

Neither Colorblind nor Oppositional: Perceived Minority Status and Trajectories of Academic
Adjustment among Latinos in Elite Higher Education

Margarita Mooney

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

and

Deborah Rivas-Drake

Brown University

Draft of paper submitted to the Population Association of America Annual Meetings,

April 17-19, New Orleans, Louisiana

*** PLEASE DO NOT CITE WITHOUT PERMISSION ***

Abstract

As more Latinos experience upward social mobility, scholars increasingly are challenging oppositional cultural assumptions to develop new theoretical frameworks and empirical models that explain how perceived minority status barriers may influence Latinos' academic achievement. The present study builds on previous work that identified three distinct minority status orientations among Latino college students entering elite colleges—which we call assimilation, accommodation and resistance. Using data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Freshmen, we now examine how these psychosocial orientations influence Latino students' academic and social adjustment from their freshmen to junior years of college. We find that accommodators—who felt ethnically distinctive from Whites but maintained optimism toward the U.S. opportunity structure—performed significantly better in their academic work over the course of their four years than assimilators—who felt the least ethnically distinct from Whites. Interestingly, the group of Latino students who most strongly questioned the openness of the opportunity structure to ethnic minorities—resisters—reported similar grades and time spent studying to both accommodators and assimilators. Although resisters did not look different from assimilators or accommodators in their academic trajectories, they did become significantly more involved in extracurricular activities between sophomore and junior years. Our findings suggest that the three distinct psychological orientations toward minority status all provide equally effective paths toward the academic integration of Latino students on primarily White campuses. Moreover, the group with the strongest perceptions of racial/ethnic inequality did not disengage from their environment but rather became increasingly involved in extra-curriculars during their college career.

Keywords: Latinos, academic achievement, academic engagement, minority status

Introduction

With the ever-growing presence of Latinos in the American landscape, there has been an increasing interest in the diversity of their academic experiences and outcomes. Much extant research has focused on mean-level differences in attitudes and outcomes among groups of Latino children and adolescents of different generations (i.e., children of immigrants versus native families) or different national origins (e.g., Mexican versus others). Comparatively little research has focused on how young, upwardly mobile Latinos perceive the openness of the opportunity structure for ethnic and racial minorities, and how this perceived minority status influences their academic achievement. During the developmental period known as emerging adulthood, individuals make decisions that will ultimately shape the kinds of social and economic contributions they will be able to make to society as adults (Arnett, 2000).

One such decision that greatly influences individuals' later contribution to society is college attendance and graduation. Consider that as of 2005, just 12% of Latinos aged 25 or older had attained a Bachelor's degree (NCES, 2006); thus, many members of this extremely young and growing ethnic group do not have a four-year college education that would allow them to then attain the graduate and professional degrees which provide necessary credentials for the most financially rewarded and highest status careers in adulthood (e.g., medicine, law; Fry, 2004; Quintana, Vogel, & Ybarra, 1991). Some of the Latinos most likely to go on to earn advanced degrees and/or start high-status careers are those who attend the most selective colleges in the United States. Although Latinos in the top tier of American higher education are clearly poised to garner greater wealth and status from their occupations than their ethnic peers with lower levels of educational attainment, even Latino students in elite colleges perform less

well academically relative to their White counterparts (Massey et al., 2003). What factors hinder or help Latinos as they move through higher education remains a largely unanswered question.

Although Latinos generally have dual experiences stemming from their immigrant backgrounds and minority status, the effects of perceived minority status on how they respond to a restricted opportunity structure has been under-explored. Research from the fields of psychology, education, and sociology has primarily focused on describing immigrant Latinos' resilience or optimism in the face of an ethnically stratified opportunity structure (e.g., Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 1995; Kao & Tienda, 1995). Nevertheless, much research indicates that immigrant youth develop numerous and distinct pathways to navigate academic choices and goals, which produce varying outcomes (e.g., Alba & Nee, 2003; Fuligni & Witkow, 2004; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Tseng, 2006). Moreover, not only do immigrant youth of different generations or from different national origin groups may approach adaptation differently, individuals within generational or national origin groups may perceive different levels of opportunity for ethnic minorities (e.g., beliefs about the utility of education for upward mobility; Berry et al., 2006; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). Yet, little research examines whether and how individual differences in perceived minority status barriers to opportunity inform Latinos' academic engagement and performance over time. The notably few previous empirical examinations of perceived barriers among Latinos have focused on younger adolescents, for whom these perceptions were linked to less positive academic outcomes (e.g., Matute-Bianchi, 1986; Taylor & Graham, 2007). It is unclear how such perceptions would function among Latinos who have gained entry into elite higher education.

As a first step towards understanding how the minority status orientations of high-achieving Latinos influence their college experiences, in previous work with the present sample

(Rivas-Drake & Mooney, 2008), we identified three profiles that are consistent with three psychosocial orientations often discussed in immigrant adaptation literature, which we called: assimilation, accommodation, and resistance. Assimilators felt the least ethnically distinctive from Whites, while resisters most strongly questioned the openness of the opportunity structure to ethnic minorities. By comparison, accommodators endorsed a mixed set of beliefs; they felt ethnically distinctive from Whites but maintained optimism toward the opportunity structure of the U.S. The purpose of the present study was to examine whether membership in these three profiles upon the transition to college was differentially associated with changes in individuals' academic performance and engagement as well as their extracurricular engagement (e.g., time spent involved in campus organizations, leadership, volunteerism) over the course of their college years.

