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ABSTRACT

Latinos comprise the second fastest growing minority group and are expected to comprise the largest contribution (75%) to the U.S. workforce growth between 2020 and 2034 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). In particular, Latino job seekers are anticipated to fill many of the absences that will emerge as the baby boomers retire at unprecedented rates. The expectancy-value theory (Eccles, 2009), social role theory (Eagly, 1987) and lack-of-fit model (Heilman, 1983) provide theoretical explanations for several social and structural barriers facing Latino parents’ decision to encourage their children’s postsecondary education. The current study explores four barriers that limit Latino parents’ attitudes and behaviors toward their children’s higher educational attainment: a) a belief that familism is contrary to seeking higher education, b) lack of knowledge about the application process, c) inaccurate perceptions of social networks in higher education, and d) a lack of awareness of Latino role models, particularly those who have college degrees. In a longitudinal experimental study, we examined the impact that educating parents about one of these four constraints have on their follow-up attitudes and behaviors. Time 1 of the study employed the interventions that were conducted in the greater Houston-area and in which brochures were provided to parents. Time 2 and Time 3, the focus of this master’s thesis, focused on documenting the potential longer-term impact and behavioral ramifications that might result from the initial interventions. Results revealed support for effective strategies that, in term, increased parents’ behavioral engagement for postsecondary education attainment. The most effective strategy was providing parents’ knowledge about the application process. In addition, these interventions enhanced parents’ supportive knowledge and leadership knowledge from Time 1 to Time 2. Implications and future research are discussed.
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Promoting First-Generation Latino Success through Parental Pro-Educational Interventions: A Longitudinal Study

Latinos are the second largest growing minority group in the United States (Cardenas, & Kerby, 2012). According to Motel and Patten (2012), there are currently 50.7 million Latinos in the United States. This number is expected to grow significantly by 2050, with Latinos projected to comprise one third of the total U.S. population (González, 2000). A similar increase in the Latino workforce is also expected, meaning this population will have a critical impact on the U.S. workforce. According to the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2012), the labor force is projected to have 10.5 million new incoming workers, reaching 164.4 million by 2034. Latinos are projected to contribute 7.8 million new workers during the same period, making their ethnic group the largest contributor to future workforce growth (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). The occupational opportunities for Latinos should be immense, particularly as the aging baby boomers are expected to retire in mass in the coming decades. In the 2010-decade alone, an estimated 25 million workers, much of whom will be White, are expected to exit the workforce (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012).

New job opportunities for Latinos particularly will be prevalent in the top five fastest growing occupations (e.g., healthcare professionals, technology, STEM fields, education and community services); however, it will be imperative that Latinos have the skills and abilities to fill these jobs (Motel & Patten, 2012). Most of these fields will require high levels of workers with four-year college degrees (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). Thus, a main concern at present is whether Latinos will have the appropriate educational background to fill these available and critical jobs.

Unfortunately, a sizable portion of the Latino workforce is not expected to gain the
necessary educational requirements to obtain future jobs. Specifically, only 13 percent of Latinos ages 25 and older have at least a bachelor’s degree while 40 percent of Whites and 60 percent of Asians have bachelor’s degree or higher (Motel & Patten, 2012). Although the need for educated Latino workers will be great, it is important to note that the number of Latinos ages 18 to 24 who enrolled in college has more than tripled in the two decades since 1993 (Kohler & Lazarín, 2007). However, 46 percent of these Latinos are enrolling in two- and not four-year colleges (Motel & Patten, 2012). One of the critical concerns for Latinos in postsecondary education is their low transfer rates from two-year to four-year institutions. Only 15 perfect of Latinos in community college successfully transfer to a four-year institution (Horn & Weko, 2009). Thus, it is critical to consider ways to increase the likelihood of Latinos attaining a four-year college degree to maximize their future success in the workforce.

If nothing changes, Latinos will continue to be underrepresented in government jobs, public office, and senior executive levels (Cardenas & Kerby, 2012). As of 2012, Latinos had the lowest representation (12%) in management or professional occupations compared to any other race. At the highest levels, Latinos occupy only seven percent of all senior executive positions in the U.S. (Cardenas & Kerby, 2012). Although Latinos represent fifteen percent of the entire workforce, the clear majority of them occupy the low-paying occupations that do not require a bachelor’s degree. These positions include agricultural workers (49%), grounds maintenance (44%), and housekeeping cleaners (43%; U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). In sum, there is evidence that Latinos deserve research attention. It is particularly important to consider strategies that might enhance their ability to seek and achieve college educations. The ability to receive a stronger education may ultimately lead to better positions in their future careers. Psychologists are well-positioned to empirically investigate the occupational obstacles
of future Latino job seekers in acquiring high-level jobs and leadership positions. The current study highlights some of these obstacles and particularly focuses on improving first-generation Latino parents’ attitudes and behaviors directed toward sending their children to college. In particular, the current study proposed four interventions that specifically tackle various structural and social barriers first-generation Latino parents might perceive or actually encounter. These proposed interventions target specific challenges or issues related to parents’ attitudes and behaviors directed toward promotion of their children’s entry into college. Three theories guide this research, Expectancy-Value Theory (Eccles, 2009), Social Role Theory (Eagly, 1987) and Lack of Fit Model (Heilman, 1983). We discuss the contribution of each in detail.

Expectancy-value theory

Expectancy-value theory (Eccles, 2009) suggests that people will adopt challenging tasks if two conditions are met: (1) people expect to perform successfully on the task at hand and (b) people value the task intrinsically (e.g., it is personally enjoyable) and in some utilitarian way (e.g., the task is useful; Durik, Vida, & Eccles, 2006). Expectancy represents individuals’ beliefs and perceptions on how well they will do on a task. Values consist of four components: (1) intrinsic, (2) attainment, (3) utility, and (4) cost. Intrinsic value represents the inner enjoyment when completing the task at interest. Attainment value represents the importance of completing the task successfully. Utility value refers to the usefulness of the task in achieving future goals. Finally, the cost refers to what one has to give up in order to complete the task. The current research expands the current literature on the expectancy-value theory as we predict that enhancing parents’ values and expectations of postsecondary education attainment may contribute to greater engagement in the application process, and
learning about various opportunities to send their children to higher education.

The expectancy-value theory (Eccles, 2009) provides a theoretical explanation for the achievement-related choices and behaviors parents decide to perform to encourage their children to attain a postsecondary education. Despite the increasing aspirations of Latino parents for their child’s postsecondary education attainment (Fraga, Garcia, Hero, Jones-Correa, Martinez-Ebers, & Segura, 2011), there is strong evidence that many first-generation Latino children do not enroll in four-year programs (Motel & Patten, 2012) and most Latino students do not successfully transfer from community college programs into four year programs (Horn & Weko, 2009). A contributing factor to these issues is the observed behaviors, or lack of support by parents for postsecondary education attainment. For instance, Zarate (2007) showed that there is low parental participation within schools and in attending college conferences by Latino parents (Zarate, 2007). The low parental behavioral support in such activities may be related to the low expectancy values that parents hold about themselves and their children’s ability for postsecondary education attainment. For instance, parents may believe that they do not have the adequate knowledge to assist their children during the application process or are worried that they will be unable to pay for their tuition due to a lack of financial resources. Hence, the current research provides a theoretical based-intervention, free of cost, that provides critical information for first-generation Latino parents about strategies and alternative methods that they can utilize for their children’s postsecondary education attainment.

Based on the expectancy-value model (Eccles, 2009), the interventions utilized for the following study aimed to increase Latino parents’ beliefs in the importance of postsecondary educational attainment. Most importantly, the interventions aimed to increase parents’
engagement in seeking out information on postsecondary education attainment through their actual behaviors. The effort to intervene through parents is an innovative strategy that may lead to the shaping and change of their children’s values towards college. Such behaviors might include being more likely to participate in college recruitment or related events, and breaking down and going beyond myths that serve as barriers (e.g., familism constraints, lack of process knowledge, misfit of social networks, and lack of role models). In this study, we provided interventions based in four theories (e.g., a focus on either familism, social networks, process knowledge, or leadership knowledge), all of which directly serve to enhance first-generation Latino parents’ beliefs about the expectancy of college attainment. Hence, we argued that providing parents with accessible interventions that alleviate the cost of attending college related programs will reinforce their high educational values for their children and provide them with tools to break down the perceived barriers of their children’s college attainment.

Social Role Theory

Social Role Theory (Eagly, 1987) provides a rationale as to why Latino parents’ emphasis on their children’s postsecondary education is reduced. The current research argues that the social role theory (SRT) may be an active contributor to the low behavioral support for postsecondary educational attainment shown by the parents’ attitudes, knowledge, and actual behaviors. SRT suggests that gender differences are created because men and women are distributed differentially into societal positions (Eagly, 1987). SRT produces a division of labor between women and men where women have jobs requiring more communal traits (e.g., helping, caring, listening) and men have jobs that require more agentic characteristics (e.g., leading, deciding, directing; Eagly, 1987; see also Madera, Hebl, & Martin, 2009).
Such divergent behaviors, according to SRT, strongly contribute to actual sex differences in social behavior found between men and women (Eagly, Wood, & Diekman, 2000). Similarly, people tend to have different expectations for men and women because they see them continuously enacting different types of behaviors. Given that people tend to see men working in upper management, business, and leadership positions, people ascribe traits such men execute in their jobs (e.g., dominance, independence, assertion) to all men. Similarly, people tend to see women working in communal positions including secretaries, nurses, and housekeepers, and ascribe communal characteristics (e.g., helpful, nurturing, sympathetic) to all women. These types of expectations result in the fulfillment of self-fulfilling prophecies, in which men and women do tend to behave differently (Williams & Best, 1982; Wood, Christensen, Hebl, & Rothgerber, 1997). SRT may be an active contributor to parents’ beliefs and expectation of their sons and daughters as they unconsciously start to reinforce behaviors that contribute to sex differences, especially during the college application process and in seeking more information about postsecondary education attainment.

SRT has several implications that limit the upward mobility of individuals into leadership positions, particularly women. Through the formation of the SRT beliefs, managers and executives may start to question the capabilities of females to hold leadership roles. Eagly, Karau, and Makhijani (1995) have demonstrated that leadership is often defined in terms of male characteristics (the assertive and agentic personality). The leadership definition often favors male characteristics and limits the opportunity of women to attain leadership positions. Furthermore, Heilman, Wallen, Fuchs, and Tamkins (2004) found that individuals who violate gender stereotypes are often perceived as unfavorable and inadequate. Hence, this produces a
critical dilemma for women in leadership positions. It is important, under this dilemma, to create interventions that remediate the effects of such beliefs, especially if parents start to believe that their daughters may not fit in certain leadership positions. Therefore, interventions that provide examples of female Latina leaders as role models may be beneficial towards the elimination of sex differences expected by the parents.

Gender stereotypes are considered to be not only descriptive narratives, but are also prescriptive narratives that influence the behavior of women in leadership situations (Rudman & Glick, 2001). For instance, the context found for women in leadership positions serves as an environmental cue that activates their competence and assertiveness characteristics, which are considered agentic traits. However, these women are often stigmatized as their followers start to perceive them as cold (Wiley & Eskilson, 1985). These biases against female leaders are found both in men and women perceivers (Heilman et al., 2004). Therefore, these gender-differentiated perceptions may also be active in Latino parents’ expectations of their daughters, which contribute to the diminishing effect of their own motivation in believing that college may help their daughters become future leaders.

SRT may also be utilized to contextualize racial-ethnic divisions in social positions, particularly for Latinos. They are disproportionately positioned in blue-collar jobs in society. There is clear evidence of a division of Labor between Latinos and Whites (US Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). Kochhar (2012) demonstrated that Latinos tend to dominate construction and service occupations, while Whites more often appear to obtain professional, agentic occupations. It is clear that the SRT norms for women and Latinos limit their upward mobility. SRT can be extremely problematic for Latina women in attaining leadership or executive positions since their gender and ethnicity interact to doubly exclude them from these agentic
positions (Eagly, 1987). In 2012, there were only 35 Latina women and 93 Latino men who held senior executive management positions at Fortune 1000 companies (Rodriguez, 2012). Clearly, there is a significant need to change the inaccurate perceptions that are defined by SRT (Eagly, 1987) that are present in parents’ belief system. Therefore, this study creates interventions that challenge the limiting factors of SRT by providing evidence of how attaining a postsecondary education may contribute to the growth of their family values (i.e., family values intervention). Interventions also provide evidence of Latino leaders that may be role models for their children, perhaps particularly for daughters, and provide hope for attaining a college degree (i.e., leaders intervention). Next are interventions that provide opportunities for Latino children through professional social networks available for their children (i.e., social networks intervention). Finally, there are some interventions that provide information about the process knowledge of navigating the application system without the limiting societal expectations created by SRT related to the gender of their child (i.e., process knowledge intervention).

Lack-of-Fit Model

Similar to the STR, the lack-of-fit model (LFM) also explains the gender and racial inequities found in the workplace by arguing that most top-management and executive-level corporate level jobs are associated with masculine characteristics (Heilman, 1983). Furthermore, women are less likely than men to be selected into male gender-typed positions, are more likely to have their performance stigmatized and devalued by others, and are given fewer career advancement opportunities (Heilman, 1983). The type of jobs that are described as high-powered, high paying, and essential to society are often categorized as men’s (rather than women’s) jobs (Duehr & Bono, 2006).

Heilman (1983) demonstrated how female leaders suffer from a perceived lack of fit in
a specific role. If they are aware of expectations, they may fail and suffer performance decrements. To avoid these stressful experiences and avoid rejection and exclusion, women may choose roles that amplify and confirm the stereotypes about them, thereby choosing roles that are hyper-feminized. For instance, Aydin, Graupmann, Fischer, Frey, and Fischer (2011) demonstrated that when women feel excluded, they are more likely to embrace and prioritize traditional feminine values and roles over work characteristics. Thus, it is important to understand the underlying mechanisms that contribute to the endorsement of traditional feminine values in order to avoid any form of rejection.

An important contribution found in the literature of LFM is that studies have gone beyond gender to explain the challenges encountered by other types of underrepresented individuals. For instance, Sy et al. (2010) found that ratings of leadership abilities and technical competence for Asians depended on the specific type of job. For instance, Asian Americans were rated higher in occupations that were racially stereotypical of their ethnic group (e.g., engineer) compared with non-stereotypical occupations (e.g., sales). Rosette, Leonardelli, and Phillips (2008) also showed that “being white” was perceived as a favorable characteristic of business leadership positions.

LFM has clear implications for Latinos as well and provides a theoretical explanation to explain why Latinos may not view themselves as able to hold leadership positions or succeed in college. Hence, many of them find themselves in low-level positions (US Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012). As society subtly provides evidence that being like the majority group remains a typical characteristic of a leader (Rosette et al., 2008), Latinos may conform to such stereotypic beliefs and feel limited in their capabilities (e.g., “There are no Latino leaders so I certainly won’t and don’t expect to be a leader” or “As a Latina woman, I am not expected to
become a leader”). Such issues contribute to the development of the leaders and social network interventions, which will be explained in more detail in the next sections. In agreement to the findings of Aydin et al. (2011), Latinos may be more likely to adopt stereotypical occupational roles when faced with the threat of social exclusion, especially in leadership positions. This potential reaction provided the theoretical rationale we used in the creating the family values and process knowledge interventions. Namely, if Latino parents envision that their children will not experience social inclusion in college, parents may urge Latino men to continue joining the workforce in spades (without going to college). Likewise, parents may urge Latina women to stay at home after earning a secondary education (Desmond & Turley, 2009). Furthermore, SRT and LFM may act together to disproportionately affect Latino parents process knowledge as these societal limitations diminish the expected value of attaining a postsecondary education for their children. Therefore, they are more likely to be hesitant to learn about the application process.

The literatures on Expectancy Theory, SRT, and LFM combine to explain gender and ethnic differences responsible for the inequities in occupational attainment as perceived through Latino postsecondary achievement. In the next part of this paper, very specific impediments will be discussed that contribute to the disjunction between the importance Latino communities place on their child’s postsecondary education and their continued low educational attainment. That is, we extend theory to address structural and social limitations found in the Latino community that may limit the attention that Latino parents allocate toward their children’s attainment of a postsecondary education.

