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Statement of Research Questions:

This thesis analyzes the relationship of Latino university students’ ethnic and racial identities and their academic achievement at California State University, Sacramento. In this study the following questions are examined: (1) from a large number of possibilities, what ethnic and racial labels do Latino university students identify with? (2) What do the chosen ethnic and racial labels mean for the university students’ identities? (3) Are Latino students’ identities associated with their academic achievement at CSU Sacramento? To analyze these questions, this study examined four possible relationships (see Chapter 4) between ethnic and racial identity (i.e., Assimilation, Biculturalism, Marginalized, and Nepantla) and academic achievement.

Methods:

The study relied on a structured survey (see APPENDIX E) examining individuals’ ethnic and racial identity perceptions and academic achievement at California State University, Sacramento, among other variables. The sample consisted of 161 currently enrolled students from California State University, Sacramento. These participants were adults, 18 and over, and identified with the Latino identity or a form thereof.
Findings:

Findings from the study revealed that most respondents identified with the “Mexican-American” label option (see FIGURE 1). Racial label identification, however, was the least desirable form of personal identification. Further reinforcing this conclusion was respondents’ reasoning in identifying their personal ethnic/racial perceptions of self. When respondents were asked to elaborate on the meaning and/or reasoning behind their chosen ethnic and/or racial label identification(s), place/country of birth and parent origin(s) were the most popular explanations given.

Furthermore, regression analysis and ANOVA revealed a positive association between bicultural identification and academic achievement (see Chapter 3/4). Compared to a bicultural (In-Between) identity, Assimilation, Marginalized, and High Latino Identification, had a much lower impact on the academic achievement of respondents. However, the data collected was unable to demonstrate any statistically significant impact of the control variables: gender, parent household income, transnationalism, and/or generational status, on the identity perceptions and/or academic achievement of respondents.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Research

Latinos have become one of the fastest growing ethnic groups in the United States with increases in immigration and natural growth (Chavez 2008). However, to avoid homogenizing Latino-origin people and to understand their lives, analyzing how Latinos identify themselves with certain ethnic and racial labels is crucial (Holley, Salas, Marsiglia, Yabiku, Fitzharris, and Jackson 2009). Identities reflect awareness of distinct histories and cultures. Unfortunately, in the U.S. Latinos are placed into fixed and static racial and ethnic categories that conceal the differences and variations in national origin, customs, cultures, and race. This “group” is commonly categorized as either “Latino” or “Hispanic.” But what do these categories really mean? Do they even give us any real information about the people checking the box beside the description?

According to Morris (2007), the imposed ethnic and racial categories go beyond the conceptions of social construction: “they are driven by power relations and result in very real patterns of inequality” (p. 411). Although the scientific community overwhelmingly views race as a social construct, studies continue to analyze race through interpretations of physical differences, while emphasizing the role of “privileged power” when constructing ideas about race (Morris 2007: 411). Therefore, Morris (2007) contends that studies on minorities view race in ambiguous terms that are in line with the present hierarchical structure. Assuming that (1) race is fixed and static and (2) that researchers’ own perception of race is enough for categorizing individuals, devalues the
social construction of race through everyday meanings and interactions that individuals maintain. Consequently, ethnic or racial research on Latinos is limited by these misconceptions (Morris 2007).

Therefore this study will explore, conceptualize, and operationalize Latino ethnic and racial identities in the effort to advance more valid understandings of who they are. Ethnicity then, is defined as the involvement maintained in a person’s culture and heritage, in conjunction with the ways responding and dealing with the dominant group’s weary outlooks towards the individual’s group, and the ramifications that occur due to these factors on the emotional welfare of the individual(s) (Phinney 1990: 499). While race can be best understood as a social historical construct with unstable social meanings formed by social relations, society, and contexts of time and space (Omi and Winant 2004: Winant 2001).

Furthermore, this study will also examine the relationship between Latino university students’ ethnic and racial identities and their academic achievement in postsecondary education within California State University, Sacramento (CSUS). Primarily the goal is to explore the relationship between Latinos’ ethnic and racial identities and their academic achievement, and whether the relationship reflects any perceived success in California State University, Sacramento. Therefore, this study will contribute to the research on why Latino students at CSUS choose specific ethnic and racial labels to describe themselves and what are the academic implications. Without restricting the number of labels these students can choose from, this study explores Latino students’ choice of specific ethnic and racial labels and their attitudes/meanings
toward them, as opposed to the normative “static and fixed” identities ascribed to them.

In effect, this study seeks to answer the following questions:

*Research Questions:*

1. From a large number of possibilities, what ethnic and racial labels do Latino university students identify with?
2. What do the chosen ethnic and racial labels mean for the university students’ identities?
3. Are Latino students’ identities associated with their academic achievement at CSU Sacramento?

To examine these questions, several theoretical frameworks are reviewed and applied, including assimilation, segmented assimilation, and Interactive Colonization (XC). These theories suggest possible outcomes of ethnic and racial identity development for minorities, and this study will assess which has the strongest explanatory power. As background to the study, scholarships on Latino identity and education are reviewed in order to contextualize the theoretically informed hypotheses. Therefore, this study examines four possible relationships between ethnic and racial identity and academic achievement:

1. Complete assimilation toward the dominant White culture and rejection of “traditional-home” culture will lead to higher academic achievement (Bean, Brown, Leach, and Bachmeier 2007).

2. “In-Betweens,” which are, “persons or groups that occupy intermediary positions between those “at the top” [i.e. White culture] and those “at the bottom [i.e. stigmatized minority culture]” and who are comfortable and feel at home in both cultures will lead to the highest academic achievement (Barajas 2009: 53, i.e., generally reflects 1.5 and second generation experiences).
3. Students who do not fully associate with either dominant culture [i.e., White] or “traditional-home” culture will have an academic achievement that is below average (Portes and Rumbaut 2006, i.e., downward assimilation).

4. Students who do not fully associate with either dominant culture [i.e., White] or “traditional-home” culture will have an academic achievement that is normative (Barajas 2009, i.e., Nepantla, hybrid identity, reflects some second and third generation experiences).

Based on prior research findings (Portes and Rumbaut 2006), Latino university students that identify with option two listed above (i.e. “In-Betweens”) will most likely demonstrate higher academic achievement in their postsecondary education at CSUS, compared to those who encompass other options. This relationship is thought to occur as a result of “In-Betweens” bicultural identities’ ability to maintain both neutrality and an equal balance and transition between country of origin culture and dominant culture (Barajas 2009). Therefore, it is hypothesized that “In-Betweens” will most likely present higher levels of acceptance and less stigmatizing depictions of their ethnic and racial identity. As a result, Barajas (2009) would argue that these university students are more likely to reject stereotypical depictions of who they are, while demonstrating greater flexibility in their accommodation within university structures and culture.

One further elaboration on the “In-Between” category, which is unique to this study and informed by XC framework, is that “In-Betweens” generally fall in a continuum whereby the 1.5 and second generation are expected to be the most bilingual/bicultural student groups. Meanwhile, the third and additional generations are expected to reflect more of a unique and hybrid culture that does not identify purely with dominant or subordinated groups but rather as a distinct group. In such cases, individuals
have lost traditional culture such as language and even some traditions, yet still identify as Latina/o though distinct from their parents’ or grandparents’ home cultures. While they might even characterize themselves as more Americanized, they will be cognizant that they are distinct or even excluded from the normative category American, which remains a racialized classification. This elaboration of ‘In-Between’ concept is distinct from the segmented assimilation’s suggestion that hybrid cultures—i.e., Chicano—fall below the pure immigrant and dominant cultures, and is defined as downward assimilation (Portes and Rumbaut 1996: 255-256; 2006: 280).

Although, option two is argued as the most favorable selection, options one (i.e., complete assimilation), three (i.e., downward assimilation), and four (i.e., *Nepantla*) are seen in prior research as possible ethnic and racial identity outcomes and potential identifiers of educational success. According to classical assimilation, individuals that identify with and assimilate into the dominant group’s culture will successfully integrate into this group’s culture, values, and ideals. Classical assimilation theorists and research therefore argue that individuals reflecting complete assimilation in the dominant culture will achieve higher educational success. However, Portes and Rumbaut (2006) and Barajas (2009) disagree with the notion of complete assimilation as a possible and/or positive identity formation.

Furthermore, both classical and segmented assimilation contend that individuals that do not fully identify with either dominant or “traditional-home” culture will portray downward assimilation and thus below average educational achievement. However, contrary to this assumption Barajas’ (2009) argues that Latino university students that do
not fully associate with either cultures are facing a growing normative trend that does not necessarily generate downward assimilation or below average educational success.

Referring to this predictive normative pattern of minority identity formation, as *Nepantlas*, Barajas’ (2009) contends that this form of hybrid identity is a common occurrence of minority identity formation. Therefore, Barajas argues that *Nepantlas* will occupy intermediary positions between those “at the top” [i.e. White culture] and those “at the bottom [i.e. stigmatized minority culture]” (2009: 51-54).