Guiding Frameworks

Our investigation was guided by several models that are consistent with a cultural-ecological perspective of development. First, we situated our research in the context of García Coll and colleagues' (1996) integrative model of development among ethnic and racial minorities and Spencer's Phenomenological Variant of Ecological Systems Theory (PVEST; Spencer, Dupree & Hartmann, 1997). These models emphasize the need to separately examine the role of social positions and social stratification processes, especially those which originate from ethnic and racial discrimination at the macro-system level (e.g., job ceilings), in order to explain divergent pathways of development among individuals. Furthermore, the models acknowledge that individuals may come from a similar place in the social stratification system, but their subjective views of their position within these social hierarchies (e.g., perceptions of opportunity and social inequality) may be different. Thus, perceived minority status may be

differentially associated with developmental trajectories among individuals. In addition, we drew insights from Berry's (2001) framework for understanding the psychology of acculturation among immigrant youth. Specifically, Berry's model suggests that the ways in which individuals acculturate to a host society is determined in large part by their ingroup and outgroup experiences, and it pays special attention to the extent to which individuals feel excluded from the mainstream or larger society.

Perceived Minority Status and Academic Adjustment

Understanding the role of perceived minority status in the academic experiences of Latino high achievers may yield important information about how children of immigrant families may embark upon divergent life trajectories during the transition to adulthood. Theory and research suggests that there are multiple ways¹ in which children from immigrant families psychologically negotiate perceived barriers to opportunity as well as feelings of social distance from the mainstream (Berry, 2001; Berry et al., 2006; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). One pattern reflects an *assimilation* orientation, in which youth intentionally or unintentionally forsake their ethnic distinctiveness in favor of beliefs, attitudes, and behaviors that are more consistent with those of the “mainstream,” and thus are presumed to fare well in academic situations (Berry, 2001; Berry et al., 2006; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). Berry and colleagues' (2006) comparative study of adolescents from immigrant families in 13 countries identified a group whose attitudes and beliefs were oriented toward what they called a national identity rather than an ethnic

¹ For example, Berry speaks of four types—three adaptive and one maladaptive—of acculturation strategies. Those who evince the poorest academic adjustment are found in the fourth and least common pattern, *marginalization*. Marginalized young people feel distinct not only from larger society, but also from their ethnic group; such individuals are the most alienated from mainstream institutions (and especially elite institutions of higher education) and demonstrate what has been called “downward assimilation” (Berry, 2001; Berry et al., 2006; Portes and Rumbaut, 2001). Given the nature of the NLSF study, it is not surprising that this pattern was not identified among the Latino students in the sample, a group of individuals that have navigated and are engaged with mainstream institutions; thus, it will not be discussed further.

identity. In a recent study using the Latino sample of the National Longitudinal Survey of Freshmen, we (Rivas-Drake & Mooney, 2008) also identified an assimilation profile, which comprised students who believed that educated minorities would get ahead and who perceived neither individual nor societal barriers to upward mobility.

A second pattern is one of *accommodation*, in which youth retain beliefs and practices that may mark them as ethnically distinct from Whites, but which do not conflict with mainstream sensibilities (Berry, 2001; Berry et al., 2006; Gibson, 1988, 2005; Kao & Tienda, 1995; LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 1995). This type of adaptation is frequently used to explain the “immigrant optimism” phenomenon, whereby children from immigrant families fare better than their native counterparts despite the disadvantages they face. Berry and colleagues’ (2006) research, for example, identified an accommodation profile (what they called “integration”) that demonstrated the best psychological and academic adjustment of the youth in the sample. In our earlier work, we identified a cluster of students who strongly endorsed the mainstream achievement ideology that emphasizes individual effort while simultaneously reporting awareness of discrimination. In other words, this group of students believed that individual effort and qualifications could overcome discrimination (Rivas-Drake & Mooney, 2008). In accommodating to the existing social order, some would argue that they justified the logic by which it works (Jost & Banaji, 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999).

A third pattern, *resistance*, entails a strong sense of ethnic distinctiveness (Berry, 2001; Berry et al., 2006; Lee, 1996; Portes & Rumbaut, 2001). For example, Berry and colleagues (2006) classified a group of youth who were oriented more towards an ethnic minority than a national identity. Similarly, we identified a profile of Latino students who were more skeptical

than their co-ethnic peers about equality of opportunity for educated minorities, who strongly believed that ethnic minorities must contend with discrimination in the workforce, and who reported the greatest level of social distance from Whites. In previous cross-sectional research, youth with this orientation have fared less well in school than accommodators (Berry et al. 2006; Rivas-Drake & Mooney, 2008).

Oppositional Culture and College Integration

The notion of resistance is often associated with oppositional culture theory, which posits that perceptions of blocked opportunity lead minority youth to disengage from academic work (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986). Oppositional culture theory has received much opposition, so to speak, in recent years. Psychologists, sociologists, and education researchers alike (Bernal, Saenz, & Knight, 2001; Carter, 2005; Chavous et al., 2003; Lee, 1996; O'Connor, 1997; Tyson, Darity, & Castellino, 2005) have critiqued oppositional culture theory for associating all forms of strong minority identity with under-achievement. If oppositional culture theory were applicable to the case of Latinos in the NLSF study, for example, it would be illogical to find, as we did, that such high-achieving students critique the very pathway through which they have found success. We use the term *resistance*, then, simply to indicate that high-achieving individuals may critique the dominant ideology of individual effort to overcome stratification. Even if individuals have moved up due to individual effort, they can simultaneously critique ethnically stratified systems for blocking the upward mobility of others from backgrounds similar to theirs.

The present line of research thus contributes to re-framing of the relationship between minority identity and academic achievement to move beyond oppositional culture theory. For example, several scholars have demonstrated how Latino and Black students can successfully use a strong minority identity to support achievement (e.g., Altschul, Oyserman, & Bybee, 2006;

Arellano & Padilla, 1996; Chavous et al., 2003; Gurin & Epps, 1975; O'Connor, 1997).

