

# A Study of Self-Esteem and Self-Efficacy as Psychosocial Educational Outcomes: The Role of High School Experiences and Influences<sup>1</sup>

Rachelle L. Brooks, Ph.D., Northwestern University<sup>2</sup>  
Michelle Van Noy, Columbia University, Teacher's College

## I. Introduction

Self-esteem and self-efficacy are important traits for advancing both personal and career goals. Self-efficacy increases the effectiveness of oral communication and promotes civic participation (Verba and Nie 1972; Verba, Schlozman, and Brady 1995). Similarly, self-esteem and other non-cognitive traits developed through education are important factors for job satisfaction, job performance, and earnings in the labor market (Bowles and Gintis 1974; Bowles, Gintis, and Osborne, 2001; Judge and Bono, 2001). Further, in young adults, higher levels of efficacy and esteem have been found to be associated with better academic performance and positive health-related behaviors (Steptoe and Wardle, 2001; Phillips and Gully 1997; Po Yin and Watkins 1998). Given their importance to numerous aspects of adult and youth quality of life, the role of education in developing the esteem and efficacy of young people merits further consideration.

That schools and teachers impact students' social and psychological orientations, in addition to cognitive abilities, has been a mainstay of educational theory. Bowles and Gintis (1974) make the argument from a Marxist perspective in their seminal work *Schooling in Capitalist America* (see also Swartz 2003 and Farkas 2003), where they assert that schools reward personality traits such as discipline, subordinancy, and hard work as a means of social control. Others have approached the topic from the perspective of gender and race and have found evidence that teacher perceptions and expectations are more important to and have a greater impact on learning for Black students, perhaps because they become self-fulfilling prophecies (Jussim, Eccles, and Madon 1996; Casteel 1997). But the question of which school characteristics impact which non-cognitive traits is by no means settled. By honing in on two individual characteristics, self-esteem and personal efficacy, this study seeks to determine which educational factors play a direct role in students' esteem

---

<sup>1</sup> This study has been generously supported by a grant from the Spencer Foundation. It uses data from the Texas Higher Education Opportunity Project and acknowledges the following funders that made the data collection possible: Ford Foundation, The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, The William and Flora Hewlett Foundation, The Spencer Foundation, National Science Foundation, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, and the Office of Population Research at Princeton University.

<sup>2</sup> Author contact information: Rachelle L. Brooks, Northwestern University, 1801 Maple Avenue, Rm. 5310, Evanston, IL 60201. Office: 847-467-0352. Fax: 847-467-0351. Email: rlb Brooks@northwestern.edu

and efficacy development. In so doing it sheds some light on the relevance of social and cultural capital in the development of these traits.

Data collected by the Texas Higher Education Opportunity Project (THEOP), for a group of high school seniors who are followed-up one year later, are examined to determine the connections between students' self-esteem and self-efficacy and their educational experiences. It addresses the following key questions: How are self-esteem and personal efficacy related to the social and cultural capital obtained in high school? How do these relationship vary by racial/ethnic subgroups? Central to the study is an examination of the differences among different gender and racial/ethnic groups. As such, we analyze three racial/ethnic groups separately (Latinos, whites, and African Americans) in order to unpack the development of esteem and efficacy for each group and to determine whether different variables operate as predictors for each group. High school experiences and influences are separated into social and cultural capital factors, in an effort to determine the relative importance of each to the development of esteem and efficacy.

## **II. Literature**

The importance of self-esteem and personal efficacy to individual success is unquestioned. That their development in high school has long-term impacts has been demonstrated by Jencks and colleagues (1972), who found they bear a relationship to occupational and earnings achievement. Similarly, Massey and colleagues (2003) found that the extent to which students have positive experiences in high school has important implications for their self-esteem and plans to pursue postsecondary education. Others have suggested that social connection helps provide the psycho-social resources for success in college (Robbins 2004, Le et al. 2005).

Theories of social and cultural capital (Coleman 1988; Bourdieu and Passeron 1977; Lamont and Lareau 1988) provide a useful framework for exploring how schooling may function to promote or develop personal characteristics: it may be the social networks and cultural competencies obtained in school that lead to positive psychosocial outcomes. Coleman (1988) defines social capital as the obligations and expectations, information flow, and norms accompanied by sanctions that make possible the achievement of certain ends. Cultural capital theory (Bourdieu and Passeron 1977) asserts that value systems about class and culture are transmitted to children at home and in other social settings. Schools also operate within and transmit a value system which privileges "high" cultural aesthetics, experiences and personal orientations.

