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

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

Richard R. Valencia

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

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

Chicano School Failure

Although the notion of 'school failure' with respect to racial/ethnic minority students has been used and discussed by other scholars (e.g., Boykin, 1983; Erikson, 1987; Ginsburg, 1986), the term itself is in need of further theoretical development and refinement. Its heuristic value and potential in theory generation about the many schooling problems experienced by Chicano students appear to be vast. How might one conceptualize school failure, a construct, among Chicano students? I offer this broad, working definition: school failure among Chicano students refers to their persistently, pervasively, and disproportionately, low
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The modifying term, 'disproportionately', is an important qualifier in that Chicano school failure, which contains its explicit meaning of low achievement, also has a second denotation — comparative performance. In the context of examining the school achievement of Chicano students, their academic performance is compared to White students. Here, the common procedure is to use the aggregated performance (e.g., reading achievement as measured on a standardized test) of White grade-level peers as a referent and then to compare the aggregated performance of Chicano students to this standard. When this is done, the common result is one of asymmetry. That is, when the Chicano distribution of achievement test scores, represented as interval data, is juxtaposed to the curve of the White grouped scores, the Chicano distribution is typically skewed positively. Simply put, there is a disproportionately greater percentage of Chicano students — compared to their White peers — reading below the middle of the distribution. Conversely, compared to White students, there is a disproportionately lower percentage of Chicano students reading above the middle of the distribution.

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

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

Low Academic Achievement

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

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

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

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

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

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

Chicano School Failure and Success

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

Language/Cultural Exclusion

The fact that Chicano students' language and culture are excluded from the school curriculum — which by the way is a longstanding historical practice — was brought to national limelight in the early 1970s by a report in the Mexican American Education Study (US Commission on Civil Rights, 1972b). It was reported that less than 7 per cent of the schools in the Southwestern US offered bilingual education. Furthermore, only 4 per cent and 7 per cent of the elementary and secondary schools, respectively, in the Southwest offered Chicano history. Periodic reports since then have confirmed the existence of language and cultural exclusion. For example, Olsen (1988) reported there are over 600,000 limited-English proficient (LEP) students in California (about three-fourths of these are Latinos). Due in large part to the serious shortage of bilingual teachers (see Valencia and Aburto, this volume), less than 25 per cent of these LEP students are being served in bilingual classes staffed by qualified bilingual teachers. The other 75 per cent of LEP students are provided little, if any, instruction in their first language. Given the schooling benefits of having bilingual education for Chicano students (see García, chapter 4, and Merino, chapter 5, this volume) as well as multicultural education (e.g., see Gonzales, 1974), the inclusion of language/cultural components in instruction can certainly help turn the tide against school failure.

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

Academic Achievement

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

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

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

(p. 38)

School Holding Power (Retention)

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

The costs to the individual Chicano who leaves school before graduation go beyond the fact that there is now an abrupt severance to his/her intellectual growth. The stakes are very high for the Chicano dropout and for society. One researcher has estimated that in the Los Angeles Unified School District — a high density Chicano district — the loss in adjusted lifetime earnings for a male dropout is $187,000, in general; for a female dropout, the loss is about $122,000 (Catterall, 1985). Furthermore, in addition to the foregone income associated with dropping out, there are foregone tax receipts as well as the social costs to local governments of providing funding for welfare, health, and related services (Rumberger, this volume). In short, the dropout problem for Chicanos is extremely costly along 'quality of life' and social lines. Suffice it to say that there is widespread interest and activity in trying to cope with and solve the Chicano dropout problem (see Rumberger, this volume, for an overview of policies and programs).
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On a final note about the dropout issue is the term itself. Orr (1987) comments in her book, *Keeping Students in School*:

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

School Financing

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

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

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

Shortly prior to the publication of the US Commission on Civil Rights (1972c) report on financial inequities in Texas, Demetrio Rodriguez and six other parents of the San Antonio Independent School District sued the district in 1968 charging that the Texas school finance system violated the US Constitution. The US Supreme Court in a 9-0 decision declared on October 2, 1989 the Texas public school system of financing to be unconstitutional (Graves, 1989a).

