PERSPECTIVES ON URBAN EDUCATION

ISSUE THEME: Immigration Issues in Urban Schools

CONTENTS:

Issue Introduction

By Rashmi Kumar and Sonia M. Rosen, Editors

We are pleased to present Volume 6, Issue 1, in which we explore the theme of immigration issues in urban schools. Throughout the last decade, the topic of immigration has generated contentious political debate, often dominating local and national news broadcasts and taking center stage in legislative sessions. Discussions of immigration have commonly overlapped with concerns about national security, and, as a result, a myriad of political and social restrictions have been placed on immigrants and their communities. At the same time, patterns of immigration have changed. Although New York and Los Angeles continue to attract the highest overall number of immigrants, more small and medium sized cities in the South, North, and Midwest are experiencing significant increases in immigration (Office of Immigration Studies, 2007). Immigrants in these newer destinations are often assumed to have low incomes and limited educational backgrounds, and, when this is the case, their access to health and social services may be compromised (NCLR, 2007). Offering the potential for social mobility (Labaree, 1997) and the chance to learn how to navigate a new social and political world (Olsen, 1997), public schooling represents one of the most vital social services for immigrant communities. In recent decades, the increase in minority students in K-12 U.S. public schools – from 22.2% in 1972 to 43.1% in 2006 – has been almost entirely due to an increase in the immigrant student population (Planty et al., 2008), and in 2007 almost 20% of all K-12 school students came from immigrant families (Pew Hispanic Center, 2009). Central to this story, then, are the experiences of students from immigrant communities in K-12 schools and higher education institutions and the impact these students have on the institutions themselves.

In this issue, the authors engage a number of interrelated themes, including the impact of bilingualism on schools and classrooms, the significance and perceptions of cultural difference for schools, students, and families, and the consequences of federal legislation and policy on local educational contexts. Several articles in this issue have used Latinos to frame broader issues concerning the effect of immigration with regards to cultural and social differences, the pedagogical needs of immigrants, and various organizations through which educational services are provided for K-16 students. Although we recognize that immigrants come from a variety of backgrounds and that researchers cannot extrapolate the needs and experiences of all immigrants by considering primarily Latino groups, there is much to be gained from the thematic framing offered by these authors. To further broaden and enrich the journal's discussion of the themes listed above, we made the decision to extend our selections to include critical ideas that resonate and explicate many of the social, political, economic, and organizational ramifications of how urban educational institutions serve and are enriched by immigrant communities.

In Home-School Conflicts and Barriers to the Academic Achievement of Children of Latin American Immigrants, Carolyn Sattin Bajaj brings attention to the gaps that often exist between schools and Latino immigrant communities within the context of policies and pedagogical norms that dominate the great majority of American schools. Nola Butler Byrd's article, Historical Identity Development Patterns and Contemporary Multicultural Identity in First, Second, and Third Generation Counseling Students, also reflects the above theme by exploring the significance of cultural and social differences. She uses a mixed-methods approach to analyze concepts of culture, race and ethnicity among first, second, and third generation students and school counselors from multicultural backgrounds. Building on Bajaj's

call to reassess the impact of pedagogy on immigrant students, H. Elizabeth Smith examines the role of pedagogy in helping immigrant students from diverse backgrounds navigate the new cultural and social contexts in On Fostering a Pedagogy of Transparency in an Urban Community College Developmental Writing Classroom. She advocates for the clarification of instructors' expectations as an instructional strategy aimed at assisting newly arrived immigrants in developing academic skills and cultural familiarity, and she shares insight into the various social and economic factors that shape the experiences of these students both in and outside of the classroom.

Of course, this discussion of immigrants' experiences in and with schools cannot be divorced from a conversation about the impact of legislation and social policy on immigrants themselves, especially the recent wave of legislation making it easier for the Department of Homeland Security to arrest and deport undocumented immigrants with the cooperation of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services and local authorities. Undocumented Immigrants: A Teacher Remembers a Raid by Darrel Hoagland is a poignant and intimate account of the U.S. government's "crack down" on undocumented immigrants. Hoagland illustrates the profound effect these policies have on immigrant youth and families across the U.S., many of whom have limited access to legal help or mediation.

Policies directly aimed at shaping the services schools offer to students also have an important effect on immigrants. David Nieto's article, A Brief History of Bilingual Education in the United States, delves into the way policies around bilingualism have constrained school instruction. Nieto discusses how public discourse around immigration, assimilation, and difference has created pedagogical and curricular constraints regarding bilingual instruction for teachers and schools.

More than a Least Restrictive Environment: Living up to the Civil Covenant in Building Inclusive Schools by Ellen Skilton-Sylvester and Graciela Slesaransky-Poe offers a framework for considering how schools' understandings of the concepts of difference and inclusion may function to restrict or to broaden students' access to a range of experiences. The authors bring attention to the challenges and inequities faced by students with disabilities because of the way in which their learning environments are conceived of and structured within schools. They point out that the constraints faced by immigrant students are not widely discrepant from the experiences of students with disabilities, and the parallels they identify raise some critical questions. What are the different lenses through which immigrant students are viewed within public schools? How do perceptions about their abilities influence the goals that are established for their learning experiences? What would be the effect of thinking about immigrant students in terms of their strengths and contributions to the school community?

Embedded in all of these issues is a reconsideration of the roles teachers, researchers, and other allies play in working towards social justice and equity for all marginalized people. Three articles in this issue analyze these constructs explicitly. Pathways to Social Justice: Urban Teachers' Uses of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy as a Conduit for Teaching for Social Justice by Jennifer Esposito and Ayanna Swain examines the relationship between culturally relevant and social justice pedagogies. This qualitative study considers how teachers can work around the structural and curricular constraints of the school to respond to the racism that is entrenched in schooling in the U.S. Eduardo Junqueira offers a researcher's perspective in Feminist Ethnography in Education and the Challenges of Conducting Fieldwork: Critically Examining Reciprocity and Relationships between Academic and Public Interests, in which he unpacks concepts of representation and exchange in ethnographic research. He uses examples from his own research in an urban school in northeastern Brazil to consider tensions associated with reciprocity between researchers and research participants. Finally, in Becoming an Anti-Racist White Ally: How a White Affinity Group Can Help, Ali Michael and Mary C. Conger reflect on the process of supporting the struggles of marginalized communities from a position of racial privilege and urge White educators to examine their own racism in order to become effective allies for people of color. These articles are valuable not only for the explicit themes that they address but also for their theoretical framing of race, power, and the concept of difference, all of which can broadly inform discussions of immigration.

We are delighted to include two reviews of recently published and highly acclaimed books. Jeremy Cutler reviews The Trouble with Black Boys by Pedro Noguera, highlighting the author's contention with a society that, on one hand, is able to utilize the societal and monetary contributions of immigrants and, on the other hand, prevents them from moving beyond the "lower rungs of the American society" (Noguera, 2008, p. 59). Zaynab Baalbaki reviews Learning a New Land: Immigrant Students in American Society by Carola Suarez-Orozco, Marcelo M. Suarez-Orozco, and Irina Todorova. Winner of the annual prize for outstanding publications from Harvard University Press, this book uses interdisciplinary studies to document the lives of immigrant youth on macro as well as micro levels to emphasize the differences that emerge due to racial and cultural attributes among immigrant youth from the same zip codes and similar SES. We are pleased to recognize that this review continues the mission of the Penn GSE Perspectives on Urban Education Writers Circle established in 2008, and our thanks go out to Writers Circle member Tanya Maloney for her excellent assistance and guidance to the author in crafting this review.

We hope that this issue provides a framework that allows readers to explore the multi-layered and complex ideas associated with immigration and to understand their relevance within the context of urban education. Immigration must be examined in relationship to legislation and policy, schools and classrooms, and students and their communities in order to begin considering its cumulative impact on education. Such an investigation raises a number of questions for further inquiry. For instance: Who has the power to shape how immigrants are defined and treated in schools? How might schools and teachers respond differently to local, state, and national policies towards new and existing immigrant communities? How might educators and policy makers broaden the reach of successful practices that acknowledge the cultural resources, community obligations, and academic and social needs of immigrant students and their families? With this issue, we have only begun to discuss these questions.

We have redesigned our journal website to allow our readers easier and more streamlined access to PDF copies of individual articles, as well as to be able to download the entire issue. We owe our sincere thanks to Editorial Board member David Soo for his important contributions and for the creative genius that made this new format possible. We hope that our new webpage and download format will make the Journal easier to use.

References

Labaree, D. (1997). How to succeed in school without really learning: The credentials race in American education. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Office of Immigration Studies (2007). 2007 Yearbook of immigration statistics. Washington, DC: Department of Homeland Security. Retrieved from http://www.dhs.gov/ximgtn/statistics/publications/yearbook.shtm (18 March 2009).

Olsen, L. (1997). Made in America: Immigrant students in our public schools. New York: New Press.

National Council of La Raza (2007). The truth about healthcare use among immigrants. Washington, DC: Author.

Noguera, P. (2008). The trouble with black boys…and other reflections on race, equity, and future of public education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Pew Hispanic Center. (2009, March 5). Statistical portrait of the foreign-born population in the United States, 2007 (Table 23: School enrollment by region of birth: 2000 and 2007). Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved from http://pewhispanic.org/factsheets/factsheet.php?FactsheetID=45 (18 March 2009).

Planty, M., Hussar, W., Snyder, T., Provasnik, S., Kena, G., Dinkes, R., et al. (2008). The Condition of Education (NCES 2008-031). Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Home-School Conflicts and Barriers to the Academic Achievement of Children of Latin American Immigrants

By Carolyn Sattin Bajaj, New York University

Abstract

This paper explores the role of home-school conflicts in the educational failure of children of Latin American immigrants and examines how these conflicts have been framed and understood in the existing research literature. It argues that structural analyses of barriers to educational attainment alone fail to capture the multiplicity of forces that contribute to negative academic outcomes. Instead, understanding this phenomenon requires a fusion of structural and cultural analytic perspectives that take into account school-based factors such as pedagogical styles, policies, and norms and the ways in which students' cultures interact with these institutional arrangements. The author starts by reviewing some of the most serious structural barriers in the lives of children of Latin American immigrants: poverty, segregation, and limited English proficiency. Then, she examines key research on the factors associated with the poor educational outcomes of many of these students. A discussion of some of the major theoretical contributions to the study of educational stratification follows, and the author highlights and analyzes three important examples of home-school conflicts that affect immigrant student outcomes. The paper will close with suggestions for future research and education reforms, including a specific focus on increasing the role of schools in generating students' social capital.

INTRODUCTION

Children in immigrant families[1] are the fastest-growing sector of the school-age population in the United States. These youth account for twenty percent of all children in the United States, and it is projected that children of immigrants will represent twenty-five percent of the primary and secondary-school age population by 2010 (Fix & Capps, 2005; Hernandez, Denton & Macartney, 2007). The exponential growth in the size of the immigrant-origin student population in the United States has come at a time when earning at least a high school degree has never been more important for long-term personal and professional stability. While at the start of the twentieth century there were occupational avenues that allowed social mobility for people with minimal formal education, the current knowledge economy is largely closed to those who do not attain post-secondary credentials. Thus, schooling stands to play a more significant role in the lives and futures of immigrant-origin children today than

it has in any other moment in history.

Between fifty-five and sixty percent of children of immigrants enrolled in school in the United States today have geographic origins in Latin America (Hernandez et al., 2007). Latino[2] students, many of whom are children of immigrants, demonstrate some of the most alarming educational outcomes, including widespread school desertion, low levels of literacy, and poor college enrollment and completion rates (Lutz, 2007; MacDonald, 2004; Perreira, Harris & Lee, 2006; Swail, Cabrera & Lee, 2006). Low parental education, high levels of poverty, and limited English proficiency are some of the major barriers identified in these students' pathways to academic success (Capps et al., 2005; Gandara, 1995; Gandara & Contreras, 2009; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Suárez-Orozco, Suárez-Orozco, & Todorova, 2008; Valenzuela, 1999). Institutional factors such as school culture, policies, and norms, which tend to correspond with middle-class forms of cultural capital and socialization in the United States, frequently interact with these structur-

al barriers to further disadvantage low-income children in immigrant families (Delgado-Gaitan, 1992; Stanton-Salazar, 2001; Valdes, 1996). These additional institutional and cultural challenges are often overlooked or their significance is minimized in analyses of Latino youth's school failure. This paper seeks to address this gap in the literature by demonstrating the ways in which cultural clashes between home and school— one powerful symptom of the institutional arrangements that complicate ethnic and racial minority students' educational experiences— combine with existing structural forces to hinder the academic progress of poor children of Latin American immigrants.

The contemporary, post-1965 wave of immigration to the United States can best be characterized by the diversity in the newcomers' education levels, skills, and countries of origin. There has been a dramatic shift from earlier waves in the primary regions sending immigrants to this country. Until 1950, nearly ninety percent of all immigrants were European and

Canadian; today, more than fifty-five percent come from Latin America and the Caribbean (overwhelmingly from Mexico), and twenty-five percent come from Asia (Camarota, 2007; Suárez-Orozco, 2005). Current immigrants to the United States represent both the most highly skilled and highly educated and the lowest-skilled and least educated members of society. On one hand, the "new" immigrants, particularly from Asia, are more likely to have advanced degrees than the native-born population in the U.S. (Suárez-Orozco, 2005). On the other, they possess some of lowest education and income levels in the country, particularly the approximately twelve million undocumented immigrants (Camarota, 2007). According to the 2000 Current Population Survey, more than twenty-two percent of all immigrants in the United States had less than a ninth grade education, the majority of whom had come from Latin America and the Caribbean (Suárez-Orozco, 2005).

As would be expected given the range of educational and professional skill levels of the foreign-born population, the academic and labor market outcomes of children of immigrants in the United States are quite varied. Status attainment research has powerfully demonstrated the role of parental education and income in intergenerational transfer of privilege (Blau & Duncan, 1967; Jencks, 1972; Mare, 1981). In general, this pattern holds true for children in immigrant families where children of low-educated, poor immigrant parents have, on average, lower levels of educational attainment than those students of higher status backgrounds.[3] According to a report from the National Center for Children in Poverty (NCCP, 2006), compared to White, Black, and Asian children, Latino children are the least likely to have a parent who attended college, and, along with Black children, Latinos are more likely to be considered low income[4] even when their parents have had some college education and are employed full-time (NCCP, 2006). Other studies have shown a marked increase in poverty levels among immigrant families over the course of the past thirty years

(Capps et al., 2005). It is not surprising, then, that students of Latin-American origin demonstrate some of the worst academic outcomes (Lutz, 2007; MacDonald, 2004; Perreira et al., 2006; Swail et al., 2004). In fact, statistics show that Latin American-origin students have the highest drop out rates of any major racial or ethnic group in U.S. schools, and those students who do make it to post-secondary education are overrepresented in two-year colleges (MacDonald, 2004; Swail et al., 2004). Identifying the factors that contribute to these disturbing educational trends is critical to interrupting this vicious cycle of poverty, inequality, and structural and cultural neglect.

This paper aims to advance current discussions of the challenges to Latin American immigrant children's school success by exploring the role of home-school conflicts in their current educational failure. Using the issue of cultural discontinuity as an example, it will argue that a range of institutional factors interact with structural barriers such as poverty, segregation, and limited English proficiency to further disadvantage low-income Latin American immigrant students, and this powerful interaction between cultural and structural obstacles must be taken into consideration in order to develop a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon at hand. Given the multiplicity of forces at play when immigrant parents and students engage with schools, solely structural or cultural analyses are often inadequate to fully explain the complexity of these exchanges and their consequences. Instead, family-school relations and the accompanying clashes, misunderstandings, and moments of convergence must be viewed as the outcome of a series of mutually constitutive structural and cultural elements, and this analysis will pay special attention to scholars' treatment of structural and cultural analyses of conflict and school failure.

This paper will begin with an overview of the most prevalent and serious structural barriers in the lives of children of Latin American immigrants: poverty, segregation, and limited English proficiency. It will also include a

discussion of some of the key factors associated with their low participation rates in post-secondary education: an important indicator of the failure of education systems to adequately prepare these students for success in the twenty-first century economy. Next, it will review some of the main theoretical contributions to the study of educational stratification and pay particular attention to the concepts of cultural capital, constitutive action, and constitutive rules. A discussion of the implications of internal school policies, practices, and culture for the academic experiences of low-income children of immigrants will follow, focusing on three of the major analytic points at which home-school conflicts and their consequences can be observed. Finally, the paper will close with a brief review of some of the explanations for immigrants' academic achievement in the face of considerable barriers. Concluding remarks will include suggestions for next steps in the research and policy arenas as well as school reform proposals to better meet the needs of the growing population of children of immigrants in schools both in the United States and across the globe.

STRUCTURAL BARRIERS IN THE LIVES OF CHILDREN IN LATIN AMERICAN IMMIGRANT FAMILIES

The widespread educational failure of low-income children of Latin American immigrants in the United States is often attributed to the severe structural barriers that many of these students face: namely poverty, segregation, and limited English proficiency. Scholars have demonstrated the ways in which poverty can affect children's mental and physical health, academic readiness, access to high quality education, and exposure to higher status peers, all of which have significant implications for student learning (Coleman et al., 1966; Guendelman et al., 2005; Rumberger & Palady, 2005; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2007). These structural issues continue to represent some of the most dramatic and intractable sources of disadvantage for poor and minority youth; however, they alone do

not tell the entire story. In response to the pervasive emphasis on structural forces that deprive children of equal educational opportunities, some scholars worked to open up "the black box of schooling" and identify the policies and practices within schools that contributed to negative outcomes. The resulting body of literature has shed new light on the ways in which certain students' home cultures and the culture and expectations of schools come into conflict and have substantial ramifications for students' emotional and academic development (Delpit, 1995; Garcia-Coll & Magnuson, 2000; Heath, 1983; Ogbu, 1978, 1987, 1991; Valenzuela, 1999). When these cultural elements are analyzed in conjunction with the existing structural factors, a full picture of the complex web of disadvantage develops. It is important to first review the major structural issues in order to lay the foundation for more nuanced analyses of cultural factors that complicate the education of immigrant-origin children.

Poverty

Poverty is one of the most critical problems facing immigrant families today, and it has significant implications for children's educational outcomes. Poverty levels among immigrant families have grown substantially over the course of the past thirty years (Capps et al., 2005). In addition, poverty rates for children in immigrant families are considerably higher than for children in native-born families. U.S. Census data indicates that 21 percent of children with immigrant parents compared to 14 percent of children with U.S.-born parents live in poverty (cited in Shields & Behrman, 2004). Some researchers claim that the criterion of 200 percent of the official poverty threshold is a more accurate indicator of poverty, and according to this measure, 49 percent of children in immigrant families versus 34 percent of children with U.S.-born parents live in poverty (Shields & Behrman 2004). Furthermore, the National Center for Children in Poverty reports that Black and Latino children are disproportionately poor, with 34 percent of Black children and 29 percent of Latino children living

in poor families compared to 13 percent of Asian and 10 percent of White children (Fass & Cauthen, 2008).

The detrimental effects of poverty penetrate all areas of life. The children of immigrants in the U.S. are four times more likely than non-immigrant origin children to live in crowded housing conditions and three times more likely to be without health insurance (Guendelman et al., 2005; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2007). Other risk factors frequently accompany situations of poverty such as living in single-parent families, residing in poorly-resourced and dangerous neighborhoods, and attending low quality schools (Wilson 1996). Furthermore, low-income children tend to be more vulnerable to psychological distress, which may cause difficulties concentrating and sleeping, anxiety, and depression that can negatively affect their academic performance (Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2007). The lack of social, political, and economic support for poor families in the U.S— particularly for non-citizen immigrants—serves to obstruct these children's educational advancement. In a society often blinded by the myth of meritocracy, where people cling to romanticized and exaggerated stories of their families' immigration successes (Foner, 2000), immigrant families today receive less support than ever to learn English or find employment and are increasingly denied access to federal public assistance programs such as food stamps, Medicaid, and welfare (Sheilds & Behrman, 2004). Until the crisis of poverty is adequately addressed in this country, significant achievement gains for children living in these circumstances—immigrant and non-immigrant children alike—will be incredibly difficult to realize.

Segregation

Residential segregation, which has been shown to be associated with both racial and class divisions (Conley, 1999; Massey & Denton, 1993), is source of significant disadvantage for immigrant-origin youth in the United States. In fact, many children of Latin American immigrants struggle against "triple segregation," that is, segregation

by race, poverty, and language. Segregated and poor neighborhoods with diminishing employment opportunities, smaller tax bases, and lower per pupil allocations are more likely to have dysfunctional, under resourced schools with high concentrations of low-income students, less qualified teachers, overcrowded classrooms, less rigorous curriculum, and an environment less conducive to educational achievement (Fine, 1991; Orfield & Lee, 2005; Rumberger & Palardy, 2005; Valenzuela, 1999). According to a report from the Harvard Civil Rights Project, Black and Latino students are three times as likely as Whites to be in high poverty schools and twelve times as likely to be in schools in which almost everyone is poor. In addition, due to severe racial isolation, Black and Latino students attend predominantly minority schools in disproportionate numbers.

The consequences of school segregation transcend unequal resource allocation and penetrate multiple areas of students' educational experiences. The effect of peers is one important aspect of this. Studies have shown that peers have a considerable effect on all students' academic outcomes, and low-income students accrue additional benefits from attending schools with middle class peers (Coleman, 1966; Orfield and Lee, 2005; Schoefield, 1995). Furthermore, Rumberger and Palady (2005) contend that the average socioceconomic level of a student's school has as much impact on her achievement as her own socioeconomic status. Therefore, the high concentration of children of Latin American immigrants in poor, low-quality schools has major implications for these students' academic chances.

Limited English Proficiency

Limited English proficiency and the severe linguistic isolation that results from school segregation along racial and class lines are two additional, interconnected barriers that impede the educational progress of too many children in Latin American immigrant families. Limited English Proficient (LEP) students are the fastest growing segment in U.S. public schools. Nationally, the figures grew from 2.1 million

LEP students during the 1990-91 school year to over four million in 2002-2003 (reported in Fix & Capps, 2005). That year, this subpopulation constituted eight percent of the entire k-12 student population in the United States. By the year 2000, the number of k-12 children speaking Spanish at home had reached seven million (Fix & Capps, 2005). Students' lack of English skills may mask their true cognitive abilities, and, as a result, many children of immigrants enroll or are tracked into the least demanding classes, classes that eventually exclude them from the courses they need for college preparation (Chamberlain, 2005; Gandara, 1995; Valenzuela, 1999). In addition, high stakes tests such as the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), the Regents exams in New York, and the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) set unreasonably short timeframes before LEP students are tested in English (Louie, 2005; Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). Given that mastery of academic English takes an estimated five to seven years (Hakuta, Goto Butler, & Witt, 2000), LEP students' frequently poor performance on standardized tests often does not accurately reflect their academic progress. Furthermore, the pressure on schools to demonstrate "adequate yearly progress" under federal *No Child Left Behind* requirements makes LEP students a liability for schools, and thus creates an incentive for them to encourage these students to drop out (Capps et al., 2005). Finally, the variable quality of many of the English-as-a-Second-Language programs currently implemented across the country, compounded by the limited supply of adequately trained teachers, constitutes a serious obstacle to LEP students' chances to get ahead in the U.S. education system (Gershberg, Danenberg, & Sánchez, 2004).

Limited English proficient students suffer additional academic consequences when they attend segregated schools with high concentrations of low-income and non-English speaking peers, and the phenomenon of linguistic segregation is widespread. Currently, almost two-thirds of students across the country attend schools in which less than one percent of students are limited English proficient. However, almost fifty percent of LEP students attend schools in which thirty percent or more of the student population is classified as LEP (Fix & Ruiz de Velasco, 2001). This form of segregation deprives English language learners of exposure to English-speaking peers, a factor that has shown to be critically important for developing proficiency in academic language (Suárez-Orozco et al., 2008). Furthermore, low-income, linguistic minority students miss out on important social capital generating opportunities such as developing relationships with native born peers and their parents who might help them learn more about the educational and college pathways in the United States. The increasingly intense degrees of school segregation nearly guarantee persistent educational challenges for children of immigrants and other disadvantaged students.

The so-called "achievement gap" continues to be forcefully perpetuated by the powerful social inequality apparent in the high poverty levels, poor school quality, and extreme school segregation found in the lives of many immigrant-origin youth. The lack of comprehensive governmental response or a social support system to address these problems constitutes one of the most egregious failures of the social contract. However, focusing solely on issues external to school operations misses an important piece of the puzzle. Introducing questions about school pedagogical practices, tracking and enrollment procedures, norms and expectations, and the ways in which school personnel interact with students and families is critical to broadening current assessments of the causes of educational problems today and widening the range of possible interventions.

THE IMPORTANCE OF POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND LATINO STUDENT OUTCOMES

The issues of poverty, segregation, and limited English proficiency provide a basic foundation for understanding the structural sources of immigrant-origin students' educational disadvantage in the United States today. These overarching issues help to frame these students' experiences in school and in society and elucidate their daily struggles. In many respects, these problems are quite similar to those experienced by immigrants at the turn of the century. What is different now, however, are the lifelong consequences of not completing high school and obtaining post-secondary credentials. As such, it is imperative to investigate the specific obstacles to the high school completion and college enrollment of children in Latin American immigrant families in order to effectively develop policy interventions, reforms, and strategies to address the needs of the students currently being failed by the education system. Structural analyses are an important first step, but to capture the full range of factors that contribute to these educational phenomena, they must be followed by examinations of the institutional and cultural arrangements within schools that are implicated in constructing barriers to academic success for certain student populations, many poor children of Latin American immigrants among them.

The Value of a High School Diploma

Over the course of the twentieth century, access to higher education has substantially expanded, most dramatically in the second half of the century. Consequently, the labor market demand for education beyond high school has markedly increased (Day & Newberger, 2002; Mare, 1981; Perna, 2005; Porter, 2002; Rowley & Hurtado, 2002; Rumberger, 1984; Shavit & Blossfeld, 1993). The premium on post-secondary credentials has translated into significant disparities in life-course earnings between those who obtain higher degrees and those who do not. In the United States, the average annual earnings of a person without a high school diploma are $19,169 while the average college graduate earns $51,554 if she has a Bachelor's degree and $78,093 if she has an advanced degree (U.S. Census Bureau, 2006). Research has also shown that the benefits of completing college extend beyond the economic realm to include emotional

and moral development and improved health, citizenship behavior, family life, and consumer behavior (Perna, 2005; Rowley & Hurtado, 2002). While the advantages of earning a college degree are considerable, the consequences of dropping out of high school may be even more significant. A study by Wald and Martinez (2003) showed that high school dropouts were more likely to be unemployed, more likely to be unemployed for longer periods of time, and more likely to be incarcerated than people with high school degrees.

In the United States, the rates of high school completion for Hispanic students are strikingly low. The National Center for Education Statistics reported that in 2006, 5.8 percent of non-Hispanic Whites, 10.7 percent of Blacks, and 22.1 percent of Hispanics ages 16 to 24 had dropped out prior to completing high school (NCES, 2008). Although these data paint a dire picture of the state of Latino education in the United States, they have been questioned for exaggerating Latino drop out rates by including those people in the age range of interest (16-24), specifically Latin American and Caribbean immigrants, who were never enrolled in high school in the United States (Schmid, 2001). It is clear that a drop out problem exists and must be addressed; however, given that approximately half of first generation Latin American and Caribbean immigrants to the United States never enrolled in school in the United States (NCES, 2003), the figures reported by NCES are likely to be largely inflated.

