can possibly reveal campus-wide patterns. Yet, these general descriptions of college services have the tendency to mask the distinctions of various subpopulations that may exist on a college campus. In all, exploring Latino students and college services can

be a connection between the real experiences of Latino college students and the social contexts they come from.

Research on College Services Using Samples Not Analyzed by Race

In a study profiling expectations and attitudes of incoming freshmen before beginning courses, Quinonez and Sedlacek (1997) found that students wanted to participate in student activities, but felt that the college schedule would limit their involvement. About 80% of students in the study indicated an interest in seeking vocational or emotional counseling. Although such findings may give insight to how students will use college services, little is known about variations of college use by particular subgroups, or triggers that may or may not enable students to utilize college services. Fuertes, Sedlacek, Roger, and Mohr (2000) found a relationship between attitudes of diversity and open-mindedness to first-year experiences and uses of college services. In particular, they found that students who exhibited more open-mindedness to diverse experiences were more likely to seek vocational or emotional counseling services. Such a relationship may be attributed to an ability, or willingness, to work in systems where diverse perspectives or ideologies exist among staff and services. Or, it may relate to the level of comfort a person may have to new and different situations.

Villalpando (2004) draws a stronger connection between diversity and college services with his argument that colleges, and the services they provide, cannot be assessed properly if one does not consider the social forces, historical legacy, and subliminal racist systems that shape how services are delivered. Villalpando proposes the use of Critical Race Theory (CRT) and Latino Critical Theory (LatCrit) as ways of accomplishing this:

... CRT and LatCrit help us recognize patterns, practices, and policies of racial inequality that continue to exist in more insidious and covert ways. CRT and LatCrit can expose these insidious practices and help us dismantle them and remove their obstruction to the success of Latinos in higher education. (p. 42)

The primary argument is that colleges tend to maintain racist and discriminatory practices despite movements to become color-blind or not apply race as an issue. Doing so only makes racist practices more covert and powerful, through their subliminal nature.

Interactions with culturally insensitive faculty and staff, use of alumni legacy as a factor in admissions, and color-blind policies are cited as examples of continued racism (Villalpando). Villalpando goes on to explain that using LatCrit moves beyond seeing power and privilege only through a racial lens, which CRT utilizes, and takes into account gender, immigration, language, ethnicity, culture, and sexuality. Utilizing multiple frameworks reflects the true multidimensionality of Latinos and the complexity of systems of power and privilege (Villalpando). Therefore, when analyzing college policies and services, it is imperative to consider how these services are presented, marketed, and organized to different communities. Presenting college services as objective and free of racism would come under question with LatCrit.

Research on College Services Analyzed by Race

As the complexity of college populations increases, it is important to move beyond looking at students as a singular entity and take into account the variety of interests and perceptions of students in relation to the services a college provides. The majority of literature exploring college services use race to test for differences among subpopulations. Overall, students of color tend to be less satisfied with college, as

compared to Whites, but were more satisfied with diversity programs and initiatives (De Amas & McDavis, 1981; Sanders & Burton, 1996).

Sanders and Burton (1996) provided a useful design to explore satisfaction through the integration of a pre-college attitude survey, a satisfaction survey given during the spring semester of the freshmen year, and registration and academic performance data collected from the campus's Office of Institutional Research, to create models of retention that compared students who reenrolled in their sophomore year and those who did not. The data were also analyzed by race in order to test for differences by subgroup. Sanders and Burton did cite this approach as limited as there was an overrepresentation of the reenrolled group, but their model presented a new approach by focusing on students' perceptions of their educational experience and responses were analyzed by race.

According to Sanders and Burton, students of color felt a strong need for colleges and universities to have special programming that encompassed social, cultural, and academic issues. These special programs could take the form of diversity initiatives and cultural centers (Livingston & Stewart, 1987; Loo & Rolinson 1986). In addition, Mallinckrodt and Sedlacek (1987) found that students of color were satisfied with initiatives that addressed vocational or job-related skills to enhance marketability and discipline. Tutorial assistance, enhancing presentation skills, career planning, leadership skills, and student employment were among the many services that students of color felt were of great importance to their success.

Even as Livingston and Stewart (1987) and Loo and Rolinson (1986) found that students of color had optimistic views of cultural centers and interventions that addressed vocational skills, they also perceived that the overall placement of these services was at a

lower priority for colleges than other support services (Jones, Castellanos & Cole, 2002). Jones et al. conducted a qualitative research study of 35 African American, Latino, Asian Pacific American, and Native American students to identify minority student experiences in a predominantly White institution and their perspectives on the delivery of campus services. Participants felt cross-cultural centers were carrying too much responsibility to support students of color, as they perceived that academic offices and more general support offices rely on cultural centers to promote diversity for the entire campus. In addition, students of color felt that cultural-centers and diversity initiatives were marginalized, away from the scope and attention of the rest of campus. Finally, participants in Jones et al.'s study felt they were not provided resources that addressed culturally specific needs.

Research on College Services and Latinos

Researchers have identified how functions of a college, such as historical legacy, curriculum, and physical environment, play a strong role in the success of Latinos (Gonzalez, 1999). Yet, it is important to identify areas where students collect observations and perceptions of the college experience and where the holistic teachings of a college are communicated to students. These areas can be found in spaces where a student interacts with the college environment such as offices, staff and faculty, and programs.

Which services seem to have the biggest impact on Latino students? Involvement in student organizations has been identified as a space of support and persistence for Latinos (Velasquez, 1996). Resident advisors, juniors and seniors, and academic counselors play a strong role in Latino adjustment (Hurtado, Carter & Spuler, 1996),

showing the need to keep counselors and advisors savvy on issues affecting Latinos. Garcia (2001) provides one of the most in-depth studies that explored how college services and functional areas of a college affect Latino student success. Garcia surveyed over 200 Latino students and 50 staff, in addition to conducting 7 focus groups, from six public colleges and universities. Garcia's study identified financial aid, academic advising, summer programs, orientation programs, orientation classes, precollege coursework, supplemental instruction, learning centers, and diversity programs as the areas of a college campus that aided in the completion of the baccalaureate for Latino college students. These areas were then discussed in focus groups, where students were asked to talk about their perceptions and satisfaction with these areas. Across all services, the biggest issues pertained to allocation of more funding and having staff to better serve Latinos. A strong overall consensus from the focus groups was that programs and services, in order to be effective, "[must not be seen as] administrative add-ons but are part of a systemic effort to improve student outcomes. Thus effective programs are associated with campus wide consensus, collaboration, and commitment" (p. 43).

Garcia's (2001) study provided some unique information related to diversity programs. Garcia's study revealed that learning centers and summer bridge programs were services most praised by focus groups, while the least favorable were academic advising and orientation. Two services that received mixed support were diversity programs and financial aid. Seniors and transfers tended to see the advantage and need for diversity programs. Freshmen and Latinos for whom English was not their first language felt out of place in all situations. Diversity programs seemed to be a double-edged sword where Latinos felt they were pre-singled out due to being automatically

considered at-risk. Specifically, seniors and freshmen felt that the number of role models on the campus was too small. Staff of diversity-related offices felt that they were held accountable for things that other functional areas were supposed to do. Staff also talked about the struggle they had to be supportive of students of color students and to also fulfill majority values. Lastly, campus-wide data, such as graduation rates, were not analyzed by race. For financial aid, Latinos reported not being fully prepared to utilize financial aid, and therefore had to work to compensate, which ultimately removes time for studying. Staff in the study agreed that the financial aid office was being undermined. Latinos seem to have a dynamic perception of the role and impact of college services. Diversity programs and other initiatives are not seen as effective as one might assume. The biggest concern related to the influence and level of support of advisors and counselors, as they disseminate information and provided guidance to students.

Summary

The various perspectives on, and dimensions of, college services are a key area to seeing how theory, outcomes, and ideologies play out in the practical arena of a college campus. In studies that did not analyze samples by race, a surprising finding was a previously unseen connection between use of college services and diversity, which may allude to outlook, where a student's identity and background are factors in using college services. Studies across racial/ethnic groups revealed a preference for programming that was intentional in meeting the unique needs of populations, but also recognized the fallacies of diversity initiatives in predominantly White institutions. Studies that focused on Latinos echoed these concerns, but also revealed that Latinos preferred services that

allowed for interaction and direct connection with resident advisors, student organization involvement, and academic counselors.

How students interpret and use these college services is a manifestation of their outlook and a campus's values playing against each other. The research indicates a need to include larger social and cultural forces in the creation and carrying out of campus services. Participants in the previously cited studies recognized a negligence of their unique needs and the importance of diversity initiatives, yet they also recognized the marginalization of these diversity initiatives in mainstream campus discourse. This recognition should prompt practitioners to explore the mainstream services and how effectively they address the needs of underrepresented populations.

First-Generation College Students

Generational differences among college students show how acculturation to a college culture, familiarity with an environment, and understanding the tools of navigating organizational structures can affect the college experience. In an attempt to counter stereotypical views of Latinos as exclusively an immigrant population, for example, a review of literature exploring more invisible lines of difference was chosen. Unfortunately, very little literature was uncovered that examined college generational differences within particular populations.

Differences Between First and Continuing Generation College Students

Research has focused primarily on comparing the experiences, outcomes, and persistence between first-generation and continuing generation college students. Overall, there are significant differences in background characteristics such as being a person of color, grades in high school, SAT scores, family income, and having financial aid,

between first-generation college and continuing generation students (Sherlin, 2002). In a national study Munez and Cuccaro-Alamin (1998) found that first-generation college students are more likely to be non-White and female and have lower family incomes than continuing generation college students. Specifically, 23% of first-generation college students have family incomes in the lowest quartile, compared with 5% of continuing generation students. First-generation students are more likely to attend two-year institutions, be enrolled in certificate programs, and live off-campus. Financial aid is a big concern, where first-generation college students report that financial factors were a bigger concern and affected their college choice more than continuing generation students. Munez and Cuccaro-Alamin also reported that first-generation college students were less likely to be academically and socially integrated, to persist, and to finish their degree in five years. Duggan's (2001) research supports these findings, adding that first-generation college students are more likely to come from larger families, start college on a part-time basis, and delay their entry to college.

Comparisons of Persistence by College Generational Status

Another area of focus by researchers is the differences in persistence and attrition between first-generation and continuing generation students. Differences in persistence occur as early as the end of the first semester, where first-generation college students persisted less than those students with at least one parent with a degree or both parents with degrees (Ishitani, 2003). By the end of the first year, first-generation college students were 71% more at risk to depart than continuing generation students (Ishitani). Sherlin (2002) reported that the percentage of students not persisting into the fall of their second year was twice as many for first-generation students than continuing generation

students. Socioeconomic status and gender also played a role for first-generation college students, where students with family incomes of less than \$25,000 had a 49% higher chance to depart than those whose family income was \$45,000 or more (Sherlin). Sherlin's study found that being a female was a negative predictor of persistence into the second year of school, yet females achieved higher grades during their first year of school, which had a positive effect on persistence. Duggan (2001) found that first-generation college students with a delayed entry had a 58% persistence rate, compared to 78% of continuing generation students. After running a logical regression test, Duggan also found that being first-generation was a significant factor in persistence. Studies exploring persistence and retention with aspects of college generational status are important as they take into account background characteristics with the overall experiences of a student. Contextualizing patterns and behaviors within social and cultural backgrounds of a student is exactly the objective of exploring outlook.

Comparisons of Experiences and Perceptions by College Generational Status

Another major area researchers explore when comparing first-generation and continuing generation college students is their experiences and perceptions of college journey. These differences can be seen in pre-college and on-campus experiences. Hahs-Vaughn (2004) reported that the biggest differences between the two groups in college experiences occurred during the first two years in college. For continuing generation students, pre-college characteristics played a stronger influence on educational outcomes, whereas college experiences played a stronger influence for first-generation students. In addition, significant differences were found between first-generation and continuing generation in expected highest level of education, entrance exam score, nonacademic

experiences, and aspirations for education. The Educational Resources Institute (1997) found that first-generation college students did not enter the higher education pipeline the same way as continuing generation students, where only 14% of first-generation students fully completed the steps to prepare for college, had the same educational aspirations, or engaged in the same process to enter college (missing them altogether) as continuing generation students. First-generation and continuing generation students also differed in when they come to college, where first-generation college students were significantly more likely to delay enrollment than those whose parents had a bachelor's degree. Only 29% of first-generation college students enrolled after high school while 75% of those whose parents had a bachelor's degree enrolled after high school.