**Significance:**

The primary purpose of this study is to analyze the relation between ethnic and racial identification and academic achievement in higher education among Latinos. Although research has been done on Latino ethnic and racial identity and its relation to academic achievement, most studies, however, have used either “predescribed” or limited ethnic identity label options (Zarate, Bhimji, and Reese 2005: 95). Researchers have not taken into consideration Latinos’ own ethnic or racial identities or their affiliation with certain labels as opposed to others. For example, studies on Latino youth, “have primarily relied on survey data without an inquiry into why youth affiliate with a certain label and not others,” in doing so, important identity conceptions were unknown to researchers (Zarate, Bhimji, and Reese 2005: 95). For instance, Zarate et al. examined high school Latino adolescents’ ethnic identities as “predictors” for achievement and found that a “cultural element” and a “bicultural identity” were important predictors of academic performance (2005: 95). Insight as to why adolescent youth subscribe to certain ethnic labels and not others helped uncover new conceptions of Latino youth
identity formations and the emergence of hybrid and bicultural ethnic and racial identity associations. More importantly, the study underscores the need to reexamine how we analyze and depict Latino identity formation and associations.

Further, in the study of Latino ethnic and racial identity, theoretical literature continues to far outweigh empirical research (Phinney 1990; Rivas-Drake et al. 2008; Zarate et al. 2005). Additionally, Latino identity and academic achievement research is limited to youth 18 and under. Research conducted on Latino ethnic and racial identity has relied mainly on minority youth and adolescents, their misidentification, or their desires towards White ideology and customs (Phinney 1990; Irizarry 2007; Zarate et al. 2005; Holley et al. 2009; Morris 2007; Portes and Hao 2004, 2006; Stamps et al. 2006; Roberts, Phinney, Masse, Chen, Roberts, and Romero 1999). With minimal research conducted on Latino identity development into adulthood, empirical studies on Latino identity are vague, inconsistent and conceptually limited (Rivas-Drake and Mooney 2008; Yang, Byers, Salazar and Salas 2009).

Studies examining relationships among Latino identities and education have also generated inconsistent results. Rivas-Drake and Mooney (2008), Portes and Rumbaut (2001), and Holley et al. (2009) report a positive relationship between Latino ethnic and racial identities and academic achievement in higher education; however, Vigil (1997) and Zarate et al. (2005) uncovered minimally significant correlations between the two, while other studies have also expressed less than consistent results for minority identity and educational achievement (Phinney and Ong 2007).
Furthermore, studies that have empirically and/or theoretically analyzed ethnic and racial identity continue to use different concepts and levels of measurement, causing great difficulty for present and future comparisons and generalizations (Phinney and Ong 2007; Phinney 1990). In using various definitions for ethnic identity, research generalizability and comparisons of ethnic identity become extremely problematic. For instance, the Latino label is treated as a melting pot concept, obscuring the ethnic and racial diversity within, and then it is compared to racial categories like Asian, Black, and White. Evidently, these comparisons are flawed, equating racial categories with a vague cultural one, Latino.

It is the hope of this study to clear up some of the problems that continue in ethnic and racial identity research. First, the study will allow individuals to self-identify themselves without the common constraints of limited ethnic and racial label options. Second, this study will add to the small body of research done on adult Latino identity while analyzing any possible relationships between ethnic/racial identity and academic achievement. Third, it will help increase university awareness of Latino’s identification and internal diversity, which will help improve their academic advising and program assistance. Finally, to minimize vagueness and/or misconceptions regarding ethnicity and race, this study will conceptualize and operationalize ethnic identity for future research and reference.
Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Despite various empirical and theoretical approaches used to examine Latino ethnic and racial identities, there is a general consensus on the dynamic nature of ethnic and racial identity formations. Ethnic/racial identities can be situational, historically situated, and malleable (Omi and Winant 1994; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Portes and Hao 2004; Phinney 1990; Barajas 2009). However, the same cannot be said about the proper techniques used in exploring ethnic/racial identity development in higher education. Further exploration is necessary, and this study examines Latino students’ ethnic and racial identities in higher education at California State University, Sacramento. The goals are to explore Latinos’ meanings of and identification with ethnic and racial labels and to examine if there is any relation between ethnic and racial identity and academic achievement.

In order to fully understand the context and importance of this study, a review of literature follows on the subject of ethnic and racial identities and academic achievement. This discussion is organized in two parts: first, how the concepts of race and ethnicity are used with Latinos is examined, and second how Latino identity and academic achievement relate. This section examines the application of ethnic and racial label options for Latino students, in connection to their ethnic and racial identity development, and its association (if any) to this group’s academic achievement. Lastly, I elaborate the theoretical arguments and application of this study. This section includes a discussion of how assimilation, segmented assimilation, and Interactive Colonization (a newer
conceptual framework) theorize acculturation and educational achievement among Latinos.

*Ethnic and Racial Identities:*

Ethnic and racial identity scholars agree that understanding ethnicity and race can be quite complicated due to variations, ambiguity, and inconsistency in their usage among scholars (Phinney 1990; Zarate et al. 2005; Portes and Hao 2004; Irizarry 2007; Morris 2007; Omi and Winant 2004). Nonetheless, researchers argue that ethnic and racial identity is a fundamental feature of self-concept and group consciousness (Phinney 1990; Harlow 2003; White and Burke 1987).

When conceptualizing the notion of race, Omi and Winant (2004) argue that race cannot be seen as static or fixed, but as a social historical construct with unstable social meanings created and shaped by social relations, society, and contexts of time and space. Ethnicity, on the other hand, elicits an increase in “ethnic consciousness and pride” (Phinney 1990: 499) and is essential in understanding minority ethnic identity. Phinney (1990) identifies ethnic identity as (1) the level and value of involvement maintained with an individual’s culture and heritage, (2) the methods of reacting and dealing with the host (dominant) group’s weary views towards the individual’s group, and (3) the repercussions that arise as a result of these factors on the psychological well-being of the individual (p.499). Phinney’s (1990) three major concepts are most widely used in social science research analyzing minority ethnic identity (Alba 1985; Tajfel 1978; White and Burke 1987).
However, ethnic and racial identity research in the U.S. continues to produce a
dualism between the dominant ethnic and racial group’s views of identity as it compares
to all minority groups (Kivel 1995; McIntosh 1997). Even though studies continue to
examine various forms of stereotyping, prejudices, and discrimination imposed on
minorities such as Latinos, most remain preoccupied with racial minority groups’
asimilation into the dominant culture (Phinney 1990; Harlow 2003; Hunt, Jackson,
Powell, and Steelman 2000; White and Burke 1987). Zarate et al. (2005) argues that this
obscures the importance of analyzing each minority group’s personal understanding and
intergroup consciousness and development. Consequently, far less research is done on
Latino’s own perception of ethnic/racial identity (Zarate et al. 2005; Phinney 1990;
Rivas-Drake et al. 2008). Therefore, with Whites as the dominant group maintaining
center stage in ethnic and racial identity research, it is not surprising that studies
regarding minority group’s ethnic and racial identities have been “of little interest to
members of the dominant group,” resulting in less empirical research and thus little
understanding of their identities (Phinney 1990: 499).

When examining current research on minority identity development, several
studies and theories help grasp these groups’ incorporation into U.S. society. Most
studies however, focus primarily on the life experiences of African-Americans and their
historical interactions with the dominant White group (Rivas-Drake et al. 2008; White
and Burke 1987; Parea 1997). In many cases, conclusions of the Black experiences are
generalized to Latinos. Rivas-Drake and Mooney (2008), however, critique the
generalizability of the African-American experience to other groups. They argue that
African-Americans and Latinos have two very different perceptions of ethnic, racial, and group identity, as each group’s history with the dominant group has produced variations in identity formation and interactions. Moreover, Latino is a vague cultural label, and it is being compared to a racial label. Barajas (2009) argues that within the Latino category, there is racial and ethnic stratification, with indigenous Latinos placed at the bottom and White Latinos at the top. The mestizos —i.e., various mixtures of Indigenous, Black, and White—are “In-Betweens.” Therefore, it is possible that Latinos perceive themselves in relation to the racial and ethnic stratification that they may recognize in the category of “Latinos” and beyond.

Therefore, even though Latinos are culturally and racially diverse, their stratification and differences are continually overlooked by “all encompassing” ethnic and racial categories. Phinney (1990) argues that individually chosen ethnic and racial identity(ies) of “Latinos” is what is “central to the psychological functioning of members of [this] ethnic and racial minority group” (pg.499). Unfortunately, several studies investigating ethnic and racial identity rely predominately on researchers’ own perceived and/or misidentified ethnic and/or racial identities of Latinos (Moore 1976; Van Ausdale and Feagin 2001; MacLeod 1987; Zuberi 2001). Yet, Morris (2007) and Holley et al. (2009) argue that understanding Latinos’ own personal ethnic and racial identifications and their association with their cultural identity is useful in exploring the categorical ambiguity of commonly imposed ethnic and racial identity classifications.
In education, researchers elaborate the emergence of hybrid identities (synthesizing more than one identity) with which many Latino students may associate (Irizarry 2007; Yon and Hall 2000; Gonzalez, Mool, and Amanti 2005). The understanding of “cultural knowledge” is needed to comprehend Latino students’ ethnic and racial identities. Gonzalez et al. (2005) challenges the perception that all members of a particular group share a common view of culture and contends that although Latinos may share similar commonalities (e.g., language, customs, etc.), they are nonetheless diverse. Irizarry agrees, yet expands on Gonzalez’s et al. (2005) argument by stating that, “Latinos draw from varied, intercultural knowledge bases and create and enact unique hybrid identities” (2007: 23). This heterogeneity among Latinos is “rarely acknowledged by schools, yet is important to consider,” and therefore, highlighting the importance of hybrid identity development can be a strategy for improving the academic success of Latinos (Irizarry 2007: 23). Similarly, these authors maintain that being culturally sensitive and understanding the “Latino” creation of hybrid identities is crucial for any ethnic and racial identity research (Irizarry 2007; Yon et al. 2000; Gonzalez et al. 2005; Barajas 2009). Irizarry (2007) argues that in re-conceptualizing Latino identities, better insight will be obtained through their own understanding of ethnic identity.

