6

LATINA/O STUDENT CHARACTERISTICS AND OUTCOMES AT FOUR-YEAR HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS (HSIs), EMERGING HSIs, AND NON-HSIs

Marcela Cuellar

Latinas/os now comprise the largest racial/ethnic minority group enrolled at four-year colleges and universities (Fry & López, 2012), with a significant proportion enrolling at Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs). In fall 2008, approximately 35% of all Latina/o undergraduates at four-year institutions were enrolled at colleges or universities where at least 25% of the students were Latina/o (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2009), a criterion of HSI eligibility. Given the enrollment-based definition of HSIs and the projected growth of the Latina/o population in the United States, more postsecondary institutions will presumably become HSIs. Colleges and universities with Latina/o student populations approaching the 25% threshold are commonly referred to as emerging HSIs (Santiago & Andrade, 2010). Despite an increasing representation of HSIs and emerging HSIs in the higher education landscape, knowledge of the factors that influence Latina/o student enrollment at these institutions and non-HSIs is just evolving. Similarly, our understanding of the influence of these institutional contexts on Latina/o student experiences and outcomes is limited (Nora & Crisp, 2009), but also beginning to develop.

To promote the educational, societal, and political advancement of Latinas/os, it is critically important to understand the extent to which the unique institutional contexts at four-year HSIs, emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs academically develop and empower Latinas/os. The findings in this chapter come from a two-part national study using data from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) at the University of California, Los Angeles (Cuellar, 2012). This chapter first examines the factors that influence Latina/o student enrollment in these three institutional contexts. It then considers how these contexts influence two outcomes—academic self-concept and social agency—which I argue represent student success and empowerment when a positive change is observed during college.

What We Know about Latina/o Students at HSIs, Emerging HSIs, and Non-HSIs

Perhaps not surprisingly, Latinas/os are more likely to enroll at HSIs than their non-Latina/o peers (Núñez, Sparks, & Hernández, 2011; Núñez & Bowers, 2011). In addition, they generally enter HSIs with different predispositions than their counterparts at non-HSIs. For instance, Latinas/os attending baccalaureate-granting HSIs are more likely to have parents with lower educational backgrounds and be older, part-time, and/or transfer students than those attending non-HSIs (Bridges, Kinzie, Nelson Laird, & Kuh, 2008). Also, Latinas/os at four-year HSIs typically want to live closer to home (Núñez & Bowers, 2011). Location and affordability are consequently key factors in Latinas/os' decisions to enroll at HSIs (Santiago, 2007). Moreover, students attending high schools with larger enrollments, higher proportions of underrepresented minorities, and more Latina/o teachers, as well as students with lower standardized math test scores, are more likely to enroll at HSIs (Núñez & Bowers, 2011). Overall, Latina/o students enter HSIs with lower levels of academic capital than their peers who enroll elsewhere, and these institutions thus provide postsecondary opportunities for a more diverse Latina/o student population.

Research on Latina/o student experiences and outcomes in these institutional contexts is less conclusive. Differences in educational experiences may be anticipated since Latinas/os at non-HSIs are more likely than their counterparts at HSIs to live on campus and be involved in co-curricular activities (Bridges et al., 2008). Yet, Latinas/os at HSIs and non-HSIs do not significantly differ on their perceptions of a supportive campus environment, faculty interactions, or overall college satisfaction (Nelson Laird, Bridges, Morelon-Quainoo, Williams, & Holmes, 2007). In fact, Latina/o students at HSIs are actually more involved in collaborative learning and report larger gains in overall development (Nelson Laird et al., 2007). That said, two major limitations of previous work stem from the cross-sectional nature of data that do not control for pre-college dispositions related to outcomes as well as a lack of information on emerging HSIs. Also, scholars question the equity of access and success for Latinas/os at HSIs because of observably lower graduation rates compared to their peers at non-HSIs (Contreras, Malcom, & Bensimon, 2008). Much of this gap is due to differences in institutional selectivity and resources, however, highlighting the importance of funding for additional services to increase Latina/o success (García, 2013).

Student Success Through a Traditional Lens

Most scholars consider degree attainment to be the definitive sign of student success (Kuh, Kinzie, Buckley, Bridges, & Hayek, 2006), with persistence and retention as indicators of progress towards this goal (Braxton, 2000; Nora, 2003). Academic achievement (such as college grades and graduate exam scores) and post-college outcomes (such as employment and graduate school enrollment) are also traditionally recognized as signs of success (Kuh et al., 2006). These concepts are easily measurable and confer tremendous economic and social returns to individuals and society. These forms of success do not, however, gauge the depth of learning or quality of the college experience.

To further tap into the impact of higher education, student success is also often represented as the development students undergo during college. Bowen (1977), for example, outlined the types of outcomes college students should develop. He argued that the educational task of colleges and universities is to promote cognitive learning, as well as emotional and moral development, in conjunction with practical skills. Furthermore, college students should develop an openness to change and become involved in public affairs. Individual gains on these outcomes cascade into greater benefits for society because college graduates may influence non-college educated individuals to adopt socially conscious values and behaviors. Thus, Bowen's view of student success places responsibility on colleges and universities to holistically prepare students for advancement in American society.

Broader notions of student success as development can be classified as cognitive or affective in nature (Astin, 1993a). The cognitive dimension represents outcomes associated with knowledge acquisition and higher order thinking skills, such as reasoning and decision making, whereas the affective dimension involves students' attitudes, values, beliefs, and self-concepts. More recently, scholars have considered how holistic development models may differ for racial/ethnic minority students, such as Latinas/os, given that experiences with race and racism may positively and negatively affect cognitive, intrapersonal, and interpersonal development (Torres & Hernández, 2007). Further, the Association of American Colleges and Universities (2002) has affirmed that all students need an education that prepares them for personal success and that fosters a democratic society by empowering them to change information into knowledge and action, develop multicultural and global competencies, and take responsibility for social justice. While many institutions tend to avoid *assessing* affective outcomes to measure these forms of student learning and development, colleges and universities usually aim to develop them (Astin, 1993a).

