CULTURAL CAPITAL AND ACHIEVEMENT GOALS IN HISPANIC COLLEGE STUDENTS AT TWO- AND FOUR-YEAR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

By

JUAN CARLOS DURAN

Bachelor of Science in Psychology

Universidad Centroamericana "Jose Simeón Cañas"

San Salvador, El Salvador

2004

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 2010

CULTURAL CAPITAL AND ACHIEVEMENT GOALS IN HISPANIC COLLEGE STUDENTS AT TWO- AND FOUR-YEAR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Thesis Approved:

Dr. Diane Montgomery

Thesis Adviser

Dr. Dale Fuqua

Dr. Steve Harrist

Dr. A. Gordon Emslie

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I want to thank the Fulbright commission in El Salvador for awarding me with this scholarship. I want to also thank my committee members whose suggestions made my thesis a better product. I also wish to thank Dr. Montgomery for her accurate and diligent feedback; my professors for their guidance and instruction; and Dr. Blum for reading my drafts and discussing my ideas. Special thanks to all those who made Stillwater my home for the last two years.

This work is for my parents, brothers, sister, nephews and nieces; for Laura, my girlfriend, and for all those who believed in me. Even though you were physically distant, your support and company were always close.

Quiero agracecer a la comisión Fulbright en El Salvador por otorgarme esta beca que me permite conseguir este logro; a los miembros de mi comité cuyas sugerencias hicieron de mi tesis un mejor producto; a la Dra. Montgomery por su prontas e informativas orientaciones; a mis profesores por sus enseñanzas y guías; a la Dra. Blum por revisar mis borradores y discutir mis ideas preliminares; y especialmente a todos aquellos que hicieron de Stillwater mi casa por los pasados dos años.

Este trabajo se lo dedico a mis padres, hermanos y hermanas, sobrinos y sobrinas, Laura, mi novia, y todos aquellos que siempre creyeron en mi. Pese a la distancia, su apoyo y compañía estuvieron siempre cerca. Para ustedes!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in 2001 the number of people who identified themselves as Hispanics was 35,305,818 representing 12.5% of the total population. Seven years later in 2008, the Census Bureau estimated that the Hispanic population was 46,943,613 increasing to 15.4%. In this period of time, the Hispanic population grew 34%, while the total U.S. population grew only 8%. Sociologist Marcelo Suarez-Orozco (2002) mentions "the U.S. Census Bureau claims that by the year 2050 a full quarter of the U.S. population will be of the Latino origin" (p. 2).

The term Hispanic includes a very heterogeneous group of people who have diverse backgrounds. For this reason any research that uses this category as criteria to inclusion, its findings should be taken with caution at the moment to make generalizations. For example, the results that could be found in a group of recent Mexican Hispanics in California might not be applicable to a group of Hispanics that are third generation in Florida. In order to avoid generalizations that could mislead perceptions of any group, this research does not attempt to make a generalization about all Hispanics or Latinos. Instead its findings are limited to the sample and the population that it was withdrawn.

The study of Hispanics as a group is based on what Suarez-Orozco (2002) has stated that justifies the use of Latinos or Hispanics as a research category. He suggested that the use of "racial and ethnic categories have become critical tools in the working of the state apparatus" (p. 6). The Federal government and other state agencies keep using these categories as tools to design, implement and assess their policies; thus its relevance to use them in research.

Hispanics in Higher Education

The Hispanic representation in the U.S. education system is larger in the elementary, middle, and high school grades than in the post-secondary educational institutions. Gandara (2009) reported that Hispanics "make up 48 percent of the public schools students in California, about 46 percent in Texas, and about 20 percent in New York State" (p. 2). In contrast, the number of Hispanics who graduate from college is considerably lower, creating what Gandara calls "educational crisis" that could have detrimental consequences not only at the personal level, but in society as a whole.
In response, most of the research has focused on the Hispanic high school dropout rate, which is one of the highest in the nation. But there has been little attention to those Hispanics who graduate from high school, enroll in college, and are unable to finish their degrees. Fry (2004), using the National Educational Longitudinal Survey (NELS) following a national sample from 1988 to 2000, stated that for the 68% of Hispanics who graduated from high school, only 23% attained a bachelor degree in the year 2000. In contrast, the percentage of white students who graduated from high school was 83%, and the percentage that attained a bachelor degree was 43%. The gap in the graduation rates

between Hispanic and white student increases as they move from high school to bachelor's degree.

Scholars like Swail (2004) have pointed to differences in high school quality to explain the low rate of bachelor attainment for Hispanic students. Swail attributes low college graduation rates to a lack of rigorous curricula in high school. According to Swail, only 25% of the Hispanics graduates were qualified to attend college. In contrast, 47% of white students were considered as qualified to attend college. The reduced number of Hispanics who are eligible to attend college shrinks the number of them who would be able to get their bachelor's degree.

Furthermore, although Hispanic students enroll in college, few complete their college education. Fry (2004) has attributed this low rate of degree attainment due to the kind of institution in which the students enrolled. He states that there is a strong correlation between college selectiveness and degree completion. In other words, those colleges that are more selective have more students who finish degrees. In line with Fry's research, most Hispanic students are enrolling in less selective institutions, which decreases their chances of graduating. Fry (2004) reported that three in five (59%) Latinos enroll at an open-door post-secondary institution, whereas only one in three (38%) white students do the same.

One typical path that many Hispanic students follow is to enroll in a community college as a first step in higher education. As a result, Hispanics are overrepresented in two-year colleges (O'Connor, 2009).

Debate continues as to whether community college generates support for students to transfer to four-year universities or hinders those chances. One of the positions is that

community colleges or two-year educational institutions are an option for those who are unable to attend a four-year educational institution, because community college's academic requirements are less competitive and tuition is more affordable. O'Connor (2009) calls this " the democratic effect" of community colleges, because they "serve society in providing higher education opportunities to students who would not attend college otherwise" (p. 123). On the other hand, researchers have pointed out that students who are bachelor-degree seekers and enroll in community colleges are less likely to attain a bachelor's degree than if they were to enroll in a four-year institution initially (Ganderton & Santos, 1995). Ganderton and Santos argue that the low transfer rate from a two-year to a four-year educational institution is the main reason that community college students are less likely to attain a bachelor's degree.

The relevance of transfering from an associate degree to a bachelor degree is founded on the expectation of a different social and economic value of the degrees earned from these two types of institutions. O'Connor (2009) states, "In today's labor market, an associate degree is as valuable as a high school diploma was a generation ago, and does not provide its holder the same level of professional returns that it had in the past" (p. 122). Along this line, if Hispanics initiate their post-secondary schooling at four-year institutions, the likelihood of college graduation may be higher, implying important changes in their life standards, including countering and superseding this group's dominant representation in societal poverty.

Theoretical Framework

In her research about college choice, Perna (2006) recommends "efforts to incorporate measures of cultural and social capital to college enrollment results in a model that better explains the decision of students to enroll in both undergraduate and post baccalaureate education" (p. 51). Following Perna's assessment, this research study combines cultural capital theory (Bourdieu, 1973) to explore what resources and practices are associated with differential college choice; and the achievement goal theory to explore how students goals and motives help them out to negotiate their personal goals in their social context.

