

The College Pathways of Foreign-Born and Native-Born Latina/o College Students at Four-Year Institutions

Victor B. Sáenz

University of Texas, Austin

Angélica Aguilar Rodríguez

University of Texas, Austin

Melissa A. Martínez

Texas State University, San Marcos

Enrique Romo

University of Texas, Austin

Abstract

With the continued growth of Latinas/os in higher education, it has become more important than ever for university leaders, administrators, and policy makers to understand the complex factors that lead to their participation and success. It is also important to acknowledge that a good proportion of these Latina/o students are foreign-born. This study explores key differences between foreign-born and native-born Latinas/os as they enter four-year institutions in key areas such as academic preparation and reasons for choosing college. Employing longitudinal trends data from the CIRP Freshman survey, we utilize chi-square analysis to explore differences across key groups (by place of birth and gender) over three decades. Our results suggest that foreign-born Latinas/os lag behind their peers in academic preparation, have greater concerns over financing college, and are likely to choose college due to low tuition. Our findings demonstrate each group's unique profile upon entering four-year institutions and provide a historic glimpse of how these student populations have changed over three decades.

Introduction

Continuing challenges exist for foreign-born Latina/o students who want to pursue a college education in the United States. Many of these students—brought here by their immigrant families—are provided with quality educational experiences within our K-12 schools, and many work hard to prepare themselves for the rigors of post-secondary education. However for many, their hopes of accessing higher education are effectively out of reach, inhibited by a lack of affordable opportunities and a complex policy debate surrounding the rights of immigrant students. This ongoing policy debate focuses primarily on the rights of undocumented immigrant students in higher education, and it tends to overshadow any discussion about the opportunities of all other Latina/o immigrant students within our higher education systems, be they documented or not. In addition, there is little research that explores the college pathways of foreign-born Latina/o students, as most scholarship in this area focuses on all Latina/o students and rarely disaggregates by characteristics such as place of birth or national origin.

This study aims to bridge this void in research by identifying academic, financial, and familial factors that facilitate access to higher education for foreign-born and native-born Latina/o students that enroll in four-year institutions. Latina/o students are often aggregated in research; however, there are critical distinctions to be examined between foreign-born students—those Latinas/os born outside of the U.S. who immigrate with their families—and their nativeborn peers, or those born in the U.S. We examine key points of conversion and diversion in the experiences of these two Latina/o student groups as they arrive at four-year colleges. Employing longitudinal trends data from the CIRP Freshman survey, we utilize chi-square analysis to explore differences (by place of birth and gender) over three decades. Areas examined include: academic preparation, financial concerns, and reasons that influence their college choice. Based on the analysis, we offer policy implications on the unique experiences of foreign-born Latina/o entering college students.

Background and Policy Context

The 2010 U.S. Census reported that the Latina/o population has grown to an estimated 50.5 million, representing almost 16.3% of the U.S. (Passel, Cohn, & López, 2011). In fact, half of the country's overall population growth between 2000 and 2010 was due to Hispanics alone, and their percentages increased in every state of the union (Pew Hispanic Center, 2011). The Latina/o population is very young, as over 17 million Latina/o children are under the age of 18 (Ibid.). Also, an estimated 11.1 million are unauthorized immigrants, the majority located in states like California (2.5 million) and Texas (1.6 million) (Ibid.). This new demographic reality underscores the need to better understand the population of foreign-born and native-born Latina/o students as they navigate their college pathways, especially in states where Latina/o immigrants are concentrated (e.g., AZ, CA, FL, NM, and TX).

Over the past three decades, national immigration policies have directly and indirectly impacted the opportunity of immigrant foreign-born Latina/o students to access higher education (Olivas, 2004). Twelve states (CA, IL, KS, MD, NE, NM, NY, OK, TX, UT, WA, and WI) have instituted policies over the last decade to allow immigrant students to pay in-state college tuition regardless of their legal status (Undocumented Student Tuition, 2011). Other states (e.g., AZ, CO, GA, & IN) have responded by banning in-state tuition for undocumented students (Ibid.). At the federal level, an attempt in 2010 to pass the Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors Act, or the DREAM Act, was led by Senator Richard Durbin (D-Illinois) as S. 729 (S. 729, 111th Cong., 2009), but it was unsuccessful.