Zarate, Bhimji, and Reese (2005), however, emphasize the importance of the conceptualization of bicultural (identifies with more than one identity) identities for minorities. Their research on Latino youths’ ethnic identities demonstrates the importance in allowing participants to choose and explain their associations with
particular ethnic labels. It also provides insights as to how and why Latino students identify with some labels and not others. Their research also adds to the body of literature that supports the development of bicultural identities for Latinos (Vigil 1997; Vila 2000; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Barajas 2009; LaFromboise, Coleman, Hardin, and Gerton 1993). Zarate et al. (2005) concludes that Latino students associate with different ethnic identities that reflect their perceived integration and acculturation within the society. Further, Zarate et al. (2005) argues that continuous interactions and reciprocal relations with the home (national origin) ideology and the dominant (western/host) ideology create bicultural identities for many Latino youth.

Portes and Hao’s (2004) three-year longitudinal study on Latino identity and educational achievement also enhances the argument of successful bicultural identity formation for Latinos, yet diverging with the finding of positive hybrid identities (see Irizarry 2007). Portes and Hao (2004) compared academic attainment and graduation rates to drop-out rates of high school seniors. They found a relationship of “negative effect” between residency length rates in the U.S. and students’ academic achievement. Residency rates also revealed a negative relation between length in the U.S. and academic achievement regardless of school contexts. Additionally, higher G.P.A levels were positively associated with co-ethnic identities (i.e., bicultural) (Portes and Hao 2004: 11920).

Portes and Hao (2004) went beyond the study of student biographies and found that time of residency in the U.S. was an influential factors affecting the academic performance of students. More importantly, their research demonstrated significant
disparities in educational attainment among and within Latinos who associated with either bicultural or hybrid identities.

Nevertheless, although disparities in the study of ethnic/racial identity are evident; scholars argue that it is imperative to take into account how individuals self-identify and associate with certain ethnic and racial labels and not others (Morris 2007; Holley et al. 2009). Syed, Moin, and Phinney (2007) claim that very few studies analyze the variations and transitions of ethnic and racial identities among Latinos, and as a result, miss their shifts of identity formation in education. Holley et al. (2009) finds that Latinos’ ethnic and racial label associations demonstrate their level of acculturation in the U.S. With time, Latinos increase their exposure and incorporate a strong influence of U.S. ideology onto their self-identity.

Furthermore, Holley et al. (2009) insights are consistent with Portes and Rumbaut (2006), Yang et al. (2009), and Zarate’s et al. (2005) research on the creation of bicultural identities as the most successful ethnic/racial identities formations for minorities. Their research identified bicultural identity development as the most favorable form of ethnic and racial identity development for educational success. Irizarry’s (2007) research, on the other hand, argues in favor of the positive results associated with hybrid identities and claims that understanding these types of ethnic and racial identities will generate higher success for Latinos. This argument supports the normality of hybridity, yet Barajas (2009) argues that societies with rigid nationalist values (assimilationist) seem intolerant of this ethnic formation (e.g., the cultural hybridity of Chicana/o). Within the historical American educational system, minorities
generally suffer exclusion, and though a few become integrated and might culturally approximate the white norm, they are still not fully perceived as authentic members of the nation (Barajas 2009).

Commonalities in research however, did arise (Irizarry 2007; Holley et al. 2009; Portes and Hao 2004; Portes and Rumbaut 2006; Zarate et al. 2005; Syed et al. 2007; Oboler 1995; Bailey 1999; Zavella 1994). The research demonstrated social factors such as language, socioeconomic status, gender, generational status, and/or parental backgrounds influence ethnic and racial identity development. These factors were also related to academic achievement. Apparently, ethnic/racial identification reflects awareness or perception of one’s social location in society, and this latter condition entails academic achievement.

To better understand the development and implications of Latino ethnic and racial identities and their relation to educational attainment, three theoretical frameworks are now examined as offering guidelines and explanations to the studies above, including assimilation, segmented assimilation, and Interactive Colonization.

Assimilation Theories:

Assimilation theories have long been the dominant perspective used to help explain ethnic and racial identities and inequalities, especially for minorities like Latinos (Feagin and Feagin 2004; Hirshman 1983). In many cases, classical assimilation has been vaguely defined as the, “orderly adaptation of a migrating group to the ways and institutions of an established group” (Feagin et al. 2004: 30).
In *Assimilation in American Life*, Milton Gordon (1964), revises and identifies three variants of the theory: Melting Pot, Pluralism, and most importantly Anglo-Conformity. Gordon (1964) argues that immigrant groups such as Latinos will more than likely lose some of their cultural heritage, as classical assimilation foresees all ethnic and racial minority groups adopting the dominant group’s ideology, while simultaneously becoming similar over time in norms, values, and culture.

Noting more complexity, Bean et al. (2007) argues that in some cases assimilation eludes some individuals with minority statuses. Yet, “uneven patterns of convergence” do not always result in a lack of assimilation, but instead demonstrate “bumpy” rather than “straight-line” trajectories (Bean et al. 2007: 6). In response to such occurrences, Portes and Zhou’s (1993) elaboration of segmented assimilation theory explains that structural obstacles reduce minority group opportunities. Yet, in some cases advantageous minorities may choose a process of selective acculturation which suggests minorities can selectively embrace “traditional home-country attitudes,” while simultaneously acculturating and adapting into the host society. Segmented assimilation elaborates on, “the contextual, structural, and cultural factors that separate success from unsuccessful, or even ‘negative,’ assimilation” (Bean et al. 2007: 7). Regrettably, for some minorities, segmented assimilation theorizes that structural barriers can lead to “divergent paths toward downward social mobility,” which may also lead to the rejection of assimilation altogether and instead “embrace the attitudes, orientations, and behaviors considered ‘oppositional’ in nature,” to create a new form of “underclass” (Bean et al. 2007: 7; Portes and Rumbaut 2006).
In short, assimilation theories emphasize the different paths of acculturation, and eventually ethnic and racial identities fade with social integration into the larger society. In assimilation theories, adaptation, fusion and gradual assimilation into host society is the expected and the ideal form of ethnic and racial acculturation; while segmented assimilation’s notion of bicultural or selective acculturation also suggests another possible form of successful assimilation. Further, segmented assimilation theories suggest a third possible outcome referred to as the “unfavorable underclass.” Contrary to Irizarry’s (2007) positive take on hybridity, this group reflects neither host nor traditional culture, but a synthesis of both and is assumed to be in opposition to mainstream values. Irizarry (2007) views hybridity as a normal ethnic identity process with positive academic implications. Segmented assimilation, however, suggests that the “unfavorable underclass” will experience low status and downward mobility (Gordon 1964; Phinney 1990; Bean et al. 2007; Feagin and Feagin 2004; Portes and Rumbaut 2006).

Unfortunately, assimilation theories are seriously limited, particularly when applied to Latinos/Chicanos (Barrera 1979; Mirandé 1985). First, assimilation theories ignore structural biases and contextual/historical differences between racial minority group’s acculturation and White European assimilation. Second, assimilation theories neglect obvious racial heterogeneity that is present in the U.S. Lastly, assimilationists ignore power inequalities among different ethnic and racial groups, and thus create the structured exclusion of racial minorities from the core of society, irrespective of acculturation or assimilation (Geschwender 1978; Mirandé 1985). Geschwender (1978) argues that assimilation theorists forget that exploitation is what fuels conflict in ethnic
and race relations and not cultural differences. Unfortunately, much scholarship continues to frame cultural differences as causes of conflict (Bean et al. 2007; Feagin and Feagin 2004).

**Interactive Colonization Theory (XC):**

Barajas’ Interactive Colonization (XC) theory also examines minority ethnic and racial relations and identity formation, yet underscores the contexts of dislocation from their homelands and the nature of their incorporation into U.S. society. However, unlike assimilation and segmented assimilation theories, Interactive Colonization argues that assimilation may be possible for individuals, but not for racialized minority groups (Barajas 2009). XC suggests that the collective *Nepantla* (group hybridity) is the norm in racially hierarchical societies, and that there is no room for substantive pluralism of racial or cultural diversity. Though some individuals might “blend in” and assimilate, their full acceptance into the mainstream society will be contingent on race, class, and gender (Barajas 2009).

According to Barajas (2009), minority group’s ethnic and racial identities are shaped through the history of colonialism, dialectical relationships (i.e., institutionalized oppression and resistance against it), and lastly through social interactions with new groups, environments, and events. These three concepts—colonialism, dialectics, and interactionism—enhance the understanding of minority group’s ethnic and racial identity development.
**Assimilation Theories and Interactive Colonization’s Divergent Propositions:**

To determine the relationship between ethnic and racial identity and educational achievement of Latino university students, assimilation, segmented assimilation, and Interactive Colonization theories’ inform this study’s hypotheses.