Recent research has found that social and cultural capital, including information channels, networks, value systems, social norms, and cues about social class are related to decisions to attend and when to attend college, and have been found to vary by racial/ethnic groups (Bohon et al. 2006, Perna 2000, Perna and Titus 2005, Rowan-Kenyon 2007). Do these outcomes result because social and cultural capital impacts the esteem and efficacy of young people? This research brings together these theories and extant studies to provide a direct examination of whether social and cultural capital in high school is related to students' esteem and efficacy immediately after high school.

Central to the study is an examination of the differences between Latino students and other racial/ethnic groups to determine the relevance of differential asset conversion (Persell, Catsambis, and Cookson 1992) for esteem and efficacy. The theory of differential asset conversion contends that the process of converting human, social and cultural capital into outcomes is not identical for different gender and racial groups. As such, we analyze three racial/ethnic groups separately (Latinos, whites, and African Americans) in order to unpack the development of esteem and efficacy for each group and to determine whether different variables operate as predictors for each group.

Previous research has explored differences by race/ethnicity with regard to the psycho-social characteristics of students and the potential impact of school-related social and cultural capital on esteem, efficacy and educational achievement (see Kao and Thompson, 2003, for a review). Recent ethnographic research on the educational achievement of Latino and Mexican-American youth has focused on school climate. In an in-depth case study of Latinos in a high school in the western US, Conchas (2001) found that institutional supports can have an important impact on Latino students' engagement and success in school. According to Valenzuela's (1999) study of Mexican-American students in a Houston high school, teachers' and administrators' relationships matter a great deal in students' development of a positive attitude towards education and their school. The schools' lack of recognition of basic cultural understandings had a negative impact on students' attitudes, engagement, and ultimately their educational aspirations. Finally, in their examination of students attending elite institutions, Massey et al. (2003) found higher levels of self-esteem present amongst Latino and African American students vis a vis their white and Asian-American counterparts.

### **III. Analyses**

**Dataset:** This study uses the THEOP survey baseline data for high school seniors, conducted in spring 2002, and a follow-up survey conducted one year later. Initially,

a stratified sampling of all Texas public high schools was used to select 108 schools, with 93 percent participating in the survey. This yielded a total sample of 13,803 students, of whom only 5,268 were white. In 2003, 5,836 students were re-interviewed. A total of 4,065 students were enrolled in college, with the majority of others in technical schools, working or in the military. Approximately 49% of respondents at Wave-2 were white, 10% African American or Black, and 28% were Mexican, Mexican-American, or Chicano. The sample sizes and racial diversity of the dataset enables disaggregation by gender and race/ethnicity for the following analyses.

**Dependent Variables:** Nine queries about self-esteem and self-efficacy (see Table 1) are comprised of 6 of the 10 items in Rosenberg's Self Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965), and 3 items measuring locus of control (Lefcourt 1982; Rotter 1966). Rosenberg's Self-Esteem Scale is a brief and unidimensional measure of global self-esteem, with questions related to overall feelings of self-worth or self-acceptance. The items are answered on a four-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale has demonstrated good reliability and validity across a large number of different sample groups. The scale has been validated for use with both male and female adolescent, adult and elderly populations.

The concept of a locus of control was developed to describe differences in how much one believes one's actions versus outside influences control one's life (Rotter 1966). Those with an internal locus of control perceive their own behavior, skill, or efforts will determine events in one's life, whereas those with an external locus of control consider fate, chance, or luck to be more determinative of one's future. Three questions about locus of control were asked using a four-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

The nine questions were indexed into two dependent variables: self-esteem and self-efficacy. The alpha inter-item coefficient was .71 for self-esteem and .5 for self-efficacy.

\*\*\*insert Table 1 about here\*\*\*

**Independent Variables:** The independent variables are summarized in Table 2. Demographic variables include father's education level, birth order in the family, and immigrant status. Human capital variables examined are those related to academic achievement, and include GPA, taking calculus or advanced placement classes, and passing a high school exit exam. Social capital variables are those related to encouragement by teachers, counselors, parents and friends to attend college. Finally,

rather than use a broad brush stroke to define cultural capital (against which Lamont and Lareau (1988) warn), we limit our investigation of cultural capital to that which is school-specific. It is an internalized sense of the importance of and need for engagement with school that we pull out of the many types of possible cultural influences on high-schoolers.