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

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

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

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

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

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

College Enrollment

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

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

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

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

Stress

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

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

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

Special Education

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

Chicano Teaching Force

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

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

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

The Changing Demography

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

The 1980s: Rise of the Latino Population

In 1980, the national Latino population was 14.5 million and accounted for 6.4 per cent of the total US population of 228 million people (Miranda and Quiroz, 1989; Swibold, 1989). During the 1980s Latinos increased nationally by 5.6 per cent, and by decade's end they numbered 20.1 million people — the highest estimate ever. From 1980 to late 1989, the total US population increased about 8.3 per cent (from 228 to 248 million). In contrast, the Latino population increased a huge 38.6 per cent (14.5 to 20.1 million) — growing during the 1980s at a rate over four times faster than the rest of the US population.

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

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

Some population demographers have looked far into the future (US Bureau of the Census, 1986). In about seventy years from now, racial/ethnic shifts will occur nationally that will become highly significant markers in the history of the United States. In the year 2060, it is projected that the Latino population will number 54.2 million people and will surpass the Black population (projected to
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Table 1.1: Projections of California's school-age population by racial/ethnic background

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

Source: Adapted from Population Reference Bureau (1985; years 1986, 2000, 2030) and Watson (1988; year 1971)

Note: na, not available

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>millions of total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>millions of total</th>
<th>% of total</th>
<th>millions of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>34.70</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>28.96</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino</td>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-9.6</td>
<td>-5.74</td>
<td>+5.3</td>
<td>+2.06</td>
<td>+1.6</td>
<td>+0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Orfield (1988).

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

2 At the start of the 1988–89 school year, White students dipped under 50 per cent of the total K-12 public school enrollment — the first time since the beginning of public education in California about 140 years ago. The most obvious implication to be made from this significant transformation is that at the present time no single racial/ethnic group constitutes a numerically majority population (Watson).

3 In about forty years from now — in the year 2030 — we will likely see in California's public elementary and secondary schools a virtual reversal of what the school-age population resembled in 1971. That is, White students will comprise 1 in 3 students, and combined students of racial/ethnic 'minority' background will account for nearly 7 in 10 students (Population Reference Bureau, 1985).

4 In 2030, Chicano and other Latino students in the public schools of California will form the single largest group, comprising about 44 per cent of the total K-12 enrollment (Population Reference Bureau).

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

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

Eighteen years [1968–69] ago there were more than three times as many Blacks as Hispanics in the school population; now the Hispanic enrollment is approaching two-thirds of the Black numbers. There was one...
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Projections of racial/ethnic youth populations: 1982-2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>% of total</td>
<td>% of total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>millions of</td>
<td>millions of</td>
<td>millions of</td>
<td>millions of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>total</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>-18.5</td>
<td>+16.0</td>
<td>+12.7</td>
<td>+1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-6.9</td>
<td>+2.6</td>
<td>+1.3</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Hispanic student for every seventeen White students eighteen years ago; in 1980-87 there was one for every seven Whites. (p. 6)

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

While the Chicano and other Latino public school enrollment is growing nationally, actually only a small number of states are the ones that are accounting for the growth. Orfield (1988) notes that eight states (which have about 40 per cent of the nation’s total population) enrolled a total of 3.57 million Latino students in 1986. These eight states represent 88 per cent of the total Latino public school enrollment. By far, California (with 1.38 million Latino students) and Texas (with 1.19 million Latino students) enroll the vast majority (i.e., nearly 7 in every 10 Latino students, overwhelmingly of Mexican origin) of the total 3.57 million Chicano and other Latino students in the eight identified states. In short, California and Texas — which have long educated most Chicano students — accounted for (and will continue to account for) the great majority of enrollment increases of Chicano students in the country.