Although the aforementioned conceptualizations of success are important, scholars have advocated for more expansive definitions of student success that are representative of a more diverse college population (Kuh et al., 2006; Rendón, 2006), especially for students who attend HSIs (Malcom, Bensimon, & Dávila, 2010; Santiago, Andrade, & Brown, 2004). Concurrently, scholars have called for the development of theories for diverse students that incorporate more critical perspectives and acknowledge the distinct backgrounds and experiences of underrepresented students, such as Critical Race Theory (Carter & Hurtado, 2007; Rendón, 2006; Solórzano, 1998). Given the historically marginalized status of Latinas/os in the United States, it is essential that they leave college not only with baccalaureate degrees and the requisite knowledge to excel professionally, but also with a sense of empowerment that positions them for success in

American society. Outcomes that represent empowerment can thus also serve as indicators of Latina/o student success.

Expanding Success as Empowerment for Latinas/os

Notions of success as empowerment can be conceptualized through a Critical Race Theory (CRT) lens and its extensions. CRT builds on the principle that racism in American society is real as it centers the experiences of people of color and examines the ways that racial oppression has historically created inequalities (Taylor, 1998). Educational scholars use CRT to examine how educational structures and practices create inequities for students of color (Solórzano, 1998). Through its commitment to social justice, CRT in education acknowledges the personal discriminatory experiences that racial/ethnic groups often face in the United States and proposes that education should empower disenfranchised students. It calls for outcomes that are empowering for oppressed groups, regardless of their benefits to society at large, simply because it is ethical. Grounded in these principles, higher education should better serve Latina/o students by developing educational environments that empower them on multiple levels at college entry and throughout the college experience.

With this mind, it is critical for two reasons to acknowledge and understand the various forms of capital that inform Latina/o students' college choices. First, their enrollment decisions have led to the development of HSIs and emerging HSIs—these institutions simply would not exist without the critical mass that stems from Latinas/os' enrollment decisions. Thus, understanding Latinas/os' choice processes will enhance our understanding of how student characteristics shape diverse institutional contexts. Second, we must understand the various forms of capital that Latinas/os possess at the beginning of college in order to better serve them.

Yosso (2005) challenged traditional notions of cultural capital in relationship to students of color because of assumptions that they enter educational environments with cultural deficiencies. She argued that students of color possess cultural assets, described as *community cultural wealth*, which represent an array of knowledge, skills, abilities, and networks that communities of color draw upon in order to resist macro and micro forms of oppression. Colleges and universities can build on these influential entering characteristics and empower Latinas/os during college by promoting a positive campus racial climate and providing a variety of curricular and co-curricular experiences.

Empowerment through higher education can be assessed by accounting for students' pre-college characteristics and the extent to which institutional contexts have enhanced outcomes by the end of the college experience. Positive changes during college on academic self-concept and social agency can represent student empowerment. Academic self-concept is associated with persistence and retention

(Robbins et al., 2004), and it is particularly important for Latinas/os because they generally enter higher education with lower levels of academic self-concept than their peers (Contreras, 2005; Núñez, 2009). This can be traced to their lower status position in American society, underrepresentation on many college campuses, and the disconnect between cultural expectations at colleges and universities and home cultures (Oseguera, Locks, & Vega, 2009). Likewise, social agency, which represents the desire to change society through sociopolitical engagement, is important because commitment to these ideas can advance the social status of a racial/ethnic group. As Latinas/os express more interest in creating social change, presumably they will demonstrate more civic involvement and increased political standing. Consequently, the extent to which institutions enhance these outcomes for Latina/o college students indicates how successful they are at talent development, which demonstrates institutional success on measures broader than degree completion (Astin, 1993a).

Data Sources and Analyses

Two datasets from the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) at the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) were utilized to explore student characteristics and outcomes at HSIs, emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs. CIRP, a national longitudinal study of the U.S. higher education system, has collected data annually on college students since 1966. Student responses from the CIRP's The Freshman Survey (TFS) in 2004 provided pre-college student information, particularly about Latinas/os' college choice of HSIs, emerging HSIs, or non-HSIs. The 2008 College Senior Survey (CSS) captured students' college experiences four years after they entered. The longitudinal 2004–2008 TFS/CSS dataset was used to examine how Latina/o students changed on two measures representing success and empowerment—academic self-concept and social agency—within the three institutional types. Thus, the study had two components: a college choice model and a student success/empowerment model.

HSIs and emerging HSIs were coded according to Latina/o full-time equivalent (FTE) enrollments in 2006–2007, in part because this period aligned with the third year that students were enrolled in college—enough time to establish the influence of the institutional context. Colleges and universities on the U.S. Department of Education's 2006–2007 list of Institutions with High Hispanic Enrollment (U.S. Department of Education, n.d.) were identified and then cross-referenced with Title V grant recipients between 2004 and 2008. Thus, HSIs in the sample had a Title V grant and/or were on the federal list of institutions that enrolled a high number of Latinas/os. Next, *Excelencia* in Education's list of colleges and universities that had between 15% and 24% Latina/o FTE undergraduates in 2006–2007 was used to identify emerging HSIs (Santiago & Andrade,

2010). Lastly, all remaining institutions were classified as non-HSIs if they had 10% or less Latina/o enrollment based on 2006–2007 fall data. This limit allowed for a more discrete differentiation between emerging HSIs and non-HSIs.

Students self-reported their racial/ethnic membership in the 2004 TFS, and the survey allowed them to mark multiple groups. Those who marked only that they were "Mexican American/Chicano," "Puerto Rican," or "Other Latino" were coded into these Latina/o ethnic categories. Those who marked a Latina/o ethnic group and another racial/ethnic group were classified into a multiracial Latina/o category to further explore the diversity among Latinas/os. Student- and institutional-level classifications yielded a significant number of Latinas/os at the three institutional types for the 2004 TFS as well as the 2008 CSS. The college choice model analysis sample represented a total of 5,079 Latinas/os at 21 four-year HSIs; 3,699 Latinas/os at 23 emerging HSIs; and 17,138 Latinas/os at 619 non-HSIs. For the success models, there were 314 Latinas/os at 18 HSIs; 359 Latinas/os at 14 emerging HSIs; and 1,451 Latinas/os at 217 non-HSIs.