Studies have shown differences in experiences occur between first and continuing generation college students. Pascarella, Wolniak, Pierson, and Terenzini (2003) found that first-generation college students in community colleges worked more hours, took fewer credits, and completed fewer courses in natural science, arts/humanities, and math. They also had lower grades and were less likely to join Greek organizations. In addition, first-generation college students were more likely to take technical courses and use the computer less. First-generation college students were reported as having less openness to diversity as well. Duggan (2001) reported significant differences between first-generation and continuing generation college students in their perceptions of campus climate, satisfaction with college costs, intellectual development, and prestige of the institution. Similarly, Pike and Kuh (2005) found that first-generation college students reported being less socially and academically integrated, and held a less favorable view of the campus climate than continuing generation students. In addition, Pike and Kuh reported

that first-generation college students had lower educational expectations than continuing generation students. First-generation college students are reported to have lower perception of their academic skills, yet a stronger sense of self-discipline, than continuing generation students (Penrose, 2002). In addition, Penrose found that first-generation students felt college influenced their identity less than continuing generation students.

Pascarella, Wolniak, Pierson, and Terenzini (2003) also found significant differences in experiences between first and continuing generation college students even after controlling for various variables such as ethnicity, gender, and cognitive development. Specifically, they found that first-generation college students had fewer college credits and worked longer hours than continuing generation students by the second year in college. By the third year, first-generation students had lower grades than their counterparts. Pascarella et al. also explored interactions with college environments and found that involvement with extracurricular activities had a positive effect on critical thinking, degree plans, internal locus of attribution for academic success, and preference for higher order cognitive tasks for first-generation college students. For continuing generation students, extracurricular activities had a nonsignificant or small effect on these same variables. In addition, work responsibilities, volunteerism, and intercollegiate athletics had either a large negative impact or a small positive one for first-generation college students, with little or no significance for continuing generation students. Finally, the Educational Resource Institute [ERI] (1997) reported that only 44% of first-generation students attained a degree within five years, compared with 56% for those students whose parents had bachelor's degree.

Differences Within First-Generation College Students

Studies that look only at first-generation college students can give light to the diversity and characteristics often overlooked when comparing them to continuing generation students. In a national study, 36% of first-generation college students expected to get a bachelor's degree after high school, 39% expected to attend a trade school, and about 25% did not expect to pursue any other form of education after high school (ERI, 1997). Of the sample of first-generation college students, 65% were White, 14% Black, and 14% Latino. About half attended two-year institutions, and 25% attended public 4-year institutions (ERI). Forty-seven percent attended college full-time. Sixty-four percent lived off campus, and 26% lived with their parents. In addition, 65% of the participants reported being financially independent, yet 63% received financial aid (ERI).

S. Rodriguez (2003) conducted a qualitative study of first-generation college students of various races and ethnicities and found unique phenomena that come from particular social contexts. For instance, S. Rodriguez identified a concept known as "Special Status" (p. 19), where family members who had no formal education singled participants in the study as having positive attributes of risk-taking and strong confidence at an early age. "Positive Naming" (p. 20) is when a family member identified and develops skills that connected participants to a college career, as an antidote to stereotyping and racism. A third phenomenon, which S. Rodriguez named "ascending cross-class identification" (p. 20), is a function of someone from a lower socioeconomic status gaining practical skills to move to a higher status through exposure to members and culture of that socioeconomic status.

Sherlin (2002) conducted a study in which he found significant differences between students for whom one parent had some college experience and students for whom neither parent had been to college. Specifically, the study found that students for whom at least one parent attained a bachelor's degree were more likely to have taken college preparatory courses, had higher SAT scores and high school grades than students for whom neither parent attained a bachelor's degree. They were also less likely to think that living close to family was an important goal in comparison to students for whom neither parent attained a bachelor's degree. Sherlin's study was able to find differences among students for whom neither parent had attended college and students for whom either parent had some college experience. For instance, students for whom neither parent attended college achieved lower SAT scores, came from lower income levels, and were less likely to live on campus, than students whose parents had some college experience. These findings are important as it challenges previous research that has traditionally grouped both categories together as first-generation.

Sherlin also found differences within first-generation college students across race, socioeconomic status, and gender as well. For instance, African American and Latino students were more likely to be female than White students. Asian Pacific American students received higher percentages of grants in financial aid packages, and were more likely to attend selective institutions than Whites, Blacks, and Latinos. Sherlin reported that being female had a negative direct effect on persistence through the first year of school, but the indirect effect was positive, resulting in a small negative total effect. The study also found that socioeconomic factors brought about a diversity among first-

generation college students, as students who had less unmet financial need were less likely to persist to the second year of college than those who had their needs met.

Lohfink and Paulsen (2005) investigated determinants of persistence among first-generation college students and found that first-generation college Latinos were 34% less likely to persist from the first to second year than first-generation college Whites. Being male gave a 9% higher likelihood of persistence than being female. Being married made it 56% less likely to persist to the second year. A major item of interest for researchers has been the phenomenon of first-generation students living at home as a factor. Lohfink and Paulsen's study also reported that those who chose a college close to home were 18% more likely to persist to the second year.

Summary

Research indicates that first-generation college students carry a unique experience and context as compared with continuing generation college students. Unfortunately, this experience is signified by a struggle to persist in college, in comparison to continuing generation college students. And, within those who are first-generation, there are unique experiences based on more complex intersections such as race and parents having some college experience. Little is known about first-generation Latino college students, as most studies have focused on studies across race or parental educational levels. Exploring differences of more invisible divisions, such as socioeconomic status, could make common assumptions and generalizations about students of color spurious. To live on campus, for example, can be just as much a manifestation of first-generation values as it is of Latino cultural values. Unfortunately, studies exploring generational differences within Latino populations focused mostly on immigrant generational differences, as

opposed to college generational differences, thereby perpetuating Latino experiences as strictly an experience of immigration or foreigner.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to determine whether differences in Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services exist between first-generation and continuing generation college Latino students and between male and female Latino students.

Research Design

The design of this study was an ex post facto comparative design. There was no random assignment or pre or post-tests conducted. This was a comparative design exploring differences between Latino first-generation and continuing generation college students and between males and females. College generation status and gender were used as the independent variables. Students for whom neither parent holds a college degree and students for whom at least one parent holds a college degree provided the two categories of the independent variable. Items from the University New Student Census (UNSC) were grouped into two categories, “Anticipated College Experience” and “Anticipated Use of College Services.” Each of the items in these two categories were tested as dependent variables. “Anticipated College Experience” includes both long-term and day-to-day experiences.

Hypotheses

The hypotheses tested in the study are:

Hypothesis 1: There are no differences between first and continuing generation college, and between male and female Latino college students, in Anticipated College Experience.

Hypothesis 2: There are no differences between first and continuing generation college, and between male and female Latino college students, in Anticipated Use of College Services.

Context of the Study

The study took place at the University of Maryland, College Park (UMCP). UMCP is a public research university located outside of Washington, D.C., and near Baltimore. UMCP is the flagship campus of the University of Maryland System, and currently enrolls 25,000 undergraduate and 10,000 graduate students (Office of University Communications [OUC], 2007). Of the undergraduate student population, 32% are students of color, with 12% African American, 13% Asian Pacific American, 5.5% Latino, and 0.4% Native American (OUC). The University of Maryland, College Park, provides a sound location to conduct this study. The low percentage of Latinos at UMCP is amplified further by the large hypergrowth of Latinos in the Maryland, Virginia, and Washington, D.C., area (Cohn, 2002). In light of these demographic shifts, exploring the diversity of Latinidades is worth researching.

Sample

The population chosen was incoming first-year Latino and Latina students at the University of Maryland, College Park. Of this population, a sample of incoming first-year Latino students who completed the University of Maryland New Student Census (UNSC)

throughout summer 2004 orientation sessions was used in the study. The entire new first-time incoming class of 2004 consisted of 4,200 students. A total of 2,903 (69%) students were in-state. For race, 2,446 (56%) students identified as White, 517 (12%) as Black/African American, 563 (13%) as Asian U.S., 222 (5.300%) as U.S. Latino/Hispanic, 14 (.030%) as Native American, and 371 (8%) as Unknown. All these students are considered U.S. residents. For gender, 2,069 (49%) of the respondents identified as female. And, 4,179 (99.500%) were full-time (Office of Institutional Research and Planning [OIRP], 2007). Of all incoming first-year students who attended orientation sessions during the summer of 2004, 3,596 students completed the University New Student Census, comprising 85.620% of all incoming students. Seven percent ($N = 251$) of the respondents identified themselves as Latino/Hispanic.

For the purposes of this study, the nonprobability sampling technique of convenience sampling was used to sample Latino college students. Convenience sampling during Orientation was used for several reasons. First, surveying students at orientation allowed questions to be answered about experiences and anticipated use of day-to-day college environments and services prior to students gathering knowledge about navigating the system and student development interventions. Therefore, predispositions and expectations would have been formed before entering the day-to-day college environment. Another reason is that 90% of the entering class attends orientation, guaranteeing a strong return rate (W.E. Sedlacek, personal communication, December 2, 2005). The final reason is that the instrument, administered during orientation, provides valid items addressing Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services, the ability to group the population by generational

status, and the potential for longitudinal study. Table 1 shows descriptive characteristics of students who responded to the 2004 University New Student census.

Table 1
Background Characteristics of 2004 University New Student Census Respondents

Variable	<i>n</i>	%
Total number of first year first-time students	4,200	100
Number of students who responded to UNSC	3,596	85.62
Gender		
Female	1788	49.7
Male	1782	49.6
Race		
White	2354	65.5
Black, African American, or Negro	324	9
American Indian or Alaskan Native	3	.1
Asian Indian	160	4.4
Chinese/Taiwanese	159	4.4
Filipino	24	.7
Japanese	7	.2
Korean	101	2.8
Vietnamese	20	.6
Other Pacific Islander	3	.1
Other	199	5.5
Biracial/Multiracial	197	5.5
Ethnicity (Latino specific)		
Mexican/Mexican American/Chicano/a	22	.6
Puerto Rican	34	.9
Cuban	18	.5
Other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino/Latina	156	4.3
College Generational Status		
Neither parent holds postsecondary degree	366	10.2
At least one parent holds postsecondary degree	3230	89.8
Total Number of Latino Students	230	6.4
Latino College Generational Status		
Neither parent holds postsecondary degree	45	19.6
At least one parent holds postsecondary degree	185	80.4

Instrument

The instrument used for this study was the 2004 University New Student Census (UNSC). Used for the past 40 years, and administered online since 1998, the UNSC is a locally developed instrument that consists of 94 multiple choice, yes/no, and scaled items that identify student attitudes and perceptions of college expectations and preparation, orientation, life satisfaction, and alcohol-related attitudes. Specifically, the instrument measured the following topics: identity/demographics, work and finances, vocation/career plans, expectations of graduation, help-seeking, major, civic engagement, dining services eating choices, leadership, perceived environmental support, academic goal self-efficacy, normative perceptions of peer alcohol consumption behavior, personal attitudes towards drinking, alcohol use behavior, and additional social-psychological topics. Scaled items were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1= strongly agree, 3= neutral, and 5= strongly disagree); multiple-choice questions were also used in the instrument. Items from the demographics, college expectations and preparation, and help-seeking expectations topics were used for this study. Test-retest reliability for the scores in the UNSC was .83, which shows strong consistency of the instrument. Content validity was established by distributing a survey instrument to university offices asking if the items in the University New Student Census were valid and seen as important.

The University New Student Census was chosen because it is administered prior to students experiencing any day-to-day interventions, services, programs, or culture of the university. In addition, Snyder and Sedlacek (2005) were able to derive seven categories that identified various dimensions of Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services, which correspond with the dimensions cited in this

current study. The survey is administered during orientation sessions, which provides a strong return rate and representation of the majority of the entire first-year first time student population.

In order to select the appropriate items for this study, the researcher reviewed the UNSC and identified items that closely related to the definitions of Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services. Items from the UNSC that focused on long-term and semester-long expectations of educational aspirations, length of stay as an enrolled student, and adjustment to social and academic demands of college were included. For Anticipated Use of College Services, items that dealt with students interacting with any functional area and initiative produced, or housed, by the university were included. Four faculty members were selected to read the instrument and reviewed the items chosen by the researcher in order to establish validity for items of both categories. Faculty were selected based on their student affairs interests in order to provide a range of lenses and paradigms that surround the research topic including college services, campus culture, student success, research on identity-based populations, college aspirations, and familiarity with research on Latino college students. Items selected by two or more faculty members, but not selected by the researcher, were also included in the study. Initially, the researcher selected five items for Anticipated College Experience and four items for Anticipated Use of College Services. After the process, an additional four items were added to the Anticipated College Experience category and one item was added to the Anticipated Use of College Services category. Items from the UNSC related to Anticipated College Experience are shown in Table 2. Items selected to determine Anticipated Use of College Services are shown in Table 3.