Cultural Capital Theory

The French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu offers a conceptual framework that can be applied to college choice. According to Bourdieu (Sadovnik, 2007), there are three forms of capital: economic capital, which refers to financial resources; social capital, which refers to the social networking that a person has, and the advantages that this social connections give to the holder; and cultural capital, which refers to the possession of cultural and symbolic goods. Cultural capital provides the theoretical support for this research and supplies the model to explain how college choice is bounded within social class structure.

Bourdieu (1973) states that the distribution of cultural capital is differential among classes in a society, making it more accessible to those who are in the higher levels of the social hierarchy than those who are in the lower levels. Bourdieu (1973) states that, "The educational system reproduces all the more perfectly the structure of the

distribution of cultural capital among classes (and sections of class) in that the culture which it transmits is closer to the dominant culture" (p. 493).

The acquisition of cultural capital requires the possession of the skills and knowledge to decode and manipulate it, which often are taught in the familial context or another context outside of the school (Bourdieu, 1973). This transmission process makes that the cultural capital stays in those groups that already have it and makes it difficult for those who do not have to access it. Hispanics, who as an ethnic group has one of the highest percentage of people (24%) below the line of poverty (US Census Bureau, 2009), may find difficult to access the cultural capital that allows them to take fully advantage in the educational system, specially post-secondary education. However, deliberated actions from the educational system and other institutions could make this capital more reachable.

Achievement Goals

Regarding the motivational component that was included in this research, the use of achievement goals in the study of motivation has become frequent in educational research. This theory focuses on how students perceive their task and performance, rather than determining whether the students possess or lack motivation. Instead of answering the question about if students are motivated, this theory answers which kind of motivation is more salient in students. Two achievement goals have received most of the research attention: the goal to develop ability, sometimes labeled as task or learning goal, and the goal to demonstrate ability or to avoid demonstrating lack of ability, called performance goal (Midgley, Kaplan, Middleton, Maher, Urdan, Aderman, et al., 1998).

Elliot and McGregor (2001) propose a two by two model where they defined mastery and performance goals. Mastery goals are those that are oriented to acquire or learn a competence, whereas performance goals are focused on the demonstration of competence relative to others. In this model, these two types of goals have two orientations, approach or avoidance. Therefore, it is possible to have a mastery approach goal and mastery avoidance goal; similarly in the case of the performance, where it is possible to have performance approach goal and performance avoidance goal. Individuals who are seeking to learn or have mastery in any given competence will have a salient mastery approach goal; meanwhile individuals oriented toward being perceived by others as competent in a task would have a more salient performance approach goal. On the other hand individuals who are more concerned about failing in a determined task, will have a more salient mastery avoidance goal, and those who are afraid of being perceived as unable to perform a task will have a performance avoidance goal salience.

Problem Statement

Considering that the type of college that students attend is related to the possibility to attain a bachelor's degree, understanding how Hispanic students make this selection is valuable in resolving the low graduation rates. College choice is far from being a simple decision; several social and individual circumstances confluence in this process. McDonough (1997) mentions, "For high school students who are choosing a college, their academic achievement, class background, and the high school's perspective on desirable college destination will shape how they perceive their higher education opportunities" (p. 2).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to explore the role of cultural capital and achievement goals in college choice within a particular group of Hispanics. The independent variable in the study is the type of educational institution that students attend in which two conditions are possible. Students are enrolled either at two-year or at a four-year educational institutions. Cultural capital and achievement goals are the dependent variables, and comparisons in those two variables are made between the two types of educational institutions.

For the purpose of this study, cultural capital was defined as "Cultural factors and forms of symbolic wealth that help define a person's class, which are often inherited form one's family and therefore may help to sustain upper- and middle-class status groups" (Wells, 2009, p. 104).

In the case of achievement goals, Schunk (2008) defines them in terms of the purpose and reasons that students have to engage in academic tasks. Two types of goals are explored in the study, mastery goals that are oriented to learn for the sake of learning. They "are focused on the development of competence through task mastery" (Elliot & McGregor, 2001, p. 501). And performance goals that are oriented to perform better than others. They "are focused on the demonstration of competence relative to others" (Elliot & McGregor, 2001, p. 501).

Research Questions

1. Is there a difference in the Mastery goals between students attending a two-year and a four-year educational institution?
2. Is there a difference in the Performance goals between students attending a two-year and a four-year educational institution?
3. Is there a difference in the measures of Cultural Capital between students attending a two-year and a four-year educational institution?

Definition of Terms

- Hispanic: This terms refers to a link to Hispania or Spain, however, it has been used to designate a group of people that has a familiar tie or inheritance from a Latin American country. For this research it is used as in the same way as Latino/a, which Suarez-Orozco (2002) defines as, "cultural category that has no precise racial signification…also lacks the specificity regarding national origin that terms such as Irish American and Italian American Convey…Nor does the term Latino evoke any particular period in U.S. history. Latinos are among the 'oldest' Americans… and the 'newest' "(p. 4).
- Two-year educational institution refers to a higher education institution that its main degree offer is an associate degree (two-year degree). It is typically called as community college or junior college.
- Four-year educational institution refers to a higher education institution that has as its minimum degree offer a bachelor's degree (four-year degree).

Significance of the Study

Hispanics have a noteworthy role in the new demographic configuration in the United States due to their large number and their increasing growth rate. In this context, the educational system has been unable to serve this group well resulting in a high dropout rate at the high school level and the lowest rate of bachelor's degree attainment. Considering that it is generally assumed that education contributes to people's improvement in their life standards, neglecting educational opportunities makes it more difficult to move away from poverty, which is the condition of a considerable number of Hispanic students. Furthermore, the consequences of leaving a large group of people with lower levels of education could be very detrimental at the economic and social levels. The costs of underserved Hispanics might be too high to not become one of the priorities for policymakers.

Attending the need to supply information for those who are concerned with this topic and through the use of analysis of empirical data, this study attempts to increase the understanding of how the cultural capital and motivation have a relevant role in the college choice among Hispanic students. As it has been mentioned, the choice to attend one or another type of college is a predictor of the attainment of the bachelor degree. Understanding what variables are associated with the process of college choice is the first step on the way to increase the number of students who are going to succeed in college.

Other scholars (Perma, 2000; Wells, 2009) have addressed the role of cultural capital in enrollment and persistence in different ethnic groups; however, few studies

have addressed this role within Hispanics, including achievement goals of those who are attending two or four-year educational institutions.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this study was to compare cultural capital and motivation between students who attend a two-year or a four-year college. The literature relevant to this study reviews research regarding Hispanics in the post-secondary education. It proposes an explicative model that combines economic resources and cultural capital to approach the college choice process. Cultural capital research is discussed in terms of its role in college enrollment and college persistence, and the motivational model discussed the adaptive role of achievement goals at the college level.

Studies among Hispanics

Due to its large number and its difficulties in the educational system, the Hispanic population has been of interest of scholars. Researchers have discussed how economic and informational barriers underlay the access that Hispanics have to postsecondary institutions (Gandara, 2009; O'Connor, 2009).

Gandara (2009) studies the condition of Hispanics in the educational system. In the case of post-secondary education, she states that economic barriers are a key detriment to the possibilities to enroll in college. Gandara suggests that despite the hard work attitude that some students may have, the tuition cost is not affordable by any

means for some Hispanics families. In her words: “Research on who goes to college shows without a doubt that money matters a lot.” (p. 242)

Hispanics choose to attend in a large proportion less selective institutions, which at the same time cost less. In addition to the economic barrier that many Hispanic students face, research has shown that Hispanics have less information about post-secondary institutions. They know less about differences between two and four year colleges, and different ways to finance college (Gandara, 2009; O’Connor, 2009).