Descriptive analyses and ANOVA with post hoc tests were performed for all variables in both the college choice and student success models in the three institutional contexts. Longitudinal *t* tests were also performed for the success outcomes. These initial analyses were utilized to identify any differences on these measures among Latina/o students in the three institutional contexts. Thereafter, different multivariate analyses were employed for the college choice and success components of the study.

For the college choice model, a multinomial logistic regression was used to determine which variables increased the likelihood of Latina/o enrollment at an HSI, emerging HSI, or non-HSI. The categorical dependent variable was enrollment at an HSI, emerging HSI, or non-HSI, for which non-HSIs served as the referent group. The overall model fit and Wald tests were assessed for the most significant variables associated with the decision to enroll at an HSI, emerging HSI, or non-HSI.

The college choice model also contained four blocks of independent variables that have been associated with Latina/o college enrollment: background characteristics, past capital accumulation, college considerations, and anticipated college conversion (McDonough, Núñez, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2003; Núñez, McDonough, Ceja, & Solórzano, 2008). The background characteristics block contained gender and language background in conjunction with traditional forms of capital, such as cultural capital (parental education) and economic capital (financial support). Measures representing Yosso's (2005) six forms of community cultural wealth (aspirational, familial, social, navigational, resistant, and spiritual) were also included. For example, familial capital referred to cultural knowledge that is nurtured by the family and carries a sense of community history; it was captured through the influence of family on the pursuit of a college education. Also, resistant capital, the knowledge and skills that challenge inequality through behaviors, was represented through participation in organized demonstrations, discussions of politics, and a

belief that racial discrimination still exists. The college considerations set of variables accounted for factors important in college selection, such as the influence of teachers and counselors and institutional reputation. The last block, anticipated college conversion, represented outcomes students hoped to gain from their college experiences, including their desire to employ and gain social capital through engagement with faculty, student organizations, and racially/ethnically diverse peers.

The dependent variables for the student success models were academic self-concept and social agency. Academic self-concept comprised four items representing students' self-ratings of academic abilities and confidence in the academic environment. Students rated themselves in comparison to an average person their age on four traits: academic ability, drive to achieve, mathematical ability, and intellectual self-confidence. The social agency variable comprised six items that measured the extent to which students valued political and social involvement as a personal goal. These items included the following: participating in community action programs, influencing social values, keeping up to date with political affairs, becoming a community leader, helping others who are in difficulty, and helping to promote racial understanding. Both of these variables were CIRP constructs measured on the 2004 TFS and 2008 CSS and validated through item response theory (Sharkness, DeAngelo, & Pryor, 2010).

Independent variables for the student success models were chosen based on the Multi-contextual Model for Diverse Learning Environments (MMDLE)[1] (Hurtado, Álvarez, Guillermo-Wann, Cuellar, & Arellano, 2012) and because they are influential predictors of academic self-concept and social agency. Independent variables were organized into three blocks based on background characteristics and capitals, institutional characteristics, and student experiences (campus racial climate, curricular, and co-curricular). Ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, pre-college academic self-concept and social agency, and familial and spiritual capital were among the background characteristics and capitals accounted for in the models. Institutional contexts included private/public control and a dummy coded variable for designation as an HSI or emerging HSI. Student experiences with the campus racial climate, such as positive and negative interactions with diverse peers, were included. Curricular variables (e.g., enrollment in ethnic and women's studies courses) were also included. Co-curricular experiences that may foster academic self-concept or social agency, such as hours spent studying or volunteering, were also included in the respective models. (For more information on the variables used in the models, please refer to Cuellar, 2012.)

Hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted to allow for a temporal ordering of blocks of independent variables to assess the influence of inputs and environments on outcomes (Astin & Dey, 1997). The regression models for academic self-concept and social agency were analyzed in two stages. First, a preliminary blocked forced entry multiple regression analysis was conducted with independent variables on the entire sample of Latinas/os at HSIs, emerging HSIs,

and non-HSIs. The second stage of analysis entailed running the same blocks of variables for the sample within each institutional type separately, in order to assess the predictive power of variables within each context and also to allow for comparisons of results across groups. Further, given the small sample size for Latinas/os at HSIs and emerging HSIs, the p value was set moderately lower for these samples ($p < .05$), while the significance level for the non-HSI sample was set at a higher threshold ($p < .01$). Finally, an equality test of coefficients (Paternoster, Brame, Mazerolle, & Piquero, 1998) was conducted to assess whether coefficient differences were significant across the institutional context models.

Factors Influencing Latina/o College Choices

Notable differences in the factors influencing the likelihood of Latina/o enrollment at four-year HSIs, emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs are shown in Table 6.1. There were enrollment differences based on gender, language background, and ethnic sub-group membership. Females were more likely to enroll at HSIs compared to their male counterparts, who were more likely to enroll at non-HSIs. Also, controlling for all other factors, Latinas/os whose first language was English were more likely to enroll at HSIs as compared to non-HSIs, but more likely to enroll at non-HSIs as compared to emerging HSIs. In addition, "Other Latinas/os" were more likely to enroll at HSIs, and multiracial Latinas/os at non-HSIs, as compared to Mexican Americans and Chicanas/os. On the whole, these differences suggest that the representation of Latinas/os was distinctive across the three institutional contexts and, as such, may create different educational environments, experiences, and outcomes for students.

Traditional measures of academic and social capital were largely associated with Latina/o enrollment decisions at HSIs, emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs. For example, Latinas/os at non-HSIs possessed more academic capital at the beginning of college; those with higher GPAs were more likely to enroll at these colleges and universities. Further, social capital played an important role for Latinas/os at HSIs and non-HSIs, but in diverse ways. Latinas/os who indicated that their academic networks (teachers and counselors) encouraged them to attend the college where they enrolled were more likely to attend HSIs. At the same time, students who spent more time at a teacher's home during high school were more likely to enroll at non-HSIs. Thus, in comparison to Latinas/os attending HSIs, those choosing non-HSIs appear to have had more extensive relationships with teachers and more access to social capital. In general, Latinas/os at HSIs possessed less academic and social capital than their counterparts at emerging HSIs and non-HSIs, as found in earlier research (Núñez & Bowers, 2011).