\*\*\*insert Table 2 about here\*\*\*

**Methods:** OLS regression models were used to predict self-esteem and self-efficacy with separate analyses conducted by race/ethnicity and gender. The racial/ethnic categories disaggregated for the analyses were whites, Mexican-Americans, African-Americans. Each gender was modeled separately within each racial/ethnic category in order to explore whether and how social and cultural capital operates differently for males and females. The separate examination by race/ethnicity and gender subgroups allows for a fully critical examination of real differences in experiences among these subgroups (Stage, 2007).

The variables were entered into the models in blocks in order to observe differences in the amount of variance in esteem and efficacy explained by social and cultural capital variables. A base model for each dependent variable was estimated including controls for human capital (as measured by school grades, performance on standardized tests, and the rigor of students' course taking), socioeconomic status (as measured by father and mother's highest education level and family's home ownership status), immigrant status, and English language proficiency. Additional models were estimated after including social capital variables (as measured by parental involvement, amount of information from counselors, and amount of encouragement from teachers, counselors, and parents). Final models were estimated after including cultural capital variables (as measured by students' perception of school supportiveness and utility, number of school changes, level of employment, participation in school activities, and early anticipation of college attendance).

#### **IV. Results**

Each subgroup reported on average moderate levels of self-esteem and self-efficacy (see Table 3). Approximately 60% of Mexican-American students reported that English was not their first language. Whites reported the highest levels of education for both fathers and mothers, whereas Mexican-Americans reported the lowest levels of education for their parents. However, it was African-Americans (no more than 70%) and not Latina/os (about 85%) who were least likely to report their parents owned their homes, while 90% of whites reported their homes were owned by their parents.

Despite the similarities between groups in terms of their levels of esteem and efficacy, large differences were found for each subgroup both with regard to the amount of variance in esteem or efficacy explained by the models, and in the significant explanatory variables.

\*\*\*insert Table 3 about here\*\*\*

In general, the full models explained between 7% and 15% of the variance in esteem and efficacy of the six sub-groups (see Tables 4 & 5). White men had the least amount of variance explained by the models (7-8%), whereas twice that amount (14-15%) of the variance in the self-esteem and self-efficacy of African-American men was explained. For every subgroup, the amount of explained variance increased when social capital factors were added to the human capital factors. An additional increase was observed when the cultural capital factors were added.

\*\*\*insert Tables 4 & 5 about here\*\*\*

Additional results are reviewed by gender and racial/ethnic category. The models explained approximately 10% of the variance in white women's feelings of self-esteem (see Table 6). Being an immigrant was negatively related to their self-esteem, but not having English as their first language was positively related to self-esteem, as was being the youngest among siblings and having a father with more education. Only one of the human capital variables, high school GPA, was related to esteem in a positive direction. When parents were more involved in their education and when counselors gave less encouragement about college, self-esteem was higher for white women. Two of the cultural capital variables were also significant for white women: a feeling of belonging and support in school and taking an active part in high school activities.

For Mexican-American women, far fewer variables contributed to explaining their self-esteem. As with white women, their father's education was positively related. Taking AP courses also had a positive impact on self-esteem. None of the social capital variables were significant and only a feeling of support and belonging in high school was significant among the cultural capital variables.

Only two variables helped to predict the self-esteem of African-American women. None of the demographic variables or cultural capital variables was relevant. However, having a higher GPA in high school and having parents more involved in their education were positively related to their self-esteem.

For white men only one demographic variable (being the youngest among siblings) and one cultural capital variable (a feeling of belonging and support in high school) were related to self-esteem. For Mexican-American men, a negative impact on self-esteem was found when English was not their first language and when their father's education was higher. However, a higher level of education for their mother had a positive impact on their self-esteem. Human capital in the form of a higher GPA and cultural capital obtained from feeling supported in high school were also positively related to the self-esteem of Latinos. For African-American men only two factors, their fathers education and taking calculus in high school, were related to their self-esteem, and in the positive direction.

\*\*\*insert Table 6 about here\*\*\*

In general, fewer variables helped to explain variation in the self-efficacy of each of the six groups, and none of the social capital variables were significant for any group (see Table 7). For white females, as was found for self-esteem, being an immigrant had a positive effect, and when English was not their first language there was a positive effect on self-efficacy. In addition, having a higher GPA in high school was positively related to self-efficacy. Three cultural capital variables had a positive impact on self-efficacy: feeling that their high school was supportive, always wanting to attend college, and taking an active part in high school activities. For Latinas, none of the demographic variables were predictors of self-efficacy and only passing the TAAS high school graduation exam was positively related when human capital variables were examined. As with white women, feeling that their high school was supportive and being an active participant in high school activities were both positively related to their self-efficacy. For African-American females, the only variable with a significant relationship to self-efficacy was a socio-economic status variable: parents owning their home.