Furthermore, the most successful students Carter (2005) identified—whom she calls cultural straddlers—knew how to “code-switch” or utilize multiple sources of cultural knowledge to gain the trust of their superiors in mainstream (i.e. White-dominated) educational institutions. At the same time, these cultural straddlers succeeded in “keepin’ it real”—or fitting in—with their peers who adopted distinct cultural identities or achievement orientations. Thus, Carter (2005) aptly summarizes one of the major critiques of oppositional culture theory by asserting that “achievement need not be based on an illusionary belief in equal access and the openness of the American opportunity system” (p. 30). In other words, race-consciousness, not just color-blindness, presents one possible adaptive path for Latino and Black youth.

As ethnic minority students leave their homes and enter predominantly White college campuses, they may find potentially threatening aspects in their new social and academic environment. Because ethnic and racial issues are often highly salient on predominantly White college campuses (see Chavous, 2005 and Lewis, Chesler, & Forman, 2000), resisters may be better prepared than accommodators or assimilators to find alternative ways to engage with other students and faculty by drawing on their strong in-group identity to resist threats to their self-identity and sense of belonging at college. For example, in examining Latino college students' adaptation, Hurtado and Carter (1997) found that membership in social-community organizations, religious groups, student government, and sports teams were all associated with a greater sense of belonging in college. Importantly, Hurtado and Carter (1997) also found that, among Latino students who reported hostile racial climates on campus, those who were members of ethnic minority student organizations reported a greater sense of belonging than nonmembers. In another study, the more ethnic minority students thought of themselves as ethnic group

members and felt their group membership was important to them, the more likely they were to join an ethnic minority-focused organization (Sidanius et al., 2004). Chavous (2005) found that Black students who perceived the campus racial climate to be less egalitarian were more likely to be involved in campus organizations. In sum, numerous studies have documented how ethnic minority students' involvement in "multiple communities" outside the classroom may help them negotiate ethnically-based academic and social threats in predominantly White institutions (e.g., Attinasi, 1989; Ethier & Deaux, 1994; Hurtado & Carter, 1997).

The Current Study

The central research question guiding the present study is how perceived minority status influences individual Latino students' academic and extracurricular engagement in college. Latino students of diverse social backgrounds arrive at elite colleges and universities with a set of beliefs that may be challenged or reaffirmed in their new context. Thus, we expected students in each profile—assimilation, accommodation, and resistance—to demonstrate different trajectories of academic and extracurricular engagement. First, we reasoned that assimilators—whose views suggest that minority status has little or no bearing on differential opportunity—might be less likely to pick up cues about disadvantage and thus be the least vulnerable to group stereotypes that would lead to diminished academic engagement and performance (e.g., Mendoza-Denton et al., 2002). Thus, we expected them to report steadily high academic performance over time as well as a steady level of engagement with extracurricular activities. Our previous work found that, relative to resisters, accommodators were more likely to exhibit a negative effect of on-campus prejudice on their academic achievement. In the present study, we hypothesized that accommodators would demonstrate increasingly stronger academic

engagement over time than resisters (but not assimilators). We also expected accommodators to spend similar amounts of time on extracurricular activities relative to assimilators.

With regards to members of the resistance profile, we developed competing hypotheses. On the one hand, as resisters seemed most concerned with issues of ethnic and racial inequality they may be most vulnerable to disengaging from the mainstream social system by being less engaged with academics. On the other hand, several studies (e.g., Carter, 2005; Gurin & Epps, 1975) found that race-conscious individuals indeed often maintain a steady level of engagement with their academics and further that they might find ways to create a positive experience within a context that they might perceive as threatening. Thus, relative to the other two groups, we expected resisters to report spending increasingly more time involved in campus organizations and activities that would foster non-academic connections to others.

Method

Participants

This study employs data from the Hispanic/Latino sample of Waves 1-5 of the National Longitudinal Survey of Freshmen (see Massey et al., 2003). Students were sampled at 28 highly selective colleges and universities in the United States (see Massey et al., 2003 for details of the sampling strategy as well as the list of schools and the demographic characteristics of the overall sample). Baseline data (Wave 1) were originally collected in face-to-face interviews in the Fall of 1999. Subsequent data were collected in telephone interviews during the Spring semesters of 2000 (Wave 2), 2001 (Wave 3), 2002 (Wave 4) and 2003 (Wave 5). The response rate for the entire NLSF sample was 97% in Wave 1, 95% in Wave 2, 89% in Wave 3, 84% in Wave 4, and 79% in Wave 5. Of the initial NLSF sample, 916 participants (58% female) self-identified as Hispanic or Latino when entering college. According to baseline data for Hispanics/Latinos, we

know that 68% had at least one foreign-born parent and 32% ($n = 293$) were U.S.-born children of U.S.-born parents. The sample was diverse by Latin American origin as well, with students of Mexican (26%), Puerto Rican (10%), Central American (4.6%), South American (15%), Dominican (3%), and Cuban (4.5%) backgrounds. In addition, more than one-third (37%) of the sample identified as having multiethnic or multiracial backgrounds, and most of those students said that they had one Hispanic parent and one White non-Hispanic parent. Although 31% reported that they were first-generation college students, students tended to have economically advantaged backgrounds. For example, 42% of students reported family incomes of over \$75,000 at the baseline.

The present analyses focus on the 890 participants included in the previous cluster analyses on which the profiles of perceived minority status are based. Of these students, 79% had GPA data at all waves subsequent to the baseline (Waves 2-5), 72% had complete longitudinal academic time use data (Waves 2-4), and 72% had complete longitudinal extracurricular time use data (Waves 2-4). Independent samples t-tests were conducted to examine differences in high school GPA for those who had complete data at all timepoints (Waves 2-5 for GPA and Waves 2-4 for time use) and those who did not. Students with complete data for GPA, academic time use, and extracurricular time use reported higher GPAs in high school than those with incomplete data ($t = -4.95, p < .001$, $t = -2.15, p < .05$. and $t = -1.99, p = .05$, respectively). In addition, those in the assimilation and resistance profiles were more likely to have complete GPA data than those in the accommodation profile ($\chi^2 = 7.63, p < .05$); however, examination of the standardized residual revealed that it was less than 2.0, thus accommodators were only slightly underrepresented among those with complete data. Finally, women were more likely to

have complete academic and extracurricular time use data than men ($\chi^2 = 4.45, p < .05$ and $\chi^2 = 4.53, p < .05$, respectively); here, too, the standardized residuals were less than 2.0.