Table 2

Items Selected for Anticipated College Experience Category

I do not expect to get a degree from the University of Maryland.

I am concerned about my ability to finance my college education.

I expect to have a hard time adjusting to the academic work of college.

Chances are good that I will drop out of school temporarily before I complete a bachelor's degree.

I expect to have a hard time adjusting to the social life in college.

I possess the necessary skills to attain my academic goals next semester.

I have the necessary knowledge to reach my academic goals next semester.

I have the ability to reach my academic goals next semester.

I have what it takes to reach my academic goals next semester.

Note. Items were measured using a five-point Likert Scale. 1 = Strongly agree, 5 = Strongly disagree.

Table 3

Items Selected for Anticipated Use of College Services Category

I would consider seeking study skills training while at the University of Maryland.

I would consider seeking counseling regarding career plans.

I would not consider seeking counseling for personal concerns.

I would consider seeking counseling for drugs/alcohol while at Maryland.

I intend to join a Greek-membership (fraternity or sorority) organization

Note. Items were measured using a five-point Likert Scale. 1 = Strongly agree, 5 = Strongly disagree.

Data Collection

Data from the University New Student Census (UNSC) were used to examine the research questions. The UNSC is a locally designed survey instrument administered to incoming first time first-year students during multi-day orientation sessions that took place during the summer of 2004. Participation in the survey is voluntary, and participants were told that the data collected would be used to help develop programs and services at UMCP. The UNSC is administered at the early part of the second day of orientation, using computer terminals. The UNSC is an appropriate instrument for this study as it is given to students prior to entering college environments.

Data Analysis

Two-way MANOVAs (multivariate analysis of variance) were used to analyze the nine dependent variables for Anticipated College Experience and the five dependent variables for Anticipated Use of College Services. College generational status and gender were chosen as the independent variables, each with two groups tested for differences: students for whom both parents held a high school diploma/GED or less, and students for whom at least one parent held an associate's degree, bachelor's degree, or technical certificate as categories for college generational status, and males and females for gender. Separate one-way MANOVA was conducted for each category of Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services.

MANOVA was chosen as this test reduces Type 1 error. Since the participants were drawn from a small population, and the focus of study has not been explored before, significance level was set at $p < .10$. At least 30 Latino students for each group were needed to conduct subgroup statistical tests. When significant main or interaction effects

were found, follow-up ANOVAs were also conducted to test for between-subjects effects.

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine if significant differences in Anticipated College Experience and use of college services existed between male and female Latino students and between Latino students for whom neither parent holds a college degree, and students for whom at least one parent holds an associate's degree, bachelor's degree, or technical certificate. Convenience sampling was used to ensure cell sizes for each subgroup were large enough for statistical analysis. The University of Maryland New Student Census was the instrument used for the study. The instrument was distributed during orientation sessions throughout the summer of 2005. The research design was an ex post facto comparative design. Two-way MAANOVA was the statistical analysis used to test for differences between subgroups. For significant main effects and interaction effects, follow-up ANOVAs were conducted to test for between-subjects effects. The following chapter provides the results of this study

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine whether differences in Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services exist between first-generation and continuing generation Latino college students, and between male and female Latino students. This chapter is organized in terms of the two hypotheses stated in Chapter III. For each hypothesis a MANOVA was conducted, where Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services were tested for differences by gender and college generational status. Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services are categories created for this study from items taken from the 2004 University New Student Census (UNSC). The UNSC is a 96-item, locally designed, instrument that asks questions relating to a wide range of variables. Items selected from the UNSC were chosen by the researcher and validated by four experts. The study tested the selected items of each category as dependent variables of the MANOVA. For each hypothesis, results of the MANOVA and its subsequent assumptions and between-subjects tests are presented. Since the participants are drawn from a small population, and the focus of the study has not been explored, significance level was set at $p < .10$. Results of univariate ANOVAs are presented for significant main effects.

Anticipated College Experience

The first hypothesis tested was whether there are differences in Anticipated College Experience between Latinos who are first-generation college students and those who are continuing generation college students and between males and females. Nine

items from the 2004 University New Student Census (UNSC) were chosen as dependent variables for this category. The null hypothesis stated that there will be no difference in college expectations between males and females, as well as between first-generation and continuing generation college Latino students. Using multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), responses to the nine items were tested for differences using college generational status and gender as the independent variables.

An important component of the MANOVA is to assess if criteria of assumptions are met. Therefore, Box's test of equality of covariance matrices (Box's M) and Levene's test of equality of error variances were conducted. Box's M test indicated that the observed covariance matrices in each of the dependent variables had been violated, $F(1.265) = .04, p < .05$. Levene's test also revealed that equality of error variance was not met on four of nine dependent variables, which are listed in Table 4. Despite violation of assumptions, results were utilized in the study as Weinfurt (1995) noted that violation of multivariate normality and homogeneity of covariance matrices has just a small effect on alpha level and statistical power. Results are still accepted in most research studies, as there is only a slight reduction of strength in results when assumptions are not met (Weinfurt).

Table 4

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variance for Anticipated College Experience

Item	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
I do not expect to get a degree from the University of Maryland.	3.149	.026*
I am concerned about my ability to finance my college education.	2.979	.033*
I expect to have a hard time adjusting to the academic work of college.	.121	.948
Chances are good that I will drop out of school temporarily before I complete a bachelor's degree.	5.49	.001*
I expect to have a hard time adjusting to the social life in college.	.731	.535
I possess the necessary skills to attain my academic goals next semester.	.631	.596
I have the necessary knowledge to reach my academic goals next semester.	1.166	.324
I have the ability to reach my academic goals next semester.	2.526	.059
I have what it takes to reach my academic goals next semester.	2.784	.042*

Note. * $p < .05$

Degrees of freedom (df1,df2) for each item was (3,207).

Results of the MANOVA showed there was not a significant difference in Anticipated College Experience between first and continuing generation college Latino students, Pillai's Trace = .04, $F(9,199) = .94$, $p > .10$. Additionally, no significant results were found in the interaction effect of college generational status and gender, Pillai's Trace = .05, $F(9,199) = 1.15$, $p > .10$. Significant results were found in regard to differences in Anticipated College Experience by gender, Pillai's Trace = .13, $F(9,199) = 3.54$, $p < .001$. The obtained power of the result was reported at .98.

Further analysis of tests of between-subjects effects for gender showed significant differences in five of the nine dependent variables. Of the five significantly different variables, females had a significantly lower mean score than males on the dependent variable, "I am concerned about my ability to finance my college education." Males had significantly lower mean scores on the dependent variables, "I do not expect to get a degree from the University of Maryland," "Chances are good that I will drop out of school temporarily before I complete a bachelor's degree," "I possess the necessary skills to attain my academic goals next semester," and "I have the necessary knowledge to reach my academic goals next semester." Having a lower mean score indicates a stronger agreement with the item. The last four dependent variables in the category, "I expect to have a hard time adjusting to the academic work of college," "I expect to have a hard time adjusting to the social life of college," "I have the ability to reach my academic goals next semester," and "I have what it takes to reach my academic goals next semester," were found to be non-significant. Summary of the results are presented in Table 5. The null hypothesis of no differences in Anticipated College Experiences by gender and college generational status was rejected.

Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for Anticipated College Experience by Gender

Item	Female		Male		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I do not expect to get a degree from the University of Maryland.	4.615	.088	4.373	.106	3.088	.080 [†]
I am concerned about my ability to finance my college education.	2.02	.134	2.717	.161	11.008	.001***
I expect to have a hard time adjusting to the academic work of college.	2.98	.112	2.915	.135	.139	.710
Chances are good that I will drop out of school temporarily before I complete a bachelor's degree.	4.716	.085	4.354	.102	7.411	.007*
I expect to have a hard time adjusting to the social life in college.	3.276	.106	3.447	.127	1.068	.303
I possess the necessary skills to attain my academic goals next semester.	1.798	.072	1.600	.086	3.144	.078 [†]
I have the necessary knowledge to reach my academic goals next semester.	2.04	.071	1.838	.085	3.364	.068 [†]
I have the ability to reach my academic goals next semester.	1.725	.067	1.633	.080	.783	.377
I have what it takes to reach my academic goals next semester.	1.816	.066	1.697	.079	1.340	.248

Note: [†] $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$
Degrees of freedom (df1,df2) for each ANOVA was (1,210).

Anticipated Use of College Services

The second hypothesis tested was whether there are differences between Latinos who are first-generation college students and those who are continuing generation college students, and between males and females in Anticipated Use of College Services. Five items from the University New Student Census (UNSC) inquired participants about their expected use of various services offered by the university. The null hypothesis stated that there will be no difference in college expectations between males and females, as well as between first-generation and continuing generation college Latino students.

In regards to meeting the assumptions of the MANOVA, Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices (Box's M) revealed that assumptions were met and equality of covariance matrices had not been violated, $F(1,265) = .38, p > .05$. Table 6 shows results from Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances, which revealed that equality had been met for each dependent variable.

Table 6

Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances for Anticipated Use of College Services

Item	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
I would consider seeking study skills training while at the University of Maryland.	1.400	.244
I would consider seeking counseling regarding career plans.	1.349	.260
I would not consider seeking counseling for personal concerns.	.462	.709
I would consider seeking counseling for drugs/alcohol while at Maryland.	.406	.749
I intend to join a Greek-membership (fraternity or sorority) organization.	1.313	.271

Note. Degrees of freedom (df1,df2) for each item was (3,207).

Results of the MANOVA for differences in Anticipated Use of College Services indicated a significant difference at the .10 level by gender, Wilks' $\lambda = .95$, $F(5,203) = 1.88$, $p = .098$, and at the .10 level by college generational status, Wilks' $\lambda = .94$, $F(5,203) = 2.21$, $p = .055$. The interaction effect of gender and college generational status was found to be non-significant, Wilks' $\lambda = .96$, $F(5,203) = 1.49$, $p > .10$. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected. The obtained power for gender and college generational status was reported at .63 and .71 respectively.

Further analysis of tests of between-subjects effects for gender showed females had lower mean scores for all three significantly different variables, "I would consider seeking counseling for career plans," "I would consider seeking counseling for drugs/alcohol while at Maryland," and "I intend to join a Greek membership (fraternity or sorority) organization." The final two dependent variables in the category, "I would

consider seeking study skills training while at the University of Maryland” and “I would consider seeking counseling for personal concerns,” were found not to be significant. Additionally, further analysis of tests of between-subjects effects for college generational status showed first-generation college students had lower mean scores for all three significantly different variables, “I would consider seeking study skills training while at the University of Maryland,” “I would consider seeking counseling for career plans,” and “I would consider seeking counseling for drugs/alcohol while at Maryland.” Having lower mean scores indicates a stronger agreement with the item. The final two variables in the category, “I would not consider seeking counseling for personal concerns,” and “I intend to join a Greek-membership (Fraternity or Sorority) organization,” were found to be non-significant (Tables 7 and 8).

Table 7

Means and Standard Deviations for Anticipated Use of College Services by College Generational Status

Item	First		Continuing		F	p
	M	SD	M	SD		
I would consider seeking study skills training while at the University of Maryland.	1.975	.139	2.342	.072	5.546	.020*
I would consider seeking counseling regarding career plans.	1.678	.116	1.932	.060	3.788	.053 [†]
I would not consider seeking counseling for personal concerns.	2.535	.147	2.715	.076	1.192	.276
I would consider seeking counseling for drugs/alcohol while at Maryland.	3.466	.156	3.831	.080	4.341	.038*
I intend to join a Greek-membership (fraternity or sorority) organization.	3.466	.173	3.501	.089	.033	.855

Note: [†] $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Degrees of freedom (df1,df2) for each ANOVA was (1,210).

Table 8

Means and Standard Deviations for Anticipated Use of College Services by Gender

Item	Female		Male		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
I would consider seeking study skills training while at the University of Maryland.	2.081	.098	2.236	.123	.972	.325
I would consider seeking counseling regarding career plans.	1.667	.081	1.943	.102	4.525	.035*
I would not consider seeking counseling for personal concerns.	2.547	.103	2.704	.129	.901	.344
I would consider seeking counseling for drugs/alcohol while at Maryland.	3.477	.109	3.819	.137	3.799	.053 [†]
I intend to join a Greek-membership (fraternity or sorority) organization.	3.319	.121	3.648	.152	2.877	.091 [†]

Note: [†] $p < .10$, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Degrees of freedom (df1,df2) for each ANOVA was (1,210).