For white men, only two variables bore a significant relationship to self-efficacy and both in the negative direction: being an immigrant and changing schools more often were both predictive of lower levels of self-efficacy. For Latinos, a single variable was related to self-efficacy: always wanting to attend college. For African-American men only taking calculus in high school bore a positive relationship to self-efficacy.

\*\*\*insert Table 7 about here\*\*\*

## V. Conclusions

With regard to self-esteem, several factors consistently had an impact across racial and gender subgroups. Socio-economic factors had a role for every group except African-American women. When fathers had a higher level of education, white women, Latinas, and black men had higher rates of self-esteem. However, the opposite was found for Latinos, and it was when their mothers' had higher education levels that their self-esteem received a boost. This may be due to mothers having a greater influence on Mexican-American young men. Alternatively, it may be that their fathers are under-employed and not reaping the benefits of their higher education levels and this has a greater impact on their sons than it does on their daughters. Human capital was predictive of self-esteem for each subgroup except for white males, and most often it was a higher GPA in high school that was associated with higher self-esteem. However, for Latinas, those taking AP courses had higher rates of self-esteem, as did African-American men taking calculus in high school. In terms of social capital, no impact was found from these variables for Mexican-American women, and white and African-American men. However, for the other groups, having parents more involved in their education and having counselors that were less encouraging about college were positively related to self-esteem. One explanation for the negative effect from counselor encouragement may be that those students with lower levels of self-esteem were encouraged more often by counselors, who may have felt they needed the additional encouragement. With regard to cultural capital, the feeling that one belongs in high school and that it is a supportive environment bore a positive relationship to self-esteem for all whites and all Mexican-Americans, but not for African-Americans.

In general, the human, social, and cultural capital variables did a poorer job of predicting self-efficacy for each of the six subgroups. While social capital was unimportant to self-efficacy for every group, cultural capital was most important for white women and least important for African-American women and men.

Several more general conclusions also yield from these findings. Large contrasts were evident between racial/ethnic and gender subgroups, as expected from prior research (Perna 2000, Perna and Titus 2005). To the extent that high schools provide a feeling of belonging for their students, white women and Latinas seem to benefit most in terms of their esteem and efficacy when compared to other racial/ethnic subgroups. In addition, there is little evidence from this study that African-Americans receive a positive effect on their esteem or efficacy from the social and cultural capital obtained from teachers, peers, and counselors in high school. Instead, the stronger association is found for the human capital obtained in high school in the form of cognitive development, and for African-American men this effect is found only when they take calculus. A strong curriculum in high school, especially for African American men, may provide not only the academic knowledge



to be successful, but may also contribute to the psycho-social development necessary to withstand the numerous challenges of college and life.

Overall, these findings provide strong evidence that human, social and cultural capital do not operate similarly by gender or race/ethnic group. In addition, despite the numerous measures included in the models to operationalize these concepts, very few social and cultural capital variables emerged as related to the self-esteem or self-efficacy of these high school students. Nonetheless, these results provide a far better understanding of the educational influences in the development of two important psychosocial variables.

**Table 1: Dependent Variables**

<b>Self Esteem</b>	I feel good about myself
	I am able to do things as well as most other people
	On the whole, I am satisfied with myself
	I feel useless at times
	I feel I do not have much to be proud of
	I feel I am a person of worth, the equal of other people
<b>Self Efficacy</b>	I don't have enough control over the direction my life is taking
	In my life, good luck is more important than hard work for success
	Every time I try to get ahead, something or somebody stops me

**Table 2: Independent Variables**

<b>Demographics</b>	Immigrant Status (y/n)
	English is not first language (y/n)
	Youngest among siblings (y/n)
	Parents own their home (y/n)
	Father's highest education
	Mother's highest education
<b>Human Capital</b>	Average GPA in high school
	Passed the TAAS graduation exam (y/n)
	Taken calculus (y/n)
	Taken AP courses (y/n)
	Taken a college prep curriculum (y/n)
<b>Social Capital</b>	Peer plans about attending college
	Parent's involvement in education
	Parents encouraged to go to college
	Teacher(s) encouraged to go to college
	Counselor(s) encouraged to go to college
	Counselor provided information about college
<b>Cultural Capital</b>	High school is supportive
	Belief in utility of education
	Always wanted to attend college
	Number of times changed schools
	Employed 15 hrs/week or more
	Active participant in high school activities