Potential Impediments that First Generation Latino Parents Face Regarding College

Evidence suggests that when asked, Latino parents tend to want their children to attend
college, but there is a disconnect between their desires and the children actually attending, particularly for parents of potential first-generation college students. Thus, we are interested in identifying and focusing on the main barriers that Latino parents cite as obstacles to sending their children to or influencing them to attend college. In particular, we highlight four of these potential barriers (e.g., familism constraint, social network barriers, lack of application process knowledge, and lack of Latino leader role models) that may contribute to the limitation of Latino children who would be first generation college graduates. It is critical to note that the current study is not intended to present this group as monolithic or to criticize deeply established cultural belief systems. Rather, it is our intention to assess common social and structural barriers in order to provide adequate strategies for successfully encouraging the efficacy of Latino parents’ attempts to encourage college attainment for their children and enhance greater social mobility.

*Familism Constraint*

According to Desmond and Turley (2009), familism is often used to conceptualize the dynamics of Latino families when making critical life and career decisions. According to Desmond and Turley (2009), “Familism can be defined as a social pattern whereby individual interests, decisions, and actions are conditioned by a network of relatives thought in many ways to take priority over the individual” (p. 314). In other words, this term implies that for Latinos, personal interests and privileges should comply with the cultural values and demands of their family, see also Suarez-Orozco and Suarez-Orozco, 1995). Desmond and Turley (2009) further highlight the importance of familism in explaining college application patterns among Latino high school seniors and revealing that Latinos (versus Blacks and Whites) are more likely to state that “living at home” is important for their own values. Researchers argue such values stem from cultural beliefs of the importance of staying at home (rather than
leaving) and honoring (rather than violating) familial obligations (Desmond & Turley, 2009; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 1995). It is also important to note that displaying divergent cultural values between the children and parents may activate familial rejection (Aydin et al., 2011).

Although living at home during college is not inherently a detrimental factor for a child’s future career success, students might be limited to applying to schools nearby their home and not exploring other opportunities that extend beyond their residing states (Desmond and Turley, 2009). Hence, it is critical for parents to understand the expected value of out-of-state college for their children as it may also benefit their child similar to or more effectively than an in-state college education. Our study, in turn, aims to provide Latino parents with critical information that may deconstruct the familism barriers created for their family and children through the machismo and marianismo culture (Salam, 2009; Stevens, 1998).

This study is the first of its kind to empirically connect the constructs of familism (Desmond & Turley, 2009) and the SRT (see Eagly, 1987) to enhance parents’ strategies to demonstrate the expected value of a college education for their children. The effects of familism are explained through SRT (Eagly, 1987), in that parents see the absence of Latinos distributed in positions that require college, and subsequently may not encourage or think it is necessary for their own children to hold (and want to hold) such positions. This thesis further examines familism by breaking it down into two more specific constructs typical in many Latino families, namely *machismo* and *marianismo* (Desmond & Turley, 2009).

*Machismo* is a term for ideologies for prescribed gendered behaviors and characteristics, or macho characteristics, associated with men (Salam, 2009). Although this term originated from Mexican culture, it has spread widely throughout Latin America and to
Latinos residing in the United States (Paz, 1961). There are many behavioral characteristics associated with machismo including the agentic and patriarchal expressions such as courage, generosity, and dominance (Gutmann, 1996). Machismo is also associated with prescribed demands of fatherhood, or the notion that Latino fathers should be the provider and defender of their families and particularly of their daughters (Ramirez, 2008). Machismo has been associated with some negative outcomes, such as high levels of arrogance, sexual aggression toward, and domestic abuse toward women (Gutmann, 1996; Peña, 1991).

Like machismo for men, marianismo is a term for ideologies associated with women (Stevens, 1998). Named for the Virgin Mary, Latina women are expected to embrace this saint’s feminine communal characteristics including, but not limited to virginity before marriage, boundless love, self-negating sacrifices, and attentiveness to their children and husbands (Peña, 1991). Also like machismo, it is clear there are some positive and negative outcomes associated with the enactment of marianismo. If women do not embrace these characteristics, they can be stigmatized, ostracized, and even outcast from their families. Hence, parents may have negative reactions towards children, especially Latinas, that do not portray such characteristics associated with marianismo (Piña-Watson, Castillo, Jung, Ojeda, & Castillo-Reyes, 2014).

Ascription to familism ideologies is present as Latino first generation students may make parents prioritize familial responsibilities over college attainment opportunities, particularly for those that require four-year colleges and universities or are moving away from their homes. Furthermore, parents particularly may perceive pursuing a college degree to conflict with the marianismo ideologies of self-sacrifice and devotion to the family rather than that of machismo. Supporting the likelihood of a gender difference, SRT and LFM would
further predict that Latina women (versus men) who attend college may be acting in a particularly incongruent way with the cultural expectation (Peña, 1991). That is, for Latino men, the machismo construct may not adversely impact their pursuit to college as strongly, simply because they are expected to demonstrate autonomy, agency, and the provision of financial resources to their families (Salam, 2009).

Importantly, in this thesis, I will manipulate one of the conditions so that parents receive information that attempts to make the pursuit of college consistent with the principles of familism. Hence, I postulate the following hypotheses:

H1: Parents who receive the family values intervention will express fewer Parental Concerns about College and more Parental Supportive Knowledge than the control condition in Time 1 (H1a). Moreover, we anticipate that family values intervention will be more effective for parents of Latina women than Latino men (H1b) as shown through fewer Parental Concerns about College and more Parental Supportive Knowledge in Time 1. Furthermore, the effects will increase such that Parental Concerns about College will decrease and Parental Supportive Knowledge will increase over time (i.e., from Time 1 to Time 2; H1c).

Perceptions of Social Networks within College Constraint

Latinos’ continued low educational attainment may also be attributed to perceived social network barriers that their children may face once upon entering college. Specifically, parents may fear that their child will experience social isolation. There is strong evidence that networking and support groups are important for affirming academic success (Datnow & Cooper, 1997; Pascarella, 2004). Research suggests that it is especially important that first-generation Latino students seek support from their Latino peers, in order to navigate difficult or
stigmatizing environments successfully (Padgett, Johnson, & Pascarella, 2012). However, there is evidence that Latino students are significantly less likely to have college-bound friends compared to White students (Alvarado and Turley, 2012). This poses a problem, since there is no established support system for these incoming Latino students. This provides further evidence for the lack-of-fit model proposed by Heilman (1983), which may contribute to the beliefs of parents that their children may not find social networks of students from similar backgrounds that they can relate to. Hence, we postulated the following hypotheses:

**H2: Parents who receive the social networks intervention will express fewer Parental Concerns about College and more Parental Supportive Knowledge than the control condition in Time 1 (H2a). Furthermore, the effects will increase such that Parental Concerns about College will decrease and Parental Supportive Knowledge will increase over time (i.e., from Time 1 and Time 2; H2b).**

Furthermore, perceptions of lack-of-fit may affect parents differentially based on their child’s gender. Due to traditional beliefs about gender roles parents of male students may be more concerned about their son’s ability to fit in with students of the ethnic majority and find students like themselves than parents of female students. As described by SRT (Eagly, 1987), women are considered more social and communal compared to men. Hence, parents may believe Latina women to be able to make college friends within and beyond their racial or ethnic groups more easily. Interestingly, research has shown that Latina women are not as affected by the social constraint of making friends in college as compared to Latino men (Saenz and Ponjuan, 2009), which may contribute to explaining the growing college enrollment gap between Latino men and women. Hence, we postulated the following hypotheses:

**H2: We anticipate that social networks intervention will be more effective for parents of**
Latino men than Latino women (H2c) as shown through fewer Parental Concerns about College and more Parental Supportive Knowledge in Time 1.

College Application Process Knowledge Constraint

Adults who did not attend college may have significant barriers navigating the college application process. Latino parents may be at a disadvantage of adequately assisting their children in applying to college due to potential language, cultural, and social barriers (Auerbach, 2006). One significant impediment to first-generation Latino parents’ attitudes toward postsecondary attainment relates to their lack of process knowledge and is based on the inability to pay for college. Research has found that such an impediment leads to their decision to not pursue more information and learn about various methods to pay for college. Parents perceive that there is lack of efficacy from their part as a parent about navigating the college application process and receiving financial aid (Auerbach, 2006). According to the U.S. Census Bureau (2012, p. 452), 62 percent of Latino households have an income under $49,999. In addition, Latinos are three times more likely than Whites to live below the poverty line (Chapa & De La Rosa, 2004). With that, Latino students on average have an expected family contribution for tuition of only $3,250 (King, 1999). At the same time, the average published tuition charges for 4-year and 2-year institutions, without counting room and board expenses, exceeds their expected family contributions (Baum & Ma, 2014), making it hard for parents to send their children to even community college. Once again, these monetary restrictions limit parents’ decision to send their children to college, even when they believe that college is important for their child’s future (Cabrera & La Nasa, 2000; Tornatsky, Cutler, & Lee, 2002).

Another significant impediment for first-generation Latino parents’ attitudes toward postsecondary attainment relates to their perceived different responsibilities during their child’s
college application process. Specifically, Latino parents have divergent expectations of their role during their child’s application or learning process about postsecondary education (Auerbach, 2006). Many Latino parents believe that the main responsibility for their child’s academic success and preparation for college attainment lies with school personnel, whereas their (the parents’) main responsibility is to provide moral development (e.g. valuing the importance of school instead of monitoring direct progress; Auerbach, 2007). Even though Latino parents play a significant role in moral support for their children’s college path, research suggests that an active parental role is often missing during the application process for Latino children, which is often attributed to parents’ lack of “college knowledge” (Goldenberg, Gallimore, Reese, & Garnier, 2001; Tornatzky, Cutler, & Lee, 2002).

Knowing these two impediments in Latino families for postsecondary education attainment, there is a need for interventions to enhance parents’ utility value of learning more about the application process in order to increase their active role during this process (Eccles, 2009). In this thesis, I will manipulate one of the conditions to be such that parents receive information that attempts to make the pursuit of college consistent with the principles of enhancing their knowledge on the application process. Hence, I postulate the following hypotheses:

H3: Parents who receive the process knowledge intervention will express fewer Parental Concerns about College and more Parental Supportive Knowledge than the control condition in Time 1 (H3a). Furthermore, the effects will increase such that Parental Concerns about College will decrease and Parental Supportive Knowledge will increase over time (i.e., from Time 1 to Time 2; H3b).
Lack of Leader Role Model Barriers Constraint

In the 2010 National Survey of Latinos, a project of the Pew Hispanic Center, Latinos and Latinas were asked about their most important national leader in the United States (Lopez & Taylor, 2010). Results indicated that sixty-four percent of Latinos and Latinas are unaware of who their leaders are in the United States. In addition, ten percent selected that there is “no one” as their leader. In addition to the disparities in top management positions (HACR, 2011), Latinos are lacking in public leaders that can serve as role models for younger generations. For instance, Latinos represent only 3.3 percent of elected seats nationally (Cardenas & Kerby, 2012). Lack of awareness and representation of Latinos leaders that are available for the Latino community presents a significant problem for Latinos’ parents expectations and perceptions of possibilities for their children to become the leaders of tomorrow. This phenomenon also provides evidence for the social role theory (Eagly, 1987) and the lack-of-fit model (Heilman, 1983).

Latino leaders are critical for the Latino community, as they become role models for their followers (Sims, 2000; Sims & Brinkman, 2002). Role modeling, however, occurs when the leader communicates a strong and directed message toward specific groups of followers about their values through his or her actions (Sims, 2002; Sims & Brinkman, 2002). They serve as a valuable tool for career development (Gibson, 2004) and can be viewed as an inspiration to their followers, especially those who are alike (Lockwood & Kunda, 1997). Gibson (2004) states that public leaders, the target role models in this study, are distant (versus proximal) role models. Distant role models are defined as inspirational figures with which individuals look to for exemplary attributes, but do not interact with directly. These role models are important to college attainment in the context similar to close role model, as Latino
parent may inspire their children to become like those figures.

Even though research may argue that role models who are proximal to children may have a greater impact of educational aspirations, Zirkel (2002) found that non-White students reported significantly fewer race or gender matched role models available to them than their White counterparts. Latinos have fewer opportunities to interact with inspiring figures who are similar to them while attaining their education. Hence, the only opportunities for inspiration are these available role models who are distal to them (Zirkel, 2002). However, the main issue is that the majority of Latinos are unaware of their leaders who can serve as role models for their children (HACR, 2011).

There is a need to assist Latino parents to become aware of the few leaders that are available as role models for their children (e.g., Sonia Sotomayor, Marco Rubio). Parents can promote leaders as role models to their children with the intention for their child’s behaviors to have a similar success like the leader, especially for female children (Peña, 1991). According to the SRT (Eagly, 1987), women are at disadvantage, compared to men, as they are more likely to pursue lower status jobs and avoid leadership positions. Despite their postsecondary education attainment, parents may perceive that their daughters are less likely to become leaders due to their lack of fit with the leadership positions (Heilman, 1983; Stevens, 1998). In this thesis, I will manipulate one of the conditions so that parents receive information about current Latino male and Latina female leaders in an attempt to increase their awareness and knowledge about potential role models and opportunities of leadership positions for their children. Hence, I postulate the following hypotheses:

H4: Parents who receive the leaders intervention will express fewer Parental Concerns about College, more Parental Supportive Knowledge and Leadership Knowledge than
the control condition in Time 1 (H4a). Moreover, we anticipate that leaders intervention will be more effective for parents of Latina women than Latino men (H4b) as shown through fewer Parental Concerns about College, more Parental Supportive Knowledge and Leadership Knowledge in Time 1. Furthermore, the effects will increase such that Parental Concerns about College will decrease and Parental Supportive Knowledge and Leadership Knowledge will increase over time (i.e., from Time 1 to Time 2; H4c).

Overall, this research proposed the four social and structural theory-based constraints that Latino first-generation parents may encounter during the college application process for their children. These constraints can have a negative impact of parents’ expected outcomes of their engagement in the process (Durik, Vida, & Eccles, 2006). Specifically, aligned with the expectancy-theory (Eccles, 2009), parents may be less likely to engage in the task (i.e., application process) because they may expect to perform unsuccessfully despite their attitudes for postsecondary attainment. Therefore, the intervention utilized in the current research attempts to change their attitudes in order to reduce concerns, increase their support during the process, and increase their knowledge of leaders as examined through parents’ attitudes for postsecondary education. However, most importantly, current research is unique because the interventions were developed with the goal of changing the actual behaviors of parents. These changes would result in parents becoming a more active role in the application process and learning more about postsecondary education attainment for their children as expressed through their actual behaviors. Hence, I postulate the following hypothesis:

H5: Parents who receive the process knowledge, networks, family values, and leaders interventions (in Time 1) are more likely attend the final conference call about postsecondary education attainment than the control group in Time 3.
The Present Research

The present research reveals waves of data collected from a longitudinal field study of first-generation Latino and Latina parents who had a child (oldest) who was 17 years old or younger to examine the impact of five different interventions. These interventions attempted to explain theoretical barriers, as explained previously, on postsecondary education attainment. In Time 1, researchers went into the field and employed the intervention to 322 parents and examined their attitudes and knowledge for postsecondary education attainment. In Time 2, researchers followed-up with the participants from Time 1 during the summer of 2016 in order to measure changes in their attitudes and knowledge for postsecondary educational attainment. Finally, in Time 3, participants were responsible for contacting the researchers to learn more about postsecondary education. Time 3 took place during a 2-week period. It was the focal point of the current research because it examined parents’ actual behaviors to engage in activities that promote a postsecondary education for their children. After all, it is critical to highlight that the aim of these studies was not to propose an ethnocentric form of thinking that aimed to eliminate Latino and Latina traditional cultural beliefs and attitudes for postsecondary education. Instead, these studies aimed to improve social, economic, and personal benefits of Latino and Latina first generation families and their children as they pursue higher education. In the next sections, we provide detailed information about the participants’ demographics, procedures and protocols, and measures and results by each time.

Time 1 Overview

In Time 1, we employed the interventions to first-generation Latino parents, who did not have a formal postsecondary education within the United States and whose oldest child was 17-years or younger. The interventions took place within the greater-Houston area over a period of
16-months starting at the beginning of 2015 until the summer of 2016. After receiving the interventions that tackled each of the theoretical barriers explained previously, we measured their attitudes and knowledge about their concerns of college, parental supportive attitudes and their leadership knowledge of Latinos and Latinas. Three measures were utilized in Time 1: a) Parental Concerns about College, b) Parental Supportive Knowledge, and c) Leadership Knowledge. We provided them with one of five interventions, study materials, and compensation. The purpose of Time 1 was to provide free-of-cost interventions to parents that aimed to raise their supportive attitudes and knowledge of sending their children to postsecondary education.