Summary

This chapter provided results of tests of the two hypotheses investigated in this study. Null hypotheses for both Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services were rejected. For Anticipated College Experience, assumptions of Box's M were not met, yet Levene's Test indicated that five of the total nine variables met assumptions for the MANOVA. Significant differences were found in Anticipated College Experience by gender at the .10 level. Differences in Anticipated College Experience by college generational status and the interaction of gender and college generational status were not significant. Further analysis of tests of between-subjects

effects revealed significant differences by gender in five of the nine dependent variables. Specifically, females had a lower mean score than males on the item, “I am concerned about my ability to finance my college education.” Males had lower mean scores than females on the items, “I do not expect to get a degree from the University of Maryland,” “Chances are good I will drop out of school temporarily before I complete a bachelor’s degree,” “I possess the necessary skills to attain my academic goals next semester,” and “I have the necessary knowledge to reach my academic goals next semester.” Lower mean scores indicate a stronger agreement with the item.

The second MANOVA, which tested for significant differences in Anticipated Use of College Services, indicated that assumptions from Box’s M and Levene’s Test were met. Significant results were found in the main effects for college generational status and gender. Further analysis of tests of between-subjects effects revealed three significantly different variables by gender, “I would consider seeking counseling for career plans,” “I would consider seeking counseling for drugs/alcohol while at Maryland,” and “I intend to join a Greek membership (fraternity or sorority) organization, ” with females scoring having significantly lower mean scores than males. Three variables were also significantly different by college generational status, “I would consider seeking study skills training while at the University of Maryland,” “I would consider seeking counseling for career plans,” and “I would consider seeking counseling for drugs/alcohol while at Maryland, ” with first-generation college students having significantly lower mean scores. Lower mean scores indicate a stronger agreement with the item. Finally the interaction effect of gender and college generational status was found to be not significant.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to explore the possible heterogeneity of expectations Latino college students have prior to beginning college. Specifically, the study sought to find whether differences existed in expected college experience and expected use of college services by college generational status and gender. The null hypothesis stated that no differences were to be found among subgroups, whereas the alternative hypothesis stated differences would be found, which was based on prior literature (Duggan, 2001; Munez & Cuccaro-Alamin, 1998; Sherlin, 2002) that found first-generation college students would have different expectations from continuing generation college students in their Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services. The second hypothesis stated there would be no difference between Latina and Latino college students in their Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services, with an alternative hypothesis stating that Latina college students would differ from Latinos in expected college experience and use of college services (Hamrick & Stage, 2000; Sherlin, 2002). This chapter will interpret the findings reported in Chapter IV, review possible limitations, suggest implications for professional practice, and make recommendations for future research.

Interpretation of Research Findings

The MANOVA for the first category, Anticipated College Experience, revealed a significant difference only by gender, and not by college generational status or interaction of gender and college generational status. Follow-up univariate ANOVAs revealed five

significant differences out of the total nine dependent variables in the category. Specifically, females had a significantly lower mean score, which indicates a stronger agreement with the item, than males on the variable, “I am concerned about my ability to finance my college education,” whereas males had significantly lower mean scores than females for the variables, “I do not expect to get a degree from the University of Maryland,” “Chances are good that I will drop out of school temporarily before I complete a bachelor’s degree,” “I possess the necessary skills to attain my academic goals next semester,” and “I have the necessary knowledge to reach my academic goals next semester.” The following items, “I expect to have a hard time adjusting to the academic work of college,” “I expect to have a hard time adjusting to the social life of college,” “I have the ability to reach my academic goals next semester,” and “I have what it takes to reach my academic goals next semester,” were found to be non-significant in terms of gender.

The category for Anticipated College Experience explored students’ expectation of completing a degree, dropping out, expectation of social and academic adjustment, and self-perceived preparedness to reach short term and long-term goals. Assumptions, however, were not met for the MANOVA. Weinfurt (1995) noted that violation of multivariate normality and homogeneity of covariance matrices has just a small effect on alpha level and statistical power. Weinfurt argued that results are still accepted in most research studies, as there is only a slight reduction of strength in results when assumptions are not met.

Scaled items from the University New Student Census were measured using a five-point Likert scale (1= strongly agree, 3= neutral, and 5= strongly disagree). Overall,

significant mean score differences for the category showed that both genders disagreed with items asking if they expected to drop out temporarily or not complete a degree at the university, as scores fell between 4 and 5. Students also felt confident in possessing the right skill sets and knowledge to reach their academic goals, as scores for both genders fell around 2. Finally, both genders agreed they were concerned about their ability to finance their education, as their responses fell between 2 and 3.

Looking at the between-subjects effects tests shows that each significant mean score differed by less than one point. The widest difference of means was found in the item that asked about students' concern to finance their college education, where females ($M=2.02$) scored significantly lower than males ($M=2.71$), indicating a stronger concern to pay for college than males. Although mean scores ranged between 4.30 and 4.70, males had significantly lower scores than females in regards to not expecting to complete a degree as well as an expectation to drop out of school temporarily, indicating dropping out or not finishing school as a more probable expectation for males than females. The Anticipated College Experience category also featured items asking about students' confidence and efficacy in meeting their semester goals. On these questions, males had lower mean scores than females in regards to their expectation of having the skills, as well as possessing the knowledge to meet their academic goals next semester. The range of mean scores was from 1.60 to 2. These results can be seen as a juxtaposition to the previous items as males felt more confident than females about possessing the abilities to meet their goals, yet indicated a stronger expectation to not complete a degree and to drop out temporarily.

An interesting observation is that the Anticipated College Experience category also contained two other efficacy questions asking if students had the ability and “what it takes” to meet their academic goals for next semester, which were found not to be significant. It seems that significant differences were found in efficacy questions that pertained to skill sets, but there were no significant differences by gender and college generational status in efficacy questions related to ability and self-confidence. Finally, the remaining two items in the category found not to be significant inquired about students’ expected adjustment to the academic and social aspects of college life. Looking specifically at the non-significant items, there seems to be a shared sense of ambiguity between males and females in expecting to adjust to the social and academic demands of college as raw scores for both adjustment items fell around 3, meaning a neutral response. Yet, there also appears to be a shared sense of confidence between males and females in regards to having the ability and “what it takes” to reach their academic goals next semester as scores fell around 2, meaning an agreement with the items.

This study expanded previous research by providing stronger detail about demographic characteristics and heterogeneity of Latino subpopulations by exploring possible connections between subgroups and their anticipated use of various college services. The study enhanced the methodological design of Widdows and Hilton (1990), which only looked at an entire entering class’s expectations of various services. By studying differences in subgroups based on demographic characteristics, this study found males and females carried different anticipated college journeys by their significant differences in long-term college aspirations, such as their expectation to complete a degree or dropping out temporarily. This finding parallels Hoyt and Winn’s (2004)

research, as their study was able to identify patterns of college experience among particular subgroups, in particular, distinguishing demographic characteristics between drop-outs, stop-outs, and opt-outs.

From the sample, male and females' general concern to finance their education is consistent with previous research (Quinonez & Sedlacek, 1997; Longerbeam, Sedlacek, & Alatorre, 2004). This study's finding of women, a socially targeted group, carrying a stronger concern to finance their education is consistent with Hamrick and Stage's (2000) test of a casual model of student college predispositions, which found significant gender differences in college predispositions, where Latinas having one college educated parent, parents' expectations, and grades directly affected predispositions of going to college. Hamrick and Stage's finding differed for Latinos, where grades, parents' expectations, and community involvement only indirectly affected college predispositions. The difference that Latinas had social factors directly affecting their predispositions, and Latinos just indirectly, suggests women are susceptible to social pressures. These findings also complement Flores's (1992) study, which showed students who did not persist were affected by social strains and did not follow collegiate cultural norms.

Although this study did not specifically look at retention, the findings do provide some context to previous studies about Latino persistence. For instance, males expected to drop out and not complete a degree more so than women, yet Lohfink and Paulsen (2005) found that being male provided a 9% likelihood of persisting more so than females. This study found that women had lower expectations to drop out and not complete a degree than males, which is different from Sherlin's (2002) finding that the

interaction of being female and first-generation college student was a negative predictor of persistence.

In sum, the significance and non-significance of the dependent variables in the Anticipated College Experience category reveal clear patterns. Non-significant differences occurred in items that dealt with students' expectations of adjustment and self-efficacy, possibly pointing towards a shared experience regardless of gender or college generational status. A unique juxtaposition is seen in males as they expected to have the skill sets to accomplish their goals more than women, but they also expected to drop out and not complete a degree more so than women. Looking at these two aspects merits attention as confidence in one's skill sets is seen through a shorter semester to semester timeframe, but expecting to drop out or get a degree are long-term expectations. Or, dropping out or not completing a degree may in fact be part of a person's expected college experience. Women, on the other hand, had more concern over financing their education, yet carried stronger expectations to complete a degree and not drop out than males. These patterns may be reflective of larger social constructs where phenomena such as the oppression of females come into play. Opportunities and privileges may not be equally dispersed across males and females which could affect confidence, financial need, or expectation to drop/stop-out. For instance, male privilege may provide a wider range of opportunities to meet personal goals not provided to females. Yet, considering the complexity of Latinidades, there may be an intersecting immigrant status or amount of social and cultural capital that could shape personal goals in a non-traditional manner not considered in current frameworks of higher education journeys.

In the second category of Anticipated Use of College Services, the overall MANOVA found significant differences by gender and by college generational status, but not the interaction of gender and college generational status. Follow-up univariate ANOVAs revealed that first-generation college students had lower mean scores than continuing generation students for all three significantly different variables, “I would consider seeking study skills training while at the University of Maryland,” “I would consider seeking counseling for career plans,” and “I would consider seeking counseling for drugs/alcohol while at Maryland.” The remaining two variables in the category, “I would not consider seeking counseling for personal concerns,” and “I intend to join a Greek-membership (fraternity or sorority) organization,” were found not to be significant in terms of college generational status. In addition, females had lower mean scores for all three significantly different variables, “I would consider seeking counseling for career plans,” “I would consider seeking counseling for drugs/alcohol while at Maryland,” and “I intend to join a Greek membership (fraternity or sorority) organization.” Having lower mean scores indicates that females and first-generation college students agreed more strongly with each item. The remaining two dependent variables in the category, “I would consider seeking study skills training while at the University of Maryland” and “I would consider seeking counseling for personal concerns,” were found to be non-significant in terms of gender. Among the many measures encompassed by the UNSC, the instrument investigates students’ expectations of utilizing campus services to address personal, vocational, and academic needs, as well as student involvement. This study focused on items exploring students’ likelihood of utilizing college services.

The UNSC attributes lower scores to a stronger agreement with the item. A score of 3 indicates a neutral response. Looking at the mean scores reveals that both males and females agreed that they would seek counseling for career planning, as both scores fell around 2. For both genders, there was ambiguity in their expectations to seek counseling for drugs/alcohol and membership in a Greek organization, as scores fell a little bit above and below 3. In regards to college generational status, scores for first and continuing generation students also fell around 3. Mean scores differed in regards to the item of expecting to seek counseling for drug and alcohol use, with first-generation college students scoring 3.44 and continuing generation college students scoring 3.83. Additionally, first and continuing college generation students overall agreed they would seek counseling for study skills training and career plans, with scores around 2.

Upon a closer look at significant mean score differences between first and continuing college generation, all three significant variables show that first-generation college students had a stronger expectation to seek study skills training and counseling for career and drugs/alcohol than continuing generation college students. No significant differences were found between first and continuing generation college students in their expectation of seeking counseling for personal concerns, or to join a Greek membership organization. An interesting observation is that both first and continuing generation college students agreed they would consider seeking study skills training and career counseling, yet their mean scores show that both groups disagreed with seeking counseling for drugs/alcohol, as both means were around 3.50 to 3.80. Although no difference in any set of mean scores exceeded more than .37 of a point, the frequency of first-generation college students exhibiting a stronger expectation to utilize college

services is worth noting. These questions posed at the time of orientation provide a clear window to see how students assess their own personal needs for reaching their collegiate goals. Study skills and career counseling point towards the study by Fuertes and Sedlacek (1990), which showed Latino students enter with more vocational and career minded outlooks than other populations. Although this study cannot point to what components of college generational status may have a role in students' expectation of their use of college services, a pattern of expectations seems to have arisen for each subgroup.