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics**

	All	White Female	Mexican- American Female	Black Female	White Male	Mexican- American Male	Black Male
Self esteem (scale 5-20)	16.11	16.09	15.91	16.63	16.35	15.82	16.59
Self efficacy (scale 4-16)	12.61	12.78	12.46	12.86	12.71	12.36	12.64
Immigrant status (%)	0.14	0.03	0.22	0.07	0.03	0.23	0.09
English is not first language (%)	0.24	0.02	0.60	0.04	0.02	0.58	0.05
Youngest among siblings (%)	0.30	0.32	0.27	0.29	0.33	0.25	0.29
Parents own their home (%)	0.85	0.91	0.84	0.63	0.91	0.86	0.70
Father's highest education (scale of 1-9)	5.42	6.02	4.12	5.40	6.06	4.14	5.88
Mother's highest education (scale of 1-9)	5.24	5.82	4.01	5.38	5.78	4.14	5.82
Average GPA in high school (scale of 1-4)	3.22	3.41	3.19	3.11	3.25	3.03	2.96
Passed the TAAS graduation exam (%)	0.96	0.98	0.97	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.97
Taken calculus (%)	0.53	0.61	0.44	0.40	0.59	0.43	0.37
Taken AP courses (%)	0.49	0.56	0.51	0.38	0.49	0.39	0.32
Taken a college prep curriculum (%)	0.76	0.77	0.80	0.78	0.71	0.73	0.76
Two or more peers plan to attend college (%)	0.96	0.98	0.95	0.97	0.97	0.93	0.96
Parents involvement in education (scale 1-4)	2.34	2.24	2.30	2.85	2.11	2.43	3.08
Parents encouraged to go to college (%)	0.97	0.97	0.96	0.97	0.96	0.95	0.97
Teachers encouraged to go to college (%)	0.90	0.93	0.94	0.92	0.86	0.87	0.93
Counselors encouraged to go to college (%)	0.78	0.79	0.83	0.82	0.73	0.76	0.86
Counselor provided information about college (0-18 discussions)	6.13	5.41	6.71	7.94	5.18	5.87	8.25
High school is supportive (scale 6-24)	17.40	17.28	18.14	17.18	17.19	17.98	17.14
Belief in utility of education (scale 5-20)	4.47	4.01	4.03	2.86	5.25	5.49	6.89
Always wanted to attend high school (%)	0.61	0.75	0.58	0.65	0.61	0.40	0.54
Number of times changed schools	1.63	1.45	1.58	1.93	1.58	1.38	2.04
Employed 15 hours/week or more (%)	0.40	0.39	0.36	0.38	0.44	0.45	0.35
Active participation in high school activities	2.66	3.12	2.80	2.77	2.28	2.02	2.30
N	3493	828	476	369	655	392	217

**Table 4: Changes in R-squared of self esteem one year after high school**

	White Females	Mexican- American Females	Black Females	White Males	Mexican- American Males	Black Males
Human capital	0.045	0.047	0.059	0.039	0.066	0.103
Human capital & social capital	0.062	0.059	0.096	0.052	0.098	0.123
Human capital, social capital & cultural capital	0.095	0.096	0.112	0.087	0.137	0.135

**Table 5: Changes in R-squared of self efficacy one year after high school**

	White Females	Mexican- American Females	Black Females	White Males	Mexican- American Males	Black Males
Human capital	0.037	0.053	0.082	0.038	0.045	0.134
Human capital & social capital	0.048	0.062	0.091	0.049	0.066	0.14
Human capital, social capital & cultural capital	0.077	0.081	0.108	0.066	0.091	0.145