Methods

Participants and Procedures in Time 1

With this study design, the literatures on college interventions related to parental involvement suggests that the average effect size is .06 for partial eta squared (Hattie, 2015). In order to achieve a power of .80, at least 196 participants were needed. A total of 322 first-generation Latino and Latina parents (213 mothers and 109 fathers; \( M_{age} = 37.55, SD = 7.16 \)) participated in the current research. Participants were parents of 175 (54%) male children and 147 (46%) female children. Participants were recruited at various locations in Northwest and Southwest Houston where medium income salary ranges between $20,000 and $30,000. The decision to recruit from these locations was an attempt to somewhat restrict the socioeconomic status (SES) of our participants, which was found through Houston facts and interactive maps provided by the United States Census Bureau. We decided to not ask parents directly about their income because inquiring information about their SES would raise issues about their resident status in the United States and potentially make them hesitant to participate. All the participants
identified as Latinos, Latinas, or Hispanics. The participants varied in their national origin and education background. Participants were 67% Mexicans, 11% Salvadorans, 9% Guatemalans, 6% Hondurans, 2% Latino Americans, and the other 5% included other nationalities South America and the Caribbean. Forty-eight percent of the participants had less than a high school degree, 40% had only a high school degree, 8% had vocational schooling, and 3% had university training outside of the United States. Parents who have received university training outside of US were still used in the current because the process of applying to college in Latin American countries is different compared to the application process in the U.S.

Thirty-five bilingual undergraduate and graduate research assistants (10 males and 25 females) from Rice University, University of Houston, Saint Thomas University, Houston Baptist University, and Houston Community College were trained to administer and deliver the experimental stimuli and dependent measures. All stimuli and measures were provided in Spanish unless (N = 4) research assistants were asked by the participant to speak in English.

Prior to attending data collection days, research assistants went through an intensive training session, which required them to memorize a standard script used during their interactions with the participants. Refer to Appendix A for a sample of the script used for the process knowledge condition. Each assistant was trained to provide a presentation for each of the following interventions: (1) Control, (2) Process Knowledge, (3) Networks, (4) Family Values, and (5) Leaders. Research assistants tried to randomly recruit participants for the study by approaching them and asking “Would you like to learn more about the importance of college for your child?” If participants showed interest, they were given a consent form to sign, followed by a demographics and eligibility screening survey, which basically asked participants to confirm that they: a) ethnically identified as Latino, Latina, or Hispanic, b) did not have a postsecondary
education, and c) that they had at least one child, and d) that their oldest child was 17 or younger (see Appendix B). It is important to note that research assistants who approached a family were instructed to get assistance from a second research assistant in order to administer the study individually to each parent. We decided to deliver the study in this form to avoid any influence of the other’s answers on the questionnaires. We approached a total of 1,600 parents and only 20% (N = 322) agreed to take part of this study. Finally, if participants did not meet the eligibility requirements, they were still provided with the presentation and dismissed.

After completing the initial forms of the study, participants were assigned randomly (by a present graduate student) to present one of the five interventions: (1) Control, (2) Process Knowledge, (3) Networks, (4) Family Values and (5) Leaders. Then, the research assistant selected the brochure that was congruent with the condition in which they were running, and gave an approximate 15-minute oral presentation that mimicked the printed information on the brochure. Afterward, participants were handed the brochure to take with them. Then, participants completed a questionnaire. Finally, the research assistant asked participants if they were interested in participating in a second portion (time) of the study, for which they would need to give their contact information (i.e., phone number or emails) and agree to receive a follow-up email or phone call. There was one participant with a male child in the family values intervention who did not complete the leadership knowledge intervention.

Intervention and Stimuli

Brochures were developed in the following way. First, the front of all brochures introduced information about the importance of a college education for Latinos or Latinas. Second, the back of all the brochures proposed a “myth” about college attainment for Latino or Latina students that was specific to one of the interventions. Third, this information was coupled
with a statement that disproved the myth. Fourth, the brochure provided information about three facts to contribute to disproving the myth. Fifth, the brochure provided personal information about students’ success related to disproving the myth. Sixth and in conclusion, the brochure gave parents contact information about five different universities in Texas.

It is important to highlight that these interventions do not aim to postulate the idea that Latino parents’ ideological beliefs as they exist are inherently wrong or bad; rather, we aimed to extend these beliefs and attempt to persuade parents that a postsecondary education for their children need not violate such beliefs. In addition, all strategies explained to parents the importance of receiving a college degree in terms of a return in investment. In addition, they were presented with information about the impact that Latinos will have in the U.S. workforce in the next three decades as stated by U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics (2012). The next sections describe differences in brochures by condition.

_Control Intervention._ The control contained the same information as the other four interventions on the front of the brochure, which was related to general information about the vast amount of work-related opportunities and benefits of a college degree for the future of Latinos or Latinas. It did not address any specific strategy, as explained previously (only included the first and sixth pieces of information). The back portion of the brochure had general information about contact information for different universities in Texas. For the specific control brochure presented in both English and Spanish, please see Appendix C.

_Process Knowledge Intervention._ The process knowledge strategy attempted to enhance parents’ attitudes and behaviors by directly teaching parents about the college application process related to increasing the financial opportunities for their children. The “myth” that was presented to the parents stated, “I can’t send my child to college because it is too expensive.” We
provided alternative facts about various resources for financial aid that related to public and private agencies. It also contained information about suggested steps that the family should take when preparing to help their child apply for college. We also indicated the importance for parents to be a strong support system that provided them with more than a moral support through engaging in their child in school, being involved in college searches, and ensuring that they are enrolled in rigorous courses so their children can obtain the benefits of a postsecondary education (Saenz & Ponjuan, 2009). For the specific Process Knowledge brochure presented in both English and Spanish, please see Appendix C.

**Networks Intervention.** The networks intervention emphasized even though there are universities that have fewer students who are Latinos or Latinas as compared to other ethnic groups, the fact is that Latinos do indeed go to college and that there are social and professional networks available for their children. The myth stated, “College isn’t for people from my background. If my child goes to college, he/she will feel like an outsider.” Adopted from Aydin et al. (2011), this intervention provided evidence of Latino cultural and other organizations relevance to their child’s interests to reduce any fears of social exclusion as an underrepresented student in college. For the specific Networks brochure presented in both English and Spanish, please see Appendix C.

**Family Values Intervention.** The family values intervention strategy drew on familism constructs presented Desmond and Turley (2009), which showed the benefits of earning college degree. For instance, it highlighted various scenarios on how the child remains as an active role and contributor to the family during his or her career in college and after earning a degree. The “myth” stated, “College will get in the way of my child’s family responsibilities.” We provided participants with evidence that a college degree can assist their child’s ability to contribute to
their family responsibilities in a larger role. We provided evidence of how a college degree can contribute to higher income and ability for future children to continue this path (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). Specifically, the median household income for an educational attainment of a Bachelor’s degree is 75 thousand dollars compared to 39 thousand dollars for high school graduates (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012). We explicitly stated that these are not the only benefits gained from earning a college degree, but there are plenty more that are worth exploring. The material was presented in a way that is respectful and not forceful towards discounting their core familism beliefs. For the specific Family Values brochure presented in both English and Spanish, please see Appendix C.

Latino Leaders Intervention. The Latino leader intervention pursued to increase parents’ awareness of national Latino leaders and proposed to them that they may be viewed as role models for their children (Sims, 2000; Sims & Brinkman, 2002). The “myth” stated, “College isn’t for people from my background. My child doesn’t have any role models like us to look up to.” The intervention provided facts that disproved this myth through several examples of national Latino or Latina leaders like Sonia Sotomayor, a U.S. Supreme Court justice, and Jorge Ramos, a national news anchor. We wanted to include male and female figures to control for any gender effects. The brochures also provided parents with information about the background of these leaders related to each person’s path to college and career achievements. We attempted to inspire these parents through the personal stories of two students that looked up to these leaders as their role models. For the specific Latino Leaders brochure presented in both English and Spanish, please see Appendix C.

Measures

All the measures were developed specifically for the present study, and a list of all
dependent measures (both in English and Spanish) appears in Appendix D. Unless otherwise noted, parents responded to each dependent measure on Likert-type scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (neutral) to 7 (strongly agree).

**Parental Attitude Support for Child’s College Attainment.** A 3-item scale was developed to measure parents’ supportive attitudes towards their children’s pursuit for postsecondary attainment. The items included were (1) “I would like my child to pursue a four-year college degree,” (2) “I think it is the school’s responsibility to educate my child about college,” and (3) “I think it is my own responsibility to educate my child about college”. The Cronbach’s alpha was .43.

**Parental Behavioral Intentions for Child’s College Attainment.** A 4-item scale was developed to measure parents’ behavioral intentions towards their children’s pursuit for postsecondary attainment by showing interest in college readiness related activities for their child. The items included were (1) “I would be willing to attend several college recruitment meetings for my child,” (2) “I am limited in how many actions I can put into improving my child’s chances of getting into college,” (3) “I monitor my child’s performance in school,” and (4) “I don’t think it’s the responsibility of the parents to have the main role in their children’s academic success”. The Cronbach’s alpha was .24.

**Process Knowledge scale.** A 3-item scale was created to measure barriers created by lack of knowledge parents have about sending their child to postsecondary education. The scale was intended to measure the extent of parents’ knowledge of the process of applying and of financial resources. The items included were (1) “I am aware of the types of classes that my child needs to take in order to be prepared for college,” (2) “I can send my child to college, even if I don’t have enough money,” and (3) “I know about the steps necessary to send my child to college”. The
Cronbach’s alpha was .56.

**Familism scale.** A 4-item scale was created to measure barriers created by traditional family values on postsecondary education attainment. The scale was intended to measure the extent of parents’ attitudes towards familism cultural values regarding college. The items included were (1) “Men should work to financially support their family instead of attending college,” (2) “Education should not interfere with familial responsibilities,” (3) “When children become adults, they should live close to their parents so that mutual aid and cooperation are possible,” and (4) “Women should live close to their families instead of moving away to college”. The Cronbach’s alpha was .65.

**Social Networks scale.** A 3-item scale was created to measure barriers created by the fear of social exclusion of parents’ children during college because of their ethnic identity. The scale was intended to measure the extent to which parents expected that their child would feel that they do not belong at their college, chiefly feelings of exclusion and isolation. The items included were (1) “College isn’t a place for people from my background,” (2) “My child will not have anybody to relate to if he/she attends college,” and (3) “I am worried that my child will be mocked/bullied if (s)he puts too much effort into school”. The Cronbach’s alpha was .62.

**Leadership Awareness scale.** A 3-item scale was created to measure barriers created by the lack of awareness in Latino and Latina parents about their fellow national leaders. The scale was intended to measure parent’s awareness of their national leaders and role models that their children may be inspired by. The items included were (1) “My children have examples of Latino leaders that can be role models to them,” (2) “There are not enough Latino leaders in the United States,” and (3) “Children of Latinos born outside the United States have little opportunities of becoming leaders in the United States”. The Cronbach’s alpha was .40.
Leadership Knowledge scale. A 11-item scale was created to measure barriers created by the lack of knowledge in Latino and Latina parents about their fellow national leaders. The scale was intended to measure parent’s knowledge of recognized Latino national leaders. There was a total of 11 leaders that were presented, of which five were fabricated Latino names (i.e., Evan Degollado, Gregorio Flores, Natalia Sanchez, Victoria Salido, Carlos Ramirez) and six were national Latino leaders (i.e., Sonia Sotomayor, Jorge Ramos, Luis Gutierrez, Dolores Huerta, Raul Guevara, Bill Richardson). Parents needed to indicate whether, or not, they know or have heard of each person (yes or no). A leader knowledge score was calculated from a total of 11 possible correct answers that parents can identify. For each correct identification, they would receive a score of one and zero for incorrect responses.

As a result of the low scale reliabilities, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis on the items measuring parents’ attitudes, behavioral support, and knowledge. As shown on Table 1, two major factors emerged. Factor 1 was called Parental Concerns about College, which was a 9-items scale that examined the parents’ attitudes and behavioral intentions towards the perceived lack of fit for their children. This scaled measured parents’ concerns about social exclusion issues in college because of their child’s ethnic identity, support of traditional family values, and lack of leadership opportunity for their children. The items included were (1) “Men should work to financially support their family instead of attending college,” (2) “Education should not interfere with familial responsibilities,” (3) “When children become adults, they should live close to their parents so that mutual aid and cooperation are possible,” (4) “Women should live close to their families instead of moving away to college,” (5) “College isn’t a place for people from my background,” (6) “My child will not have anybody to relate to if he/she attends college,” (7) “I am worried that my child will be mocked/bullied if (s)he puts too much
effort into school,” (8) “I am limited in how many actions I can put into improving my child’s chances of getting into college,” and (9) “Children of Latinos born outside the United States have little opportunities of becoming leaders in the United States.” The Cronbach’s alpha was .73.

The second factor developed through the factor analysis was called Parental Supportive Knowledge (see Table 1). This factor was based on a 3-item scale that examined parents’ supportive knowledge of their children’s postsecondary education attainment. The items for this scale included (1) “I am aware of the types of classes that my child needs to take in order to be prepared for college,” (2) “I know about the steps necessary to send my child to college,” and (3) “My children have examples of Latino leaders that can be role models to them.” The Cronbach’s alpha was .56. Even though this scale is not reliable, we will discuss next the correlations between items and factors during Time 1 of the current study for the support of using these two scales. Finally, the original Leadership Knowledge scale was also utilized in the current study. A total of three scales were utilized for the current study: (1) Parental Concerns about College, (2) Parental Supportive Knowledge, and (3) Leadership Knowledge.
Table 1

*Factor Analysis for Time 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Network Identity</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>-.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Women</td>
<td>.630</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Men</td>
<td>.553</td>
<td>-.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks Origin</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Home</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks Bully</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Influence</td>
<td>.421</td>
<td>-.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Opportunity</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>-.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Values</td>
<td>.290</td>
<td>-.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Steps</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Classes</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Examples</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* *Factor 1 refers to Parental Concerns about College (13.44% of Variance Explained). **Factor 2 refers to Parental Supportive Knowledge (7.17% of Variance Explained).*

Establishing Validity

In Table 2, we provide the correlations between individual items to the two factor composites we established. The correlations reveal that each item is strongly correlated with Parental Concerns about College. Beyond the adequate reliability of the construct, this provided evidence for establishing validity during Time 1. Table 3 also showed the correlations between Parental Supportive Knowledge dependent variable and all the individual items that create this composite. This measure had a low reliability ($\alpha = .56$). However, we demonstrated that each of the items correlated with the construct. Finally, Table 4 also showed the correlations between Leadership Knowledge dependent variable and all the individual items that create this composite. All the individual items were correlated with Leadership Knowledge. During Time 2, this thesis will discuss the correlations between the same constructs and individual items. In addition, we will discuss the correlations between the constructs from Time 1 to Time 2. These analyses were
conducted to establish evidence for validity construction in the new developed measures. Next, we will discuss the participants, procedures, measures, and validity construction. Finally, we will present the results from Time 1 and 2 because the current design is based between and within measures.

Table 2

*Correlations Between Parental Concerns about College and Composite Items from Time 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Parental Concerns</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Family Men</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family Values</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family Home</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Family Women</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Networks Origin</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Networks Identity</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Networks Bully</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Behavior Influence</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Leadership Opportunity</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

*Correlations Between Parental Supportive Knowledge and Composite Items from Time 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Parental Supportive Knowledge</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Process Steps</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Process Classes</td>
<td>.73**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leadership Examples</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

_Correlations Between Leadership Knowledge and Composite Items from Time 1_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leadership Knowledge</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evan Degollado</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Natalia Sanchez</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gregorio Flores</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Victoria Salido</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Carlos Ramirez</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sonia Sotomayor</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.12**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Jorge Ramos</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Luis Gutierrez</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Bill Richardson</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>-.24**</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Dolores Huerta</td>
<td>.38**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Raul Guevara</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results for Time 1

Parental Concerns about College Results

A two-way ANOVA was conducted that examined the effect of gender of the child and intervention on Parental Concerns about College. Refer to Table 5 for all means related to this test. Results showed no significant interaction between gender of the child and intervention on Parental Concerns about College, $F(4, 312) = 1.19, p = .314$, partial $\eta^2 = .015$. There were no significant main effects of intervention and gender of child on Parental Concerns about College (refer to Table 6 for all relative $F$-tests). Therefore, hypotheses concerning H1a, H1b, H2a, H2c, H3a, H4a, and H4b that were related to the Parental Concerns about College dependent variable were not supported.
Table 5

Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes on the Measure of Parental Concerns about College Composite as a Function of Intervention and Gender in Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Values</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6

ANOVA Summary for Between-Subjects Effects by Gender of Child and Intervention Type on Parental Concerns about College in Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child *</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>549.71</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parental Supportive Knowledge Results

A two-way ANOVA was conducted that examined the effect of gender of the child and intervention on Parental Supportive Knowledge. Refer to Table 7 for all means related to this
test. Results showed no significant interaction between gender of the child and intervention on Parental Concerns about College, $F(4, 312) = 0.91, p = .458$, partial $\eta^2 = .012$. There were no significant main effects of intervention and gender of child on Parental Supportive Knowledge (refer to Table 8 for all relative $F$-tests). Therefore, hypotheses concerning H1a, H1b, H2a, H2c, H3a, H4a, and H4b that were related to the Parental Supportive Knowledge dependent variable were not supported.