Research conducted by the Pew Hispanic Center indicated that only sixty-six percent of Latino students in their sample enrolled and participated in postsecondary education compared to 74.5 percent of White students and 90 percent of Asian students. Although the data was not disaggregated by generation and therefore cannot speak specifically to the experiences of children of Latin American immigrants, the ultimate message of this and other studies of the educational outcomes of Latino students in the United States is clear: Latino students are struggling, and the education system is failing to meet their needs. The overrepresentation of Latino youth in two-year col-

leges and poor college completion rates are two other trends that give cause for serious concern. Understanding why Latin American immigrant-origin students do not make it to college in the first place, why so few of them persist in earning a degree, and what can be done to better support these students is essential in the face of this growing educational dilemma.

Transitioning to College

Given the demand for post-secondary credentials in the current global economy, it is more important than ever to identify and address the specific impediments to college enrollment. Scholars studying the college pipeline and the low rates of college enrollment and completion among Latino youth have identified a number of micro-level factors that interact with the larger structural issues to contribute to these outcomes. Using two large data sets—longitudinal data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS) that tracked a cohort of eighth grade students in 1988 through eight years after scheduled high school graduation and data from the Postsecondary transcript study (PETS) that examined college transcripts from all postsecondary institutions these students attended between 1992 and 2000—Swail et al., (2004) analyzed students' achievement outcomes and identified key mediating factors. On every indicator relevant to college eligibility and enrollment--high school completion; participation in postsecondary education; enrollment in a four year college; enrollment in a two-year college; institutional selectivity; delayed postsecondary entry; attendance patterns, and postsecondary completion--Latino youth performed significantly worse than White students, the primary reference group. These findings are echoed by subsequent reports of the disparity in Latino youths' high school completion and college participation relative to White students (Lutz, 2007; MacDonald, 2004; Perreira et al., 2006).

The novelty of Swail et al.'s (2004) study was its illumination of the major variables at play in the complex process that results in low levels of

Latino post-secondary participation and completion. The authors cite family income; educational legacy (having a parent with some post-secondary education), educational aspirations, academic preparation, mathematics course-taking statistics, and "risk factors" (parents without a high school degree, low family income, siblings who have dropped out, being held back in school, changing schools, earning a GPA the equivalent of a C or less, and bearing children while in high school) as the main indicators that help to explain why, on average, Latino youth are significantly less likely to be eligible for college, to enroll in a four year institution, and to complete any post-secondary studies. These findings are significant, and many of the influential variables identified correspond directly with the structural barriers discussed at length above. However, the study focused predominantly on individual and family-level factors and did not consider the role of schools or other public institutions in promoting or combating these disturbing trends. For example, NELS data grouped students into three categories of college eligibility ("not qualified," "minimally qualified," and "qualified"), and, of the 1000 Latino students in the sample, 557 were considered "not qualified" for college and 166 "minimally qualified." This stands in stark contrast to the breakdown for the 1000 White students in the sample: 390 were categorized as "not qualified" and 136 "minimally qualified." The criteria used to assign students into each category were not provided, but the concentration of Latinos in the "not qualified" category should raise questions about what, beyond individual-level factors such as poverty, parental education, and family size may contribute to the disproportionate number of unqualified Latino youth. School quality, school segregation, school culture, and tracking mechanisms are just some of the institutional-level factors that may also contribute to these outcomes, but this as well as many other studies overlook them in their analysis.

The relationship between student background characteristics, institutional-level factors, structural barriers

to achievement, and educational attainment is highly complex and individuated. However, current research and policy-making tends to focus on individual-level characteristics and ignores the ways in which these different levels interact to support or hinder a child's progress. As a result, critical ingredients may be missing and proposed solutions respond to only part of the issue. To fully comprehend immigrant-origin students' educational experiences and barriers to achievement, the factors under consideration must be dramatically expanded. The complex ways in which immigrant families interact with schools and the often invisible obstacles they encounter is one area that must be probed more deeply. An analytic perspective that takes into account both cultural and structural factors implicated in low achievement levels stands to expand the frame and better represent the totality of this multifaceted phenomenon. Theoretical advances in the study of educational stratification helped pave the way for scholars to engage in substantive empirical work to identify the cultural conflicts that contribute to poor and minority students' difficult educational experiences. These theoretical contributions and their implications for understanding cultural factors in the negative schooling experiences and outcomes of children of Latin American immigrants will be discussed below.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS FOR STUDYING EDUCATIONAL INEQUALITY: SOCIAL REPRODUCTION, CULTURAL PRODUCTION & CONSTITUTIVE ACTION

Stratification research has long been faulted for its narrow focus on structural issues. Significant empirical and theoretical advances were made to the study of inequality when questions related to culture and cultural differences were introduced (Gandara, 1995; Gibson, 1988; Macleod, 1987; Valdes, 1995; Willis, 1977; Zhou, 1997; Zhou & Bankston, 1998). Inserting culture into the equation has not always been positive, however, and cultural deficit explanations have had devastating effects on minority populations, including the infamous "culture of poverty" hypothesis (see Delpit, 1995; Massey & Denton, 1993; Valencia & Black, 2002 for a longer discussion). Just as purely structural analyses often miss a large part of the picture, culture alone cannot fully explain divergences and disparities in outcomes, educational or other. In fact, attempts to rely solely on one or the other approach run the risk of leading to spurious conclusions with potentially harmful consequences.

Conflicts and misunderstandings between immigrant families and their children's schools and the ramifications of such are a prime example of that which may get overlooked or inaccurately evaluated when structural or cultural analyses alone rather than a combination of both are employed. The intense interactions between home and school may, in fact, be instrumental in the educational failure of many immigrant-origin youth, and they rarely reveal themselves in large quantitative studies or macro-level analyses of educational attainment. A considerable amount of scholarship has worked to identify sources of conflict and confusion, often through deep ethnography (Valdes, 1996; Valenzuela, 1996). This research relies heavily on a long theoretical tradition of work on social and cultural reproduction, and it has made significant contributions to the field. At the same time, however, there are few examples in this body of literature that fully appreciate and account for the intricate relationship between structural and cultural factors; this may be due, in part, to the failure of the major theories to interrogate or attempt to explain this relationship. In order to respond to the prevailing educational crises of poor high school completion and low college participation rates of children of Latin American immigrants, the ways in which micro level cultural forces and conflicts intersect with larger structural issues must be thoroughly evaluated. When used together, theories of social reproduction, cultural production, and constitutive action are helpful in elucidating these links, with the concepts of constitutive action and rules perhaps offering the most concrete ways to identify and understand the larger implications of quotidian, exclusionary school-based practices.

Scholars' attempts to make sense of consistent patterns of intergenerational status transfer and restricted mobility for working-class youth in a supposedly meritocratic society resulted in the development of new theories to explain the mechanisms by which social inequality is produced and reproduced. Bowles and Gintis (1976) articulated some of the earliest theories of social reproduction, arguing that a deliberate correspondence existed between the organization of work and the organization of schooling so that elites would be trained for positions of power and working-class students would be taught to conform to the social hierarchy and accept their social and professional locations at the bottom. While these scholars were criticized for being overly deterministic and exaggerating the degree to which the economy and schooling are integrated, Bowles and Gintis' theory of social reproduction made a lasting impression on educational stratification scholarship and has continued relevance today.

Through their introduction of the concept of cultural capital, Pierre Bourdieu and Jean-Claude Passeron (1977) revolutionized the field of social reproduction by asserting that culture serves as a mediating factor in the complex relationship between the economy, the educational system, and individuals and identifying some of the key mechanisms through which intergenerational status transfer occurs. In their original conception, cultural capital referred to the elite resources, knowledge, skills, and experiences that confer social and economic advantages on those who possess them. Bourdieu (1977), using empirical evidence from school-based research in France, argued that school rules, norms, expectations, and even curriculum, were based on dominant forms of cultural capital that elite students acquire early through family socialization. Not all students have equal access to these arbitrary "instruments of knowledge," yet these instruments are made to appear universal and objective and are required for advancement in capitalist societies.

The introduction of cultural variables was a powerful addition to analyses of educational stratification. By depicting cultural practices as a reflection of broader structural forces, however, Bourdieu and Passeron were criticized for limiting the scope of culturally-based explanations (Apple, 1985; Giroux, 1983; Macleod, 1987; Willis, 1997). Through his intensive ethnographic work in a working-class school in England, Willis (1977) depicted the oppositional behavior of the "lads" he studied, and he afforded them a degree of agency that was missing in earlier studies of social reproduction. Rather than seeing cultural forms as a direct product of social structures, Willis argued that cultural attitudes and practices ("cultural production"), particularly those of oppressed groups, must be understood in terms of their own logic. This approach to studying inequality inspired a long line of scholars and dramatically reshaped the academic landscape (Macleod, 1987; Valenzuela, 1999).

The concepts of constitutive action and constitutive rules represent a final intervention into studies of educational inequality that made considerable headway in opening the "black box" of schooling. Mehan (1992) described constitutive action as "elaborate enactments of cultural conventions, institutional practices, and constitutive rules" (p.10) and constitutive rules as the rules that indicate rights and obligations and thus define and constrain the possibilities of human action. The constitutive rules are based on dominant norms and values in a society, and thus tend to disadvantage those people who do not conform to or meet these standards. Mehan et al. (1986) used these concepts in their work to understand the institutional arrangements and processes that produced special education assignments for certain students and not others. Home-school conflicts based on cultural differences offer a unique site for exploring the nexus of structure and culture through the concept of constitutive action. According to Mehan (1992), "the importance of educators' constitutive action for our understanding of social inequality is shown when educators determine whether students'

behavior counts for their placement in [college-bound or less rigorous] educational programs" (p.11). It is important to add that parents' actions [or inaction] may also influence teachers' perceptions and responses to students beyond students' own behavior. Scholars have demonstrated the ways in which educators' feelings toward and assessments of students are strongly influenced by both the students' cultures as well as teachers' interactions with parents (Lareau & Horvat, 1999; Nakagawa, 2000; Valencia & Black, 2002). The framework of constitutive rules and constitutive action is instructive in helping to analyze the causes and consequences of home-school conflicts, and three examples of these conflicts that serve to disadvantage immigrant-origin youth will be discussed below.

HOME-SCHOOL CONFLICTS, CULTURAL CLASHES AND CULTURAL MISMATCH

Home-school conflicts, also known as cultural clashes and cultural mismatch, have been objects of psychological and anthropological inquiry for a number of years. Psychologists have investigated the effects of such clashes on child development, parent-child relationships, and academic outcomes (Garcia-Coll & Magnuson, 2000; Garcia-Coll et al., 1995; Suárez-Orozco & Suárez-Orozco, 2001; Weisner, 1998), and anthropologists have studied the sources of conflict and their ramifications in different cultural and ethnic contexts (Delgado-Gaitan, 1992; Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001). Sociologists have also included this construct in their investigations of immigrant assimilation, mobility, and educational attainment (Bankston et al., 1997; Portes & Zhou, 1993; Zhou, 1997), and it has become an increasingly powerful and politicized issue in educational debates, particularly those surrounding questions of multiculturalism (D'Souza, 1995; Glazer, 1997; Nieto, 1991).

A growing body of literature on the educational consequences of home-school clashes for immigrant-origin youth builds on the earlier work of Ogbu (1978, 1987, 1991, 1993), Delpit (1995) and others (i.e. Valenzuela,

1999), who sought to explore the ways in which societal norms and schooling practices, particularly pedagogy and the relationships between students and teachers inside and outside of the classroom, serve to alienate and/or disadvantage minority students. Ogbu (1991) pointed to exclusionary forces in society (which are mirrored in public institutions such as schools) that reject those cultural characteristics of minority students (i.e. speech, dress) that differ from those of the dominant culture(s). He analyzed the adaptations and coping strategies of these youth in the face of discrimination and barriers to mobility, and he identified key differences in the experiences, challenges, and reactions of those students he called "immigrants" and those he termed "involuntary minorities." Ogbu (1987, 1991) and others (Fordham & Ogbu, 1986; Matute-Bianchi, 1991) understand minority youth's oppositional reactions as strategies of self-preservation in response to constant attacks on their cultural identities. This opposition often takes the form of resistance to authority, withdrawal or apathy in the classroom, and other behaviors that signal to teachers a lack of interest or commitment to education, and it may ultimately serve to hinder these students' academic progress. Ogbu's work set forth a framework for analysis of cultural clashes inside schools and laid the groundwork for important research that began to explore the specific policies and practices in schools that served to demean and devalue the cultures of minority students and impede their academic advancement (for examples of such research, see Delpit, 1995; Nieto, 1991; Valenzuela, 1999).

Parent Involvement as a Site of Cultural Clash

Since Ogbu's foundational work, new empirical studies of home-school conflicts have brought to light the ways in which these conflicts and misunderstandings affect teachers' perceptions of students and parents, parents' ability to navigate school processes, interact with school personnel, support their children's progress, and ul-

timately impact students' development and performance in school (Andre-Becheley, 2004; Auerbach, 2002; Delgado-Gaitan, 1991, 1992; Garcia-Coll & Magnuson, 2000; Stanton-Salazar, 2001; Reese et al., 1995; Valdes, 1995; Valenzuela, 1999). Parents' lack of information about school policies, procedures, and expectations is one issue that has been shown to result in misunderstanding, lost opportunities, and negative assessments about parents' investment in their children's education (Andre-Becheley, 2004; Delgado-Gaitan, 1992; Lareau, 1989; Ramirez, 2003; Tornasky, Cutler & Lee, 2002; Valdes, 1995; Valencia & Black, 2002). The difference between the concept of education in the United States and *educación* in many Latin American cultures provides one poignant example of how culturally bound and normative ideas about appropriate behavior can create a type of home-school conflict and how it plays out for immigrant families. Valenzuela (1999) offers a succinct explanation of this difference:

Educación is a conceptually broader term than its English language cognate. It refers to the family's role of inculcating in children a sense of moral, social, and personal responsibility and serves as the foundation for all other learning. Though inclusive of formal academic training, *educación* additionally refers to competence in the social world. (p.23)

A division of labor between the responsibilities of parents and those of teachers often follows from this wider conceptualizing of education in many Latin American immigrant families. In her studies of the way in which the importance of education is transmitted to children in Mexican immigrant families and how these immigrant parents become empowered to participate in schools, Delgado-Gaitain (1991, 1992) encountered many Mexican immigrant parents who felt that their primary role was to raise a respectful child, while the academic development belonged in the hands of the professional teacher. These parents rarely made requests of schools or intervened directly in school-based events, instead, they waited to receive direction from school. Her findings are echoed

in the work of other scholars researching Latin American immigrant parents' relationships to schooling in the U.S. (Reese et al., 1995; Stanton-Salazar, 2001; Valdes, 1996). The consequences of this subtle form of conflict—that is, different normative conceptions about the suitable role of parents in their children's schooling—can been seen in the ways in which school personnel interpret and respond to parents' behavior (or, in this case, inaction), and how this affects a child's educational experience in the classroom or in the school.

Scholars have shown that active engagement in a child's classroom learning, frequent communication with teachers, and physical presence at school events are generally taken as signs of parent involvement and investment in their children's schooling in the United States (Epstein, 1995; Lareau, 1987, 2003). Parents who do not conform to these behavioral expectations are often assumed to care less about their children's education (Delgado-Gaitan, 1991). In some cases, teachers and schools have responded to the lack of visible involvement on the part of some immigrant parents by reducing their sense of obligation to their children or concluding that these children cannot or do not deserve to be educated if their parents are not involved (Nakagawa, 2000). Although teachers' expectations of what constitute appropriate forms of parent involvement may not have been clearly articulated, the parents who fail to behave accordingly are sanctioned, and the consequences for these students can be tremendous.

School administrators' or teachers' failure to articulate school norms and behavioral expectations, such as appropriate forms of parent involvement or parents' and students' rights (e.g. to challenge special education assignments or to request additional academic support), constitutes more than just a cultural clash; in fact, this oversight functions as a powerful form of symbolic violence against students and families who may be less familiar with how schooling works in the United States and with the cultural assumptions and expectations embedded within school policies and procedures.. Many immi-

grant parents, especially low-income, poorly educated immigrants, lack basic information about the education system in their host country. Having been educated elsewhere, Latin American immigrants, for example, have different frames of reference for educational processes, policies, and norms. Their limited knowledge and experience with schooling in the United States compounds with existing structural barriers to accessing information such as the lack of translators at school functions, inflexible work schedules that conflict with school events, childcare issues, and transportation problems (Delgado-Gaitan, 1992; Trumbull et al., 2001). Furthermore, even when school-related information is provided, it may not be communicated in ways that make sense within immigrant parents' linguistic, cultural, and experiential framework (Trumbull et al., 2001). Understanding the educational challenges that low-income children of Latin American immigrants face in the United States requires a nuanced look at all areas of their experience, both inside and outside of the school building. This example of home-school conflict brings into sharp relief the way in which people's behaviors and thinking patterns are culturally bound and how people from non-dominant cultures may be at a disadvantage when they interact with institutions built around a culture different from their own.

Pedagogy and Culture Clash

Pedagogy is another, perhaps more significant, aspect of schooling that can be analyzed through the lenses of home-school conflicts and constitutive action. Pedagogy is not culturally-neutral; instead, certain forms of pedagogy correspond better to certain methods of socialization, communication, and value systems (Delpit 1995; Lareau 2003). In the United States, pedagogy often reflects the dominant, middle class forms of socialization (Chamberlain 2005; Heath 1983; Lareau 2003). As such, the pedagogical practices that teachers employ can be understood as sanctioned constitutive action (Mehan 1992; Mehan et al.,

1986).. Scholars across disciplines have scrutinized different teaching practices and children's responses to them based on their linguistic, ethnic, cultural, and class backgrounds to illuminate the existence of cultural and class-based bias (Chamberlain, 2005; Delpit, 1995; Heath, 1983; Lareau, 2003; Nieto, 1992; Stanton-Salazar, 2001). They have found that commonly used interrogative methods, communication styles, and teaching strategies (across subject areas) tend to mirror what goes on in the homes of many middle-class White children but stand in contrast to the ways in which many low-income and minority students are socialized (Delpit, 1995; Lareau, 2003; Stanton-Salazar, 2001). For example, Heath (1983) concludes that the language used in low-income homes did not prepare children for the type of language used in the classroom. Delpit (1995) argues that the non-authoritative communication style of many progressive White teachers sent mixed messages to Black students about the teacher's expectations. Finally, Stanton-Salazar (2001) describes the individualistic/competitive approach found in many U.S. classrooms as completely at odds with the collectivist value system of Mexican families. Forms of socialization, communication methods and value systems constitute cultural capital, and, in contemporary American schools, middle-class, Anglo forms of cultural capital are most highly valued. As such, low-income children of Latin American immigrants suffer in classrooms where their cultural forms are devalued, and they do not automatically possess the tools to effectively participate in learning in the same way as other students.

Assessment

The inherent inequality built into many forms of academic and psychological assessments has been a hotly debated topic for decades. Cultural and class-based biases built into tests of I.Q. and language proficiency, as well as many other assessments, has been widely evidenced (Chamberlain, 2005; Louie, 2005; Mehan et al., 1986; Noguera, 2003; San Miguel & Valencia, 1998). Their continued and expanded use, however, coupled with well-developed academic tracking systems that frequently place minority students in the least challenging courses and limit their college eligibility, contributes to the perpetuation of disparities in educational attainment. The current high stakes testing regime propelled by federal *No Child Left Behind* legislation is particularly punitive to language minority students who are required to be tested in English after only one year (Louie, 2005). Assessments and tracking are two of the most powerful engines of educational inequality today. Although they do not necessarily attack immigrant-origin students' cultures directly, these, like the other forms of home-school conflict mentioned above, function to put cultural minority students at a disadvantage by requiring knowledge and exposure to certain norms and expectations to which these students may not have access at home.

CONCLUSION

In the face of seemingly insurmountable obstacles, many low-income children of Latin American immigrants still manage to succeed in American schools that, in many ways, are designed to encourage their failure. Home-school conflicts and misunderstandings pervade these children's educational experiences, and they arrive at school with skills, cultural practices, and sensibilities that are frequently rejected or seriously devalued (Valenzuela 1999). How do some of these students manage to achieve when the dominant culture and institutional practices based on that culture work against them? Some scholars have argued that immigrant parents possess a greater degree of optimism than native-born parents, and this helps to motivate their children to achieve (Kao & Tienda, 1995). Others contend that children of immigrants feel additional pressure to succeed given the incredible sacrifices they have witnessed their parents make on their behalf (Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001). Still others argue that there is a selectivity bias at play that can help to explain higher than expected levels of achievement (Chiswick, 1978; Feliciano, 2005; Portes & Rumbaut, 1996).

Research on the multiple forms of social capital generated within immigrant communities has perhaps made the most significant contribution to our understanding of immigrant achievement. By broadening the empirical and theoretical scope of studies of immigrant achievement, social capital offers a powerful analytic tool. Social capital within immigrant communities, also referred to as ethnic or community capital, has been shown to be generated in various arenas and through many different kinds of relationships (Bankston et al., 2002; Goyette & Conchas, 2002; Noguera, 2004; Stanton-Salazar, 2001; Zhou & Bankston, 2002; Zhou & Kim, 2006). While scholars continue to reveal new sites and forms of social capital development within immigrant communities, the role of schools in producing and sustaining social capital is still largely unknown (Hannum & Fuller 2002). Exploring the nexus between schools and social capital, and social capital specifically as it relates to academic achievement, is one important way in which research can respond to the crisis of educational inequality.

Beyond increasing opportunities for immigrant-origin youth's social capital development, large-scale, systematic reforms of daily school practices are necessary in order to begin to address the long-term injustices waged against ethnic and cultural minority children in American schools. Teachers must embrace a more expansive conception of merit that acknowledges the skills and talents of youth that cannot be measured in standardized assessments. New forms of cultural capital that may not conform to dominant ideas of appropriate language, dress, and behavior must be recognized and valued in and out of school. Perhaps most importantly, better ways to connect students' families with their schools must be developed, because academic success today requires a coordinated effort among home and school resources. For any of these strategies to work, however, changes must occur on both cultural and structural levels. Reform efforts that fail to recognize and then dismantle the hegemony of one dominant culture that determines and is reinforced

by institutional structures are doomed to repeat these vicious cycles.

Carolyn Sattin Bajaj is an advanced doctoral student in International Education at New York University and a research assistant at the Institute for Globalization and Education in Metropolitan Settings (IGEMS). Her dissertation research looks at Latin American immigrant families' experiences with high school choice in New Yor0k City.

ENDNOTES

1   The phrase "children in immigrant families" refers to both first generation (immigrant) children and second generation children (U.S.-born children of immigrant parents). In their research brief based on data from the 2000 U.S. Census, Hernandez, Denton, and Macartney (2007) included children with at least one foreign-born parent in their analysis of children in immigrant families. In this paper, the phrase "children in immigrant families" will be used interchangeably with "immigrant-origin children" to refer to first and second generation children of immigrants.

2   The terms "Latino" and "Hispanic" are often used interchangeably in studies that include people who trace their origins to Spanish-speaking parts of Latin America and the Caribbean (Suarez-Orozco & Paez, 2002). Most government agencies, including the U.S. Census Bureau and the U.S. Department of Education, use the term Hispanic in their survey materials and in public data. This author prefers the term Latino but will use the term Hispanic when referencing work that originally employed it. A sample of Latinos may include the third generation as well as first and second generation children of immigrants. In addition, the term Latino refers to Cubans, Puerto Ricans, and Dominicans from the Caribbean as well as people from Latin America. Therefore, data on Latinos does not exclusively describe children of immigrants from Latin America— the population of interest to this paper— but rather encompasses a broader population. Many studies of educational outcomes group students into a single category (Latino/Hispanic) but rarely provide disaggregated data by generation or parents' country of origin; in spite of these limitations, those studies with valuable data on Latino students will be referenced in this paper.

3   While this is the general trend, some research has shown evidence of the ways in which the immigration experience can disrupt predicted mobility outcomes and intergeneration status transfer and has highlighted the complicated role that race and ethnicity play in this process (Bankston, Caldas & Zhou, 1997; Gandara, 1995; Kao & Tienda, 1995; Ogbu, 1991).

4   Low income is defined in this report as twice the federal poverty level or $40,000 for a family of four in 2006.

REFERENCES

Andre-Bechely, L. (2005). *Could It Be Otherwise? Parents and the Inequities of Public School Choice*. New York: Routledge.

Apple, M. (1985). *Education and Power*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Auerbach, S. (2002). Why Do They Give the Good Classes to Some and Not to Others? Latino Parent Narratives of Struggle in a College Access Program. *Teachers College Record* 104(7):1369-1392.

Bankston, C. L. (2004). Social Capital, Cultural Values, Immigration, and Academic Achievement: The Host Country Context and Contradictory Consequences. *Sociology of Education* 77(2):176-179.

Bankston, C.L., Caldas, S.J., and Zhou. M. (1997). The Academic Achievement of Vietnamese American Students: Ethnicity as Social Capital. *Social Focus* 30: 1-16.

Bankston, C.L., and Zhou, M. (2002). Social Capital and Immigrant Children's Achievement. *Schooling and Social Capital in Diverse Cultures* (B. Fuller and E. Hannum, Eds.). New York: JAI.

Blau, P., and Duncan, O.D. (1967). *The American Occupational Structure*. New York: Wiley.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction. *Power and Ideology in Education* (J. Karabel, and A.H. Halsey, Eds.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bourdieu, P., and Passeron, J. (1977). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.

Camarota, Steven A. (2007). Immigrants in the United States, 2007: A Profile of America's Foreign Born Population. *Backgrounder*, November 2007. Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies.

Capps, R., Fix, M., Murray, J., Ost, J., Passel, J. and Herwantoro, S. (2005). *The New Demography of American's Schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act*. The Urban Institute. Retrieved on 25 April 2008 from http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/311230_new_demography.pdf

Chamberlain, S. P. (2005). Recognizing and Responding to Cultural Differences in the Education of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners. *Intervention in School and Clinic* 40(4):195-211.

Chiswick, B.R. (1978). The Effect of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign-born Men. *Journal of Political Economy* 86: 897-921.

Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Wienfeld, F., and York, R. (1966). *Equality of Educational Opportunity*. Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education.

Conley, D. (1999). *Being Black, Living in the Red*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Day, J. C. and Newburger, E. C. (2002). *The Big payoff: Educational attainment and synthetic estimates of work-life earnings*. Current Population Reports, Special Studies P23-210. Washington, DC: Commerce Department, Economics and Statistics Administration, Census Bureau.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1991). Involving parents in the schools: A process of empowerment. *American Journal of Education,* 100(1): 20-46.

Delgado-Gaitan, C. (1992). School Matters in the Mexican-American Home: Socializing Children to Education. *American Educational Research Journal* 29(3):495-513.

Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York: The New Press.

D'Souza, D. (1995). *The End of Racism: Principles for a Multiracial Society*. New York: The Free Press.