The future of the DREAM Act may remain uncertain, yet challenges persist for foreignborn Latina/o students as they navigate their college pathways. This federal and state policy context serves to underscore the urgency of examining the postsecondary pathways of Latina/o immigrant students. While the study is unable to focus explicitly on undocumented college students, even focusing on the category of foreign-born Latina/o students represents an important contribution.

Literature Review

Social science research focused on Latina/o college students is rarely disaggregated by place of birth. Latina/o foreign-born and native-born students come equipped with different skill sets, funds of knowledge (González, Moll, Tenery, Rivera, Rendón, Gonzales, & Amanti, 1995), and future aspirations. Immigrants, particularly those that are undocumented, have several barriers in pursuing and completing higher education. Foreign-born Latinas/os worry about career opportunities afforded to them after graduation because of their inability to work in the U.S. legally (Abrego, 2006). Moreover, regardless of immigration status, most students are concerned about costs affiliated with attending college (Santiago, 2007). Many Latinas/os, both foreign-born and native-born, attend high poverty, high minority schools that limit their educational opportunities. Such challenges are exacerbated if Latina/o students' parents lack a formal education, if students come from low-income families, are held back in school, and/or have a low GPA (Swail, Cabrera, & Lee, 2004).

Latino parents, however, maintain strong support for educational goals by instilling in students the concept of an *educación* (Auerbach, 2006; Reese, Balzano, Gallimore, & Goldenberg, 1995) and motivating students through the use of *consejos*, or words of wisdom (Delgado-Gaitán, 1994; Fránquiz & Salazar, 2004; Villenas, Godínez, Delgado Bernal, & Elenes, 2006). Some researchers have documented how Latina/o parents can draw upon their funds of knowledge (González, et al., 1995) in order to help students navigate the American educational system, despite the fact that they may lack proficiency with the English language or have little familiarity with the American educational system themselves (Ceballo, 2004). Also, the college decision-making process is directly tied to parental and sibling influences. For instance, in Ceja's (2004) study on the college choice process of Chicanas, participants consistently noted parents as influential in their academic success. Pérez (2010) also identified parents as essential in this process, but also found peers and siblings to be influential. Nevertheless, pursuing social and economic mobility through education is a prominent feature of the contemporary immigrant experience (Tseng, 2006). As a result of this desire, Latina/o immigrant students tend to have higher levels of motivation to climb the academic ladder.

Immigrant students also have to contend with deficit thinking on the part of educators and administrators (Valencia, 1997, 2010; Valenzuela, 1999). Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco (2002) note that many teachers view their immigrant students as less intelligent than their native peers even though the teachers believe that their immigrant students are more eager to learn. With immigrant students facing an uncertain future in higher education, this brief literature review is useful in framing our study, which focuses on the academic preparation, financial concerns, and the college choices of Latina/o foreign-born and native-born students in an effort to better understand and support them through their college pathways.

Methodology

This study focused on institutions that participated in the CIRP Freshman Survey in the years 1985, 1994, and 2004 from five states: Arizona, California, Florida, New Mexico, and Texas. These states were chosen due to their large Latina/o immigrant populations. These years were selected in order to maximize the number of four-year institutions that participated in the CIRP Freshman Survey. This group of states includes three that offer in-state tuition to immigrant students (CA, NM, and TX), one that prohibits it (AZ), and one that has failed on its attempt to pass similar legislation (FL). Given this geographic and policy context, two interrelated research questions guided our analysis related to differences between foreign-born and native-born Latina/o students entering college over the last three decades:

1. How do they compare on academic preparedness as they enter college?
2. What are key differences that influence their financial concerns and college choice?