Table 7

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes on the Measure of Knowledge Support Composite as a Function of Intervention and Gender in Time 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Knowledge</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Values</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

ANOVA Summary for Between-Subjects Effects by Gender of Child and Intervention Type on Knowledge Support in Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.987</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child * Intervention</td>
<td>9.21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>.458</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>789.76</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership Knowledge Results

A two-way ANOVA was conducted that examined the effect of gender of the child and intervention on Leadership Knowledge. Refer for Table 9 for all means related to this test.

Results showed no significant interaction between gender of the child and intervention on Leadership Knowledge, $F(4, 311) = 0.89, p = .468$, partial $η² = .011$. There was not significant main effects of intervention and gender of child on Leadership Knowledge (refer to Table 10 for all relative $F$-tests). Therefore, hypotheses concerning $H_4a$ and $H_4b$ that were related to the Leadership Knowledge dependent variable were not supported.
Table 9

Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes on the Measure of Leadership Knowledge Composite as a Function of Intervention and Gender in Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Knowledge</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Values</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>6.94</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10

ANOVA Summary for Between-Subjects Effects by Gender of Child and Intervention Type on Leadership Knowledge to College in Time 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>8.99</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.711</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child *</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.468</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>586.48</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Time 2 Overview**

In Time 2, we followed up with the parents that took part of Time 1 via phone during the summer of 2016, a month after Time 1 was completed. Once again, we measured their attitudes and knowledge about their concerns of college, parental supportive attitudes and their leadership knowledge of Latinos and Latinas. The same measures utilized during Time 1 were also employed during Time 2. As a reminder, there were three measures were utilized in Time 1: a) Parental Concerns about College, b) Parental Supportive Knowledge, and c) Leadership Knowledge. After completing the measures, we provided parents with information about the conference calls that took place during Time 3. They signed-up for a conference call for Time 3 at the end of Time 2. The purpose of Time 2 was to examine parents’ attitude changes in respect to their support and knowledge of sending their children to postsecondary education. In addition, Time 2 was critical because allowed parents to sign-up for the conference calls for Time 3.

**Methods**

**Participants and Procedures in Time 2**

A total of 209 first-generation Latino and Latina parents (143 mothers and 66 fathers; $M_{age} = 38.08, SD = 7.00$) continued to participate on to Time 2. The overall retention rate was 65%. Participants were parents of 119 (57%) male children and 90 (43%) female children. As noted from Time 1, all the participants identified as Latinos, Latinas or Hispanics. The participants varied in their national origin and education background. Participants were 66% Mexicans, 12% Salvadorans, 8% Guatemalans, 6% Hondurans, 1% Latino Americans, and the other 7% included other nationalities South America and the Caribbean. Forty-nine percent of the participants had less than a high school degree, 37% had only a high school degree, 9% had vocational schooling, and 4% had university training outside of the United States.
Time 2 was based on a 2-month process starting the summer of 2016 where the same researchers had to call via phone the recruited participants from Time 1. Once again, this included thirty-five bilingual undergraduate and graduate research assistants (10 males and 25 females) from Rice University, University of Houston, Saint Thomas University, Houston Baptist University, and Houston Community College. They were trained to administer and conduct this conference via a phone conversation that involved multiple parts. These parts included (1) a reminder of how individuals were recruited to take part of the study, (2) provide participants with all the questions that measured the dependent variables, and (3) assign participants to a time-slot to participate in the final conference about postsecondary education attainment for Time 3. Research assistants were required to contact the parents during evening times in the week between 19:00 and 21:00 hours. In addition, they could also contact the parents during the weekend between 13:00 and 18:00 hours.

To standardize the method of contacting the parents, research assistants were required to call the parents a maximum of three times. For instance, if a parent did not answer the call during the first initial call, research assistants were required to call them back a day after. If they did not pick up after the second call, research assistants were required to call them one week after for the final contact attempt. In addition, there were a total of 35 parents who answered the call during the initial contact attempt, but requested for the research assistant to return the call at a specific date that was more convenient to them. The thirty-five parents were contacted back and they participated during Time 2. All measures were provided in Spanish unless research assistants were requested to provide the materials in English. Refer to Appendix E for the calling script for the research assistants during Time 2. A sample sign-up sheet is provided on Appendix F for Time 3, which is fully later in this thesis. Each conversation lasted between 15 to 20 minutes
during Time 2.

Thus, there were a total of 209 parents who participated in Time 2. Thirty-seven participants in the Control, 54 Process Knowledge, 41 Networks, 40 Family Values, and 37 Leaders participated in Time 2. Refer to Table 11 for the sample sizes and retention rates between Time 1 and Time 2. We analyzed the reasons for nonparticipation for Time 2. They were as followed: 24 (21%) number was disconnected, 15 (26%) pairs of parents (n = 30) of the same child who received individual presentations, 12 (11%) number not given on Time 1, 9 (8%) wrong number was given, 8 (7%) hung up during the conversation, 26 (23%) did not answer, and 4 (4%) explicitly said they did not want to participate. Research assistants attempted to contact the participants who did not give a phone number during Time 1 by using contact information in the yellow pages. This method was unsuccessful because no one was appropriately identified when we attempted to contact them. In addition, we did not use both parents of the same child because it would serve as a confound to the current research such that we would not be able to identify the specific intervention that was effective. Overall, the method of contacting parents over the phone to participate in Time 2 was an appropriate decision by the research team as it yielded a high retention rate of 65%. The decision of contacting parents via phone was used because we wanted to respect and be considerate of their study and work.
Table 11

*Participation as a Function of Intervention Sample Size (Retention Rate) between Time 1 and Time 2.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37 (58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Knowledge</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54 (77%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41 (59%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Values</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40 (68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37 (62%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>209 (65%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sample sizes (retention rate based on previous time sample size) by intervention and time.

**Measures**

The researchers decided to conduct an exploratory factor analysis for Time 2 to demonstrate convergence evidence between the scales developed in Time 1 with the scales used in Time 2. Refer to Table 12 for the factor analyses conducted for measures in Time 2. Results showed that the same factor loadings for Factor 1 (i.e., Parental Concerns about College) and Factor 2 (i.e., Parental Supportive Knowledge) reappeared. Therefore, the same scales used in Time 1 were used for Time 2. These included (1) Parental Concerns about College, (2) Parental Supportive Knowledge, and (3) Leadership Knowledge. Refer to Table 13 for an overview of the reliabilities of Parental Concerns about College and Parental Supportive Knowledge between Time 1 and 2. As a reminder of the content and material of these scales, they were as followed:

*Parental Concerns about College.* A 9-item scale that examined the parents’ attitudes and behavioral intentions towards the perceived lack of fit for their children. This scale measured parents’ concerns about social exclusion issues in college because of their child’s ethnic identity, support of traditional family values, and lack of leadership opportunity for their children. Parents responded to each dependent measure on Likert-type scales ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to
4 (neutral) to 7 (strongly agree). The items included were (1) “Men should work to financially support their family instead of attending college,” (2) “Education should not interfere with familial responsibilities,” (3) “When children become adults, they should live close to their parents so that mutual aid and cooperation are possible,” (4) “Women should live close to their families instead of moving away to college,” (5) “College isn’t a place for people from my background,” (6) “My child will not have anybody to relate to if he/she attends college,” (7) “I am worried that my child will be mocked/bullied if (s)he puts too much effort into school,” (8) “I am limited in how many actions I can put into improving my child’s chances of getting into college,” and (9) “Children of Latinos born outside the United States have little opportunities of becoming leaders in the United States.” The Cronbach’s alpha was .70 for Time 2.

**Parental Supportive Knowledge.** A 3-item scale that examined parents’ supportive knowledge for their children’s postsecondary education attainment. Parents responded to each dependent measure on Likert-type scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 4 (neutral) to 7 (strongly agree). The items for this scale included (1) “I am aware of the types of classes that my child needs to take in order to be prepared for college,” (2) “I know about the steps necessary to send my child to college,” and (3) “My children have examples of Latino leaders that can be role models to them.” The Cronbach’s alpha was .58 for Time 2.

**Leadership Knowledge scale.** An 11-item scale that examined barriers created by the lack of knowledge in Latino and Latina parents about their fellow national leaders. The scale was intended to measure parents’ knowledge of recognized Latino national leaders. There was a total of 11 leaders presented, of which five were fabricated Latino names (i.e., Evan Degollado, Gregorio Flores, Natalia Sanchez, Victoria Salido, Carlos Ramirez) and six were national Latino leaders (i.e., Sonia Sotomayor, Jorge Ramos, Luis Gutierrez, Dolores Huerta, Raul Guevara, Bill
Richardson). Parents needed to indicate whether, or not, they knew or had heard of each person (yes or no). A leader knowledge score was calculated from a total of 11 possible correct answers that parents could identify. For each correct identification, they received a score of one and a score of zero for incorrect responses.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Analysis for Time 2</th>
<th>1*</th>
<th>2**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Identity</td>
<td>.655</td>
<td>-.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Women</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Men</td>
<td>.450</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks Origin</td>
<td>.532</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Home</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>-.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks Bully</td>
<td>.583</td>
<td>-.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Influence</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Opportunity</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Values</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>-.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Steps</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Classes</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Examples</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *Factor 1 refers to Parental Concerns about College (11.74% of Variance Explained). **Factor 2 refers to Parental Supportive Knowledge (7.00% of Variance Explained).

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability of Factors at Time 1 and Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Parental Concerns about College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parental Supportive Knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Establishing Validity

To demonstrate validity of dependent measures we decided to examine the correlations between the individual items to the composite in Time 2. In addition, we examined the relationships between the three factors (i.e., Parental Concerns about College, Parental Supportive Knowledge, and Leadership Knowledge) between Time 1 and Time 2 to establish
convergence validity. Table 14 showed the correlations between Parental Concerns about College dependent variable and all the individual items that created this composite. The correlations showed that each item was strongly correlated with Parental Concerns about College. Beyond the adequate reliability of the construct, like Time 1, this provided evidence for establishing validity during Time 2. Table 15 also showed the correlations between the Parental Supportive Knowledge dependent variable and all the individual items that created this composite. Similar to Time 1, this measure had a low reliability ($\alpha = .58$). However, each of the items once again correlated with Parental Supportive Knowledge. Table 16 showed the correlations between the Leadership Knowledge dependent variable and all the individual items that create this composite in Time 2. All the individual items were also correlated with Leadership Knowledge.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Parental Concerns</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Family Men</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Family Values</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family Home</td>
<td>.59**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Family Women</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Networks Origin</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Networks Identity</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Networks Bully</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Behavior Influence</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Leadership Opportunity</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.21**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

_Correlations Between Parental Supportive Knowledge and Composite Items from Time 2_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Parental Supportive Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Process Steps</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Process Classes</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leadership Examples</td>
<td>.67**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 16

*Correlations Between Leadership Knowledge and Composite Items from Time 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leadership Knowledge</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evan Degollado</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Natalia Sanchez</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gregorio Flores</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Victoria Salido</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Carlos Ramirez</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Sonia Sotomayor</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Jorge Ramos</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Luis Gutierrez</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bill Richardson</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Dolores Huerta</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Raul Guevara</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to establish convergence validity, we examined the correlation of each of the constructs from Time 1 to Time 2. Please refer to Table 17 for the inter-correlations between all the dependent measures used in the current thesis. Results showed that each of the constructs strongly correlated with each other. For instance, there was a strong relationship between Parental Concerns about College from Time 1 to Time 2 ($r = .69$). This provided evidence for convergence validity. Table 17 also showed discriminant validity since none of the constructs correlated with other constructs. For instance, Parental Concerns about College was not correlated with Parental Supportive Knowledge and Leadership Knowledge. These results provided evidence for both convergence and discriminant validity. Despite the low reliability of Parental Supportive Knowledge in Time 1 and 2, we kept it for the remaining analyses because it showed evidence for validity. The limitation section of this thesis will discuss other measurement issues that contributed to the high inter-correlations and low reliabilities of the measures in Time 1 and Time 2.

Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Parental Concerns</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parental Concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>.69 **</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Parental Supportive Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Parental Supportive Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.70 **</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Leadership Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 1</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Leadership Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time 2</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.61 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17

Correlations Between All Dependent Variables from Time 1 to Time 2
Results for Differences between Time 1 to Time 2

Parental Concerns about College Results

A two-way 2 (gender: male or female) x 3 (type of intervention: control, process knowledge, networks, family values, or leaders) mixed ANOVA with repeated measures on the time of study (i.e., Time 1 and Time 2) was conducted on Parental Concerns about College. Refer for Table 18 for all means related to this test. Mauchly’s sphericity test for the repeated measures variable (i.e., time) was not violated because it only has two levels. Levene’s test of equality of error variances was analyzed for the assumption of homogeneity of variance. Results showed no significant evidence for violation for Parental Concerns about College in Time 1, $F(9,199) = 1.46, p = .165$, and in Time 2, $F(9,199) = 1.01, p = .434$. Test for the within-subjects effects revealed that there was not a significant effect for time, time by intervention, time by gender of child, or interaction of the three variables (refer to Table 19 for all relevant F-values). Test for the between-subjects effects revealed that there was no significant interaction between intervention and gender of child on Parental Concerns about College (refer to Table 20). There was marginal evidence for a main effect of gender of child on Parental Concerns about College, which showed that female children were perceived to have greater parental concerns about their fit in college ($M = 3.06, SD = 1.43$) compared to male children ($M = 2.78, SD = 1.16$), $F(1,199) = 2.74, p = .100$, partial $\eta^2 = .014$. There was no significant main effect for intervention on Parental Concerns about College (refer to Table 14). Therefore, hypotheses concerning H1c, H2b, H3b, H4c that were related to the Parental Concerns about College dependent variable were not supported from Time 1 to Time 2.
Table 18

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes on the Measure of Parental Concerns about College Composite as a Function of Intervention and Gender from Time 1 to Time 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Values</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19

*ANOVA Summary for Within-Subjects Effects by Gender of Child and Intervention Type on Parental Concerns about College from Time 1 to Time 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study * Intervention</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study * Gender of Child</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study * Intervention * Gender of Child</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>96.65</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20

ANOVA Summary for Between-Subjects Effects by Gender of Child and Intervention Type on Parental Concerns about College from Time 1 to Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child * Intervention</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>.546</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>502.88</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parental Supportive Knowledge Results

A two-way 2 (gender: male or female) x 3 (type of intervention: control, process knowledge, networks, family values, or leaders) mixed ANOVA with repeated measures on the time of study (i.e., Time 1 and Time 2) was conducted on Parental Supportive Knowledge. Refer for Table 21 for all means related to this test. Mauchly’s sphericity test for the repeated measures variable (i.e., time) was not violated because it only has two-levels. Levene’s test of equality of error variances was analyzed for the assumption of homogeneity of variance. Results showed no significant evidence of violation for Parental Supportive Knowledge in Time 1, F(9,199) = 1.58, p = .123, and in Time 2, F(9,199) = 0.15, p = .998. Test for the within-subjects effects revealed that there was a significant effect for time such that parents’ Parental Supportive Knowledge increased from Time 1 (M = 5.14, SD = 1.58) to Time 2 (M = 5.41, SD = 1.51), F(1,199) = 9.43, p = .002, partial η² = .045. There was no significant effect of time by intervention, time by gender of child, or interaction of the three variables (refer to Table 22 for all relevant F-values). Test for the between-subjects effects revealed that there was no significant interaction between intervention and gender of child on Parental Supportive Knowledge (refer to Table 23). Results also showed no significant main effect for intervention or gender of child on Parental Supportive Knowledge (refer to Table 17). Therefore, hypotheses concerning H1c, H2b, H3b, H4c that were
related to the Parental Supportive Knowledge dependent variable were not supported from Time 1 to Time 2.