In her research about a group of Hispanic who succeeded in college, Gandara (2009) found that despite their differences, students consistently come from homes in which parents were interested in reading and highly appreciate education, although their formal education was limited. She states “Many parents scraped together the money to buy encyclopedias and other books for their children, even in circumstances where the next meal was not a certainty” (Gandara, 2009, p. 208)

Explicative Model

College choice implies dynamic interactions among economical resources, familial constraints, and personal agency –the personal ability to navigate and endure in their context. Limiting to a linear interaction is reductive, thus a more complex system of causation and effect should be kept in mind. A research model that integrates the interactions of most of these elements would explain better how students choose colleges. Perna (2006) proposes a model that integrates personal resources, most of them economical, and sociological notions of social and cultural capital. As Perna (2006) states, “The model also recognizes the multiple layers of context influence an

individual's college related decision making by providing access to different resources and opportunities" (p. 58).

Reducing the issue of college enrollment and its achievement to economical resources oversimplifies the issue. Perna (2006) mentions that, "Despite the substantial investment in student financial aid by the Federal government and other entities… racial ethnic group gaps in college enrollment remains" (p. 55). Furthermore, if other barriers are not considered, making more money available without any other consideration could increase the gap. For instance, those who already know how the system works could take advantage of the resources more than those who are already struggling to get into college. Instead, it would be more promising to use a holistic approach that includes social and cultural capital in addition to economical resources to analyze college decision processes. Social and cultural capital theory prevents us from focusing on solely economic capital and purposefully suggests that there are other elements that go beyond income and are critical in this process.

Cultural Capital Research

The cultural capital theory focuses on how social class hierarchy is reproduced in the educational system, as Wells (2009) posits, "If those that are privileged and therefore amass the most social and cultural capital… are more likely to attain a college degree, then the social hierarchy is effectively reproduced via higher education" (p. 104). Scholars have used this theory to explain how minority groups access and persists in the educational system. Research in cultural capital is extensive; however, the scope of this review is limited to the role of cultural capital as related to college choice and college

persistence, how cultural capital improves the understanding of familial background beyond its social economic status, and how cultural capital has been measured in prior studies.

Using the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS), Perna (2000) and Wells (2009) established several indicators of cultural capital. Both use high school quality, defined as the percentage of its students who attend college after graduation, and parent's level of education. In addition, each researcher used indicators such as desegregation in schools or familial resources to account for social and cultural capital. After comparing different ethnic groups, both researchers found that Hispanics have lower levels of social and cultural capital.

Proposing an econometric model that weights present cost of college with perceived lifetime benefits, Perna (2000) studies African American, Hispanic, and white students' college enrollment decisions. She mentions that the lack of required cultural capital may impact student's perception of cost and benefits for attending college, student's educational aspirations, and student's expectations about rewards for attending college. In her study she includes as measures of social and cultural capital, desegregation in schools school's composition of ethnic groups, and parental school involvement. Perna found that the expectation to get an advanced degree or a bachelor's degree increased significantly the probability for Hispanic students to enroll in college. Analyzing how students could develop expectations to enroll in college and seek a degree when they are attending low quality and segregated high schools is a task that Perna neglected in her study. She concluded that lower level of cultural capital is associated with lower probabilities to enroll in college.

Unlike Perna, Wells (2009) includes the number of friends planning to attend college, test preparation tools, and familial resources available as indicators of cultural capital. Hispanics score significantly lower in all of these indicators compared to Asian and white students. He found that parent's college education, number of friends planning to attend college, high school quality, and test preparation tools were significant predictors of first to second year persistence. Considering these results, the odds for Hispanic to persist were lower compared to Asian and white students.

In another study that used cultural capital as the theoretical framework, Nonoyama (2008) analyzes the effect of familial background on student's achievement across countries. The researcher's premise is that cultural resources and familial lifestyle establish the intellectual climate in which children develop educational aspirations and goals. Nonoyama (2008) suggests, "Differences in cultural capital, thus, illustrate the differences in the quality of home environment between different status groups." (p. 62).

Comparing the effect size of standard familial social economic status (SES) defined as parental education and occupation, and multidimensional SES that includes home educational resources, cultural possessions and number of books at home in addition to the standard SES, Nonoyama found that the effect size of multidimensional SES is larger than standard SES across all countries. This finding implies that the inclusion of cultural capital indicators contributes to a better explanation of student achievement, thus "cultural resources predicted achievement over and above parental education and occupation" (Nonoyama, 2008, p. 79).

Cultural Capital in Qualitative Studies

McDonough (1997) in her qualitative study at four high schools in California analyzed the process that the students from private and public high schools go through when they choose colleges. She studied the role that parents, counselors, the school as organization, friends and peers, and students have in this decision process. She found that students perceive college options under the influence of personal academic achievement, economic circumstances, and values. She mentions, "Given these ability, economic, and value constraints, a student eventually narrows down the 3,600 colleges and universities to a piece of opportunity structure that she believes is within her grasp" (p. 151). Furthermore, student's aspirations are shaped by their familial, economic, and school context; it is impossible to understand them as the result of individual options.

McDonough (1997) introduces the concept of "entitlement", defined as, "students believe they are entitled to a particular kind of collegiate education based on their family's and or high school's habitus. Class socialization precedes and significantly shapes the formation of aspirations" (p. 152). In her conclusion, she states that the opportunity structure that students have differs because of their social class; those in the lower levels restrict their options to close small community colleges; meanwhile, those in the top of the social class do not restrict their options, neither geographically nor economically.

Critics to Cultural Capital Theory

Understanding cultural capital as high status cultural signals that economically advantaged people have, Kingston (2001) argued that within the American society, due to its plural and democratic character, these groups do not display exclusive signals that

other social classes could not demonstrate. Therefore, cultural capital theory can not explain why elites in American society perform better in school than other groups. Kingston (2001) states, "Cultural capital theories of academic success face an obvious problem. This success can be explained as the result of class-based exclusionary cultural practices only if there are such practices to activate, but signs of these practices are weak in our highly pluralistic, democratized culture" (p. 91).

Moreover, Kingston (2001) argues that there may be a spurious correlation between cultural capital and school achievement, because cultural practices encompass other practices that have a positive effect on achievement. As an example he mentions: "Students who go to museums are also likely to be advantaged by, among other matters, intellectual ability, educationally savvy parents, and material resources" (Kingston, 2001, p.91,).

Kingston concluded saying that the difference between those who achieve in school and those who do not is due to the presence of "learning resources", books, computers, and study spaces, rather than "cultural resources". He claims that learning resources are not exclusively distinctive of the American's elite. Instead,they are often part of the resources of the middle class.

It can be said that Kingston limits the conceptualization of cultural capital to cultural practices. He does not include in his assumption of cultural capital the knowledge that the elites have about how the educational system works. Furthermore, what he defines as learning resources are similar with other authors like Perna (2000) and Wells (2009) have identified as cultural capital as well. Kingston's assumption that these learning resources are not exclusive of particular groups is questionable. This is exactly

one of the main findings that cultural capital researchers have found that differential access to cultural capital has an effect on student's achievement (Perna, 2000; Wells, 2009).

Achievement Goals in College

In order to determine what motivates students while they are in college, the achievement goals theory offers a model to understand those goals that drive students' intentions and behaviors. Harackewicz, Barron and Elliot (1998) define achievement goals as, "Broadly defined, achievement goals reflect the desire to develop, attain, or demonstrate competence at an activity, and they can influence the way that students approach and experience their course work" (p.2).

In the original formulation of achievement goals, two categories or goals were identified, mastery and performance goals. Students with mastery goals tend to choose challenging task rather than easy ones and persist more when facing difficulties. In contrast, students with performance goals tend to choose easier task, and their persistence could be less when facing adversity. Within this formulation, mastery goals are perceived as adaptive and desirable in students, and performance goals are maladaptive (Witkow & Fulgini, 2007).

Research has shown that this perception of mastery and performance goals is not totally accurate (Harackewicz, Barron and Elliot, 2008). Under certain circumstances, performance goals may be adaptive too. In college context, which is highly competitive and student's performance is essentially measured by grades, developing performance goals become critical to achieve. Due to its emphasis in a grading structure that relies on

comparative performance, students are encouraged to assess their performance in comparison with their peers. As Harackewicz, Barron and Elliot (1998) suggest:

> "These grading practices create a context in which competence is often defined in terms of normative comparison and relative ability. In this performance-oriented setting, students who adopt performance goals might actually be striving to attain good grades in a manner that is consistent with the classroom context, and a performance goal orientation might prove more adaptive than in other educational contexts" (p. 15).

It would be more accurate to perceive both mastery and performance goals as contributing to student success in college. A desirable outcome would be that students could develop these two types of goals. This possibility led to the analysis of the relationship between these two kinds of goals.

Harackewicz, Barron and Elliot (1998) have discussed whether mastery and performance goals are independent one from the other. Although both goals have been defined in mutually exclusive terms, they argue that both can be present at the same time. They state that "Although some theorists have discussed the effects of mastery and performance goals as if they were mutually exclusive, striving to outperform other is not necessarily inconsistent with trying to attain task mastery, and it should be possible for students to adopt both goals to varying degrees" (p. 3).

The inclusion of two orientations within these two types of goals helps to identify which goals are more and less adaptive. The two by two model that Elliot proposes, in which both goals have the two orientations, approach and avoidance, makes a distinction between approach orientation which refers to those goals oriented to perform at the top of

the group or learn as much as possible, and avoid orientation which refers to perform just to avoid to be in the bottom of the group, or learn as minimum as necessary. Clearly, the last orientations of the two types of goals are less adaptive in the college context.

Two implications can be drawn The first one is that a multi goal approach would be more effective in college such as Harackewicz, Barron and Elliot (1998) suggest, "The key to success in college may therefore stand in adopting mastery and performance goals rather than just one type of goal" (p. 15). And the second implication is that rather than assessing whether students are motivated or not, an analysis that describes which goals are more salient would be more effective to understand how students succeed in college.

Summary

This literature review included the role of cultural capital in college choice and persistence. Perna (2000) found that lower levels of cultural capital were associated with reduced probabilities to go to college. Along the same line Wells (2009) found that cultural and social capital were predictors of student's college persistence from the first to second year. Nonoyama (2008) using the cultural capital as a framework compared the effect size of social economic status in student achievement in an international sample. She found that the use of a social economic status that includes measures of cultural capital improved the prediction of student achievement.

Concerning achievement goals, the literature reviewed suggested that both mastery and performance goals are adaptive in college context, because the grading system, which relies heavily on group standards, demands student's concern about their performance in comparison with their classmates (Harackewicz, Barron & Elliot, 2008).

This interpretation differs from what previously have said that just mastery approach goals were adaptive at the college level (Witkow & Fulgini, 2007).

.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

The purpose of this study was to identify whether there are differences in cultural capital and achievement goals between students attending a two and four-year educational institution. This section describes the sample studied, the instrument used, the procedures, and the research design. The recruitment process, instruments and procedures used in the research were approved by the Institutional Review Board at Oklahoma State University (See Appendix A).

Participants

To participate in the study two criteria were required. First, participants were enrolled at Oklahoma State University (OSU) a four-year comprehensive university or at Tulsa Community College (TCC), a two-year college. Second, participants identified themselves as Hispanic. Two cases were not considered in the analysis because they were older than 30 years, making them not representative of the population of the population that the result may be generalized.

The researcher contacted the participants in three ways. First, the researcher attended the Hispanic Student Association (HSA) meetings at each educational institution

and asked for the participation of the attendees. OSU and TCC have their own HSA, and they are independent one from each other. Second, the researcher contacted two TCC counselors who knew several Hispanic students. The counselors assisted the researcher in recruiting students to be part of the study. And third, the researcher contacted directly students known to him at OSU who were Hispanic and invited them to be part of the study.

The participants who attended OSU came from the Stillwater campus; whereas those who attend TCC may be from two campuses, one that is located in the downtown area, and the other that is located in the southeast city area. The final sample contains 58 participants, 30 females and 28 males (See table 1).

Table 1

Sample distribution by gender, age and educational institution

	Gender (frequency)			**Age (in years)**	
	Female	**Male**	**Total**	**Mean**	**SD**
OSU	11	18	29	21.44	3.19
TCC	19	10	29	21.10	3.47
Total	30	28	58	21.27	3.31

Instruments

Participants completed one survey document (Appendix B), which contained two instruments, the *Attitude Toward Learning and Performance in College this Semester Scale* (ATL) (Miller & Sundre, 2008) that measures achievement goals and the *Cultural Capital Questionnaire* (Noble & Davies, 2009) that measures the personal and familial

cultural capital. In addition, the survey had a section that collects demographic information.

The Attitude Toward Learning and Performance in College this Semester Scale (ATL)

The scale contains sixteen items and measures achievement goals that students have set for their coursework during the semester (Miller & Sundre, 2008). Twelve of the items are framed according to the 2 x 2 achievement goal model proposed by Elliot and McGregor (2001), three for each kind of goal, Mastery approach (3), mastery avoidance (3), performance approach (3), and performance avoidance (3). The remaining four items measure work avoidance goals. The items are answered in a scale range from 1 "Not at all true for me" to 7 "Very true of me".

The reliability coefficients reported by Miller and Sundre (2008) were: .73, .74, .87, and .61 for mastery approach, mastery avoidance, performance approach, and performance avoidance, respectively.

Cultural Capital Questionnaire

This questionnaire is based on one that Noble and Davies (2009) have proposed, and it contains two sections: personal cultural capital that explores the student's personal cultural capital through the frequency that student's cultural practices take place such as attending museums and art galleries, reading books, joining a local library; and familial cultural capital, that explores parent's occupation and level of education, parent's discussion topics at home, parent's cultural practices, and the number of books at home Noble and Davies reported an reliability coefficient of .653 and .814 for personal cultural

capital and familial cultural capital, respectively. In addition to the items that Noble and Davies suggested, a section was included for educational resources that students may have at home, such as a dictionary, a specific place to study, a daily newspaper, textbooks, a calculator, computer with internet, and computer only. A third section asks demographic information, such as gender, age, employment situation, place of residence, and sources of funding for college.

Concerning achievement goals, participants have a total score for each achievement goal: mastery approach (items: 3, 7 and 10), mastery avoidance (items: 5, 11 and 14), performance approach (items: 1, 6 and 12), and performance avoidance (items: 2, 8 and 15). This score was computed after adding up the individual scores that the participant has in every item related with a particular goal (see table 2). For example, if one participant scores 5, 4, and 6 in the items that measure mastery approach, the total score for this goal will be 15. The higher the score, the more salient this goal is for the participant.

In the case of cultural capital the procedure is different. Every subject has two measures of cultural capital. The first one is the personal cultural capital that were defined in terms of individual cultural practices such as attending museums, art galleries, reading books, and listening to music, among others (items: 17a*, 17b, 17c, 17d, 17e, 17f, 17g, 17h, 17i, 19 and 21). The second measure is the familial cultural capital index. This index was composed by the linear combination of three indicators, parents' level of education (item 28), familial cultural practices (items: 29a, 29b, 29c, 29d, 29e, 30a*, 30b,

* Items have been reversed from its original presentation.

30c, 30d, 30e, 30f, 30g, 30h, 30i, 30j, 30k), and educational resources at home (31, 32a, 32b, 32c, 32d, 32e, 32f, 32g). For example, a participant who scores 4 in parent's level of education, 32 in familial educational practices, and 7 in educational resources at home will have a cultural capital index of 43. Cultural capital index indicators have not been standardized; therefore the weights of each one in the scale are unequal.

For each one of the measures used in the study, a reliability analysis has been performed. Each alpha is detailed in Table 2. The coefficients are similar to those who were obtained by the original authors of the scale.

Table 2

Reliability coefficients, maximum, and minimum scores for each subscale

Scale	**Alpha obtained**	**Alpha originally reported**	**Minimum possible score**	**Maximum possible score**
Mastery Approach	.851	.73	3	21
Mastery Avoidance	.774	.74	3	21
Performance Approach	.868	.87	3	21
Performance Avoidance	.821	.61	3	21
Personal Cultural Capital (Personal cc)	.653	.75	9	42
Index Cultural Capital	.814	.83	16	72

Procedure

The researcher attended several Hispanic Student Association meetings at both educational institutions, in which the researcher invited students to participate in the study. At the meeting the researcher read the student recruitment script, followed by requesting the participation of those attendants who fulfilled the criteria and had not already taken part of the study. Participants willing to collaborate read the study information sheet, and if they agreed to be part of the study, they completed the questionnaire at the site. Those students who were contacted by their counselors were asked to read the study information sheet. If they agreed to participate in the study, they completed the questionnaire in the counselor's office. Those students who were contacted personally by the researcher completed the questionnaire at a site that they previously agreed to meet with the researcher.

Data Analysis.

All the surveys were imputed in a database and analysis were performed using the SPSS version 17.0. The statistical analysis were guided by the research questions that were proposed for the study:

1. Is there a difference in the mastery goals between students attending a two-year and a four-year educational institution?
2. Is there a difference in the performance goals between students attending a two-year and a four-year educational institution?
3. Is there a difference in the measures of cultural capital between students attending a two-year and a four-year educational institution?

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of the study was to determine whether there are differences in motivation and cultural capital between students attending a two-year (TCC) and a four-year (OSU) educational institution. The results presented in this section are sequentially organized according to the research questions. Later a description of the overall results and a summary of different economic indicators are presented.

Research Questions

The design that has been used in the study is non-experimental because it involves neither random assignation of the participants to the groups, nor manipulation of an independent variable.

Research question 1 and 2: Is there a difference in the mastery and performance goals between students attending a two-year and a four-year educational institution?

An examination of the comparison of the means in each one of the achievement goals is shown in Table 3. A t-test between the two groups showed that there were no statistical differences in the achievement goal between students attending a two- or a four-year educational institutions at the level of .05.

Table 3

Achievement goals means by educational institution.

Achievement goal	Educational institution	N	Mean	SD	p.<
Mastery approach	OSU	28	17.93	3.80	.099
	TCC	29	19.31	2.12	
Mastery avoidance	OSU	29	10.83	4.58	.740
	TCC	28	10.43	4.45	
Performance approach	OSU	30	17.03	4.36	.193
	TCC	29	15.48	4.67	
Performance avoidance	OSU	30	16.03	4.39	.143
	TCC	28	14.00	5.96	

Research question 3: Is there a difference in the measures of cultural capital between students attending a two-year and a four-year educational institution?

After performing a t-test for mean differences in each one of the cultural capital indicators (see Table 4), only personal cultural capital (Personal cc) mean difference proved to be significant, $t(56) = 2.15$, $p<.036$, and a small effect size, Cohen's $d = 0.12$. Students who attend TCC obtained a higher mean (M=24.32) than students who attend at OSU (M= 21.77). This difference can be understood as students at TCC participate in cultural activities more often than students at OSU.

Table 4

Cultural capital indicators by educational institutions

Indicator	Educational institution	N	Mean	SD	P<
Personal cc	OSU	30	21.77	4.96	.036*
	TCC	28	24.32	4.07	
Familial cc	OSU	29	32.21	6.61	.426
	TCC	26	30.65	7.74	
Father level of education	OSU	28	2.54	1.57	.792
	TCC	28	2.43	1.45	
Mother level of education	OSU	29	2.34	1.29	.611
	TCC	28	2.18	1.16	
Educational resources	OSU	28	6.57	2.66	.189
	TCC	26	7.42	1.96	
Index cc	OSU	27	43.55	1.97	.829
	TCC	22	42.90	2.23	

* Difference is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

Exploring in more depth, an ANOVA was run in which the independent variable was the campus that students were attending. Therefore, students could attend three different campuses: OSU-Stillvater, TCC-Metro, and TCC-Southeast campus. The dependent variable was the Index for cultural capital. The results show that there were statistical differences in the means of the three campus $F(2, 46) = 5.62$, $p<.007$. They also show that the effect size was large enough to take in consideration, Cohen's $d = .44$.

After running a pos-hoc analysis, the Scheffe test for pair-wise comparisons showed that there was a statistical mean difference between the TCC metro (M=38.33) and TCC southeast (M=52.71). These results should be considered with caution because the sample sizes are small; therefore, they cannot be generalized to the population that they come from (See table 5).

These differences may be related to differences in the neighborhood where the students come from. Consulting the responsible for outreach at TCC he supported this findings, suggesting that students who attend the southeast campus come from a suburb of the Tulsa area, where families are more economically advantageous. On the other hand, students who attend the metro campus come more often from areas that families are less economically privileged.

Table 5

Index cultural capital by campus

Campus	N	Mean	SD
OSU-Stillwater	27	43.55	10.24
TCC-Metro	15	38.33	8.58
TCC-Southeast	7	52.71	7.06

Descriptive analysis

A descriptive analysis of the achievement goals is provided in Table 6. Mastery approach has the highest mean score; whereas, mastery avoidance has the lowest one. Performance approach and performance avoidance had similar averages, with performance approach

slightly highest than performance avoidance. Sample size reported for each goal differs because some cases were not included due to missing data.

Table 6

Achievement goals descriptive

Achievement goal	**N**	**Range**	**Min**	**Max**	**M**	**SD**
Mastery approach	57	13.00	8.00	21.00	18.63	3.11
Mastery avoidance	57	18.00	3.00	21.00	10.63	4.48
Performance approach	59	18.00	3.00	21.00	16.27	4.54
Performance avoidance	58	18.00	3.00	21.00	15.05	5.26

The zero order correlations among the four achievement goals are displayed in Table 4. The data show a significant positive correlation between performance approach and performance avoidance ($r = .58$, $p<.01$). This correlation indicated that those who score high in performance approach tend to score high in performance avoidance. This may occur because students could perceive as performing better than their classmates as similar as to perform at an acceptable level, making these two goals correlate. On the other hand, there was not a significant correlation between both mastery goals and between mastery and performance goals.