Economic and cultural capital were also largely associated with Latina/o students' enrollment decisions. For example, those from lower income backgrounds were more likely to enroll at HSIs and emerging HSIs than were their counterparts from higher income brackets. Latinas/os wanting to live closer to home

TABLE 6.1 *Multinomial Logistic Regression Models for Latina/o Enrollment at HSIs and Emerging HSIs (referent: non-HSIs = 16,828)*

Variable	*HSIs (N = 4,962)*				*Emerging HSIs (N = 3,625)*			
	B		SE	Exp(B)	B		SE	Exp(B)
Demographics								
Ethnicity (Mexican American/Chicano referent)								
Puerto Rican	-0.02		0.09	0.98	0.18	*	0.09	1.20
Other Latina/o	0.13	*	0.06	1.14	0.14	*	0.06	1.15
Multiracial Latina/o	-0.87	***	0.06	0.42	-0.26	***	0.06	0.77
Gender								
Male (Female referent)	-0.24	***	0.05	0.79	-0.31	***	0.05	0.74
Language Background								
Native English speaker	0.24	***	0.05	1.28	-0.31	***	0.05	0.74
Past Capital Accumulation								
Cultural Capital								
Mother's highest level of education (Graduate level referent)								
Less than high school	0.07		0.09	1.08	0.58	***	0.09	1.79
High school graduate	0.13		0.08	1.14	0.38	***	0.08	1.46
Some college	0.02		0.08	1.02	0.29	***	0.08	1.34
College graduate	-0.03		0.08	0.98	-0.09	***	0.09	0.92
Income Quartile (Upper income referent)								
Low-income	1.13	***	0.08	3.08	0.72	***	0.08	2.05
Lower middle-income	0.78	***	0.08	2.17	0.59	***	0.07	1.81
Upper middle-income	0.49	***	0.08	1.64	0.42	***	0.07	1.52
Academic Capital								
Average high school GPA	-0.24	***	0.02	0.79	-0.16	***	0.02	0.85
Familial Capital								
Parents wanted me to go to college	0.27	***	0.03	1.31	0.11	***	0.03	1.12
Social Capital								
Was a guest in a teacher's home	-0.27	***	0.05	0.77	-0.19	***	0.05	0.83
Resistant Capital								
Racial discrimination is still a major problem in America	-0.16	**	0.06	.83	0.03		0.06	1.03
Economic Capital								
Parental financial support	-0.15	***	0.02	0.86	-0.02		0.02	0.98
Grant aid	-0.26	***	0.02	0.77	-0.19	***	0.02	0.82

(Continued)

TABLE 6.1 (Continued)

Variable	HSIs (N = 4,962)				Emerging HSIs (N = 3,625)			
	B		SE	Exp(B)	B		SE	Exp(B)
College Considerations								
Reason for choosing this particular college:								
Academic Reputation Factor	-0.30	***	0.02	0.74	-0.25	***	0.02	0.78
College visit	-0.28	***	0.03	0.76	-0.09	**	0.03	0.92
Influence of Academic Network Factor	0.10	***	0.02	1.10	0.03		0.02	1.03
Not offered aid at first choice	0.36	***	0.05	1.44	0.11	*	0.05	1.12
Wanted to live near home	0.53	***	0.03	1.70	0.43	***	0.03	1.54
Anticipated Capital Conversion								
Personal Goal: Being very well off financially	0.33	***	0.03	1.39	0.19	***	0.03	1.21

***$p < .001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$.

were also more likely to enroll at HSIs and emerging HSIs. Echoing previous research (Núñez & Bowers, 2011; Santiago, 2007), for Latinas/os who chose to enroll at HSIs, issues of affordability were more pronounced. In contrast, Latinas/os who had more financial support from family were more likely to enroll at non-HSIs. Indeed, other research has shown that the availability of financial aid and affordability are generally critical components of Latinas/os' decisions about which colleges to attend (Kim, 2004). With respect to cultural capital, Latinas/os with mothers who had less formal education were more likely to enroll at emerging HSIs than non-HSIs. Although this cultural capital variable was not a significant predictor for Latinas/os who enrolled at HSIs instead of non-HSIs, it appears that this was largely due to the overpowering nature of the economic measures for these students. Overall, the findings suggest that Latinas/os entered HSIs and emerging HSIs with less access to economic and cultural capital than their non-HSI counterparts.

Familial capital, one of the main elements of community cultural wealth, was a highly significant factor in Latinas/os' college choice. While the operationalization of the variable did not directly tap into cultural knowledge, it did measure the importance of family as a motivating factor in pursuing postsecondary education, which can also encourage Latinas/os to succeed in college (Nora, 2003) and ultimately serve as a form of capital. Latina/o students across institutional contexts acknowledged that parents and family were a fairly important reason for pursuing postsecondary education; for Latinas/os at HSIs and emerging HSIs, however, this factor increased the likelihood of enrollment at these institutions, which confirms

previous research on the strong influence of family and the desire to stay close to home in the choice to enroll at an HSI (Núñez & Bowers, 2011; Santiago, 2007) and extends this finding to students at emerging HSIs. Altogether, this finding counters the deficit-minded myth that Latina/o families deter their children from college and shows that parental encouragement is important in getting students to college in the first place (Gándara, 1995). By extension, the inclusion of families in the college experience, particularly at HSIs and emerging HSIs, may further bolster Latina/o student success.

Resistant capital, also within the community cultural wealth framework, refers to the knowledge and skills to challenge inequality through behaviors, which can increase the likelihood of college enrollment for Latinas/os. Latinas/os who believed that racial discrimination was still a pervasive problem in the United States were more likely to enroll at non-HSIs than HSIs. There were no differences on this measure for Latinas/os' choices between emerging HSIs and non-HSIs, indicating that students at these institutional types essentially possessed similar and higher levels of resistant capital than their counterparts at HSIs. Further, these findings suggest that Latinas/os who enrolled at emerging HSIs and non-HSIs were critical of the inequities within American society. Thus, enrolling at a college or university where they would be numerically underrepresented may have been a conscious way to challenge existing racial inequalities and promote social change in the future.