Data and Analysis

The primary data source for this study was CIRP Freshman Survey trends data, collected annually since the late 1960s by the UCLA Higher Education Research Institute. The CIRP Freshman Survey is administered every summer to incoming college freshmen at hundreds of four-year institutions across the country, and it is the nation's longest running study of entering college students. The survey items cover a variety of pre-college experiences, motivations, aspirations, life goals and objectives, and expectations for college. The data are collected according to a sampling strategy that ensures broad representation of four-year institutions to reflect a national normative profile of the entering first-year population at all four-year public or private colleges and universities across the country (Pryor, Hurtado, Sáenz, Santos, & Korn, 2007).

The CIRP Freshman Survey trends data offer a unique historical context with which to examine entering college students over the last four decades. Our study parallels a recent trends report of Latina/o students in higher education (Hurtado, Sáenz, Santos, & Cabrera, 2008). Due to limitations in the types of demographic questions that have been asked in this survey, we cannot explicitly identify students' undocumented status or their country of origin, but we are able to distinguish between foreign-born and native-born Latina/o students. Focusing on four-year colleges represents a limitation given that a slight majority of Latinas/os are enrolled in the two-year sector, yet there is important value in examining this context given the prevailing degree attainment goals (e.g., President Obama's 2020 Goal) that call for more four-year degrees. Another limitation lies with our use of the Latina/o label, as there are many terms that can be used to refer to individuals of Latina/o or Hispanic origin in social science research. Throughout the study we employ the term Latinas/os and Hispanics interchangeably to describe students that are of Mexican, Puerto Rican, or other Latina/o descent, acknowledging that this imperfect grouping could serve to mask important variances that inevitably exist between such sub-groups. These limitations do affect the specificity of our analyses with respect to national origin, but we are nonetheless able to make meaningful comparisons between foreign-born and native-born entering Latina/o college students.

Our analyses of the CIRP Freshman Survey trends data for the three survey years of 1985 (n=4,915), 1994 (n=17,421), and 2004 (n=40,870) focuses on documenting significant between-group differences through descriptive summaries and chi-square analysis. We employ this analysis to examine key comparisons by gender across these sub-groups. Table I displays a frequency distribution of these sub-groups. good place to begin.

Foreign-born Males	224	1148	1287
Native-born Males	1793	6142	15137
Foreign-born Females	195	1458	2165
Native-born Females	2703	8673	22281
Total	4915	17421	40870

Source: CIRP Freshman Survey, UCLA Higher Education Research Institution.

Notes: Data are from respondents to the CIRP Freshman survey, and sample sizes are weighted to reflect the national normative profile of entering freshmen for the given year. Data include respondents from institutions in five states (AZ, CA, FL, NM, TX) across three years: 1985, 1994, and 2004. For additional information on these data, see: Hurtado, S., Sáenz, V. B., Santos, J. L., & Cabrera, N. L. (2008). *Advancing in higher education: A portrait of Latina/o college freshmen at four-year institutions: 1975–2006*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.

Appendix A displays the results of selected chi-square analysis in tabular format. Our results are focused on differences in academic preparation for college, financial concerns, and factors that influence where they decide to go to college. We were unable to employ more advanced analytic techniques due to the fact that these data are aggregate in nature and do not allow for unit-level analysis.

Results

Demographic Portrait

The proportion of entering foreign-born Latina/o students at four-year institutions has been increasing over the last several decades, although there has been a decline in the last few years. A closer look at CIRP Freshman Survey trends data corroborates this, as the proportion of foreign-born Latina/o students was under 4% in 1971, reaching a high of 12% in the mid-1990s and then settling back at about 7% in 2008 (See Figure 1).