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

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

Pallas et al. (1988) observed that the overall increase indicates two different factors. First, as seen in Table 1.3, the number of White youngsters is actually expected to decline 13 per cent, or 6 million over this period. Second, the number of Chicano and other Latino children, on the other hand, will more than triple — increasing from 6 million in 1982 (a time which they comprised 9 per cent of the national youth population) to 19 million in 2020 (when they will make up 25 per cent of the country’s youth population). In short, the anticipated increase in the Latino youth population of nearly 13 million more than offsets the projected decline of 6 million in the White youth population. In fact, the remarkable increase in the Chicano and Latino youth population will account ... for most of the overall youth population growth [italics added] expected between 1982 and 2020' (Pallas et al., p. 22).

In summary, in the decades ahead our nation will witness a profound transformation of the youth population. As Pallas et al. (1988) comment, almost 18 million Latino school-age children are in the age range of 5 to 17 years of age in 1982. As the Latino school-age population increases from 18.6 million in 1982 to 25.3 million in 2020, the Latino youth population will account for most of the overall youth population growth.

The 1980s: ‘Decade of the Hispanic?’

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

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

1. Latinos benefited least from the economic recovery in that their incomes stagnated and high rates of poverty continued. For example, in 1979, 21.8 per cent of Latinos were poor; in 1988, the rate was 26.8 per cent.
2. Latinos had higher rates of children living in poverty in 1988 (37.9 per cent) compared to 1979 (28.0 per cent).
3. There was no economic improvement for Latina-maintained households.
4. Latino married-couple families experienced deepened hardships (e.g., poverty rates increased from 13.1 per cent in 1979 to 16.1 per cent in 1988).
5. There was a widening income disparity. For example, Latinos in 1988 were 14 per cent more likely to make under $10,000 a year than they were in 1979.

6. Although in some areas there were slight educational gains, Latinos overall continued to feel the full impact of the educational crisis. For example, in 1978, 12.5 per cent of Latino families with householders who completed four years of high school lived in poverty. In 1988, the figure climbed to 16 per cent. In short, Latinos continue to experience unequal benefits from education.

7. Although Latinas (year-round, full-time workers) showed a slight increase in annual earnings from 1979 ($13,795) to 1988 ($14,845), male Latino workers dropped in earnings from $20,626 to $17,851 from 1979 to 1988, respectively.

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

The 1990s: A Time for Informed Action

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

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

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

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

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

In light of our discussion thus far on the plight of Chicano students, it would be most fitting to conclude by presenting a few lines from Henry Trueba's recent and fine book, Raising Silent Voices: Educating the Linguistic Minorities for the 21st
century. In his concluding chapter, Trueba (1989) offers these sober-minded but encouraging words:

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

Notes

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

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

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

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

5 The problems attached to the term underachievement (as well as overachievement) are so grave that they have led Cronbach, a highly noted tests and measurement expert, to conclude ‘the terminology of over- and underachievement should be abandoned’ (1984, p 253).

6 In 1989 there were 1,060 school districts in Texas. Some districts spent as much as $119,000 per student, and others spent as little as $2,800 (Graves, 1989b). Poor school districts, defined as those with property tax wealth below the state average) abound in Texas. That is, 265 (81 per cent) of Texas’ 254 counties contain poor school districts (Phillips, 1989). A disproportionately higher number of poor school districts, however, are located in South Texas, the region where Chicanos are mostly concentrated.

7 Of the total 39 1 million Latinos in the US in 1989, the largest segment by far is the Mexican-origin population (12.6 million, 62.7 per cent of the total). In descending order, the other Latino populations are: Central and South American (2.5 million, 12.4 per cent), Puerto Rican (2.3 million, 11.4 per cent), Cuban (1.07 million, 5.3 per cent), and Spanish or other Latino (1.63 million, 8.1 per cent) (Miranda and Quiroz, 1989; Vickers, 1989).

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

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

9 The eight states with their respective enrollments (in millions) in descending order are: California (1.38), Texas (1.09), New York (1.39), Illinois (1.6), Arizona (1.6), Florida (1.5), New Jersey (1.3), and New Mexico (1.3) (Ofrild, 1988).
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