Table 21

*Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes on the Measure of Parental Supportive Knowledge as a Function of Intervention and Gender from Time 1 to Time 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parental Supportive Knowledge Time 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parental Supportive Knowledge Time 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Knowledge</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Values</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 22

**ANOVA Summary for Within-Subjects Effects by Gender of Child and Intervention Type on Parental Supportive Knowledge from Time 1 to Time 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time * Intervention</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time * Gender of Child</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time * Intervention * Gender of Child</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>.663</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>148.75</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23

**ANOVA Summary for Between-Subjects Effects by Gender of Child and Intervention Type on Parental Supportive Knowledge from Time 1 to Time 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child * Intervention</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>843.78</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>4.240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Leadership Knowledge Results_

A two-way 2 (gender: male or female) x 3 (type of intervention: control, process knowledge, networks, family values, or leaders) mixed ANOVA with repeated measures on the time of study (i.e., Time 1 and Time 2) was conducted on Leadership Knowledge. Refer for Table 24 for all means related to this test. Mauchly’s sphericity test for the repeated measures variable (i.e., time) was not violated because it only has two-levels. Levene’s test of equality of error variances was analyzed for the assumption of homogeneity of variance. Results showed no significant evidence of violation for Leadership Knowledge in Time 1, \(F(9,199) = 1.37, p = .206\),
and in Time 2, $F(9,199) = 1.24, p = .271$. Test for the within-subject effects revealed that there was a significant effect for time such that parents’ leadership knowledge increased from Time 1 ($M = 7.06, SD = 1.46$) to Time 2 ($M = 7.44, SD = 1.40$), $F(1,199) = 16.00, p = .001$, partial $\eta^2 = .075$. However, there was no significant effect of time by intervention, time by gender of child, or interaction of the three variables (refer to Table 25 for all relevant F-values). Test for the between-subject effects revealed that there was not a significant interaction between intervention and gender of child on leadership knowledge (refer to Table 26). Results also showed no significant main effect for intervention or gender of child on leadership knowledge (refer to Table 26). Therefore, hypothesis concerning H4c that was related to the Leadership Knowledge dependent variable was not supported from Time 1 to Time 2.
Table 24

**Means, Standard Deviations, and Sample Sizes on the Measure of Leadership Knowledge as a Function of Intervention and Gender from Time 1 to Time 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Knowledge</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.68</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.35</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.41</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Values</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.90</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.03</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.62</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.24</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 25

**ANOVA Summary for Within-Subjects Effects by Gender of Child and Intervention Type on Leadership Knowledge from Time 1 to Time 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study * Intervention</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study * Gender of Child</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study * Intervention * Gender of Child</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>.895</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>159.70</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 26

ANOVA Summary for Between-Subjects Effects by Gender of Child and Intervention Type on Leadership Knowledge from Time 1 to Time 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>partial η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender of Child * Intervention</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>672.89</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Time 3 Overview**

In Time 3, participants called us to take part of the final conference call about postsecondary education attainment. This time took place over a 2-week period beginning at the end of September and ending in first week of October. The overall purpose of Time 3 was to examine the actual behavior of parents to attend a conference about postsecondary education attainment. As previously discussed by Ajzen and Fishbein (1977) and other research in psychology (see Dockery & Bedaian, 1989), an individual’s attitudes and intentions do not always determine their actual expressed behaviors. A limitation of Time 1 and Time 2 is that they were unable to fully measure the behavioral outcomes of parents, though they aimed to measure parents’ attitudes and knowledge. Time 3 measured the effectiveness of these interventions through the actual behavioral outcomes of parents’ participation in the final conference. Time 3 was the focal point of the current thesis research.

**Methods**

**Participants and Procedures**

A total of 82 first-generation Latino and Latina parents (50 mothers and 32 fathers; $M_{age} = 37.37$, $SD = 5.78$) participated in Time 3. The overall retention rate from Time 2 to Time 3 was
39%. Refer to Table 27 for information on the sample sizes and retention rates related to the entire study. Participants were parents of 54 (66%) male children and 28 (34%) female children. As noted from Time 1 and Time 2, all of the participants identified as Latinos, Latinas, or Hispanics. The participants varied in their national origin and education background. Participants were 68% Mexicans, 12% Salvadorans, 9% Guatemalans, 6% Hondurans, 1% Latino Americans, and the other 5% included other nationalities within South America and the Caribbean. Forty-six percent of the participants had less than a high school degree, 40% had only a high school degree, 7% had vocational schooling, and 5% had university training outside of the United States.

Table 27

*Participation as a Function of Intervention Sample Size (Retention Rate) at Time 1, Time 2, and Time 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
<th>Time 3</th>
<th>Time 1 to 3*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>37 (58%)</td>
<td>11 (30%)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Knowledge</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>54 (77%)</td>
<td>28 (52%)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41 (59%)</td>
<td>15 (37%)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Values</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40 (68%)</td>
<td>15 (38%)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37 (62%)</td>
<td>13 (35%)</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>209 (65%)</td>
<td>82 (39%)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Sample sizes (retention rate based on previous time sample size) by intervention and time. *Retention rate from Time 1 to Time 3.*

Time 3 was completed over a two-week period starting at the end of September and ending in the beginning of October in 2016. As a reminder, participants were assigned to a conference date via phone during Time 2. Participants were required to sign-up for a 20-minute phone conference to learn more about the process of attaining postsecondary education (see Appendix F for a sample signed-up sheet). To increase the feasibility of participants to contact us, we created a schedule that allowed participants to sign-up for mornings and evening slots any day of the week and weekend. A total of 150 20-minute study time slots were available on a
weekly basis for parents to select. Participants were provided with a text that included all the information about their selected conference data and contact information of the presenter. During Time 3, the researcher administered a 15-minute presentation about postsecondary education attainment and 5 minutes of questions and answers. In Time 2, a total of 209 participants signed up for a conference call. Refer to Appendix G for complete script used for the presentations during the conference calls.

For the final time of the current research, participants had to return a phone call. When initiated, the researchers explained to them (1) the purposes of the myths explained during Time 1, (2) classes their children might want to take during high school, (3) information about the application process, (3) tests that students are required during high school, (4) resources for financial aid, and (5) the importance of community college. In the last five to ten minutes, participants could ask any form of question that related to their personal experiences and preparation. Refer to Appendix G for a copy of the presentation script.

*Presentation Material*

The presentation began by reminding the participants of the myths that they were assigned in Time 1. Second, we provided participants with information about the five core courses (English, Math, Science, Social Studies, and Foreign Language) that students need to take while they are in high school. We followed this with further information, explaining to parents the purpose of Advance Placement (AP) classes. Third, we described to the participants a list of steps that could inform them more about the process for applying to college. Fourth, we briefly explained to them the different tests that students must take while in High School. These included the SAT, ACT, and other subject tests that align with their interests. Fifth, we spoke to them about the importance of financial aid, which is obtained through FAFSA, scholarships, and
grants. Finally, we presented on the importance of community college for students’ postsecondary attainment, the benefits of earning an associate’s degree, and the fact that 46% of Latinos are likely to enroll in two-year colleges (Motel & Patten, 2012), but only 15% of them successfully transferred to 4-year institutions (Horn & Weko, 2009).

Measures

As a reminder, Time 3 was created to measure the actual behaviors of parents in attending a conference call about postsecondary education attainment. Research has shown that individual’s attitudes and behavioral intentions do not always determine their actual behaviors (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1977; Dockery & Bedaian, 1989). Therefore, Time 3 explored the effectiveness of the interventions provided to the parents during Time 1 on their participation in the final phase of the current longitudinal study.

Results for Time 3

A chi-square test of independence was performed to examine the relations between type of intervention received during Time 1 and final participation (yes or no) on Time 3 for the conference call. Results revealed a significant effect, $\chi^2(4) = 11.02$, $p = 0.026$, Cramer’s $V = .185$, indicating that parents who received the process knowledge intervention during Time 1 were more likely to participate in the final time compared to any other intervention (see Table 20 for observed counts of participation in Time 3). This showed that if a parent received the Process Knowledge intervention during Time 1, the odds of their participation during Time 3 was 3.21 times higher than if they received the control intervention, 2.40 times higher than those in the Networks intervention, 2.00 times higher than those in the Family Values intervention, and 2.41 times higher than those in the Leaders intervention. Refer to Figure 1 for a graphic representation of final participation of parents during Time 3. Therefore, H5 was partially supported in that
parents who received process knowledge intervention in Time 1 were more likely to come back for the final conference call in Time 3 compared to the control. However, this result was not found for the other interventions.

Figure 1. Time 3 participation by intervention.

**General Discussion**

Despite the growing aspirations of Latino parents for their child’s postsecondary education attainment highlighted by previous research (Fraga et al., 2011), there is also evidence that suggests many first-generation Latino children do not enroll in postsecondary education, especially four-year programs (Motel & Patten, 2012). As indicated by the current and previous research, Latino parents demonstrate low parental support behaviors related to seeking information about the college application process and participating in their children’s current and future schooling (Zarate, 2007). The current research extended this examination to see how parents’ attitudes and actual behaviors towards postsecondary education attainment related to the
different times of interventions. This thesis is the first of its kind to field experimentally test and compare different types of psychological interventions for parents of future would-be, first-generation college students. Often educational and psychological research provides evidence of programs that intervene directly towards the students instead of parents (Chavous, Bernat, Schmeelk-Cone, Caldwell, Kohn-Wood, & Zimmerman, 2003; Levin, Belfield, Muennig, & Rouse, 2007).

Importantly, the present study considered a potential lack of support for postsecondary education attainment as predicted by expectancy-value theory (Eccles, 2009), social role theory (Eagly, 1987) and lack-of-fit model (Heilman, 1983). Overall, results showed that parents’ Parental Supportive Knowledge and Leadership Knowledge of Latino and Latina leaders increased over time from Time 1 to Time 2, despite the intervention received during Time 1. This showed that teaching parents about the importance of postsecondary college attainment may increase the expectancy value held towards their children (Eccles, 2009). A growth of knowledge from Time 1 to Time 2 was evident for all parents. Even though the family values intervention aimed to reduced parents’ concerns about college, especially for parents with female children, results showed partial evidence that parents perceived their daughters to have greater Parental Concerns about College compared to their sons. This provides growing evidence for the limitation forces related to the social role theory (Eagly, 1987) and the lack-of-fit model (Heilman, 1983). Specifically, parents may expect that their daughters do not belong in college and may be perceived to be a better fit for remaining at home instead of going to college. This provides empirical evidence for the theoretical factors of familism (Desmond and Turley, 2009) indicating that the perceived social exclusion of parents’ children for potentially earning a college degree may reinforce traditional values related to marianismo (e.g., Latina women should
stay at home instead of pursuing other opportunities). These results should invite other researchers to create interventions that remediate the effects of traditional family values that are direct contributors to the upward mobility of women’s success through education. Furthermore, these findings may contribute to the gender differences that start in a home environment through parents’ expectations. These differences may be responsible for the inequities in occupational attainment during the 2020 and 2034 period where new occupational opportunities will be available for upcoming Latino and Latina workers (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2012).

Additionally, one of the most compelling findings uncovered in the current research related to the effectiveness of the process knowledge intervention (compared to the other interventions) for promoting an active engagement of parents during the college attainment process. Previous research has shown that Latino and Latina parents believe that their primary role during this process is to be a moral support for their children’s college path (Auerbach, 2006; 2007). In addition, Latino and Latina parents, especially those who are first-generation, are less likely to be involved in the application process because they are worried about their inability to pay for college. After all, these are significant contributors that lower the expected value in successfully engaging in this process, because of the lack of knowledge they have towards the entire application process (Tornatzky et al., 2002). Despite these limiting barriers, the current study provides evidence of effective strategies that researchers may utilize by directly teaching about the application process to make parents more active in the affair (e.g., process knowledge intervention). I believed that the effectiveness of this intervention compared to other interventions is due to the proximal connection between the strategies provided by the intervention and the actual behavioral engagement needed to complete the process. The other interventions (e.g., leaders, social networks, and family values) may be perceived as more distal
strategies related to the actual outcome of postsecondary education attainment.

Even though most of the research hypotheses were not confirmed in the current study, the actual findings provide evidence of effective interventions that may be utilized by future researchers. In addition, presenting information about the importance of college through interventions, free-at-cost, may allow parents to become more active in this process. The current study provided evidence for new avenues of research that may assist the future of Latino and Latina postsecondary education attainment. We hope that the impact of this thesis was not only beneficial to the parents, but their altered behaviors can also have positive effect on the children themselves. As far as we can access, no study has been conducted to examine this type of relationship among Latino and Latina parents and children.

Limitations

As with any study, there were some limitations to our research. First, the measures that we used had low reliabilities (see Table 28). While we intended to measure efficacy associated with each of the four interventions (e.g., process knowledge, networks, family values, and leaders), we had to rely instead on the results of the factor analysis. While this solution was an acceptable one, we would have preferred to have the four intended measures.

Table 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measurements</th>
<th>Time 1</th>
<th>Time 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Intentions</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral intentions</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Knowledge</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Values</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Networks</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Awareness</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, there was a noticed general lack of knowledge about taking part in a psychological study by the participants in our sample. That is, many of the participants were
first-generation Latino parents who seemed to have low knowledge of taking part in psychological studies. Thus, while we didn’t intend to read the brochures, our early recruitment efforts lead us to realize that we needed to read it to them. Additionally, participants did not fully understand the 7-point Likert-type scales used in the study. The only values that had anchors with a description were 1 (i.e., not at all likely), 4 (i.e., neutral) and 7 (i.e., extremely likely). Hence, participants were less likely to select answer choices between the scale anchors. Figure 2 and Figure 3 showed evidence of the current issues. In addition, parents were more likely to answer yes or no to refer to 7 (i.e., extremely likely) and 1 (i.e., not at all likely), respectively, instead of answering the entire spectrum of the questions. Even though researchers tried to resolved the current issue by providing a description of all the values to the parents during Time 2, Figure 3 indicates that the issue was still present during Time 2. Hence, researchers who conduct studies with sensitive populations that have never taken part of a psychological study should consider providing effective methods that contribute to greater variability on participants’ answer choices. One solution may include descriptive anchors for all the scale values.
Figure 2. Observed count of responses to behavioral limitations during Time 1. Item question was, “I am limited in how many actions I can put into improving my child’s chances of getting into college.”
Figure 3. Observed count of responses to behavioral limitations during Time 2. Item question was, “I am limited in how many actions I can put into improving my child’s chances of getting into college.”

Third, the current study may have provided cognitive overload to participants during Times 1 and 2. Research assistants noticed that they had to present the material during Time 1 quickly because they only had 20 minutes to present. In addition, the graduate researcher that presented during the final conference calls during Time 3 encountered the same issue. Information about the entire application process, ranging from information that provided details about high school classes that their child might take to information about all financial resources available to the parents, believed to create cognitive overload for parents. Researchers should consider effective strategies to deliver their intervention that provide enough information for their participants at a manageable timeline.
Future Research and Implications

Overall, this research provided evidence of effective strategies that contributed to behavioral engagement of parents for their children’s postsecondary education attainment. It was evident that the process knowledge intervention contributed to the largest effect of increasing engagement for parents to seek more information about colleges. Future research should continue to examine effective theoretical based interventions that contribute to the engagement of parents’ behaviors by playing an active role throughout the process. In addition, future research should attempt to identify interventions that actually contribute to enhancing the expectancy and utility values of college attainment for children of first generation parents grounded in Eccles’ (2009) expectancy-value theory. Furthermore, psychology and education researchers should analyze the impediments that contribute to the disconnection between first generation Latino parents’ high aspirations and expectations towards their children’s education and their low college attainment.