In addition, we have mapped onto this enrollment timeline some key federal immigration policies that in some cases have coincided with sharp increases or decreases in enrollment. The movement of the trend line suggests such policies may have some effect on college enrollment rates of foreign-born Latina/o students, although further research would be necessary to further extend such a conjecture. The general trend since 1971 indicates a steady increase in the proportion of foreign-born Latinas/os entering four-year colleges, providing an important demographic context with which to consider our analysis of survey differences between these students and their native-born Latina/o peers.

Figure 1. Proportion of Foreign-Born Latinas/os Among All Latinas/os Entering Four-Year Institutions



Academic preparation

As students transition from high school to college, it is vital that they are academically prepared and college-ready. Research suggests that immigrant students in high school often demonstrate stronger academic motivation when compared to their native-born peers (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2002). This may be because immigrant students often have an increased desire to do well for their parents, repaying them for the sacrifices they made to provide students a better life (Tseng, 2004). This increased level of academic motivation, however, does not always translate to higher academic achievement, in part because the greater familial interdependence that immigrant students experience can result in increased family obligations (Fuligni & Pedersen, 2002; Sy & Romero, 2008; Tseng, 2004). Tabular results for our analysis can be found in Appendix A.

High school grade point average. The difference in high school GPA between both native-born and foreign-born students is significant in 1994 and 2004 but not in 1985, indicating that native-born Latinas/os are academically outperforming foreign-born Latinas/os in high school in more recent years. Additionally, the proportion of foreign-born students that received top grades increased by more than 12% in two decades. Differences by gender present more of a mixed picture. Even though in each year, native-born students outperformed their foreign-born peers, it was only significant in 1985 for males. Male foreign-born and native-born high school GPAs have converged, while their female peers have diverged. Similarly, females outperformed males in self-reported GPAs in both native-born and foreign-born populations each year and were significant. These findings provide support for a gender gap in Latina/o academic achievement, regardless of citizenship status (Saenz & Ponjuan, 2009).

College Choice. The analysis revealed several significant findings when comparing college choice to gender and citizenship. In 1994 native-born males and foreign-born females were more likely to enroll in their top two choices than their peers, while in 2004 it was foreignborn females and males who were more likely than their native-born peers. The data is limited, however, in that it does not indicate what the actual choices of these individuals were. It may be that foreign-born Latinas prefer public, four-year institutions that are more affordable and closer to home than their native-born Latina peers. Latinas' sense of obligation and decision-making process are directly tied to parental and sibling influences, trends corroborated in prior research by Ceja (2004) and Pérez (2010).

Time spent studying. The analyses indicate that foreign-born Latinas/os actually spend more time per week doing homework or studying than do native-born Latinas/os. In this instance, foreign-born Latinas/os' commitment to succeed may have taken priority, perhaps enabling them to more efficiently manage their time between studying and familial obligations. Another explanation for these findings may be that foreign-born Latinas/os recognize that they need to devote more time and energy to their studies due to a difference in motivation that has also been noted in prior research (Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2002).

Financial Concerns

Financial and social capital factors can affect access to pre-college opportunities—such as access to AP courses, access to reading materials, etc.—that can positively impact students and lead to increased college success (Contreras, 2005). Differences in financial and social capital between foreign-born and native-born Latinas/os could help to account for some of the differences in achievement and graduation rates between these two groups.

Level of aid & Concern over financing college. In our analysis, parents of native-born Latina/o students were better able to provide higher levels of assistance than foreign-born counterparts. By gender, male foreign-born Latinos had higher levels of aid than foreign-born Latinas, making the challenge to be successful in college even more difficult for foreign-born students. Lower levels of parental aid can impact foreign-born Latina/o students in a variety of ways, including college choice, time to graduate, and necessity of procuring a job in college (Hurtado et al., 2008).

It is important to note that for foreign-born Latinas/os, a third to more than a half across the three cohort years noted that financing college was a major concern. Foreign-born Latinas also had higher levels of concern than their male counterparts. However, these findings should not underestimate the fact that native-born Latinas/os are also concerned about affordability. The majority of these students had at least some concern about financing college with a substantial amount having major concerns. Along with possibly lacking the income to pay for school, their concern could also be linked to the student and their families' ability to work in the U.S.