Epstein, J. L. (1995). School/family/community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 701-712.

Fass, S., and Cauthen, N.K. (2008). *Who Are America's Poor Children? The Official Story*. New York: National Center for Children in Poverty.

Feliciano, C. (2005). Educational Selectivity in U.S. Immigration: How Do Immigrants Compare to Those Left Behind?

Demography 42(1): 131-152.

Fine, M. (1991). *Framing Dropouts: Notes on the Politics of an Urban Public High School*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Fix, M., and Capps, R. (2005). *Immigrant Children, Urban Schools, and the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.

Fix, M., and Ruiz de Velasco, J. (2001). *Challenges Facing High Immigrant-Serving Secondary Schools in the Context of Standards Based School Reform*. Report for the Subcommittee on Education, Illinois Immigrant Policy Project. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Fordham, S., and Ogbu, J.U. (1986). Black students' school success: Coping with the "burden of acting white." *Urban Review* 18(3): 176-206.

Foner, N. (2000). *From Ellis Island to JFK: New York's Two Great Waves of Immigration*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Fuller, B. and Hannum, E. (2002). Introduction: Scaffold for Achievement? Institutional Foundations of Social Capital. *Schooling and Social Capital in Diverse Cultures* (B. Fuller and E. Hannum, Eds.). New York: JAI.

Gandara, P. (1995). *Over the Ivy Wall: The Educational Mobility of Low-Income Chicanos*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Gandara, P., and Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino Education Crisis: The Consequences of Failed Social Policies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Garcia-Coll, C.T., and Magnuson, K. (2000). Cultural differences as sources of developmental vulnerabilities and resources: A view from developmental research. *Handbook of Early Childhood Intervention* (S.J. Meisel and J.P. Shinkoff, Eds.). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Garcia-Coll, C.T., Meyer, E.C., and Brillon, L. (1995). Ethnic and minority parenting. *Handbook of parenting,* (M.H. Borenstein, Ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Gershberg, A.I., Danenberg, A., and Sánchez, P. (2004). *Beyond Bilingual Education: New Immigrants and Public School Policies in California*. New York: The Urban Institute Press.

Gibson, M. (1998). *Accommodation Without Assimilation: Sikh Immigrants in an American High School*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Giroux, H. (1983). *Theory and Resistance in Education*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Harvey.

Glazer, N. (1997). *We Are All Multiculturalists Now*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Goyette, K.A., and Conchas, G.Q. (2002). Family and Non-Family Roots of Social Capital Among Vietnamese and Mexican American Children. *Schooling and Social Capital in Diverse Cultures* (B. Fuller and E. Hannum, Eds.). New York: JAI.

Guendelman, S., Angulo, V., Wier, M., and Oman, D. (2005). Overcoming the Odds: Access to Care for Immigrant Children in Working Poor Families in California. *Maternal and Child Health Journal* 9(4):351-362.

Hakuta, K. Goto Butler, Y. and Witt, D. (2000). "How Long Does it Take English Learners to Attain Proficiency?" Santa Barbara, CA: University of California, Linguistic Minority Research Institute, Policy Report 2000-1.

Heath, S.B. (1983). *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hernandez, D.J., Denton, N. A., and Macartney, S.E. (2007). *Children in Immigrant Families – The U.S. and 50 States: National Origins, Language, and Early Education*. Albany, NY: Child Trends & the Center for Social and Demographic Analysis, University of Albany, SUNY.

Jencks, C. (1972). *Inequality*. New York: Basic Books.

Kao, G. (2002). Ethnic Differences in Parents' Educational Aspirations. *Schooling and Social Capital in Diverse Cultures* (B. Fuller and E. Hannum, Eds.). New York: JAI..

Kao, G. and Tienda, M. (1995). Optimism and Achievement: The Educational Performance of Immigrant Youth. *Social Science Quarterly* 76(1):1-19.

Lareau, A. (1987). Social Class Differences in Family-School Relationships: The Importance of Cultural Capital. *Sociology of Education* 60(2):73-85.

_____. (1989). *Home advantage: Social class and parental intervention in elementary education*. London: Falmer.

_____. (2003). *Unequal Childhoods: Class, Race, and Family Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Lareau, A., & Horvat, E. M. (1999). Moments of social inclusion and exclusion: Race, class, and

cultural capital in family-school relationships. *Sociology of Education* 72: 37-53.

Louie, V. (2004). *Compelled to Excel: Immigration, education, opportunity among Chinese Americans*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.

Louie, V. (2005). Immigrant Newcomer Populations, ESEA, and the Pipeline to College: Current Considerations and Future Lines of Inquiry. *Review of Research in Education* 29(1):69-105.

Lutz, A. (2007). Barriers to high-school completion among immigrant and later-generation Latinos in the USA: Language, ethnicity and socioeconomic status. *Ethnicities* 7(3):323-342.

Macleod, J. (1987). *Ain't No Makin' It*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

MacDonald, V.M. (2004). *Latino Education in the United States: A Narrated History from 1513-2000*. New York: Palgrave.

Mare, R.D. (1981). Change and Stability in Educational Stratification. *American Sociological Review* 46(1): 72-87.

Massey, D. S., and Denton, N.A. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Matute-Bianchi, M.E. (1991). Situational ethnicity and patterns of school performance among immigrant and nonimmigrant Mexican-descent students. *Minority Status and Schooling: A Comparative Study of Immigrant and Involuntary Minorities* (M.A. Gibson and J.U. Ogbu, Eds.). New York: Garland Publishing.

Mehan, H. (1992). Understanding Inequality in Schools: The Contribution of Interpretive Studies. *Sociology of Education* 65(1): 1-20.

Nakagawa, K. (2000). Unthreading the ties that bind: Questioning the discourse of parentinvolvement. *Educational Policy, 14*(4), 443-472.

NCES (2003). *Status and Trends in the Education of Hispanics*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

NCES (2008). *The Condition of Education 2008*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

Noguera, P.A. (2003). *City Schools and the American Dream: Reclaiming the Promise of Public Education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Noguera, P. A. (2004). Social Capital and the Education of Immigrant Students: Categories and Generalizations. *Sociology of Education* 77(2):180-183.

Ogbu, J.U. (1978). *Minority Education and Caste: The American System in Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

_____. (1987). Variability in minority responses to schooling: Nonimmigrants vs. immigrants. *Interpretive Ethnography of Education: At Home and Abroad*, (G. Spindler and L. Spindler, Eds.). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

_____. (1991). Immigrant and Involuntary Minorities in Comparative Perspective. *Minority Status and Schooling: A Comparative Study of Immigrant and Involuntary Minorities* (M.A. Gibson and J.U. Ogbu, Eds.). New York: Garland Publishing.

_____. (1993). Frameworks—variability in minority school performance: A problem in search of an explanation. *Minority Education: Anthropological Perspectives*. (E. Jacob and C. Jordan, Eds.). Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Olsen, L. (1997). *Made in America*. New York: The New Press.

Orfield, G., and Lee, C. (2005). *Why Segregation matters: Poverty and Educational Inequality*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University.

Perna, L. W. (2005). Benefits of higher education: sex, racial/ethnic, and socioeconomic group differences. *Review of Higher Education, 29*(1), 23-52.

Perreira, K.M., Harris, J.M., and Lee, D. (2006). Making in it America: High School Completion by Immigrant and Native Youth. *Demography* 43(3): 511-536.

Porter, K. (2002). *The value of a college degree*. Washington DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education.

Portes, A. and Rumbaut, R. (1996). *Immigrant America: A Portrait*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Portes, A., and Rumbaut, R.G. (2001). *Legacies: The Story of the Second Generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Portes, A. and Zhou, M. (1993). The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants. *The Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* 530:74-98.

Ramirez, A.Y. F. (2003). Dismay and Disappointment: Parental Involvement of Latino Immigrant Parents. *The Urban Review* 35(2): 93-110.

Reese, L., Balzano, S., Gallimore, R., and Goldenberg, C. (1995). The Concept of *Educacion:* Latino Families and American Schooling. *International Journal of Educational Research* 23(1):57-81.

Reese, W.J. (2005). *America's Public Schools: From the Common School to 'No Child Left Behind.'* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Rowley, L.L., and Hurtado, S. (2002). *The non-monetary benefits of an undergraduate education*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Center for the Study of Higher and Postsecondary Education.

Ruiz de Velasco, J. and Fix, M. (2000). *Overlooked & Underserved: Immigrant Students in U.S. Secondary Schools*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Rumberger, R. W. (1984). The Changing Economic Benefits of College Graduates. *Economics of Education Review* 3(1):3-11.

Rumberger, R. W., and Palardy, G. J. (2005). Does Segregation Still Matter? The Impact of Student Composition on Academic Achievement in High School. *Teachers College Record* 107(9):1999-2045.

San Miguel, G., and Valencia, R.R. (1998). From the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo to Hopwood: The educational plight and struggle of Mexican Americans in the Southwest. *Harvard Educational Review* 68(3):353-398.

Schmid, C.L. (2001). Educational Achievement of Language-Minority Students, and the New Second Generation. *Sociology of Education* 74:71-87.

Schofield, J.W. (1995). Review of research on school desegregation's impact on elementary and secondary school students. *Handbook of research on multicultural education,* (J.A. Banks and C.A.M. Banks, Eds.). New York: Simon & Schuster Macmillan.

Shavit, Y., and Blossfeld, H.P. (1993). *Changing Educational Attainment in Thirteen Countries*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Shields, M.K., and Behrman, R.E. (2004). Children of Immigrant Families: Analysis and Recommendations. *The Future of Children* 14(2): 4-15.

Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (2001). *Manufacturing Hope and Despair: The School and Kin Support Networks of U.S.-Mexican Youth*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Stanton-Salazar, R. D. (2001). *Manufacturing Hope and Despair: The School and Kin Support Networks of U.S.-Mexican Youth*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Suárez-Orozco, M.M. (2005). Right Moves? Immigration, Globalization, Utopia, and Dystopia. *The New Immigration: An Interdisciplinary Reader* (M.M. Suárez-Orozco, C. Suárez-Orozco, and D. Baolin Qin, Eds.). New York: Routledge.

Suárez-Orozco, M.M., and Paez, M.M. (2002). The Research Agenda. *Latinos Remaking America,* (M.M. Suárez-Orozco and M.M. Paez, Eds.). Berkeley: University of California Press.

Suárez-Orozco, C. and Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2001). *Children of Immigration.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, C. and Suárez-Orozco, M. M. (2007). Education. *The New Americans: A Guide to Immigration Since 1965* (M.C. Waters, U. Reed and H. B. Marrow, Eds.). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, C. and Suárez-Orozco, M. M., and Todorova, I. (2008). *Learning a New Land: Immigrant Students in American Society.* Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University.

Swail, W. S., Cabrera, A. F., and Lee, C. (2004). *Latino Youth and the Pathway to College.* Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.

Tornatzky, L.G., Cutler, R., and Lee, J. (2002). *College Knowledge: What Latino Parents Need to Know and Why They Don't Know It.* Report for The Tomas Rivera Policy Institute, Claremont, California.

Trumbull, E., Rothstein-Fisch, C., Greenfield, P.M., and Quiroz, B. (2001). *Bridging Cultures between Home and School: A Guide for Teachers.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

U.S. Census Bureau (2006). *Educational Attainment in the United States: 2006.* [Electronic Version]. Washington, DC: Author.

Valdes, G. (1996). *Con Respeto: Bridging the Distance between Culturally Diverse Families and Schools: An Ethnographic Portrait.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Valencia, R. R., and Black, M.S. (2002). "Mexican Americans Don't Value Education!"- On the Basis of the Myth, Myth-making, and Debunking. *Journal of Latinos and Education* 1(2):81-103.

Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Wald, M., and Martinez, T. (2003). *Connected by 25: Improving the Life Chances of the Country's Most Vulnerable 14-24 year olds.* Working Paper for the William and Flora Hewitt Foundation.

Weisner, T.S. (1998). Human development, child well-being, and the cultural project of development. *New directions for child and adolescent development: No. 91. Socioemotional development across cultures.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Willis, P.E. (1977). *Learning to Labour.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Wilson, W.J. *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor.* New York: Vintage Books.

Zhou, M. (1997). Growing Up American: The Challenge Confronting Immigrant Children and Children of Immigrants. *Annual Review of Sociology* 23:63-95; 63.

Zhou, M., and Bankston, C. (1998). *Growing Up American: How Vietnamese Children Adapt to Life in the United States.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Zhou, M. and Kim, S. (2006). Community Forces, Social Capital and Educational Achievement: The Case of Supplementary Education in the Chinese and Korean Immigrant Communities. *Harvard Educational Review* 76:1.

Historical Identity Development Patterns and Contemporary Multicultural Identity in First, Second, and Third Generation Counseling Students

By Nola Butler Byrd, San Diego State University

ABSTRACT

This study examines the historical and contemporary identity development patterns of first, second, and third generation students to determine the attributes students bring with them and how they develop through their experiences in a multicultural counselor training program. The paper examines patterns between groups, followed by a discussion of implications and recommendations for multicultural counseling and education.

Studies have found that prior multicultural training and the race or ethnicity of the counselor can be predictive of counselor's self-assessed abilities to work with culturally diverse clients. Counselors of color in many of these studies have reported greater levels of multicultural counseling competence versus their European American counterparts, and higher levels of multicultural preparation have been associated with greater self-assessed multicultural counseling competence (Constantine, 2001; Constantine, Juby, and Liang, 2001; Neville et al., 1996; Ottavi, Pope-Davis, and Dings, 1994; Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Dings, and Nielson, 1995; Pope-Davis, Reynolds, Dings, and Ottavi, 1994; Sodowsky, Kuo-Jackson, Richardson, and Corey, 1998; Sodowsky, Taffe, Gutkin, and Wise, 1994). However, little is known, about the determinants of multicultural identity among students based on their generational background in the United States (U.S.).

For many years, practitioners in the fields of education and psychology responded to this need by developing multicultural education opportunities and researching multicultural awareness and identity development in order to prepare competent multicultural professionals. The field of counseling psychology was the first to develop a set of multicultural counseling competencies (Sue, Arredondo, and McDavid, 1992). Recently, the conceptualizations of multicultural counselors' and educators' regarding multiculturalism have been challenged by scholars and activists calling for the inclusion of immigrant perspectives and linguistic diversity in order to end the oppression of immigrants. The majority of studies and preparation programs in the fields of education, counseling and psychology have tended to focus on English-speaking clients and practitioners born and raised in the U.S. and not those on with linguistic diversity or immigration status.

The utility of the Multicultural Experience Inventory (MEI) as an outcome measure was examined in this study of first, second and third or more generation students in the (CBB Program). This study assessed historical and contemporary multicultural development patterns prior to their matriculation in the CBB program to determine what participants brought with them in terms of their multicultural experiences and identity. It also contrasted their entry and exit scores on a measure of multicultural attitudes and behaviors to assess the affects of the preparation program on a student's behaviors and attitudes. The data used in this study was collected by the author, who was also a faculty member in the program, as part of a longitudinal study (2003-2006) of the CBB program.

MULTICULTURAL IDENTITY DEVELOPMENT TRENDS

Traditionally, identity development scholars have explored the significance of individual identities. In recent years, however, scholars have expanded this to include multiple identities, in part because the social movements of the 1950s and 60s exposed a range of identities and experiences that had been concealed by the dominant European American postwar culture. This shift was also influenced by the work of Zinn (1980), Takaki (1993, 1998), among others who reframed the history of the U.S. based on interviews with diverse ethnic and immigrant groups. Evidence revealed blatant and subtle discrimination and oppression of people in the U.S. based on class, race, gender, immigration status and other diverse identities. It exposed the complexities and intersectionalities of the identities of many people previously overlooked by scholars. Such revelations demand the services of competent multicultural counselors who can work successfully with individuals and communities with diverse, multiple identities.

Trends in multiple identity development address the complexity of human identity. These theories represent human identity as multifaceted, yet integrated. Each identity is a frame of reference that includes an array of social and cultural identities, gendered and sexual identities, and other identities based on beliefs, national and local alliances, socio-economic status, language, generation, etc. (Barvosa-Carter, 1998; Gutierrez Keeton, R., 2002).

Within this field, scholars have examined the characteristics that individuals need in order to develop healthy identities. Erickson (1987) theorized that healthy identity development occurs when people are provided psychosocial time and space and the freedom to experiment with different social roles before making long term commitments to a chosen occupation, to intimate relationships, social and political groups and ideas, and to a philosophy of life. Gurin, Dey, Hurtado, and Gurin (2002) added that psychosocial moratoriums of this nature should include exposure to diverse, complex interactions or people may passively make life decisions and commitments based solely on their limited past experiences. This would support decision-making informed by new, broader, and more complex perspectives and relationships, which has been supported by research on multiethnic juries (Sommers, 2006). As members of racially homogeneous or heterogeneous mock juries, European American participants deliberated on the trial of an African American defendant. Half of the groups were exposed to pretrial jury selection questions about racism. Analyses of these deliberations supported Sommer's hypothesis that diverse groups exchange a wider range of information than all-European American juries. European Americans in this study also cited more case facts, made fewer errors, and were more open to discussion of racism when in diverse versus homogeneous European American groups. Even before deliberations, European Americans in diverse groups who were exposed to blatant racial issues in pre-trial questionnaires showed more tolerance and mercy toward the African American defendant, demonstrating that the effects of diversity do not occur solely through information exchange (Sommers, 2006).

Other scholars advocate a more critical, hermeneutic orientation in identity development through analysis of multiple identities (Herda, 1999), transcultural identities (Huffman, 2001), and liminal identities stemming from the "borderization" of the U.S. Herda (1999) argues that identity development is a community process:

(…) the identity of an individual does not arise from a developmental process resulting in a separate unit that when united with many others makes up a group, society, or community. Rather, the identity of an individual is found in a moral relationship with others which, when in aggregate form, makes up more than the sum of the membership. A full and mature sense of self does not stem from a developmental process grounded in individualism but instead arises from a recognition that in one's relationship with others there resides the possibility of seeing and understanding the world, and therefore one's self, differently. When I change, the rest of the world changes. (p. 7)

Borderization includes the physical boundary between the U.S., Mexico, Canada and other countries or territories occupied by the U.S. It includes a pedagogy that creates new knowledge that addresses social justice issues. Borders are "sites of interlinguistic engagement and liminal identities where many realities come together" (Estrada and McLaren, 1993). As borders widen, they create cultural instability where cultures collide creatively or destructively. People with bicultural/multicultural identities, such as immigrants, have extensive socialization and life experiences in two or more cultures and participate actively in these cultures. This is reflected by their behaviors and lived experiences with extensive and intimate interactions with people from other cultures (Ramirez, 1998). Competent bicultural/multicultural people have the potential to change American society and their development and contributions will have an impact on counseling and education practices in all of the countries and communities in which they are involved (Calderon and Carreon, 2000).

However, Steele's (1992, 2002) stereotype threat theory and its relationship to domain identification theory also pose important factors that can promote or impede the resilience of multicultural people. Stereotype threat theory asserts that the academic achievement of students-at-promise and women in advanced quantitative areas is determined by their ability to identify with the school and its subdomains. Their ability to identify is influenced by societal pressures such as gender roles and economic disadvantage. In schools where students "at promise" identify with the domain of schooling, there is the additional barrier of stereotype threat, which Steele (2002) defines as "the threat that others' judgments or their own actions will negatively stereotype them in the domain" (p. 336).

This research shows that it is not enough for counselors to understand traditional identity scholarship. In our multicultural society, competent culturally responsive counselors must be aware of their own multiple identities, as well as those of their clients in order to foster transformative, socially just relationships with themselves, their clients and the community.

METHODOLOGY

This study used the Multicultural Experience Inventory (MEI) (Ramirez, 1998) as the primary instrument to examine the experiences of first- and second-generation immigrant students contrasted with students who have been in the U.S. for three or more generations and addresses the following questions: What do first, second, and third or more generation students bring with them into multicultural education programs in terms of multicultural awareness and identity? Do historical identity patterns vary substantially among first, second and third or more generation students in this counselor preparation program? How did the CBB counselor preparation program affect first, second and third or more generation students' multicultural awareness and identity? This study used both qualitative and quantitative measures to address the research questions.

Overview of the CBB Program's Multicultural Education Model

The 35-year-old Community-Based Block CBB Program is located in a large urban southwestern city on the U.S. border. The demographics are reflective of a highly diverse population in the U.S., including a growing

Latino population. CBB's mission is to prepare multicultural counselors committed to working with marginalized individuals and communities. Many of the students attracted to the program come from low-income communities and are the first in their families to matriculate in graduate school or college. CBB attracts more than three times the number of students it can accept, which makes it highly competitive.

The program operates in an affective experiential learning environment (Kolb, 1984), with a critical theoretical approach (Freire, 1972) designed to help learners look deeply within, without and beyond the self to find new ways of seeing, knowing and being in multicultural contexts. Through CBB's democratic partners-in-learning philosophy, students are empowered to take ownership of their own learning while they engage experientially in their own, and their colleagues', personal experiences of oppression, privilege, and personal growth issues. As part of this experiential process, students apply their learning in their work with clients and in the learning community. Knowledge and learning that occurs in affective experiential environments emphasizes the *experience* of what it is actually like to be a counseling professional/change agent. In this environment, information discussed and generated is most often current and immediate, and derived from learners' feelings, values, and opinions expressed in dialogues with peers or faculty. The program's culturally diverse faculty serve as role models for the counseling, social justice, and/or multicultural education profession, relating to learners more often as colleagues than as authority figures. Learner assessment is most often presented in the form of feedback that is personalized with regard to each individual's needs and goals (Kolb, 1984).

This approach builds on existing literature examining needs, conditions, and strategies for incorporating multicultural competence and social justice content into counselor preparation curricula. It attempts to meet the challenges that many educators have identified in teaching about diversity and social justice. The validity of this methodology has been corroborated in research about racially diverse group decision-making performance contributing to positive cognitive effects. This includes more thorough information processing and accuracy than homogeneous European American group decision-making because of the diverse perspectives People of Color contribute, and because European Americans exhibited better comprehension in groups with ethnically diverse people (Sommers, 2006; Sommers, Warp and Mahoney, 2008).

High percentages of the over 800 CBB alumni have been accepted into further graduate training and doctoral programs. Typically, some 40% to 50% of each year's graduates go on to receiving school counseling and school psychology credentials or MFT licensure preparation. Approximately one third of alumni ultimately earn doctoral degrees. Longitudinal outcomes studies (Nieto and Senour, 2005; Robinson-Zanartu et al., 2004), demonstrate that CBB graduates often emerge in leadership positions; alumni include a college presidency, deanships, presidency of a faculty union and several in elected office. One group of alumni designed and operated an urban Afro-centric charter school. Results of employer surveys demonstrate high employer satisfaction with graduates' counseling and professional skills, sensitivity to issues of diversity, advocacy for social justice issues, and leadership (Senour, 1998).

Participants

Ninety-six CBB students participated in the study. Demographic data about this sample population are presented in Table 1 by number of generations in the U.S. for the following characteristics: age, ethnicity, languages, gender and sexual orientation, and number of years in the U.S. Students enrolled in the CBB program agreed to participate in this study and were assessed prior to matriculation, and at the end of the nine-month program.

Multicultural Experience Inventory

The Multicultural Experience Inventory (MEI) was designed by Ramirez (1998) to assess participants' Historical Development Pattern (HDP) or path of development of multicultural orientations to life using 22 qualitative, fill-in-the-blank items. It also assessed their HDP and Contemporary Multicultural Identity (CMI), including attitudes towards dominant and non-dominant cultures and ability to function and move between dominant and non-dominant cultural groups using 26 Likert-type items for People of Color, and 23 items for European Americans. These items are divided into two types: A and B. The instrument was pilot-tested, reviewed by external consultants and revised three times. Ramirez' scoring methods are described below.

Type A items are scored so that People of Color who respond, "1 = almost entirely my ethnic group" or "5 = almost entirely Whites" or European Americans who respond, "1 = almost entirely my ethnic group or "5 = almost entirely People of Color" receive one point; People of Color who respond "2 = mostly my ethnic group with a few People of Color from other groups" or "4 = mostly Whites with a few People of Color" or European Americans who respond, "2 = mostly my ethnic group with a few People of Color", or "4 = mostly People of Color with a few people of my ethnic group" receive two points; People of Color who respond, "3 = mixed (Whites, my ethnic group and People of Color about equally)" or European Americans who respond, "3 = mixed (my ethnic group and People of Color, about equally) receive three points. Higher scores signify a greater degree of multiculturalism.

Type B Likert-type items are scored so that a response of "Extensively" or Frequently" is assigned two points. All other responses are assigned one point. Items 1-8 are HDP items and items 9-26 are CMI items. A total Multicultural score is obtained by summing HDP and CMI scores.

Finally, the MEI assesses participants' entry and exit degrees of comfort, acceptance and identification with different ethnic, sexual orientation, physical disabilities and other groups specified by the participant using Likert scaled items from 1 = Very Comfortable to 5 = Very Uncomfortable.

The Historical Development Pattern scale reveals five potential patterns or

Table 1

2003-2006 Learning Community Demographics by Generations in the U.S.

Generation	1st n (%)	2nd n (%)	3 or more n (%)	Total N (%)
Characteristic				
Age				
21-25	10 (41.7%)	10 (47.6%)	16 (28.6%)	36 (37%)
26-35	10 (41.7%)	10 (47.6%)	34 (60.7%)	51 (53%)
36-45	2 (8.3%)		6 (10.7%)	7 (7%)
46-55	2 (8.3%)	1 (4.8%)		3 (3%)
Total	24 (100%)	21 (100%)	56 (100%)	96 (100%)
Ethnicity/Race				
Latino/a & Hispanic	10 (41.7%)	10 (47.6%)	10 (17.9%)	29 (30%)
African American		1 (4.8%)	16 (28.6%)	18 (19%)
Asian/Pacific Islander	4 (16.7%)	2 (9.5%)	2 (3.6%)	8 (8%)
Euroamerican/White/Anglo	2 (8.3%)	2 (9.5%)	11 (19.6%)	14 (14%)
Multiracial	3 (12.5%)	6 (28.6%)	15 (26.8%)	23 (24%)
Other	5 (20.8%)		2 (3.6%)	5 (5%)
Total	24 (100%)	21 (100%)	56 (100%)	96 (100%)
Languages				
Bilingual	18 (75%)	12 (57.1%)	18 (32.1%)	46 (45%)
Multilingual	5 (20.8%)	1 (4.8%)	5 (8.9%)	9 (9%)
English Only	1 (4.2%)	7 (33.4%)	32 (57.1%)	39 (40%)
Total	24 (100%)	21 (100%)	56 (100%)	94 (100%)
Missing			1 (1.8%)	2 (2%)

paths of development toward a multicultural orientation to life, with several variations:

a) Parallel Pattern (High score = 23-33)—indicates extensive, continuous parallel exposure to non-dominant and dominant cultures beginning during preschool and for a least two or more life periods.

b) Early Non-dominant/Gradual Dominant Pattern (Medium score = 12-22)—indicates extensive, almost total exposure to a non-dominant culture throughout most life periods with gradually increasing exposure to dominant culture with increasing age.

c) Early Non-dominant/Abrupt Dominant Pattern (Medium score = 12-22)—indicates extensive, almost total exposure to non-dominant cultures in the first two or three periods of life, followed by sudden immersion into dominant culture.

d) Early Dominant/Gradual Non-dominant Pattern (Low score = 1-11)—indicates extensive, almost total exposure to dominant culture throughout most life periods with gradually increasing exposure to non-dominant culture with increasing age.

e) Early Dominant/Abrupt Non-

dominant Pattern indicates (Low score = 1-11)—indicates extensive, almost total exposure to dominant culture in the first two or three periods of life followed by sudden immersion into non-dominant culture.