Future research should analyze the transfer of interventions that aim to enhance parents’ attitudes, behavioral intentions, knowledge, and actual behaviors onto their children. Research should examine the effectiveness of these interventions by also measuring children's attitudes and behaviors of attaining a postsecondary education. Such research should examine the convergence relationships between both samples. Finally, future research should determine the effectiveness of interventions that promote postsecondary educational attainment by tracking the students’ decisions to attend college, their retention rates, and academic performance throughout college. Furthermore, research should also investigate the child’s willingness to become leaders of clubs and organizations to measure the perceived values of theories such as social role theory (Eagle, 2009) and lack-of-fit model (Heilman, 1983).
The main intention for the current study was to bring awareness of the importance of the role of parents in their children’s life when they are seeking more information about college and learning methods of to make the optimal decision about their choices for college attainment. This research provided evidence about effective interventions that can increase parents’ supportive attitudes and behaviors for attaining a postsecondary education. We hope that this research contributes to the growth of Latinos and Latinas in college and provides an avenue for the future of successful Latino and Latina leaders as this group becomes increasingly influential in the U.S. labor force (Cardenas & Kerby, 2012). However, this process is initiated at an early stage of the child’s educational career. Parents play a critical role in increasing the utility and expectancy value of education for their children. Once the children are appropriately educated and likely to begin a 4-year college degree, an intended implication is this type of intervention can lead to an increased gender and ethnic equality in the U.S. labor force. Specifically, Latinos will have the adequate knowledge, skills, and abilities to qualify for high-level leadership roles. The current study aimed towards this outcome by providing Latino parents with the proper information that can encourage them to motivate their child to obtain a postsecondary education degree. The interventions presented suggest promise of achieving this goal, especially for vulnerable populations like children of first-generation Latino and Latina parents, who may be at a disadvantage for college attainment in comparison to other ethnic groups.
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Gracias por tomarse el tiempo para participar en esta breve presentación!
En la economía de hoy, una educación universitaria es super importante para el futuro de su hijo o hija. La diferencia de ingreso entre las personas con y sin un diploma de la universidad es muy grande. Dejeme le enseño:

En esta grafica podemos ver que una persona que se graduó de la universidad puede ganar un promedio de 36,000 dólares mas que una persona que se graduó de la preparatoria pero no de la universidad.

(Image on next page)
También es muy importante que nuestras familias sepan que los Latinos estamos cambiando el futuro de la fuerza laboral de los Latinos en Estados Unidos. Por ejemplo, entre el 2010 y 2020, la fuerza laboral en Estados Unidos va crecer por 10.5 millones de nuevos trabajadores. Impresionantemente, Latinos van a contribuir 75 por ciento (%) a este crecimiento.

Los más importante que ustedes deben saber es que la mayoría de estos trabajos requieren que sus hijos tengan un diploma universitario.

Para concluir, una educación universitaria es una de las mejores maneras para asegurar que su hijo tenga un buen futuro!
Alguna gente podrán pensar diferente

Queremos hablar con usted sobre un mito común que los padres enfrentan sobre las decisiones para mandar a los hijos a la universidad.

Mito: No puedo mandar a mi hijo a la universidad porque es muy costoso.

Realidad: Hay muchas oportunidades federales y privadas disponibles que ayudan financieramente para ayudar a pagar el costo de la universidad!

Como muestra la imagen, hay subvenciones que se dan basadas en la necesidad financiera de la persona. El dinero no se tiene que devolver. Hay préstamos que son como una inversión en su futuro aunque se tiene que pagar con intereses. También hay un programa de trabajo-estudio con el cual su hijo puede ganar dinero mientras esta en la escuela.

(image on next page)
Aparte de la ayuda federal, su hijo también puede poner solicitudes para muchas becas privadas.

Existen algunas organizaciones que dan becas específicamente para los estudiantes Hispanos, como el Hispanic Scholarship Fund, y el Ronald McDonald House HACER Scholarship Program. Hay varias organizaciones que también ofrecen becas completas, pagando para estancia, comida, y colegiatura. Como yo, soy estudiante de la Universidad de Rice, que tuve la fortuna de ganarme una beca.

Para que su hijo/hija califique para una beca privada, es muy importante que tomen un currículo riguroso, les vaya bien en la escuela y que investiguen muy bien cual universidad es la mejor opción para ellos.

Usted es una parte muy importante de este proceso!

Para empezar a ver las oportunidades de ayuda financiera, las becas y el proceso de poner solicitudes para la universidad, comience con una conversación con un consejero en la escuela de su hijo. Deben tener toda la información que usted necesite, o por lo menos le pueden decir en donde encontrarla.

Así que si puede mandar a su hijo a la universidad!

Por ejemplo, aquí tengo la opinión de dos estudiantes que actualmente van a la universidad:

“Muchas personas se pierden de la oportunidad de ir a la universidad por el gran costo financiero. No se dan cuenta de que hay varias organizaciones que los pueden ayudar a pagar la universidad. Es importante que aprendan mas sobre estas becas para que puedan ir a la universidad y usen su mayor potencial.”
- Lyanne Gonzalez, Rice University

(image on the next page)
“Estoy feliz de que mi familia me haya apoyado para poder ser la primera en mi familia en ir a la universidad. No tenemos mucho dinero y no podíamos pagar la escuela con solo nuestro ingreso pero con ayuda financiera y becas fue posible cumplir mis metas. Estoy agradecido de que mis padres me hayan motivado a tener buenas calificaciones en la escuela para prepararme para la universidad.”
-Greg Flores, Rice University
Gracias por su atención!

Ahora le daremos un ultimo cuestionario.

*(Provide the final questionnaire)*

El propósito de este estudio es ver si informar a los padres sobre las estadísticas de los Latinos en la universidad y los efectos positivos que trae un diploma universitario incrementaría el apoyo de los padres para que sus hijos vayan a la universidad.

Ahora le pagaremos cinco dólares por su participación en este estudio.
Appendix B

Screening Spanish Form

*Examen de Elegibilidad para Participación*

1. Cual es su edad?

________________

2. Cual es su sexo?

Mujer

Hombre

Otro

3. Cual es su idioma principal?

Ingles

Español

Frances

Chino

Otro

4. Cual es el nivel más alto de educación que usted a completado?

Menos que la preparatoria

Preparatoria o equivalente (GED)

Escuela vocacional, estudió tecnico, posgrado

Diploma universitario o mas alto

5. Cómo clasifica su raza o etnicidad?

Caucásico/ Blanco
Hispano/Latino/Chicano

Negro/ Africano Americano

Asiático/ de las Islas Pacíficas

Indigena

Otro

Prefiere no decir

6. Usted esta casado o soltero?

Casado

Viviendo con una pareja

Soltero

Prefiero no decir

7. Si está usted casado o viviendo con una pareja, cual es el nivel más alto de educación que su pareja a completado?

Menos que la preparatoria

Preparatoria o equivalente (GED)

Escuela vocacional, estudió tecnico, posgrado

Diploma universitario o mas alto

8. Si usted es un padre o madre, su hijo/hija es menor de 16 años?

Si

No
No tengo hijos

9. Si usted contestó que sí a la pregunta 8, su hijo/hija mayor está registrado en una preparatoria pública o privada?

Publica

Privada

10. Si usted contestó que sí a la pregunta D8, que sexo es su hijo/hija mayor?

Hombre

Mujer

Screening English Form

*Eligibility Screening*

1. What is your age?

________________

2. What is your gender?

Female

Male

Other

3. What is your primary language?

English

Spanish

French

Chinese

Other
4. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Less than high school
High school or equivalent
Vocational/technical school/Associate’s degree
Bachelor’s degree or higher

5. How would you classify your race/ethnicity?

Caucasian/White
Hispanic/Latino/Chicano
Black/African American
Asian/Pacific Islander
Indigenous or Aboriginal
Other
Would rather not say

6. What is your current marital status?

Married
Living with a significant other
Single
Would rather not say

7. If married or living with a significant other, what is the highest level of education he/she has completed?

Less than high school
High school or equivalent
Vocational/technical school/Associate’s degree
Bachelor’s degree or higher
8. If you are a parent, is your first child 16 or younger?

Yes

No

I do not have children

9. If answered yes to item 8, is your first child enrolled in a public or private school?

Public

Private

10. If answered yes to item 8, what is your first child’s gender?

Male

Female
Appendix C

Family Values Spanish Brochure

La universidad puede afectar el ingreso de su hijo

- En la economía de hoy, una educación universitaria es sumamente importante para el futuro de su hijo o hija. La diferencia de ingreso entre las personas con y sin un diploma de la universidad es muy grande.
- En esta gráfica podemos ver que una persona que se graduó de la universidad puede ganar un promedio de $36,000 dólares es más que una persona que se graduó de la preparatoria pero no de la universidad.

Latinos y la fuerza laboral

- Es muy importante que nuestras familias sepan que los Latinos estamos cambiando el futuro de la fuerza laboral de los Latinos en Estados Unidos.
- Por ejemplo, entre el 2010 y 2020, la fuerza laboral en Estados Unidos va crecer por 10.5 millones de nuevos trabajadores.
- Impresionantemente, Latinos van a contribuir 75% a este crecimiento.

La Universidad: un buen futuro para sus hijos

Las opciones para el futuro de su hijo son infinitas!
Mito común sobre mandar su hijo a la universidad: “La universidad hará que mi hijo no complete las responsabilidades familiares que tiene.”

La verdad:

Un diploma universitario puede ayudar que si hijo cumpla sus responsabilidades familiares.

Como es esto?

Razón 1: Un diploma universitario significa un ingreso más alto y más oportunidades para apoyar a su familia financieramente.

Razón 2: Un diploma universitario continuara a ayudar a su familia por generaciones, incluyendo a sus nietos.

Una educación universitaria ayuda a mejorar la comunicación y la habilidad de pensamiento crítico, las cuales ayudaran a que su hijo cuide no solo de sí mismo sino también de sus futuros hijos.

Así que, mandar a su hijo a la universidad puede asegurar un mejor futuro por muchas generaciones!

Opciones para su hijo:

Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas
http://www.tsu.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-313-7071
admissions@tsu.edu

University of Texas at San Antonio
San Antonio, Texas
http://www.utsa.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
admissions@utsa.edu

St. Edwards
Austin, Texas
https://www.stedwards.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
855-468-6738

University of St. Thomas
Houston, Texas
http://www.sthom.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-525-3500
admissions@sthom.edu

University of Houston
Houston, Texas
http://www.uh.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-743-1010
admissions@uh.edu

Rice University
Houston, Texas
http://www.rice.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-348-7423
admis@rice.edu
University can affect the income of your children

In today’s economy, a college education is more important than ever for your child’s future. The difference in income for people with and without college degrees is very large:

• In this graph we can see that a person with a college degree can earn on average $36,000 more dollars than a person that has a high school diploma, but not a college degree.

Latinos and the labor force

• It’s very important that your families know that latinos are changing the future of the labor force of the United States.

For example, between 2010 and 2020, the labor force of the United States is going to increase by 10.5 million workers.

Amazingly, Latinos will contribute 75% of that growth.

The most important thing you should remember is that the majority of these jobs require that your children have a college degree.

University: A good future for your children

The options for your children are limitless!
Myth “College will get in the way of my child’s familial responsibilities”

Fact:

A bachelor’s degree can actually help your child fulfill his/her family responsibilities!

How?

Reason 1: a college degree = higher income = a greater ability for your child to financially support the family

Reason 2: a college degree causes a ripple effect (for your future grandchildren)

A college degree also enhances communication and critical thinking skills, which will help your child to not only take good care of his or herself, but also to become a stronger advocate for his/her future children.

So, sending your child to college could ensure a bright future for many generations to come.
La universidad puede afectar el ingreso de su hijo

En la economía de hoy, una educación universitaria es sumamente importante para el futuro de su hijo o hija. La diferencia de ingreso entre las personas con y sin un diploma de la universidad es muy grande.

- En esta gráfica podemos ver que una persona que se graduó de la universidad puede ganar un promedio de 36,000 dólares más que una persona que se graduó de la preparatoria pero no de la universidad.

Latinos y la fuerza laboral

También es muy importante que nuestras familias sepan que los Latinos estamos cambiando el futuro de la fuerza laboral de los Latinos en Estados Unidos. Por ejemplo, entre el 2010 y 2020, la fuerza laboral en Estados Unidos va crecer por 10.5 millones de nuevos trabajadores. Impresionantemente, Latinos van a contribuir 75% a este crecimiento.

Los más importantes que ustedes deben saber es que la mayoría de estos trabajos requieren que sus hijos tengan un diploma universitario.

La Universidad: un buen futuro para sus hijos

Las opciones para el futuro de su hijo son infinitas!
Back of the Social Network Spanish Brochure

Mito “La universidad no es para gente de mi origen. Si mi hijo va a la universidad, sentirá que no pertenece ahí.”

¡Si hay Latinos en la Universidad!

La realidad:

Ejemplos:

En este momento hay más de 250 instituciones que ayudan a los Latinos en los Estados Unidos. Estas instituciones son universidades con una dedicación especial para proveer una educación universitaria a la primera generación de estudiantes Latinos.

Una gran cantidad de estados tienen universidades que buscan promover la presencia de latinos dentro del campus a través de distintos programas y servicios. Además, Texas tiene la segunda mayor cantidad de estas universidades, por lo que si su hijo no se siente cómodo yendo a un lugar lejano no habrá ningún problema. Por otro lado, si se quiere ir a otro lugar, por cualquier motivo, también tiene muchas opciones para considerar.

Así que la universidad sí es lugar para su hijo!

“Como un estudiante Latino que forma parte de la primera generación de mi familia en ir a la universidad, la Asociación de Latinos para el Enriquecimiento Cultural en Rice es como mi segunda familia. Los al otro y compartimos nuestra cultura con una comunidad aún más grande.”

-Greg Flores, Rice University

“Hay muchos Latinos como yo en mi escuela y todos nos apoyamos unos a los otros. Como un grupo de apoyo me dio confianza para conocer a mas personas de diferentes etnias.”

-Lyonne Gonzales, Rice University

Opciones para su hijo:

Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas
http://www.tsu.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-313-7071
admission@tsu.edu

University of Texas at San Antonio
San Antonio, Texas
http://www.utsa.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
admission@utsa.edu

St. Edwards
Austin, Texas
https://www.stedwards.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
512-235-6738
admissions@stedwards.edu

University of St. Thomas
Houston, Texas
http://www.sitthom.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-525-3500
admissions@sitthom.edu

University of Houston
Houston, Texas
http://www.uh.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-743-1010
admiss @uh.edu

Rice University
Houston, Texas
http://www.rice.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-348-7423
admi @rice.edu
University can affect the income of your children

In today's economy, a college education is more important than ever for your child’s future. The difference in income for people with and without college degrees is very large:

- In this graph we can see that a person with a college degree can earn on average $36,000 more dollars than a person that has a high school diploma but not a college degree.

Latinos and the labor force

- It's very important that your families know that latinos are changing the future of the labor force of the United States.
- For example, between 2010 and 2020, the labor force of the United States is going to increase by 10.5 million workers.
- Amazingly, latinos will contribute 75% of that growth.
- The most important thing you should remember is that the majority of these jobs require that your children have a college degree.

University: A good future for your children

The options for your children are limitless!
Myth: “College isn’t for people from my background. If my child goes to college, he/she will feel like an outsider.”

Fact: There are latinos in college!

Examples:

- Many states have universities that look to promote Latino presence on campus with different programs and services. Also, Texas has the second highest number of universities, so your child doesn’t have to worry about going far away. On the other hand, if he wants to go somewhere else, for any reason, there are many options to consider.

- “As a first generation Latino entering college, the Hispanic Association for Cultural Enrichment at Rice (HACER) is my home away from home. Our club supports one another and we also get to share our culture with the greater community.”
  - Greg Flores, Rice University

- “There are many Latinos like me at my school. Having them as my support group has given me confidence to know people from different backgrounds.”
  - Lyanne Gonzales, Rice University

Opciones para su hijo:

- Texas Southern University
  - Houston, Texas
  - http://www.tsu.edu/
  - Departamento de admisiones: 713-333-7071
  - admissions@tsu.edu

- University of Texas at San Antonio
  - San Antonio, Texas
  - http://www.uta.edu/
  - Departamento de admisiones: admissions@uta.edu

- St. Edwards
  - Austin, Texas
  - https://www.stedwards.edu/
  - Departamento de admisiones: 512-465-6738

- University of St. Thomas
  - Houston, Texas
  - http://www.stthom.edu/
  - Departamento de admisiones: 713-525-3500
  - admissions@stthom.edu

- University of Houston
  - Houston, Texas
  - http://www.uh.edu/
  - Departamento de admisiones: 713-743-1010
  - admissions@uh.edu

- Rice University
  - Houston, Texas
  - http://www.rice.edu/
  - Departamento de admisiones: 713-346-7423
  - adm@rice.edu
La universidad puede afectar el ingreso de su hijo

En la economía de hoy, una educación universitaria es sumamente importante para el futuro de su hijo o hija. La diferencia de ingreso entre las personas con y sin un diploma de la universidad es muy grande.

• En esta gráfica podemos ver que una persona que se graduó de la universidad puede ganar un promedio de 36,000 dólares, lo que es más que una persona que se graduó de la preparatoria pero no de la universidad.