Reason to go to college: Low tuition. Financial concerns are also exhibited when looking at the influence of low tuition on the college choice process for entering Latina/o students. Foreign-born Latinas/os consistently reported that low tuition at an institution was more important than did native-born Latinas/os. Interestingly, when comparing across the cohort years, both foreign- and native-born Latinas/os reported the increasing importance of low tuition in choosing a college. For both groups, the proportion viewing the importance of low tuition as “very important” more than doubled from 1985 to 1994. As the costs of college have increased, along with financial aid focusing more on loans and less on scholarships and grants, the draw for an institution with low tuition intensifies.

It is useful to consider these findings in conjunction with the amount of aid from family and concern about financing college that foreign-born Latina/o students indicated. A student who anticipates little to no family financial support would be concerned about paying for college and would look to perhaps attend a school with lower tuition. This becomes even more challenging when coupled with the limited opportunities to access federal and/or state funds due to their immigrant status.

Desire to live close to home. Our analysis found that foreign-born students were more likely to want to live closer to home. Both female and male foreign-born Latina/o students were more likely to attend a college or university that is less than 50 miles from their home. Females, both native- and foreign-born, were also significantly more likely than their male counterparts to opt to attend a university closer to home. This finding is significant as it is consistent with prior research on why Latinas/os opt to live close to home while pursuing their degree, namely due to the reasons of access, location, and affordability (Santiago, 2007). Being close to home allows students to commute, work, study, and above all fulfill their family obligations.

Conclusion and Implications

This study found several key differences between foreign-born and native-born entering Latina/o college students attending a four-year institution within the five target states (AZ, CA, FL, NM, & TX) that could affect the success of these students in college. These range from differences in their academic preparedness to the level of aid they receive from their families to the key influences on their college choice.

Our results suggest that differences persist between the academic preparation of foreignborn Latinas/os and their native-born peers as they enter four-year institutions over the last three decades. These differences warrant further investigation to aid in improving the quality of support that is currently provided to foreign-born Latinas/os in accessing, enrolling in, and graduating from college. Further, families of foreign-born Latinas/os have a diminished ability to financially support them through college, which could lead to higher expectations to work while in college. All of these factors affect a student's concern about financing their education, a concern that remained strong across all groups across the three decades. Though financial barriers exist for both groups, foreign-born Latina/o students as a whole experience them with higher frequency and with more severity.

Parental and family encouragement, the distance between college and home, and participation in religious services are decisive factors in how students, and in particular foreignborn Latina/o students, approach their first year in college (Santiago, 2007). Our findings demonstrate that parents and family members can be a strong positive influence on a student's college career. College administrators should evaluate how to integrate family members into programming, such as orientation and financial aid programs. Additionally, a substantial proportion of both foreign- and native-born Latina/o students report living close to home as an important influence in their college choice. Accordingly, institutions should actively engage their surrounding Latina/o communities in light of this finding through aggressive recruitment and outreach services that engage the entire family.

Finally, our study findings suggest some important implications for policy and practice:

1. Increase opportunities for affordability and funding of higher education that target immigrant students. As the cost of higher education keeps increasing, financial aid subsidies for Latina/o immigrant students need to continue to come from local, state, and federal sources. Current legislation in states like CA, NM, and TX that provide in-state tuition for their residents regardless of citizenship status, along with providing some form of state financial aid, has provided many foreign-born (and undocumented) students the opportunity to attend college. More states, especially those with increasing immigrant populations, should seek to enact similar legislation to make higher education more accessible. The federal DREAM Act needs to continue to be a strategy to make college more affordable and attainable for all eligible students.
2. Degree completion should lead to the ability to work legally. Some immigrant students who are attending higher education in the U.S. face the prospect of being unable to utilize their degree because they may not have the legal right to work. Foreign-born Latina/o college students represent perhaps America's most under-utilized source of human capital. In using a human capital argument, a strong economic rationale could be a politically palatable strategy to build support for enhancing the higher education opportunities for all immigrant Latina/o students.
3. Increase focus on Latino male students, regardless of native-born or foreign-born status. The difference in participation in higher education by Latinas and Latinos at the undergraduate level is staggering (Saenz & Ponjuan, 2009), and though the focus has been to increase the participation of women due to past gender inequities, there is now an imperative to increase