Measures

Adaptation profiles. In the baseline survey (Wave 1), four perceptions and beliefs about minority status barriers were assessed: 1) educated minorities encounter equal opportunity (6 items; $\alpha = .89$), 2) individual qualifications can overcome discrimination (3 items; $\alpha = .94$), 3) individual effort can overcome discrimination (3 items; $\alpha = .91$), and 4) minorities encounter discriminatory job ceilings (3 items; $\alpha = .86$). In addition, students were asked to indicate how close they felt to Whites as an indicator of social distance from the majority group at their colleges and universities (3 items). Using standardized values of these five variables, *k*-means iterative cluster analysis to create profiles that reflected distinct profiles of adaptation. As discussed above, three profiles were identified: assimilation ($n = 228$), accommodation ($n = 282$), and resistance ($n = 380$); these were reliably replicated in two random halves of the sample (see Rivas-Drake & Mooney, 2008, in press, for additional details about the measures as well as the cluster analyses; see Table 1 for profile z-scores of all variables by profile). In the present research, membership in these profiles (i.e., based on baseline data upon the transition to college) was used as an individual-level predictor of change in academic performance and time use in multilevel growth curve analyses.

Academic adjustment. Self-reported freshman, sophomore, junior, and senior grade point averages (all on 4-point scales, where 4 = A) were used as indicators of academic performance; this information was collected at Waves 2-5. In addition, academic engagement was assessed by asking students how many hours per week they spent on academics only; this information was collected at Waves 2, 3, and 4, corresponding to freshmen through junior years. In addition to

time spent on academics, extracurricular campus engagement at college (e.g., with clubs, organizations, and volunteerism) reflects whether and how students are able to navigate the academic environment that occurs outside the classroom. These activities appear to play a particularly important role in the development of ethnic and racial minority college students, many of whom may feel isolated in predominantly White campuses (e.g., Hurtado & Carter, 1997). To assess engagement with the campus, students were asked how many hours per week they spent on extracurricular activities such as leadership, community involvement, and volunteerism. This data was also available only from freshmen to junior years. Both measures excluded time spent on recreation, such as spending time hanging out with friends, and watching television, as such activities do not generally have the same effects on academics or a sense of belonging as being in a club or studying

Covariates. Gender (female = 1), parental immigrant status (1 = either mother or father is foreign-born), whether the student's family had ever been on public assistance (public assistance = 1), family income at baseline, status as a first-generation college student (1 = neither parent had a college degree), and self-reported high school grade point average were employed as time-invariant covariates in longitudinal analyses.

Analysis Strategy

For analyses of profile differences in academic adjustment over time, a two-level model was examined that nested time within individual. We then used cluster membership at baseline as an individual-level concurrent and longitudinal predictor of GPA. These analyses are summarized by the following equations using Bryk & Raudenbush (1992) notation:

$$L1: \quad GPA = B0 + B1*(Time) + R$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{L2: } B_0 &= G_{00} + G_{01}*(\text{Accommodation}) + G_{02}*(\text{Resistance}) + G_{03}*(\text{Female}) + \\
 &G_{04}*(\text{Immigrant Family}) + G_{05}*(\text{Family Income}) + G_{07}*(\text{Public Assistance}) + \\
 &G_{06}*(\text{First-Generation College}) + G_{07}*(\text{HS GPA}) + G_{08}*(\text{Mexican}) + \\
 &G_{09}*(\text{Puerto Rican}) + G_{10}*(\text{Central American}) + G_{11}*(\text{South American}) + \\
 &G_{12}*(\text{Dominican}) + G_{13}*(\text{Cuban}) + U_0 \\
 B_1 &= G_{10} + G_{11}*(\text{Accommodation}) + G_{12}*(\text{Resistance}) + G_{13}*(\text{Female}) + \\
 &G_{14}*(\text{Immigrant Family}) + G_{15}*(\text{Family Income}) + G_{16}*(\text{First-Generation} \\
 &\text{College}) + G_{17}*(\text{HS GPA}) + G_{18}*(\text{Mexican}) + G_{19}*(\text{Puerto Rican}) + \\
 &G_{110}*(\text{Central American}) + G_{111}*(\text{South American}) + G_{112}*(\text{Dominican}) + \\
 &G_{113}*(\text{Cuban})
 \end{aligned}$$

All variables were grand mean centered except for dichotomous variables (e.g., cluster membership, background control variables), because the zeros were meaningful for interpretation. All analyses were conducted using the mixed model procedure in SPSS with the restricted maximum likelihood (REML) solution. Because we were interested in initial profile differences in academic adjustment (i.e., first year of college), time was centered such that Wave 2 = 0. It should be noted as well that a quadratic term was initially included in the GPA and academic time use models, but it was not significant as a fixed effect and furthermore, did not improve the fit of the unconditional models according to the Akaike Information Criterion for each outcome (AIC_{GPA} increase = 8.29 and $AIC_{\text{Academic Time}}$ increase = 4.00). The quadratic effect in the unconditional extracurricular time use model was retained in subsequent analyses because it was significant, as will be discussed below.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Means and standard deviations of academic performance, time spent on academic activities, and time spent on extracurricular engagement at each wave are summarized in Table 1 overall and by profile. An Analysis of Variance revealed that there were profile differences in GPA as sophomores (i.e., time 3; $F = 3.36$; $p < .05$); in posthoc Tukey tests, assimilators were found to report higher grades on average than resisters. Otherwise, there were no significant differences in GPA or engagement outcomes between profiles within each wave.