Latinos y la fuerza laboral

También es muy importante que nuestras familias sepan que los Latinos estamos cambiando el futuro de la fuerza laboral de los Latinos en Estados Unidos. Por ejemplo, entre el 2010 y 2020, la fuerza laboral de Latinos en Estados Unidos va a llegar a 10.5 millones de nuevos trabajadores. Impresionantemente, Latinos van a contribuir 75% a este crecimiento.

Los más importantes que ustedes deben saber es que la mayoría de estos trabajos requieren que sus hijos tengan un diploma universitario.

La Universidad: un buen futuro para sus hijos

Las opciones para el futuro de su hijo son infinitas!
Mito: “No puedo mandar a mi hijo a la universidad porque es muy costoso”

La realidad:

¡Hay muchas oportunidades federales y privadas disponibles que ayudan financieramente para ayudar a pagar el costo!

Ejemplos:

Hay subvenciones que se dan basadas en la necesidad financiera de la persona. El dinero no se tiene que devolver. Hay prestamos que son como una inversión en su futuro aunque se tiene que pagar con intereses. También hay un programa de trabajo-estudio con el cual su hijo puede ganar dinero mientras esté en la escuela. Existen algunas organizaciones que dan becas específicamente para los estudiantes Hispanos, como el Horner Scholarship Fund, y el Ronald McDonald House. HACER Scholarship Program.

Hay varias organizaciones que también ofrecen becas completas, pagando para estancia, comida, y colegiatura. Usted es una parte muy importante de este proceso. Para empezar a ver las oportunidades de ayuda financiera, las becas y el proceso de poner solicitudes para la universidad, comience con una conversación con un consejero en la escuela de su hijo. Deben tener toda la información que usted necesita, o por lo menos le pueden decir en donde encontrarla.

Así que sí puede mandar a su hijo a la universidad!

“Estoy feliz de que mi familia me haya apoyado para poder ser la primera en mi familia en ir a la universidad. No tenemos mucho dinero y no podríamos pagar la escuela con solo nuestro ingreso pero con ayuda financiera fue posible cumplir mis metas. Estoy agradecido de que mis padres me hayan motivado a tener buenas calificaciones en la escuela para prepararme para la universidad.”

- Greg Flores, Rice University.

Muchas personas se pierden de la oportunidad de ir a la universidad por el gran costo financiero. No se dan cuenta de que hay varias organizaciones que los pueden ayudar a pagar la universidad. Es importante que aprendan más sobre estas becas para que puedan ir a la universidad y usen su mayor potencial.”

- Lourdes Gonzalez, Rice University.

Opciones para su hijo:

Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas
http://www.tsu.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-313-7071
admissions@tsu.edu

University of Texas at San Antonio
San Antonio, Texas
http://www.utsa.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
admissions@utsa.edu

St. Edwards
Austin, Texas
https://www.stedwards.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
512-469-7381
admissions@stedwards.edu

University of St. Thomas
Houston, Texas
http://www.stthomas.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-526-3500
admissions@stthomas.edu

University of Houston
Houston, Texas
http://www.uh.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-743-1010
admissions@uh.edu

Rice University
Houston, Texas
http://www.rice.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-348-7432
admissions@rice.edu
University can affect the income of your children

In today’s economy, a college education is more important than ever for your child’s future. The difference in income for people with and without college degrees is very large.

* In this graph we can see that a person with a college degree can earn on average $36,000 more dollars than a person that has a high school diploma but not a college degree.

Latinos and the labor force

* It’s very important that your families know that latinos are changing the future of the labor force of the United States.

For example, between 2010 and 2020, the labor force of the United States is going to increase by 10.5 million workers.

Amazingly, latinos will contribute 75% of that growth

The most important thing you should remember is that the majority of these jobs require that your children have a college degree.
Myth “I can’t send my child to college because it’s too expensive.”

Fact:

There are many federal and private financial aid opportunities available to help pay for college

Examples:

There is aid that is given based on a person’s financial need. That many don’t have to be returned. There are also loans that you must pay with interest. There is also work-study where your child can earn money while being in school. There are also organizations that give scholarships specifically to Latinos like the Hispanic Scholarship Fund, y el Ronald McDonald House HACER Scholarship Program.

So you can send your child to college!

“I’m glad my family supported me in becoming the first one in my family to go to college. We don’t have a lot of money and couldn’t afford it on our own, but financial aid and scholarships have made it possible for me to reach my goals! I’m thankful that my parents pushed me to do well in school to prepare for college.”

-Grec Flores, Rice University

“Many people miss out on college because of the great expense. They don’t realize that there are organizations who can help them pay for college. It’s important they look into these organizations so that they can go to college and reach their full potential.”

-Lynanne Gonzales, Rice University
La universidad puede afectar el ingreso de su hijo

• En la economía de hoy, una educación universitaria es sumamente importante para el futuro de su hijo o hija. La diferencia de ingreso entre las personas con y sin un diploma de la universidad es muy grande.

• En esta gráfica podemos ver que una persona que se graduó de la universidad puede ganar un promedio de 36,000 dólares más que una persona que se graduó de la

Latinos y la fuerza laboral

• Es muy importante que nuestras familias sepan que los Latinos estamos cambiando el futuro de la fuerza laboral de los Latinos en Estados Unidos.

• Por ejemplo, entre el 2010 y 2020, la fuerza laboral en Estados Unidos va crecer por 10.5 millones de nuevos trabajadores.

• Impresionantemente, Latinos van a contribuir 75% a este crecimiento.

Lo más importante que ustedes deben saber es que la mayoría de estos trabajos requieren que sus hijos tengan un diploma universitario.

La Universidad: un buen futuro para sus hijos

Las opciones para el futuro de su hijo son infinitas!
Mito común sobre mandar su hijo a la universidad: “La universidad no es para las personas de mi origen. Mi hijo no tiene ejemplos a seguir.”

La realidad:

Hay muchos líderes Latinos que su hijo puede tener como ejemplo a seguir.

Ejemplos:

Sonia Sotomayor es la primera jueza Latina de la Corte Suprema de los E.U. Es la hija de padres Puertorriqueños y fue la primera de su familia en ir a la universidad. Estudió en Princeton University y recibió su posgrado como abogada de Yale Law School. Su perseverancia y muchas horas estudiando y su buena comunicación con sus profesores fueron lo que la hicieron muy exitosa y una gran líder.

Jorge Ramos es reportero en Univisión y autor. Nació en la Ciudad de México, y fue a la Universidad Iberoamericana en la Ciudad de México. Después, recibió su posgrado en estudios internacionales en la Universidad de Miami. Ha ganado varios premios Emmy y premios de periodismo.

Así que, si hay ejemplos a seguir para sus hijos! Por ejemplo, aquí hay las opiniones de dos estudiantes que actualmente asisten a la universidad:

“Mis modelos a seguir durante mi niñez y adolescencia fueron Luis Gutiérrez y Janet Murguía. Me inspiraron a ser un líder Latino fuerte y me mostraron que nosotros los Latinos tenemos potencial para hacer un gran cambio.” —Greg Flores, Rice University

“Los modelos a seguir que mas me inspiraron a conseguir un diploma de universidad fueron Dolores Huerta y Bill Richardson. Mi familia me enseño que con una educación universitaria yo podría ser un líder como ellos.” —Luisa González, Rice University
University can affect the income of your children

In today's economy, a college education is more important than ever for your child's future. The difference in income for people with and without college degrees is very large:

• In this graph we can see that a person with a college degree can earn on average $36,000 more dollars than a person that has a high school diploma but not a college degree.

Latinos and the labor force

• It's very important that your families know that latinos are changing the future of the labor force of the United States.

For example, between 2010 and 2020, the labor force of the United States is going to increase by 10.2 million workers.

Amazingly, latinos will contribute 75% of that growth.

The most important thing you should remember is that the majority of those jobs require that your children have a college degree.

University: A good future for your children

The options for your children are limitless!
Myth: “College isn’t for people from my background. My child doesn’t have any role models like us to look up to.”

Fact:

There are numerous Latino leaders who your child can look up to as a role model

Examples:

Sonia Sotomayor is the first Latina Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States. She is the daughter of Puerto Rican-born parents and was the first in her family to attend college. She attended Princeton University and then received her law degree from Yale Law School. She received a full scholarship to both Princeton and Yale, but had to work hard to overcome challenges in college. Her perseverance and long hours in the library and meeting with professors are what made her so successful and a true leader.

Jorge Ramos is a news anchor on Univision and an author. He was born in Mexico City, and attended college at the University Iberoamericana in Mexico City. Then, he received his master’s degree in international studies at the University of Miami. He has won numerous Emmy Awards and journalism awards.

“Growing up, I looked up to role models like Luis Gutierrez (U.S. Congressman) and Janet Murguia (political activist). They really inspired me to be a strong Latino leader and showed me that we are Latinos have potential to make real change.”

-Greg Flores, Rice University

“My biggest role model that inspired me to pursue college was Dolores Huerta (civil right activist) and Bill Richardson (former governor of New Mexico). My family taught me that with a college education I could become an influential leader like them.”

-Lynne Gonzales, Rice University
La universidad puede afectar el ingreso de su hijo

En la economía de hoy, una educación universitaria es sumamente importante para el futuro de su hijo o hija. La diferencia de ingreso entre las personas con y sin un diploma de la universidad es muy grande. En esta gráfica podemos ver que una persona que se graduó de la universidad puede ganar un promedio de 36,000 dólares es más que una persona que se graduó de la preparatoria pero no de la universidad.

Latinos y la fuerza laboral

También es muy importante que nuestras familias sepan que los Latinos estamos cambiando el futuro de la fuerza laboral de los Latinos en Estados Unidos. Por ejemplo, entre el 2010 y 2020, la fuerza laboral en Estados Unidos va crecer por 10.5 millones de nuevos trabajadores. Impresionantemente, Latinos van a contribuir 75% a este crecimiento. Los más importante que ustedes deben saber es que la mayoría de estos trabajos requieren que sus hijos tengan un diploma universitario.

La Universidad: un buen futuro para sus hijos

Las opciones para el futuro de su hijo son infinitas
Back of the Control Spanish Brochure

Opciones para su hijo

University of Houston
Houston, Texas
http://www.uh.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-743-1010
admissions@uh.edu

University of St. Thomas
Houston, Texas
http://www.stthom.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-525-3500
admissions@stthom.edu

Rice University
Houston, Texas
http://www.rice.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-348-7423
admin@rice.edu

St. Edwards
Austin, Texas
http://www.stedwards.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
855-468-6738
stu.admit@stedwards.edu

Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas
http://www.tsu.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
713-313-7071
admissions@tsu.edu

University of Texas at San Antonio
San Antonio, Texas
http://www.uta.edu/
Departamento de admisiones:
210-468-8000

“Ser la primera de mi familia en ir a la universidad no solo es un gran logro para mí, es para toda mi familia”
-Lyann Gonzales, Rice University

Una educación universitaria es una de las mejores maneras para asegurar que su hijo tenga un buen futuro!

“Estoy feliz de que mi familia me haya apoyado para ser el primero en mi familia en ir a la universidad”
-Greg Flores, Rice University
University can affect the income of your children

In today’s economy, a college education is more important than ever for your child's future. The difference in income for people with and without college degrees is very large:

- In this graph we can see that a person with a college degree can earn on average $36,000 more dollars than a person that has a high school diploma but not a college degree.

Latino and the work force

- It's very important that your families know that Latinos are changing the future of the labor force of the United States.

For example, between 2010 and 2020, the labor force of the United States is going to increase by 10.5 million workers.

Amazingly, Latinos will contribute 75% of that growth.

The most important thing you should remember is that the majority of these jobs require that your children have a college degree.

University: A good future for your child

The options for your children are limitless!
Options for your child

University of Houston
Houston, Texas
http://www.uh.edu/
Departamento de admisiones: 713-743-3010
admissions@uh.edu

University of St. Thomas
Houston, Texas
http://www.stthom.edu/
Departamento de admisiones: 713-525-3500
admissions@stthom.edu

Rice University
Houston, Texas
http://www.rice.edu/
Departamento de admisiones: 713-348-7423
adm@rice.edu

St. Edwards
Austin, Texas
http://www.stedwards.edu/
Departamento de admisiones: 833-696-6738
seu.admin@stedwards.edu

Texas Southern University
Houston, Texas
http://www.tsu.edu/
Departamento de admisiones: 713-313-7070
admissions@tsu.edu

University of Texas at San Antonio
San Antonio, Texas
http://www.utsa.edu/
Departamento de admisiones: 210-658-8000

“Being the first in my family to go to college isn't just for me- it's for my whole family.”
- Lyanne Gonzales, Rice University

“A college education is one of the best ways to make sure your child has a good future!”

“I am thankful that my family supported me to become the first in the family to go to college.”
- Greg Flores, Rice University
Appendix D

Questionnaire in Spanish

**Cuestionario Final**

*Por favor indique su nivel de acuerdo con cada declaración. Por favor considere su hijo/hija mayor cuando conteste las preguntas.*

1A. Me gustaría que mi hijo/hija estudie en una universidad que tenga un programa de 4 años.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2A. Pienso que la escuela tiene la responsabilidad para educar mi hijo acerca de la universidad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No muy probable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demasiado probable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3A. Creo que es mi responsabilidad para educar a mi hijo/hija acerca de la universidad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No muy probable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demasiado probable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Por favor indique su nivel de acuerdo con cada declaración. Por favor considere su hijo/hija mayor cuando conteste las preguntas.*

1B. Me gustaría asistir a una conferencia sobre las universidades para sus hijos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2B. Estoy limitado en las cosas que puedo hacer para mejorar la probabilidad de que mi hijo/hija entre a la universidad.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3B. Monitoreo el progreso escolar de mi hijo/hija.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4B. No creo que los padres tengan la responsabilidad de ser la influencia principal de los logros académicos de los hijos.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Por favor indique su nivel de acuerdo con cada declaración. Por favor considere su hijo/hija mayor cuando conteste las preguntas.*

**1C. Soy consciente de que tipo de clases mi hijo/hija necesita tomar para estar preparado para la universidad.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2C. Puedo mandar mi hijo a la universidad, aunque no tenga suficiente dinero.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3C. Yo se acerca de los pasos necesarios para mandar mi hijo/hija a la universidad.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Por favor indique su nivel de acuerdo con cada declaración. Por favor considere su hijo/hija mayor cuando conteste las preguntas.

1D. Los hombres deberían trabajar para cuidar su familia financieramente en lugar de ir a la universidad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2D. La educación no debe interferir con sus valores familiares.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3D. Cuando los niños se vuelven adultos, ellos deberían vivir cerca a los padres para que puedan ayudarlos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4D. Las mujeres deberían vivir cerca a sus familias, en vez de ir a una universidad lejana.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Por favor indique su nivel de acuerdo con cada declaración. Por favor considere su hijo/hija mayor cuando conteste las preguntas.

1E. La universidad no es un lugar apropiado para la gente de mi origen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2E. Me preocupa que mi hijo/a no tendrá con quien identificarse o relacionarse si el/ella se va a la universidad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3E. Estoy preocupado que la gente se burle de mi hijo/hija si le pone mucho esfuerzo a sus estudios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Por favor indique su nivel de acuerdo con cada declaración. Por favor considere su hijo/hija mayor cuando conteste las preguntas.

1F. Mis hijos tienen ejemplos de líderes para seguir.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2F. No hay suficientes líderes Latinos en Estados Unidos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3F. Hijos de Latinos nacidos en el exterior tienen pocas oportunidades de ser líderes en Estados Unidos.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No estoy de acuerdo</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Estoy completamente de acuerdo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

En esta lista están los nombres de Latinos con posiciones de liderazgo en Estados Unidos. Estamos interesados en calificar cuanto influencian estos líderes a los Americanos. Por favor indique si alguna vez a oído de las siguientes personas:

1F. Evan Degollado  SI o NO 
2F. Sonia Sotomayor  SI o NO 
3F. Jorge Ramos  SI o NO 
4F. Luis Gutierrez  SI o NO
Final Questionnaire

In answering the following questions, please think about your response in regard to your first child. Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement.

1A. I would like for my child to attend a four-year college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2A I think it is the school’s responsibility to educate my child about college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3A. I think it is my own responsibility to educate my child about college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how likely you are to engage in the following behaviors. Again, please consider only your first child in your response.
Please indicate the extent to which each of the following statements applies to you.