First, classical assimilation theories expect that Latino university students that identify with and assimilate into the dominant group’s culture and ideology will successfully integrate into the dominant society and reflect higher success rates than co-ethnics that are less assimilated. In theory, their completion of “the straight line [of] convergence” into the host society is expected to enhance their overall success in education and society. Thus, individuals that identify with ethnic and racial labels consistent with complete assimilation are expected to illustrate similar customs, values, behaviors, and characteristics that are consistent with the dominant group’s views (Bean et al. 2007).

Interactive Colonization, on the other hand, suggests that complete assimilation into a host society is not possible given the racial hierarchies of the nation. Further, cultural assimilation generally entails devaluing one’s own ethnic and racial identity. In agreement with Portes and Rumbaut (2006), cultural assimilation is hypothesized to be harmful to self-concept and academic achievement. From an assimilationist perspective, however, the first hypothesis suggests that Latino university students whom identify with ethnic and racial labels consistent with complete assimilation (complete assimilation toward dominant White culture and rejection of “traditional-home” culture) will demonstrate high levels of academic achievement.
In line with segmented assimilation and Interactive Colonization, the second hypothesis expects that Latinos who maintain selective acculturation (and are bicultural) will have the highest educational success, as they are able to fluidly move between selective “traditional home-country attitudes” and the cultural ideology of the White society (Bean et al. 2007; Portes and Rumbaut 2001, 2006). Barajas (2009) refers to this group as “In-Betweens.” He argues that “In-Betweens” have dual and flexible identities (Barajas 2009: 52). Accordingly, “In-Betweens,” are hypothesized to be the most empowered, and this study predicts they will maintain the highest academic achievement. Therefore Latino “In-Betweens” will more likely project less stigmatizing views of their ethnic and racial identities, because they are able to maintain relations with and feel part of their ethnic community which protects them from accepting the stigmatizing and/or stereotypical views of their minority group. Further, Portes and Rumbaut (2006) and Barajas (2009) contend that biculturalism provides individuals with more positive perceptions of self-identity and thus will experience higher levels of academic success. The ability to function in two worlds and see problems from multiple perspectives advantages bicultural students over other Latinos (Portes and Rumbaut 2006).

XC hypothesizes, as does segmented assimilation, that minorities with transnational identities (bicultural and fluid in movement across borders) will most likely identify with ethnic and racial labels consistent with dual identities, and demonstrate the highest levels of academic achievements. This hypothesis is also consistent with prior research on biculturalism and minority ethnic/racial salience (Phinney 1990; Portes and Rumbaut 2001, 2006; La Fromboise et al. 1993). However, it is distinct because it is
extending the biculturalism and academic achievement thesis to transnational identities (e.g., who feel at home in more than one nation).

Finally, both classical and segmented assimilation associate minorities that identify with the “rejection of the sending and/or receiving society,” as belonging to a “defective underclass” (Portes and Rumbaut 2001, 2006). Diverging from this view (as does Irizarry 2007), Barajas (2009) suggests that over time structured racial, class, and gender inequalities limits biculturalism and selective acculturation. Therefore, as Latino generational statuses increase (second and third generations) within the dominant culture, their emergence into a Nepantla (hybridity) will become more apparent. These Latinos, then, are expected to become generally English monolinguals, but maintain a sense of distinctiveness from their ethnic roots and from the normative ‘American.’ Barajas (2009) argues that Nepantlas occupy intermediary positions between those “at the top” [i.e. White culture] and those “at the bottom” [i.e. stigmatized minority culture] (2009: 51-54).

Hence, when examining these two very different possible assumptions of accommodation, it becomes evident that theoretical literature greatly outweighs empirical research; and as a result, findings in support of either the “defective underclass” or normal Nepantlas theses are warranted. Filling this void, XC framework hypothesizes that those who do not associate fully with either dominant culture [i.e., White] or “traditional-home” culture will have an academic achievement that is normative and not defective as defined by both classical assimilation and segmented assimilation. Furthermore, rather than predicting a positive relation as Irizarry above (2007), XC
underscores that institutional inequalities normalize and privilege those at the top (i.e., middle/upper class, white, and men) and that therefore the emergent academic outcomes of hybrid Latinos will reflect those social hierarchies.

Consequently, to explore the relationship between Latinos’ ethnic and racial identities and their academic achievement at California State University, Sacramento, this study hypothesizes the possible relationships. First, classical assimilation expects that complete assimilation toward the dominant White culture and rejection of “traditional-home” culture will lead to higher academic achievement (Bean et al. 2007). Divergently, both segmented and Interactive Colonization expect “In-Betweens,” who feel at home in both cultures, to elicit the highest academic achievement (Barajas 2009: 53, i.e., generally reflects 1.5 and second generation experience). Yet, segmented assimilation and XC theory diverge with regards to students that associate with hybrid identities (i.e. Nepantla). Segmented assimilation expects students who do not fully associate with either dominant culture [i.e., White] or “traditional-home” culture to undergo downward assimilation and have below average academic achievement (Portes and Rumbaut 2006, i.e., downward assimilation). Consequently, in line with this theoretical claim, hybrid identified Latinas/os will be absent in the university. However, Interactive Colonization suggests that students with hybrid cultural identities that do not fully identify with dominant or subordinated groups will have an academic achievement that is normative (Barajas 2009, i.e., Nepantla) and will reflect some second and third generation experiences.
Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

This study will examine the relationship of Latino university students’ ethnic and racial identities and their academic achievement at CSUS. First, the meanings and reasons Latino students provide for their choice of specific ethnic and racial labels will be explored. This information will serve to understand the relationship between Latinos’ ethnic and racial identities and their academic achievement. Hence, this study seeks to answer the following questions: First, what ethnic and racial labels do Latino university students identify with? Second, what meanings do the chosen ethnic and racial labels have for the university students’ identities? Finally, how are Latino students’ identities associated with their academic achievement at CSU Sacramento?

Therefore, in order to answer these questions, a structured survey approach will be used to test theoretically informed hypotheses and to maximize the understanding of ethnic/racial identity and educational achievement.

Sample:

The sample will come from a nonrandom Latino population from California State University, Sacramento (CSUS). Participants will be obtained from various undergraduate courses, clubs, and organizations associated with the university. The sample will incorporate only adult (18 years or above), undergraduates that identify with the Latino identity or any form thereof. Participation will be voluntary. A convenient, nonrandom sample of Latino students enrolled only at CSUS is chosen to facilitate the study, ensuring representation of the various racial/ethnic experiences within the Latino
population. A sample of at least 150 will be obtained for the study. CSUS professors and heads of clubs and organizations will be contacted and asked if they consent to participate in this study. If so, I will present the purpose of the study to students who may be willing to participate in the study. Those who decide to participate will be given a packet containing a 15 minute survey and a consent letter elaborating the purpose of this study, any potential risks that may arise as a result of participation within the study, and assurance of anonymity for the participants and confidentiality for the class.

Survey Description:

A structured survey will be used to study Latinos’ ethnic and racial identities. Ethnicity and racial identity will be measured using a revised version of the Orthogonal Cultural Identity Scale developed and used by Oetting and Beauvais (1990-91). The scale has been tested and used as an approved measure of ethnic identity and acculturation, especially among minority groups such as Mexican-Americans, Hispanics, Koreans, and American Indians to name a few (Oetting and Beauvais 1990-91; Angstman, Harris, Golbeck, and Swancy 2009). Moreover, social labels that individuals associate or identify in part, obtained from the U.S.’s 2010 Census and other variables such as: transnationalism, language acquisition, generational status, religiosity, age, gender, and social class (self and parents) will also be explored. Therefore, the survey will be divided into three major sections: (1) respondents ethnic and racial identity formations (2) the respondents’ academic achievements, and (3) sample demographics information (see APPENDIX E).
Assessing Dependent Variable:

Academic Achievement: In order to measure academic achievement the following questions will be asked: (1) What is your current grade level at CSU Sacramento? (2) How much academic development have you experienced at CSU Sacramento? (3) What is your overall academic grade point average (GPA) at CSU Sacramento? Categorical response options and five-point continuum scales will be available for possible response options.

Assessing Independent Variables:

Application of Theory/ Acculturation: In evaluating participants’ perceived ethnic and racial identities, classical and segmented assimilation and Interactive Colonization theories will be used to examine the possible conclusions that may result from this study. Therefore, this study examines four possible relationships between ethnic/racial identity and academic achievement:

1. Complete assimilation toward the dominant White culture and rejection of “traditional-home” culture will lead to higher academic achievement (Bean et al. 2007).

2. “In-Betweens,” which are, “persons or groups that occupy intermediary positions between those “at the top” [i.e. White culture] and those “at the bottom [i.e. stigmatized minority culture]” and who are comfortable and feel at home in both cultures will lead to the highest academic achievement (Barajas 2009: 53, i.e., generally reflects 1.5 and second generation experiences).

3. Students who do not fully associate with either dominant culture [i.e., White] or “traditional-home” culture will have an academic achievement that is below average (Portes and Rumbaut 2006, i.e., downward assimilation).
4. Students who do not fully associate with either dominant culture [i.e., White] or “traditional-home” culture will have an academic achievement that is normative (Barajas 2009, i.e., *Nepantla*, hybrid identity, reflects some second and third generation experiences).