**Table 6: Predictors of self esteem one year after high school**

	White Females	Mexican- American Females	Black Females	White Males	Mexican- American Males	Black Males
Immigrant status	-0.989* (0.406)	-0.245 (0.234)	-0.689 (0.436)	0.896 (0.501)	0.292 (0.233)	-0.624 (0.481)
English is not first language	1.015* (0.507)	-0.038 (0.207)	-0.576 (0.607)	-0.715 (0.593)	-0.567** (0.207)	-0.624 (0.651)
Youngest among siblings	0.316* (0.152)	-0.175 (0.208)	-0.046 (0.239)	0.426** (0.163)	-0.071 (0.215)	-0.262 (0.296)
Parents own their home	-0.008 (0.260)	-0.049 (0.258)	0.162 (0.233)	-0.345 (0.277)	-0.085 (0.277)	0.002 (0.302)
Father's highest education	0.137** (0.050)	0.149* (0.069)	0.078 (0.076)	0.066 (0.053)	-0.195** (0.064)	0.191* (0.090)
Mother's highest education	-0.091 (0.054)	-0.097 (0.071)	0.015 (0.084)	-0.111 (0.058)	0.183** (0.066)	0.013 (0.093)
Average GPA in high school	0.284* (0.134)	-0.066 (0.173)	0.426* (0.203)	0.26* (0.135)	0.347* (0.169)	0.253 (0.246)
Passed the TAAS graduation exam	0.769 (0.483)	0.174 (0.511)	0.661 (0.524)	-0.483 (0.397)	-0.099 (0.454)	-0.362 (0.746)
Taken calculus	-0.059 (0.175)	-0.241 (0.215)	0.396 (0.269)	0.033 (0.186)	0.106 (0.229)	0.708* (0.319)
Taken AP courses	0.023 (0.174)	0.513** (0.210)	0.016 (0.265)	0.064 (0.185)	-0.067 (0.235)	-0.166 (0.333)
Taken a college prep curriculum	-0.036 (0.182)	0.33 (0.236)	-0.483 (0.272)	-0.3 (0.176)	0.144 (0.225)	0.129 (0.331)
Peer plans about attending college	0.435 (0.490)	0.06 (0.431)	1.21 (0.630)	0.109 (0.447)	0.233 (0.372)	0.429 (0.676)
Parents involvement in education	0.085* (0.039)	0.044 (0.048)	0.14** (0.053)	0.063 (0.043)	0.018 (0.048)	0.064 (0.064)
Parents encouragement about college	0.062 (0.461)	-0.929 (0.491)	-0.328 (0.620)	0.332 (0.447)	0.299 (0.460)	-0.849 (0.754)
Teachers encouragement about college	0.287 (0.287)	-0.247 (0.417)	0.39 (0.432)	0.289 (0.243)	0.586 (0.307)	0.385 (0.527)
Counselors encouragement about college	-0.386* (0.192)	-0.05 (0.277)	-0.067 (0.328)	-0.093 (0.201)	-0.618* (0.257)	0.265 (0.422)
Counselor provided information about college	-0.003 (0.017)	-0.028 (0.019)	-0.017 (0.022)	-0.016 (0.018)	-0.009 (0.022)	-0.042 (0.029)
High school is supportive	0.084*** (0.021)	0.107*** (0.030)	0.028 (0.030)	0.1*** (0.023)	0.079** (0.028)	0.001 (0.038)
Belief in utility of education	0.002 (0.005)	0 (0.007)	0.032 (0.250)	0.001 (0.002)	0.002 (0.003)	0 (0.003)
Always wanted to attend college	0.258 (0.173)	-0.026 (0.190)	0.396 (0.227)	0.24 (0.163)	0.371 (0.196)	-0.083 (0.272)
Number of times changed schools	0.058 (0.031)	-0.064 (0.044)	-0.035 (0.045)	-0.024 (0.031)	0.034 (0.051)	-0.038 (0.051)
Employed 15 hours/week or more	-0.131 (0.151)	0.099 (0.190)	0.103 (0.227)	-0.06 (0.159)	0.396 (0.190)	0.376 (0.290)
Active participation in high school activities	0.093* (0.047)	0.08 (0.050)	-0.039 (0.057)	0.024 (0.053)	0.035 (0.064)	0.026 (0.090)
Constant	11.443	14.586	12.248	14.01	12.743	14.738