The CMI scale assesses the dynamics of identity formation according to the following criteria: functionalism, commitment, and transcendence. Functionalism indicates an individual's ability to move between two cultures without making corresponding changes to his/her first cultural identity. Degree of Commitment to the cultural groups to which an individual participates indicates level of emotional and time investment, including their willingness to work toward the improvement of the culture and well-being of group members. An individual with high commitment plays the role of cultural ambassador and mediator through her/his commitment to improve relationships and understanding among the several groups in which she/he participates. Transcendence refers to the dynamics of identity formation and indicates an individual's ability to be part of and stand apart from the different groups in which she/he participates. The CMIs are classified as follows:

a) Synthesized Multicultural (High score = 27-54)—individuals with this orientation demonstrate positive attitudes toward several cultures and competent functioning in more than one culture. These individual feel accepted by members of more than one culture and are committed to more than one culture.

b) Functional Bicultural/Dominant Orientation (Medium score = 19-36)—individuals with this orientation function competently in both non-dominant and dominant cultures, but are more comfortable and self-assured in the dominant culture. They exhibit a greater commitment to the dominant culture, which is expressed through their philosophy of life and life goals.

c) Functional Bicultural/Non-dominant Orientation (Medium score = 19-36)—individuals with this orientation function competently in both non-dominant and dominant cultures, but are more comfortable and self-assured in their non-dominant culture. They express a greater commitment to the non-dominant culture through their philosophy of life and life goals.

d) Mono-cultural (Low score = 1-18)—individuals with this orientation function competently and are more comfortable and self-assured in their culture of origin to the exclusion of other cultures (Ramirez, 1998).

RESULTS

Historical Development Patterns and Contemporary Multicultural Identities

These results address research questions one and two: What do first, second, and third or more generation students bring with them into multicultural education programs in terms of multicultural awareness and identity? And, Do historical identity patterns vary substantially among first, second and third or more generation students in this counselor preparation program?

First generation students. The HDP of the majority of the first generation students was in the medium range, Early Almost Entirely their Ethnic Group/Gradual Mainstream, with a mean of 20.14 (4.26). These students experienced extensive, almost total exposure to the culture of their ethnic group during their early life periods, with gradually increasing exposure to dominant European American culture with their increasing age. The ethnic composition of the neighborhoods they lived in before and during elementary school was almost entirely their ethnic group (2.25 [1.49]). As they progressed into middle and high school, their neighborhoods became mostly European American with a few People of Color (3.07 [1.44]). This reflects their transition from their native country or segregated ethnic neighborhood to

mainstream European American neighborhoods in the U.S. The HDP scores for these students ranged from 13-28, placing some in the outer extremes of segregation in their ethnic group, or as the only one of their ethnic group in the European American neighborhoods in which they grew up, with few People of Color. One student, Cessair, an Armenian-Azerbaijani-American, describes her experiences:

I was happy to finally be able to come to the U.S. From the age of sixteen, almost every night I prayed to God to help my family to get to the U.S. where we all can live together again since eventually my grandmother and mother had fled to a neighbor republic for a while. We knew that only the U.S. could give us an opportunity to unite us and become a family again. My prayers were heard after four years when my father won a Green Card, through the lottery, and by luck he was allowed to immigrate to the United States with his wife and all children under twenty-one. By that time, my sister and brother were above twenty-one, so it was the best and the worst news for our family. I had to separate [from them] again, and I did not know when I would have a chance to see them again. I will never forget how I was holding up in the airport [trying] not to cry, and even on the plane I was crying silently so that I would not [attract] the flight attendant's attention. I was not safe, and I knew I would not be until I could step on American land.

(...) I immigrated here when I was twenty, but I felt like I was fifteen. My life experiences, my first job, and my first relationship started in the United States (...) I hope that my future children would have a homeland; hopefully, it would not dishonor them because of who they are and who their parents are.

The mean CMI score of these first generation students was 37.27 (6.22). This score placed them in the category of synthesized multiculturals who express positive attitudes toward several

cultures, function competently in more than one culture, feel accepted by members of more than one culture, and are committed to more than one culture as expressed through their beliefs and goals in life. Their scores ranged from 25-45, the CMI medium to high range. First generation students with lower scores in this category fell into the medium range as functional multiculturals, with either a mainstream or ethno-centric orientation. Similar to synthesized multiculturals, functional multiculturals function competently in both ethno-centric and mainstream cultures. Still, they may be more comfortable and self-assured in either mainstream or ethno-centric cultures, not both, and demonstrate a commitment to either of those cultures as expressed through their philosophy of life and life goals.

Second generation students. The HDP of the majority of the second generation students were also Early Almost Entirely their Ethnic Group/ Gradual Mainstream 20.24 (4.53), indicating extensive and almost total exposure to the culture of their ethnic group during their early life periods, with gradually increasing exposure to dominant culture with their increasing age. Like the first generation students, the majority of second generation students indicated that the ethnic composition of the neighborhoods in which they lived before going to school were almost entirely their ethnic group 2.24 (1.46), then their neighborhoods were progressively more diverse when they attended elementary through high school 2.79 (1.13). The HDP scores for these students ranged from 10-27, placing some of them in the outer extremes of segregation in their ethnic group or being the only one of their ethnic group in the neighborhoods in which that they grew up, with few People of Color. A Latina/Pilipina American student describes her experiences:

Having grown up in an impoverished community in Southeast San Diego, I witnessed many of my childhood friends and neighbors become single parents, gang members, drug addicts, dropouts, many were victims of violence and death. Statistically, the odds were against

me. My mom's hard work, her sacrifices, my sacrifices, determination and motivation allowed me to reach my educational goals. In 1999, with much support and patience from my family and friends, I became the first person in my family to receive a bachelor's degree, and in doing so; I became responsible to my friends, family and community. Academic achievement at San Diego State University proved to be very challenging. I was faced with all the issues that non-traditional students face in seeking a higher education and as I learned the ropes of academic and social survival, I shared them with other underrepresented students by becoming a peer advisor for the Student Affirmative Action office. As a peer advisor, I was able to introduce other students to the social, cultural and educational resources on campus. I also helped them explore student life, discussed academic difficulties with them, and encouraged community involvement. Being able to share my experience with others and witnessing them benefit from it was very rewarding for me.

The majority of second generation students scored as CMI synthesized multiculturals with a mean score of 36.29 (5.30), expressing positive attitudes toward several cultures; competent functioning in more than one culture, feeling accepted by members of more than one culture, committed to more than one culture as expressed through their philosophy of life and life goals. Scores ranged from 24-43, the CMI medium to high range. The medium range describes functional multiculturals with either a mainstream or ethno-centric orientation. These individuals function competently in both ethno-centric and mainstream cultures. Yet, they may be more comfortable and self-assured in either mainstream or ethno-centric cultures, not both, and demonstrate a commitment to either of those cultures as expressed through their philosophy of life and life goals.

Three or more generation students. The HDP of the majority of the three or more generation students were also Early Almost Entirely their Eth-

nic Group/Gradual Mainstream 14.32 (3.66), though their scores were lower than first or second-generation students. They, too, experienced extensive, almost total exposure to the culture of their ethnic group during their early life periods, with gradually increasing exposure to dominant culture with their increasing age. The majority of these students indicated that the ethnic composition of the neighborhoods in which they lived before going to school were almost entirely their ethnic group 2.80 (1.47) and grew progressively more diverse through elementary, middle and high school 3.15 (1.46). The HDP scores for these students ranged from 9-22, which were lower than first or second generation students, placing some in the outer extremes of segregation in their ethnic group or being the only one of their ethnic group in the neighborhoods in which that they grew up, with few People of Color. Martin, an African American male described his experiences:

Living in poverty makes the world look and rotate on a separate axis. The ghetto causes its people to form a sub-culture. A culture where what's important in the normal world means nothing, but what's important in the neighborhood meant everything. Going to college and doing something positive with your life was looked down upon. What was prevalent in my neighborhood was selling drugs, gang banging, acquiring clothes, jewelry, cars and respect. I was unique though. I say this because I had different dreams and aspirations than most of my friends. In elementary school, I can remember that I was the only one in my neighborhood who was in the school orchestra, as well as being the school's president. I caught a lot of flack, but nevertheless I was class vice president in 5th grade, president in 6th, and learned how to play two instruments: clarinet and saxophone. In junior high I joined the band. My friends would laugh at my band uniform and when I marched in parades. They use to call me an L7, which meant that I was a square (conformist). I be-

Table 2

Historical Development Patterns and Contemporary Multicultural Identities by Number of Generations in the U.S.

	1st Generation	2nd Generation	3 or More Generations
	n = 15	n = 21	n = 37
	Mean (Standard Deviation)		

I. Historical Development Pattern

High = 23-33
  Parallel
Medium = 12-22
  Early Nondominant/
    Gradual Dominant
  Early Dominant/
    Gradual Nondominant
Low = 1-11
  Early Nondominant/
    Abrupt Dominant
  Early Dominant/
    Abrupt Nondominant

	1st Generation	2nd Generation	3 or More Generations
Mean (Standard Deviation)	19.67 (4.50)	20.24 (4.53)	14.32 (3.66)
Score Range	13-28	10-27	9-22

II. Contemporary Multicultural Identity

High = 27-54
  Synthesized Multicultural
Medium = 19-36
  Functional Bicultural/
    Dominant Orientation
  Functional Bicultural/
    Nondominant Orientation
Low = 1-18
  Monocultural

	1st Generation	2nd Generation	3 or More Generations
Synthesized Multicultural	37.27 (6.22)	36.29 (5.30)	37.03 (4.79)
Mean (Standard Deviation)			
Score Range	25-45	24-43	27-44

III. Total Multicultural Score

	1st Generation	2nd Generation	3 or More Generations
High = 59-87	56.93 (9.44)	56.52(8.13)	51.35 (6.73)
Medium = 30-58			
Low = 1-29			
Mean (Standard Deviation)			
Score Range	39-70	36-69	38-65

lieve from this point on, I began to hide the not so cool stuff from my friends. If I wanted to do something that no one else would do, I would sneak and do it. This caused me to struggle with self-acceptance... The high school district decided to switch the boundaries around. They started busing kids from our neighborhood to schools, which were predominantly White. Almost all of my friends were Black and Hispanic. They refused to go to the new school, so they would catch the city bus and attend school where we were suppose to go. All of them except me! My father had my brother and I go to the new school, because a friend of the family worked there. Here is was a different world. It was only 31 Black males attending the school

and I could hardly identify with the rest of the students. My neighborhood was mainly Afro-American and Mexican, with a few Caucasian. I had to adapt to a dissimilar world.

The majority of these students scored as CMI synthesized multiculturals, with a mean score of 37.03 (4.79), expressing positive attitudes toward several cultures; functioning competently in more than one culture, feeling accepted by members of more than one culture, committing to more than one culture as expressed through their philosophy of life and life goals. Scores ranged from 27-44, the CMI medium to high range. The medium range describes functional multiculturals with either a mainstream or ethno-centric orientation. These individuals function competently in both ethno-centric and mainstream cultures; however, they may be more comfortable and self-assured in either mainstream or ethno-centric cultures; not both and demonstrate a commitment to either of those cultures as expressed through their philosophy of life and life goals.

Catching Multicultural Awareness in Counselor Preparation: Comfort, Acceptance, and Identification with Other Ethnicities

These results describe the analyses of the MEI that address research question three: How did the CBB counselor preparation program effect first, second and third or more generation students' multicultural awareness and identity?

On the entry/exit t-tests of measures of Comfort, Acceptance and Identification with Different Ethnicities (Likert scale: 1 = Very comfortable, accepted or identified, 2 = Somewhat comfortable, accepted, or identified, 3 = Sometimes/sometimes not comfortable, accepted, or identified, 4 = Somewhat uncomfortable, unaccepted, or minimally identified, 5 = Very uncomfortable, unaccepted, or not at all identified.), all of the mean scores increased slightly across all three groups. This indicates slight decreases in their comfort, acceptance and identification with other groups. Two of these categories were statistically significant in two-tailed comparisons for the combined group of 67 paired participants: Acceptance

(2.73 vs. 2.98, $t(67) = 3.42$, $p = .001$, two-tailed), and Identification (3.80 vs. 4.12, $t(67) = 3.46$, $p = .001$, two-tailed). Overall, by the end of the counselor preparation program, the group indicated that they felt slightly less comfort, acceptance and identification with other ethnic groups than they had when they began the program. Their scores were in the medium range 2.72 to 3.70 (sometimes accepted, comfortable or identified; sometimes not).

First generation students. First Generation participants' only statistically significant category was their identification with people of other diverse groups (3.39 vs. 3.70, $t(16) = 1.53$, $p = .012$, two-tailed) indicating that they were sometimes identified/sometimes not with other groups. Their scores on comfort and feelings of acceptance by other ethnic groups were also slightly more negative at the exit of the program, but were not statistically significant.

Second generation students. Similar to first generation participants', second generation students' identification with people from other ethnic groups was their only statically significant category, (3.93 vs. 4.38, $t(19)$

Table 3

Entry and Exit Comfort, Acceptance and Identification with Other Ethnicities by Number of Generations in the U.S.

	1st Generation n = 16		2nd Generation n = 19		3+ Generations n = 33		Total n = 67	
	Entry	Exit	Entry	Exit	Entry	Exit	Entry	Exit
Mean (Standard Deviation)								
IV. Comfort, Acceptance and Identification with Other Ethnic Groups								
1. Comfort felt with other ethnic groups								
	2.63	2.72	2.49	2.55**	2.75	2.78	2.65	2.70
	(.57)	(.50)	(.44)	(.50)	(.66)	(.58)	(.56)	(.54)
2. Acceptance felt with other ethnic groups								
	2.62	2.89	2.71	2.84***	2.82	3.10**	2.74	2.98***
	(.64)	(.47)	(.52)	(.51)	(.55)	(.51)	(.56)	(.51)
3. Identification felt with other ethnic groups								
	3.39	3.70**	3.93	4.38*	3.94	4.18***	3.80	4.12***
	(.98)	(.74)	(1.0)	(.81)	(.86)	(.78)	(.94)	(.81)

Note. (1 = very positive; 5 = very negative). ***$p \leq .001$, **$p < .01$, * $p < .05$, (two-tailed, paired *t*-test analyses).

=2.16, p = .045, two-tailed). Their entry and exit scores were slightly higher than first generation students, meaning that they felt less comfort, acceptance and identification with diverse groups than first generation students. Their comfort and feelings of acceptance by other groups also lessened at the end of the program, but were not statistically significant.

Three or more generations. Similar to the first and second generation students, third generation students' identification with people from other groups proved to be statistically significant (3.94 vs. 4.18, t(31) = 2.20, p = .035, two-tailed), reflecting minimal identification with other groups. However, their degree of acceptance was even more statistically significant than first or second generation students (2.82 vs. 3.10, t (31) = 2.91, p =.007, two-tailed), meaning that they felt less accepted with other groups compared to first or second generation students.

Limitations

Because this study focused on students from one specific counselor preparation program, these findings are specific to that sample group and caution must be exercised in generalizing these findings to first, second and third or more generation students in multicultural counselor preparation programs. Still, these findings provide important information for educators and others working with immigrants and other diverse populations.

This investigation is also limited to the extent that the primary researcher was a faculty member in the program during the time of this study. Though the researcher attempted to account for her biases and expectations in analyzing the data by using an independent auditor and getting feedback directly from participants, it is possible that her perceptions uniquely influenced aspects of the study (e.g., selection of study instrument), which, in turn, may have affected the data obtained.

DISCUSSION

The Multicultural Experience Inventory (MEI) provided a helpful set of dimensions of multicultural identity development for this study. This instrument addresses the calls in identity and group decision-making scholarship for diverse, complex interactions in order to enhance identity development and improve the quality of group decision-making.

Findings in this study show that first, second, and third or more generation students brought very similar multicultural identity development patterns and identities into the CBB program from 2003 to 2006. Historical identity patterns (HDP) varied minimally among first, second and third or more generation students in this program and placed them in the same Early Almost Entirely their Ethnic Group/Gradual Mainstream category of multicultural development. These students had similar experiences growing up in ethnic/culturally segregated neighborhoods, whether they were born in another country or in the U.S. and, as they grew older, they gradually integrated into dominant European American neighborhoods. Third or more generation students lived in more segregated neighborhoods longer than either first or second-generation students. This finding may be a reflection of the ongoing segregation of People of Color in the U.S., especially for those in lower socioeconomic groups and points to another area of important research and consideration for working with students from these backgrounds.

The Contemporary Multicultural Identity (CMI) scores of students in this sample were even closer together than their HDP scores and all were in the category of Synthesized Multiculturals. Their scores indicate that they are individuals who exhibit positive attitudes toward several cultures and are competent functioning in more than one culture. They feel accepted by members of more than one culture and are committed to more than one culture. Having a clearer understanding of the backgrounds and identities of these students provides a more informed understanding of their scores on other measures of multicultural competence and identity.

One of the unfortunate aspects of many pre- post-measures is that there is no understanding of the backgrounds or identities of participants. The assumption is that these are equal or that the differences do not matter. However, as can be seen on the HDP and CMI measures, there can be some significant background and identity differences between individuals who evaluate themselves on pre-post measures. A participant could be mono-cultural and self-assess themselves on pre-post measures with the same score as a synthesized multicultural and it would appear as if there was no difference in their scores. Understanding that students in this study are synthesized multiculturals provides a context for their other characteristics and can help counselors and educators develop more relevant curricula.

The pre-post assessments in this study show decreases in students' comfort, acceptance and identification with people from diverse groups at the end of the CBB program. This finding may be a sign of a negative program effect. Another possible explanation for this finding is that CBB programs and processes trigger significant identity disequilibrium in students with high levels of multicultural experience. This has the potential to help them learn to negotiate disequilibrium, ambiguity and tension in "real life" multicultural contexts, and to help them develop the agency to operationalize the multicultural competencies in these challenging contexts. Qualitative data collected as part of a five-year longitudinal study of the CBB program will be used to investigate this phenomenon. Preliminary analysis of this data suggests that students experience a good deal of tension and ambiguity during the CBB program related to their learning processes and identity development, especially related to group decision-making. This may be similar to some of the negative effects of diversity found in some studies of group decision-making, including increased conflict and decreased morale. Other studies on diverse decision-making and work groups have found that these variables weaken or disappear over time (De Drue and Weingart, 2003; Jackson, 1992; Jehn, Northcraft and Neale, 1999; O'Reilly, Caldwell and Barnett, 1989; Watson, Kumar and Michaelsen, 1993 as cited in Sommers, Warp, Mahoney, 2008).

Previous studies on semester-long intergroup dialogues using processes similar to the CBB program have produced findings similar to those of this

study. Their participants' self-assessed levels of multicultural awareness, commitment to dialogic processes and building bridges were high in pre-assessments, and then declined on post assessments. These scholars postulated several alternative explanations for this apparent lack of effectiveness, including: (a) Self-selection bias. Because students in their intergroup dialogues chose to participate, they already had well-developed attributes related to the outcomes and they sought out intergroup dialogues to further their interests in learning about racial issues, which have impacted their post assessment scores; (b) Differential outcomes on racial engagement measures for Students of Color and European Americans. Several scholars have documented the differential experiences and outcomes for Students of Color in multicultural education interventions (Gurin et al., 1999, as cited in Nagda and Zuniga, 2003; Solorzano, Ceja and Yosso, 2000; Tatum, 1997). Students of color who have been educated in environments dominated by European Americans have been shown to have experienced an accumulation of racial microaggressions—stereotyping, victimization and invisibility in the curriculum—that negatively affect their learning experiences. Therefore dialogic multicultural education may have a different effect on them, as well as on other participants from underrepresented groups versus European Americans (Tatum, 1997); and (c) A threshold effect. There may have been a threshold effect similar to Pettigrew and Tropp's (2000) explanation of their finding that contact effects are greater for participants who are forced to participate in intergroup interventions than those who were willing volunteer. Examining these hypotheses may lead to greater understanding of variables related to learning disequilibrium in the developmental process of multicultural identity and competence.

Investigating a mature multicultural training program with a high degree of ethnic diversity and immigrant representation in both its student and faculty populations was a significant research opportunity. This study extends the knowledge base in the fields of multicultural counseling and education to include the experiences of first and second generation students in graduate-level education. These results provide important insights into the development of multicultural identity and competence in diverse individuals and encourage the investigation of historical multicultural patterns and contemporary multicultural identity in examinations of multicultural competence and identity. Understanding these variables can help programs and educators expand their conceptualization(s) of multiculturalism, better understand their students and improve their multicultural programming. More research needs to be conducted on first and second generation students, and the roles they play in diverse groups in terms of cultural brokering and borderization. Further research is especially needed to better understand identity development in dominant and nondominant people in highly diverse contexts, especially interventions that help people negotiate the tension and disequilibrium that can be produced in diverse decision-making groups, and recommendations about how educators and practitioners can integrate best practices into their work with individuals and communities.

Nola Butler Byrd is a scholar and Assistant Professor in the Community-Based Block Program in the Department of Counseling and School Psychology, College of Education at San Diego State University, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA 92182-1179; email: nbutler@mail.sdsu.edu. Her research interests include: experiential multicultural education and counseling for social justice, indigenous healing and world view, somatic body work, multicultural identity development, multi-ethnic faculty retention, and community practice.

REFERENCES

Butler-Byrd, Nieto, J. & Senour, M.N. (2006). Working successfully with diverse students and communities: The Community-Based Block counselor preparation program. Urban Education, 41(4), 376-401.

Calderon, M. & Carreon, A. (2000). In search of new border pedagogy: Sociocultural conflicts facing bilingual teachers and students along the U.S.-Mexico border. In C.J. Ovando & P. McLaren (Eds.), *The politics of multiculturalism and bilingual education* (pp. 166-187). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

Constantine, M.G. (2001). Predictors of observer ratings of multicultural counseling competence in Black, Latino, and White American trainees. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 48(4), 456-462.

Constantine, M. G., Juby, H. L., & Liang, J. J-C. (2001). Examining self-reported multicultural counseling competence and race-related attitudes in White marital and family therapists. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 27, 353–362.

De Drue, C.K.W., & Weingart, L.R. (203). Task versus relationship conflict, team performance and team member satisfaction: A metanalysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 88, 741-749.

Erickson, F. (1987). Transformation and school success: The politics and culture of educational achievement. *Anthropology and Education, 18*(4), 335-356.

Estrada, R. & McLaren, P. (1993). A dialogue on multiculturalism and democratic culture. *Educational Researchers, 22(3),* p. 27-33.

Freire, P. (1972). *Pedagogy of the oppressed.* New York: Continuum Publishing Company.

Gurin, P., Dey, E. L., Hurtado, S., & Gurin, G. (2002). Diversity and higher education: Theory and impact on educational outcomes. *Harvard Educational Review, 72*(3), 330-366.

Gutierrez Keeton, R. (2002). *Reframing identities for justice: Honoring multiple identities.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Clarement Graduate University, Claremont, CA.

Herda, E. (1999). *Research conversations and narrative: A Critical hermeneutic orientation in participatory inquiry.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Huffman, T. (2001). Resistance theory and the transculturation hypothesis as explanations of college attrition and persistence among culturally traditional American Indian students. *Journal of American Indian Education, 40*(3), 1-23.
Kolb, D. A. (1981, revised 1985). Learning-Style Inventory. Boston: McBer & Company.

Jackson, S.E. (1992). Team composition in organizational settings: Issues in managing an increasingly diverse work force. In S. Worchel, W. Wood, & J.A. Simpson (Eds.), *Group process and productivity* (pp. 138-173). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Jehn, K.A., Northcraft, G.B., & Neale, M.A. (1999). Why differences make a difference: A field study of diversity, conflict, and performance in workgroups. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 44,* 741-763.

Kolb, D. A. (1984). *Experiential learning.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Nagda, B. R. A., & Zuniga, X. (2003). Fostering meaningful racial engagement through intergroup dialogues. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6*(1), 111-12

Neville, H. A., Heppner, M. J., Louie, C. E., Thompson, C. E., Brooks, L., & Baker, C. E. (1996). The impact of multicultural training on White racial identity attitudes and therapy competencies. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 27, 83–89.

O'Reilly, C., Caldwell, D.F. & Barnett, W.P. (1989). Work group demography, social integration and turnover. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 34,* 21-37.

Ottavi, T. M., Pope-Davis, D. B., & Dings, J. G. (1994). Relationship between White racial identity attitudes and self-reported multicultural counseling competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 41, 149–154.

Pettigrew, T., & Tropp, L. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 93-114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pope-Davis, D. B., Reynolds, A. L., Dings, J. G., & Nielson, D. (1995). Examining multicultural competencies of graduate students in psychology. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 26*, 322–329.

Pope-Davis, D. B., Reynolds, A. L., Dings, J. G., & Ottavi, T. M. (1994). Multicultural competencies of doctoral interns at university counseling centers: An exploratory investigation. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 25*, 466–470.

Ramirez, M. (1998). Multicultural/multiracial Experience Inventory. In M. Ramirez (Ed.), *Multicultural/Multiracial Psychology* (pp. 245-254). Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, Inc.

Sodowsky, G. R., Kuo-Jackson, P. Y., Richardson, M. F., & Corey, A. T. (1998). Correlates of self-reported multicultural competencies: Counselor multicultural social desirability, race, social inadequacy, locus of control racial ideology, and multicultural training. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45*, 256–264.

Sodowsky, G. R., Taffe, R. C., Gutkin, T. B., & Wise, S. L. (1994). Development of the Multicultural Counseling Inventory: A self-report measure of multicultural competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 41*, 137–148.

Solorzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education, 69*(1-2), 60-73.

Sommers, S.R., Warp, L.S. & Mahoney, C.C. (2008). Cognitive effects of racial diversity: White individuals' information processing in heterogeneous groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 1129-1136.

Sommers, S.R. (2006). On racial diversity and group decision making: Identifying multiple effects of racial composition on jury deliberations. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 90* (4), 597-612.

Steele, C. M. (2002). A threat in the air: How stereotypes shape intellectual identity and performance. In C. S. Turner, A. A. Lising, M. Garcia, B. V. Laden, A. Nora & C. L. Presley (Eds.), *Racial and ethnic diversity in higher education* (pp. 336-356). Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.

Sue, D. W., Arredondo, P., & McDavid, R. J. (1992). Multicultural counseling competencies and standards: A call to the profession. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 477-486.

Takaki, R. (1993). *A different mirror: A history of multicultural America*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Tatum, B. D. (1997). *"Why are all the Black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?" and other conversations about race*. New York: Basic Books.

Wallace, B. (2000). Call for change in multicultural training at graduate schools of education: Educating to end oppresion for social justice. *Teachers College Record,* 102(6), 1086-1111.