Primary Analyses

Academic performance. Our discussion of the primary results begins with the unconditional model for academic performance trajectories. Students began with an average GPA of 3.10 ($se = .02$, $p < .001$) in the spring of freshman year, and their grades increased, on average, by .09 ($se = .01$, $p < .001$) every additional academic year. Adding the hypothesized predictors substantially improved the fit of the model (AIC decrease = 56.53). In the hypothesized model, freshman GPA was positively associated with being female, family income, and with high school GPA (see Table 2). In addition, being a first-generation college student was associated with having a lower freshman GPA. Students' minority status profile at Time 1 was not significantly associated with freshman GPA. Adjusting for the associations of background variables on the changes in GPA, however, the longitudinal components of the model show that students' type of minority status profile predicted changes in GPA over time. Specifically, the slope representing the increase in GPA for students in the accommodation profile was significantly steeper than that for students in the assimilation profile (the comparison group). However, the coefficient representing the linear change in GPA for students in the resistance

profile was not significantly different from that of the assimilation profile. In additional analyses alternating the comparison group (not shown), the slopes for each profile were found to significantly differ from zero, and the slopes for accommodation and resistance were not found to differ significantly from each other.

Academic time use. The unconditional model for hours spent on academic engagement revealed that in the spring of freshman year, students spent an average of approximately 47 hours per week engaged in academic activities and their time spent on such activities significantly decreased by approximately 3.5 hours ($se = .41, p < .001$) between freshman and junior years. Adding the hypothesized predictors substantially improved the fit of the model (AIC decrease = 139.33). In the hypothesized model, there were no significant differences in academic engagement in freshman year by profile membership. Indeed, the only significant predictors of initial time spent on academics were high school GPA and having Dominican heritage, both in the positive direction. In addition, students' adaptation profile was not differentially associated with the linear decrease of time spent on academic activities between freshman and junior years. That is, the linear slope for students in each profile significantly differed from zero, however, the profiles' slopes did not significantly differ from each other.

Extracurricular time use. For time spent on extracurricular activities, the unconditional model shows that, on average, students spent 11.45 hours per week engaged in leadership, campus organizations, and volunteerism during the spring of their freshman year. In addition, the linear and quadratic slopes were significant, suggesting that for some students, there was a gradual increase ($G = -4.08, se = .80, p < .001$) over their first three years in college. The significant quadratic slope indicates that for others, there was an accelerated increase ($G = 1.78, se = .39, p < .001$) in the amount of time they spent on extracurricular activities between

sophomore and junior years. The addition of hypothesized predictor and control variables substantially improved the fit of the model (AIC decrease = 134.93). In the hypothesized model, there was a trend that suggests that as freshmen, students in the accommodation profile spent less time engaged in extracurricular activities than those in the assimilation and resistance profiles. Between freshman and junior years, students in the assimilation and accommodation profiles reported a similar and steady decrease in extracurricular time use. In contrast, there was a different pattern of extracurricular time use among students in the resistance profile. Initially, there was a trend for students in the resistance profile to report a slightly steeper decrease than those in the assimilation profile in time spent involved in extracurricular activities between freshman and sophomore years; however, the significant quadratic effect for this group suggests that they reported a sharp increase in such involvement between sophomore and junior years.

Discussion

Increasingly, researchers, educators, and policymakers are turning their attention to the social and academic integration of young Latinos in the U.S.—most of whom are from immigrant families. The present study took a developmental approach to understanding how Latino students at elite colleges and universities in the United States adapt during college. Taking advantage of the longitudinal structure of NLSF data, we developed hypotheses about the transition to college among Latino students that emphasized that students may undergo a period of adjustment and perhaps a re-evaluation of one's beliefs and perceptions. First, we argued that not all Latino students enter elite, predominantly White colleges with the same minority status orientation, but that they adopt one of three profiles—assimilation, accommodation and resistance. Importantly, we demonstrated that these orientations differ not only across

generations and national origin groups, but across individuals as they make the transition from high school to college.

Once at college, we expected these orientations to influence the academic and social trajectories of group members in different ways. In discussing our results, we call attention first to differences between assimilators and non-assimilators. The assimilation group—those least likely to report systemic ethnic discrimination—had trajectories of time spent studying and time spent on extra-curriculars that followed a linear slope. These trajectories appear consistent with much qualitative and historical research that refers to “straight-line” assimilation whereby immigrants and children of immigrants gradually become more integrated into the mainstream. In grades earned, assimilators did have somewhat different trajectories from accommodators—those who think minorities need to try harder to overcome discrimination. Accommodators’ grades increased somewhat more rapidly than assimilators over time. Although this difference is not large enough in substantive terms to claim that assimilators are “underachieving,” it does appear that accommodators hold a slight edge in academic performance relative to the assimilators. It could be that accommodators are more strategic at navigating the structures of academic support, such as seeking help from professors and librarians or studying with peers, thus gaining a slight edge on grades earned—this is a question that merits further investigation. Overall, accommodators’ academic trajectory is consistent with the conception of them as optimistic and resilient in the face of potential difficulties.

We also theorized that non-assimilationist students (i.e., accommodators and resisters) can negotiate perceived minority status in different ways. Much recent research takes umbrage at the argument emanating from oppositional culture theory that high-achieving minorities must become “raceless” or “colorblind” to succeed. Of our three profiles, both accommodators and

resisters perceive racial inequality whereas only the assimilators held a colorblind orientation.

We compared how the two race-conscious groups—accommodators and resisters—fared in their academic achievement, time spent studying and extra-curricular activities. Importantly, accommodators and resisters did not differ from each other in terms of grades earned or time spent studying. Thus, in academic terms, members of these two profiles exhibited similar trajectories, both of which we consider to be adaptive or successful. The primary difference between accommodators and resisters emerges when looking at academically relevant activities outside the classroom, specifically, time spent volunteering and participating in organized campus activities. Although all three groups spent less time on extra-curriculars from their freshmen to sophomore years, only the resisters recuperated their time spent on extra-curriculars from sophomore to junior years. Consistent with Hurtado and Carter (1997), we believe this means that the most race-conscious Latino students do not disengage from their campus environment but rather seek out opportunities to build social networks. Although we lack detailed information about whether or not this time was spent with other Latinos, it is likely the case that at least some of this involvement would take place in ethnic activities or organizations.