Overall, these findings represent a potential conjoining influence of familial, resistant, social, cultural, economic, and academic capital that creates distinct educational contexts for Latina/o college students. The forms of capital Latinas/os possessed within the three institutional contexts support the notion of a cascading effect (Flores & Morfin, 2008) of race and ethnicity within higher education, specifically in relation to enrollment decisions at HSIs and non-HSIs. Here, the cascading effect refers to racial/ethnic stratification based on institutional selectivity; Latinas/os are increasingly more likely to enroll at less selective institutions that are HSIs in states where they predominate, and this may increase the potential for stratification of educational outcomes (Flores & Morfin, 2008). The findings of the present study further indicate that this stratification overlaps with socioeconomic background. Therefore, it appears that the sorting of Latinas/os based on previously established forms of capital is informed by different dispositions, such as a preference to stay close to home during college (Núñez & Bowers, 2011). Consequently, Latina/o student experiences and outcomes may differ based on enrollment at an HSI, an emerging HSI, or a non-HSI.

In sum, the Latinas/os in this study who entered HSIs, emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs generally possessed different types and levels of capital at the beginning of college. A better understanding of how they made their decisions to enroll in these institutional contexts matters tremendously for the future success of Latinas/os. Traditional notions of excellence may fail to capture the potential of Latinas/os at HSIs (Núñez & Bowers, 2011; Santiago et al., 2004) since Latinas/os enter HSIs with different forms of capital than their emerging HSI and non-HSI

counterparts. Institutions should therefore consider the various forms of capital that students possess at college entry to truly capture the value added by the end of the college experience (Astin, 1993b; Núñez & Bowers, 2011). Presumably, there is potential for more growth on student outcomes when institutions incorporate culturally sensitive practices (Laden, 2004; Santiago et al., 2004) that build on the extensive forms of capital that students possess (Yosso, 2005).

Latina/o Student Outcomes at HSIs, Emerging HSIs, and Non-HSIs

Latina/o students had different levels of growth across institutional contexts, depending on the outcome being assessed. While change on academic self-concept was more pronounced for Latinas/os at HSIs, students showed growth on social agency across all institutional types. Further, their characteristics and college experiences influenced their academic self-concept differently. The results for academic self-concept and social agency are discussed separately to highlight changes on these two outcomes.

Academic Self-Concept

Latinas/os entered HSIs, emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs with varying levels of academic self-concept (see also Cuellar, 2014). Those at HSIs and emerging HSIs entered college with lower levels of academic self-concept than their peers at non-HSIs, with Latinas/os at HSIs expressing the lowest average. Despite these significant differences at the beginning of college, the gaps were greatly diminished four years later. Toward the end of college, there were only differences between Latinas/os at emerging HSIs and non-HSIs on academic self-concept, with those at emerging HSIs indicating a lower average academic self-concept than their peers at non-HSIs. By contrast, although the average academic self-concept after four years for Latinas/os at HSIs was still slightly lower than for those at non-HSIs, the differences were insignificant. In other words, Latinas/os at HSIs and non-HSIs had surprisingly comparable levels of academic self-concept by the end of college. Upon further examination, Latinas/os at HSIs, on average, increased their academic self-concept during their years at HSIs, while academic self-concept for Latinas/os at non-HSIs actually decreased during that time span. Collectively, the positive change on academic self-concept for Latinas/os as a whole at HSIs indicates that these institutions were strongly developing Latina/o students' academic potential and self-perception of academic abilities as compared to students who attended emerging HSIs and non-HSIs.

Differences on the explanatory power of background characteristics and various forms of capital further highlight how Latina/o student experiences at HSIs can significantly shape their academic self-concept. At emerging HSIs and non-HSIs, Latinas/os' entering college characteristics explained most of the variance on their academic self-concept, while less of the variance on this outcome was explained by incoming student characteristics for those at HSIs. Latinas/os may have entered HSIs with lower self-perceptions of their academic abilities than their counterparts who attended other institutions, but they left these institutional contexts with a stronger sense of their academic potential as a result of some of their experiences during college. Thus, these federally designated HSIs did quite a bit of talent development and empowered Latina/o students.

Not surprisingly, pre-college academic self-concept was the strongest explanatory variable for growth in academic self-concept across all institutional contexts. For Latinas/os at HSIs, however, academic self-concept at the beginning of college was slightly less predictive of future academic self-concept as compared to Latinas/os at emerging HSIs and non-HSIs. In addition, some factors were associated with growth in two of the three institutional contexts. For example, females attending HSIs and non-HSIs were more likely to have lower levels of academic self-concept than their male peers. In addition, "Other Latinas/os" were more likely to report higher levels of academic self-concept than Mexican Americans and Chicanas/os. Moreover, Latinas/os with higher levels of supportive interactions with faculty and who spent more time tutoring other students reported higher levels of academic self-concept. Altogether, these findings suggest that some factors similarly show growth on academic self-concept, regardless of institutional context.

In contrast, other background characteristics and college experiences uniquely influenced change on academic self-concept within specific institutional types. In HSIs, for example, Latinas/os who felt more family support to succeed in college were more likely to indicate higher academic self-concept. Also, Latina/o students at HSIs had higher academic self-concept toward the end of college if they spent more hours on homework every week and had more discussions on course content with peers. Academic factors external to the classroom thus seemed highly influential on Latinas/os' academic self-concept at HSIs, which differed from their counterparts at non-HSIs. Latinas/os attending non-HSIs who did not report their academic self-concept at the beginning of college tended to have lower scores than their peers who did, suggesting that students who did not report academic self-concept entered this institutional context with lower academic self-concept. Latinas/os at non-HSIs also had lower academic self-concept after four years if they felt intimidated by faculty, which shows how faculty can have a positive and a negative influence on Latina/o students' perceptions of their own academic abilities, particularly at non-HSIs.

For Latinas/os at emerging HSIs, three college experiences distinctly shaped academic self-concept. Among curricular experiences, students who asked professors for advice more frequently reported higher levels of academic self-concept. Interestingly, aspects of the campus racial climate were also important within emerging HSIs. Latinas/os who experienced more positive cross-racial interactions were more likely to grow on academic self-concept. Conversely, Latinas/os who participated in ethnic student organizations reported lower academic

self-concept after four years of college. The racial/ethnic composition of these contexts, where Latina/o students constituted anywhere between 15% and 24% of the student body, may have uniquely shaped how campus racial climate, assistance from faculty, and participation in ethnic student organizations affected students' academic self-concept.