Watson, W.E., Kumar, K. & Michaelsen, L.K. (1993). Cultural diversity's impact on interaction process and performance: Comparing homogeneous and diverse task groups. *Academy of Management Journal, 36,* 590-602.

Zinn, H. (1980). *A people's history of the United States*. New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

Zuniga, X., Nagda, B. R. A., & Sevig, T. D. (2002). Intergroup dialogues: An educational model for cultivating engagement across differences. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 35*(1), 7-17.

More Than a Least Restrictive Environment: Living Up to the Civil Covenant in Building Inclusive Schools

By Ellen Skilton-Sylvester and Graciela Slesaransky-Poe, Arcadia University

ABSTRACT

This article describes and analyzes data from the first annual Inclusion Institute (AAII) held during the 2006-2007 academic year at Arcadia University, and raises questions about the essential processes needed to create inclusive schools. In particular, our analysis focuses on the need to redirect our attention from the individual needs of particular students and toward the social and civil rights of all students, including those with disabilities. The innovative, team-based professional development model used in this project asks school-based teams of teachers, administrators and parents to create action plans, meet regularly, implement changes, and reflect on their practices to create inclusionary learning environments for all children. The authors have found that a limited definition of who gets included in the meaning of "all" students as well as an exclusive emphasis on legal mandates and the learning needs of particular students have obscured the need to think holistically and systematically about the ways that schools may need to fundamentally change in order to live up to the civil covenant of the United States.

It has been a challenge, but I've been pretty successful at demonstrating to teachers that these children are quite capable if given a different format to display their talents. I believe this is because of experiences with my own son who found the physical act of writing extremely difficult. Writing a biographical report on William Penn seemed like a task he would never conquer. After consulting with his very understanding teacher, he had a rubric for essential elements that needed to be related. He also had the "green light" to present his biography in any format with which he was comfortable. He has always been a fan of Elvis Presley songs, so on "Biography Day", he dressed like Penn and took an electric guitar to school. His report was sung to the tune of "Blue Suede Shoes" and was entitled "Don't Step on my Religious Views." He earned an "A" for that report which was a big hit with the teacher and the students. Since then, his teacher has changed the format of the project and the students can demonstrate their learning in a variety of ways. Some have written and performed plays; others have done videos and Power Points or have built dioramas. One even made a comic book about the life of a former president. That teacher admits that some of the most creative projects have come from children with suspected or diagnosed learning differences. These projects have exceeded her expectations for her students (teacher journal, March).

In this vignette, a teacher gives a compelling example of the possibilities for inclusion when students within the same classroom context are able to highlight their talents utilizing multimodal pathways toward common goals. Although the vignette begins by focusing on an individual child, the most compelling part of this story for our purposes has to do with how it altered the assignment possibilities for many other students – those with and without disabilities. In this article, we would like to draw the reader's attention away from a primary focus on particular children and their individual experiences of inclusive practices. We would instead like to emphasize the ways that an attention to alternative learning modalities creates an enhanced learning environment for *all* students. It is clear from this account that it is not just a story of individual student success, it is also a story of an improved assignment, new opportunities for individual and collaborative learning, and enhanced meaningful participation by a greater number of classroom participants. In

this article, we emphasize the ways that these benefits to the community of learners are not just side benefits of meeting the needs of an individual student with disabilities, but a critical and often missed opportunity for living up to the spirit and not just the letter of the law.

Although this article focuses on students with disabilities and not immigrant newcomers, the questions it raises about how we create classroom environments that work for diverse students has implications for immigrant students as well. In fact, much of the literature on social rights utilized in this article focuses on immigrant newcomers and how to meet their social rights in educational contexts. As we have written previously (Skilton-Sylvester & Slesaransky-Poe, 2002), the legal mandates that govern special education services have significantly more "teeth" than those that have shaped educational programs for English Language Learners. Even so, for both special education as well as immigrant education in the United States, the legal system is often what drives changes in policy and practice from the top-down. In this way, in an issue that focuses on immigrant education, it is relevant to investigate how and if local schools and districts respond to legal mandates as

catalysts for meaningful change (Skilton-Sylvester, 2003).

LIVING UP TO THE CIVIL COVENANT: SOCIAL RIGHTS AND A RELATIONAL VIEW OF DIFFERENCE

In the spring of 2006, we heard John Hockenberry speak at an Inclusion Conference at Syracuse University (Hockenberry, 2006). In his keynote address, he told hilariously painful stories of trying to use public transportation in New York City in a wheelchair. He also used the notion of a civil covenant to talk about the work that still needs to be done to fully embrace members of our society who have disabilities. This notion of a "civil covenant" moves beyond the notion of an individual person's civil rights (what Castles and Davidson (2000) describe as "freedom from discrimination") in that it implies a mutually enhancing relationship among members of society. This civil covenant requires not only attention to civil rights but also to social rights that guarantee citizens the capacity to participate fully in society. What Hockenberry is advocating is strongly linked to Abu El-Haj's (2006) description of a relational perspective on difference. As she says,

Thinking about difference from a relational standpoint not only demands that teachers unmask assumptive frameworks that exclude some individuals or groups; it also requires that the community make substantive inclusion of all its members a primary value, whatever that takes in terms of reconfiguring practice. (pp. 190-191)

This "reconfiguring of practice" is what we are most interested in understanding, particularly in relation to the legal concept of the "Least Restrictive Environment."

Legal mandates, however, focus on the rights of the few without addressing normative assumptions in schools and classroom in a way that might alter the structure for all students rather than those "covered" by the lawsuit. The resulting outcomes are often the minimum amount that needs to be done without regard for the historical and current contexts in which education is taking place. The emphasis on students being placed in the Least Restrictive Environment, by definition, makes the student's placement seem like the most important aspect of inclusion when it is, in fact, the minimum. In spite of these limitations, legal intervention in school policies and practices can also open the door for the possibility of reconfiguring practice. At this point, it is unclear whether or not new legal mandates concerning the Least Restrictive Environment will create lasting opportunities for reconfiguring practice or merely new room assignments and similarly segregating practices.

Like Artiles, Harris-Murri and Rostenberg (2006), we have also been struck by the tensions in special education between addressing individual educational needs and rights and creating a collective school vision for how all students can fully participate. We also agree with Varenne and McDermott (1998) that a focus solely on individuals will not lead to better policies and practices in schools. As they say:

Individuals must be the units of concern and justice, but they are misleading units of analysis and reform. The greater our concern with individuals, the greater must be our efforts to document carefully the social conditions in which they must always express themselves. We must look away from individuals to preserve them. (p. 145)

In the analysis that follows, we have attempted to frame the experiences of individual teachers, parents and students within very specific micro and macro social conditions in ways that allow us to look beyond the individual.

PARTICIPANTS, CONTEXT, METHODS

In the summer of 2006, 20 teams of principals, general education and special education teachers, school counselors, and parents came to our campus to learn about inclusion, develop a vision for what inclusion should look like in their schools, and create year-long action plans to implement that vision. The state's funding of our year-long Inclusion Institute and the enthusiastic response from school teams to participate are framed by the guidelines of IDEA and the recent court-mandated Gaskin Settlement Agreement (2005). In this settlement between multiple families of children with disabilities and the Pennsylvania Department of Education, the state agreed to prioritize placing all students identified with disabilities in the "least restrictive environment," reinforcing the understanding that special education ought to be a service not a place.

The current reality in the state of Pennsylvania is that schools are being monitored based on the percentage of time students with disabilities are spending with their general education peers. If schools report that students with IEPs spend significant time outside of the general education classroom, they are mandated to take corrective action with the support and supervision of the state. There are many involved in the process who see this as a pivotal and potentially transformative moment in the history of educational inclusion in K-12 education in the state, in spite of the ways that legal action can bring about a surface-level shift in actions without (necessarily) a corresponding shift in underlying philosophies and beliefs.

In this article, we have focused on analyzing Year 1 data – particularly interviews of school teams and journal entries from participants in which they were asked to reflect on their day-to-day experiences of designing more inclusive settings. Our analysis included systematic, inductive coding of key themes from a year's worth of data with an emphasis on uncovering participants' varied experiences and points of view. In looking closely at the lived realities of a group of practitioners actively seeking to build more inclusive environments, our analysis focuses on some of the dilemmas of enacting the relational promise of the civil covenant in daily classroom and school decisions and practices. The data presented here focus both on day-to-day practices as well as underlying assumptions about what inclusion is and what it ought

to be. In the sections that follow, we first highlight the range of ways these schools are thinking about and practicing inclusion. Next, we illustrate the ways that particular schools or teachers are addressing (or not addressing) what Hockenberry (2006) calls the civil covenant – which includes social rights – not only civil ones.

FOR THESE TEAMS, WHAT IS INCLUSION AND WHAT DOES IT LOOK LIKE?

What comes up in these "discourses on the ground" in the day-to-day work of building inclusive environments is that there is tension around what is possible, what is desirable, and how we address what students actually need. The parent coordinator of the Inclusion Institute at our university articulates these tensions well in response to the distance between schools' philosophies and their on-going practices that focus more on labeling and placement than on what Abu El-Haj (2006) has called "substantive inclusion." The parent coordinator explains: "Inclusion seems to be promoted as more of a philosophy, rather than as something natural and as a civil right..." (Parent program coordinator, 10/28/06).

This parent highlights how important the rights perspective is in moving forward with inclusion; from this point of view, it is not just about a preference for a particular style of education. It is a mechanism for addressing the civil and social rights of all. In discussing the "natural" dimensions of inclusion, she is imagining the fulfillment of the civil covenant in which those with disabilities are seen as legitimate members of communities in spite of the ways those communities may need to be restructured so that all members can achieve full participation. Changing the structure of schools is also very much connected to what we see as natural or normal. We tend to see classrooms segregated by "ability" as normal, but this is a societal decision. There is nothing inherently natural about this way of dividing students up for learning.

In an effort to understand the underlying assumptions driving school teams' actions, we asked team members to define inclusion in our initial interviews with them. What happened was that participants started with a definition of inclusion that mentioned that *all* students are a part of the school – both academically and socially. Soon after, we would ask them to describe their programs and it would become quickly clear that all didn't really mean *all*. Students with significant behavioral or cognitive challenges were not typically a part of their (or their administration's) vision for inclusion. There is a huge range of ways inclusion is implemented, even within the same district. As one parent team member said,

> It also seems evident that inclusion means something different to each school, even inside of our own school district (some of the schools are including the children for small times then pulling back out, while at our school, the students who were pushed in, remain in, the entire day with support). The principals' expectations at each school are different; therefore the end products are different. (Parent, November journal)

In some cases, signing on to build an inclusive environment has inadvertently reified existing tracking policies. In one school, they have eliminated self-contained classes for students with disabilities and have moved all of those students into the lowest track, called "Intensive." This is an example of how the emphasis on LRE has obscured the underlying goals of inclusion and has not always meant that the community has made "substantive inclusion of all its members a primary value" (Abu El-Haj, 2006, p. 191).

Often, inclusionary practices are treated as an add-on rather than as something that fundamentally alters what a school is doing for all students. Many schools who are participating this year have designed "inclusion classes" that run parallel to classes without students with identified disabilities. As our parent coordinator suggests, "Once you call a class an 'inclusion class,' it no longer is; now it's the class where they place labeled kids" (AAII coordinator, March). When this happens, the number of students with IEPs often continues to rise throughout the year. As one participant explained:

> The administration keeps piling kids into this class because they need extra assistance, but what they don't realize is that the more kids, the less assistance you can give... It frustrates me in faculty meetings or our Inclusion meetings when administration states that ideally there are only 4-5 included students in the room, when I'm facing at least half of my class. And constant new additions each month for no reason. It's very frustrating. (Teacher, December journal)

Ironically, this move to create "inclusion classes" within the regular structure of the school, in the end, begins to recreate a pull-out situation as the number of students with IEPs increases. In still other classes, inclusion is described in relation to students with disabilities visiting a general education classroom for a specific event. Here again, the emphasis is on the place where instruction is happening rather than on how all students come to feel a sense of belonging in the school – a focus on individuals and on narrowly defined civil rights rather than an expanded sense of civil rights as well as social rights that guarantee the capacity to participate fully.

At one of our professional development sessions on campus, we had the principals of a middle school present about how they had completely altered how they schedule students with IEPs and support both students and staff. It is clear that they took a relational view of difference and moved toward an expanded view of students rights that focused not just on freedom from discrimination but also full, substantive inclusion, and recognition of their social rights as well. One of our participants had this to say after hearing about their school:

> The two co-principals... were extremely insightful... One point that really stuck in my mind was when they said that the schools belong to our children. This statement is at the core of inclusion in my mind too. Each and every child *needs and has the right to* view their schooling

as their own....Each day, I strive to promote a sense of belonging in my classroom for every child. (Teacher, February journal, emphasis added)

In discussing belonging, needs, and rights, this teacher is highlighting key elements of what it means to be a full citizen. Often in the literature (see, for example, Castles and Davidson, 2000), these same issues were discussed in relation to immigrant newcomers who do not always have the opportunity to participate fully – even if they are legal citizens. In, the following section, we explore in more specific terms what it would take to address not only freedom from discrimination but full participation.

INCLUSION IN RELATION TO SOCIAL RIGHTS: EXPANDING THE CIVIL COVENANT

What we like about thinking in terms of social rights is that it pertains to participation in society and not just to freedom from discrimination, as civil rights are typically framed. According to this understanding of social rights, they should be available to everyone in a society regardless of how s/he contributes. As Castles and Davidson (2000) suggest:

Social rights are hard to define precisely. Perhaps the core of the notion of social rights is that of decoupling achievement from entitlement: everyone should be entitled to the minimum standard seen as appropriate for a given society. (p. 110)

In that social rights are connected to us all being in the same boat and getting what we need, they open up the focus not just to individuals but to all of the members of a particular classroom or school. This focus on needs and rights shifts the gaze away from particular labels of individuals and toward meeting the various needs of the group. As one participant explained:

As I had suspected, teachers repeatedly say that the regular ed kids don't look so much different from the special education students, when you compare behavior and academic functioning. Maybe the pendulum will swing back to less labeling and just providing kids what they need to succeed in a classroom... Since the days of 'just' refer, test, and place are over, hopefully regular education teachers will do more to keep their students in their classrooms. (Teacher, February journal)

Focusing on the rights of students with disabilities to be full social members of a particular school and classroom community is typically seen as the fluff of inclusion – it is not the academic piece, but the social piece. In fact, there is literature that suggests that social belonging and positive relationships within schools have much to do with academic achievement. As Hicks (2002) suggests, "students' searches for social belonging are as much a part of learning in school as anything that might be described as cognitive or even discursive" (p. 1). This perspective is evident in the following example:

We had our monthly meeting this morning...Our parent member shared how rewarding inclusion has been for her son. She spent a half day observing in her son's classroom. She sees that her son is looked at first rather than his disability being viewed first. She observed students in the classroom working as a team and caring for each other socially and academically. Her son is reading aloud without hesitation and raising his hand to volunteer and share experiences and knowledge. This parent has seen her son grow so much during this school year both inside the school environment and outside of the school setting. He is having new play dates and has joined a basketball team. His classroom experiences this year have given him strategies to cope and interact with new friends and adults. (Teacher, January journal)

In this example as well as in the one that began the article, it is easy to see the possibilities and potential of substantive inclusion.

We would like to argue, based on our initial analysis of the data, that substantive inclusion is only possible when there are several significant shifts beyond student placement. Creating opportunities for substantive inclusion requires at least three shifts: 1) an ability to focus beyond the needs and behaviors of individual students and toward the needs of a community of learners, 2) a move from imagining that students with disabilities need to change to a sense that the structures of classrooms and schools need to change, and 3) a fundamental shift in attention from the deficits of students with disabilities to the value of those students to the community as full, participating members. In this first example, the teacher sees inclusion where our parent coordinator does not:

Inclusion at its best today! The Social Studies teacher in the classroom next door to me has been doing a USA floats on parade activity for several years. His students pick a state and make a float depicting important aspects of that state. The culminating event is a "parade" through the hallways of the school. Last week I brought my life skills students to watch the parade but it was a bit overwhelming (too many kids, too much noise). When I asked if a couple of his students could come down to the life skills class with their floats, he invited the class up to his room. So today we had a wonderful activity where my students practiced their social skills, asked questions and mingled with typical students who they don't usually come in contact with. All of the students seemed to enjoy the activity. There are so many opportunities for this type of inclusion. We should all be thinking and planning these kinds of activities on a regular basis. (Teacher, December journal, emphasis added)

In contrast, the parent coordinator sees this in a very different way:

Disappointing, this journal depicts visiting and practicing skills as inclusion. Not to mention the label

"my life skills students." Also, the assumption that "watching" the parade was overwhelming because of the number of kids and noise, but what about the thought they had no ownership in creating the parade, or no knowledge about what the parade was about? It bothers me when students with disabilities are considered like a project, they are "given" an opportunity to "mingle" as if that should be considered a great goal. If the students don't usually come in contact how can they claim they are doing inclusion? (Parent Program Coordinator, 1/5/07)

To us, this illustrates an example of how isolated instances of having students in the same room has taken the place of meaningful interactions over time that would acknowledge the unique contributions of these students to the community and allow all students to be members rather than dividing the group into mainstream members and guests with IEPs . The task has been defined solely in "majority" terms rather than in terms that would include the unique contributions of the students with disabilities and the fostering of relationships across difference.

CONCLUSION

The data we have analyzed from this project thus far are full of contradictions and full of possibility. Rarely have we seen educators more involved in the fundamental issues of education in the U.S. and rarely have we seen such frustration in the midst of competing discourses and priorities. The history of providing educational services to students with disabilities has been very focused on the individual. Legal mandates in education have often reinforced this idea by focusing on potential violations to individuals civil rights. Current legal mandates focusing on the Least Restrictive Environment both reinforce this tendency and (indirectly) push back at it. The notion of the LRE is still very individually focused and very focused on the placement itself as the priority. This can leave schools scrambling to look as though they are "doing the right thing" without having

fundamentally altered how they run their classrooms or organize their institutions. Even so, this current legal moment does open up the possibility for other kinds of change. In this paper, we argue that looking beyond the individual and toward a relational view of difference and an expanded view of the rights of all students provides opportunities to frame what is needed differently. If we can think of students' civil and social rights as central to their experiences of schooling, we have provided a potential place where theory and practice can meet. A rights discourse (in relation to students needs) keeps theory grounded and could keep special education practice from remaining solely in the service of the location of instruction. We believe that finding ways to connect inclusionary discourses to inclusionary practices begins with expanding what we mean by rights – to see them in relational terms, moving beyond focusing exclusively on civil rights that work to assure *freedom from* discrimination and toward the guaranteeing of social rights that foster full participation. Living up to the civil covenant will require nothing less.

Ellen Skilton-Sylvester is an Associate Professor of Education at Arcadia University where she coordinates ESL Programs and is the Director of Global Connections. With Dr. Slesaransky-Poe, she helped design and implement the first year of Arcadia's Annual Inclusion Institute and now serves as the Research Coordinator for the project. Her research interests include citizenship and citizenship education for diverse members of US society, immigrant education, biliteracy, and the role of the legal system in educational policy.

Graciela Slesaransky-Poe is an Assistant Professor of Special Education at Arcadia University and the Director of Arcadia's Annual Inclusion Institute. Her research interests include the study of inclusive practices in schools, district-wide educational change, and preparing teachers to work with diverse student populations. She has an extensive history of supporting schools and families to promote the successful inclusion of all students, both in the United States and in Argentina, her country of origin.

REFERENCES

Abu El-Haj, T. (2006). Elusive justice: Wrestling with difference and educational equity in everyday practice. New York: Routledge.

Artiles, A. J., Harris-Murri, N., Rostenberg, D. (2006). Inclusion as social justice: Critical notes on discourses, assumptions and the road ahead. *Theory into Practice* 45(3), 260-268.

Castles, S. & Davidson, A. (2000). *Citizenship & migration: Globalization and the politics of belongin*g. New York: Routledge.

Gaskin v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania (2005). No. 90-4048. Ed. Pa. 16 Sept. 2005.

Hicks, D. (2002). Reading lives: Working-class children and literacy learning. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hockenberry, J. (2006, April). *We're not there yet: Fulfilling the civil covenant of inclusion.* Keynote address presented at the Inclusion Imperative Conference, Syracuse, New York.

Skilton-Sylvester, E & Slesaransky-Poe, G. (2002). *Every* student and *every* teacher: Crossing the boundaries of middle-level, TESOL, bilingual and special education, pp. 75-102. In V. Anfara (ed.) *The handbook of research in middle level education.* Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Skilton-Sylvester, E. (2003). Legal discourse and decisions, teacher policymaking and the multilingual classroom: Constraining and supporting Khmer/English biliteracy in the United States. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism* 6 (3 & 4), 168-184.

Varenne, H., & McDermott, R. (1998). *Successful failure: The school America builds.* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Pathways to Social Justice: Urban Teachers' Uses of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy as a Conduit for Teaching for Social Justice

By Jennifer Esposito and Ayanna N. Swain, Georgia State University

ABSTRACT

This article explores issues surrounding teaching for social justice in urban schools. Using qualitative methods, our study examined the ways in which seven urban teachers used culturally relevant pedagogy as a mechanism for teaching for social justice. We found that by adhering to the tenets of culturally relevant pedagogy (e.g. personal accountability and cultural critique), our participants helped their students think critically about how social injustices affected their lives. The implications of our findings suggest that while the constraints inherent in urban schools perpetuate the injustices of social reproduction, the implementation of culturally relevant and social justice pedagogies help prepare students to effect change in their communities and the broader society.

In urban schools that have long been academically, economically, socially, and politically left behind, there are teachers striving to ignite flames that have been snuffed by the obvious inequities in the world. Despite the blighted conditions with which their students have to contend, these teachers—using culturally relevant pedagogy— are able to implement lessons that generate an awareness of social justice issues while inspiring their students to dream of a better world for themselves and their communities. Culturally relevant pedagogy as a bridge between home and school cultures (Howard, 2003) allows teachers of ethnically diverse populations to incorporate the values, experiences, and perspectives of their students' cultures into the curriculum (Gay, 2002). Moreover, teachers who implement culturally relevant pedagogy are able to "empower students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically" (Ladson-Billings, 1992, p. 382). Culturally relevant pedagogy has two main purposes. First, as suggested earlier, culturally relevant pedagogy draws on students' home cultures as a mechanism for helping them achieve success in school. Second, through culturally relevant pedagogy, teachers enable their students to think critically about the injustices inherent in schools and the broader society. In other words, culturally relevant pedagogy is a vehicle for examining social injustices on both a micro- and macro level, thereby opening the door for the implementation of social justice pedagogy.

According to Gutstein (2003), social justice pedagogy has three specific goals, including helping students develop 1) a sociopolitical consciousness - an awareness of the symbiotic relationship between the social and political factors that affect society, 2) a sense of agency, the freedom to act on one's behalf and to feel empowered as a change agent, and 3) positive social and cultural identities. Following Gutstein's definition of social justice pedagogy, we will explore the connection between culturally relevant pedagogy and social justice pedagogy that emerged from our research. We believe that issues of social justice naturally arise as teachers implement culturally relevant pedagogy.

The purpose of this article is to explore the challenges facing urban teachers as they implement culturally relevant pedagogy and to demonstrate the inextricable link between culturally relevant and social justice pedagogies. In this article, we will explore how teachers in urban settings use culturally relevant pedagogy as a mechanism for ultimately attaining social justice. Our research questions were: 1) How do urban educators perceive the meaning of teaching for social justice? and 2) What does teaching for social justice in urban classrooms involve? Bell (1997) argues "social justice education is both a process and a goal" (p. 1). This means that achieving social justice is the intended outcome in teaching for social justice, whereas struggling against the social injustices inherent in schools is the process. Our data lends itself toward the *process* of social justice education.

Given that we are examining "urban" teachers' practices, it is important to explain how we define urban. According to the 2000 Census, an urban area is classified as:

All territory, population, and housing units located within an urbanized area (UA) or urbanized cluster (UC). It delineates UA and UC boundaries to encompass densely settled territory, which consist of 1) core census block groups or blocks that have a population density of at least 1,000 people per square mile, and 2) surrounding census blocks that have an overall density of at least 500 people per square mile (U.S. Census Bureau"Census 2000 urban and rural classification," 2002, April 30).

While the U.S. Census definition refers to the term "urban" in geographical terms, it is also a euphemism for people of color (particularly people of African descent and Latinos/as) that attempts to cover up the social ills impacting people living in urban areas (Carlisle, Jackson, & George, 2006). Our definition of urban is informed by the Census guidelines, as the cities in which teachers in this study worked were densely populated. We also recognize that ur-

ban carries with it challenges inherent in under resourced and overcrowded areas. As such, the "urban" schools included in this study faced challenges including high poverty, underfunding, minimal teacher support, limited resources, and other structural inequities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The link between culturally relevant pedagogy and social justice pedagogy rests in the notion that both pedagogies aim to expose and eradicate the hegemony that permeates almost every aspect of society, including schools. In this next section, we will briefly review the literature that addresses both pedagogies.

Culturally Relevant Pedagogy

There is a burgeoning collection of research on culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Ladson-Billings & Henry, 1990). Au and Jordan (1981), who coined the term "culturally appropriate," were two of the first researchers to investigate this topic. Mohatt and Erickson (1981) used the term "culturally congruent" to describe the teaching practices of Native American teachers while Cazden and Leggett (1981) added to this body of knowledge with the term "culturally responsive" teaching. More recently, Ladson-Billings (1994) using the term culturally relevant in a study of the teaching practices of teachers who were successful with African American students. In her ethnographic study of these teachers, Ladson-Billings (1995) found that although they had very different pedagogical approaches, there were some common traits each of the teachers shared, including an ethic of caring, an ethic of personal accountability, cultural competence, and cultural critique.

Finally, in an attempt to gain students' perspectives on culturally relevant teaching, Howard (2001) found that there were three teacher characteristics that were most important to students, such as possessing a caring attitude, the ability to build community within the classroom, and the ability to engage the students in the learning process. As evidenced by the findings in the aforementioned studies, culturally relevant teachers and their pedagogical practices have positive effects on culturally and ethnically diverse students, both academically and socially.

Social Justice Pedagogy

The voices of marginalized populations are often absent from the "mainstream" discourse, and the issues that are most important to these populations are frequently ignored. Social justice pedagogy provides marginalized students with the tools to aid in effecting change. According to Bell (1997), the ultimate goal of social justice education is to combat oppression by enabling all groups to have an equitable portion of society's resources and, with these resources, to be able to participate fully in a democratic society.

In a two-year qualitative study that explored teaching and learning for social justice through mathematics, Gutstein (2003) connected mathematics learning objectives with his students' experiences. He utilized the Freirean approach in which he encouraged his students to "read the world" with mathematics, which he defined as the use of mathematics to understand networks of power and race, class, and gender discrimination. The result was a classroom of students with heightened sociopolitical awareness.

In Sheets' (1995) study of Latino students who were transformed from "at risk" to "gifted," she found that the cultural awareness achieved through culturally relevant pedagogy played an integral role in improving the participants' ethnic identities, which she defined as "a sense of self determined by racial and cultural variables and embedded in a social and historical context" (p. 190). Sheets further argued that in addition to gaining more positive ethnic identities, the students were also able to engage in discussions surrounding social and political issues. We believe these examples are a testament to the relationship between the tenets of culturally relevant pedagogy and those of social justice pedagogy.