N	828	476	369	655	392	217
r2	0.095	0.096	0.112	0.087	0.137	0.135

**Table 7: Predictors of self-efficacy one year after high school**

	White Females	Mexican- American Females	Black Females	White Males	Mexican- American Males	Black Males
Immigrant status	-0.642* (0.292)	-0.165 (0.178)	-0.566 (0.352)	0.943* (0.384)	0.058 (0.209)	-0.311 (0.400)
English is not first language	1.175*** (0.364)	-0.136 (0.157)	-0.153 (0.491)	-0.209 (0.454)	-0.049 (0.186)	-0.036 (0.542)
Youngest among siblings	0.02 (0.109)	0.186 (0.158)	0.309 (0.193)	0.179 (0.124)	0.173 (0.193)	0.22 (0.246)
Parents own their home	-0.09 (0.187)	-0.002 (0.196)	0.388* (0.189)	0.102 (0.212)	-0.029 (0.248)	-0.046 (0.251)
Father's highest education	0.034 (0.036)	0.049 (0.053)	0.089 (0.062)	0.013 (0.040)	-0.094 (0.058)	0.067 (0.075)
Mother's highest education	-0.045 (0.039)	-0.055 (0.054)	0.019 (0.068)	-0.015 (0.044)	0.107 (0.059)	0.019 (0.077)
Average GPA in high school	0.253** (0.096)	0.056 (0.131)	0.264 (0.164)	0.193 (0.103)	0.282 (0.152)	0.223 (0.205)
Passed the TAAS graduation exam	-0.24 (0.347)	0.912* (0.388)	0.202 (0.423)	-0.135 (0.304)	0.63 (0.407)	-0.408 (0.620)
Taken calculus	0.066 (0.126)	0.069 (0.163)	0.39 (0.218)	0.251 (0.143)	-0.155 (0.205)	0.737** (0.265)
Taken AP courses	0.08 (0.125)	0.248 (0.159)	0.027 (0.214)	0.206 (0.142)	0.28 (0.211)	0.106 (0.277)
Taken a college prep curriculum	-0.169 (0.131)	0.056 (0.179)	0.153 (0.220)	-0.12 (0.135)	-0.123 (0.201)	0.521 (0.276)
Peer plans about attending college	0.127 (0.352)	-0.124 (0.327)	0.545 (0.509)	-0.04 (0.343)	0.311 (0.333)	0.308 (0.563)
Parents involvement in education	0.038 (0.028)	-0.044 (0.037)	-0.008 (0.042)	0.056 (0.033)	0.08 (0.043)	-0.015 (0.053)
Parents encouragement about college	0.357 (0.332)	-0.365 (0.373)	0.045 (0.502)	-0.102 (0.342)	0.059 (0.412)	0.315 (0.628)
Teachers encouragement about college	0.287 (0.206)	-0.156 (0.317)	0.475 (0.349)	0.226 (0.186)	0.217 (0.275)	-0.152 (0.438)
Counselors encouragement about college	-0.197 (0.138)	0.213 (0.210)	-0.026 (0.266)	0.092 (0.154)	-0.161 (0.230)	-0.053 (0.351)
Counselor provided information about college	-0.01 (0.012)	-0.02 (0.015)	-0.008 (0.018)	-0.018 (0.014)	-0.019 (0.019)	-0.001 (0.024)
High school is supportive	0.039** (0.015)	0.046* (0.023)	0.026 (0.025)	0.025 (0.018)	0.032 (0.025)	0.022 (0.032)
Belief in utility of education	0 (0.003)	0.001 (0.005)	0.042 (0.203)	-0.001 (0.002)	0.001 (0.003)	0 (0.003)
Always wanted to attend college	0.352** (0.124)	0.044 (0.144)	0.182 (0.183)	0.119 (0.125)	0.47** (0.175)	0.022 (0.226)
Number of times changed schools	0.037 (0.022)	-0.021 (0.034)	-0.008 (0.036)	-0.058** (0.024)	0.026 (0.046)	0.034 (0.042)
Employed 15 hours/week or more	0.036 (0.108)	0.093 (0.144)	0.079 (0.183)	0.159 (0.122)	-0.01 (0.170)	0.082 (0.241)
Active participation in high school activities	0.069* (0.034)	0.074* (0.038)	-0.083 (0.046)	0.006 (0.041)	-0.042 (0.057)	0.022 (0.075)
Constant	10.489	10.886	9.321	11.239	9.689	10.268