*Ethnic and Racial Identity (Acculturation):* Levels of acculturation are measured in part with Oetting and Beauvais’ (1990-91) Orthogonal Cultural Identification Scale (OCIS). OCIS model helps measure complete assimilation, biculturalism, and association with neither dominant or minority culture. In Oetting and Beauvais’ (1990-91) two-dimensional model, individuals adjusting to a host culture can (1) identify with host culture (i.e., assimilation) (2) identify with host culture while retaining an identification with traditional culture (i.e., In-Betweens or Biculturalism) and (3) identify with neither culture (i.e., marginalized or downward assimilation) (pg.655). The advantage in using the OCIS model to measure the levels of hypothesized acculturation is its versatility. Individuals can be classified in terms that are not mutually exclusive. Oetting and Beauvais’ (1990-91) model precludes the implicit negative correlation between the dominant culture and traditional culture like that of older models of acculturation.

Therefore a revised version of the OCIS six-item scale will be implemented to measure the possible levels of acculturation. The scale consists of six questions assessing the relationship between traditional culture and dominant culture. The four main cultural identification questions include: (1) Do you live or follow the …way of life? (2) Are you a success in the …way of life? (3) Does your family live by or follow the …way of life? (4) Is your family a success in the… way of life?
In addition to the 4-item scale, “family tradition” items are also applied for greater validity while broadening the concepts of identification and reducing specificity (Oetting and Beauvais 1990-91). These questions are adjusted for adults and include:

(5) Sometimes families have special activities or traditions that take place every year at particular times (such as holidays parties, special meals, religious activities, trips or visits). How many of these special activities or traditions does your family have that are based on …culture? (6) In the future, with your own family, will you do special things together or have special traditions, which are based on …culture?

Analysis using OCIS model: With item responses scored from 4 (A lot) to 1 (None at All), an average item score higher than the sample mean is assigned to indicate “High” identification and an average item score less than the sample mean is assigned to indicate “Low” identification. Therefore the mean of the sample will be classified as “Medium” identification. All combinations of High, Medium, and Low may occur (Oetting and Beauvais 1990-91).

Those who identify with the dominant culture will be classified as part of the complete assimilation group and will demonstrate a High (dominant culture) and Low (traditional culture) identification. However, those that may identify with dominant culture, yet not White, will be distinguished with an elaboration of self-identity (e.g., White or Latino/ American or Mexican American, etc.). In-Betweens or individuals with bicultural identities will demonstrate a High (dominant culture) and High (traditional culture) identification. Individuals that do not associate with either culture with demonstrate a Low (dominant culture) and Low (traditional culture). OCIS considers this
as the marginalized group and its predictions of success are consisted with the segmented assimilation perspective.

In addition to measuring acculturation using the OCIS model, questions regarding transnationalism, language acquisition, generational status, and personal label identification will also be used to in order to obtain a more comprehensive ethnic and racial identity perception of respondents. Studies have also suggested that age, gender, and social class (self and parents), may be related to one’s racial and ethnic identity and therefore will also be examined.

**Ethnic and Racial Label Options:** Prior studies have revealed that ethnic and racial self-identification or categorization with particular ethnic and racial label(s) or social group(s) is vital to an individual’s self-evaluation (Phinney and Ong 2007). Therefore, as with prior studies done on ethnic and racial identity, a combination of ethnic/racial categories options will be available, in addition to self-reporting categories, so as to allow for self-identification (Morris 2007). Additionally, an open-ended question will also be asked to allow for personal assessment and exploration of self-identities.

**Transnationalism:** This concept is defined as the social ties and relations across borders with family members and friends, or symbolic affinities with the homeland (Barajas 2009: 238). For this study, transnationalism will be measured by respondents’ amount of travel across borders with home country and host country. Respondents will be asked: How often do you travel to your country of origin? Options such as 1-3, 4-6, 7+, or never will be offered.
Language: Language fluency will be assessed by asking respondents (1) the number of languages spoken, (2) their level of fluency in each, and (3) the language they most prefer to speak. Language then will be measured through a dual language assessment measurement using five-point continuum scales.

Generational Status: To assess generational status, respondents will be asked to choose their generational status from a list of options (i.e., 1st generation, 1.5, 2, 3, 4, other).

Age: To measure age respondents will be asked to state their age rounded up to the nearest whole number.

Gender: Respondents will choose their gender from either male/female categorical options.

Social Economic Status of Respondents and Parents: Socioeconomic status will be measured using questions: (1) What is your estimated annual household income? (2) What is your parents’ estimated annual household income? Respondents will have the ability to select their responses from preestablished categorical options.

Control Variables:

Sample Demographics: The sample will come from a nonrandom Latino student population at California State University, Sacramento (CSUS). The sample will include adult, undergraduates that identify as Latino(s). These participants must be adults 18 and over and have either part-time (less than 12 units) or full-time (12 units and over) student status in the university.
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ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

A total of 161 Sacramento State university Latino undergraduate students participated in a self-administered survey. Sixty-one percent of the sample was female, while the average age of participants was 22 years. Of the total, 47% were first year or freshmen standing university students, while 48% identified with a third year or junior level standing within the university. TABLE 1 summarizes some of the sample’s characteristics and variable dimensions, i.e., means and proportions. Furthermore, analysis of the data revealed interesting results with regards to this study’s objectives.

TABLE 1

Measurement Description and Comparison of Means and Proportions: Ethnic and Racial Identity and Academic Achievement Among Latino University Students (N-161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Proportions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>On a scale from one to five, how much academic development have you experienced at CSU Sacramento?</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>0.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino Identification</td>
<td>Identification with Latino culture</td>
<td>20.845</td>
<td>3.25684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo Identification</td>
<td>Identification with Anglo/White culture</td>
<td>14.955</td>
<td>3.9846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Identification</td>
<td>Spanish as primary language identification</td>
<td>18.465</td>
<td>4.80703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Identification</td>
<td>English as primary language identification</td>
<td>22.27</td>
<td>2.59914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>What is your gender?</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Household Income</td>
<td>Logged Parent household income in dollars</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>2.349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnationalism</td>
<td>How often do you travel to your country of origin?</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status</td>
<td>Please check the box below that indicates your generational status in the U.S.</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Logged age in years</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>5.714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three important questions guided this study’s examination of Latino university students’ ethnic/racial identity and academic achievement. First, from a large number of possibilities, what ethnic and racial labels do Latino students identify with? A combination of ethnic and racial categories and a self-reporting open-ended response question revealed that 43% of total responses identified with the “Mexican-American” label option, 29% recognized the “Latino” label, and 26% identified with the “Chicano/a” label (see FIGURE 1).
Students favored racial label options the least as forms of personal identification. When asked how much respondents liked or disliked the racial labels, “Brown,” “White,” and “Black,” 53% of responses disliked the racial label “Brown” and 19% liked it, 50% disliked the “White” label and 12% liked it, and lastly 44% disliked the “Black” label and 13% liked it.

To further explore these findings, we examined question two, what do the chosen ethnic and racial labels mean for Latino university students’ identities? According to the data, racial label identification was the least desirable form of personal identification. Further reinforcing this conclusion was respondents’ reasoning in identifying their personal ethnic/racial perceptions of self. When asked to elaborate on the meanings associated with the chosen ethnic and/or racial label identification(s), place/country of
birth (33%) and parent origin (30%) (i.e., country of birth and/or ancestry location), were the most popular reasons given by students.

A person’s culture or heritage (17%) was also used as an explanation for ethnic/racial identification, while physical features (i.e., skin color, etc.) and/or race (2%) were the least likely forms of self-identification. When examining “Mexican-American” as the most popular label identification, in many cases Mexico and/or America were either respondents’ place of birth or parents’ country of birth/origin and/or vice versa.

Some examples demonstrate how and/or why students identified themselves using certain ethnic/racial labels as opposed to others. In these four examples either place of birth and/or parent origin were the underlying themes for the choice of Mexican-American.

Example 1: “I was born in Mexico but became a U.S. Citizen.”
Example 2: “Because I am a Mexican American. I was born in the US but my parents are Mexican, and I maintain my parents’ cultural traditions and values.”
Example 3: “I am Mexican and American. Parents Mexican, I was born in the U.S.A.”
Example 4: “For one I am of Mexican descent but I was born here in America. Therefore Mexican American best described who I am.”

However, upon further exploration of the actual meanings associated with respondents’ identity perceptions, we must revert to question three, are Latino students’ identities associated with their academic achievement at CSU Sacramento? To answer this question, Latino identity was examined using Oetting and Beauvais’ (1990-91) OCIS model for identity acculturation, in conjunction with respondents’ perception of academic
achievement. Four hypotheses, based on several theoretical frameworks, were therefore created to answer this question. To facilitate the testing of hypotheses, a revised version of Oetting and Beauvais’ (1990-91) two-dimensional model was used in conjunction to respondents’ individual perceptions of their academic achievement at CSU Sacramento. Additionally, the survey also considered prior literature on the subject of Latino identification and academic achievement, and included factors such as gender, parent household income, transnationalism, generational status, and language.