While other research has indicated that all students generally show increases in self-perceived academic abilities during college (Astin, 1993b), fewer studies have compared Latinas/os across institutional contexts. Overall, the disaggregation of Latina/o college students based on institutional type provides a more comprehensive view of academic self-concept and confirms a positive association between institutions with larger percentages of Latinas/os and increases on academic self-concept (Cole, 2007; Hurtado, Carter, & Spuler, 1996), which may be a proxy for HSIs. When these institutional contexts were disaggregated based on actual federal HSI designation, positive change was observed within HSIs, as they had the largest representation of Latinas/os. Regarding academic self-concept, there was evidently more talent development and empowerment occurring at HSIs.

Importantly, positive changes on academic self-concept may have been associated with the HSI designation specifically. Many HSIs use Title V funding to develop programs designed to increase academic self-confidence and, over the past six years, Title V funds have been increasingly used to develop academic support programs and provide professional development for faculty (Villareal & Santiago, 2012). Latinas/os at HSIs appear to more frequently experience positive interactions with faculty (Dayton, González-Vázquez, Martínez, & Plum, 2004), and these interactions can help Latinas/os increase academic self-concept (Cole, 2007; Núñez, 2009). Moreover, Title V grant funds are often used to develop academic programs to help Latina/o students transition into postsecondary environments (Santiago et al., 2004). As a result, Title V-funded HSIs may very well provide academic programs and services that promote the academic development of Latinas/os.

Social Agency

There were no significant differences on social agency at the beginning of college between Latinas/os at HSIs, emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs, as Table 6.2 shows. Essentially, Latina/o students entered these college environments with similar levels of commitment to social action and increased their commitment to social agency at comparable levels. Consequently, HSIs, emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs provided learning environments where Latinas/os were equally empowered to value political and social engagement, thus effectively developing our future citizenry.

Several key background characteristics and forms of capital significantly influenced growth on Latina/o social agency across institutional types. As might be expected, the pre-college measure of social agency was the most significant factor on future social agency. Also, students who entered college aspiring to obtain higher educational degrees, such as PhDs, showed higher levels of social agency four years later. Perhaps Latina/o students who aspired to obtain advanced degrees used this approach as a way to challenge negative racial/ethnic perceptions and change society in the future (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001). Moreover, students who frequently discussed spirituality or religion with their families during high school were more likely to value future social action, substantiating previous research that Latinas/os draw on spiritual capital to challenge social inequities (Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001).

TABLE 6.2 *Dunnett T-3 Post Hoc Test of Mean Difference for Social Agency and Longitudinal Paired Sample* t *Tests by Institutional Context*

Student Samples	2004		2008		M_D	
	M	SD	M	SD		
HSIs	50.96	9.08	54.57	10.66	3.61	***
Emerging HSIs	50.74	9.06	54.56	10.59	3.82	***
Non-HSIs	51.00	9.30	54.06	10.14	3.06	***

*** $p < .001$.

A multitude of college experiences can enhance Latinas/os' social agency across institutional types. Interestingly, Latina/o students attending private institutions were less likely to show growth on social agency as compared to their peers who attended public institutions, regardless of HSI designation. Curricular activities, such as frequent interaction with faculty and completion of an ethnic studies course, enhanced social agency for Latinas/os. Additionally, activities outside of the classroom also positively influenced social agency—for example, participation in political demonstrations, attendance at cultural awareness workshops, and volunteering. Further, Latinas/os who experienced more negative cross-racial interactions valued social action more, perhaps suggesting that these negative exchanges developed their resistant capital to challenge racial inequities.

The longitudinal findings support the notion that these three institutional contexts differentially influenced the development of college outcomes that represent empowerment for Latinas/os. There were some common factors that influenced growth on outcomes of empowerment across all three contexts, but there were others that were solely predictive of change within one or two. The findings clearly show that these institutional types represent distinct institutional contexts that differentially empowered Latinas/os in terms of academic self-concept and social agency. As such, it is important to distinguish between these three institutional types whenever possible in order to better understand how background characteristics and college experiences impact educational outcomes for Latinas/os.

Implications for Research, Practice, and Policy

Future studies on Latina/o college students should further consider how student experiences and outcomes may differ at HSIs, emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs. Latinas/os clearly enter these college environments with different pre-college characteristics and, after four years, show different levels of growth on outcomes representing success and empowerment. In addition, demographic characteristics within Latina/o ethnic sub-groups influence whether students enroll at HSIs, emerging HSIs, or non-HSIs, as well as subsequent changes on outcomes. For instance, in the current study, "Other Latinas/os" were more likely to enroll at HSIs and emerging HSIs and, on average, showed more gains on academic self-concept than their Mexican American and Chicana/o peers. Also, Latinas were more likely to enroll at HSIs and emerging HSIs, yet they were also more likely to report decreases on self-perceived academic abilities within HSIs and non-HSIs. These distinctions highlight the complexity of race/ethnicity among Latinas/os and the intersectionality of social identities that may influence college choice and outcomes. As such, equity in college access and success within the monolithic Latina/o group are critical issues for further exploration.

Interestingly, the differential gains on academic self-concept after controlling for background characteristics indicate that distinct elements within institutional contexts may impact outcomes for Latinas/os. Overall, the findings suggest that different Latina/o student experiences in college do indeed shape distinct outcomes at HSIs, emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs. Future studies should therefore extend the current research by including other outcomes and by considering how these institutional contexts influence educational experiences and outcomes for students from other racial/ethnic groups.

There are also direct implications for practice. Latinas/os enter each educational environment with different levels and forms of capital, and this impacts their experiences and outcomes in distinct ways. For example, their experiences with the campus racial climate and specific elements of the learning environment may differ. Thus, practitioners and faculty at HSIs, emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs should understand who their Latina/o students are in order to develop curricular and co-curricular programs that positively influence the types of outcomes they aim to develop in students. More targeted approaches should be employed based on research that reflects students and their institutional contexts. Further, faculty and staff need to recognize the diverse forms of capital that Latinas/os possess, including familial and resistant capital, since these are associated with change in educational outcomes.