Gender brought about a parallel pattern in which females' mean scores indicated a stronger agreement with utilizing college services more than males for all three significant dependent variables. Females seemed to have a stronger expectation to seek counseling for career plans as well as drugs/alcohol, and to join a Greek membership organization. Non-significant differences were found in items asking about seeking study skills training and seeking counseling for personal problems. Both college generational status and gender shared similar mean scores for both items asking about seeking counseling for career plans and drugs/alcohol. Similarly, both independent variables showed no significant differences in seeking counseling for personal problems.

These findings are similar to previous studies where students were found to be favorable toward certain college functional areas and not favorable towards others (De Amas & McDavis, 1981; Sanders & Burton, 1996). For example, first-generation college students' and females' stronger expectation to use college resources, and in particular their desire to seek study skills training and career counseling, parallels Mallinckrodt and Sedlacek's (1987) research in which they found that students of color were satisfied with initiatives that addressed vocational and job-related skills such as tutorial assistance and

presentation skills. Also from the study, respondents were neutral and even disagreed with the expectation to join a Greek organization which is consistent with Terenzini, Springer, Yaeger, Pascarella, and Nora (1986), who found that first-generation college students underutilized involvement with co-curricular activities because of their primary concern with taking classes and getting their degrees. This study's finding also differed from previous research that found student organization involvement as a positive impact for Latino students (Velasquez, 1996).

The study attempted to explore heterogeneity of Latinos in their Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services. Significant differences between males and females were found along both categories, whereas significant differences between first and continuing generation college students were found only for Anticipated Use of College Services. An observation drawn from results of this study can be that identities that are more socially and culturally targeted in this study, females and first-generation college students, tended to exhibit a stronger intention to utilize college services. This suggests an interesting paradox, as students who have been affected by social and cultural biases tend to seek out engaging with functions of the college campus more than dominant groups. Also, recognizing the heterogeneity of Latino populations merits stronger attention and further exploration. The findings allude to how subpopulations within a Latino context differ in views and expectations at the time students are about to begin classes and enter day-to-day college environments.

Limitations

There are limitations in this study that should be considered. As this study used an ex post facto research design, there were possible gaps between the research questions

and collection of data that could create threats to validity. An additional threat to validity could stem from the sample not being randomly selected.

Due to the constraints in sample size, items selected, and lack of prior research, the concept of Outlook could not be addressed directly in this study. Outlook, as stated in Chapter I, intends to provide a view of behaviors, interactions, and expectations of a student's college journey, as a function of one's demographic, social, cultural, and identity. The intent of Outlook is to remove biases that are embedded in the assessment, interaction, and theories that guide practitioners and administrators in their interventions, thereby providing services that are congruent and empathic to a student's unique context. A significant gap in the literature in developing a concept of Outlook is that most literature looks at student populations homogeneously. Studies not analyzed by race do not allow researchers to see if voices and experiences of students are overpopulated by a particular subgroup, or not present altogether, which can make generalized suggestions or strategies inapplicable to particular subgroups. Studies that compare across race neglect the distinct characteristics, history, and legacy of socially different populations. The current framework of studies looking across race can provide a false connotation that experiences of a particular group are comparable to others, yet these studies conceptualize race as an equal lens for all groups. Finally, studies exploring solely Latino populations also tend to homogenize populations, as many depict Latinidad as an "equalizer" without to how gender, immigration status, geographic location, ethnicity, and race may vary the experiences of Latinos.

The instrument was given during the second day of orientation, which was chosen as it is the one of the earliest opportunities to collect information and the number of

students who attended provided a high response rate. The concern is that students are in a strong transition/socialization process at the time of the survey. Students had one day of orientation to be exposed to collegiate and UMCP specific cultural characteristics. Experiencing a traditional college environment such as orientation could influence student expectations. Additionally, students completed the instrument in a computer room with fellow first-year students and their orientation advisors. Information could be exchanged among participants and with orientation advisors that could influence responses to questions. Also, focusing on students who went to orientation most likely includes only students who have knowledge and understanding of why one should attend orientation and those who are able to attend orientation. Students who are transfers, started courses in summer, registered for summer classes, athletes, and other non-traditional students who entered the university without attending orientation, may not be included in the sample (W.E. Sedlacek, personal communication, December 2, 2005). An underlying theme in this consideration is the role of socioeconomic status as the affordability of orientation can possibly omit some students from the study. As students who struggle with barriers related to socioeconomic status also provide a unique and important set of college journeys, their inclusion unfortunately may not have been present to enrich the study. This very phenomenon of neglecting the voices of students who do not follow traditional paths through college, but are vital in the overall understanding of the diversity of college students, is what this study's concept of Outlook addresses. As stated in Chapter I, Outlook takes on a social/cultural lens to see students' anticipated experiences through their context, which considers their social, economic, and cultural status as factors in shaping their expectations. This is an especially important limitation

as the concept of Outlook is expansive and considers students of various educational and social journeys.

Social filters in admissions processes, biases in qualifications, and other factors may affect the outlook of Latino college students (Hurtado, 1994b). Latino college students struggle with many social issues and conditions that put them at a large disadvantage compared with students from dominant populations (Castellanos & Jones, 2003). Issues of socioeconomic status, cultural clashes, and so forth can have a stronger effect on Latinos who are seen as eligible, and have been admitted, to college (Gonzalez, 2002). So, a funnel effect may occur that limits the range of Latino contexts that enter college due to social/cultural biases embedded in higher education and admissions processes (Hurtado, 1994b; Villalpando, 2004). A strong example of the filtering process is seen in the data that more than half of Latino high school graduates attend community colleges, and that only a small percentage attends universities (in particular highly selective schools) (Castellanos & Jones, 2003; Llagas, 2003).

In the case of an ex post facto research design, there were several limitations in the instrument used. One strong advantage the University New Student Census has is the ability for Latinos to also select a race as well as ethnicity, yet ethnicity was limited to only three identified groups and one “other.” What is interesting is that the demographic makeup of the Mid-Atlantic region is different from other geographic locations as it contains various Latino groups that comprise nationalities, contexts, and histories not found in other parts of the country where dominant Latino subpopulations reside (Suro, 2002). So, within the UNSC, many populations with their different histories, journeys and relationships to the United States are homogenized to one group, which could affect

the ability to make connections to the heterogeneity of Latinidad and outlook. The instrument also limited the number of functional areas students could consider in developing their Anticipated Use of College Services. A specific item, “I would consider seeking counseling for drugs/alcohol while at Maryland,” provides a gap where students who may not drink or do drugs are asked to respond an item that may seem inapplicable. The format of the item does not allow such data to be disaggregated. A related consideration is the potential social and cultural bias in how questions were presented to respondents and its affect on students from non-dominant populations. Specifically, items that are prefaced with “I would consider...” or “I expect to...” may obligate students to consider aspects of their college journey in ways not realized, potentially making a respondent feel ignorant or marginalized for not thinking in terms presented in the instrument. A student’s level of connectivity to these items may be interpreted as being unappreciative of the college services, if the student had no intention to interact with college in the suggested fashions.

The instrument was locally designed, which may affect the generalizability to a larger Latino context. Yet, the ethnicities, social setting, and interests of Latino students in the study are congruent with the definition of Latinidad being a multiplicity of intersections (J.M. Rodriguez, 2003; Validova, 2005).

Due to sample size, this study was not able to fully explore the complexities of college generational status, as found by Sherlin (2002). An attempt was made to create three subgroups of college generational status that included students for whom neither parent had completed high school/GED, a second category of students where one parent had only a high school diploma/GED, and a third category of students for whom at least

one parent held a bachelor's degree, but was not accomplished due to the low number of participants per group. Also, items in the UNSC for each category have never been combined before to assess Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services; therefore, questions can be raised about the cohesiveness of the items in each category and the relationship of one category to another.

As stated in Chapter I, *Latinidad* brings attention to the social, historical, and personal conflicts that take place for Latinos. A practical manifestation of *Latinidad* can be found in the immigrant experience where social conflicts may occur. For instance, one possible phenomenon for immigrant communities is not recognizing their levels of education obtained in their native country and the subsequent social misplacement of Latinos in the United States. Educational systems vary greatly from one country to the next, so the curriculum received in Latin America at one particular grade level can be offered earlier or later in United States education systems. Also, many occupations and schools in the United States do not recognize degrees, diplomas, or certificates obtained in Latin America. Therefore, many highly educated Latinos come to the United States and are placed in jobs and occupations that do not match their level of education. This phenomenon is important to consider when classifying first or continuing generation college students in survey instruments. As a result, there may be a presence of students who transgress or shift in class and could possibly carry collegiate or vocational paradigms with them. A final delimitation comes in admissions criteria that can funnel particular types of Latino students who may be more acculturated to the college culture (Ferdman & Gallegos, 2001). Therefore, a population of students sampled in only one

college is not just a reflection of the geographic area and the Latinos in it, but a reflection of standards, filters and biases in a college or university's admissions process.

Implications for Professional Practice

The purpose of this study was to explore the possible heterogeneity of expectations Latino college students have prior to beginning college. Specifically, the study sought to find whether differences existed in expected college experience and expected use of college services by college generational status and gender. This study is particularly significant as it found differences between Latinos and Latinas as well as first and continuing generation college students. Additionally, the study attempted to establish connections between demographic background variables and anticipated experiences and uses of college services, thereby connecting complex views of Latino identity with practical use of services. Another unique aspect of this study is it considered stopping and dropping out, through the inclusions of items asking students' expectations of dropping out or not completing a degree, as a college path that is part of a larger framework of Anticipated College Experience. Including these journeys to the larger framework breaks stigmas of students who expect to drop out or not complete a degree as not being considered worthy of study. This student-centered approach is considerate of personal perceptions and socialization, and attempts to not impose social or cultural biases of higher education onto research.

Overall, this study was able to find out that Latino college students, prior to beginning college, can carry differing expectations of the college experience and use of university services. Finding significant differences by gender and college generational status sheds light that subgroups within the Latino context are salient for researchers,

practitioners, and administrators to consider in practice. In addition, college functional areas are being challenged to complicate services and approaches, where students have traditionally been categorized only by race or other singular view of a student experience. A view of the results also shows that the two socially targeted populations, females and first-generation college students, indicated a stronger expectation to utilize college services, as identified on the UNSC, than the dominant groups, males and continuing generation college students. These results should prompt practitioners who work in functional areas that interact directly with student populations, such as academic and student organization advising, financial aid, and counseling, to be mindful of the importance of providing empathic and socially congruent services and resources to populations whose targeted identities may not be immediately visible. The likelihood that targeted groups may be more interested in utilizing functional areas than students who identify in more dominant groups, such as males or continuing generation college students, is extremely important to be aware of, as perceptions of campus climate are created through interactions between students and their peers, faculty, and college environments.

Several specific results provide insight and direction for student affairs practitioners. Significant differences were found between males and females in their expectation to get a degree, ability to finance their education, expectation of dropping out temporarily, and possessing the skills as well as knowledge to attain academic goals for the semester. Even so, as differences in the means did not exceed .69 of a point, males and females generally disagreed on their expectation to drop out temporarily and expectation to complete their degree. Both males and females also exhibited a sense of

possessing the skill sets and knowledge to meet their academic goals, yet both groups had a strong concern about their ability to finance their education. A gap may exist where there are motivated students with strong self-confidence, yet they carry a concern that may affect their likelihood of staying in school. The overall closeness of the mean scores in significantly different dependent variables should indicate to researchers and practitioners a possible collective set of expectations to consider along with specific differences between subgroups.

Additionally, males and females in the study had significant differences in their concern over their ability to finance their education, but both generally had a shared concern, as mean scores were 2.02 and 2.71 respectively. Practitioners should take into consideration the role of finances, and other practical considerations for that matter, in how students could engage with services and shaping their experience in school. Students' concern over finances should prompt administrators to look further into socioeconomic status of Latinos as a factor in students accomplishing their academic goals.