To do so Oetting and Beauvais’ (1990-91) Cultural Identification Scale was modified to help answer the four possible relationships that are thought to occur within the study. In using the OCIS internal consistency reliability ranged into the high .80s, while language internal consistency reliability ranged in the lower .70s and upper .80s, ensuring typical results for both scales (see APPENDIX A). Further, a multivariate regression and ANOVA bivariate analysis were performed to test the four hypothesized relationships of identity and academic achievement of Latinos.
As shown in TABLE 2 above, in the regression analysis, academic development was the measurement used to most accurately measure academic achievement. Academic achievement was maintained as the constant dependent variable while the hypothesized forms of identity or acculturation were treated as dummy variables. For example, when testing for levels of assimilation into the dominant culture, the “Assimilation” variable was treated as 1= (yes) and all other forms of identity as 0= (no). All other variables of acculturation were treated in the same manner.

Therefore, four different forms of identity were examined, assimilation into dominant culture (Assimilation), ("In-Betweens"), the (Marginalized/Nepantla) identities, and an unexpected form of identity which includes those that only identify with the “traditional home” culture as opposed to the dominant (White) culture (High Latino Identification). In order to create ranges for comparison for each of the possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 2</th>
<th>Regression Models Testing Academic Achievement and Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td><strong>Academic Achievement</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>-.536 ** .090 .183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;In-Betweens&quot;</td>
<td>.536 ** .200 .627 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalized/Nepantla</td>
<td>-.090 .183 -.627 ** .196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Latino Identification</td>
<td>.154 .173 -.383 * .184 .244 .160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.002 .124 .002 .124 .002 .124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Household Income</td>
<td>.019 .028 .019 .028 .019 .028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnationalism</td>
<td>.084 .063 .084 .063 .084 .063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status</td>
<td>-.010 .083 -.010 .083 -.010 .083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted R-square</strong></td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01 †p<.10
identifications, the means of each level of acculturation or identities were used as middle ranges. Any associations greater than the mean were considered high associations with an identity, whereas any associations less than the mean were viewed as low associations with an identity. In conjunction to these possible identity perceptions, the control variables—gender, parent household income, transnationalism, generational status, and language—were also incorporated in the regression and ANOVA analysis. The results for each of the four hypotheses demonstrated in TABLE 2, Models 1, 2, and 3 were as follows:

**Hypothesis One**: Complete assimilation toward the dominant White culture and rejection of “traditional-home” culture will lead to high academic achievement (Bean et al. 2007).

As demonstrated in TABLE 2, Model 1, testing *Hypothesis One* required the observance of the impact of assimilation on academic achievement of Latino students. According to the data, there was no support for the assimilation hypothesis as a significant predictor of Latino students’ academic achievement. When controlling for the Assimilation identity, regression analysis showed no statistically significant difference between Assimilation identity and all other tested identities’ effects on academic achievement. Therefore it seems that those individuals identifying with the Assimilation category are not excelling at any higher or greater rate than those that identify with “In-Betweens,” Marginalized, or High Latino Identification. Reinforcing this conclusion was the ANOVA bivariate analysis that depicted the comparison of means for each created level of acculturation. In the analysis comparing identity to academic achievement, Assimilation identity’s mean was 3.97, compared to “In-Betweens” at 4.56, Marginalized
at 3.92, and High Latino Identification at 4.17. Compared to the norm mean of 4.13, Assimilation identity did not depict a higher statistically significant difference in academic achievement as opposed to “In-Betweens”, Marginalized, and High Latino Identification. Additionally, when controlling for gender, parent household income, transnationalism, generational status, and language, no statistically significant impact was shown from any of the variables. This implies that any real or perceived effect on academic achievement by any of the control variables could not be statistically supported by the analyses.

*Hypothesis Two:* “In-Betweens,” which are, “persons or groups that occupy intermediary positions between those “at the top” [i.e. White culture] and those “at the bottom [i.e. stigmatized minority culture]” and who are comfortable and feel at home in both cultures will lead to the highest academic achievement (Barajas 2009: 53, i.e., generally reflects 1.5 and second generation experiences).

By contrast to *Hypothesis One*, support for “In-Betweens” identity’s effect on academic achievement was apparent. TABLE 2, Model 2 shows when controlling for an “In-Between” identity, the multivariate analysis demonstrated a statistically significant impact of biculturalism identity on academic achievement. An ANOVA analysis reinforced the regression results shown in TABLE 2, Model 2, by demonstrating that at the bivariate level of comparison, “In-Betweens” identity maintained the highest association with academic achievement with a mean of 4.56. In the same table, Model 2 also illustrates that compared to the “In-Betweens” identity, Assimilation, Marginalized, and High Latino Identification, had a much lower impact on the academic achievement of respondents. Compared to the “In-Betweens” identity, those that associated with the
Marginalized identity displayed the most difference or lowest impact on academic achievement, which in part may be support for Hypothesis Three. Yet, like Hypothesis Two, no support was found to illustrate any impact of the control variables on academic achievement. Although Hypothesis Two was supported, the assumption that respondents whom identified with the “In-Betweens” identity would generally reflect 1.5 and beyond generational experiences, could not be supported by the data.

Hypothesis Three: Students who do not fully associate with either dominant culture [i.e., White] or “traditional-home” culture will have an academic achievement that is below average (Portes and Rumbaut 2006, i.e., downward assimilation).

When testing for Hypothesis Three, the results were inclusive. According to the multivariate analysis (see TABLE 2, Model 3) when controlling for the Marginalized identity, “In-Betweens” identification exposed a greater, positive relationship with academic achievement that proved to be statistically significant at a p-value < .01. This in part produced support for Hypothesis Three in that compared to “In-Betweens,” students that did not fully associate with either dominant culture or “traditional-home” culture were associated with an academic achievement that was lower. In other words, those individuals that identified with the Marginalized identity portrayed a lower, positive association with academic achievement when compared to the “In-Betweens.” However, the same support could not be shown when Marginalized identity’s academic achievement was compared to Assimilation’s and High Latino Identification’s academic achievement associations. Analysis of the data (see TABLE 2, Model 3) revealed that associations for Assimilation and High Latino identity and academic achievement were not proven to be statistically significant, thus generating inconclusive results for
Hypothesis Three’s assumption of downward assimilation for Marginalized individuals. Furthermore, no statistically significant associations were uncovered when analyzing the impact of the control variables on academic achievement.

Hypothesis Four: Students who do not fully associate with either dominant culture [i.e., White] or “traditional-home” culture will have an academic achievement that is normative (Barajas 2009, i.e., Nepantla, hybrid identity, reflects some second and third generation experiences).

Similar to the results of Hypothesis Three, the impact of the control variables on respondents’ academic achievement in Hypothesis Four was not found to be statistically significant. Diverging from Hypothesis Three’s view of downward assimilation creating the Marginalized identity, Hypothesis Four’s assumption that those with Nepantla identities will demonstrate an academic achievement that is normative, also generated inconsistent results. As clarified in the previous elaboration for Hypothesis Three, Hypothesis Four was also only partially supported by the data (see TABLE 2, Model 3). Again compared to “In-Betweens,” the Nepantla identity showed a lower, positive association with individuals’ academic achievement, yet once more, other identity associations were not statistically significant. One key difference however, was the ANOVA results. This bivariate analysis seemed to somewhat suggest that Hypothesis Four’s assumption that Nepantla individuals’ academic achievement would portray a normative pattern may have in fact occurred within the sample. According to the analysis of variance, those that identified with the Nepantla identity showed a mean of 4.17 which was slightly higher than the normative mean of 4.13. In other words, the data demonstrated that those Latino university students that identified with a Nepantla
identity did in fact have the lowest academic achievement mean, but not significantly lower or different than that of assimilation (3.97) and most importantly, than that of the normative mean for identity and academic achievement.
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CONCLUSION

Summary:

As Latino-origin populations continue to grow in the U.S., so does the need to examine the diversity that exists among the individuals that are placed within the broad “Latino” classification. Exploring Latino’s individual identity is vital if we are to understand the cultural and historical differences within this “group.” To this end, this study examined a segment of the Latino-origin population in the U.S.—university students. Specifically, this study explored the relationship of Latino students’ ethnic/racial identification and their academic achievement at CSU Sacramento. Driving this study was the desire to understand what ethnic and/or racial labels Latino university students most commonly identified with and what these labels mean for these students. The ultimate interest is to understand whether Latino students’ identities are associated with their academic achievement at CSU Sacramento.

Guided by existing scholarship, four possible relationships or hypotheses were examined (see Chapter 2). Based on theory and existing empirical research, this study predicted that Latino university students who identified with an “In-Between” or bicultural (more than one identity, see Chapter 3) identity would demonstrate the highest academic achievement at CSUS, compared to students that identified with complete assimilation (low on Latino identity), marginalization (low on Anglo and Latino identity) or a Nepantla identity.
Using a structured, self-administered survey, this study tested the potential relationships between Latino identity and academic achievement in higher education. A total of 161 students participated in study. All respondents were adult university students from CSUS that identified with the Latino identity or a form thereof. Upon retrieval and examination of the data, findings were presented in aggregate form.

**Conclusion:**

Findings from the study revealed that as a group, Latino university students did not choose the dominant ethnic labels (i.e., “Latino” and/or “Hispanic”) as their first choice for self-identification. Surprisingly, most respondents identified with the “Mexican-American” label option. Racial label identification, however, was the least desirable form of personal identification.

In trying to understand the reasoning behind the most popular chosen label options, respondents were asked to elaborate on their preferred identity. Latino university students generally defined their identity through their place/country of birth and/or parent origin(s). Having the ability to choose their own ethnic/racial label(s) and/or self-identification, was the way in which respondents demonstrated their unique distinction from and of each other.