The findings support continued federal funding for HSIs, especially with regard to Title V. HSIs represent some of the most poorly resourced institutions with large proportions of first-generation and low-income students, who often possess fewer resources than their peers at non-HSIs (see Chapters 3, 4, 9, and 11, this volume). As such, there are inequities at both the institutional and student level. Despite these challenges, HSIs are performing above expectations and tremendously developing the academic self-concept and social agency of Latinas/os—two outcomes that are directly and indirectly connected to national interests. Growth on both of these outcomes for Latinas/os within HSIs offer an example of the positive impact that these institutions can have on advancing educational opportunities. Furthermore, while there is evidence that talent development occurred for Latinas/os across the three institutional contexts, the growth was more pronounced for Latinas/os at HSIs. In short, these lower resourced institutions were outperforming more highly resourced colleges and universities. Thus, the empowerment Latinas/os demonstrated in the HSI context in particular shows the importance of continued support for Title V funding.

As Latinas/os enroll in higher education in greater numbers, an understanding of what factors motivate their pursuit of postsecondary education can help colleges and universities better serve and empower them, creating more equitable outcomes. Through more nuanced approaches, HSIs, emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs can prepare Latinas/os for long-term success with stronger academic self-confidence and more interest in social action. This understanding is essential to ensure that Latinas/os leave colleges and universities not only with degrees but also with a quality education that empowers them on academic and social levels. This will enable institutions of higher education to fulfill their basic function of developing individuals who positively enhance American society.

Notes

This manuscript is based on Marcela Cuellar (2012), *Latina/o student success in higher education: Models of empowerment at Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs* (Unpublished dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles, CA.

1 The MMDLE illustrates how external and institutional contexts shape student outcomes, particularly for historically underrepresented racial/ethnic groups. Within the institutional context, the campus climate for diversity, also known as the campus racial climate, frames the curricular and co-curricular dimensions of students' experiences. For a detailed description, see Hurtado et al. (2012); for its application specifically to HSIs, see Hurtado and Ruiz Alvarado, Chapter 2, this volume.

References

Association of American Colleges and Universities. (2002). *Greater expectations: A new vision for learning as a nation goes to college.* Washington, DC: Author.

Astin, A.W. (1993a). *Assessment for excellence: The philosophy and practice of assessment and evaluation in higher education.* Westport, CT: The Oryx Press.

Astin, A.W. (1993b). *What matters most in college: Four critical years revisited.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Astin, A.W., & Dey, E. (1997). *Causal analytic modeling via blocked regression analysis (CAMBRA): An introduction with examples.* Los Angeles, CA: UCLA.

Bowen, H.R. (1977). *Investment in learning: The individual and social value of American higher education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Braxton, J.M. (Ed.). (2000). *Reworking the student departure puzzle.* Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Bridges, B.K., Kinzie, J., Nelson Laird, T.F., & Kuh, G.D. (2008). Student engagement and student success at Historically Black and Hispanic-Serving Institutions. In M. Gasman, B. Baez, & C.S.V. Turner (Eds.), *Understanding minority-serving institutions* (pp. 217–236). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Carter, D.F., & Hurtado, S. (2007). Bridging key research dilemmas: Quantitative research using a critical eye. In F.K. Stage (Ed.), *Using quantitative data to answer critical questions* (New Directions for Institutional Research No. 133, pp. 25–35). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cole, D. (2007). Do interracial interactions matter? An examination of student-faculty contact and intellectual self-concept. *Journal of Higher Education, 78*(3), 249–281. doi: 10.1353/jhe.2007.0015

Contreras, F.E. (2005). Access, achievement, and social capital: Standardized exams and the Latino college-bound population. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 4*(3), 197–214. doi: 10.1177/1538192705276546

Contreras, F.E., Malcom, L.E., & Bensimon, E.M. (2008). Hispanic-Serving Institutions: Closeted identity and the production of equitable outcomes for Latina/o students. In M. Gasman, B. Baez, & C.S.V. Turner (Eds.), *Understanding minority-serving institutions* (pp. 71–90). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Cuellar, M. (2012). *Latino student success in higher education: Models of empowerment at Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), emerging-HSIs, and non-HSIs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles, CA.

Cuellar, M. (2014). The impact of Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs on Latina/o academic self-concept. *Review of Higher Education, 37*(4), 499–530.

Dayton, B., González-Vázquez, N., Martínez, C.R., & Plum, C. (2004). Hispanic-Serving Institutions through the eyes of students and administrators. In A.M. Ortiz (Ed.), *Addressing the unique needs of Latino American students* (New Directions for Student Services No. 105, pp. 29–40). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Flores, S.M., & Morfin, O.J. (2008). Another side of the percent plan story: Latino enrollment in the Hispanic-Serving Institutions sector in California and Texas. In M. Gasman, B. Baez, & C.S.V. Turner (Eds.), *Understanding minority-serving institutions* (pp. 141–155). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Fry, R., & López, M.H. (2012). *Now largest minority group on four-year colleges and campuses: Hispanic student enrollments reach new highs in 2011.* Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

Gándara, P. (1995). *Over the ivy walls: The educational mobility of low-income Chicanos.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

García, G.A. (2013). Does percentage of Latinas/os affect graduation rates at 4-year Hispanic serving institutions (HSIs), emerging HSIs, and non-HSIs? *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 12*(3), 256–268.

Hurtado, S., Álvarez, C.L., Guillermo-Wann, C., Cuellar, M., & Arellano, L. (2012). A model for diverse learning environments: The scholarship on creating and assessing conditions for student success. In J.C. Smart & M.B. Paulsen (Eds.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (Vol. 27, pp. 41–122). New York, NY: Springer.

Hurtado, S., Carter, D.F., & Spuler, A. (1996). Latino student transition to college: Assessing difficulties and factors in successful college adjustment. *Research in Higher Education, 37*(2), 135–157.

Kim, D. (2004). The effects of financial aid on students' college choice: Differences by racial groups. *Research in Higher Education, 45*(1), 43–70.

Kuh, G.D., Kinzie, J., Buckley, J.A., Bridges, B.K., & Hayek, J.C. (2006). *What matters to student success: A review of the literature.* Washington, DC: National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.

Laden, B.V. (2004). Hispanic-Serving Institutions: What are they? Where are they? *Community College Journal of Research and Practice, 28*(3), 181–198.