the participation and academic success of all Latino men as well. Increased mentorship opportunities and specific programs conducted by schools to raise participation and degree aspiration are necessary to clarify the pathways to higher education that may seem out of reach. Ultimately, institutions must realize that focusing on Latino males is a key strategy towards making significant gains in their goals around increasing college completion, as there is more room for growth.

4. Provide more funding for Hispanic Serving Institutions (HSIs). HSIs educate the majority of Latinas/os in the country and awarded over 40% of bachelor's degrees to Latinas/os in 2003-2004 even though they made up 7% of all four-year institutions (Santiago, 2007). HSIs are located in areas with high Latina/o populations and generally serve the local region. As the findings demonstrate, foreign-born Latina/o students are more likely to stay close to home, so it is imperative to increase funding at schools where they attend: HSIs. Such funding increases should not be left to Title V efforts at the federal level, as states can be more strategic in targeting these institutions as the chief economic engines in regions where the Latina/o population growth is strongest (i.e., AZ, CA, FL, NM, & TX).
5. Tap into family structures. Families provide a strong support system to students and also induce students to be hard-working, to stay motivated, and to ultimately be successful. It is vital that higher education institutions and primary and secondary schools connect with parents and students' immediate and extended families to provide information regarding opportunities for immigrant Latina/o college students. Institutions should work to demystify the higher education pathways available to these students, and the sharpest strategy for this intervention is to engage Latina/o families and communities proactively and purposefully.

References

- Abrego, L. J. (2006). "I can't go to college because I don't have papers": Incorporation patterns of Latino undocumented youth. *Latino Studies*, 4(3), 212-231.
- Auerbach, S. (2006). "If the student is good, let him fly:" Moral support for college among Latina/o immigrant parents. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 5(4), 275-292.
- Ceballos, R. (2004). From barrios to Yale: The role of parenting strategies in Latino families. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 26, 171-186.
- Ceja, M. (2004). Chicana college aspirations and the role of parents: Developing educational resiliency. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 3(4), 338-362.
- Contreras, F. E. (2005, July). Access, achievement, and social capital: Standardized exams and the Latino college-bound population. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 4(3), 197-214. doi: 10.1177/1538192705276546
- Delgado-Gaitán, C. (1994). Consejos: The power of cultural narrative. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 25, 298-316.
- Fránquiz, M., & Salazar, M. (2004). The transformative potential of humanizing pedagogy: Addressing the diverse needs of Chicano/Mexicano students. *The High School Journal*, 87(4), 36-53.
- Fuligni, A. J., & Pedersen, S. (2002). Family obligation and the transition to young adulthood. *Developmental Psychology*, 38(5), 856-868.
- González, N., Moll, L.C., Tenery, M.F., Rivera, A., Rendón, P., González, R., & Amanti, C. (1995). Funds of knowledge for teaching Latina/o households. *Urban Education*, 29(4), 443-470.
- Hurtado, S., Sáenz, V. B., Santos, J. L., & Cabrera, N. L. (2008). *Advancing in higher education: A portrait of Latino college freshmen at four-year institutions: 1975-2006*. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.
- National Immigration Law Center (NILC). (2010, December). *DREAM Act Summary*. Retrieved from <http://www.nilc.org/immlawpolicy/dream/dream-bills-summary-2010-09-20.pdf>