Bringing this notion to mind, it became clear that being continually classified under the Latino or Hispanic label diminishes the complexities and variations in culture, origin, and history among these individuals. Although Latino identification was the second most popular form of ethnic identity, it obtained 14% lower responses than the
Mexican-American label. By contrast, a Hispanic identification did not even make the top three most commonly chosen self-identification labels for respondents. Additionally, racial identification (i.e., use of color) also did not prove to be an ideal form of self-identification for the majority of respondents.

Therefore, the results demonstrate the need for individual self-identification, as it may reveal identities that are different from those imposed by the dominant society. Although much of the sociological community now views race and ethnicity as imposed social constructs, empirical research does not always identify them as such.

Identity and Academic Achievement:

Although the study revealed clear distinctions in self-identification using ethnic/racial labels among the participants, identity in terms of acculturation was a more complex issue to examine. Therefore the study examined the association of each predicted form of acculturation (i.e., assimilation, “In-Between,” marginalized, and Nepantla) and academic achievement. This analysis shed light on four possible relationships between the identity and academic achievement of Latino university students at CSUS.

In support of the literature on biculturalism as a positive minority identity development, the findings generated some support for Hypothesis Two: “In-Betweens,” which are, “persons or groups that occupy intermediary positions between those “at the top” [i.e. White culture] and those “at the bottom [i.e. stigmatized minority culture]” and who are comfortable and feel at home in both cultures will lead to the highest academic achievement (Barajas 2009: 53, i.e., generally reflects 1.5 and second generation
experiences). Regression analysis and ANOVA revealed a positive association between bicultural identification and academic achievement. Compared to biculturalism, assimilation, and marginalized identifications had much lower impacts on students’ academic achievement. However, the data collected was unable to demonstrate any statistically significant impact of the control variables predicted to have influenced the results or levels of acculturation of respondents.

Yet, despite the lack of support for the predicted generational status of “In-Betweens,” this study was unable to support the assimilation’s position that complete assimilation is the most successful form of identification. Both assimilation and segmented assimilation’s predictions that individuals with a marginalized identity would demonstrate below average academic achievement could not be proven in this study. According to the data, respondents with a marginalized or *Nepantla* identity did not demonstrate significantly lower academic achievement as compared to other forms of identifications, thereby questioning assimilation’s perspective of what constitutes “successful” acculturation.

**Limitations:**

Even though generalizability was one of the limitations of this study, it will nevertheless offers important insights about Latino identity perceptions and their academic achievement. Unfortunately, conducting a study using a self-administered survey did not go without its limits and costs.
Studying the relationship of Latino’s ethnic/racial identities from a quantitative approach undoubtedly reduced the level of acquired “good quality” data usually obtained from comprehensive interviews and research. Contrast to qualitative research, this empirical study relied on what respondents choose to write and fill in on a self-administered survey. Without the use of semi-structured interviews, probing respondents for elaboration was lost. Furthermore, when evaluating academic achievement, the study relied on individuals’ own interpretation of achievement. In regards to academic achievement, two forms of measurement were used, including G.P.A. and individual perceptions of academic development at CSUS. Therefore, if individuals did not accurately portray their true academic achievement, the information gathered may have been skewed.

Fortunately, this study attempted to reduce the inaccuracy of the information obtained by using more than one form to measure ethnic and racial identification and academic achievement. To increase the validity of ethnic and racial identification, various ethnic/racial labels options were available in addition to open-ended response options. Most importantly, however, was the use of Oetting and Beauvais (1990-91) OCIS model that maintained a high internal consistency range of reliability.

So, by using a reliable survey approach to analyze the ethnic and racial identities and academic achievement of Latino students, I was able to increase my sample size to 161. This helped me examine a larger sample group whose findings may be generalizable to the desired population being explored. Therefore, although limits and costs may have arisen as a result of using a structured survey to study ethnic and racial
identity and academic achievement of Latino students, the benefits still outweighed the limitations and costs.

*Future Recommendations:*

As Latino populations continue to grow in the U.S., so does the need to research their perception of self-identity. It is research done by Phinney (1990), Irizarry (2007), Portes and Hao (2004), Barajas (2009), and Oetting and Beauvais (1990-91) that add to the literature on Latinos’ ethnic identity and its relation to education. From their scholarship, we can learn, grow, and begin to build a better foundation to help future research consider the diversity among Latinos. Expanding Latino identity research beyond ambiguous and “all encompassing” categories will help social sciences uncover significant distinctions within this minority group.

But unfortunately Latino categorization presently incorporates groups of people that do not display the same colors, cultures, values, or even national origins. As a result of this ethnic and racial ambiguity, we fail to understand the diversity in perceptions, culture, and history that exists among Latinos. Therefore, it would also be of great benefit to incorporate the historical contexts that have affected minority groups like Latinos. To understand Latino ethnic and racial identities, we must acknowledge and incorporate the historical events that have occurred in the United States as well as in other countries. Using Interactive Colonization theory, Barajas (2009) takes into consideration the micro and macro level concept seen in colonialism, dialectics, and interactionism to help elaborate on the disparities and inequalities that are widely present in the U.S. Additionally, Interactive Colonization allows greater comprehension of the
fluidity of ethnic and racial identities for minorities, as they are exposed to the dominating world controlled by white privilege and stratification that normalizes, justifies, and influences various forms of self-identity.

In this study moving passed the use of categorization and examining the acculturation of Latino students helped uncover distinctions in identities perceptions and academic achievement that have yet to gain reasonable empirical support. Future steps should include the examination of the information gathered from this study as it compares to past, present and future research on the topic. As a result, future researchers can begin to use this study’s findings on Latino identity perceptions and academic achievement as an introduction to this under examined group.
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Reliability Index for Identification and Language (N= 161)
Reliability Index for Identification and Language (N= 161)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Items Used</th>
<th>Coding</th>
<th>Reliability (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Anglo Identification | 1. Some families have special activities or traditions that take place every year at particular times. How many of these special activities or traditions does your family have that are based on…  
2. In the future, with your own family, will you do special things together or have special traditions, which are based on…  
3. Does your family live by or follow the …  
4. Do you live by or follow the …  
5. Is your family a success in the…  
6. Are you a success in the… | 1- None at all  
2- A few  
3- Some  
4- A lot | 1. Anglo Identification (.843)  
2. Latino Identification (.84) |
| 2. Latino Identification | 1. How often or how much do you speak English?  
2. You enjoy listening to music in English.  
3. How often or how much do you enjoy watching TV in English?  
4. How often or how much do you write in English?  
5. You think in English. | 1- Never  
2- Rarely  
3- Sometimes  
4- Most of the time  
5- A lot of the time | 3. English Identification (.714) |
| 3. English Identification | 1. How often or how much do you speak Spanish?  
2. You enjoy listening to music in Spanish.  
3. You enjoy watching TV in Spanish.  
5. You think in Spanish. | 1- Never  
2- Rarely  
3- Sometimes  
4- Most of the time  
5- A lot of the time | 4. Spanish Identification (.887) |
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Regression Model Testing Academic Development and Language
Regression Model Testing Academic Development and Language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Development</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>b</strong></td>
<td><strong>SE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Identification</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Identification</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Household Income</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnationalism</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status</td>
<td>-.053</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-square</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05  **p<.01 †p<.10
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Regression Model Testing Academic Grade Point Average and Identification
**Regression Model Testing Academic Grade Point Average and Identification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Academic Grade Point Average</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>.666</td>
<td>.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-Between</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginalized/Nepantla</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Latino ID</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English ID</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish ID</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.721 *</td>
<td>.293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Household Income</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transnationalism</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generational Status</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adjusted R-square</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note TABLE 5: When analyzing Latino university students’ identity perceptions and academic achievement, academic grade point average or GPA was not used as the measure of analysis for academic achievement, due to its lack of statistical significance in association with the acculturation identities being tested in the hypotheses. However, it is interesting to note that unlike academic development perception (used as the measurement for academic achievement), the control variable, gender did seem to have a statistically significant association with GPA (when GPA is used as the dependent variable in measuring achievement). According to TABLE 5, respondents’ gender had a negative (-.721*) association with GPA.*
APPENDIX D

Consent to Participate
You are being asked to participate in research which will be conducted by Ali Perez, a graduate student from California State University, Sacramento. The study explores Latinos’ own description of ethnic identity as opposed to ascribed ethnic/racial identities. Specifically, this investigation seeks to understand Latino’s perceptions of ethnic/racial identity, and its relation to academic achievement.

You will be asked to complete a survey on your perceptions of your ethnic/racial identity and your present and future educational goals at California State University, Sacramento. Personal views and values, and your relationships with others, family, and friends may also be asked. The questionnaire will take between 15-20 minutes of your time.

Some of the items in the survey may seem personal or discuss a sensitive issue, but you don’t have to complete or answer any question in the survey that you do not feel comfortable with and you can stop at any time with no consequences to you. Completing this survey is entirely voluntary.

If you choose to complete the survey you may gain insight as to your own personal feeling about your ethnic/racial identity. You may also gain insight into factors that affect education in the university, or you may not personally benefit from participating in this research. It is hoped that the results of the study will be beneficial for the university to become more aware of the Latina/o diversity in terms ethnic/racial identity and experiences, so as to improve the success of students in university.