Malcom, L.E., Bensimon, E.M., & Dávila, B. (2010). *(Re)constructing Hispanic-Serving Institutions: Moving beyond numbers toward student success* (Vol. 6). Ames, IA: Iowa State University, Education Policy and Practice Perspectives.

McDonough, P.M., Núñez, A.-M., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. (2003). *A model of Latino college choice.* Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education, Portland, OR.

National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). *Fall enrollment of specific racial/ethnic groups in degree-granting institutions, by type and control of institution and percentage of students in the same racial/ethnic group: 2008.* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d09/tables/dt09_230.asp?referrer=list

Nelson Laird, T.F., Bridges, B.K., Morelon-Quainoo, C.L., Williams, J.M., & Holmes, M.S. (2007). African American and Hispanic student engagement at minority-serving and predominantly White institutions. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(1), 39–56.

Nora, A. (2003). Access to higher education for Hispanic students: Real or illusory? In J. Castellanos & L. Jones (Eds.), *The majority in the minority: Expanding the representation of Latina/o faculty, administrators and students in higher education* (pp. 47–68). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Nora, A., & Crisp, G. (2009). Hispanics and higher education: An overview of research, theory, and practice. *Higher education: Handbook of theory of research, 24*, 317–353. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4020-9628-0_8

Núñez, A.-M. (2009). Modeling the effects of diversity experiences and multiple capitals on Latina/o college students' academic self-confidence. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 8*(2), 179–196. doi: 10.1177/1538192708326391

Núñez, A.-M., & Bowers, A.J. (2011). Exploring what leads high school students to enroll in Hispanic-Serving Institutions: A multilevel analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 48*(5), 1–29.

Núñez, A.-M., McDonough, P., Ceja, M., & Solórzano, D. (2008). Diversity within: Latino college choice and ethnic comparisons. In C. Gallagher (Ed.), *Racism in post-race America: New theories, new directions* (pp. 267–284). Chapel Hill, NC: Social Forces Publishing.

Núñez, A.-M., Sparks, P.J., & Hernández, E.A. (2011). Latino access to community colleges and Hispanic-Serving Institutions: A national study. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 10*(1), 18–40.

Oseguera, L., Locks, A.M., & Vega, I.I. (2009). Increasing Latina/o students' baccalaureate attainment. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education, 8*(1), 23–53. doi: 10.1177/1538192708326997

Paternoster, R., Brame, R., Mazerolle, P., & Piquero, A. (1998). Using the correct statistical test for the equality of regression coefficients. *Criminology, 36*(4), 859–866.

Rendón, L.I. (2006). *Reconceptualizing success for underserved students in higher education.* Washington, DC: National Postsecondary Education Cooperative.

Robbins, S.B., Lauver, K., Le, H., Davis, D., Langley, R., & Carlstrom, A. (2004). Do psychosocial and study skill factors predict college outcomes? A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 130*(2), 261–288. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.130.2.261

Santiago, D.A. (2007). *Choosing Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs): A closer look at Latino students' college choices.* Washington, DC: *Excelencia* in Education.
Santiago, D.A., & Andrade, S.J. (2010). *Emerging Hispanic-Serving Institutions: Serving Latino students.* Washington, DC: *Excelencia* in Education.
Santiago, D.A., Andrade, S.J., & Brown, S.E. (2004). *Latino student success at Hispanic-Serving Institutions: Findings from a demonstration project.* Washington, DC: *Excelencia* in Education.
Sharkness, J., DeAngelo, L., & Pryor, J. (2010). *CIRP construct technical report.* Los Angeles, CA: Higher Education Research Institute.
Solórzano, D.G. (1998). Critical Race Theory, race and gender microaggressions, and the experience of Chicana and Chicano scholars. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 121–136.
Solórzano, D.G., & Delgado Bernal, D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through a Critical Race and Latcrit Theory framework: Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education, 36*(3), 308–342.
Taylor, E. (1998). A primer on Critical Race Theory. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education, 19*, 122–124.
Torres, V., & Hernández, E. (2007). The influence of ethnic identity on self-authorship: A longitudinal study of Latino/a college students. *Journal of College Student Development, 48*(5), 558–573.
U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Institutions with high Hispanic enrollment from IPEDS spring 2007 survey (Fall Enrollment 2006).* Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocr/edlite-minorityinst-list-hisp-tab.html
Villareal, R., & Santiago, D. (2012). *From capacity to success: HSIs and Latino student success through Title V.* Washington, DC: *Excelencia* in Education.
Yosso, T.J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A Critical Race Theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education, 8*(1), 69–91.

7

THE HORIZON OF POSSIBILITIES

How Faculty in Hispanic-Serving Institutions Can Reshape the Production and Legitimization of Knowledge Within Academia

Leslie D. Gonzales

This chapter was guided by the pragmatic phrase "horizon of possibilities" (Rosiek, 2013), which is intended to orient one toward the future without dismissing the importance of the past. This notion inspired me to consider the possibilities that lie within Hispanic-Serving Institutions (HSIs), particularly in relation to the role of faculty. To develop my argument, I lean on scholarship related to "funds of knowledge," which suggests that all communities, especially underserved communities such as Latinas/os who enroll in HSIs, hone historically, culturally, and socially relevant knowledge, which is often dismissed by mainstream educational institutions. One of the central goals of the funds of knowledge scholarship is to have this knowledge recognized and validated (Moll, Amanti, Neff, & González, 1992; Ríos-Aguilar & Kiyama, 2012; Ríos-Aguilar, Kiyama, Gravitt, & Moll, 2011; Yosso, 2005).

Following this line of thinking, I argue that HSI faculty members have extraordinary potential to (re)shape the production and legitimization of knowledge inside academia. Although there are potential parallels and insights applicable to two-year college settings and relevant to part-time faculty, my argument here focuses on tenure-track faculty within four-year institutions, where there is considerably more emphasis on research activity. While I readily acknowledge that the production of knowledge unfolds across many contexts and is crafted by all individuals, my focus on tenure-track faculty at four-year institutions is rooted in the assumption that these professors are much more likely to be heavily involved in creating and disseminating new knowledge that will eventually inform teaching, learning, and research inside of higher education, as well as policy formation outside of academia.

This chapter is organized as follows: First, I briefly set faculty work roles and rewards in context. Second, I describe the HSI faculty landscape and offer a more