N	828	476	369	655	392	217
r2	0.077	0.081	0.108	0.066	0.091	0.145



## References

- Anderson, J., Evans, F. (1976). Family socialization and educational achievement in two cultures: Mexican-American and Anglo-American. *Sociometry* (39) 3: 209-222.
- Bohon, S. A., Johnson, M. K., and Gorman, B. K. (2006). College aspirations and expectations among Latino adolescents in the United States. *Social Problems* (53): 207-225.
- Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Bowles, S. and Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in Capitalist America*. New York: Basic Books, Inc.
- Bowles S., Gintis H., Osborne M. (2001). The determinants of earnings: A behavioral approach. *Journal of Economic Literature*. 39: 1137-76.
- Casteel, C. (1997). Attitudes of african american and Caucasian eighth grade students about praises, rewards and punishments. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling* 31 (April): 262-72.
- Coleman, J.S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human-capital. *American Journal of Sociology*. 94: S95-S120.
- Conchas, G. (2001). Structuring failure and success: Understanding the variability in Latino school engagement. *Harvard Educational Review*, (71) 3: 475-504.
- Evans, F., Anderson, J. (1973) The psychosocial origins of achievement and achievement motivation: The Mexican-American family. *Sociology of Education* (46) 4: 396-416.
- Hernandez, N. (1973) Variables affecting achievement of middle school Mexican-American students", *Review of Educational Research*. 43 (1): 1-39.
- Jencks, et al. (1972). *Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effect of Family and Schooling in America*. New York: Basic Books.
- Judge T.A, Bono, J.E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job

satisfaction and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 86 (1): 80-92.

Jussim, L., Eccles, J., and Madon, S. (1996). Social perception, social stereotypes, and teacher expectations: Accuracy and the quest for the powerful self-fulfilling prophecy. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 28: 281-387.

Lamont, M. and Lareau, A. (1988). Cultural capital: Allusions, gaps, and glissandos in recent theoretical developments. *Sociological Theory* 6 (2): 153-168.

Le, H., Casilla, A., Robbins, S. B. et al. (2005). Motivational and skills, social, and self-management predictors of college outcomes: constructing the student readiness inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*. 65 (3): 482-508.

Lefcourt, H.M. (1982). *Locus of control: Current trends in theory and research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence-Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Massey, D. S., Charles, C.Z., Lundy, G. F. et al. (2003). *The source of the river: the social origins of freshmen at America's selective colleges and universities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Perna, L.W. (2000). Differences in the decision to attend college among African Americans, Hispanics, and Whites. *Journal of Higher Education*. (71) 2: 117-141.

Perna, L. W and Titus, M.A. (2005). The relationship between parental involvement as social capital and college enrollment: an examination of racial/ethnic group differences. *Journal of Higher Education*. (76) 5: 485-518.

Persell, C. H. , Catsambis, S., and Cookson, P. W. (1992). Differential asset conversion: Class and gendered pathways to selective colleges. *Sociology of Education*, 65 (3): 208-225.

Phillips J.M. and Gully S.M. (1997). Role of goal orientation, ability, need for achievement, and locus of control in the self-efficacy and goal-setting process. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82 (5): 792-802.

Po Yin, D. and Watkins, D. (1998). Affective variables, learning approaches and academic achievement : a causal modeling investigation with Hong Kong tertiary students. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 68 (2): 173-188.

- Robbins, S. B, Lauver, K., Le, H. et al. (2004). Do psychosocial and study skill factors predict college outcomes? A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*. 130: 261-288.
- Rosenberg M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Rotter, J.B. (1966). Generalized expectancies for internal versus external control over students outcome. *Journal of Educational Research*, 75: 185-190.
- Rowan-Kenyon, H.T. (2007). Predictors of delayed college enrollment and the impact of socioeconomic status. *Journal of Higher Education*. 78 (2): 188-214.
- Rumberger, R., Larson, K. (1998). Toward explaining differences in educational achievement among Mexican-American language-minority students. *Sociology of Education* (71) 1: 68-92.
- Stage, F K. (ed.) (2007). *Using quantitative data to answer critical questions*. New Directions for Institutional Research. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stephoe A. and Wardle J. (2001). Locus of control and health behaviour revisited: a multivariate analysis of young adults from 18 countries. *British Journal of Psychology*, 92 (4): 659-673.
- Swartz, D. L. (2003). From correspondence to contradiction and change: Schooling in Capitalist American revisited. *Sociological Forum* 18 (1): 167-186.
- TenHouten, W, Lei, T, Kendall, F, and Gordon, W. (1971). School ethnic composition, social contexts, and educational plans of Mexican-American and Anglo high school students. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 77 ( 1): 89-107.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999), *Subtractive Schooling*. State University of New York Press; Albany, NY.
- Verba S. and Nie N. (1972). *Participation in America: Political Democracy and Social Equality*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Verba S., Schlozman, K.L. and Brady, H.E. (1995). *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.