One of the main links between culturally relevant pedagogy and social justice education is the ethic of caring. Stemming from Noddings' (1984) philosophy of caring as a pedagogical choice, studies utilizing culturally relevant pedagogy and social justice education, such as those reviewed here, relied on teachers who cared about their students. In the spirit of democratic caring, teachers cared about whether or not their students faced discrimination and racism, and they wanted to utilize education as a site of liberation. Clark (2006) argued that educators can engage students in the fight for social justice only after they have educated students on "what social justice is and how it is to be expressed in their lives and the lives of others" (p.281).

METHODOLOGY

Situated between critical theory (Giroux, 2001), social justice feminism (Collins, 2000), and critical race theory (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995), our research explored systems of oppression and privilege inherent within schools (which manifest through school reform mandates) as well as alternative modes of teaching (such as culturally relevant pedagogy and social justice pedagogy) that help to eradicate these inequities. Schools, as microcosms of the society in which we live, serve as sites that promote the interests of the dominant class, thereby perpetuating social reproduction (DeMarrais & LeCompte, 1999). However, as DeMarrais & LeCompte (1999) argue, the role of critical theorists is to seek alternatives that allow "individuals to structure their own destiny and to ameliorate the oppressive nature of the institutions in which they live," (p. 32).

Giving "voice" to those who have been silenced by the master narrative is one of the crucial components of critical race theory (Ladson-Billings, 1998). However, as feminist social justice researchers, we are cognizant of the complexities associated with "giving voice" to our participants. There are benefits and limitations of speaking for participants. As such, our aim is not to speak for our participants, but rather to provide an opportunity for their voices to be heard. According to Ladson-Billings & Tate (1995), "the 'voice' component of critical race theory provides a way to

communicate the experience and realities of the oppressed, a first step on the road to justice" (p. 58). Our research, we believe, illustrates voices of teachers who have been forced to use scripted curricula in their classrooms, a practice that is rapidly becoming the master narrative in many urban schools across the United States.

As feminist, social justice researchers (Collins, 2000), we endeavored to be reflexive throughout the study. We believe identifying as Latina and African American females, respectively, may have facilitated the development of a positive rapport with our informants.[1] We are both former K-12 urban educators and have a commitment to social justice. This experience enabled us to probe more deeply into the educators' experiences, as we knew very intimately the structure and form of urban education.

Data Collection Methods

Because we were interested in our participants' perspectives and understandings (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003) related to social justice, we utilized qualitative methods. Our methods included in-depth interviews and a focus group session. We conducted semi-structured interviews with seven urban educators who were identified to us by a university faculty colleague as having an interest in culturally relevant pedagogy and issues surrounding social justice. We sampled purposefully, as we were interested in including urban teachers who believed in culturally relevant pedagogy but also had a school reform model implemented at the institutional level. We interviewed each informant twice from one to three hours and conducted a two-hour focus group session at the end of the study. Serving as an opportunity to collect additional data and to member check, the focus group session allowed us to share our interpretations of the data with the participants, clarify remaining questions, and receive their feedback on our interpretations. The interviews and focus groups were audio-recorded and later transcribed.

Participants

The participants included seven African American teachers who taught in urban schools located in a southeastern city. The teachers, most of whom had attended urban schools, had varying degrees of teaching experience, ranging from non-traditional teacher preparation programs to more traditional teacher preparation programs. Each of the teachers had a master's degree or was in the process of pursuing a master's degree. The participants carried with them differing philosophies regarding social justice and, consequently, had a variety of approaches for implementing culturally relevant pedagogy in the classroom. Despite the variation in the ways they implemented culturally relevant pedagogy, the participants all commented on the transformative journey they undertook in becoming teachers who taught for social justice. In an effort to define the research context, we will provide a brief description of the participants.

Alexis Stone,[2] a 27-year-old African American woman, had taught five years at Hamilton Elementary School. As a second grade teacher, she chose the teaching profession after participating in an alternative teacher certification program. She had fond memories of her elementary schooling experience and used those experiences to inform her teaching practices.

Poem McNeal, a 25-year-old African American woman, was in her fourth year of teaching fourth grade at Marshall Elementary School. She, too, began teaching after matriculating through an alternative teacher certification program. Being a first-generation college graduate, she said she identified with the students she taught because their experiences were very similar to her own.

A graduate of a traditional teacher preparation program, Jabari Moore was a 28-year-old African American man who taught eighth grade social studies at Rockingham Middle School. Having taught six years, Jabari strove to incorporate his passion for African and African American history into his lessons. In addition to teaching, he established a leadership development program through which he mentored African American young men.

Lydia Williams, a 27-year-old African American woman, also had a passion for studying the history of people of African descent. She began teaching at Wilmington Elementary School after participating in an alternative teaching program and had taught third grade throughout her five-year teaching career. She so strongly believed in implementing culturally relevant pedagogy that she purchased, with her own money, an innovative software program to supplement the curriculum at her school.

Treneka Jenkins was a 28-year-old African American woman who taught fourth grade. After participating in an alternative teacher certification program, she began teaching at Bennington Elementary School, where she had been teaching for four years. Although her socioeconomic background differed somewhat from her students, she commented that she tried to understand and positively influence their lives by incorporating real-life lessons into the curriculum.

A graduate of a traditional teacher preparation program, Giselle Thompson, a 27-year-old African American woman, had been teaching fifth grade for six years at Springdale Elementary School. As an advocate of culturally relevant pedagogy, Giselle incorporated music into the curriculum and regularly engaged her students in meaningful dialogue about cultural misrepresentations found in the textbooks.

Beautiful Starr was a 43-year-old African American woman who after receiving an undergraduate degree in another field had also gotten a second undergraduate degree in early childhood education. Having taught first grade for four years at Foster Elementary School, she stressed the importance of paying attention to the nonverbal cues students get when their cultures are not represented in the curriculum.

Data Analysis

Because our analysis was ongoing, we coded our data as it was transcribed and utilized the constant comparison method (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), which

allowed us to make decisions about how to proceed based on previously collected data. Initial coding was completed individually. We then met weekly over a two-month period to discuss our interpretations of the codes and data. Together we developed a coding scheme that included over 50 categories and subcategories, which we believe allowed us to capture the nuances of our participants' responses. We utilized this scheme to analyze subsequent transcripts and modified the scheme as new, interesting codes emerged.

Themes. We found several interesting themes that emerged from the data. The first was that teaching for social justice involves risk, time, and self-reflection. The second group of themes discuss the ways participants defined teaching for social justice. For them, teaching for social justice involved teaching critical thinking skills, empowering students, helping students achieve academically, and helping them see themselves in relation to others. We also discovered that our participants viewed culturally relevant pedagogy as a mechanism for effectively teaching for social justice. This theme is woven throughout the discussion of our findings.

FINDINGS

Teachers are charged with the extremely challenging task of ensuring students thrive both academically and socially. In this era of accountability, particularly in urban schools with prescriptive school reform models, the majority of the school day is dedicated to intensive "academic development," leaving little time to address social justice issues. This "academic development" often translates into curricula that are "teacher proof." That is, they may include scripted lessons from which educators are not able to deviate (Delpit & White-Bradley, 2003). Teachers committed to raising their students' sociopolitical consciousness, developing their sense of agency, and positively affecting their social and cultural identities must find creative ways to incorporate social justice awareness into the curriculum. In this next section, we will explore factors that contributed to and

inhibited our participants' ability to use culturally relevant pedagogy to address social justice issues.

Implementation of Social Justice Pedagogy

As argued earlier, there is an inextricable link between culturally relevant pedagogy and social justice pedagogy. Borrowing from Gutstein's (2003) framework, we have integrated our participants' voices on culturally relevant pedagogy into the three main goals of social justice pedagogy: sociopolitical consciousness, sense of agency, and positive social and cultural identities.

Sociopolitical consciousness. When asked how they implemented culturally relevant pedagogy, several of our participants' responses included themes related to social justice. For example, Lydia discussed why a culturally relevant pedagogy was important, particularly for urban students:

> ...This is really education for liberation, and I think that's what we really have to [do], we really need to focus on that in urban school settings.

When asked to clarify what she meant by education for liberation, Lydia responded:

> It's educating beyond just being able to graduate from high school and [getting] a job. [It's] education that's [going to] turn you into a critical thinker... getting knowledge for the sake of knowledge... Learning for the sake of learning... Learning because you want to, because you love to learn, instead of just having to.

Jabari had strong views about how the curriculum perpetuated social injustice. By simply pointing out specific questions from a daily workbook to his students, Jabari encouraged them to think critically about the curriculum. One multiple-choice question asked students to choose the items they believed were important to being a "good citizen:"

> Look, "Check the items you think

are important to being a good citizen." "Vote when there is an election." Okay, I can see that, we talked about that. "Go to church on Sunday." That's indoctrinating! Right? So [to] the student [who] is sitting in my class, that's not culturally sensitive. Because I'm not a good citizen if I go to the mosque, or to the synagogue, or to the Buddhist temple, right? So we analyze that. You see what I'm saying? And this stuff is laid out there so, and I tell them. I say, "Teachers give y'all this stuff and it's all programming. And then you grow up and it reinforces the prejudices and everything that happens. It's deep. Like I said, "A good citizen stands during the Pledge of Allegiance"...

Jabari then analyzed the Pledge of Allegiance:

> One of the [questions] had them to fill [in the blanks] in the pledge of allegiance. So we analyzed the Pledge. "Please look at this: I pledge allegiance to the flag. What [does] pledge mean? What does allegiance mean? What is this flag? And to the republic for which it stands, one nation... What does one nation mean? Is it one nation? Under God? What do you mean? Indivisible? Meaning it cannot be divided?... That's true, you can't divide something that's already divided. That might be true. Liberty and justice for all? Come on, now! So, we picked it apart.

One of the choices read, "A good citizen supports our military and soldiers." Jabari prompted his students to consider the propaganda being promoted through the curriculum:

> Then it says "our!" What does "our" mean? This [incident happened after Hurricane] Katrina, so I said, "Okay...but was it 'our' government, 'our' people?... When they say 'our,' you gotta understand who they're talking about... Have we ever been considered in the 'our?' Even when the Pledge was written...originally, [when] that pledge was written, we were still in chains. The Constitu-

tion [of the United States]... all that stuff. They're talking about 'ours,'" I said, "It's theirs. Don't come here talking about 'ours.'"

Like Jabari, Treneka used the curriculum to help her students think critically. When asked how she was able to implement culturally relevant pedagogy, she expressed her commitment to ensuring her students thought critically about the curriculum in place:

In terms of implementing culturally relevant pedagogy in my room, just when we're reading certain things... if we're talking about Thanksgiving, I'll bring in other perspectives on who discovered America. [It is] culturally relevant in terms of them being African American because I like to teach them certain things about [the] great things that Africans have done... from that perspective, the African perspective... I also teach them [to] try to be critical thinkers. "Don't always [accept] everything at face value. Also, research and look it up yourself." Because we're... sometimes... just going through our social studies book and I'll just ask them, "So do you think this is true? Why do you think this is true? So, who wrote this book? Who published this book? Don't you know there's this huge industry making money off education?" Things like that.

Schools, as argued earlier, are microcosms of the larger society. Consequently, social injustices such as racism, classism, and sexism manifest in schools through the curriculum. It is incumbent upon teachers to instill in their students a sense of agency to combat these injustices.

Sense of agency. Social reproduction theory posits that schools are sites that perpetuate the dominant paradigm and maintain social stratification (Bourdieu & Passeron, 1990). Treneka's interactions with her students helped them think critically about the conditions in which they lived and placed into perspective social reproduction theory in terms they could understand. By encouraging her students

to think critically, Treneka empowered them to have a sense of agency:

Certain articles that I find I may read to them... Sometimes we have these conversations where the other day we were talking about research [that] found that the highest level, the highest percentage of African American males in jail, in jail or prison in our state, was at the zip code 12345. 'What zip code do you all live in?' '12345' [the students responded]. 'So...Do you think that's true?' And then everybody just rattled off a good ten, twenty names they knew who were in prison or in jail. And they're like, 'Yeah, I could see that.' 'So why do think it's so high here?' 'Well, they don't ever have an opportunity, they're not doing nothing. A lot of 'em dropped out.' Right, and so we just got into talking about that, [I am] getting them thinking... It definitely made them think... Some of them really started to look at [themselves] in a different way. We use our language, 'Would you like to end up that way? So...what is it that you could do so you will not end up in a situation like that?'

Poem also strove to instill a sense of agency in her students. She believed teachers must approach students in an empowering way instead of viewing them as victims. She discussed the dilemma that arises when there is a cultural incongruence between teachers and students:

When the kids ask you (teachers from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds) certain questions and tell you certain stories, what will your reaction be, instead of [saying] "Oh, I can't believe you go [through] this!" [The response should be], "How can we change this?" "How can you grow up to change this, being that you see this on a daily [basis], what do you think need to be done and how can we get it done?"

In addition to providing students with a sense of agency, social justice pedagogy also involves helping students develop positive social and cultural identities.

Positive social and cultural identities. Part of helping students develop positive social and cultural identities is giving credence to the culture students bring to the classroom. Lydia shared how she worked to foster positive social and cultural identities with her students:

Even teaching here, because I come from a middle class background, and so just because I share the same race as my children, we have different cultural experiences. And I have to remember that as well, Okay these kids are coming, Reddington Road (a pseudonym) is something to them. And that means something different than what that means to me and I have to make sure I understand what that means, I take that. I take whatever Reddington Road is to them and use it as a bridge to where they need to be as far as curriculum.

Lydia worked tirelessly to ensure that her students learned about their own culture in addition to the mainstream culture that was being promoted by the school's administration. When asked how she made decisions about implementing culturally relevant pedagogy, Lydia responded:

I don't even see it as... it's not even a thought I have. I'm very cautious about the things that I expose my children to at this stage, because they get so little of their own culture. And [they] are so negative about their own culture. Our book this month was a book about Hanukkah... I shared that with them. At the same time, sharing with them about Kwanzaa. So I [said] "Okay, we're gonna do that book (the book about Hanukkah), because I do want you all to know about other people. But let's talk about what we do [too]."

Lydia infused her pedagogy with culturally relevant materials as a way of empowering students and enabling them to experience cultural pride. Beautiful also incorporated culturally relevant material into her school's curriculum. In her view, when children do not see images like themselves in their class-

rooms, they get the nonverbal message that they are not worthy. She shared how she ensured her students saw positive images of African Americans in the classroom:

> I put [pictures of] Martin Luther King, Malcolm X, Shirley Chisholm [on the wall]… Some people who they [may] not even know about. They know about Martin Luther King, but [not] Shirley Chisholm… and [I] put some other people [like] Thurgood Marshall up there. [They are] part of USA.

Jabari's students had also internalized negative stereotypes. In the excerpt below, he shared how he dealt with this:

> I said, "When you think of Africa, what you think of? They started naming all [these stereotypes]. I had to list all the stereotypes: Black, dirty, naked, ugly feet, hungry, etc. I just let them go on. They were laughing and having a field day with it. I just let them go on and do it. Then, I asked them, "Who's been there?" No hands. I asked them, "Who wants to go there?" No hands. And then I started asking them where they got these ideas. They were still kind of skeptical. I have to expand on [the textbook]. But the book gives me some seeds where I can go and run with it. I look at the riches that we [African descent people] had, the gold, Mali, Timbuktu… Ancient Egypt, over there in Nubia, Aksum, and Kemet and I just explain to them all these things that came out of that era. I let them know that we are the original man. You were the original man, you were the king, the queen, the goddess of the earth, there would be no life had it not been for [your ancestors].

The students Jabari taught held negative stereotypes about Africans. Jabari had to interrupt these psychologically damaging conceptualizations before he could teach them subject content.

Jabari, like so many of the educators we studied, spoke of the changes he witnessed in his students. Here he commented on this transformation:

> I have this [saying] called "Conquered," the conquered mind. I relate the conquering of the African land by European colonizers. We talk about that and what [the colonizers] did to maintain power. And then we talk about the whole slave trade and relate that to now… showing that the same conqueror then is the same conqueror right now. You (the students) are not enslaved in chains, but it's the ideological war that we are fighting. I said, "Okay, so you have the choice to make. Are you going to continue to be conquered, and make someone else happy when you fail your class, when you get suspended, [or have] ISS (in-school suspension), [when] you're acting a fool in the hall? Because this is what you were expected to do." I just show them how that [the system] works. Now [if they see students misbehaving in the hallway] they'll come back to me say "Conquered. Mr. Moore, you see, they're conquered."

The responses made by Jabari's students are a testament to his level of social consciousness and the impact he has had on his students.

Constraints Associated with Teaching for Social Justice

Insofar as our participants were committed to battling against the social injustice inherent in schools, they were faced with obstacles that made teaching for social justice challenging. It was clear to us that our participants had a commitment to teaching for social justice through their implementation of culturally relevant pedagogy. However, there were several constraints including school reform models, risks to their career, time involvement, and lack of resources that presented them with challenges.

School reform models. As argued earlier, schools that have adopted school reform models experience unique challenges that often prevent teachers from having time to teach. Poem shared her frustrations with her school reform model's focus on paperwork:

> The frustration with me rests in the fact that [there are] just so [many] outside things that I feel like I don't have any time to teach.

Poem also shed light on how the distribution of the school reform models in her school system contributed to the perpetuation of social injustice. Poem was very critical of the disparities she witnessed in her school system with regard to the racial distribution of school reform models among the schools. The district where Poem taught included a number of predominately White schools:

> The third frustration that I have is the school reform model that we adopted was America's Choice, which I don't like. I don't really care for reform models, period. I just don't understand why [the school system where I teach] is so inconsistent, you know? When I just look at, when I think about my own experience [growing up] and when I just look at other school systems, the whole Fairbanks County [school system] has the same textbook. Every school has the same set of curriculum. And I don't understand how, now I get [to the school system where I teach], and I hate to say it, all predominantly Black schools have school reform models, and… all the predominantly White schools across the line they still got International Baccalaureate and these kind of reform models [International Baccalaureate], they give them a little bit more autonomy, giving teachers a little bit more autonomy, a little bit more freedom to construct their own lesson.

When asked how she thought racism factored into the implementation of school reform models, Poem added:

> It's sad to say… racism is the underlying cause as to why we have these reform models, because [they're] basically saying that minority children in [our school system]… Black children, are behind. [They're] not looking at lack of resources and

those things. They're behind because the companies [that] created those reform models had an agenda. They had stereotypes,... agendas already set [in place] and assumptions that we need to get these children up to par to this status. Well how do [they] define that standard? 'Well, we need to educate them...into the dominant society, which is White.' I feel that way. What standards are [they] measuring them on? [Which] children are [they] using? How do [they] define this concept of intelligence? Where are [they] getting this? Are you going back to eugenics? Show me the group of children that you [are] using [to measure] our children. That's your racism right there because the standards that they're using are predominantly White children in affluent neighborhoods and communities that have everything... That have other resources... with White teachers [who] have the autonomy to teach... Where the parents are trying to build their child as a person and as an individual and a citizen participating in democratic societies versus [trying to get] a child to graduate and get a good job.

Giselle had a similar comment about the disparities between the predominantly African American and predominantly White schools in the district:

They have a lot more resources, although they're not a Title I school, they don't even get the money, but yeah, they have more [resources]... as far as down to the food that's served to the [students]... All their technology is working in their school... Plus they're not required to have a reform model.

Here, Poem took issue with African American children being "measured" utilizing culturally biased assessments. She lamented how other factors like school funding were not considered in the debates about school performance. Poem also critiqued the lack of autonomy in the reform models she utilized in a predominately African American school versus the reform model found

in her district's predominately White schools:

So you get into racism, then you get into classism... When I look at the reform models they put into the predominantly Black schools, [they're] telling us that Black teachers can't, that... I'm not teaching. How can you construct a reform model that gives me line by line or tells me how much time I have to teach this concept to a student and what I should be teaching, when... some schools don't even have that (school reform models). I just can't understand it. So that's why I feel it's racism... because [they're] basically telling me "Well you're not getting it done, so let us get it done for you... You're our robot so this is what you need to do."

Poem's frustrations with the school reform models compounded with the risks associated with teaching for social justice.

Teacher risks. There are numerous risks associated with teachers teaching for social justice. By challenging their students to think critically about the inequities within their schools and the broader society, teachers are encouraging their students to question authority, a practice that is seen as a threat by school officials (Gutstein, 2003). Jabari, in challenging his students to deconstruct the Pledge of Allegiance, realized the risk he was taking. He also made a political statement in his decision not to fully display the United States flag in his classroom:

That's why I [have] my flag rolled up. I feel like we, we are involved in guerilla warfare; you can't put yourself out there. Mine is up but it's rolled up all the way where you can only see like an inch of it coming up. And I [have] the huge liberation flag, I [have a] shrine standing in front of it. But it still kinda pokes out from behind. So it's up. And then I [have] another one that I just got, the red, black and green American flag. With red and green stripes, black where it's blue, and then green stars. You know the whole thought behind that [is that] we [African Americans]

built this. Most of the time [when] I come to work I have a suit on and a tie. I don't come in there with my dashiki on. I think I could (wear a dashiki)... but I feel like it's (the suit and tie) camouflage. I don't wanna expose myself. I don't want them to ever be able to point at me and blame me.

Beautiful had a similar view:

No, it's [African American history] not part of QCC (Quality Core Curriculum standards). [There is really no] time to teach it. But if you look at my wall right there, I got Martin Luther King, I got the Black history there, [other] African Americans. We had to do a cultural unit on Calendar USA and Mexico. Now, [nothing negative] was said to me, but they [administrators] looked in my room...and said, "Look what she [has] up there." I didn't have the American flag, [but] I got it indirectly... I didn't have a lot of European stuff up there. I got Black people. They're American.

Giselle discussed the risk she took by refusing to use a program she believed was not in her students' best interest:

[Reading Achievement][3] is very similar to SFA (Success for All). It's a scripted [curriculum] that they give you. [With] the teacher book, you read through it, [and] the kids repeat a word after you... My first year wasn't so bad because I was new and I hadn't been taught reading strategies in college. So for a while it was like, "Okay, let me just do this." Then I started attending professional development [courses] and reading books and started seeing how this [was] absolutely ridiculous for our children, especially our children... It did not teach decoding, and building for fluency, and a lot of things related to reading comprehension... It... was just memorizing things. [The students] didn't benefit... from it. The crazy thing is that they [Reading Achievement personnel] were trying to prove that kids who had been here from kindergar-

ten through fifth grade were more fluent readers, which they were, but they weren't looking at other variables. The kids who were stable and were here from K through 5 also had supportive parents. So, I really don't attribute any of their success to that program. After I had done research, I just made a stand and decided this was not good for my kids. This [was] not beneficial, so I started to adopt my own strategies... [On one occasion] we were being observed by somebody from Reading Achievement. She came in and [said], "I don't know what you're doing. This is not our program." And I told her, "This is not the best way." I just had to tell her.

Giselle presented a proposal to the principal and the Reading Achievement representative explaining why the Reading Achievement program was ineffective for their school's population. Although she initially received opposition, the program was removed at the end of the school year. When asked how taking this risk affected her, Giselle responded:

> [I felt] like I knew what I was talking about. It was really the first time that I kinda actually stood up for something that I felt was harming my kids. I can't say that... it was because of me that it was removed, but somebody needed to not approve it. So that... encouraged me to decide from that point on that if there's something that I see that's not right, not only do I need to not keep it myself, [because] you can know something is wrong and just keep it to yourself. But I felt like all students need to benefit from [my opinion], so I need to make it public.

Poem shared her perspective on the risk involved in trying to organize teachers to voice their concerns to the superintendent:

> I'm willing to take that risk. So, anything that I talk about doing, like getting a collective of teachers to voice their concerns... If [the teachers] don't want to [sign their] names [on

the letters], I'll take it [myself] Just because I'm willing to take that risk.

When asked what "risk" entailed, Poem responded:

> Risk entails... it's like almost giving up your livelihood. You hear about people who went to jail... for social change, that risked their livelihood. They risked their family [and] their own lifestyle for a change... That's what I'm trying to organize now. The teachers are saying, "But I don't wanna put my name on it... But what if they try to pull something up on me?" I said, "You don't have to put your name on it, just [tell] the experience that you've had... [I'll] let them know that it's anonymous." It's just sad.

Faced with the economic reality of needing jobs, many urban educators eschew risk or, like Jabari, risk only so much. Poem was our only participant who communicated that she was willing to risk everything to best meet the needs of her students.

Time involvement and lack of resources. Although it is common for teachers to use their personal time to prepare for their lessons, the toll is even greater for teachers in schools with limited resources. For instance, Poem shared how she spent her personal time searching for supplemental materials:

> I always go to the [school] library or the local library on my weekends [to check out] particular books that the kids... can relate to. I try [not to rely too] much [on the basal] reader stories and the five questions in the book... but to really do a theme. So, if we're working on making predictions, we use those [supplemental] texts to actually make predictions.

Alexis shared her perspective on how time constraints, among other issues, affected her physically and emotionally:

> I think in the Black community it's still like a profession that's still held in very high esteem. But I think it's

one of those where you really have to be a special person to keep in it. Cause it does wear you down. It wears on your nerves, it wears on your time, your energy, you know, you get tired of seeing other folks, who don't, who're not doing anything. You say to yourself, "Wait a minute. I did all my work, and you didn't do anything. Your kids don't know anything. I'm up here making stuff at home, bringing it in and what have you done?"

Beautiful had a similar comment:

> This year it seems like [our school system] has us doing so much other stuff we don' t have time to uplift the culture... even doing Black history.

Our participants spoke about having to use their personal resources to supplement the curriculum. Alexis, for example, shared the stress associated with having limited classroom resources:

> Well, I think it is a financial stress. It's a mental stress too because sometimes you just don't know where to find the stuff. [For example] you [may] go to Barnes and Nobles. That might not be their top priority. "Oh, can I find some culturally relevant, you know, books." They [are] looking at you like, "Whatever. This is what we got, okay? Eric Carle." So, I had to go to [an African American bookstore] and just ask [a salesperson] for help.

This excerpt also illustrates the commitment involved with social justice pedagogy. Alexis was not deterred when a major bookseller did not have culturally relevant materials. She sought a bookstore that did.

Lydia, as most teachers do, spent her own money to supplement the resources provided by the school system. Lydia extended herself even further by purchasing a supplemental math curriculum geared toward African American students. When we first spoke to Lydia about her decision to purchase the curriculum, she had this to say:

My kids absolutely love it. I don't have the equipment that I need to make it bigger. I'm still working on that so we have to gather around a laptop. I actually bought a laptop so you know that I can use for home and here [school] so that... but they love it and I was kinda like 'Okay, is this really gonna work? Are they really gonna remember this stuff?' And it's working, so I gave them um a pre- and a post-test with just traditional math instruction and then we're gonna go from chapter four in my math book, which is money and I found that on there too, we're gonna go from there, with, you know, strictly [this supplemental curriculum].