1B. I would be willing to attend several college recruitment meetings for my child.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Extremely likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2B. I am limited in how many actions I can put into improving my child’s chances of getting into college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Extremely likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3B. I monitor my child’s performance in school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Extremely likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4B. I don’t think it’s the responsibility of the parents to have the main role in their children’s academic success.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not at all likely</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Extremely likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1C. I am aware of the types of classes that my child needs to take in order to be prepared for college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2C. I can send my child to college, even if I don’t have enough money.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3C. I know about the steps necessary to send my child to college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate the extent to which you agree with each of the following statements.

1D. Men should work to financially support their family instead of attending college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2D. Education should not interfere with familial responsibilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3D. When children become adults, they should live close to their parents so that mutual aid and cooperation are possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4D. Women should live close to their families instead of moving away to college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1E. College isn’t a place for people from my background.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following is a list of Latinos who hold prominent National leadership positions. We are interested in the extent to which each of these leaders serves as a role model for Americans.
Please indicate whether you have ever heard of each of the following individuals.

1F. Evan Degollado    YES or NO
2F. Sonia Sotomayor   YES or NO
3F. Jorge Ramos       YES or NO
4F. Luis Gutierrez    YES or NO
5F. Natalia Sanchez   YES or NO
6F. Gregorio Flores   YES or NO
7F. Dolores Huerta    YES or NO
8F. Raul Guevara      YES or NO
9F. Victoria Salido   YES or NO
10F. Bill Richardson  YES or NO
11F. Carlos Ramirez   YES or NO
Appendix E

SPANISH
Buenos días/tardes, puedo hablar con []?  
Hola, mi nombre es []. Soy un/a estudiante de X (dile tu universidad) University. Hablamos con usted hace unos meses sobre mandar a su hijo o hija a la universidad y le di un cuestionario. Quería pedirle si me podría contestar unas pocas preguntas porque aun estamos tratando de saber mas sobre la opinión de los padres acerca de la universidad.

Si dicen que si, haz las preguntas.  
Si dicen que no, diles que no tardaras mucho tiempo porque no estamos dando una presentación otra vez.  
Si dicen que están ocupados, pregúntales cuando les puedes volver a llamar y llámales otra vez. Después de que hayan contestado las respuestas, diles sobre las presentaciones que vamos a dar.

También quería decirle que vamos a tener unas conferencias sobre la importancia de ir a la universidad y el proceso de entrar. Va ser súper fácil y conveniente para ti porque las conferencias van hacer por el teléfono. Si estas interesado, necesitamos que usted se inscriba a una fecha para hablar con un representante. Tú te puedes inscribir a una conferencia durante 8/29 y 10/2. Hay tiempos disponibles todos los días de la semana y el fin de semana. ¿Por favor dime cual fecha y hora podría asistir?

Si no pueden asistir alguno de estos días, pregúntales sobre otro tiempo que yo este disponible. Refiérete al calendario.

Gracias. Si tienes alguna pregunta por favor dame una llamada o mándame un texto. Que tenga un buen día.
ENGLISH
Hello may I speak to []?  
Hi my name is []. I’m a student from X (tell them about your university) University. We spoke to you a couple of months ago about your sending your child to college and gave you a questionnaire. I was wondering if I could ask you a few questions because we are still trying to learn more about parent’s opinions on the subject of college.

If they say yes, yay! Ask the questions.
If they say no, let them know that it won’t take long because we are not giving a presentation again.
If they say they are busy at the moment, ask when it would be a good study to call them back and then call again.
After they have answered the questions let them know about the presentation.

I also wanted to let you know that we will be having a conference to speak more about the importance of college and the process of getting in. This opportunity will be extremely convenient to you because all the conferences will be held over the phone. If you are interested, we need you to signed up for a study slot in order to participate. There are many study slots available to you from 8/29 and 10/2. There are free slots throughout the week and the weekend. Please let us know which study works best for you?

If they cannot make any of these times and days, provide them with different options as shown on the calendar signed up sheet.

Thank you. If you have any questions please feel free to give us a call or text us. Have a good day.
## Appendix F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>lunes (9/26)</th>
<th>martes (9/27)</th>
<th>miércoles (9/28)</th>
<th>jueves (9/29)</th>
<th>viernes (9/30)</th>
<th>Sábado (10/1)</th>
<th>domingo (10/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9:00 Maria/Rey</td>
<td>Aredi Marragato</td>
<td>David Tacuvo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10:00 Hector Aragon</td>
<td>Veimar Sanchez</td>
<td>Jaqueline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>10:40 Araceli Guzman</td>
<td>Rafael Rodrigues</td>
<td>Francisco Hernandez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>11:00 Elizabeth Sanchez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11:20 Valeria Tienda</td>
<td>Maryrin Palacio</td>
<td>Jorge Mora</td>
<td>Maria Guzman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11:40</td>
<td>Angelica Sanchez</td>
<td>Maria Balvan</td>
<td>Juan Sarceno</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mele Guzman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12:40</td>
<td>Nely Olvera</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jose Puga</td>
<td>Pablo Luna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>13:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>13:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Maria Ramirez</td>
<td>Santos Joj</td>
<td>Porfirio Olivas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>15:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ofelia Morales</td>
<td>Heriberto Almagi</td>
<td>William Tahay</td>
<td>Brenda Reyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>15:20</td>
<td>Silvia Jerinimo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Leila Lagunas</td>
<td>Emma Caneguez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>15:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Juliesta Gama</td>
<td>Guadalupe</td>
<td>Valentin Espinoza</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16:20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Francisca Hernandez</td>
<td>Vesiam Lopez</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>16:40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>Maribel Garcia</td>
<td>Cindy Pardo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bienvenida/ Introducción al programa

Mitos:

- **La universidad hará que mi hijo no complete sus responsabilidades familiares.** En realidad un diploma ayudará a que mi hijo complete sus responsabilidades familiares ya que lo ayudará a tener un ingreso más alto y habrá un mayor probabilidad que las futuras generaciones de la familia también vayan a la universidad.

- **La universidad no es lugar para gente de mi origen. Mi hijo no tiene ejemplos de líderes a seguir.** Hay varios latinos que han logrado tener una posición alta en el país debido a su educación universitaria como Jorge Ramos y Sonia Sotomayor.

- **La universidad no es lugar para gente de mi origen. Si mi hijo va a la universidad, sentirá que no pertenece ahí.** Hay varios clubes y centros de apoyo en las universidades específicamente para estudiantes de primera generación y hispanos.

- **No puedo mandar a mi hijo a la universidad porque cuesta mucho.** Hay una gran variedad de becas y ayuda financiera que pueden ayudar a pagar parte o todo el costo de la universidad.

Clases:
Las universidades quieren que sus aplicantes sean academicamente competitivos. Para esto necesitaran conocimiento general en las cinco clases fundamentales. Sus hijos deben de tomar esas cinco clases cada año.

1. **Inglés (English)**
   a. Tomalo cada año

2. **Matemáticas**
   a. por lo menos, tómalo para tres años  
   b. Algebra, geometría, algebra 2 (Son necesarios para en SAT)

2. **Ciencias**
   a. Por lo menos, tres años  
   b. Ayuda en pensar analíticamente
   c. Un año de Biología, Química, Física,

2. **Ciencias Sociales**
   a. Por lo menos, 2 años
   b. Historia Americana (1 año), Gobierno (½ año), Historia Mundial o Geografía (½ año)

2. **Idioma Extranjero**
   a. Por lo menos, 2 año

Ten en cuenta que el estado de Texas y también cada escuela tienen sus propios requisitos para graduarse. Algunas serán lo mismo, pero muchas veces hay cambios pequeños.

Clases de AP: Son clases universitarias que se ofrecen en algunas escuelas secundarias. Esos muchas veces tienen más tarea, pero con una buena nota en el examen final de AP podrán recibir crédito universitario. Esto significa que ustedes pueden gastar menos dinero en la universidad.
Si tiene hijos en la escuela primaria o secundaria, enfoquese en las clases de matemáticas y Inglés. Trata de animar a su hijo a leer antes de acostarse para mejorar su vocabulario. También, felicite a su hijo cuando le pone mucho esfuerzo en sus estudios. (por ejemplo cuando estudian mucho para un examen)

**Proceso:**
- Complete los requisitos para graduarse de la preparatoria
- Complete los cursos/clases requeridos para la universidad
- Asegúrese de que su hijo tenga buenas calificaciones (explica GPA)
- Participa en trabajos voluntarios durante la preparatoria
- Encuentra información sobre universidades que le interesen a sus hijos (visita universidades, internet, pregúntele a la escuela)
- Complete el Common App o Apply Texas para mandar una solicitud para varias universidades
- Las solicitudes cuestan pero el costo puede ser cubierto por la preparatoria u otros programas. Pregúntele a el consejero universitario en la preparatoria de sus hijos
- Questbridge
- No use ensayos viejos y editalos lo más que puedas
- Complete el FAFSA
- Meta solicitudes para becas

**Exámenes:**
Para entrar a una Universidad de cuatro años su hijo/a necesita tomar un examen estandarizado para admisión a una Universidad.
- Los dos exámenes principales para admisión son el ACT y SAT.
- Estos dos exámenes son muy similares y son creados para considerar cuanto preparado su hijo(a) está para entrar a la universidad. Los exámenes son diseñados un poco diferente.
  - El SAT= 3 partes, matemáticas, lectura, y escrito con un ensayo.
  - El ACT= 4 partes, matemáticas, inglés, lectura, y ciencia, con un ensayo que es opcional.
- Cuando tomas los exámenes?
- La mayoría de estudiantes toman el examen en el otoño o primavera del tercer año de la preparatoria, o en el otoño del último año de la preparatoria.
- Cómo se inscribe para los exámenes?
  - Vaya a [www.actstudent.org](http://www.actstudent.org) (ACT) o [www.collegeboard.com](http://www.collegeboard.com) (SAT)
  - Crea una cuenta
  - Inscribíase para la fecha y lugar donde irá para tomar el examen (normalmente es en la preparatoria de su hijo o en una preparatoria en su ciudad). En el sitio web de los exámenes tendrá que contestar unas preguntas sobre su hijo(a) y subir un foto de su hijo(a).
  - Paga por el examen.
  - Llega y toma el examen.
- Que pasa si no tengo suficiente dinero para pagar por el examen?
  - En los sitio web de los exámenes hay algunos criterios para familias de baja ingresos. Si algún criterio se aplique a su familia, son elegibles para una dispensa de pago.
  - El consejero de la universidad en la preparatorio de su hijo(a) puede ayudarte obtener una dispensa de pago.
- Cómo prepararse para los exámenes?
Será buen idea que su hijo(a) pregunte el consejero de la universidad en su escuela para secciones de práctica de los exámenes para familiarizarse con el examen antes de tomarlo. También, en el día del examen, su hijo(a) debe haber tenido un buen descanso, un desayuno con proteína, lápices #2, y una calculadora.

Ayuda Financiera
- Requiere tiempo y paciencia- no se desespere
- 3 tipos: FAFSA, becas, grants
  I. FAFSA necesita:
    a. formatos de devolución de impuestos
    b. documentos W-2 (declaración de ingresos)
    c. enviados electrónicamente (aplicación de celular gratis llamado camscanner que le permite escanear documentos sin escaneadora)
  II. una variedad de becas disponibles- les recomendamos que sus hij@ solicite a una variedad de becas; aun los de menos dinero pueden ayudar con gastos menores como libros y comida
  ****si encuentra una beca que requiere cuota no solicite*****
    a. basados en merito academic, atlético, etc.
    b. hsf son becas específicamente para latinos
    c. Quest Bridge es una beca disponible en línea en lo cual mandan estudiantes a la universidad por gratis (??????)
  III. Pell Grant es ayuda financiera dado por el estado a estudiantes de bajos recursos económicos
  IV. Texas be on study loans- pr(e)stamos del estado sin interes. Si mantiene cierto promedio el estudiante se puede absolver lo que debes.
- hay varias opciones para hacer posible que su hij@ vaya a la universidad

Hablar sobre community college
- Esta es una manera excelente para que los estudiantes suban el promedio, especialmente si no les fue tan bien la high school.
  o 60 credits associates
- Hablar sobre la verda que 50% Latinos van a community college, pero 14% siguen para las universidades de cuatro años.

Actividad: Les pedimos que hicieran su propia lista de pasos necesarios para mandar a sus hijos a la universidad. Les vamos a dar una lista de pasos de los cuales nosotros hablamos hoy. En casa y con sus hijos, vean si hay algún paso que no escribieron pero creen que es importante incluir en su lista.

Preguntas?
Despedida/Gracias por venir

ENGLISH
Myths
- Attending university will not allow my child to carry out his family responsibilities
- College is not an appropriate place for people of my ethnicity. My children do not
have leaders to look up to.
- College is not an appropriate place for people of my ethnicity. My children will feel out of place in the university.
- I cannot send my child to college because it is very expensive.

Classes
Theory: Colleges look for a solid foundation of learning in the students applying. This foundation should be made up of 5 core courses each year in high school.
1. English and/or Language arts
   a. Take this every year
2. Math
   a. At least 3 years
   b. Algebra, Geometry, Algebra 2 should be taken (needed for the SAT)
2. Science
   a. At least 3 years
   b. Helps teach you to think analytically
   c. At least one year of Biology, Chemistry, Physics
2. Social Studies
   a. At least 2 years
   b. US History (1 year), Government (½ year), World History or Geography (½ year)
2. Foreign Language
   a. Most colleges like to see at least 2 years of foreign language

Keep in mind that these are what universities across the country like to see. Texas state has its own requirements for high school graduation.

AP Classes: AP classes are special, college classes that are offered at some High Schools. These are typically more work, but if your child scores well on the end of year test, he/she will receive college credit for that class. That means that college will be cheaper/ less study for them.

For those with children in middle school/ elementary school, focus on math classes and english classes. Try to read with your child before bed as much as possible. Praise them when they put in work for school (for example when they study really hard for a test or project).

Process
Attend elementary, middle and high school
- Complete requirements for high school graduation
- Complete courses required for college/universities
- Make sure to have a good GPA
- Participate in volunteering work during high school
- Find information about colleges that interest student- visit universities, search online, ask college counselors
- Fill out common application to apply for colleges in the common app service.
- Fill out apply Texas- similar to common app- more in depth info about families, required essays- choose 2 out of 3, only for public schools
- Applications cost money- per school but the cost can be waived. Talk to college counselor.
• Questbridge
• Don’t reuse essays
• Fill out the Fafsa
• Apply for scholarships

Tests
To get into a four-year college or university you must take a standardized college admissions tests.
• The two main college admissions tests are the SAT and ACT.
• These tests are very similar and most universities will accept either test. They are designed to measure your child’s college readiness. They are different in the way they are structured.
• The SAT= 3 parts, math, reading, and writing (has an essay).
• The ACT= 4 parts, English, math, reading, and science, optional essay.
When do you take the tests?
• Most students take the SAT/ACT in the fall or spring of their junior year. Depending on their score, they may take it again during the fall of senior year before sending their scores to colleges.
How do you sign up for the tests?
• Go to www.actstudent.org (ACT) or www.collegeboard.com (SAT)
• Create an account
• Register for the date and place you want to take the test- usually your highschool or a nearby highschool or college. You will be asked some questions and also to upload a picture of your child.
• Pay for the test.
• Show up on the date of the test.
• What if you can’t pay for the tests?
  • On the www.actstudent.org and www.collegeboard.com websites they have certain criteria that if met, make you eligible for a fee waiver.
  • For example: if you child qualifies for free lunch, if your family receives any public assistance, if you are involved in any federal programs that help low income families, you qualify for a fee waiver.
  • To get a fee waiver talk to your child’s college counselor or principal and they will help you to get one.
How to prepare for these tests?
• To prepare for the tests it would be a good idea for your child to ask his/her counselor for practice sections to become familiar with the type of questions on the tests.
• On the day of the test your child will need to be well-rested, have eaten a good breakfast, and take #2 pencils and a calculator to the test.

Financial Aid
• Requires study and patience
• 3 types: FAFSA, scholarships, grants
  I. FAFSA needs tax return forms and W-2 forms (free scanning app)
  II. variety of scholarships (skills, demographic, large and small sums)
  III. Pell Grant (low income state aid)
IV. Quest Bridge (online and matches students with school- full ride)

V. Texas be on study loan-

Talk about the importance of community college
- This is fantastic opportunity for students to raise their GPA, especially if they did not perform as well during high school.
  o 60 credits associates
- Talk about the truth that only 50% of Latinos go to a 4-year institution, but only 14% have the ability to transfer.

Q&A