- Olivas, M. (2004). IIRIRA, the Dream Act, and Undocumented College Student Residency. *Immigration and Nationality Law Review*, 323-352.
- Passel, J.S., Cohn, D., & López, M.H. (2011). Census 2010: 50 million Latinos. Retrieved from: <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/140.pdf>
- Pew Hispanic Center. (2011). Statistical portrait of Hispanics in universe: 2009 Hispanic resident population, Table 6. Retrieved from <http://pewhispanic.org/files/factsheets/hispanics2009/Table%206.pdf>.
- Pérez, P. A. (2010). College choice process of Latino undocumented students: Implications for Recruitment and Retention. *Journal of College Admissions*. Retrieved from <http://www.nacanet.org>
- Pryor, J. H., Hurtado, S., Saenz, V. B., Santos, J. L., & Korn, W. S. (2007). *The American freshman: Forty year trends*. Higher Education Research Institute. Los Angeles: CA. S.729, 111th Cong. (2009).
- Reese, L, Balzano, S., Gallimore, R., & Goldenberg, C. (1995). The concept of educación: Latina/o family values and American schooling, *International Journal of Educational Research*, 23(1), 57-81.
- Saenz, V.B., & Ponjuan, L. (2009). The vanishing Latino male in higher education. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 8 (1) 54-89.
- Santiago, D. (2007). Choosing Hispanic Serving Institutions: A closer look at Latino students' college choices. *Excelencia in Education*, 1-17.
- Stanton-Salazar, R. D., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1995). Social capital and the reproduction of inequality: Information networks among Mexican-origin high school students. *Sociology of Education*, 68(2), 116-135.
- Suárez-Orozco, C., & Suarez-Orozco, M. (2002). *Children of immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Swail, W. S., Cabrera, A. F., & Lee, C. (2004). Latino youth and the pathway to college. Pew Hispanic Institute. Retrieved from <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/31.pdf>
- Sy, S. R., & Romero, J. (2008). Family Responsibilities Among Latina College Students from Immigrant Families. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 7(3), 212-227.
- Tseng, V. (2006). Unpacking immigration in youths' academic and occupational pathways. *Child Development*, 77(5), 1434-1445.
- Tseng, V. (2004). Family interdependence and academic adjustment in college: Youth from immigrant and U.S.-born families. *Child Development*, 75(3), 966-983.
- Undocumented Student Tuition: State Action. (2011). National Conference of State Legislatures. Retrieved July 19, 2011 from <http://www.ncsl.org/default.aspx?tabid=12846>
- Valencia, R. R. (1997). Conceptualizing the Notion of Deficit Thinking. In R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *The Evolution of Deficit Thinking: Educational Thought and Practice* (pp.1-12). New York, NY: The Falmer Press.
- Valencia, R. R. (2010). The plight of Chicano students: an overview of schooling conditions and outcomes. In R. R. Valencia (Ed.), *Chicano School Failure and Success: Past, Present, and Future* (3rd ed.). Hoboken: Taylor & Francis.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S. Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Villenas, S., Godínez, F., Delgado Bernal, D., & Elenes, A. (2006). Chicanas/Latinas building bridges. In D. Delgado Bernal, A. Elenes, F. Godínez, & S. Villenas (Eds.), *Chicana/Latina Education in Everyday Life. Feminista Perspectives on Pedagogy and Epistemology* (pp. 1-9). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Appendix A. Results of Chi-Square Analysis by Year, Place of Birth, and Gender

High School Grade Point Average

	1985			1994			2004		
	A+ to A-	B+ to B-	C+ or less	A+ to A-	B+ to B-	C+ or less	A+ to A-	B+ to B-	C+ or less
Foreign-born Females	34.9	58.1	7	26.4	65.7	7.9 *	42.6	53.5	3.9 *
Native-born Females	27.7	64	8.3	36.8	57.9	5.3 *	45.2	52	2.6 *
Foreign-born Males	21.9	65.6	12.5 **	34	53.3	12.7	35.2	60.6	4.2
Native-born Males	35.2	55.7	9.1 **	35.9	53.5	10.5	38.1	57.3	4.7