In exploring the achievement of Latino students, the first two groups—assimilators and accommodators—are often presumed to be the most prevalent or the best adapted. Resisters, if oppositional culture theory were applicable, would not have gained entry into the kinds of universities included in the present study. Thus, it may seem counter-intuitive to refer to high-achieving Latinos at elite colleges as “resisters.” Nonetheless, we use this term call attention to how some Latinos resist pressure from the mainstream to drop their ethnic minority affiliations or orientations. The high-achieving resisters in the NLSF sample are not likely struggling against peer pressure not to perform well academically, and indeed they do perform well academically.

However, after gaining entry to predominantly White institutions where the ideology of meritocracy prevails, they are quite likely to encounter tensions with, perhaps even pressure from, non-minority students—and, as we have seen, some Latinos—to adopt a colorblind or "raceless" identity. Our results suggest that they may resist following a pre-determined, uniform path of integration at college and instead choose to use their time to build clubs and volunteer in ways that are likely consistent with their worldviews. In fact, their orientations may compel them to find ways to manage these multiple academic and social aspects of the college environment in response to perceived future discrimination.

Limitations and Future Directions

In this study, we built on previous work that identified three distinct minority status profiles—which we call assimilation, accommodation and resistance—among Latino students in the National Longitudinal Survey of Freshmen. A particular strength of this research is that it bridges person-oriented (i.e., cluster) and longitudinal analytical approaches by examining how individual membership in these profiles predicted multiple forms of engagement over the course of their college years. Nevertheless, there are several limitations that must be considered alongside the present findings. First, the Latino students in the present study, although diverse in terms of the national origins and socioeconomic backgrounds, attend very selective colleges and universities. It would be useful and necessary to examine whether there are similar relationships of minority status profiles with academic and extracurricular engagement over time among Latinos at less selective colleges and universities. Building a body of knowledge such as this will help determine the generalizability of our study to the experiences of Latinos in higher education.

A second issue regards the fact that minority status beliefs and perceptions at the start of college may reflect different pre-college trajectories of opportunity. It will be necessary to continue examining whether and how adolescent resisters, accommodators, and assimilators in other studies differentially engage with school in ways that promote their participation in higher education. Moreover, minority status orientations are likely to change during the college years. The NLSF includes similar items at Wave 5 as those used to create the initial profiles (at Wave 1). Accordingly, it is our goal to examine change in perceived minority status profile membership using these data in future research. We also believe that multiple methods might be necessary to provide a more complete picture of why and how changes come about in students' perceived minority status over time. For example, it would be useful to have observational as well as contextual data about the nature of students' experiences around ethnicity and race in particular settings within colleges and universities. Previous ethnographic research suggests there are nuances in students' experiences around ethnicity and race that could be overlooked by relying only on self-report measures that paint broad strokes of the overall picture (e.g., Lewis, Chesler, & Forman, 2000). Such information is needed, as experiences associated with changes in students' perceived minority status might be relevant for long-term outcomes such as occupational choice, political participation, and civic or community engagement after college.

Finally, we did not examine the psychological correlates, such as stress, depression, or somatic symptoms that may accompany different minority status profiles. Stereotype threat literature, for example, would suggest that being ethnic- or race-consciousness would entail feelings of anxiety in high-performance contexts (Steele & Aronson, 1995). Related to this point, it is possible that an unexamined psychological correlate, such as having a resilient or generally optimistic (or pessimistic) outlook, might explain both ideologies and campus engagement

trajectories. However, it is important to note that such psychological correlates would also likely be associated with many of the control variables included in the present research.

Conclusion

The present findings extend the conversation about the role of minority status in the normative development of ethnic minority young people. Our results are consistent with a growing literature across several disciplines that questions some of the assumptions of oppositional culture. Such scholars have suggested that among high-achieving ethnic minority students, adopting an orientation that questions the egalitarianism of the U.S. opportunity structure may motivate them to pursue academic goals in spite of perceived systemic discrimination. Indeed, in the present study, resisters' grades increased at a similar rate to their peers for whom systemic discrimination was less salient or not at all salient. As Latinos increasingly engage mainstream routes to upward social mobility, it is essential to chronicle how they have successfully navigated ethnic experiences in order to identify diverse ways of promoting other Latinos' equitable participation in such routes.

References

- Alba, R. & Nee, V. (2003). *Rethinking the American mainstream: Assimilation and contemporary immigration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Altschul, I., Oyserman, D., & Bybee, D. (2006). Racial-ethnic identity in mid-adolescence: Content and change as predictors of academic achievement. *Child Development, 77*(5), 1155-1169.
- Arellano, A. R. & Padilla, A. M. (1996). Academic invulnerability among a select group of Latino university students. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 18*(4), 485-507.
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood. *American Psychologist, 55*(5), 469-480.
- Attinasi, L. C. (1989). Getting in: Mexican Americans' perceptions of university attendance and the implications for freshman year persistence. *Journal of Higher Education, 60*(3), 247-277.
- Bernal, M. E., Saenz, D. S., & Knight, G.P. (1991). Ethnic identity and adaptation of Mexican American youths in school settings. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 13*(2), 135-154.
- Berry, J. W. (2001). A psychology of immigration. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*(3), 615-631.
- Berry, J. W., Phinney, J. S., David, S. L., & Vedder, P. (2006). Immigrant youth: Acculturation, identity, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 55*(3), 303-332.
- Carter, P. (2005). *Keepin' it real: School success beyond Black and White*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Chavous, T. M. (2005). An intergroup contact-theory framework for evaluating racial climate on predominantly White college campuses. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 36*(3-4), 239-257.