To preserve the confidentiality of your information, you will be asked not to put your name on any part of the survey or add any personal information that would personally identify you, such as your address, phone number, or social security number. Your responses on the survey will be anonymous. Only the number at the top of the survey will be used to organize and keep track of the surveys administered. The surveys will be destroyed as soon as the study is finalized. Until that time, they will be stored in a secure location. Only aggregated results for the study will be reported.

You will not be receiving compensation for participating in the research.

If you have any questions about this research, you may contact Ali Perez at (xxx) xxx-xxxx or by email at axxxxxxx@mail.csus.edu. You may also contact Dr. Barajas by phone at (916) 278-1576 or by email at barajasm@csus.edu. Counseling services may also be available by contacting the Student Health and Counseling Services at (916) 278-6416.

Again, your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. Your completion of the survey conveys that you have read this page and consent for a researcher to use the survey in the research study.
APPENDIX E

Survey
Survey

ID NUMBER: ___________

Ethnic and Racial Identity and Academic Achievement
Among Latino University Students

This study seeks to learn more about the relation between ethnic and racial identification and academic achievement in higher education among Latinos. To this end, we are interested in learning more about you. Participation involves the completion of this survey in which you will be asked about your perceptions of your ethnic/racial identity and your present and future educational goals at California State University, Sacramento. Personal views and values, and your relationships with others, family, and friends may also be asked. This survey will take about 15 minutes of your time. All answers you provide will remain strictly anonymous.

PLEASE DO NOT PUT YOUR NAME ANYWHERE ON THIS SURVEY.
**PLEASE RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ACCORDING TO YOUR PERSONAL OPINION**

**PLEASE START HERE ↓↓**

_Ethnic and Racial Label Options:_

**EID1.** My ethnicity is… (Please check as many boxes as desired)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>1. Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>2. Asian American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>3. Black or African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>4. Hispanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>5. Latino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>6. Mexican American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>7. Central American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>8. South American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>9. White, Caucasian, European American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□</td>
<td>10. Not Hispanic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EID2.** Please explain why you think the chosen label(s) describe who you are:
What are your feeling towards using the labels below to describe your race and ethnicity?

(Please check the box to indicate how much you Like or Dislike the use of EACH label)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EID3</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>□</th>
<th>□</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EID4</td>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID5</td>
<td>Mexican-American</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID6</td>
<td>Indo American/Indigenous</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID7</td>
<td>Central American</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID8</td>
<td>South American</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID9</td>
<td>Chicano/a</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID10</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID11</td>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID12</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID13</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID14</td>
<td>Other: ___________</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EID15. Please fill in: In terms of ethnic group, I consider myself to be:
______________________________________________________________

The following questions ask how close you are to different cultures. When answering the questions about “family,” think about the family that is most important to you now. How would you define that family? You can include your current family, your family of origin, or both. Answer the questions keeping that definition in mind. You may identify with more than one culture, so please mark all responses that apply to you.

(Please check ✓ your response to each question)

Some families have special activities or traditions that take place every year at particular times (such as holiday parties, special meals, religious activities, trips or visits). How many of these special activities or traditions does your family have that are based on…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot (4)</th>
<th>Sometime (3)</th>
<th>A few (2)</th>
<th>None at all (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCU1: White American or Anglo Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCU2: Latino or Hispanic Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the future, with your own family, will you do special things together or have special traditions, which are based on…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot (4)</th>
<th>Sometime (3)</th>
<th>A few (2)</th>
<th>None at all (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCU3: White American or Anglo Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCU4: Latino or Hispanic Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Does your family live by or follow the…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot (4)</th>
<th>Sometime (3)</th>
<th>A few (2)</th>
<th>None at all (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCU5 White American or Anglo Culture</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCU6 Latino or Hispanic Culture</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Do you live by or follow the…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot (4)</th>
<th>Sometime (3)</th>
<th>A few (2)</th>
<th>None at all (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCU7 White American or Anglo Culture</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCU8 Latino or Hispanic Culture</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Is your family a success in the…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot (4)</th>
<th>Sometime (3)</th>
<th>A few (2)</th>
<th>None at all (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCU9 White American or Anglo Culture</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCU10 Latino or Hispanic Culture</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Are you a success in the…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A lot (4)</th>
<th>Sometime (3)</th>
<th>A few (2)</th>
<th>None at all (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCU11 White American or Anglo Culture</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCU12 Latino or Hispanic Culture</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
<td>( )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the following questions ask about your language preference.
My primary language is: ________________________.

On a scale of one (Never) to five (A lot of the time) please answer the following questions.

(Please circle the number that indicates your response)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>A lot of the time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANG2</strong> How often or how much do you speak Spanish?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANG3</strong> How often or how much do you speak English?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANG4</strong> You enjoy listening to music in Spanish.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANG5</strong> You enjoy listening to music in English.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANG6</strong> You enjoy watching TV in Spanish.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANG7</strong> How often or how much do you enjoy watching TV in English?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANG8</strong> You write in Spanish.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LANG9</strong> How often or how much do you write in English?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LANG12. On a scale of one (very negative) to five (very positive) how do you feel about Latinos who do not speak English? (Please circle your response)

Very Negative  Very Positive
1------2------3------4------5

LANG13. On a scale of one (very negative) to five (very positive) how do you feel about Latinos who do not speak Spanish?

(Please circle your response)

Very Negative  Very Positive
1------2------3------4------5

Next, we would like to ask you about your connection with your country of origin.

ORIGIN1. Where were you born?
(Please check the box below that indicates where you were born)

□ In the USA—Which state were you born?
□ Outside USA—Which country were you born?

ORIGIN2. *If you were born outside the USA, how old were you when you came to live in the United States? ____________ years old.

ORIGIN3. Was either of your parents born outside the United States?

□ Yes  □ No

ORIGIN4. *Yes—Which country was (were) he/she (both of your parents) born?

(please write your response here)
ORIGIN5. Please check ☑ the box below that indicates your generational status in the U.S.

☐ 1st generation (Immigrants)
☐ 1.5 generation (Immigrant children under 12)
☐ 2nd generation (First born in the US)
☐ 3rd generation and beyond (Parent(s) born in the US)

TRANS1. How often do you travel to your country of origin?
(Please check ☑ the box below that indicates your response for the total times you have been to your country of origin)

☐ 1-3
☐ 4-6,
☐ 7+
☐ Never

In the following question we would like to know about your religiosity.

RELIGION1. On a scale of 1 (not committed at all) to 10 (extremely committed) how committed would you say you are to your religion? (Please circle the number below that indicates your response)

Not committed at all                                      Extremely committed

1-----2------3-------4------5-------6------7------8------9------10\n
Now, we would like to know about your academic achievement
AACHIEVE 1. What is your current grade level at CSU Sacramento? (Please check the box below that indicates your response)

- Freshmen
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior

AACHIEVE 2. On a scale from one (no development) to five (a lot of development), how much academic development have you experienced at CSU Sacramento? (Please circle the number below that indicates your response)

No development 1------2------3-----4------5 A lot of development

AACHIEVE 3. What is your overall academic grade point average (GPA) at CSU Sacramento? (Please check the box below that indicates your response)

- □ A  (4.0+)
- □ A-  (3.7-3.9)
- □ B+  (3.3-3.6)
- □ B   (3.0-3.2)
- □ B-  (2.7-2.9)
- □ C+  (2.3-2.6)
- □ C   (2.0-2.2)
- □ C-  (1.7-1.9)
- □ D+  (1.3-1.6)
- □ D   (1.0-1.2)
- □ D-  (0.7-0.9)
- □ F   (0.0-0.6)
AACHIEVE4. Over the past year, has your grade point average …
(Please check ☐ the box below that indicates your response)

☐ Gone up
☐ Gone down
☐ Stayed about the same

(For the following questions, please check ☐ the box that indicates your response)

AACHIEVE5. Do you plan on graduating from a university?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

AACHIEVE6. Do you plan on obtaining a bachelor’s degree?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

AACHIEVE7. Do you plan on continuing your education next year?  ☐ Yes  ☐ No

Finally, we would like to ask you some basic information about you. Remember that none of this information can or will be used to identify you in any way.

*PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ANYWHERE ON THIS SURVEY*

GENDER1. What is your gender? (Please check ☐ the box that indicates your response).

☐ Male
☐ Female

AGE1. What is your age? ______________
**INCOME1.**
What is your estimated annual household income?
(Please check the box that indicates your response).

- □ Under $19,999
- □ $20,000 to $29,999
- □ $30,000 to $39,999
- □ $40,000 to $49,999
- □ $50,000 to $59,999
- □ $60,000 to $69,999
- □ $70,000 to $79,999
- □ $80,000 to $89,999
- □ $90,000 to $99,999
- □ $100,000 or more

**INCOME2.**
What is your parents’ estimated annual household income?
(Please check the box that indicates your response).

- □ Under $19,999
- □ $20,000 to $29,999
- □ $30,000 to $39,999
- □ $40,000 to $49,999
- □ $50,000 to $59,999
- □ $60,000 to $69,999
- □ $70,000 to $79,999
- □ $80,000 to $89,999
- □ $90,000 to $99,999
- □ $100,000 or more

Thank you for participating in this survey.

Your effort is truly appreciated!!

*If you have any additional comments, please include them here ↓↓
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