When we spoke with Lydia later in the semester, she had even more positive comments about the supplemental curriculum she had purchased:

I really like it. I really, really like it. And it's really helped me in other subjects as well. Because it kinda, it's kinda shown me that I, it's empowered me to kinda make some of my own decisions about what I'm gonna teach in the classroom, and I don't have to be tied to a certain curriculum, I can find what works for my children. And I can make that decision because... I'm the teacher. That's what I've learned from that. Like, even,... I saw the math... "I don't wanna do this for writing, I don't wanna do this for reading, I wanna do this." And I can do this, because I see that... alternative things can work. And I still can find things that work, not just what they tell me to do. My children really enjoy it, like they are, they're really engaged.

CONCLUSION

We live in a world with a long history of oppression that manifests in virtually every aspect of society, including our schools. Individuals who neither conform to what society has deemed as normative nor subscribe to the dominant paradigm are marginalized and systematically excluded from enjoying the privileges that are so freely given to those who do fit the norm. Schools echo society's oppressive messages by serving as sites where students are sorted based on racist, classist, and sexist ideologies. Because many African American and Latino students in urban schools are constantly barraged with messages that they do not measure up to the standards, they begin to internalize these messages and fulfill the prophesy. The result is that these students are often relegated to the lower echelons of the social structure as a direct result of their school experiences.

Culturally relevant pedagogy and social justice pedagogy both aim to combat negative messages by instilling in students cultural pride and critical consciousness. Empowered by positive messages about themselves and their heritage, students are able to exceed academic expectations and overcome the obstacles of social injustice placed before them. Teachers who promote the academic and social development of their students through culturally relevant and socially just pedagogies prepare them to make a tremendous impact on their communities and the world. We found that our participants did just that. By helping their students develop a sociopolitical consciousness, a sense of agency, and positive social and cultural identities (Gutstein, 2003), our participants provided students with the resources to create a better world for themselves and their communities. Refusing to be silenced by challenging the injustices of prescriptive, inappropriate curricula and limited resources, our participants shared how they helped students develop an awareness of the subtle and glaring injustices found in the curriculum, their schools, and the larger society.

There are two major implications of our findings. First, the constraints inherent in school reform models perpetuate social reproduction. The scripted curriculum leaves little room for critical thinking activities, which leaves students ill equipped for careers that require critical thinking skills, thereby perpetuating social reproduction. In other words, students who are not challenged to think critically may be less able to navigate the injustices in society, likely forcing them to remain in the lower social strata. Second, teaching for social justice requires a great deal of risk and time involvement, which can contribute to teacher attrition. Teaching is a labor-intensive profession, even under the best circumstances. It is even more difficult for teachers who must use an excessive amount of their personal time to compensate for the limited resources in their schools. Furthermore, the risk of being reprimanded, or even worse, fired for challenging the status quo prompts some teachers to leave the profession altogether. To be sure, the negative implications associated with teaching for social justice are complex. The attainment of social justice, however, is well worth the struggle.

Jennifer Esposito is an Assistant Professor of Educational Policy Studies at Georgia State University. Her research interests include urban education; race, class, gender, and sexual orientation identity construction; and popular culture as a site of education. She has most recently published in Educational Action Research, Journal of Educational Foundations, and Educational Studies.

Ayanna N. Swain is a student in the College of Education at Georgia State University.

ENDNOTES

1   See (Archer, 2002; Egharevba, 2001; Johnson-Bailey, 1999) for a discussion of the complexities of gender and race and the researcher-participant relationship.

2   All of the participants' names are pseudonyms that they themselves chose. School/District names have been changed as well.

3   Giselle asked that this particular school reform model be given a pseudonym.

REFERENCES

Archer, L. (2002). 'It's easier that you're a girl and that you're Asian:' Interactions of 'race' and gender between research-ers and participants. *Feminist Review, 72*(1), 108-132.

Au, K., & Jordan, C. (1981). Teaching reading to Hawaiian children: Finding a culturally appropriate solution. In H. T. Trueba, G. P. Guthrie & K. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 139-152). Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Bell, L. A. (1997). Theoretical foundations for social justice education. In M. Adams, L. A. Bell & P. Griffin (Eds.), *Teaching for diversity and social justice: A sourcebook*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Bogdan, R., & Biklen, S. K. (2003). *Qualitative research in education : an introduction to theory and methods* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. C. (1990). *Reproduction in education, society, and culture* (1990 ed.). London ; Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage in association with Theory, Culture & Society, Dept. of Administrative and Social Studies, Teesside Polytechnic.

Carlisle, L. R., Jackson, B. W., & George, A. (2006). Principles of social justice education: The social justice education in schools project. *Equity & Excellence in Education, 39*(1), 55-64.

Cazden, C., & Leggett, E. (1981). Culturally responsive education: Recommendations for achieving Lau remedies II. In H. T. Trueba, G. P. Guthrie & K. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 69-86). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

Census 2000 urban and rural classification (2002, April 30). Retrieved December 11, 2006, from http://www.census.gov/geo/www/ua/ua_2k.html

Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Delpit, L., & White-Bradley, P. (2003). Educating or imprisoning the spirit: Lessons from ancient Egypt. *Theory Into Practice, 42*(4), 283-288.

DeMarrais, K. B., & LeCompte, M. D. (1999). *The way schools work: A sociological analysis of education* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Egharevba, I. (2001). Researching an-'other' minority ethnic community: Reflections of a Black female researcher on the intersections of race, gender and other power positions on the research process. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 4*(3), 225-241.

Giroux, H. A. (2001). *Theory and resistance in education: a pedagogy for the opposition* (Rev. ed.). South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory; strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing Company.

Gutstein, E. (2003). Teaching and learning mathematics for social justice in an urban, Latino school. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 34*(1), 37-73.

Howard, T. C. (2001). Telling their side of the story: African-American students' perceptions of culturally relevant teach-ing. *Urban Review, 33*(2), 131-149.

Howard, T. C. (2003). Culturally relevant pedagogy: Ingredients for critical teacher reflection. *Theory Into Practice, 42*(3), 195-202.

Johnson-Bailey, J. (1999). The ties that bind and the shackles that separate: Race, gender, class, and color in the research process. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 12*(6), 659-670.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1992). Liberatory consequences of literacy: A case of culturally relevant instruction of African Ameri-can students. *Journal of Negro Education, 61*(3), 378-391.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*(3), 465-491.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a *nice* field like education? *Qualitative Studies in Education, 11*(1), 7-24.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Henry, A. (1990). Blurring the borders: Voices of African liberatory pedagogy in the United States and Canada. *Journal of Education, 172*(2), 72-88.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 47-68.

Mohatt, G., & Erickson, F. (1981). Cultural differences in teaching styles in an Odawa school: A sociolinguistic approach. In H. T. Trueba, G. P. Guthrie & K. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography* (pp. 105-119). Rowley, MA: Newbury.

Sheets, R. H. (1995). From remedial to gifted: Effects of culturally centered pedagogy. *Theory Into Practice, 34*(3), 186-193.

NOTES FROM THE FIELD

On Fostering a Pedagogy of Transparency for Immigrant Students in an Urban Community College Developmental Writing Classroom

By H. Elizabeth Smith, Bronx Community College of The City University of New York

Since Mina Shaughnessy published her landmark study Errors and Expectations (1977) over thirty years ago, high-stakes testing has become endemic while the pedagogical dilemmas basic writing teachers face have remained consistent. The politicization of basic writing pedagogy has especially impacted the many immigrant students who populate the developmental writing classes in urban community colleges. In many institutions, in fact, standardized assessment has become the sole means of measuring the academic achievement of immigrant students, who arrive in class with educationally, culturally, nationally, and linguistically diverse backgrounds and life experiences. How can teachers improve access to higher education (retention) for immigrant students? In particular, how can we help our immigrant students negotiate an academy that subjects them to constant testing? By constructing a space that engenders a pedagogy of transparency and acknowledges the need for students to hear and recognize their own voices and experiences within an academic context, teachers can create a learning context that both values the local knowledge of diverse students and prepares them for the inevitable "normalization" processes of educational standardization. Teachers, particularly those who have many immigrant students, should not assume that their students are familiar with the reasons for assessments and their significance. Most immigrant students who have been educated in very different systems must cope with a tremendous amount of new material at once. Fostering a pedagogy of transparency is especially effective in facilitating their transition into American classrooms because it draws students into a community of learners, acknowledges and celebrates the gifts they bring to class, encourages them to develop the skills they need, and provides them with a fundamental working knowledge of the American higher education system.

The climate of high stakes testing affects the full sequence of basic writing and college composition classes, composed largely of immigrant students, who I teach at Bronx Community College, an urban, predominantly Hispanic-serving institution. Throughout the semester, developmental writing teachers must constantly negotiate the mandate to prepare students for the assessments that will provide the ticket to a college education. To this end, I attempt to incorporate liberal classroom practices as a means of "talking back" to the test-driven basic writing curricula while simultaneously, on a local classroom level, ensuring that my immigrant students have the tools they need to successfully pass the tests required to pass through the gateway of the institution and into credit-bearing freshman composition classes.

By virtue of having been educated under many different systems, immigrant students bring many academic and social strengths—as well as challenges—to their developmental writing classes. Teaching composition at any level—remedial writing, composition, and rhetoric and literature—ideally positions teachers to bring out their students' strengths and to develop their communication skills while ensuring curricular transparency. Indeed, a pedagogy of transparency is effective in helping to address the needs of immigrant students to help them successfully navigate a system that subjects them to relentless assessment: tests to matriculate, tests throughout the course, tests to exit, and more tests to enter higher level courses. Though the definition of "success" may range from gaining a better understanding of the assessment to actually passing, the implications for engendering a pedagogy of transparency in the urban composition classroom allow students to more effectively respond to the assessment demands of the course, as well as the institution.

Immigrant students who enroll in developmental writing classes at Bronx Community College reflect the ethnic and national diversity of the institution. While the majority of immigrant students are from the Dominican Republic and other Caribbean Islands (such as Jamaica, Haiti, St. Kitts, and Dominica), classes are often also populated with students from Ghana, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Vietnam, Albania, Belize, and Guyana. Regardless of where immigrant students have originally come from, whether they are matriculating into remedial or credit-bearing courses, most of them are experiencing some sort of transition: from their homeland to the United States, from high school to college, from work to college, from home to college, or from another college to Bronx Community College.

In my experience, immigrant students bring tremendous academic and social strengths to their developmental writing classes: they are intellectually curious and hard-working; they don't take much for granted; and they are effective multi-taskers, often balancing their academic course load with grueling work schedules and family responsibilities that often extended family

both in the United States and in their home countries. The life challenges with which immigrant students must contend on a daily basis are often enormous: from caring for young families and aging relatives, to working full-time jobs, to balancing their academic work and financial responsibilities, to adjusting to a very new culture in a fast-paced city. When students arrive in my classes, many have the burden of multiple responsibilities on their shoulders: some are burned out from working the night shift at their jobs (often in hospitals or nursing homes or as security guards) and haven't slept when they arrive in class, while others may feel apathetic or anxious about learning. Regardless of their context, I find immigrant students very much want to get something out of the class; they want to learn, to think, to evolve, and to move on to the next level, ever closer to their profession and personal goals.

The majority of immigrant students at Bronx Community College are "non-traditional" in addition to being immigrants: they are often first-generation college students, older then the average high school graduate, working full-time or part-time jobs, caring for families, and sending money home to support family in their home countries. To account for the bumps and hurdles along the semester's path, I have developed what I call a 'pedagogy of transparency' for my classes of immigrant students. To this end, two main constructs inform my teaching: first, the *Course Guide* (a document that maps out the course assignments, requirements, and materials) and second, a *Class Anthology* (a compilation of students' best writing which is published towards the end of the semester into a booklet). While the *Course Guide* introduces students to the course, gives them a sense of expectations and explains what they need to do in order to be successful in the course, the *Class Anthology* "talks back" to the *Course Guide* and celebrates students' accomplishments over the course of the semester by including the voices of all students in the form of essays, poems, personal narratives, and commentaries. Between the *Course Guide* and the *Class Anthology* fall a semester's worth of classes, assignments, readings, con-

versations, and interactions—the usual ups and downs of a teaching-learning life. What can teachers do in their classrooms to respond to and acknowledge the needs of immigrant students? And how, exactly, cant teachers foster a pedagogy of transparency in the developmental writing classroom? The following are proven strategies I use to approach teaching immigrant students at Bronx Community College:

COMPOSE AN INTRODUCTORY "LETTER TO STUDENTS"

In the *Course Guide*, I include at the very beginning a letter I've written to my students. This letter is intended to give them a sense of what the class will be about but, more important, it sets the tone for the course. I want my students to know that we will be working hard to achieve our goals but that I am with them, I wll answer their questions, I will respond in a humane manner to their papers, and they will have multiple opportunities to succeed—indeed, that I want them to do well. On the first day of class I also ask my students to fill out a Student Information Sheet to get a sense of who they are and what their goals are for the course and for themselves; this provides them with an initial opportunity to respond to my letter.

MAKE THE DAILY CLASS AGENDA EXPLICIT

In each class, I provide students with a clearly written agenda on the blackboard that lists the sequence of activities in the class; this gives students not only a sense of what to expect and but also a sense of mission. Because our attention spans last between fifteen and twenty minutes, I usually time activities throughout each session to reflect this human reality. For example, I will often start with a quiz (always based upon a homework assignment, but also designed to motivate students to arrive on time) and then I review the agenda and calendar to clarify any "housekeeping" issues, give a mini-lesson on a particular writing topic, or review a reading and then engage students in a discussion or question/ answer session. I also attempt to involve all students in

the class through a variety of means; for example: responding to a question on an index card, reading aloud directions or a text, having them do three-minute brainstorming exercises, or working in small groups to respond to a particular assignment. This fast-paced sequence of events moves us briskly along and keeps students task-oriented.

OFFER A VARIETY OF ACTIVITIES

Providing students with a variety of assignments gives them multiple opportunities to do well and to experience different types of learning. For example, assignments such as vocabulary quizzes that allow students to study different ways of defining words (denotation, connotation, etymological, synonym, antonym) allow students who aren't strong writers to get some encouraging good grades, which can elevate their confidence. Journals help students to practice difficult assignments; responding to quotations, for example, allows students to think on paper without worrying so much about formalities—yet they are getting their initial ideas down and beginning to learn how to incorporate in-text citations to support their own claims. In addition, I try very hard to return assignments within a week or sooner, if possible. And I explain to students why they get the grade they do by always writing a focused comment and by balancing positive and negative observations.

Creative writing, especially, provides a wonderfully effective means for immigrant students to bring their culture and identity into the classroom to share with others and to commemorate their respective homelands. In the following poem, composed as part of a larger assignment that asked students to perform a close reading of Carl Sandburg's "Chicago," one student, Vachelle Byron, vividly imagines her homeland, the island of St. Kitts, and she recreates the sounds, images, rhythms, and language on the page so that we, too, feel the sun hot on our skin; we, too, hear the lively, lilting conversation with its Caribbean cadences. In her poem we, too, can almost taste the "sweetest food":

St. Kitts
Vachelle Byron

St. Kitts is me land I say,

Lots of enjoyment when de bands a play,

Carnival, Mas we jumping up all day,

Jump-Up to the sweet sounds of Nu-Vybes & Small Axe Band.

We like to "bang we mout" and make aloud,

Chat bout we small days running up and down in we panty,

The sweetest food you could eat, Goatwater, black pudding, the list goes on.

Laying on de beach wit de sun ablaze,

Hot like fire with a coconut in me hand,

Can field can't dun

Sweet Sugar City.

INCORPORATE ORGANIZATION STRATEGIES

In order not only to help students stay organized and on task, but also to take pride in their work, I provide each with a manila folder within which to maintain and document all their assignments. This is especially effective for immigrant students who are facing a new teaching and learning environment, though it does require some micro-managing and modeling of organization skills on the teacher's part. It also reminds my students that their work in progress is both valuable and a useful benchmark for measuring their progress over the course of the semester. In addition, I create individual Student Grade Sheets that include a weighted breakdown of the grades, which I tape into the individual folders. These Student Grade Sheets provide an ongoing and up-to-date record of assignments students have completed and are missing, and it documents how they are doing in the class.

PROVIDE MULTIPLE OPPORTUNITIES FOR INTERACTION AND RESPONSE

I interact with students in myriad ways to update them on their progress: through office visits, in-class student-teacher conferences, notes and comments on their papers, and e-mail correspondence. By understanding a student's personal situation, it is less likely that I will take it personally if they fall asleep in class or fail to turn in an assignment on time or miss a week of classes or seem unusually addicted to their Sidekicks. Knowing who is traveling two hours from Brooklyn to attend an eight o'clock A.M. class, who has worked all night without sleep, who has a sister in the hospital with a burst appendix, who is living with her daughters in a shelter, who has just come out of jail, who is in an abusive domestic relationship, and who is just plain desperately aching for her/his family thousands of miles and an ocean away helps create a sense of empathy with our students so we can make their difficult lives a little easier through compassion as simple as listening to them and hearing where they are.

UTILIZE COLLEGE RESOURCES

Many immigrant students, especially those who are new to the country, are not aware of the numerous academic, social, and psychological resources available to them as students at the college. Consequently, I attempt to familiarize my students with these resources by employing them in my classes: we use the computer labs, the Writing Center, our library's databases, the expert librarians in the Learning Center, the Hall of Fame for Great Americans, and the Center for Teaching Excellence's faculty development workshops. We use a computer lab at least once a week, and this gives my students opportunities to write in class (and have me on hand to respond immediately to their questions along the way) as well as providing useful time in class to meet individually with students.

Although my goals for the students and their goals for themselves may, ultimately, be very different, we both want to experience a successful course. One

key to this success is to pass the assessment so students meet the prerequisite for Freshman Composition. As an English teacher, I want my students to develop their writing and thinking skills, to have at least one paper of which they are proud (hence the *Class Anthology*), and to learn something content-wise. And, of course, I want my students to develop the skills they need in order to pass whatever test they have that looms on the horizon. Most of my students are not planning to become English majors, but what we do in the classroom is nevertheless relevant to other fields. Towards the end of the semester—and often earlier—I know my students quite well: who is gifted in writing; who was a lawyer in the Dominican Republic but must start all over in a basic writing class; who is sending money home to family in Ghana; who has aspirations to be a nurse, a pediatrician, a police officer, an engineer, a teacher; who is taking care of a bed-ridden relative; who is responsible for feeding and clothing four children; whose sister was violently attacked in the street last week; and who is planning to apply to Columbia and NYU when she/he graduates. For now, though, these immigrant students are here, in New York City, and many have made it their new home, in search of opportunity and, perhaps, the American Dream, despite the many social, economic, and educational challenges the city poses. In this poem, Emmanuel Blanco, a trans-national Dominican student, responds to Carl Sandburg's "Chicago" with his own take on New York, the city he has come to claim as his own:

New York City
Emmanuel Blanco

Welcome to the city of bright lights

The city where young kids get thrown out of school for having too many fights

Welcome to the home of hip hop

The city where nobodies make it to the top

Welcome to the city of broken down dreams

The city that told me everything

isn't what it seems

Welcome to the city where being prejudice is banal

The city where everyone seems to be in denial

Welcome to the city where the strong are really the weak

The city where bodies get laid in creeks then found in two weeks

Welcome to the city of four seasons Where hot summers lead to cold blooded killings for no reason

Welcome to the city of hard working people

The city where everyone appears to be evil

Welcome to the city of unsanitary hospitals and clinics

The city where whoever does something bad, someone else tends to mimic

Welcome to my home sweet home

Where the Bronx is my kingdom and I sit on the throne

The city where men thing they're untouchable until they stop breathing

And the city where everyone and everything around you is deceiving

Welcome to My City

New York City

Regardless of my students' personal circumstances, we meet in the classroom for four hours a week to do the work of English and composition: reading, writing, listening, discussing, and some deep critical thinking. Constructing a rich classroom space offers myriad possibilities for immigrant students to make new friends, meet people from different places, and discuss issues relevant to them. But immigrant students also need to discover their own personal relevance in our joint mission, regardless of whether we are preparing for the entrance exam, meeting the challenges of a difficult reading, or participating in a tour of the Hall of Fame for Great Americans and connecting with those bronze busts of so many

of the canonized Americans—all children or grandchildren or great-grand children of immigrants. Learning is a recursive process, and, the more opportunities students have to learn, the more they will be able to adapt and progress. While I encourage and push my students towards better writing and harder thinking, I also want to celebrate their accomplishments along the way, and I want them to have a positive experience in my classroom. While I expect my students to take responsibility for their learning, I also believe it is my responsibility, as their teacher, to show them *how* to take responsibility. The *Course Guide* helps to make transparent the rules of the institution and contributes to creating a pedagogy of transparency so immigrant students can more successfully navigate the many assessments they will have to experience. I also attempt to make my directions clear and my expectations explicit; I want my mission—the why and wherefore of every assignment—to have purpose. All first-semester immigrant students—from those who have traveled from tiny islands in the Caribbean to the trans-national Dominican students who have made New York City their second home to the brave young West African students who have left behind their closely-knit families to the Central American students who seek a better life for their children North of the border—bring their cultures, their languages, their passions, and their fierce energies to contribute to the developmental writing classes. In turn, I hope to make the requirements of the mandated tests, the department and the institution as visible as possible. I seek to do this in a compassionate manner in order to better help immigrant students succeed by gaining entry into credit-bearing college courses so they may continue their educational journeys.

H. Elizabeth Smith, a graduate of Teachers College, Columbia University, teaches developmental writing, composition and rhetoric, and literature at Bronx Community College. Her research and literary interests include pedagogy and assessment, open admissions, the American Lyceum Movement, women in Afghanistan, and South Asian literature. She lives in the Bronx.

REFERENCES

Shaughnessy, M. P. (1977). *Errors and expectations: A guide for the teacher of basic writing*. New York: Oxford University Press.

NOTES FROM THE FIELD

Undocumented Immigrants: A Teacher Remembers a Raid

By Darrel Hoagland

It was so cold on that day in March 2007, even native New Englanders were complaining about the freezing temperatures. In our classroom, near the end of the school day, the principal addressed the students on the public address system saying, "Students, if you go home and your parents are not there, and you can't get in, come back to school." That was all he said, and, even though I thought his comment odd, I assumed it was precipitated by the frigid New England temperatures and let his comment slip out of mind. School ended and I went home.

Later that day while driving down Rodney French Boulevard, traffic was exceptionally slow and two or three white school buses passed me going in the opposite direction. They weren't the usual yellow buses, and the windows were darkened. As my car crept to the intersection, I heard the loud rumblings of one or two low flying helicopters. I looked around and saw crowds of people. Frightened men, women, and children were in the frigid New England cold looking and pointing to the factory. I saw others trying to put coats and blankets around people who seemed to have rushed out of their homes with no outerwear. I kept driving, snarled in slowly moving traffic as people were darting and running about, most of them sobbing.

More of the white buses I saw earlier were parked in front of the factory and cordoned off by the plastic yellow bands that police use to block off the scene of a crime. People were prohibited from crossing the yellow bands by big men wearing bulletproof vests and jeans. Some were shouting and restraining children who cried and pleaded as they attempted to reach the people, mostly young women, being led from the factory. I realized a raid for undocumented immigrants was in progress and detainees were being driven away from the factory in the white buses.

My car crept further along Rodney French Boulevard and I heard voices from bullhorns, people promising to reunite families as soon as possible. Aid organizations, churches, and social service workers were distributing warm cups of coffee, cocoa, and food as they assisted family members and friends of the frightened detainees being paraded from the building. There was so much going on as busloads of people were being driven away. Media people were everywhere reporting on the activities and the desperation frozen in the air. New Bedford police officers directed traffic to cut down on some of the confusion, panic and hysteria. As the car crept past the factory, I felt helpless, hopeless, and very upset. I felt for the traumatized fellow humans who were being ripped from the fabric of their families, forcibly separated from their babies and their loved ones. I felt sick, my stomach knotted by sympathetic anguish.

For weeks after the raid there was a barrage of media coverage; politicians gave interviews. *The New Bedford Standard-Times* newspaper wrote that Senator John Kerry visited the city and called the treatment of detainees an abuse of Immigration and Customs Enforcement's discretion. Massachusetts Congressman Barney Frank and Senator Ted Kennedy made public comments against demonizing immigrants and lamenting the negative consequences of the raid. Of course immigration officials fired back saying they acted appropriately. All kinds of stories were circulating. We heard about a woman or two who broke their bones when they jumped from factory windows trying to avoid detention. These formerly Southeastern Massachusetts-based mothers were now separated from their children in places as far away as Texas. Attorneys, many from Boston, provided great help. Churches, community workers, and many different organizations helped anyone and everyone affected by the raid.

Our Lady of Guadalupe Chapel/Shelter at New Bedford's St. James Catholic Church was a monumental force for those traumatized by the raid. Many immigrants worship there, and the church was a mobilizing force for them, especially after the raid. The church collected and distributed supplies, monies, information, and other emergency services needed by families in crisis. A friend and I drove to the church to donate money and supplies. The parking lot was full of cars and people. The church basement was gigantic, and tables were loaded with food, pampers, toiletries, everything. Many immigrants stood, talking, collecting supplies, and waiting. Many school-aged children were there, and some had not seen or heard from parents who were being detained. The youngsters were being cared for by friends and relatives. A community activist said The Massachusetts Department of Social Services had been asked to take and place 125 children; they refused and worked to keep the children with family members and friends of the detained undocumented immigrants. As my friend and I walked in and out with our donations, we realized the immigrant community gathered at the church for their necessities and to cope and ease their fears, troubled minds and souls.

The raid on the Michael Bianco Inc. factory netted 361 undocumented workers, mainly women. The newspaper said they were sewing backpacks and vests for the United States military while their children were at home with babysitters or in school.

There are many immigrant chil-

dren at our school, and over the years many were in my classes. According to The New Bedford Sunday Standard-Times, "there are approximately 6,000 to 8,000 Central American immigrants living in New Bedford, making up about 8% of the city's population" (Evans, Spillane, 2008, p. A1) . As cited in the paper "most have come from Guatemala, El Salvador or Honduras, with as much as 70% living in the city illegally" (p. A1). It is reported that in Xicalcal, Guatemala, most residents can name a relative now living in New Bedford, and wages sent there are helping families to build modern housing. In the New Bedford School System, 26.2 percent of the student population is listed as Hispanic "and a high majority of those students, recent immigrants or not, speak Spanish as their first language, and their parents and siblings speak it at home" (Urbon, 2008, p. A6). Spanish (in several dialects) is only one of the foreign languages spoken at home by the students in my classroom.

New Bedford is a seaport town with a rich maritime history. Regarding catch profits for its scallop fishery and other fishing, the city has been "America's Number One Fishing Port" for the past several years. And at the height of the whaling industry, "The City That Lit The World" with whale oil had one of the highest per capita incomes among all the cities of the world. The first chapters of Moby Dick, a classic American novel by Herman Melville, are set in old New Bedford.

New Bedford has a legacy of welcoming people. Many immigrants and marginalized peoples come to work even in very substandard conditions. During the practice of chattel slavery, the slavery of Black Africans and people of African descent from 1654-1865 in the United States, many enslaved people escaped to New Bedford. They could live here, despite status as an illegal run-away, and work to get equitable pay. For example, they could ship out on whaling vessels and get equal pay as crew members. And the community often protected them from slave catchers who traveled to New Bedford to recapture and return them to slavery. Frederick Douglass, the most famous person who ever lived in New Bedford, was

an escaped slave who settled in the city and worked for several years in the late 1830's and very early 1840's. People of all kinds still come to New Bedford seeking to advance themselves and to send their children to school.