Analyses revealed that females were more concerned about financing college than males but expected to drop out or stop out less than males. On the other hand, males felt stronger than females in expecting to stop out and not complete their degree even though males expressed a stronger sense than females of having the skills and knowledge to complete their academic goals their first semester. Looking at these results should prompt researchers to investigate the social and cultural context of each gender in relation to career, vocation, and economic opportunity. As personal expectations are not visible, strong attention should be paid to the personal journeys of Latino males and females as

there seems to be a possibility of being misled by students' confidence in being able to complete goals and following collegiate cultural norms, which may hide less visible characteristics such as financial need and expectations to stop or drop out. Practitioners should make an effort to have personal dialogue with students to break through and find out how these less visible features are affecting the day-to-day and long-term experiences of Latino college students.

Using personal dialogue and analytical skills to address the complex and multi-layered concerns males and females have with efficacy, financial concern, and expected level of educational attainment can be applied to a hypothetical example such as counseling a first-generation college Latina student in a financial aid office. Financial aid counselors should not only address logistical needs of the student but their social context, Latinidad, and intersections of identity, in order to provide congruent interventions and strategies. By coupling the dialogue with logistical needs, a counselor can identify the salient issues and provide interventions that fit within a student's Outlook. It is through dialogue, strong understanding of salient intersections of identity, and removal of oppressive bias that suggestions can be made that are equitable and free of stereotypes.

Results showed a degree of ambiguity by Latinos in regards to their expectation to adjusting to the academic and social aspects of college life, as most answers for all identities fell between 3.27 and 3.44. Although between-subjects tests showed no significance, the means falling around 3 deserve some attention. Practitioners should view Latinos' uncertainty as a cue to ensure environments, functional areas, and interactions with staff are positive and empathic to students' context.

Both first and continuing generation college students, and males and females, shared similar expectations in regards to help seeking behaviors. Results indicated that Latino college students would consider seeking counseling for career plans and study skills training. Again, a closer look at the independent variables reveals that both first-generation and female students exhibited a stronger expectation to seeking help. Practitioners should consider implementing programs and services that focus on strategizing career choices, opportunities to develop study skills, time management, coping with stress, and social balance. Results also revealed Latino college students are not very certain about, and almost disagreeing with seeking counseling for drugs and alcohol, with scores for both college generational status and gender falling around 3.5. Practitioners might want to consider not only promoting culturally competent outreach for Latino college students, but also initiating peer-to-peer programs on issues of drugs and alcohol, as well as encouraging non-counseling focused functional areas to address issues of drugs and alcohol. As Latino college students continue to have negative experiences with college environments and struggle with navigating systems (Gonzalez, 1999; Hurtado, 1994b), empowering functional areas and spaces not normally associated with counseling centers, but where Latino students meet, can provide significant outreach.

Finally, the overall landscape of Latinos and their Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services carries a unique phenomenon. At first glance, males and females, as well as first and continuing generation college students, carry similar expectations. Yet, a closer look reveals significant differences with patterns that follow along social constructs. The stronger expectation of targeted populations to utilize

college services, along with the unique phenomenon of males and females having invisible concerns that are hidden under socially constructed generalizations (i.e., dominant males having greater confidence but expecting to drop out more than females, and females having more concern with finances but expecting to stop or drop out less than males), should prompt administrators to work harder to deal with these concerns early in a student's experience. Tracking and assessment instruments can be modified, or created, to gather more specific information and detail, as this study only identified expectations before students began their first semester. Further, the complication of tracking and assessment instruments can address the overall anticipated patterns of various populations. As this study also revealed, students carry different expectations across different college services, as noted in the findings that showed students expecting to seek out study skills training and career planning assistance, and yet less likely to seek counseling for drugs and alcohol or joining a Greek organization. Administrators should take a look at assessment at the individual functional area, and compare with other functions across campus, revealing a clearer picture of the needs and expectations of Latino college students.

The study was able to look at a seemingly homogeneous population and found differences in expectations among subpopulations (college generational status and gender). Implications of these findings can be somewhat complicated as practitioners are asked to consider macro issues that affect Latinos simultaneously with significant differences within subgroups. Recommendations and implications related to the findings of this study are the following:

1. Complicate demographic data collected in assessment tools to be reflective of the unique range of Latinidades.
2. Apply interventions and strategies that are congruent with heterogeneous Latino subpopulations in “mainstream” services such as the career center or financial aid office, and spaces such as student unions or libraries.
3. Use social and cultural lenses when in dialogue with students. Being aware of these constructs allows practitioners to connect issues related to multiple identities, social oppression, and cultural norms, to the personal experiences and concerns of a student. Empathetic and congruent interventions can be made that take account for the complexity of Latino college students.

Suggestions for Future Research

Identifying students’ expectations of their overall college experience and their potential use of college services can benefit future research. This study explored if Latino male and female as well as first and continuing generation college students differed significantly in their Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services. The study intended to identify multiple expected college journeys among Latino contexts. Complicating how educators understand Latino college students can prompt researchers, administrators, and practitioners to prepare a variety of lenses and tools to address Latinos’ dynamic viewpoints and needs.

Broadening ways data are collected can expand the range of Latino contexts considered in the study. One suggestion is to collect data from multiple college settings

and geographic locations. For instance, conducting a study with students from community colleges can be more inclusive of additional college journeys. Future studies can also include any number of additional independent variables such as socioeconomic, in state/out of state, or on-campus/off-campus statuses. An additional modification is to utilize non-cognitive variables in student assessment. Sedlacek (2004) noted that utilizing non-cognitive variables such as “positive self-concept “ and “realistic self appraisal” supports assessing expectations and Outlook of a student, as non-cognitive variables factor a student’s confidence and determination to meet academic goals with the anticipation of having to cope and overcome socially oppressive obstacles throughout one’s college journey. Not including a student’s assessment of his or her abilities to deal with oppressive systems can limit a researcher’s ability to understand how Anticipated College Experience and Anticipated Use of College Services are developed. Sedlacek argued that studies could also collect data from transfers and other non-traditional points of entry. Another method to expand how data are collected is by including additional Latino contexts, which follows Torres’ (2004) reporting of the varying histories and contexts of Latino populations in the United States. For instance, as more research is conducted in the mid-Atlantic context, subpopulations other than Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Mexican-American/Chicano will be studied that reflect the ethnic and national diversity of this particular region.

A unique question is how researchers and practitioners should negotiate and deal with the finding that students have different expectations that may not follow traditional collegiate cultural norms and journeys, such as temporarily stopping out or expecting to not complete a college degree. Researchers should look beyond traditional notions of

college aspirations and entrance to higher education and be inclusive of existing, but less traditional, college journeys. For example, strong attention should be paid towards stop-outs, dropouts, and opt-outs, through exit interviews and survey instruments. In addition, studies should be conducted for students starting college in the summer, athletes, and transfers, as their stories may carry more significance than previously considered.

Another suggestion for future studies is to expand the range of college experiences and college services explored. By using the University New Student Census, the selection of items for each category and the non-inclusion of potential items were partially shaped before the study was created. So, including existing items and creating new items that focus on the two categories should be considered. For instance, the category of Anticipated Use of College Services could benefit from asking students their expectations of becoming involved in other forms of student organizations besides Greek organizations, such as identity, interest-based, advocacy oriented, or socially based student groups. Future research should consider asking questions beyond counseling, and including items that explore students' expected use of other college services such as tutoring programs, multicultural affairs offices, resource centers, campus activities, academic support offices, and financial aid. For the category of Anticipated College Experience, including items that ask about students' expected residency, reasons for determining a major, and work status would provide a more dynamic view of Latino college students.

Considering other sources of information acquired by students to navigate and shape their college experience, in addition to parents' levels of educational attainment, may provide a more realistic and comprehensive illustration of Anticipated College

Experience. Studies focusing on first-generational college students do not identify potential sources of college knowledge outside of parents' level of educational attainment (Lohfink & Paulsen, 2005; Sherlin 2002). Yet S. Rodriguez (2003) and Hurtado, Carter, and Spuler (1996) found peers and exposure to collegiate culture can provide opportunities for students to adjust to and navigate college systems. One suggestion is to create items and instruments that explore "college knowledge" as a possible factor in the development of students' expectations of their college experience. For example, items that would have benefited this current study would ask students if they have siblings currently attending an institution of higher education, or inquiring where students have received formal or informal information about college. The National Education Longitudinal Study (NELS) provides a template in assessing college knowledge.

Lastly, several prompts can be provided to help develop the concept of Outlook to be more useful in future research. A first approach would be to create measures in instruments that are grounded in identity specific constructs. For instance, the University New Student Census should contain measures that are reflective of the demographic, social, and ethnic characteristics of Latinos in the Mid-Atlantic region. The inclusion of ethnicities such as "Salvadoran" or "Honduran" in the University New Student Census would be more congruent with the demographic makeup of the area. It is also recommended that the University New Student Census include questions related to language status where students are asked if they are English or Spanish dominant in language, are bilingual, or use code-switching/Spanglish as a function of segmented acculturation that is grounded in *Lainidad*. Data sources such as the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP)

provide comprehensive data sets for researchers to disaggregate data in complex ways. These national data sets should adapt identity-grounded measures that focus on intersections and social factors unique to that subgroup, in order to acquire information that is pertinent to the wide range of Latinidades found across the country. A second approach is to remove the racial and collegiate biases embedded within assessment of students by taking a student-centered approach. For example, conducting studies that are inclusive of college aspirations beyond the norm of a four-year completion timeframe for a bachelor's degree exhibits an understanding that a student's chosen college aspiration may differ in length of time or desired educational level. A third approach is to create comprehensive "maps" of student journeys that infuse coursework, outside classroom activities, and use of college services coupled with identity-grounded demographic information. These maps, which may include a student's time in school, work status, residency, and so forth, may reveal patterns and usages of college that are unique to subgroups.

Appendix A

University New Student Census 2004

1. Sometimes I refuse to believe a problem will happen, and things manage to work themselves out.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

2. I possess the necessary skills to attain my academic goals next semester.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

3. Leaders should be most concerned about facilitating positive social change in the environment.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

4. I would consider seeking study skills training while at the University of Maryland.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

5. When I have to make a decision I like to spend a lot of time thinking about my options.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

6. I will vote in November.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

7. Having social prestige on campus is important to me.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

8. I've more-or-less always operated according to the values with which I was brought up.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

9. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

10. Many times by not concerning myself with personal problems, they work themselves out.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

11. I would consider seeking counseling regarding career plans.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral

4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

12. Regarding religion, I've always known what I believe and don't believe; I never really had any serious doubts.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

13. The conditions of my life are excellent.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

14. The attitude of most entering first-year students at Maryland is that getting drunk is not okay.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

15. I expect to have a hard time adjusting to the academic work of college.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

16. I intend to join a Greek-membership (fraternity or sorority) organization.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

17. I would not consider seeking counseling for personal concerns.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

18. A prerequisite to effective leadership is having cross-cultural skills.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

19. I have the necessary knowledge to reach my academic goals next semester.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

20. My friends expect me to drink with them at parties.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

21. I'm not really thinking about my future now; it's still a long way off.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

22. I am satisfied with my life.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral

4. Disagree
 5. Strongly Disagree
23. I think it's better to have a firm set of beliefs than to be open minded.
1. Strongly Agree
 2. Agree
 3. Neutral
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly Disagree
24. I would consider seeking counseling for drugs/alcohol while at Maryland.
1. Strongly Agree
 2. Agree
 3. Neutral
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly Disagree
25. In order to be a more effective leader, I need to learn about my own culture.
1. Strongly Agree
 2. Agree
 3. Neutral
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly Disagree
26. Chances are good that I will drop out of school temporarily before I complete a bachelor's degree.
1. Strongly Agree
 2. Agree
 3. Neutral
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly Disagree
27. When I have a personal problem, I try to analyze the situation in order to understand it.
1. Strongly Agree
 2. Agree
 3. Neutral
 4. Disagree
 5. Strongly Disagree

28. My attitude is that getting drunk is not okay.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

29. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

30. When I am with groups of people of different races, I am typically perceived to be the leader of the group.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

31. I prefer to deal with situations where I can rely on social norms and standards.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

32. I try not to think about or deal with problems as long as I can.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

33. When making important decisions, I like to have as much information as possible.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree

3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

34. I have the ability to reach my academic goals next semester.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

35. Most entering first-year Maryland students believe that the people who get drunk at least sometimes have the most social prestige.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

36. I've always had purpose in my life; I was brought up to know what to strive for.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

37. Regarding alcohol, my attitude is that drinking 5 or more drinks in one sitting is okay.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

38. I think sometimes getting drunk is fine.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

39. I expect to have a hard time adjusting to the social life in college.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

40. Most entering first-year students at Maryland think sometimes getting drunk is fine.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