- Chavous, T. M., Bernat, D. H., Schmeelk-Cone, K. H., Caldwell, C. H., Kohn-Wood, L., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2003). Racial identity and academic attainment among African American adolescents. *Child Development, 74*(4), 1076-1090.
- Ethier, K. A. & Deaux, K. (1994). Negotiating social identity when contexts change: Maintaining identification and responding to threat. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(2), 243-251.
- Fordham, S. & Ogbu, J. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of 'acting White.'" *Urban Review, 18*(3), 176-206.
- Fry, R. (2004). *Latino youth finishing college: The role of selective pathways*. Pew Hispanic Center Report. Retrieved April 18, 2007 from Pew Hispanic Center Web site <http://pewhispanic.org/topics/index.php?TopicID=4>.
- Fuligni, A. J. & Witkow, M. (2004). The postsecondary educational progress of youth from immigrant families. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 14*(2), 159-183.
- García Coll, C., Lamberty, G., Jenkins, R., McAdoo, H. P., Crnic, K., Wasik, B. H. et al. (1996). An integrative model for the study of developmental competencies in minority children. *Child Development, 67*(5), 1981-1914.
- Gibson, M. A. (1988). *Accommodation without assimilation: Sikh immigrants in an American high school*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Gibson, M. A. (2005). Promoting academic engagement among minority youth: Implications from John Ogbu's Shaker Heights ethnography. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 18*(5), 581-603.
- Gurin, P. & Epps, E. (1975). *Black consciousness, identity, and achievement*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Hurtado, S. & Carter, D. F. (1997). Effects of college transition and perceptions of campus racial climate on Latino college students' sense of belonging. *Sociology of Education*, 70(4), 324-345.
- Jost, J. T. & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology. Special Issue: Stereotypes: Structure, function and process*, 33(1), 1-27.
- Kao, G. & Tienda, M. (1995). Optimism and achievement: The educational performance of immigrant youth. *Social Science Quarterly*, 76(1), 1-19.
- LaFrombroise, T., Coleman, H. L. K., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 395-412.
- Lee, S. J. (1996). *Unraveling the model minority stereotype: Listening to Asian American youth*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Lewis, A., Chesler, M., & Forman, T. (2000). The impact of "colorblind" ideologies on students of color: Intergroup relations at a predominantly White university. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), 74-91.
- Massey, D., Charles, C. Z., Lundy, G. F., & Fischer, M. J. (2003). *The source of the river: The social origins of freshmen at America's selective colleges and universities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Matute-Bianchi, M. E. (1986). Ethnic identities and patterns of school success and failure among Mexican-descent and Japanese-American students in a California high school: An Ethnographic Analysis. *American Journal of Education*, 95(1), 233-255.
- Mendoza-Denton, R., Downey, G., Purdie, V. J., Davis, A., & Pietrzak, J. (2002). Sensitivity to

- status-based rejection: Implications for African Americans students' college experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(4), 896-918.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). *The condition of education 2006*. Retrieved April 18, 2007 from National Center for Education Statistics Web site <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/coe/2006/section3/indicator26.asp>
- O'Connor, C. (1997). Dispositions toward (collective) struggle and educational resilience in the inner city: A case analysis of six African-American high school students. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34(4), 593-629.
- Portes, A. & Rumbaut. R. G. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Quintana, S. M., Vogel, V. C., & Ybarra, V. C. (1991). Meta-analysis of Latino students' adjustment in higher education. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 13(2), 155-168.
- Deborah Rivas-Drake and Margarita Mooney. 2008. "Profiles of Latino adaptation at elite colleges and universities." *American Journal of Community Psychology*, Forthcoming.
- Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Sidanius, J., Van Laar, C., Levin, S., & Sinclair, S. (2004). Ethnic enclaves and the dynamics of social identity on the college campus: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(1), 96-110.
- Spencer, M. B., Dupree, D., & Hartmann, T. (1997). A Phenomenological Variant of Ecological Systems Theory (PVEST): A self-organization perspective in context. *Development and Psychopathology*, 9(4), 817-833.
- Suárez-Orozco, C. & Suárez-Orozco, M. (1995). *Transformations: Immigration, family life, and*

achievement motivation among Latino adolescents. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Taylor, A. & Graham, S. (2007). An examination of the relationship between achievement values and perceptions of barriers among low-SES African American and Latino students.

Journal of Educational Psychology, 99(1), 52-64.

Tseng, V. (2006). Unpacking immigration in youths' academic and occupational pathways. *Child Development, 77*(5), 1434-1445.

Tyson, K., Darity, W., & Castellino, D. R. (2005). It's not a "Black thing": Understanding the burden of acting White and other dilemmas of high achievement. *American Sociological Review, 70*(4), 582-605.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations for Outcome Variables

	Freshman Year M(SD)	Sophomore Year M(SD)	Junior Year M(SD)	Senior Year M(SD)
GPA				
Overall	3.10 (.51)	3.18 (.49)	3.32 (.45)	3.40 (.46)
Assimilators	3.13 (.52)	3.24 (.50) _a	3.35 (.46)	3.35 (.52)
Accommodators	3.10 (.51)	3.21 (.45)	3.33 (.45)	3.43 (.45)
Resisters	3.08 (.50)	3.13 (.50) _a	3.30 (.45)	3.41 (.42)
Hours Spent on Academic Activities				
Overall	47.48 (19.63)	42.74 (18.14)	40.56 (17.85)	--
Assimilators	46.62 (19.66)	42.18 (19.18)	38.62 (17.85)	--
Accommodators	47.53 (18.68)	41.05 (16.47)	40.45 (17.21)	--
Resisters	47.97 (20.32)	44.31 (18.59)	41.86 (18.27)	--
Hours Spent on Extracurricular Activities				
Overall	11.47 (11.07)	9.11 (10.36)	10.43 (11.05)	--
Assimilators	12.16 (11.41)	9.88 (9.74)	9.22 (9.63)	--
Accommodators	10.56 (10.18)	9.37 (12.27)	10.58 (12.16)	--
Resisters	11.73 (11.49)	8.47 (9.12)	11.07 (10.98)	--

Note. Outcome means that share subscripts within columns denote significant within-time differences between profiles at $p < .05$.