College Choice

	1985			1994			2004		
	First	Second	Third or less	First	Second	Third or less	First	Second	Third or less
Foreign-born Females	76.4	16.8	6.8	80.9	13.3	5.8 *	65.6	26.1	8.3 *
Native-born Females	75.5	17.8	6.7	73.5	19.6	6.9 *	61.8	26.9	11.4 *
Foreign-born Males	80.4	17	2.7	69	16.9	14.1 **	59.9	29.2	10.9 **
Native-born Males	73.8	21.1	5.1	71.2	20.9	7.9 **	62.3	25.4	12.3 **

Hours Spent Studying (last year of high school)

	1985			1994			2004		
	5 Hrs or less	6-15 Hours	16+ Hours	5 Hrs or less	6-15 Hours	16+ Hours	5 Hrs or less	6-15 Hours	16+ Hours
Foreign-born Females	56.3	32	11.7 *	48	39.1	12.9 *	58.7	32.4	8.9 *
Native-born Females	51.3	37.6	11.1 *	55.8	31.3	12.7 **	69	24.8	6.3 **
Foreign-born Males	48.2	33.2	18.5 **	57.4	33.9	8.8 **			
Native-born Males	57.4	33.9	8.8 **						

Level of Concern for Financing College

	1985			1994			2004		
	None	Some	Major	None	Some	Major	None	Some	Major
Foreign-born Females	4.8	53.7	41.5 *	7	32.9	60.1 *	14	51.4	34.6 *
Native-born Females	17.2	58.8	24 *	11.4	47.3	41.3 *	15.1	58.2	26.7 *
Foreign-born Males	12.7	57.7	29.5 **	12.3	40.1	47.6 **	23.7	49.4	26.9 **
Native-born Males	24.5	52.9	22.6 **	16.2	48	35.9 **	25.6	55.1	19.3 **

Importance of Low Tuition in College Choice

	1985			1994			2004		
	Not Impt	Some Impt	Very Impt	Not Impt	Some Impt	Very Impt	Not Impt	Some Impt	Very Impt
Foreign-born Females	56.2	23.2	20.5 *	35.8	37.5	26.8 *			
Native-born Females	64.7	25.4	9.9 *	42.2	33.5	24.3 *			
Foreign-born Males	53.6	41.1	5.4 **	29.9	36.3	33.8 **			
Native-born Males	63.1	26.7	10.3 **	43.5	36.3	20.1 **			

Importance of Closeness of College to Home

	1985			1994			2004		
	Not Impt	Some Impt	Very Impt	Not Impt	Some Impt	Very Impt	Not Impt	Some Impt	Very Impt
Foreign-born Females	44.7	21.8	33.5 *	39.1	23.8	37.1 *	38.9	28	25.1 *
Native-born Females	52.3	29.7	18 *	41.1	28	30.6 *	36.4	34.1	22.7 *
Foreign-born Males	67.4	28.6	4 **	46.6	27.8	25.6 **	46.9	28	25.1 **
Native-born Males	65.6	20.3	14.3 **	47.4	32.8	19.8 **	43.2	34.1	22.7 **

Source: CIRP Freshman Survey trends data (1985, 1994, & 2004). UCLA Higher Education Research Institute.

* $p < 0.01$; ** $p < 0.001$. Notes: Data are from respondents to the CIRP Freshman survey, and sample sizes are weighted to reflect the national normative profile of entering freshmen for the given year. Chi-square tests were run between foreign-born and native-born and gender within each year. Data is not available for some years. Only selected comparisons are displayed here. Additional trends tables available upon request from the lead author. Data includes institutions from five states (AZ, CA, FL, NM, TX) across three years: 1985, 1994, and 2004. Sample sizes are available in Table 1. For additional information on these data, see: Hurtado, S., Sáenz, V. B., Santos, J. L., & Cabrera, N. L. (2008). Advancing in higher education:

A portrait of Latina/o college freshmen at four-year institutions: 1975–2006. Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA.