DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 387 280 RC 020 225

AUTHOR Valencia, Richard R.
TITLE The Plight of Chicano Students: An Overview of Schooling Conditions and Outcomes. Chapter 1.
PUB DATE 93
NOTE 27p.; In: Chicano School Failure and Success: Research and Policy Agendas for the 1990s; see RC 020 224.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Failure; Dropouts; *Educational Environment; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Educational Policy; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Higher Education; Low Achievement; *Mexican American Education; Mexican Americans; Minority Groups; *Outcomes of Education; *Population Growth; School Holding Power; White Students
IDENTIFIERS *Chicanos; Hispanic American Students

ABSTRACT

This chapter addresses the Chicano schooling experience by presenting an overview of the conditions and outcomes of Chicano schooling problems. School failure among Chicano students refers to their persistently, pervasively, and disproportionately low academic achievement. For example, in 1979 the average number of years Chicanos remained in school was 11 as compared to 13.4 years for Whites. In addition, school failure is not confined to any one location and is widespread among Chicano student enrollments. Schooling conditions and outcomes for the Chicano student population include: (1) a history of segregation; (2) exclusion of Chicano students' language and culture from the curriculum; (3) disproportionately low performance on achievement tests; (4) a significantly high dropout rate; (5) lower funding for schools with predominantly minority students; (6) poor quality of teacher-student interactions; (7) exposure of Chicano students to greater amounts of "low-status knowledge" as opposed to "higher-status knowledge"; (8) lower rates of college eligibility, lower rates of enrollment in college, and higher rates of attrition once enrolled in college, compared to White students; (9) exposure of Chicano students to harmful amounts of stress; (10) questionable or inappropriate special education assessment tools and practices; and (11) a low percentage of Chicano school teachers. A projection of racial/ethnic youth population indicates that the number of Chicano and other Latino children will triple by the year 2020. This population growth, along with the gradual erosion of economic and educational gains of Chicanos, point to the immediate need for school reform. Contains 70 references. (LP)

Chapter 1

The Plight of Chicano Students: An Overview of Schooling Conditions and Outcomes

Richard R. Valencia

There is a crisis in many of our nation's schools in which racial/ethnic minority students attend. We are not speaking of the charges of increasing mediocrity of schooling quality as described by a rash of 'excellence' reports in the 1980s (e.g., National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Rather we are alluding to a considerably more grave problem — the massive school problems experienced by a large proportion of minority students enrolled in public kindergarten through twelfth grade (K-12) schools. With respect to Chicano students — the target group of this book — they are prime examples of pupils affected by the pernicious ideologies, institutional mechanisms, and outcomes of educational inequality.[1]

In this introductory chapter, three aspects of the Chicano schooling experience will be addressed. First, there will be an attempt to unpack the notion of 'Chicano school failure'. Second, I will provide a descriptive level of Chicano schooling problems by presenting an overview of numerous conditions and outcomes. Third, I will focus on the 'changing demography'; that is, I will describe the dramatic growth in the Chicano population and then discuss current and future implications of these demographic changes *vis-à-vis* the Chicano community and the schooling of its children.

Chicano School Failure

Although the notion of 'school failure' with respect to racial/ethnic minority students has been used and discussed by other scholars (e.g., Boykin, 1983; Erikson, 1987; Ginsburg, 1986), the term itself is in need of further theoretical development and refinement. Its heuristic value and potential in theory generation about the many schooling problems experienced by Chicano students appear to be vast. How might one conceptualize school failure, a construct, among Chicano students?[2] I offer this broad, working definition: school failure among Chicano students refers to their *persistently, pervasively, and disproportionately, low*

academic achievement. Next, we turn to a brief discussion of each of the italicized terms.

Persistence

School failure among Chicanos is not a new situation. On the contrary, it is an old and stubborn condition. It refuses to relent. It continues even in the face of opposition. Imagine having a toothache that never goes away, and you can get a sense of the persistent nature of the poor academic performance of a substantial portion of the Chicano student population. In short, Chicano school failure is deeply rooted in history. When Chicanos did eventually gain wider access to public schooling at the turn of the twentieth century (Cameron, 1976), major schooling problems existed since the earliest period and such patterns continued unabated (Carter and Segura, 1979; Sanchez, 1966). For example, Drake (1927) compared the relative academic performance of Mexican (i.e., 'Chicano') and White seventh and eighth graders in Tucson, Arizona. Based on group-administered achievement tests, Chicano students performed considerably lower than their White peers. Reynolds (1933), in a comprehensive report more than fifty years ago (*The Education of Spanish-Speaking Children in Five Southwestern States*), quoted an Arizona study as follows: 'In general, the type of Mexican child taken into the Arizona school tends to be backward in rate of mental development, lags a year or two behind other pupils, shows a heavy failure percentage, and an early elimination from school' (p. 38). An example of such school failure was the finding that for every '... 100 Mexican children in grade 1 there are 7 in grade 8, while for 100 non-Mexican children in grade 1 there are 52 in grade 8' (p. 39). Another example of the persistent nature of Chicano school failure comes from Chapa's (1988) analysis of census data. In 1940, Chicanos in California (ages 25–64) completed an average of 7.5 years of schooling while Whites finished an average of 10.5 years — a gap of 3 years. Nearly forty years later (1979), the mean for Chicanos was 11.0 years and 13.4 years for Whites — a gap of 2.4 years.

Pervasiveness

Chicano school failure is not confined to one single location. Wherever Chicano communities exist, school failure appears to be widespread among Chicano student enrollments. There are at least two evidential ways of looking at the pervasive character of this low academic achievement. First, one can analyze it from a geographical vantage point. Whether one views the academic performance data described in national (e.g., Coleman *et al.*, 1966), regional (e.g., US Commission on Civil Rights, 1972a), state (e.g., Brown and Haycock, 1985), or numerous local reports, the results are alarmingly consistent: Chicano students, on the whole, tend to exhibit low academic achievement. Second, one can study such data using a cross-sectional approach (i.e., comparing various grade levels at one point in time; for example, see Brown and Haycock, 1985). Again, Chicano academic performance — on the average — is characterized by poor achievement. In sum, the pandemic branches of Chicano school failure are clearly tied to their persistent roots.

Disproportionality

The modifying term, 'disproportionately', is an important qualifier in that Chicano school failure, which contains its explicit meaning of low achievement, also has a second denotation — comparative performance. In the context of examining the school achievement of Chicano students, their academic performance is compared to White students. Here, the common procedure is to use the aggregated performance (e.g., reading achievement as measured on a standardized test) of White grade-level peers as a referent and then to compare the aggregated performance of Chicano students to this standard. When this is done, the common result is one of *asymmetry*. That is, when the Chicano distribution of achievement test scores, represented as interval data, is juxtaposed to the curve of the White grouped scores, the Chicano distribution is typically skewed positively. Simply put, there is a disproportionately greater percentage of Chicano students — compared to their White peers — reading below the middle of the distribution. Conversely, compared to White students, there is a disproportionately lower percentage of Chicano students reading above the middle of the distribution.

In addition to examining the notion of disproportionality of achievement scores from a perspective of asymmetry, one can also look at *disparity*. For example, when a comparison is made between the percentage of Chicano secondary school dropouts to White dropouts (i.e., represented as dichotomous data — dropout/non-dropout), the common pattern shows disparity, where the Chicano rate of dropouts in secondary schools is higher than one would predict when compared to the percentage of Chicano students in the general secondary school population.

Before we leave the term, disproportionality, a caveat is in order. Although the difference between Chicano and White students in academic achievement is large, there is indeed variability in Chicano academic development and performance (see Laosa and Henderson, this volume, for a discussion of some predictors that help to explain such variability). Some Chicano students do read at or above grade level. Many Chicano students graduate from high school. In short, there are noticeable within-group differences, and thus the issue of disproportionality is not confined only to between-group (i.e., White/Chicano) differences. It is important to underscore, however, that given the current schooling outcomes experienced by Chicano students as measured by most achievement indicators — and despite the fact that some of these students will not have academic problems — the available evidence indicates that the low academic achievement is the norm for a substantial portion of the Chicano student population in the nation's public elementary and secondary schools.

Low Academic Achievement

Here, there is a need to provide a justification for the usage of 'low academic achievement'. First, we need to examine the term 'achievement'. Achievement (academic) is a concept, an '... abstraction formed from the observation of certain behavior of children ... associated with the "learning" of school tasks — reading words, doing arithmetic problems ... and so on' (Kerlinger, 1986,

p. 27). According to major reports and studies (e.g., California Superintendents' Council on Hispanic Affairs, 1985; US Commission on Civil Rights, 1972a), two of the most significant academic achievement indicators, particularly in the schooling of Chicano students, are (a) test performance in the content areas (especially reading) and (b) secondary school holding power (i.e., the '... school systems' effectiveness in its ability to hold its students until they have completed the full course of study', US Commission on Civil Rights, 1972a, p. 8).[3]

I have deliberately chosen the term 'low academic achievement' rather than the often used notion of 'underachievement'.[4] It is tempting to want to use the construct of underachievement as it connotes that the typical group performance of low test scores and high dropout rates are not truly reflective of what Chicano students are capable of achieving. Although there is likely a great deal of credence to the belief that, by and far, the depressed academic achievement of Chicanos does not mirror their potential, to try to interpret this discrepancy as 'underachievement' presents several conceptual problems.

First, the converse notion of underachievement (that is, 'overachievement') appears to be '... a logical impossibility' (Anastasi, 1984, p. 131) because the term implies that a person is performing above his/her capacity. Second, the terms underachievement/overachievement are meaningless if not looked at from a measurement perspective. As a number of scholars have noted, the two terms tell us little more than the widely acknowledged fact that intelligence and achievement tests are far from being perfectly correlated (cf. Anastasi, 1984; Jensen, 1980). Third, the concept of underachievement is typically used in describing the special education category of learning disabilities (that is, a commonly accepted characteristic of learning disabilities is a marked discrepancy between measured intelligence and school achievement). The discrepancy index as such is particularly troubling in trying to describe the test behavior of normal Chicanos (i.e., non-special education students) in that it is fairly common for them to perform well within the normal range on intelligence tests but perform below the norm on achievement tests (see Valencia and Rankin, 1988). Given all the confusion and issues associated with the term underachievement, I have selected the term 'low academic achievement' — a more meaningful construct — for inclusion in my definition of Chicano school failure.[5] Now that we have dissected the notion of school failure and provided some semblance of its configuration, we move next to a description of conditions and outcomes that characterize current schooling of Chicanos.

Schooling Conditions and Outcomes: An Overview

Based on my knowledge of the Chicano schooling experience, there are at least eleven schooling generalizations that characterize conditions and outcomes for a sizable proportion of the Chicano public school population. The reader should keep in mind that the following descriptive overview contains broad-based general statements. That is, they are meant to capture what appears to be the norm for a good number of Chicano students, not every Chicano student.

Segregation

Chicano students are typically isolated from their White peers — and of course, vice-versa (White students have little contact with their Chicano peers). There is, however, an interesting new development to this condition of racial/ethnic isolation. As Menchaca and Valencia (1990) note, 'The segregation of school-age Latinos, of which two-thirds are Chicano, has increased to such an extent that they now have the dubious distinction of being the most highly segregated group of America's children' (p. 222; also see Orum, 1986). In 1968, 23 per cent of Latinos attended 90 to 100 per cent minority schools. By 1984, nearly 1 in 3 (31 per cent) of Latinos attended such ethnically segregated schools (Orfield, 1988). In short, the segregation of Chicano students has increased over the last twenty years. Given the sharp increase in the Chicano school-age population, Chicano/Mexicano migration and settlement patterns, the foot dragging of desegregation efforts, and other factors, it is very likely that the segregation of Chicano students will intensify in the years ahead.

The connection between school segregation and academic achievement of Chicano students has been widely documented (e.g., Espinosa and Ochoa, 1986; Haro, 1977; Orfield, 1988; Valencia, 1984). As the Chicano enrollment increases, achievement (as measured by standardized tests) decreases. These observed negative correlations are pervasive and strong in magnitude. For example, Valencia (1984) found a near perfect negative correlation between Chicano (and Black) school percentage and mean achievement scores in an analysis of eleven high schools in the Phoenix, Arizona Union School District. As the minority percentage of the high schools increased, test scores systematically decreased. Espinosa and Ochoa (1986) found a strong negative correlation between California Assessment Program test scores and Latino school concentration for a state-wide sample of third-graders.

It is clear that segregation has and continues to be a major institutional process in denying equal educational opportunities for Chicano students and thus has helped shape their school failure. Although one cannot imply causality from correlational data, it is safe to assume that segregation is implicated in creating barriers for Chicano students. Or as Orfield (1988) notes, such '... data does not, of course, show that the segregation causes the inequality, but it does show that Hispanic students tend to be concentrated in schools where the tone and the level of instruction are set by large proportions of poorly prepared students' (p. 29).

In recent publications, the unfolding of the history of the Chicano schooling experience has had school segregation as a prominent focus of attention (Alvarez, 1988; Gonzalez, 1985; Menchaca and Valencia, 1990; San Miguel, 1986, 1987). A major conclusion drawn by these scholars is that the segregation of Chicano students has operated throughout history as a key administrative practice leading to harmful schooling consequences (also see, Donato, Menchaca and Valencia, this volume). For example, Menchaca and Valencia (1990) discuss the issue in this manner:

> ... although contemporary school segregation of Chicano students is complexly related to social, economic, and population demographic factors over time, one should not ignore the historical blueprint of forced

segregative practices of the early 1900s. Although the knot between past and present school segregation cannot be snugly tied, there is ample evidence from California case studies that the segregative policies of the early 1900s have had long-term effects. Despite the variability among the communities of California, segregation of Chicano students today can generally be said to have been strongly influenced by Anglo-Saxon ideologies of the past. To the present day, the schools in the Chicano barrios continue to experience the deleterious impact of the 'separate but equal' policies passed by previous generations. (p. 243)

Language/Cultural Exclusion

The fact that Chicano students' language and culture are excluded from the school curriculum — which by the way is a longstanding historical practice — was brought to national limelight in the early 1970s by a report in the *Mexican American Education Study* (US Commission on Civil Rights, 1972b). It was reported that less than 7 per cent of the schools in the Southwestern US offered bilingual education. Furthermore, only 4 per cent and 7 per cent of the elementary and secondary schools, respectively, in the Southwest offered Chicano history.

Periodic reports since then have confirmed the existence of language and cultural exclusion. For example, Olsen (1988) reported there are over 600,000 limited-English proficient (LEP) students in California (about three-fourths of these are Latinos). Due in large part to the serious shortage of bilingual teachers (see Valencia and Aburto, this volume), less than 25 per cent of these LEP students are being served in bilingual classes staffed by qualified bilingual teachers. The other 75 per cent of LEP students are provided little, if any, instruction in their first language. Given the schooling benefits of having bilingual education for Chicano students (see Garcia, chapter 4, and Merino, chapter 5, this volume) as well as multicultural education (e.g., see Gonzalez, 1974), the inclusion of language/cultural components in instruction can certainly help turn the tide against school failure.

Two likely contributing factors that have helped shape the language/cultural exclusion issue are the limited multicultural education training and the apparent disinterest in such training during the preservice development of prospective teachers. With respect to the limited training concern, there is some evidence that teachers are inadequately prepared to teach multicultural education. A case in point is Olsen's (1988) finding that only 5 per cent of future teachers in California take any course in multicultural education. Regarding the issue of disinterest, Mahan and Boyle (1981) surveyed student teaching directors in twenty-five states. The authors reported that two-thirds of the respondents believed 60 to 100 per cent of students in teacher education training programs had no desire for preparatory experiences in multicultural education.

Academic Achievement

As we have previously discussed in our conceptualization of Chicano school failure, Chicano students — compared to White students — achieve at considerably lower levels on various group-based and individually administered standardized achievement tests (e.g., see Valencia and Rankin, 1988; see Valencia and Aburto, this volume, for a discussion of Chicano students' considerably poorer performance on minimum competency and school-based competency tests). The disproportionately lower performance of Chicanos on achievement tests is one of the most persistent and pervasive findings seen in the Chicano schooling literature. Clearly, the improvement of achievement test scores of Chicanos should be an educational priority during the 1990s. We should be very cautious, however, that the means to achieve such ends do not penalize Chicano students (see Valencia and Aburto, this volume) nor do they infringe on a Chicano's right to a democratic education (see Pearl, this volume).

On a related point there is evidence that test scores, in general, are increasing in the nation. We should be aware, though, of illusions that help to create a false sense of security for the Chicano community, as well as for policymakers (see Valencia and Aburto, Chapter 8 in this volume, note 22). As Gandara (1989) recently admonished:

Nearly a quarter of America's children are on an educational path leading nowhere. While test scores appear to be on the rise all over the country, a closer look at the figures reveals that the least successful students are actually losing ground: The gap between their skills and performance and those of their peers is growing wider. These are the children of the poor, who coincidentally are also often ethnic minorities. (p. 38)

School Holding Power (Retention)

The fact that Chicano students, compared to their White peers, drop out of secondary school at considerably higher rates is one of the truly major tragedies of the Chicano schooling experience. Although it is difficult to obtain reliable data on dropout incidence data, there are estimates. Recent data indicate that about 1 in 2 Chicano students drop out of secondary schools (Rumberger, this volume).

The costs to the individual Chicano who leaves school before graduation go beyond the fact that there is now an abrupt severance to his/her intellectual growth. The stakes are very high for the Chicano dropout and for society. One researcher has estimated that in the Los Angeles Unified School District — a high density Chicano district — the loss in adjusted lifetime earnings for a male dropout is $187,000, in general; for a female dropout, the loss is about $122,000 (Catterall, 1985). Furthermore, in addition to the foregone income associated with dropping out, there are foregone tax receipts as well as the social costs to local governments of providing funding for welfare, health, and related services (Rumberger, this volume). In short, the dropout problem for Chicanos is extremely costly along 'quality of life' and social lines. Suffice it to say that there is widespread interest and activity in trying to cope with and solve the Chicano dropout problem (see Rumberger, this volume, for an overview of policies and programs).

On a final note about the dropout issue is the term itself. Orr (1987) comments in her book, *Keeping Students in School*:

> Although the implication of the term *dropout* is that the student has left school willfully and without good reason, there is overwhelming evidence that many so-called dropouts leave because of the treatment they receive at school or the failure of the school programs to meet their learning needs. In effect these students are forced out. (p. xii)

School Financing

Typically, the schools that Chicano students attend are underfinanced compared to the schools White students attend. For example, one study of the Los Angeles Unified School District demonstrated that large differences were evident in the amount of money spent in elementary schools along racial/ethnic lines. Fairchild (1984) found that as the percentage of Chicano and other Latino students increased among the various schools, per-pupil expenditures decreased. In contrast, as the proportion of White students increased, school financing increased.

It has been known for sometime that some states in the Southwest spend significantly less to educate Chicano students than their White counterparts. A case in point is Texas, the state with the second largest enrollment of Chicano students. The US Commission on Civil Rights (1972c) *Mexican American Education Study, Report Number 4 (Mexican American Education in Texas: A Function of Wealth)* linked financial inequities with schooling inequities in this manner:

> The Texas school finance system results in discrimination against Mexican American school children. Predominantly Mexican American districts are less wealthy in terms of property values than Anglo districts and the average income of Chicanos is below that of Anglos. These circumstances existing, the State of Texas has devised an educational finance system by which the amount spent on the schooling of students is a function of district and personal wealth. The end result is that the poor and those receiving inferior education continue to receive inferior education. (p. 28)

Shortly prior to the publication of the US Commission on Civil Rights (1972c) report on financial inequities in Texas, Demetrio Rodriguez and six other parents of the San Antonio Independent School District sued the district in 1968 charging that the Texas school finance system violated the US Constitution (*Rodriguez v. San Antonio Independent School District*, 1971). In one of the most critical legal cases in the history of Texas, and after twenty-one years of struggle, the Texas Supreme Court in a 9–0 decision declared on October 2, 1989 the state's public school system of financing to be unconstitutional (Graves, 1989a). The Court mandated state legislators to prepare a new, comprehensive funding plan by May 1990. As we enter the 1990s, the nation's eyes will be on Texas, closely observing its attempts to equalize the large funding discrepancies among

the state's many districts and its efforts to bring an end to a pattern of education in Texas — one kind for the poor, one kind for the rich.[6]

Teacher-Student Interactions

There is longstanding evidence that Chicano students, as a whole, tend to be treated less favorably than White students by teachers. For example, Parsons (1965) found a great deal of racial/ethnic cleavage in a small farming community in California. Regarding schooling, Parsons observed that social relationships and interactions between students and students and teachers and students mirrored the larger social structure of the community — one of White dominance. Teachers routinely demonstrated preference for Whites over Chicanos by selecting the former students for leadership roles. Chicanos were also negatively stereotyped by teachers (e.g., perceived to be lazy, not bright).

In the most comprehensive study to date of teacher-student interactions involving Chicano students, the US Commission on Civil Rights (1973) *Mexican American Education Study, Report Number 5 (Teachers and Students: Differences in Teacher Interaction with Mexican American and Anglo Students)* found a great deal of differences in the quality and quantity of teacher-student interactions along lines of students' racial/ethnic background. Based on systematic observation and evaluation of behavior in over 400 classes in New Mexico, California, and Texas, the Commission staff found — among other results — that Chicano students, compared to Whites, received significantly less praise and encouragement from teachers. Furthermore, teachers were found to spend less time in asking questions of Chicanos, and they provided more noncriticizing talk to White pupils than to Chicanos. These and other findings of teacher-student disparities in interaction patterns led the US Civil Rights Commission to conclude:

> The basic finding of this report is that the schools of the Southwest are failing to involve Mexican American children as active participants in the classroom to the same extent as Anglo children. . . . The classroom is the setting in which a child's schooling takes place and the interaction between teacher and students is the heart of the educational process . . . all elements of this interaction, taken together, create a climate of learning which directly affects educational opportunity. Consequently, the discovered disparities in teacher behavior toward Mexican Americans and Anglos are likely to hinder seriously the educational opportunities and achievement of Chicano pupils. These findings raise disturbing questions concerning the ability of our schools to meet the educational needs of all students adequately. (p. 43)

Although very little research of teacher-student interactions involving Chicano students has occurred since the time of the *Mexican American Education Study*, I believe it is safe to assume that some teachers in our nation's schools continue to respond more positively to White students than they do to Chicano students. As such, it is vital that our vision of schooling embraces philosophies and practices consonant with a democratic educational process in which useful knowledge,

participation, rights, and equal encouragement are present (see Pearl, this volume).

Curriculum Differentiation

The sorting of students, based on perceived educability, into small groups or classes for instructional purposes has been an educational practice for many decades (Oakes, 1985). Chicano students are no exception to the practices of 'ability grouping' (elementary level) and 'tracking' (secondary level) (Oakes, 1985; US Commission on Civil Rights, 1974; Valencia and Aburto, this volume). Through such curriculum differentiation, Chicano students — compared to their White peers — are often exposed to greater amounts of 'low status knowledge' (e.g., non-challenging, rote-learning curriculum) and exposed to lesser amounts of 'high status knowledge' — that is, the knowledge that is deemed to be a prerequisite for college admissions (Oakes).

For Chicano students, the link between not having the necessary high status knowledge and not matriculating to college is tight. Orum (1986), for example, has reported that 75 per cent of Chicano and other Latino high school seniors have not completed a college preparatory program. Given the negative implications of curriculum differentiation for a sizable percentage of Chicano students, it is not surprising that a number of school reform efforts *vis-à-vis* Chicano pupils involve, in part, providing greater access of high status knowledge for them (e.g., Haycock and Navarro, 1988).

College Enrollment

Chicano students, compared to their White peers, have: (a) lower rates of college eligibility, (b) lower rates of enrollment to college (e.g., in the California State University and University of California systems), and (c) higher rates of attrition once enrolled in college (e.g., Brown and Haycock, 1985; Orum, 1986).

Recent research has documented a rather unfortunate situation: not only is there a very low college attendance rate of Chicanos, but it is *declining*. (Here we are defining college attendance rate as the percentage of Chicano and other Latino high school graduates who go on to college.) The Chicano and other Latino college attendance rate hit a peak of 36 per cent in 1976, dropped sharply to 30 per cent in 1980, and plummeted even further to 26 per cent in 1985 (Mingle, 1987). In short, from 1976 to 1985, the Latino college attendance rate dramatically declined 28 per cent. Orum (1986) adds this observation about the higher education issue:

> The popular perception that Hispanic participation in institutions of higher education has greatly increased is a myth. Despite the appearance of increased access to higher education through affirmative action programs, proportionately fewer Hispanics attended college in 1980 than in 1975. While the number of Hispanic students attending college between 1975 and 1980 remained steady, these students as a percentage of Hispanic high school graduates dropped markedly. This fact, coupled with the soaring high school dropout rates, sends a clear message of the critical and continuing Hispanic under-representation in postsecondary education. (p. 37)

In sum, the low and declining proportion of Chicanos entering college represents another crisis within the larger crisis of Chicano schooling problems. In that college is the point of entry for prospective professional careers and leadership roles, it is imperative that institutions of higher education open their doors widely, as well as implement proactive measures during the collegiate experience to ensure Chicano school success.

Stress

Although the conceptual status of stress is somewhat problematic because of vague definitions and obscure mediating constructs (Wills and Langer, 1980), it remains an important area of study. Regarding school stress and anxiety, the available literature has documented higher amounts among students of lower socioeconomic status and/or racial/ethnic minority backgrounds (e.g., Coney and West, 1979; Hawkes and Koff, 1970). With respect to Chicano students, there is some evidence that they experience considerably high and harmful amounts of stress at the elementary school level (Gerard and Miller, 1975; Phillips, 1978) and college level (Munoz, 1986).

In the area of race relations, one particular 'environmental stressor' that has become a scholarly concern is race prejudice of Whites towards racial/ethnic minorities in the school setting. Theoretically, such '... stress is likely to adversely affect [minority] students' daily academic performance by reducing their willingness to persist at academic tasks and interfering with the cognitive processes involved in learning' (Goughis, 1986, p. 147).

In that the linkages between race prejudice, resultant stress, and the generally poor academic performance of Chicano students have not been empirically demonstrated, one can only speculate at this time about the parts and the whole of this socio-psychological process. For example, perhaps teacher prejudice against Chicano students can be looked at as an environmental stressor. A case in point is the study by Olsen (1988) who noted that more than a third of her total sample of 11 to 18-year-old California immigrant students (a very sizable percentage of whom were Mexican-origin) reported racial incidents of what they perceived to be caused by teacher prejudice (e.g., derogatory or stereotypic comments voiced in front of the class; cultural clashes; being punished or embarrassed for using their native language). In any event, and despite the absence of empirical studies documenting the existence between adverse stress and poor achievement, it is still important to move ahead in designing psychologically healthy learning environments for Chicano students.

Special Education

The system of special education with respect to Chicano students continues to have problems, particularly dealing with questionable or inappropriate assess-

ment tools and practices, overrepresentation and underrepresentation of Chicanos in certain placements, the poor delivery of intervention services, and so on. Given these issues, and accompanied with the substantial increase in the Chicano school population, it will be important as we enter the 1990s to reform the special education system. Rueda (this volume) offers a critique of the existing system and presents a reconceptualization of how special education can be improved to address the academic development of those Chicano students who perform markedly below the norms (also, see Valencia and Aburto, this volume, for an overview of the abuses of educational testing and a discussion of how testing might be improved to promote Chicano school success).

Chicano Teaching Force

Finally, there is the subject — or perhaps we should say the dwindling numbers — of Chicano teachers. Recent studies show that the percentage of Chicano public school (K-12) teachers is extremely low and steadily declining (Valencia and Aburto, in press, a; Valencia and Aburto, this volume).

A major obstacle to Chicano teacher production is their high failure rate on teacher competency tests. In terms of a Latino student/Latino teacher national disparity analysis, Chicano and other Latino teachers are underrepresented by a huge 75 per cent (Valencia and Aburto, in press, a). The growing shortage of Chicano public school teachers is a concern for all in that it works against the need to have a multicultural teaching force at a time when our school system is becoming more and more culturally diverse. Chicano teachers are needed to serve as role models for Chicano students, to deliver bilingual education, and to help promote racial/ethnic understanding and respect among all students. As Valencia and Aburto note (this volume), for our country to dive into the twenty-first century without Chicano and other minority teachers is unpardonable. As such, we need to get on with the business of identifying and implementing strategies that will increase the percentage of Chicano teachers (see Valencia and Aburto, in press, b).

In summary, the general profile I just painted of schooling conditions and outcomes faced by many Chicano students is quite disturbing. The prognosis for a healthier and more equitable schooling experience for Chicanos attending school in the 1990s and beyond is not promising — unless reform begins *now*. That is, the transformation of Chicano school failure to Chicano school success involves the issue of timeliness. Given the tremendous current and future growth patterns in the Chicano population, now is the time for informed action — lest the grave problems Chicano students currently face will increase as concomitantly does their population. We turn next to this aspect of the 'changing demography' and its schooling implications for Chicanos.

The Changing Demography

More than a decade ago, the dramatic growth of the Chicano population captured the interest of demographers, and soon after, the media. The 'rediscovering' of the Chicano people was exemplified by lengthy news stories on Chicanos

published in several national magazines. The articles ranged, for example, from the general ('Chicanos on the Move', *Newsweek*, January, 1979; 'Mexican Americans: A People on the Move', *National Geographic*, June, 1980) to the specific ('A Year With the Gangs of East Los Angeles', *Ms.*, July, 1978). A controversial movie (*Boulevard Nights*) that glorified Chicano gangs was viewed by millions of moviegoers nationally in 1979. In 1981, *Zoot Suit* — a powerful movie about oppression against Chicanos in the early 1940s — was released. In short, new attention was directed to the Chicano people. Some people predicted that the 80s would be the 'decade of the Hispanic'.

The 1980s: Rise of the Latino Population

In 1980, the national Latino population was 14.5 million and accounted for 6.4 per cent of the total US population of 228 million people (Miranda and Quiroz, 1989; Swibold, 1989).[7] During the 1980s Latinos increased nationally by 5.6 million, and by decade's end they numbered 20.1 million people — the highest estimate ever. From 1980 to late 1989, the total US population increased about 8.7 per cent (from 228 to 248 million). In contrast, the Latino population increased a huge 38.6 per cent (14.5 to 20.1 million) — growing during the 1980s at a rate *over four times faster* than the rest of the US population.

With respect to where Latinos are located in the US, California, Texas, New York, and Florida (in descending order), continue to account for almost 75 per cent of the total Latino population in late 1989 (Swibold, 1989). California is home to 34 per cent of all Latinos (6.8 million, mostly Mexican origin). Texas is number two with 21 per cent of the total Latino population (4.3 million, mostly Mexican origin). New York follows with 2 million Latinos (10 per cent of total, mostly Puerto Rican), and Florida contains 1.6 million (8 per cent, mostly Cuban). About 1.7 million Latinos (8 per cent of total, mostly Mexican origin) live in Arizona, Colorado, and New Mexico. New Jersey is the home to 640,000 Latino residents (3 per cent, mostly Puerto Rican), and finally, the remaining states contain 14 per cent of the total Latino population.

By all indications, the Chicano and other Latino population segments will continue to soar in size in the 1990s and well into the next century. For example, let us take the case of growth patterns in Los Angeles, California and Houston, Texas — the two cities with the largest Chicano populations (Staff, 1989).[8] In Los Angeles, the Chicano and other Latino population was 816,000 people (27.5 per cent of the total 2.97 million) in 1980. By the year 2000, Chicano and other Latinos will constitute 38.2 per cent of the total Los Angeles population (1.21 million of 3.16 million people). A similar pattern will be seen in Houston. In 1980, this city was the home for 281,000 Chicanos (and a very small percentage of other Latinos), comprising 17.6 per cent of the total population of 1.6 million. It is projected that by the year 2000, Chicanos (520,000) will account for 23.3 per cent of the total population of Houston (2.24 million).

Some population demographers have looked far into the future (US Bureau of the Census, 1986). In about seventy years from now, racial/ethnic shifts will occur nationally that will become highly significant markers in the history of the United States. In the year 2060, it is projected that the Latino population will number 54.2 million people and will surpass the Black population (projected to

ble 1.1: Projections of California's school-age population by racial/ethnic background

Year	Race/Ethnicity				
	White (%)	Latino (%)	Black (%)	Asian (%)	Other (%)
1971	71	16	9	4	na
1986	52	29	10	7	2
2000	45	35	8	11	2
2030	33	44	6	16	1

Source. Adapted from Population Reference Bureau (1985; years 1986, 2000, 2030) and Watson (1988; year 1971)
Note na. not available

be 53.7 million) to become the nation's largest racial/ethnic minority group. The Latino population in 2060 will account for 17.5 per cent of the total population of 309.7 million. (Currently, Latinos account for about 8.1 per cent of the total US population.)

In sum, the demographic predictions of the late 1970s laid the foundation for what is occurring now and will continue well into the future. That is, the terms 'minority' and 'majority' are undergoing radical transformations with respect to numerical and social significance.

The Chicano/Latino School-Age Population: A Look to the Future

The unprecedented growth rate of the Chicano and other Latino school-age segments is a clear reflection of the rise in the general Chicano/Latino population. Here, we will discuss California as a case in point and then describe some patterns in the national scene. Demographers predicted in 1978 that by 1990 the combined racial/ethnic minority K-12 population in California (i.e., Chicano and other Latino, Black, American Indian, Native Alaskan, Asian, and Pilipino) will be the new 'majority' and White students will be the new 'minority' (Foote, Espinosa, and Garcia, 1978) Well, that projection was slightly in error — the racial/ethnic shift occurred two years earlier than predicted. The combination of declining White birthrates, booming school enrollments of minority students, and unprecedented immigration from Latin America and Asia brought the racial/ethnic transition sooner than forecast (Watson, 1988).

In short, the school enrollment shifts in the numerical status of 'majority' and 'minority' groups are no longer mere future projections. They are a current reality and will become more pronounced as racial/ethnic minority populations — particularly Latinos and Asians — continue to increase in large numbers. On the other hand, as the years go by, Whites will gradually comprise proportionately less and less of the school-age population. To illustrate this, we continue our discussion with the racial/ethnic shifts in California, as an example. The following points (numbers 1, 3, and 4) can be gleaned from Table 1.1.

1 Approximately twenty years ago, 7 in every 10 California K-12 students were White, and about 3 in 10 were racial/ethnic minority background (Watson, 1988).

Table 1.2: National public school enrollment changes by race/ethnicity, autumn 1968–autumn 1986

Year	Race/Ethnicity					
	White		Latino		Black	
	% of total	millions of total	% of total	millions of total	% of total	millions of total
1968	80.0	34.70	4.6	2.00	14.5	6.28
1986	70.4	28.96	9.9	4.06	16.1	6.62
Change	–9.6	–5.74	+5.3	+2.06	+1.6	+0.34

Source: Adapted from Orfield (1988).

2 At the start of the 1988–89 school year, White students dipped under 50 per cent of the total K-12 public school enrollment — the first time since the beginning of public education in California about 140 years ago. The most obvious implication to be made from this significant transformation is that at the present time no single racial/ethnic group constitutes a numerically majority population (Watson).
3 In about forty years from now — in the year 2030 — we will likely see in California's public elementary and secondary schools a virtual reversal of what the school-age population resembled in 1971. That is, White students will comprise 1 in 3 students, and combined students of racial/ethnic 'minority' background will account for nearly 7 in 10 students (Population Reference Bureau, 1985).
4 In 2030, Chicano and other Latino students in the public schools of California will form the *single largest* group, comprising about 44 per cent of the total K-12 enrollment (Population Reference Bureau).

The tremendous school-age racial/ethnic shifts we presently are experiencing, and will continue to experience in California, are similar to changes occurring nationally. Orfield (1988), in a report titled 'The Growth and Concentration of Hispanic Enrollment and the Future of American Education', has underscored the enormous growth in the proportion of Chicano and other Latino public school students in the United States (as well as a decline in the percentage of White students).

As Table 1.2 shows, in 1968–69, the Latino public school enrollment accounted for 4.6 per cent (2.0 million) of the national total. By the 1986–87 school year, Latinos made up 9.9 per cent (4.1 million) of the total — that is, the Latino share of the total public school enrollment doubled in less than two decades. White students during this same period decreased 5.7 million, and the Black enrollment rose a modest .3 million students. Orfield (1988) translates these changes as such:

> Eighteen years [1968–69] ago there were more than three times as many Blacks as Hispanics in the school population; now the Hispanic enrollment is approaching two-thirds of the Black numbers. There was one

e 1.3: *Projections of racial/ethnic youth populations: 1982–2020*

Year	White		Latino		Black		Other	
	% of total	millions of total	% of total	millions of total	% of total	millions of total	% of total	millions of total
1982	73 0	45 9	9 3	5 9	14.7	9 3	2.9	1.8
2020	54 5	40 0	25 3	18 6	16.5	11.9	4 2	3 0
Change	-18 5	-5 9	+16 0	+12.7	+1 8	+2 6	+1 3	+1 2

Source Adapted from Pallas, Natriello, and McDill (1988).
Note 'Youth' refers to newborn to age 17 years

> Hispanic student for every seventeen White students eighteen years ago; in 1986–87 there was one for every seven Whites. (p. 6)

In short, during this eighteen-year period, Chicano and other school-age students increased in raw numbers 103 per cent, Whites actually dropped by 17 per cent, and Black students were up by only 5 per cent.

While the Chicano and other Latino public school enrollment is growing nationally, actually only a small number of states are the ones that are accounting for the growth. Orfield (1988) notes that eight states (which have about 40 per cent of the nation's total population) enrolled a total of 3.57 million Latino students in 1986. These eight states represent 88 per cent of the total Latino public school enrollment.[9] By far, California (with 1.38 million Latino students) and Texas (with 1.09 million Latino students) enroll the vast majority (i.e., nearly 7 in every 10 Latino students, overwhelmingly of Mexican origin) of the total 3.57 million Chicano and other Latino students in the eight identified states. In short, California and Texas — which have long educated most Chicano students — accounted for (and will continue to account for) the great majority of enrollment increases of Chicano students in the country.

In another recent national demographic report, Pallas, Natriello, and McDill (1988) examined long-term projections from 1982 to the year 2020. Using the newborn to age 17 years population as the target group, it is expected that the total US population of newborns to 17-year-olds will increase by 17 per cent over the thirty-eight year period. That is, estimates are that the number of children in this age group will rise from 63 million in 1982 to 73 million in 2020.

Merely studying the general growth rate, however, is not very revealing. When one disaggregates the overall growth of these 10 million children from 1982 to 2020 along racial/ethnic lines, clear patterns can be discerned.

Pallas *et al.* (1988) observed that the overall increase indicates two different forces. First, as seen in Table 1.3, the number of White youngsters is actually expected to decline 13 per cent, or 6 million over this period. Second, the number of Chicano and other Latino children, on the other hand, will more than triple — increasing from 6 million in 1982 (a time which they comprised 9 per cent of the national youth population) to 19 million in 2020 (when they will make

up 25 per cent of the country's youth population). In short, the anticipated increase in the Latino youth population of nearly 13 million more than offsets the projected decline of 6 million in the White youth population. In fact, the remarkable increase in the Chicano and Latino youth population will account '... *for most of the overall [youth] population growth* [italics added] expected between 1982 and 2020' (Pallas *et al.*, p. 22).

In summary, in the decades ahead our nation will witness a profound transformation of the youth population. As Pallas *et al.* (1988) comment, almost 3 in 4 children in 1982 were White. In 2020, only about 1 in 2 will be White. In, 1982, only 1 in 10 children were Chicano and other Latino. By 2020, about 1 in 4 are expected to be Chicano and other Latino. Regarding long-term projections, it is predicted that in the year 2050 the Latino school-age population (5 years to 17 years of age) will number 9.02 million and will surpass Black youth (8.86 million) to become the nation's largest racial/ethnic minority school-age group (US Bureau of the Census, 1986). The following excerpt from Orfield (1988) captures the wider implication of Latino school-age growth patterns:

> Should these trends continue very long they will fundamentally change the social structure of American education. Hispanics will become the nation's largest minority group and the proportion of Whites will fall substantially. All signs show that these changes are continuing. (pp. 6–7)

The 1980s: 'Decade of the Hispanic?'

Accompanying the national attention that Chicanos and other Latinos received in the late 1970s and early 1980s was the often stated claim that the 1980s would be the 'decade of the Hispanic'. There were expectations within and outside the larger Latino community that Chicanos and other Latinos would benefit from their growing presence. Gains were anticipated along educational, economic, political, and general 'quality of life' aspects.

Contrary to the expected gains during the 'decade of the Hispanic', the 1980s left many Latinos — particularly Chicanos and Puerto Ricans — worse off. In a recent report by the National Council of La Raza, *The Decade of the Hispanic: A Sobering Economic Retrospective* (Miranda and Quiroz, 1989), seven trends were identified that characterized Latinos' economic situation during the 1980s. This retrospective identified the following:

1. Latinos benefited least from the economic recovery in that their incomes stagnated and high rates of poverty continued. For example, in 1979, 21.8 per cent of Latinos were poor; in 1988, the rate was 26.8 per cent.
2. Latinos had higher rates of children living in poverty in 1988 (37.9 per cent) compared to 1979 (28.0 per cent).
3. There was no economic improvement for Latina-maintained households.
4. Latino married-couple families experienced deepened hardships (e.g., poverty rates increased from 13.1 per cent in 1979 to 16.1 per cent in 1988).

5 There was a widening income disparity. For example, Latinos in 1988 were 14 per cent more likely to make under $10,000 a year than they were in 1979.
6 Although in some areas there were slight educational gains, Latinos overall continued to feel the full impact of the educational crisis. For example, in 1978, 12.5 per cent of Latino families with householders who completed four years of high school lived in poverty. In 1988, the figure climbed to 16 per cent. In short, Latinos continue to experience unequal benefits from education.
7 Although Latinas (year-round, full-time workers) showed a slight increase in annual earnings from 1979 ($13,795) to 1988 ($14,845), male Latino workers dropped in earnings from $20,626 to $17,851 from 1979 to 1988, respectively.

In sum, Miranda and Quiroz (1989) conclude that, 'By any standard, Hispanics lost ground economically during the 1980s' (p. 27). Among several immediate policy interventions, 'improving educational opportunities' was targeted by the National Council of La Raza.

The 1990s: A Time for Informed Action

The plight of Chicano students (as previously described in the overview of current schooling conditions and outcomes), the soon-to-be and remarkable transformation of the racial/ethnic makeup of American youth, and the gradual erosion of economic and educational gains of Chicanos all point to the immediate need for school reform. When the schoolbell rings throughout the barrios in the 1990s, hopefully it will call us all to action. There is little doubt that resources — both human and monetary — will be needed on an unprecedented scale to mount a serious offensive on the schooling problems faced by Chicano students. The path we travel in the 1990s to the door of the next century could be the most important trek in the educational experience of Chicano students. But, let us not be naive. Linking theory, research, and policy is no easy matter. As Orfield (1988) admonishes, Latino students '. . . are increasing very rapidly in the United States, so rapidly that both research and policy are running far behind the demographic changes' (p. 32). As such, it is the intent of the remaining chapters in this book to help push along the research, policy, and demographic connections by discussing some agendas for the 1990s and beyond. Now is the time for informed action, a time to begin a very serious commitment to transforming Chicano school failure to Chicano school success.

Regarding research, the various chapters will be attempting, in part, to draw from what we know and what we do not know in order to ask how the research community of the 1990s can move ahead *vis-à-vis* its efforts and Chicano schooling issues. Given the large finite universe of possible research concerns, which ones are more important to address? Why is it significant to address these unanswered research questions? In which ways can answers to these questions provide insights to the theoretical and practical sides of the Chicano schooling experiences? That is, resultant from such proposed research what might be some theoretical implications and practical applications? Can we frame research proposals in such ways that future researchers can feasibly tackle them? In short, what might some research agendas for the 1990s look like?

With respect to proposed policy agendas, the challenge before scholars is to assess the extent to which research has influenced and should influence educational policy and practice. Regarding Chicano students, there are numerous questions about policy one can ask. For example, what are the central policy considerations? How are these policy issues currently framed? Are there alternative ways to frame them? Is current policy based on solid research and scientific evidence, and how can such an evaluation prove useful in formulating research-driven policy agendas for the 1990s? What are the prevailing paradigms used to examine the issues? Is there a need for paradigm shifts? What drives specific interventions (if any) that seek to address the problem? What is the current level of attention focused on the problem? What specific resources are committed — or need to be committed — to the problem? With an eye to the 1990s, what might be some proposed policy agendas regarding the schooling problems faced by Chicano students?

In addition to the multitude of research and policy questions/statements regarding Chicano schooling issues that can be formulated, there is the subject of doing what is good *now* for the sake of what will be good for the *future*. Hayes-Bautista, Schink, and Chapa (1988) in a recent study of California's changing demography (*The Burden of Support: Young Latinos in an Aging Society*), point out that aging Whites will increasingly become dependent on young Latino workers. The aging of the 'Baby Boom Anglos' in California will result in a more than tripling of the 65-and-over population around 2030. The young, vastly undereducated Latino population will likewise triple in size. Therefore, the 'burden of support' for the elderly (e.g., health care; income support) will fall primarily on the shoulders of the Latino workers. Hayes-Bautista *et al.* argue that if the currently working-age generation in California invests in improving schooling for Latino youth, this will assist in providing a stronger economic foundation for its own security in the future. On a broader, national scope, Miranda and Quiroz (1989) draw similar conclusions:

> In the 1990s, reducing inequality between Hispanics and the rest of society will not be a moral preference, but an economic imperative. Hispanics will constitute about one-third of overall labor force growth between now and the end of the century, and a growing proportion of taxpayers supporting Social Security, Medicare and other transfer payment systems needed to support an aging society. An untrained and underemployed labor force will not only retard direct economic output, but increase demand for public assistance and diminish the tax base necessary for the support of essential government services. Improving the Hispanic community's economic standing — and the human capital characteristics of individual Hispanics — clearly services the economic interest of the nation. . . . Hispanics are a 'good bet' for future public policy investments. (p. 28)

In light of our discussion thus far on the plight of Chicano students, it would be most fitting to conclude by presenting a few lines form Henry Trueba's recent and fine book, *Raising Silent Voices: Educating the Linguistic Minorities for the 21st*

century. In his concluding chapter, Trueba (1989) offers these sober-minded but encouraging words:

> The end of the twentieth century is rapidly approaching. The children who will crowd our schools are already among us. Minority children are rapidly becoming, or already have become, the majority in a number of cities and areas of this country.... Moral, humanitarian, and economic arguments can be made to motivate us to support minority education in our schools. The future of this country will be in good hands if we extend our support to minority children today. (pp. 185–6)

Notes

1 Here I am conceptualizing educational inequality as a form of oppression. Chesler (1976) in an essay on theories of racism — which by the way, can be generalized to the study of other forms of oppression — argues that there are three forms of evidence from which theorists can draw to contend the existence of oppression. These evidential bases are: (a) personal attitudes or cultural values — as seen in symbol systems and ideology; (b) institutional processes — as seen in mechanisms that lead to differential advantages and privileges; (c) effects or outcomes — as seen in differentials among groups.

2 Here, I follow the logic of Kerlinger (1986) who describes the distinctions between a concept and a construct. 'A *concept* expresses an abstraction formed by generalizations from particulars' (p. 26), and although a construct is a concept, a construct has an added meaning '... of having been deliberately and consciously invented or adopted for a special scientific purpose' (p. 27). Furthermore, as Kerlinger notes, constructs can be of the *constitutive* and *operational* type. A constitutive defintion defines a construct by using other constructs, and are particularly valuable in theory construction. An operational definition describes, with some precision, how a particular construct will be observed and measured. In the present analysis, our use of Chicano school failure is largely along constitutive lines, yet it can be refined in an operational sense.

3 The 'dropout rate', which is the converse of school holding power, is simply estimated by subtracting the school holding power (a percentage) from 100 per cent.

4 Underachievement refers to a discrepancy between measured aptitude (i.e., intelligence) and achievement (see for example, Kubiszyn and Borich, 1987). When one's obtained aptitude score is higher than one's obtained achievement score, a student is typically labeled as an 'underachiever'. Conversely, an 'overachiever' is a student whose aptitude score is lower than his/her obtained achievement score.

5 The problems attached to the term underachievement (as well as overachievement) are so grave that they have led Cronbach, a highly noted tests and measurement expert, to conclude 'The terminology of over- and underachievement should be abandoned' (1984, p. 255).

6 In 1989 there were 1,060 school districts in Texas. Some districts spent as much as $19,600 per student, and others spent as little as $2,000 (Graves, 1989b). Poor school districts (defined as those with property tax wealth below the state average) abound in Texas. That is, 205 (81 per cent) of Texas' 254 countries contain poor school districts (Phillips, 1989). A disproportionately higher number of poor school districts, however, are located in South Texas, the region where Chicanos are mostly concentrated.

7 Of the total 20.1 million Latinos in the US in 1989, the largest segment by far is the Mexican-origin population (12.6 million, 62.7 per cent of the total). In descending order, the other Latino populations are: Central and South American (2.5 million, 12.4 per cent), Puerto Rican (2.3 million, 11.4 per cent), Cuban (1.07 million, 5.3 per cent), and Spanish or other Latino (1.63 million, 8.1 per cent) (Miranda and Quiroz, 1989; Vickers, 1989).

With respect to within-group growth rates, data comparison between 1982 to 1989 shows that Central and South Americans had the sharpest increase (67 per cent). The 'other Hispanic' increased by 31 per cent, followed by: Mexican origin (30 per cent), Puerto Rican (14 per cent), and Cuban (12 per cent) (Vickers, 1989).

8 This report (based on an article in *Ebony* magazine; see Staff, 1989) is also interesting in that it provides projections for cities that will have large percentages of Latino and Black populations. By the year 2000, it is predicted that Black and Latinos combined will constitute a clear majority in about one-third of the country's fifty largest cities. In the ten most populated cities in the nation — including the four largest (in descending order, New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Houston) — Blacks and Latinos will be the majority in six of these top ten cities. For example, in Los Angeles, in the year 2000, they will number about 53 per cent. In Chicago, 50 per cent. In New York, almost 50 per cent.

9 The eight states with their respective enrollments (in millions) in descending order are: California (1.38), Texas (1.09), New York (.39), Illinois (.16), Arizona (.16), Florida (.15), New Jersey (.13), and New Mexico (.13) (Orfield, 1988).

22

References

ALVAREZ, R., JR. (1988) 'National politics and local responses: The nation's first successful desegregation court case', in H.T. TRUEBA and C. DELGADO-GAITAN (Eds) *School and Society: Learning Content Through Culture*, New York, Praeger, pp. 37–52.

ANASTASI, A. (1984) 'Aptitude and achievement tests: The curious case of the indestructible strawperson', in B.S. PLAKE (Ed.) *Social and Technical Issues in Testing: Implications for Test Construction and Usage*, Hillsdale, NJ, Erlbaum, pp. 129–40.

BOYKIN, A.W. (1983) 'The academic performance of Afro-American children', in J. SPENCE (Ed.) *Achievement and Achievement Motives*, San Francisco, CA, W.H. Freeman, pp. 321–71.

BROWN, P.R. and HAYCOCK, K. (1985) *Excellence for Whom?* Oakland, CA, The Achievement Council.

CALIFORNIA SUPERINTENDENTS' COUNCIL ON HISPANIC AFFAIRS (1985) *Response to the First Term Report*, Sacramento, CA, State Department of Education.

CAMERON, J.W. (1976) 'The History of Public Education in Los Angeles, 1910–1930', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

CARTER, T.P. and SEGURA, R.D. (1979) *Mexican Americans in School: A Decade of Change*, New York, College Entrance Examination Board.

CATTERALL, J.S. (1985) *On the Social Costs of Dropping Out* (Report 86-SEPI-3), Stanford, CA Stanford Education Policy Institute, Stanford University.

CHAPA, J. (1988) 'The question of Mexican American assimilation: Socioeconomic parity or underclass formation?', *Public Affairs Comment*, **35**, pp. 1–14.

CHESLER, M.A. (1976) 'Contemporary sociological theories of racism', in P.A. KATZ (Ed.) *Towards the Elimination of Racism*, New York, Pergamon Press, pp. 21–71.

COLEMAN, J.S., CAMPBELL, E.G., HOBSON, C.J., MCPARTLAND, J., MOOD, A., WEINFELD, F.D. and YORK, R.L. (1966) *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, Washington, DC, US Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

COSBY, Y. and WEST, C.K. (1979) 'Academic pressures and the black adolescent', *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, **4**, pp. 318–33.

23

NBACH, L.J. (1984) *Essentials of Psychological Testing*, 4th ed., New York, Harper and Row.

DRAKE, R.H. (1927) 'A Comparative Study of the Mentality and Achievement of Mexican and White children', unpublished master's thesis, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

ERIKSON, F. (1987) 'Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational thought', *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, **18**, pp. 335–56.

ESPINOSA, R and OCHOA, A. (1986) 'Concentration of California Hispanic students in schools with low achievement: A research note', *American Journal of Education*, **95**, pp. 77–95.

FAIRCHILD, H.H. (1984) 'School size, per-pupil expenditures, and academic achievement', *Review of Public Data Use*, **12**, pp. 221–9.

FOOTE, T.H., ESPINOSA, R.W. and GARCIA, J.O. (1978) *Ethnic Groups and Public Education in California*, San Diego State University, CA, The California School Finance Project and the California Association for Bilingual Education.

GANDARA, P. (1989) '"Those" children are ours: Moving toward community', *NEA Today*, **7**, pp. 38–43.

GERARD, H.B. and MILLER, N. (1975) *School Desegregation: A Long-Term Study*, New York, Plenum.

GINSBURG, H.P. (1986) 'The myth of the deprived child: New thoughts on poor children', in U. NEISSER (Ed.) *The School Achievement of Minority Children: New Perspectives*, Hillsdale, NJ, Erlbaum, pp. 169–89.

GONZALEZ, G.C (1985) 'Segregation of Mexican children in a southern California city: The legacy of expansionism and the American Southwest', *The Western Historical Quarterly*, **16**, pp. 55–76.

GONZALEZ, J.M. (1974) 'A Developmental and Sociological Rationale for Culture-Based Curricula and Cultural Context Teaching in the Early Instruction of Mexican American Children', unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

GOUGHIS, R.A. (1986) 'The effects of prejudice and stress on the academic performance of black-Americans', in U. NEISSER (Ed.) *The School Achievement of Minority Children: New Perspectives*, Hillsdale, NJ, Erlbaum, pp. 145–67.

GRAVES, D. (1989a) 'School finance woes echo across nation', *Austin American Statesman*, October 7, pp. A1, A15.

GRAVES, D. (1989b) 'Court strikes down school finance plan: Justices set May 1 deadline for equitable system', *Austin American Statesman*, October 3, pp. A1, A6.

HARO, C.M. (1977) *Mexicano/Chicano Concerns and School Segregation in Los Angeles*, Los Angeles, CA, Chicano Studies Center Publications, University of California.

HAWKES, T.H. and KOLB, R.H. (1970) 'Differences in anxiety of private school and inner city public elementary school children', *Psychology in the Schools*, **7**, pp. 250–9

HAYCOCK, K and NAVARRO, M.S. (1988) *Unfinished Business: Fulfilling our Children's Promise*, Oakland, CA, The Achievement Council.

HAYES-BAUTISTA, D.E., SCHINK, W.O. and CHAPA, J. (1988) *The Burden of Support. Young Latinos in an Aging Society*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press.

JENSEN, A.R (1980) *Bias in Mental Testing*, New York, The Free Press.

KERLINGER, F.D (1986) *Foundations of Behavioral Research*, 3rd ed., New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

KUBISZYN, T. and BORICH, G (1987) *Educational Testing and Measurement. Classroom Application and Practice*, 2nd ed., Glenview, IL, Scott, Foresman

MAHAN, J. and BOYLE, V. (1981) 'Multicultural teacher preparation: An attitudinal survey', *Educational Research Quarterly*, **6**, pp. 97–112

MENCHACA, M. and VALENCIA, R.R (1990) 'Anglo-Saxon ideologies and their impact on the segregation of Mexican students in California, the 1920s–1930s', *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, **21**, pp. 222–49.

MINGLE, J.R. (1987) *Focus on Minorities. Trends in Higher Education Participation and Success*, Denver, CO, A joint publication of the Education Commission of the States and the State Higher Education Executive Officers.

MIRANDA, L. and QUIROZ, J.T. (1989) *The Decade of the Hispanic: A Sobering Economic Retrospective*, Washington, DC, National Council of La Raza.

MUNOZ, D.G. (1986) 'Identifying areas of stress for Chicano undergraduates', in M.A. OLIVAS (Ed.) *Latino College Students*, New York, Teachers College Press, pp. 131–56.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION (1983) *A Nation at Risk: The Imperatives for Educational Reform*, Washington, DC, US Government Printing Office.

OAKES, J. (1985) *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*, New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.

OLSEN, L. (1988) *Crossing the Schoolhouse Border: Immigrant Students and the California Public Schools*, Boston, MA, California Tomorrow.

ORFIELD, G. (1988) 'The growth and concentration of Hispanic enrollment and the future of American education', paper presented at the National Council of La Raza Conference, Albuquerque, NM, July.

ORR, M.T. (1987) *Keeping Students in School*, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass.

ORUM, L.S. (1986) *The Education of Hispanics: Status and Implications*, Washington, DC, National Council of La Raza.

PALLAS, A.M., NATRIELLO, G. and MCDILL, E.L. (1988) 'Who falls behind: Defining the "at risk" population — current dimensions and future trends', paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA, April.

PARSONS, T.W. (1965) 'Ethnic Cleavage in a California School', unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.

PHILLIPS, B.N. (1978) *School Stress and Anxiety: Theory, Research, and Intervention*, New York, Human Sciences Press.

PHILLIPS, J. (1989) 'Districts agree: Schools are underfunded — rich and poor see huge infusion of money as only lasting solution', *Austin American Statesman*, October 3, p. A6.

POPULATION REFERENCE BUREAU (1985) *Population and California's Future*, Washington, DC, Author.

REYNOLDS, A. (1933) *The Education of Spanish-Speaking Children in Five Southwestern States* (Bulletin 1933, No. 11) Washington, DC, Government Printing Office.

RODRIGUEZ V. SAN ANTONIO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT (1971) Civil action no. 68-175-5A (W.D.Tex.).

SAN MIGUEL, G., JR. (1986) 'Status of the historiography of Chicano education: A preliminary analysis', *History of Education Quarterly*, **26**, pp. 523–36.

SAN MIGUEL, G., JR. (1987) 'The status of historical research on Chicano education', *Review of Educational Research*, **57**, pp. 467–80.

SANCHEZ, G.I. (1966) 'History, culture, and education', in J. SAMORA (Ed.) *La Raza: Forgotten Americans*, Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press, pp. 1–26.

STAFF (1989) 'The biggest secret of race relations: The new White minority', *Ebony*, April, pp. 84, 86, 88

SWIBOLD, D. (1989) 'US Hispanic numbers rise 39% since 1980', *San Antonio Light*, October 12, pp. A1, A12.

TRUEBA, H.T. (1989) *Raising Silent Voices: Educating the Linguistic Minorities for the 21st Century*, New York, Harper and Row.

US BUREAU OF THE CENSUS (1986) *Projections of the Hispanic Population. 1983 to 2080* (Current Population Reports, Series P-25, No. 995) Washington, DC, US Government Printing Office.

US COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS (1972a) *Mexican American Education Study, Report 2: The Unfinished Education: Outcomes for Minorities in the Five Southwestern States*, Washington, DC, Government Printing Office.

US COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS (1972b) *Mexican American Education Study, Report 3: The Excluded Student: Educational Practices Affecting Mexican Americans in the Southwest*, Washington, DC, Government Printing Office.

US COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS (1972c) *Mexican American Education Study, Report 4: Mexican American Education in Texas: A Function of Wealth*, Washington, DC, Government Printing Office.

US COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS (1973) *Mexican American Education Study, Report 5: Teachers and Students: Differences in Teacher Interaction with Mexican American and Anglo Students*, Washington, DC, Government Printing Office.

US COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS (1974) *Mexican American Education Study, Report 6: Toward Quality Education for Mexican Americans*, Washington, DC, Government Printing Office.

VALENCIA, R.R. (1984) *Understanding School Closures: Discriminatory Impact on Chicano and Black Students* (Policy Monograph Series, No. 1) Stanford, Stanford University, Stanford Center for Chicano Research.

VALENCIA, R.R. and ABURTO, S. (in press, a) 'Competency testing and Latino student access to the teaching profession: An overview of issues', in J. DENEEN, G.D. KELLER and R. MAGALLAN (Eds) *Assessment and Access: Hispanics in Higher Education*, Albany, NY, State University of New York Press.

VALENCIA, R.R. and ABURTO, S. (in press, b) 'Research directions and practical strategies in teacher testing and assessment: Implications for improving Latino access to teaching', in J. DENEEN, G.D. KELLER and R. MAGALLAN (Eds) *Assessment and Access: Hispanics in Higher Education*. Albany, NY, State University of New York Press.

VALENCIA, R.R and RANKIN, R.J. (1988) 'Evidence of bias in predictive validity on the Kaufman Assessment Battery for Children in samples of Anglo and Mexican American children', *Psychology in the Schools*, **22**, pp. 257–63.

VICKERS, R.J. (1989) 'Hispanic population tops 20 million in US', *Austin American Statesman*, October 12, p. A12.

WATSON, A. (1988) 'Changing classes: State's minority students to make a majority next fall', *San Jose Mercury News*, May 15, pp. 1A, 12A.

WILLS, T.A. and LANGER, T.S. (1980) 'Socioeconomic status and stress', in I.L. KUTASH, L.B. SCHLESINGER, and Associates (Eds) *Handbook on Stress and Anxiety*, San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass, pp. 159–73.