Table 2. *Hierarchical Linear Models of Academic Performance between Freshman and Senior Years in College*

Parameter	Estimate	SE
Intercept (Assimilation)	3.10	(.05)***
Accommodation	-.04	(.04)
Resistance	-.04	(.04)
Female	.07	(.03)*
Immigrant Parent	-.02	(.03)
Family Income	.06	(.03) ⁺
Public Assistance	-.06	(.05)
First-generation College	-.16	(.04)***
High School GPA	.48	(.05)***
Mexican heritage	-.02	(.04)
Puerto Rican heritage	-.04	(.05)
Central American heritage	.18	(.07)*
South American heritage	.12	(.05)**
Dominican heritage	.08	(.09)
Cuban heritage	.08	(.08)
Linear Slope (Assimilation)	.05	(.02)*
Accommodation	.03	(.02)*
Resistance	.02	(.02)
Female	.03	(.01)*
Immigrant Parent	.00	(.02)

Family Income	.00	(.01)
Public Assistance	-.01	(.02)
First-generation College	.01	(.02)
High School GPA	-.04	(.02)
Mexican heritage	.01	(.02)
Puerto Rican heritage	.03	(.02)
Central American heritage	-.04	(.03)
South American heritage	-.02	(.02)
Dominican heritage	-.04	(.04)
Cuban heritage	-.02	(.03)
<hr/>		
Between-Individual Variance	.08	(.01)***
AIC unconditional model	3053.61	
AIC hypothesized model	2997.08	
<hr/>		

Table 3. *Hierarchical Linear Models of Time Spent on Academic Activities between Freshman and Junior Years in College*

Parameter	Estimate	SE
Intercept (Assimilation)	44.95	(2.05)***
Accommodation	-.61	(1.64)
Resistance	.44	(1.56)
Female	.85	(1.26)
Immigrant Parent	1.74	(1.42)
Family Income	-2.24	(1.40)
Public Assistance	-.09	(1.89)
First-generation College	2.76	(1.48) ⁺
High School GPA	11.43	(1.95)***
Mexican heritage	1.25	(1.62)
Puerto Rican heritage	1.86	(2.19)
Central American heritage	-3.75	(3.07)
South American heritage	-.44	(1.98)
Dominican heritage	9.28	(3.78)*
Cuban heritage	1.00	(3.10)
Linear Slope (Assimilation)	-4.18	(1.36)**
Accommodation	.68	(1.08)
Resistance	1.04	(1.02)
Female	.01	(.84)

Immigrant Parent	-0.13	(.94)
Family Income	.55	(.93)
Public Assistance	-.42	(1.26)
First-generation College	.78	(.98)
High School GPA	-4.14	(1.30)**
Mexican heritage	-.37	(1.08)
Puerto Rican heritage	.25	(1.44)
Central American heritage	.07	(2.08)
South American heritage	.26	(1.29)
Dominican heritage	-3.90	(2.55)
Cuban heritage	-2.79	(2.03)
<hr/>		
Between-Individual Variance	77.91	(18.16)***
AIC unconditional model	19679.13	
AIC hypothesized model	19534.86	
<hr/>		

Table 4. *Hierarchical Linear Models of Time Spent on Extracurricular Activities between Freshman and Junior Years in College*

Parameter	Estimate	SE
Intercept (Assimilation)	14.19	(1.25)***
Accommodation	-1.84	(1.00) ⁺
Resistance	-.58	(.95)
Female	-2.29	(.77)**
Immigrant Parent	-.26	(.86)
Family Income	-.31	(.86)
Public Assistance	.95	(1.15)
First-generation College	1.40	(.90)
High School GPA	1.02	(1.19)
Mexican heritage	-.44	(.99)
Puerto Rican heritage	.18	(1.33)
Central American heritage	-2.83	(1.88)
South American heritage	-1.94	(1.21)
Dominican heritage	-3.90	(2.30) ⁺
Cuban heritage	-3.85	(1.88)*
Linear Slope (Assimilation)	-5.55	(2.65)*
Accommodation	.94	(2.14)
Resistance	-3.35	(2.03) ⁺
Female	4.26	(1.64)**

Immigrant Parent	1.39	(1.84)
Family Income	-.71	(1.82)
Public Assistance	-.58	(2.47)
First-generation College	-4.04	(1.94)*
High School GPA	1.10	(2.56)
Mexican heritage	1.97	(2.11)
Puerto Rican heritage	-4.69	(2.86) ⁺
Central American heritage	-2.05	(3.97)
South American heritage	2.94	(2.57)
Dominican heritage	10.05	(4.89)*
Cuban heritage	1.14	(4.09)
Quadratic Slope (Assimilation)	2.02	(1.29)
Accommodation	.38	(1.04)
Resistance	2.33	(.98)*
Female	-2.18	(.79)**
Immigrant Parent	-.58	(.89)
Family Income	.48	(.88)
Public Assistance	-.21	(1.20)
First-generation College	1.54	(.94) ⁺
High School GPA	-1.52	(1.24)
Mexican heritage	-.83	(1.02)
Puerto Rican heritage	2.20	(1.39)
Central American heritage	1.82	(1.94)

South American heritage	-1.64	(1.24)
Dominican heritage	-5.08	(2.39)*
Cuban heritage	.35	(1.98)
<hr/>		
Between-Individual Variance	26.25	(5.53)***
AIC unconditional model	17285.99	
AIC hypothesized model	17151.06	
<hr/>		