Table 7

Achievement goals zero order correlations

Achievement Goals	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
1. Mastery approach	1.00	.018	.226	.204
2. Mastery avoidance		1.00	.157	.182
3. Performance approach			1.00	.587*
4. Performance avoidance				1.00

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

A descriptive analysis of the indicators of cultural capital is shown in Table 8.The personal cultural capital mean score is 23, which is allocated roughly to the middle point of the scale that runs from 9 to 51. The familial cultural capital mean is 31.47, which is below the middle point of the scale which is 37.5 out of the maximum possible score of 59 and minimum possible score of 16. On average, the sample had a mean of almost 7 educational resources at home, from a total possible of 13 resources. Father and mother's level of education averaged 2.48 and 2.26, respectively, the education level ranges any point between a high school diploma and an associate degree (See table 5). The different sample size (N) for the indicators is due to the missing information that some subjects failed to supply.

Table 8

Cultural capital indicators descriptive

Indicator	N	Range	Min.	Max.	M	SD
Personal cc	58	19.00	14.00	33.00	23.00	4.66
Familial cc	55	31.00	19.00	50.00	31.47	7.15
Father's level of education	56	5.00	.00	5.00	2.48	1.50
Mother's level of education	57	5.00	.00	5.00	2.26	1.22
Educational resources	54	12.00	.00	12.00	6.98	2.37
Index cc	49	45.00	23.00	68.00	43.26	10.26

The zero order correlations among these indicators are shown in Table 9. Personal cultural capital and familial cultural capital are significantly correlated. This suggests that the personal cultural practices are associated with familial cultural practices. The factors that compose the cultural capital index are correlated significantly. This suggests that all the indicators are measuring a similar construct. There is a significant positive correlation between the index and all its components.

Table 9

Cultural capital indicators zero order correlations

Indicator	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**
1. Personal cc	1.00	.363*	.209	.243	.397*	.413*
2. Familial cc		1.00	.543*	.443*	.615*	.956*
3.Father's level of education			1.00	.546*	.374*	.658*
4. Mother's level of education				1.00	.389*	.585*
5. Educational resources					1.00	.750*
6. Index cc						1.00

* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Demographic Information

Concerning demographic information, students supplied information about parent's employment situation, living situation, personal employment situation, and sources for funding college. A Chi square analysis was performed with each variable and the type of institution that students were attending. This was the appropriate test due to the variables under analysis were categorical and not continuous.

The chi square analysis revealed that the proportion of students who live with their family of origin was significantly higher for those at TCC than those who were attending at OSU, χ^2 (2, N=59) = 16.437, P<.000. Three of four students at TCC live with their family of origin; whereas, just one of three live with their family of origin in the OSU case. Most of the students who are attending OSU reported to live by themselves (63.3%).

Moreover, the chi square test revealed that the proportion of students who reported having loans to fund college tuition was significantly higher in students attending OSU than students attending TCC, χ^2 (2, N=59) = 24.686, P<.000. Seven of ten students at OSU reported to have a loan to fund college, whereas just one in twenty students at TCC reported have a loan for the same purpose.

Table 10

Demographic indicators by educational institutions (Percentages that reported having these indicators)

Indicator		Educational institution	
		TCC	OSU
Parents employment situation	Father employed	84.0	82.8
	Mother employed	60.7	76.7
Living situation*	Family of origin	75.9	36.7
	Own family	10.3	0.0
	By themselves	13.8	63.3
Personal employment	Non-employed	20.7	33.3
situation	Part-time job	55.2	46.7
	Full-time job	24.1	20.0
Sources for funding college	Parents	41.4	46.7
	Loans*	6.9	70.0
	Self	72.4	73.3
	Other	51.7	50.0

Three in four OSU's students have a mother who is employed, at TCC the proportion is reduced to three in five. One in three students at OSU did not report working at the moment they took the questionnaire, meanwhile one in five reported the same condition at TCC. These results suggest that the economic situation of students at OSU might be more advantageous than students at TCC, since a higher percentage of OSU students seem to have both parents employed and delaying their entrance in the labor force while in college.

Summary of Findings

The results did not show statistical difference in the achievement goals between students at a two- and a four-year college. Concerning cultural capital, students at two-year college scored significantly higher in personal cultural capital than those students at a four-year college. In the case of the cultural capital index, the results did not show any statistically difference between the two groups. The demographic information showed that students at two-year college are living with their family of origin in a higher proportion than students at a four-year college. On the other hand, a significantly higher proportion of students at four-year college reported funding college with loans, while the students at a two-year college did not use this resource.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to identify whether there were differences in the achievement goals and cultural capital between students attending a two-year or a four-year college. This chapter summarizes the study, presents the conclusions based on the results and discusses implications for future research in the topic.

Summary of the Study

The study examined differences in achievement goals and cultural capital among Hispanics attending a two or four-year educational institution. The aim of the study was to determine if differences in these two variables could help to understand a better college choice process that Hispanics go through. In the study a sample of 58 college students — 29 in each educational institution– were surveyed with a questionnaire that explored four types of achievement goals, mastery approach, mastery avoidance, performance approach, and performance avoidance; and two measures of cultural capital, personal cultural capital and a cultural capital index. Personal cultural capital refers to the frequency that cultural activities, such as attending museums, galleries, libraries, etc., take place; whereas, the cultural capital index was a composed measure that accounts for the familial cultural practices, the parental work situation and education, and the amount of educational resources at home. A mean scored was calculated for each one of the

indicators mentioned above and comparative analyses were performed to test for statistical differences.

Conclusions

Research questions 1 and 2: Is there a difference in the Mastery goals and Performance goals between students attending a two-year and a four-year educational institution?

The results showed that the differences in mastery and performance goals between students attending two and four year-educational institutions were not statistically significant. The kind of academic goals that students who attend a two-year college have are similar to those that students who attend a four-year college have. This finding do not support the idea that differences in the achievement goal could help to understand better the college choice process.

Research question 3: Is there a difference in the measures of Cultural Capital between students attending a two-year and a four-year educational institution?

Concerning cultural capital, differences were observed in personal cultural capital, but not for the cultural capital index. Personal cultural capital refers to the frequency that students participate in cultural activities, such as attending museums, galleries, reading for pleasure, etc. Students attending the two-year college scored significantly higher than students attending a four-year college. This might be explained by the fact that the community college is located in a larger city in which the cultural offering is more extensive.

There was not statistical difference in the cultural capital index between the two and four-year colleges. However, there were statistically significant differences among students attending different campuses at the two-year college. This finding suggests that

the population that attends the two-year college is heterogeneous among their different campuses due to the programs offered or their locations in different areas of the city. The campus located in the suburb area showed to have a higher cultural capital, which at the same time is recognized as an area where higher income householders live. This shows the close relationship between cultural capital and economical resources.