41. My friends expect me to drink with them on weekdays.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

42. Regarding alcohol, the attitude of most Maryland entering first-year students is that drinking 5 or more drinks in one sitting is okay.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

43. I follow a vegetarian dietary lifestyle.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

44. I have what it takes to reach my academic goals next semester.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree

3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

45. In terms of frequency of drinking alcohol, I usually drink alcohol more often than my closest friends.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

46. In terms of quantity (amount) of alcohol I drink, I usually drink no more than my closest friends.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

47. My friends expect me to get drunk with them on weekends.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

48. My friends expect me to drink with them on weekends.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

49. When I have to make a decision, I try to wait as long as possible in order to see what will happen.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

50. If I could live my life over, I would change nothing.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

51. I do not expect to get a degree from the University of Maryland.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

52. I intend to get drunk sometime this coming semester.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

53. I've spent a lot of time and talked to a lot of people trying to develop a set of values that makes sense to me.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

54. I've spent a great deal of time thinking seriously about what I should do with my life.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

55. I am concerned about my ability to finance my college education.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree

3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

56. I think it's better to have fixed values than to consider alternative value systems.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

57. I feel comfortable being labeled the "leader" in a group setting.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

58. When it comes to alcohol, my drinking choices are entirely my own.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

59. This coming semester, I intend to drink no more than 4 alcoholic beverages in one sitting at any time.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

Items 60 - 65 refer to your decision to come to the University of Maryland. Using the 1-5 scale (Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree), please indicate how likely you believe you would be to experience each of the following situations:

60. Have access to a "role model" in this school (i.e., someone you can look up to and learn from by observing).

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree

3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

61. Feel support for this decision from important people in your life (e.g., teachers).

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

62. Get helpful assistance from a tutor or mentor in this area, if you felt you needed such help.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

63. Get encouragement from your friends for coming to this school.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

64. Feel that your family members support this decision.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

65. Feel that close friends or relatives would be proud of you for making this decision.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

Multiple Choice Questions

66. Drinking 5 or more drinks in a single session is: (Choose the best option from the scale unenjoyable to enjoyable.)

- a Unenjoyable
- b Somewhat unenjoyable
- c Neither unenjoyable nor enjoyable
- d Somewhat enjoyable
- e Enjoyable

67. Drinking 5 or more drinks in a single session is: (Choose the best option from the scale favorable to unfavorable.)

- a Favorable
- b Somewhat favorable
- c Neither favorable nor unfavorable
- d Somewhat unfavorable
- e Unfavorable

68. Drinking 5 or more drinks in a single session is: (Choose the best option from the scale satisfying to unsatisfying.)

- a Satisfying
- b Somewhat satisfying
- c Neither satisfying nor unsatisfying
- d Somewhat unsatisfying
- e Unsatisfying

Please consider your own behavior to answer the next three (3) items:

69. Thinking specifically about the past 4 weeks or 28 days, on how many days, if any, did you have at least one drink of beer, wine, or liquor?

- a 1-2 days
- b 3-4 days (once a week or less)
- c 5-6 days
- d 7-8 days (about 2 days a week)
- e 9-10 days
- f 11-12 days (about 3 days a week)
- g 13-14 days
- h 15-16 days (about 4 days a week)
- i 17-18 days
- j 19-20 days (about 5 days a week)
- k 21-22 days
- l 23-24 days (about 6 days a week)
- m 25-26 days
- n 27-28 days (about daily)
- o 0 days in the past 28 days

70. Again, in the past 4 weeks or 28 days, on days when you drank alcohol how many drinks did you typically have?

- a 1 drink
- b 2 drinks
- c 3 drinks
- d 4 drinks
- e 5 drinks
- f 6 drinks
- g 7 drinks
- h 8 drinks
- i 9 drinks
- j 10 drinks
- k 11 drinks
- l 12 drinks
- m 13 drinks
- n 14 drinks
- o 15 drinks
- p 16 drinks or more
- q No drinks. I did not drink in that time period.

71. In the past two weeks (14 days), on how many days have you consumed 5 or more drinks in a 24-hour period? (Assume drinking past mid-night on any day to be part of that day rather than the next.)

- a On 1 day
- b On 2 days
- c On 3 days
- d On 4 days
- e On 5 days
- f On 6 days
- g On 7 days
- h On 8 days
- i On 9 days
- j On 10 days
- k On 11 days
- l On 12 days
- m On 13 days
- n On 14 days
- o On no days did I drink 5 or more drinks in a 24-hour period.

Please consider the behavior of most entering first year students at Maryland to answer the next three (3) items:

72. Thinking specifically about the past 4 weeks or 28 days, on how many days, if any, do you think most entering first year students have at least one drink of beer, wine, or liquor?

- a 1-2 days
- b 3-4 days (once a week or less)
- c 5-6 days
- d 7-8 days (about 2 days a week)
- e 9-10 days
- f 11-12 days (about 3 days a week)
- g 13-14 days
- h 15-16 days (about 4 days a week)
- i 17-18 days
- j 19-20 days (about 5 days a week)
- k 21-22 days
- l 23-24 days (about 6 days a week)
- m 25-26 days
- n 27-28 days (about daily)
- o 0 days in the past 28 days

73. Again, in the past 4 weeks or 28 days, on days when most entering first year students drank alcohol how many drinks do you think they typically had?

- a 1 drink
- b 2 drinks
- c 3 drinks
- d 4 drinks
- e 5 drinks
- f 6 drinks
- g 7 drinks
- h 8 drinks
- i 9 drinks
- j 10 drinks
- k 11 drinks
- l 12 drinks
- m 13 drinks
- n 14 drinks
- o 15 drinks
- p 16 drinks or more
- q None. Most did not drink in that time period.

74. In the past two weeks (14 days), on how many days do you think most Maryland entering first-year students consumed 5 or more drinks in a 24-hour period? (Assume drinking past mid-night on any day to be part of that day rather than the next.)

- a On 1 day
- b On 2 days
- c On 3 days
- d On 4 days
- e On 5 days
- f On 6 days
- g On 7 days
- h On 8 days
- i On 9 days
- j On 10 days
- k On 11 days
- l On 12 days
- m On 13 days
- n On 14 days
- o On no days did most drink 5 or more drinks in a 24-hour period.

75. What will be your work status this year?

- a Do not plan to work
- b Will work in federally-funded work/study program
- c Will do other on-campus work
- d Will work off-campus
- e Will work for academic credit as part of departmental program
- f A combination of b-e

76. Which one of the following is most important to you in your long-term career choice?

- a Job openings usually available
- b Rapid career advancement possible
- c High anticipated earnings
- d Well respected or prestigious occupation
- e Great deal of independence
- f Make an important contribution to society
- g Avoid pressure
- h Work with ideas
- i Work with people
- j Intrinsic interest in the field

77. If you leave school before receiving a degree, what would be the most likely cause?

- a Absolutely certain that I will obtain a degree
- b To accept a good job
- c To enter military service
- d It would cost more than my family or I can afford
- e Marriage
- f Disinterest in study

- g Lack of academic ability
- h Insufficient reading or study skills
- i Other

78. Which one of the following statements best describes your current status regarding a major: I HAVE

- a A major in mind and am sure that I will not change it.
- b Decided on a major after considering several possibilities.
- c A couple of general ideas of interest but have not decided on a major.
- d Absolutely no idea what I would like to study/major in.

79. Ethnicity: Mark the NO box if not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino/Latina.

- a No, not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino/Latina
- b Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano, Chicana
- c Yes, Puerto Rican
- d Yes, Cuban
- e Yes, other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino/Latina

80. Race

Select one or more:

- a White
- b Black, African American, or Negro
- c American Indian or Alaskan Native
- d Asian Indian
- e Chinese/Taiwanese
- f Filipino
- g Japanese
- h Korean
- i Vietnamese
- j Native Hawaiian
- k Guamanian or Chamorro
- l Samoan
- m Other Pacific Islander
- n Other

81. Gender

- a male
- b female

82. What is your religious preference?

- a Atheist
- b Agnostic
- c Buddhist
- d Catholic
- e Hindu
- f Islamic

- g Jewish
- h Protestant (e.g. Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, etc.)
- i Other
- j No preference

83. Which one of the following best describes your disability?

- a I have none of the disabilities listed
- b Deaf/Hard of Hearing
- c Blind/Visually Impaired
- d Learning Disabled
- e Medical/Other
- f Physical disability
- g Attention Deficit Disorder
- h Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder
- i Psychological
- j Other

84. Please indicate your citizenship and/or generation status (choose one).

- a Your grandparents, parents and you were born in the U.S.
- b Both of your parents and you were born in the U.S.
- c You were born in the U.S., but one of your parents was not.
- d You are a foreign born, naturalized citizen.
- e You are a foreign born, resident alien/permanent resident.
- f You are on a student visa.

85. What is the main reason you decided to go to college?

- a Get a better job
- b Gain an education
- c Next logical step after high school
- d To learn critical thinking skills
- e Prepare for graduate or professional school
- f My parents expect it of me
- g Other

86. When you entered this institution, it was your:

- a First choice
- b Second choice
- c Third choice or lower

87. Which option best describes your ranking in your high school graduating class?

- a Top 5%
- b Top 10%
- c Top 25%
- d Upper half of class
- e Lower half of class

88. Do you expect to send money home during your first year at UM?
YES NO

89. If yes: What proportion of what you earn/receive in financial aid will you send home?

- a Less than 25%
- b 26-50%
- c 51-75%
- d 76-100%
- e I do not receive financial aid.

90. What is the highest academic degree you intend to obtain?

- a Do not expect to complete a degree
- b Associate's (AA or equivalent)
- c Bachelor's (BA or BS)
- d Master's (MA, MS, or MEd)
- e Doctoral (PhD, EdD)
- f Law (LLB, JD)
- g Medical (MD, OD, DDS, or DVM)
- h Divinity (BD or MDiv)
- i Other

91. Please indicate which of the following describes your father's/guardian's education.

- a Less than high school diploma/GED
- b High school diploma/GED
- c Technical Certificate
- d Associate's degree
- e Bachelor's degree
- f Master's degree
- g PhD or professional degree (MD, JD, DVM, LLB, DDS, etc.)
- h I don't know

92. Please indicate which of the following describes your mother's/guardian's education.

- a Less than high school diploma/GED
- b High school diploma/GED
- c Technical Certificate
- d Associate's degree
- e Bachelor's degree
- f Master's degree
- g PhD or professional degree (MD, JD, DVM, LLB, DDS, etc.)
- h I don't know

93. What is your combined annual parental income?

- a Less than \$12,500
- b \$12,500 - \$24,999
- c \$25,000 - \$49,999
- d \$50,000 - \$74,999

- e \$75,000 - \$99,999
- f \$100,000 - \$149,999
- g \$150,000 - \$174,999
- h \$175,000 and over
- i I don't know

94. Where will you be living this semester?

- a Parent's or guardian's home
- b Other relative's home
- c University residence hall
- d Fraternity or sorority house
- e Renting an off-campus room or apartment alone
- f Sharing a rented room or apartment
- g Owning or renting a house alone
- h Sharing a house
- i Other

Please be sure to press DONE when finished to be sure your responses are saved!

Thank you for your time and participation!

If you have questions or comments regarding this survey, please contact Renee Snyder at rbsnyder@wam.umd.edu.

University New Student Census 2004

References

- Akerhielm, K., Berger, J., Hooker, M., & Wise, D. (1998). *Factors related to college enrollment: Final report*. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, Washington, DC.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.
- Boschung, M.D., Sharpe, D.L., & Abdel-Chany, M. (1998). Racial, ethnic, and gender differences in postsecondary financial aid awards. *Economics of Education Review, 17*, 219-222.
- Caraveo-Ramos, L.E., Francis, R.W. Jr., & Odgers, R.P. (1985). Attitudes of Mexican-Americans and Anglo-American college students toward psychologists and psychiatrists. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 26*, 134-137.
- Castellanos, J., & Jones, L. (2003). Latino undergraduate experiences in American higher education. In J. Castellanos & L. Jones, (Eds.), *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators, and students in higher education* (pp. 1-13). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Cohn, D. (2002, July 31). Latino growth among top in U.S. *Washington Post*, pp. B1.
- Constantine, M.G., & Chen, E.C. (1997). Intake concerns of racial and ethnic minority students at a university counseling center: Implications for developmental programming and outreach. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 25*, 210-219.