The demographic information showed that a significant higher proportion of students attending the four-year college reported having loans to fund college. The difference in the proportions of having loans to fund college raises the issue about whether this possibility is accessible to all students. To have a loan to fund college implies at least two conditions, being eligible for this financial aid and knowing how to and where to apply for this aid. Many Hispanics could face difficulties fulfilling these two conditions, as Gandara (2009) mentions. Students are not eligible for loans due to their immigration status, even though they have been in the country since they were children and graduated from a US High school. Among those who are eligible, the information for them about these financial resources is not readily available. O'Connor (2009) concluded that Hispanics know less about how to fund college because parents are less aware about this.

The findings of this research show that students at two- and four-year college are more similar than different concerning achievement goals and cultural capital. However, they were drastically different in the way that they fund their post-secondary education. This could lead to suggest that before the cultural capital or the motivation, the economical resources available condition the decision of the type of institution that Hispanics attend.

Limitations of the Study

One of the measures of cultural capital, the cultural capital index, was the linear combination of three components. The index was not weighted because these components were not standardized. This makes that the variance in the index was not evenly distributed among its components. After standardizing the components the results may be different to those reported in this research.

Implications for Future Research

Two lines for research are proposed after this study, one that follow the analysis of cultural capital between students attending two and four-year educational institutions and different measures of economic income are included to make an statistical control of the variance that can be account for the economic resources and for the cultural capital. The other line of research that is proposed is a predictive study in which Hispanic students at high school to determine the predictive role of cultural capital in the educational expectations that students have. The research (Perna, 2000; Wells, 2009; McDough; 1997) suggests that the role that cultural and social capital may be more critical at the high school level.

The definition of the terms Hispanic is also a fundamental issue in future similar research. The broad definition that this term refers, many times makes difficult to specify which population it refers to. Suarez-Orozco (2002) warned about may be inaccurate to include under the same term a group of people with such diverse background. However, the frequent use of this category for public policy or other public initiatives makes relevant the inclusion of the category in the social research. Caution should be exercised

when conclusions are withdrawn from a particular study of this population avoiding making overgeneralizations. Instead, the researcher should describe accurately their populations and establish the limits of their findings.

REFERENCES

Bourdieu, P. (1973). Cultural reproduction and social reproduction. In J. Karabel & A. H. Halsey (Eds.), *Power and ideology in education* (pp. 487-511). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2 X 2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 501-519.

Fry, R. (2004). *Latino youth finishing college: The role of selective pathways*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

Gandara, P., & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Ganderton, P., & Santos, R. (1995). Hispanic college attendance and completion: Evidence from the high school and beyond surveys. *Economics of Education Review*, *14*, 35-46.

Harackiewicz, J. M., Barron, K. E., & Elliot, A. J. (1998). Rethinking achievement goals: When are they adaptive for college students and why? *Educational Psychologist, 33*, 1–21.

Kingston, P. W. (2001). The unfulfilled promise of cultural capital theory. *Sociology of Education, 74*, 88–99.

McDonough, P. M. (1997). *Choosing colleges. How social class and schools structure opportunity*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Midgley, C., Kaplan, A., Middleton, M., Maher, M. L., Urdan, T., Anderman, L. H., et al. (1998). The development and validation of scales assessing student's achievement goal orientation. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 23*, 113-131.

Miller, B. J., & Sundre, D. L. (2008). Achievement goal orientation toward general education versus overall coursework. *The Journal of General Education, 57*, 152-169.

Noble, J., & Davies, P. (2009). Cultural capital as an explanation of variation in participation in higher education. *British Journal of Sociology of Education, 30*, 591-605.

Nonoyama-Tarumi, Y. (2008). Cross-national estimates of the effects of family background on student achievement: A sensitivity analysis. *International Review of Education*, *54*, 57-82.

O'Connor, N. (2009). Hispanic origin, socio-economic status, and community college enrollment. *The Journal of Higher Education, 80*, 121-145.

Perna, L. W. (2000). Differences in the decision to attend college among African Americans, Hispanics, and Whites. *The Journal of Higher Education, 71*, 117–141.

Perna, L. W. (2006). The sources of racial-ethnic group differences in college enrollment: A critical examination. *New Directions For Institutional Research*, *133*, 51-66.

Sadovnik, A. R. (Ed.). (2007). *Sociology of education*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Suarez-Orozco, M. M., & Paez, M. (Eds.). (2002). *Latinos remaking America*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Swail, W. S., Cabrera, A. F., & Lee, C. (2004). *Latino youth and the pathway to college*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2009). Current Population Survey (CPS). Annual Social and Economic Suplement. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/cpstables/032009/pov/new01_100_09.htm

Wells, R. (2009). Social and cultural capital, race and ethnicity, and college student retention. *Journal of College Student Retention, 10*, 103–128.

Witkow, M. R., & Fulgini, A. J. (2007). Achievement goals and daily school experiences among adolescents with Asian, Latino and European American backgrounds. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*, 584-596.

APPPENDICES

Appendix A: IRB Approval

Oklahoma State University Institutional Review Board

Date:	Wednesday, January 20, 2010
IRB Application No	ED09168
Proposal Title:	Cultural Capital and Achievement Goals in Hispanic College Students at Two- and Four-Year Educational Institutions
Reviewed and Processed as:	Exempt

Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved Protocol Expires: 1/19/2011

Principal Investigator(s):

Juan Carlos Duran
70 S Univ. Place #4
Stillwater, OK 74075

Diane Montgomery
424 Willard
Stillwater, OK 74078

The IRB application referenced above has been approved. It is the judgment of the reviewers that the rights and welfare of individuals who may be asked to participate in this study will be respected, and that the research will be conducted in a manner consistent with the IRB requirements as outlined in section 45 CFR 46.

☑ The final versions of any printed recruitment, consent and assent documents bearing the IRB approval stamp are attached to this letter. These are the versions that must be used during the study.

As Principal Investigator, it is your responsibility to do the following:

1. Conduct this study exactly as it has been approved. Any modifications to the research protocol must be submitted with the appropriate signatures for IRB approval.
2. Submit a request for continuation if the study extends beyond the approval period of one calendar year. This continuation must receive IRB review and approval before the research can continue.
3. Report any adverse events to the IRB Chair promptly. Adverse events are those which are unanticipated and impact the subjects during the course of this research; and
4. Notify the IRB office in writing when your research project is complete.

Please note that approved protocols are subject to monitoring by the IRB and that the IRB office has the authority to inspect research records associated with this protocol at any time. If you have questions about the IRB procedures or need any assistance from the Board, please contact Beth McTernan in 219 Cordell North (phone: 405-744-5700, beth.mcternan@okstate.edu).

Sincerely,

Shelia Kennison, Chair
Institutional Review Board

Appendix B: Instrument

Date. _____
OSJ student____ TCC Student____

Thank you for participating!! Please read the instructions for each section and respond according to what is true for you.