- De Amas, C.P., & McDavis, R.J. (1981). White, Black and Hispanic students' perceptions of a community college environment. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 22, 337-341.
- Duggan, M. (2001, November). *Factors influencing the first year persistence of first-generation college students*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the North East Association for Institutional Research, Cambridge MA.
- Dungy, G. J. (2003). Organization and functions of student affairs. In S. R. Komives, & D. B. Woodard Jr. (Eds.), *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (4th ed., pp. 339- 357). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Education Resources Institute and the Institute for Higher Education Policy. (1997, December). *Missed opportunities: A new look at disadvantaged college aspirants*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Ferdman, B.M. & Gallegos, P.I. (2001). Racial identity development and Latinos in the United States. In C.L. Wijeyesinghe & B.W. Jackson III (Eds.), *New perspectives on racial identity development: A theoretical and practical anthology* (pp. 32-65). New York: New York University Press.
- Flores, J.L. (1992, April). *Persisting Hispanic American college students: Characteristics that lead to the baccalaureate degree*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Fry, R. (2002). *Latinos in higher education: Many enroll, too few graduate*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center Report.
- Fuertes, J., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1990). Needs and interests of Hispanic students. *College Student Affairs Journal*, 10(2), 16-21.

- Fuertes, J.N., Sedlacek, W.E., Roger, P.R., & Mohr, J.J. (2000). Correlates of Universal-Diverse Orientation among first-year university students. *Journal of the First-Year Experience*, 22(1), 45-59.
- Garcia, P. (2001, April). *Understanding characteristics and barriers to Hispanic baccalaureates*. A report from the RAND Corporation by the Inter-University for Latino Research with support from the Hispanic Scholarship Fund, San Francisco, CA.
- Gonzalez, K.P. (1999, November). *Campus culture and the experiences of Chicano students in predominately White colleges and universities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Antonio, TX.
- Gonzalez, K. (2002). Campus culture and the experiences of Chicano students in a predominantly White university. *Urban Education*, 37, 193-218.
- Gutierrez, L.M., & Poore, C. (1990, April). *Retaining Latino undergraduates: Lessons from the University of Michigan*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association for Higher Education, San Francisco, CA.
- Hahs-Vaughn, D. (2004). The impact of parents' education level on college students: An analysis using the Beginning Postsecondary Students Longitudinal Study 1990-1992/94. *Journal of College Student Development*, 45, 483-500.
- Hamrick, F.A., & Stage, F.K. (2000, April). *Community activities, educational mentors, and college predisposition decisions of White, African American, and Hispanic eighth graders*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

- Hoyt, J.E., & Winn, B.A. (2004). Understanding retention and college student bodies: Differences between drop-outs, stop-outs, opt-outs, and transfer-outs. *NASPA Journal*, *41*, 395-417.
- Hurtado, M.T., & Gauvain, M. (1997). Acculturation and planning for college among youth of Mexican descent. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *19*, 506-517.
- Hurtado, S. (1994a, May). *Latino student transition to college: Assessing difficulties and factors in successful college adjustment*. Paper presented in Forum for the Association for Institutional Research, New Orleans, LA.
- Hurtado, S. (1994b). The institutional climate for talented Latino students. *Research in Higher Education*, *35*, 21-41.
- Hurtado, S. & Carter, D.F. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of the campus racial climate on Latino college students' sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education*, *70*, 324-345.
- Hurtado, S., Carter, D.F., & Spuler, A. (1996). Latino student transition to college: Assessing difficulties and factors in successful college adjustment. *Research in Higher Education*, *37*, 135-157.
- Ishitani, T.T. (2003). A longitudinal approach to assessing attrition behavior among first-generation students: Time-varying effects of pre-college characteristics. *Research in Higher Education*, *44*, 433-449.
- Jones, L., Castellanos, J., & Cole, D. (2002). Examining the ethnic minority student experience at a predominantly White institution: A case study. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, *1*(1), 19-39.

- Jones-Correa, M., & Leal, D.L. (1996). Becoming "Hispanic": Secondary panethnic identification among Latin-American origin populations in the United States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 18*, 213-254.
- Kaufman, P., Chavez, L., & Lauen, D. (1998). *Generational status and educational outcomes among Asian and Hispanic 1998 eighth graders* (Report No. NCES-1999-020). Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- King, W.M. (1995). The triumphs of tribalism: The modern American university as a reflection of Eurocentric culture. In B.P. Bowser, T. Jones, & G.A. Young (Eds.), *Toward the multicultural university* (pp. 21-40). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Krallman, D., & Holcomb, T. (1997, May). *First year student expectations: Pre and post orientation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Institutional Research, Buena Vista, FL.
- Lanni, J.C. (1992, March). *The longitudinal success story: The entering student survey*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education, Washington, DC.
- Livingston, M.D., & Stewart, M.A. (1987). Minority students on a White campus: Perception is truth. *NASPA Journal, 24*(3), 39-48.
- Llagas, C. (2003). *Status and trends in the education of Hispanics*. (Report no. NCES 2003-008). Washington D.C: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

- Lohfink, M.M. & Paulsen, M.B. (2005). Comparing the determinants of persistence for first-generation and continuing generation college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 46, 409-428.
- Longerbeam, S.D., Sedlacek, W.E., & Alatorre, H.M. (2004). In their own voices: Latino student retention. *NASPA Journal*, 41, 538-550.
- Loo, C.M., & Rolison, G. (1986). Alienation of ethnic minority students at a predominantly White university. *Journal of Higher Education*, 57, 58-77.
- Lopez, E.S. (1996). *Social capital and the educational performance of Latino and non-Latino youth* (ISRI Research Report No. 11). East Lansing: Michigan State University, Julian Somora Research Institute.
- Mallinckrodt, B., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1987). Student retention and use of campus facilities by race. *NASPA Journal*, 24(3), 28-32.
- Mancuso-Edwards, F. (1983, November). *The myth of social equalization: Hispanics and higher education*. Paper presented at the Puerto Rican Family Institute's Forum on the Rights of the Puerto Rican Migrant Family, New York, NY.
- Martinez, E. (2000). *Seeing more than Black and White*. In M. Adams, W.J. Bloomfield, R. Casteneda, H.W. Hackman, L. Peters & X. Zuniga (Eds.), *Readings for diversity and social justice. An anthology on racism, anti-semitism, sexism, heterosexism, ableism, and classism* (pp. 93-98). New York: Routledge.
- McCormick, A.C. (1997, November). *Changes in educational aspirations after high school: The role of post-secondary attendance and context*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Albuquerque, NM.

- Montelongo, R. (2003, April). *Latino/a undergraduate involvement with college student organizations and its effects on specific outcomes at two large predominantly White Midwestern universities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Munez, A.M. & Cuccaro-Alamin, S. (1998). *First-generation students: Undergraduates whose parents never enrolled in postsecondary education*. Statistical analysis report. Postsecondary Descriptive Analysis Reports. Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics
- Nora, A. (2003). Access to higher education for Hispanic students: Real or illusory? In J. Castellanos & L. Jones (Eds.), *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators, and students in higher education* (pp. 47-68). Sterling, VA: Stylus.
- Office of Institutional Research and Planning (2007, November). *New first-time student profile*. Retrieved January 12, 2007 from <http://oirp.umd.edu/WOCN/fresh.cfm>
- Office of University Communications. (2007, January). *University quick facts*. Retrieved January 12, 2007 from <http://www.newsdesk.umd.edu/index.cfm>
- Pascarella, E.P., Pierson, C.T., Wolniak, G.C., & Terenzini, P.T. (2004). First-generation college students: Additional evidence on college experiences and outcomes. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 75, 249-284.
- Pascarella, E.T., Wolniak, G.C., Pierson, C.T., & Terenzini, P.T. (2003). Experiences and outcomes of first-generation college students in community colleges. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44, 420-429.

- Penrose, A.M. (2002). Academic literacy perception and performance: Comparing first-generation and continuing generation college students. *Research in the Teaching of English, 36*, 437-461.
- Perna, L.W. (2000a). Differences in the decision to attend college among African Americans, Hispanics, and Whites. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*, 117-141.
- Perna, L. W. (2000b, April). *Racial/ethnic group differences in the assimilation of educational plans*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Pew Hispanic Center. (2004). *National survey of Latinos: Education. Report supplement from the Pew Hispanic Center/Kaiser Family Foundation*. Washington DC: Author.
- Pike, G.R., & Kuh, D.H. (2005). First- and second-generation college students: A comparison their engagement and intellectual development. *The Journal of Higher Education, 76*, 276-300.
- Quinones-Rosado, R. (1998, Summer). Hispanic or Latino? The struggle for identity in a race-based society. *The Diversity Factor, 20-25*.
- Quinonez, C., & Sedlacek, W.E. (1997). *A profile of incoming freshmen students at the University of Maryland at College Park, 1996-1997* (Research Rep. No. 10-97). College Park: University of Maryland, College Park, Counseling Center.
- Ramirez, R. (2004). *We the people: Hispanics in the United States. Special report from the 2000 U.S. Census [CENSR-18]*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics, and Statistics Administration.

- Ramirez, R. & de la Cruz, G. (2002). *The Hispanic population in the United States: March 2002, Current population reports (P20-545)*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.
- Rodriguez, J. M. (2003). *Queer Latinidad: Identity practices, discursive spaces*. New York: New York University Press.
- Rodriguez, S. (2003, October). What helps some first-generation college students succeed? *About Campus*, 8, 17-22.
- Sanders, L., & Burton J.D. (1996). From retention to satisfaction: New outcomes from assessing the freshmen experience. *Research In Higher Education*, 37, 555-567.
- Sedlacek, W.E. (2004). *Beyond the big test: Noncognitive assessment in higher education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Schmidt, P. (2003, November 28). Academe's Hispanic future. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A8.
- Sherlin, J.H. Jr. (2002). *Understanding the system persistence of first-generation college students through path modeling* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, 2002). (UMI No. 3070558)
- Smith, M. (1992, March). *Contexts for writing on the border: The community and the constraints of Hispanic freshmen writers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication, Cincinnati, OH.
- Snyder, R.B., & Sedlacek, W.E. (2005). *A profile of the University of Maryland, College Park Incoming first-year student class, 2004-2005* (Research Report # 2-05). College Park, Maryland: University of Maryland, College Park, Counseling Center.

- Suro, R. (2002). *Counting the "Other Hispanics": How many Colombians, Dominicans, Ecuadorians, Guatemalans, and Salvadorans are there in the United States?* Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center Report.
- Terenzini, P.T., Springer, L., Yaeger, P.M., Pascarella, E.T., & Nora, A. (1996). First-generation college students: Characteristics, experiences, and cognitive development. *Research in Higher Education*, 37, 1-22.
- Torres, V. (1999). Validation of a bicultural orientation model for Hispanic college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 40, 285-297.
- Torres, V. (2003). Influences on ethnic identity development of Latino college students in the first 2 years of college. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44, 532-547.
- Torres, V. (2004). The diversity among us: Puerto Ricans, Cuban Americans, Caribbean Americans, and Central and South Americans. In A.M. Ortiz (Ed.), *Addressing the unique needs of Latino American students* (New Directions for Student Services no. 105, pp. 5-16). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Wiley.
- Trevino, J. (1994). Participation in Chicano student organizations: A social identity perspective. In A. Hurtado & E. Garcia (Eds.), *The educational achievement of Latinos: Barriers and successes* (pp. 75-98). Santa Cruz, CA: University of California Latino Eligibility Study.
- Validova, A.N. (2005). Geographies of Latinidad. In C. McCarthy, W. Crinchow, G Dimitriadis & N. Dolby (Eds.), *Race, identity, and representation in education* (pp. 307-317). New York: Routledge.
- Velasquez, P. (1999, November). *The relationship between cultural development, sense of belonging, and persistence among Chicanos in higher education: An*

exploratory study. Paper presented to the Association for the Study of Higher Education, San Antonio TX.

Velasquez, P.M. (1996, April). *The integration and persistence of Chicano students in higher education: Student and institutional characteristics*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, New York, NY.

Villalpando, O. (2004). Practical considerations of critical race theory and Latino critical theory for Latino college students. In A.M. Ortiz (Ed.), *Addressing the unique needs of Latino American students* (New Directions for Student Services no. 105, pp. 41-50). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/Wiley.

Widdows, R., & Hilton, P.J. (1990). Assessing the extent to which students' initial expectations of the higher education experience are being met. *College and University*, 65, 85-94.

Weinfurt, K.P. (1995). Multivariate analysis of variance. In L.G. Grimm & P.R. Yarnold (Eds.), *Reading and understanding multivariate statistics* (pp. 245-276). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.