SECTION I: Attitudes toward Learning and Performance in College this semester

The following statements concern your attitudes toward learning and performance in all of your college classes this semester. Please indicate how true each statement is of you. If you think the statement is true of you, mark a 7. If a statement is not at all true of you, mark a 1. If the statement is more or less true of you, find the number between 7 and 1 that best describes you. There are no right or wrong answers. Just answers as accurately as possible.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Not at all true of me						**Very true of me**
1. My goal this semester is to get better grades that most of the other students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. I just want to avoid doing poorly compared to other students this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Completely mastering the material in my courses is important to me this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. I really don't want to work hard in my classes this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. I'm afraid that I may not understand the content of my classes as thoroughly as I'd like.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. It is important for me to do well compare to other students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. I want to learn as much as possible this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. The fear of performing poorly this semester is what motivates me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. I want to do as little work as possible this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. The most important thing for me this semester is to understand the content in my courses as thoroughly as possible.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. I worry that I may not learn all that I possible could this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. I want to do better than other students this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. I want to get through my courses by doing the least amount of work possible.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. I am definitely concerned that I may not learn all that I can this semester.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. My goal this semester is to avoid performing poorly compared to other students.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. I look forward to working really hard this semester in my coursework.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

1

SECTION II. Activities

17. How often do you do each of these activities in your spare time? (Check the proper number)

		Often	*Sometimes*	*Hardly ever*	*Never*
a.	Watching popular entertainment on television	4	3	2	1
b.	Going to art galleries or museums	4	3	2	1
c.	Going to the theater (to see plays)	4	3	2	1
d.	Going to concerts	4	3	2	1
e.	Playing an instrument	4	3	2	1
f.	Listening to music	4	3	2	1
g.	Keeping up with news on TV or internet	4	3	2	1
h.	Keeping up with news on the radio	4	3	2	1
i.	Keeping up with news by reading quality newspapers	4	3	2	1

18. Which TV programs do you watch regularly?

a.
b.
c.

19. About how often do you read books that are not connected to your college work? (Check the proper box)

Never/ Hardly ever | 1 per month | 1 per two weeks | 1 per week | 2 per week | 3 or more per week

20. State the titles and/or authors of any books you have read recently that are not connected with college work.

a.
b.
c.

21. Are you a member of a public library? (Check the proper box)

Yes | No

SECTION III. Family

The following questions are related to your familial background. The questions that ask about your family of origin refer to features of the family in which you grew up. In case you didn't live with your parents, provide information about the person who was the head of household. Own family refers to the case in which you have already formed your own family besides your parents.

22. I currently live with... (Check the proper box)

My family of origin (go to question #23)	1
my own family (Skip to question #24)	2
by myself (Skip to question #25)	3

23. Which adults do you live with? (Check all that applied)

	Yes	No	
Mother/Stepmother			
Father/Stepfather			Quantity
Brothers/Sisters			
Aunts			
Cousins			
Grandparents			

2

24. I live with . . . (Check all that applied)

	Yes	No	Quantity
My spouse/partner			
My children or my spouse's or partners children			
Brother/Sisters			
Aunts/Uncles			
Others			

	Yes	No
25. Is your father, or head of your household employed?		
26. Is your mother, or the spouse of the head of household employed?		

27. Please provide some information about the jobs that your parents or caretakers have. (Check the proper box)

		Father/Male caretaker		Mother/Female caretaker	
a.	What is the name of their current or most recent job				
b.	Do they have their own business?	Yes	No	Yes	No
c.	Do they work full-time or part-time	Yes	No	Yes	No

28. What is the highest educational qualification that each of your parents or caretakers has (or is studying for.

	Father (Male caretaker)	Mother (Female caretaker)
No qualifications	0	0
Elementary education	1	1
High school diploma	2	2
Vocational degree	3	3
Bachelor degree	4	4
Graduate degree (Master, Ph. D., etc.)	5	5

29. Which of the following have you heard your parents or caretakers discuss?

		Often	Sometimes	Never
a.	Art	3	2	1
b.	Books	3	2	1
c.	Science	3	2	1
d.	Current affairs	3	2	1
e.	Music	3	2	1

30. Do your parents or caretakers do any of these activities in their leisure time?

		Often	Sometimes	Hardly ever	Never
a.	Watching popular entertainment on television	4	3	2	1
b.	Listening to music	4	3	2	1
c.	Going to art galleries or museums	4	3	2	1
d.	Going to the cinema	4	3	2	1
e.	Reading novels	4	3	2	1
f.	Reading non-fiction	4	3	2	1
g.	Going to the theater	4	3	2	1
h.	Going to concerts	4	3	2	1
i.	Playing a musical instrument	4	3	2	1
j.	Evening or daytime classes	4	3	2	1
k.	Listening to the radio	4	3	2	1

3

31. Approximately, how many books does your family have at your house?

0	1-10	11-50	51-100	101-250	251-500	501 or more

32. Which one of the following does your family have in your house? (Check the proper box)

	Yes	No	
a. dictionary			
b. specific place to study			
c. daily newspaper			
d. Textbooks			
e. a calculator			Quarilly
f. computer with internet			
g. computer only			

SECTION IV. Demographics. Put a check next to all of the boxes that apply.

33. Gender (Check the proper box)

Male Female

34. Age: _____ years old.

35. Ethnicity

African American
Asian American
Caucasian
Hispanic
Middle Eastern
Native American
Other, please specify

36. I have a . . . (Check the proper box)

Full-time job Part-time job I do not work

37. Where do you live? (Check the proper box)

city Rural area

38. What is the source of funding for attending college? (Check all that apply)

Parents/ Relatives
Loans
Self
Other

4

VITA

Juan Carlos Durán Bonilla

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: CULTURAL CAPITAL AND ACHIEVEMENT GOALS IN HISPANIC COLLEGE STUDENTS AT TWO- AND FOUR-YEAR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Major Field: Educational Psychology

Biographical:

Education: Bachelor of science degree in Psychology, Universidad Centroamericana "José Simeón Cañas", San Salvador, El Salvador, October 2004. Completed the requirements for the Master of Science in Educational Psycholgoy at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in May, 2010.

Experience: Junior analyst at the Instituto Universitario de Opinion Publica (Public Opinion Research Institute) at the Universidad Centroamericana "José Simeón Cañas", San Salvador, El Salvador, from June 2006 to June 2008. High School advisor at Colegio Externado San Jose, San Salvador, El Salvador, from January 2003 to May 2006.

Professional Memberships: Fulbright scholar El Salvador.

Name: Juan Carlos Durán Bonilla Date of Degree: May, 2010

Institution: Oklahoma State University Location: Stillwater, Oklahoma

Title of Study: CULTURAL CAPITAL AND ACHIEVEMENT GOALS IN HISPANIC COLLEGE STUDENTS AT TWO- AND FOUR-YEAR EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Pages in Study: 58 Candidate for the Degree of Master of Science

Major Field: Educational Psychology

Scope and Method of Study: The purpose of the study was to determine whether there were differences in the achievement goals and cultural capital between Hispanic students attending a two- or a four-year educational institution. A sample of 58 subjects were surveyed, 29 from each educational institution. The instrument used to measure achievement goals was the Attitude Toward Learning and Performance in College this Semester Scale (ATL) (Miller & Sundre, 2008). Cultural capital was measured by an adaptation of the Cultural capital questionnaire proposed by Noble and Davies (2009).

Findings and Conclusions: The results showed that there were not statistically significant differences in the achievement goals. Concerning cultural capital, statistically differences were found in personal cultural capital between the two types of college. The cultural capital index was statistically different when students at different campuses where compared. Concerning demographic information, it was found that students at two-year college were living with their families of origin in a higher proportion than students at a four-year college. The source to fund college appeared to be different for both groups. The proportion of students that use loans to fund college was significantly higher in those who are attending a four–year college. The results suggest that decision to attend one or other type of post-secondary institution may be related to economic resources or aspects of cultural capital.

ADVISER'S APPROVAL: Dr. Diane Montgomery