Schools work to accommodate all children, and in 2002 a Massachusetts ballot eliminated "bilingual education" in favor of "full immersion". Full immersion is when "students are no longer taught academic subjects in their native language, only in English with course material simplified to account for their early grasp of English" (Urbon, 2008, p. A6). They are immersed in regular education classes. In compliance with this new ruling, my classroom is representative of New Bedford and its very diverse population. Portuguese, Brazilian, Cape Verdean,[1] Puerto Rican and other Latino immigrant children, as well as White, Black and other so-called children "of color" sit side by side in my regular education classroom and "the understanding that it is best to educate everyone ...has firmly established itself" (pp. A6, A9). State mandates for "full immersion" classrooms have resulted in a rich diversity of students, and interspersed among them are the children of undocumented immigrants.

The school staff is very diverse because of efforts to represent the city's population. Even though staff, by and large, support the state mandated "full immersion" and everyone wants students to be successful, there are varying opinions about the undocumented immigrants who settle in New Bedford. Some believe current immigration laws are intentionally class based. And like the race based laws which legalized chattel slavery, made it illegal for African Americans to learn to read and write, and to compete in business with Whites, these laws perpetuate oppression and forced labor. Other staff members believe Americans cannot afford to share limited resources, the high numbers of undocumented immigrants strain the infrastructure of cities and towns, and the country's first obligation is to its present citizenry. One or two of my colleagues believe America's trade and economic policies create situations that force undocumented immi-

grants to come here looking for work, opportunities, and resources.

On September 3, 2008 the New Bedford Standard Times conducted a forum to discuss issues related to undocumented immigrants. Of course, one topic of the forum was the raid. More than one year and a half has passed since the raid. Some families are still not reunited. When I think about our students who are the children of undocumented immigrants I think about their overwhelming secret fears and unseen pressures. I continue to adapt, to redefine, to modify and to reconstruct my role as their teacher in response to their manifest needs and my own professional standards

Every teaching career has an unforgettable moment or two. I will always remember standing in my classroom looking at the children when the principal said, "Students, if you go home and your parents are not there and you can't get in, come back to school."

I could never have dreamed his prescient advice foreshadowed coming catastrophic events that would dramatically impact so many lives.

Dr. Darrel Hoagland (Gr.Ed., 2005), native of Philadelphia, PA, has twenty-two years of full-time teaching experience. Her interests include reading/writing/literacy among urban elementary and middle school students and effective instructional practices and curriculum for marginalized students. She can be reached at dmshoagland@aol.com.

ENDNOTES

1   People/culture from the archipelago nation off the coast of West Africa with a Criolou language derived from a mixture of Portuguese and West African languages.

REFERENCES

Evans, B. (2008, June 29). Hopes hit a wall. *The Standard-Times, New Bedford,* MA, pp. D1, D6.

Evans, B. and J. Spillane (2008, June 29). The new immigrants. *The Standard-Times, New Bedford,* MA*,* pp. A1, D3.

Golden, M. (1995). *Saving our sons.* New York: Doubleday.

Urbon, S. (2008, June 30). Learning curveball. *The Standard-Times, New Bedford,* MA, pp. A6, A9.

NOTES FROM THE FIELD

Becoming an Anti-Racist White Ally: How a White Affinity Group Can Help

By Ali Michael and Mary C. Conger with contributions from Susan Bickerstaff, Katherine Crawford-Garrett, and Ellie Fitts Fulmer, University of Pennsylvania

INTRODUCTION

Navigating aspects of personal identity within American social institutions, such as schools and workplaces, is often challenging and complex. Affinity groups are an effective means through which people can reaffirm and explore aspects of their identity, as well as provide each other guidance and support for interacting with those who might not share, understand, or respect that identity. This article examines ways in which one such affinity group, White Students Confronting Racism (WSCR) at the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education, helps white students understand their racial identities and work to become effective anti-racist allies.

Affinity groups are not new in race education. Many people of color, especially race educators, are familiar with the term "affinity group" (or its more alliterative cousin, "safe space"). In this context the term, borrowed from political and business contexts, describes an assembly of people gathered with others who share a common element of identity in order to explore, celebrate, sustain, and process their experiences around that identity. Naturally, there are as many affinity groups as there are identities: multiracial, Asian American, Catholic, Black, first-generation Mexican immigrant, female engineer of color... The possibilities are endless, but the objective remains them same: for people with some shared experience to have an opportunity to collectively reflect on their realities.

Affinity groups can have as few as two or more than 50 members, although 12 is probably a good maximum to ensure meaningful discussions. Groups might gather every couple days, once a week, biweekly, or every few months.

Some groups discuss an article or book about race or racism at each meeting, while others use movies to focus their dialogue. Some groups preselect discussion topics and bring in outside speakers. But many groups simply meet to discuss individuals' personal experiences of race and racism, to talk (or practice talking) about race, and to learn more about what others have to say about race.

In what follows, we describe White Students Confronting Racism (WSCR), an affinity group for white people who have passion for ending racism, who have anger and confusion about institutional racism, who have guilt and hope about internalized racism, and who have questions about race that they are afraid to ask. It is a place for white people to examine what it means to be white, to critically reflect on themselves and their actions, and to work to identify and confront racism in schools, in society, and at the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education. By sharing our experiences of WSCR, we hope to enhance the reader's understanding of affinity groups in general, and their potential benefits for white educators specifically.

WSCR'S HISTORY, DYNAMICS, AND NORMS

A white affinity group can take as many different forms as do affinity groups as a general category. The only requirement is white people who want to take an anti-racist stance in learning about race and whiteness, and who are willing to face their discomfort, uncertainty, or anger in the process. Today our white affinity group is much different than when it started in 2006. Originated by four doctoral students as an informal space for the continuation of conversations begun in a shared seminar, WSCR is now an official GSE student organization that meets biweekly and has over 40 members. It draws students from across programs and divisions at GSE, and includes a few students from other colleges at Penn as well. We have allies of color among our members, but most members identify as white or multiracial. Meetings consist primarily of discussions led by volunteers on topics of their choice, but each session begins with introductions, clarification of the group's norms, and personal remarks on what brings each person there that day.

Topics of discussion have included: giving up privilege; avoiding collaboration with institutional racism; talking to family members about race; and mentoring for anti-racism. In addition

---

THE SEVEN NORMS OF WSCR

- Respect confidentiality

- Speak from the "I" perspective

- Listen to each other

- Embrace discomfort

- Monitor your own participation

- None of us are experts—be open, avoid judgment

- Focus on whiteness as a racial category

to regular dialogue meetings, a book discussion group meets the first Friday of each academic semester; books selected in 2008-2009 were Tim *Wise's White Like Me: Reflections on Race from a Privileged Son* (2004); Paul Kivel's *Uprooting Racism: How White People Can Work for Racial Justice* (2002); and Mica Pollock's *Colormute: Race Talk Dilemmas in an American School* (2004). WSCR has also co-hosted a mini film festival with Students of Color United and the Association of African American Graduate Students of Education, screening the documentaries *Traces of the Trade* and *Meeting David Wilson*, and hosting a presentation by "The Minority Reporter."

DISCUSSING RACE IN THE ABSENCE OF PEOPLE OF COLOR

Members of WSCR have complained that they never quite know how to describe our meetings—"I'm off to my white group tonight!" The thought of white people convening to discuss race conjures images of the KKK and other supremacist organizations. How ironic, given that white people routinely gather in monochromatic groups to discuss just about everything—except race—in our segregated society. Somehow, white people discussing race together can seem wrong or threatening.

Because of this inherent fear, white people often wait to talk about race until we are in interracial dialogues. This is problematic, however, as many white people are frequently hindered in such conversations by our inexperience discussing race, ignorance about the legacy of racial injustice in the US, and underdeveloped racial identities. Many people of color, on the other hand, arrive at interracial dialogues with an intimate understanding of racial dynamics and experience talking about race with friends or family. They may not necessarily have spoken with many white people about race, but people of color often do have a sense of their own racial identity, of how society identifies them as members of a racialized group, and of where they stand on questions pertaining to race.

Bringing white people and people of color together to discuss race can be like placing pre-algebra students in a calculus class. The people of color are often so far ahead of the white people that they would have to slow down in order to let us catch up. And since "catching up" involves extensive emotional processing, it does not happen quickly. This can be endlessly frustrating to everyone involved. People of color may feel cheated out of their own growth around race while white people may shut down or feel inadequate, scared, and intimidated. Consider this narrative from a WSCR member:

When I found my principal waiting outside my classroom early one morning, I expected she had come to congratulate me. My fifth grade students and I had orchestrated a school-wide celebration the evening before for Martin Luther King, Jr's birthday that had an unprecedented parent turnout. Instead, I followed her to a dimly lit conference room where several African American parents sat around a table, their rage palpable. One father immediately said: Did you realize that the white students had all the significant parts? Then a mother asked: Did you realize that the Black students were relegated to the margins while the white students were front and center? I sat in silence. I hadn't realized either of these things. I grew defensive and uncomfortable. I made a million excuses. The kids chose their parts. I was, in fact, accommodating the shyness of some of the African American students. Why couldn't their parents recognize my decisions as a mark of sensitivity instead of an unexamined act of racism? I decided, within minutes, that it wasn't my fault. I moved on. In the ensuing months, I thought little about this aggression against students and families.

Race was a frequent topic of discussion in my classroom. My students and I analyzed and critiqued all the injustice that occurred out there: in the world, in history and in our communities. Together we spent a semester exploring civil rights in the United States. We conducted case studies of resistance movements, translated the Bill of Rights into our own words and sacrificed our collective rights for a day in solidarity with "oppressed" people everywhere. We wrote persuasive letters to government officials. We protested gender-based violence and an unregulated international arms trade. I thought I was doing everything right. The culmination of our study was the Martin Luther King, Jr. birthday celebration. For many years, I deemed these thematic units and the conversations they inspired the measure of success for a white educator. I never paused to consider the notion that the injustice we discussed might also exist within the classroom, or worse, within me.

When I returned to graduate school last year, my studies required me to re-visit these memories. I attempted to do it alone. I spent many nights journaling about Whiteness and privilege, topics that had previously felt remote or irrelevant. I tried to make sense of who I had been as a teacher. As I reflected critically on my practice, I began to consider myself an imposter who had no business pursuing an advanced degree in education. I attended my first White Students Confronting Racism meeting from this unsteady location. There, I found a group of students committed to self-examination and the open discussion of race. I also found a new way to make sense of my experience. I no longer had to frame my teaching as "good" or "bad." I acknowledged, instead, its complexity and nuance. I shared my shortcomings, my blind spots, and my resistance to change. I listened as others did the same. I felt the stirrings of transformation. Mistakes became a lot less scary and over time, I became less afraid. And as the fear gradually evaporated, I find myself changed.
- Katherine Crawford-Garrett

Many white people benefit from a space where we can practice talking

about race—a space in which we can be honest, ask possibly ignorant questions, and process our deep emotions around race, while also challenging ourselves to do better, to examine and engage our privilege more critically. In order to be full participants in interracial dialogues and multiracial communities, white people need to understand how racism privileges us, to recognize how racism injures our colleagues of color, and to consider our responsibility and role in responding to racism in our environment. Much of this work can be done in a white affinity group so that, in time, white people can be productive members of interracial conversations on race, rather than requiring constant and remediated attention.

REFLECTION AS A FORM OF ACTION

Facilitating candid, constructive reflection on our position and privilege as white people is WSCR's primary responsibility and goal. We believe that reflection is a form of action. This is especially true for white people as have spent our lives internalizing the structural racism that surrounds us. Dismantling these racist structures and replacing them with healthy, anti-racist counternarratives requires hard daily work.

Upon initially learning about oppression, many people ask instinctually, "What can I do?" This is especially true for white people who, unfamiliar with the dynamics of oppression, generally feel empowered in our society to make change and fix what is wrong. Take, for example, this reflection from a WSCR member on her initial approach to teaching in an urban school:

I entered education with the expectation that I would be helping poor students of color "rise up" from their circumstances. I began my first job at a predominantly Black school with a combination of arrogance and ignorance that is born of privilege. As a result, I privately agonized over my students' disadvantages, but made few or no connections with community members, parents, or even students themselves who were already engaged in longstanding efforts to fight systems of oppression.

Instead I muttered to myself about how things should be done, somehow imagining that because I read the "right books" and had the "right politics" I was qualified to design a plan to end institutional racism.

After a few years, I entered graduate school slightly more humbled, but no more certain about the role I could or should take in fighting racism. I hoped to use research to shed light on injustices, but I was losing confidence. I wrote in a response journal early in my graduate school career:

I feel strongly that issues of race, culture, and class are inherent in the research questions I wish to pursue. To what extent does my identity as a white middle class woman preclude me from writing critically about these issues? I once had a Black colleague say that even her most well intentioned white friends did not "get it." Who am I to write about race?

Troubled by how my "savior" approach had unwittingly patronized so many colleagues, parents and students, I felt paralyzed.

I now see that what was lacking in both of these approaches was a realization that race and racism are not things that occur outside of me. Working toward racial justice by "helping" others ignores the ways in which I, as a white person, continually benefit from systems of oppression and privilege. To ask who am I to write about race implies that I have no racial identity and that I am somehow outside institutionally racist systems. White Students Confronting Racism has provided a space for me to reconsider what it means for whites to engage in anti-racist work. I do have a role to play in the fight against racial injustice; the first step in assuming that role is to engage in self-education and self-reflection about systems of race in America and my place in them.
- Susan Bickerstaff

WSCR helps white people—especially white educators—understand that the laudable instinct to "fix things" is also highly problematic. This is the case because it undermines the work that people of color have been doing for hundreds of years in this country, and the work that is already underway in our particular institutions. It is also problematic because white people who are newly acquainted with racism and its many complex tentacles do not yet have sufficient resources to fight against it. They often still harbor racism or an internal sense of superiority that makes them inadequate allies to people of color. Stories abound in which purported white allies join an anti-oppression movement and quickly take over, dominate the conversation, control the agenda, put people of color at undue risk, and ultimately destroy the coalition (Kivel, 2002).

When WSCR takes action beyond "reflection as action," we follow the lead of people of color in our institution. It is important to remember that anti-racist action often has negative repercussions for people of color locally. It is necessary to have a coordinated strategy in order to do anti-racism work that does not end up hurting people of color in our institutions more than it helps.

BENEFITS OF A WHITE AFFINITY GROUP

Our group is not only a setting for learning and reflecting—it is also an important public declaration of white anti-racism. WSCR is a visible presence to white students at GSE in particular, and to our faculty and community overall. This serves both white people and people of color in our institution in different, valuable ways.

First, we are a resource for white people who seek further knowledge about race, or a space in which to process their thoughts and feelings around race. Classrooms often fail to provide the appropriate mechanisms, opportunities, or room for this to happen—our group fills the gap. WSCR is a place to which faculty or students can refer white students who feel confused, angry, or dissatisfied with their learning about race.

WSCR as Practitioner Inquiry

Although I studied urban education and thought I knew a thing or two about power, race and culture in schools, it wasn't until being mentored by a white woman during my first year in the field that realized I was marginalizing students of color by holding a subconscious deficit standard in mind. Rather than scolding or "retraining" me, my mentor supported me in my questions, providing a critically conscious lens on my own privilege. She caught my presuppositions in midair, and held them out for me, nonthreateningly, to examine. My fellowship as a Teach For America mentor has crystallized my belief in the importance of mentoring towards critical reflection. I'm passionate about supporting new teachers; however, I strive to approach my role as a tenuous guide. I question, "Who am I to mentor towards this goal?" and seek to bring a practitioner inquiry stance to my mentoring. But I lack the ability to do it alone.

Thankfully, within WSCR we have formed a space for individual inquiries. I wonder, for instance, how I might address differences in race and cultural background between the first-year teachers I mentor and their students? This problem is the heart and soul of my mentoring inquiry, within this critically conscious group. Without this group membership, I would likely be grasping at these problems of practice ineffectually on my own.

In both my classroom and my research, the model of personal movement toward reflective inquiry within a group of practitioners has been challenged by day-to-day reality. Teachers typically don't have the time or resources to undertake such inquiry, and when we do, our findings are often hard-pressed to find respect from administration and academe. Yet, I am hopeful. As Gerald Campano (2007) maintains, practitioner inquiry is taking place—in brief minutes in the faculty room or during shared prep periods—even though it isn't titled 'teacher research.' The power may be in the naming, he suggests: by giving a name to what it is many practitioners do – that is, inquire about our own practice – one may provide accessibility to practitioner research.

- Ellie Fitts Fulmer

Second, we offer "a fourth path" for white people. Beverly Daniel Tatum (2003) talks about the three white identities available to white people: the overtly racist white person, the guilty white person, or the colorblind "I don't see race" white person. Larger society does not portray many other models for white racial identity. WSCR helps white people approach Tatum's fourth white racial identity path, that of a white anti-racist ally. History books and popular culture do not teach us about white people who have allied themselves to the struggle for anti-racism throughout our history (Loewen, 2007; Tatum, 2003). And yet our history is full of white people who skillfully and successfully fought racism in their time. We hope that WSCR offers white people a way to be white while also being anti-racist.

Third, this work is critical for white educators who are preparing to work in, conduct research on, and understand multiracial settings. Educating, particularly classroom teaching, is an all-consuming effort that leaves little energy left over to reflect on one's own practice, especially in the first few years. Yet it is essential to continually examine one's race and its role in schools. (Indeed, avoiding this path is part of the dangerous lethargy of white privilege.) WSCR serves as an organic inquiry group, where our practice is the discipline of engaging in life as researchers, students, mentors, and teachers. Our

inquiry is a two-fold challenge: How we might examine our participation in these activities thoughtfully as white people? And, more importantly, how might we catch, provoke, and guide one other as we work to align our learning, teaching, and research practices with principles of social justice?

Fourth, our group is a symbol to people of color at our school that there are white people who want to collaborate to end racism in our institution and in ourselves. No person of color asked us to form this group, and we certainly do not participate in it in order to secure thanks, appreciation, or approval. We do this work because we believe that we need it and our school needs it. However, we can also be a resource when other student groups and people of color ask us to work together with them as allies on anti-racism projects. Speaking out about race is often much less risky for us than it is for people of color, and we can therefore be useful and strategic as allies in classrooms. Having a white affinity group on campus means that when students of color are mobilizing around issues of race, they know where to find willing white allies. WSCR's visible presence helps make such partnerships possible.

WHITE ALLIES IN THE STRUGGLE FOR RACIAL JUSTICE

Unfortunately, we cannot guarantee that we will always be perfect allies. Given the way that whiteness has been rendered invisible in our society, much of our training as white people has taught us to see racism and racial hierarchies as normal. This is probably our single greatest challenge as allies. Even as we work to end racism, it is constantly cultivated in the world around us and in ourselves. We need to persistently root it out. Simultaneously, we must approach our allyship with humility, recognizing that we are fallible and remaining open to feedback and critique. In his talk at Penn as a part of the visiting Scholars of Color series (2008), Dr. Derald Wing Sue said that white allies can be the biggest barrier to racial justice because of their belief in their own superiority and their tendency to dominate the agenda, even within

the struggle for racial justice. This is one of our primary concerns as a group and we work to keep one another and ourselves accountable on this point.

White allies are not just allies to people of color. We are allies to each other.

It is extremely difficult to stay engaged in anti-racism work as a white person. There are many institutional forces telling us to butt out, or questioning the legitimacy of our stake in anti-racist work. People (mostly white) question our motives, claiming it is racist or supremacist—or just plain silly—to have a separate group. It can be hard to explain to family and friends. Yet a group like this is critical for identifying the other white allies in our environment who will challenge us and support our growth as anti-racist white people.

At each of our meetings, it is inspiring and sustaining to see the number of white people at Penn who choose to engage honestly and painfully in the work of self-reflection in order to be better white allies. Now we know whom we can count on to confront words or deeds of racism inside and outside of classes. We know whom we can approach when we are confused or dismayed by a conversation in class and need to talk about it. And most importantly, we know that there is a small but critical mass of people in our institution who are working to actively resist the racism and white superiority that surrounds us.

CONCLUSION

As an affinity group, White Students Confronting Racism provides a space for white people to develop our racial identity while simultaneously becoming effective anti-racist allies to people of color. "White" is often ignored as a racial category, yet its members wield considerable power within American social institutions, including schools. Understanding white identity within the context of immigration is also important, as American whiteness is arguably unique. Both white and non-white immigrants to the US may find themselves assumed to have racial identities they have never before experienced. White affinity groups can help white American teachers become competent and comfortable with racial issues, so that they can better support their students as they navigate racial structures that constrict opportunities for immigrants of color if they do not recognize them.

It is especially imperative that white educators work to identify and understand our privilege so that we do not perpetuate racial injustice. Doing this hard work with and among other white people is critical—not only for support and sustenance, but also for accountability and caution against co-opting the efforts of people of color. In short, we need to know our racial selves better before we can fully participate in anti-racist work, as understanding how race works enhances our ability to counter racism in ourselves and our environment.

Ali Michael co-founded White Students Confronting Racism in 2006 and coordinated the group until 2008. She is a doctoral student at the Graduate School of Education of the University of Pennsylvania. Her research focuses on facilitating effective race dialogue based on participants' self knowledge and an understanding of the personal, institutional and historical dynamics of whiteness and racism.

Mary C. Conger is a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership program at the University of Pennsylvania's Graduate School of Education where she has been a member of the affinity group White Students Confronting Racism since 2007. In addition to pursuing wide-ranging academic interests, she has also founded Collegocity, a web-based company that helps families and school groups make productive, affordable, and fun visits to college campuses.

REFERENCES

Kivel, P. (2002). Uprooting racism: How white people can work for racial justice. British Columbia: New Society Publishers.

Loewen, J. (2007). Lies my teacher told me. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Pollock, M. (2004). Colormute. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Tatum, B.D. (2003). Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria? New York: Basic Books.

COMMENTARIES

A Brief History of Bilingual Education in the United States

By David Nieto, University of Massachusetts Boston

INTRODUCTION

In the history of the United States of America, multilingual communities have subsisted side by side. Among the many languages spoken throughout the country, we could mention first all the original Native American languages and then a multitude of languages that immigrants from all over the world have brought into the country. Together with English, Italian, German, Dutch, Polish, French, Spanish, Chinese, and Japanese are just some of the more than two hundred languages that have been spoken in the United States. As James Crawford (2004) has noted, "Language diversity in North America has ebbed and flowed, reaching its lowest level in the mid-20th century. But it has existed in every era, since long before the United States constituted itself as a nation" (p. 59).

Such a phenomenon is partly a result of the fact that immigration is one of the *authenticities* in the history of the United States of America. Immigration is one of the most prominent features of the country, together with the promise of liberty and a better life, which led this nation to be labelled a *nation of immigrants*. As Sonia Nieto (1992) asserts, contrary to many contemporary arguments about immigration,

Immigration is not a phenomenon of the past. In fact, the experience of immigration is still fresh in the minds of a great many people in our country. It is an experience that begins anew every day that planes land, ships reach our shores, and people make their way on foot to borders. Many of the students in our schools, even if they themselves are not immigrants, have parents or grandparents who were. The United States is thus not only a nation of immigrants as seen in some idealized and romanticized past; it is also a living nation of immigrants even today. (p. 333)

In fact, Fix and Passel (2003) estimate that during the 1990s the number of immigrants that entered the U.S. exceeded that of any previous decade in the U.S. history. They also indicate that, together with the immigrant population overall, the English Language Learner (ELL) population increased by 52 percent in the 1990s. In addition, they projected that the in-flow of immigrants would be sustained, if not increased, during the 2000s. The diverse demographic reality of the U.S. is still changing drastically. Early 20th century European migration was superseded by the number of immigrants that arrived from Latin America and Asia in the second half of the century. By the year 2000, more than a quarter of the population was composed of ethnic minorities. Latinos have already surpassed African Americans as the nation's largest minority, and they are expected to make up to 25 percent of the total population of the country by 2050 (Suarez-Orozco & Páez, 2002).

However, despite the vast richness of such a linguistic and cultural landscape, quick assimilation into English is another prevailing characteristic of U.S. history. The pattern of linguistic assimilation, or 'language shift', has been documented to last no more than three generations. Consequently, grandchildren of today's new immigrants will hardly speak the language of their ancestors (Schmidt, 2000). The uniqueness of such an extended process of language shift led the linguist Einar Haugen (1972) to define it as 'Babel in Reverse.'

This process of rapid linguistic assimilation into English may have been the origin of one of the assumptions about language and education in the United States; namely, that former immigrants integrated into the American mainstream without any special type of instruction or curriculum "aide." Nevertheless, this process of Anglicisation cannot exactly be characterized as a voluntary assimilation. As Urban & Wagoner (2003) have pointed out, "assimilation [...] was neither completely painless nor evenly or eagerly embraced by all groups" (p. 388).

The actual situation was much more complex. Various cultural groups have embraced and resisted the assimilation process in numerous ways and at different times. Wiley (1999) claimed that, whereas languages that came from Europe were generally more accepted and tolerated, those of Native Americans, Africans, and the Mexican territories were intentionally depleted by being assigned an inferior status.

Regardless of whether the process was voluntary or whether it was forced, it is significant to identify at least two of its most pronounced effects. One effect is the emergence of feelings of frustration that many immigrant students experience when forced to abandon their language, which also puts them at odds with their families and communities, who may have less direct access to the mainstream (Brisk, 1998; Urban & Wagoner, 2003). The imposition of linguistic behaviors leaves an imprint of ambivalence toward one's own native language, the value of one's cultural background, and, ultimately, the value of oneself (Bartolomé, 2008; McCarty, 2000; Nieto, 1992;).

The second effect of such a linguistic approach in education may have a direct connection with the significantly lower grades and higher dropout rates that immigrant students have persistently attained in the history of American Education (Crawford, 2004). This achievement gap has usually been attributed to the social class and the rural background of many immigrants, but

other factors have been left unexplored. Sonia Nieto (1992) observed that,

> Curriculum and pedagogy, rather than using the lived experiences of students as a foundation, have been based on what can be described as an alien and imposed reality. The rich experiences of millions of our students, their parents, grandparents, and neighbours have been kept strangely quiet. Although we almost all have an immigrant past, very few of us know or even acknowledge it. (p. 334)

As a consequence, the linguistic and cultural realities of a large number of students have been purposefully not only forgotten, but also silenced in schools' curricula. In this sense, and regardless of the number and the diversity of the individuals and groups that have entered the country, the prime institutional attitude that has been officially adopted toward languages other than English in the United States can be labelled as "indifferent" (Crawford, 1989). The notion that presided over such a political position was that most people would understand the convenience and advantages of learning English and thus would tend to abandon their mother tongues without coercion. Still, the U.S. government has had a fundamental role in promoting the conformity into Anglicisation standards. At times, it has been more open and accepting of the multilingual reality and at others blatantly repressive and intolerant (Crawford, 1989; Schmid, 2001).

Within the context of language legislation in education in the U.S. during the 20ᵗʰ century, the present article attempts to assess the importance of ideological considerations and political momentum over empirical data at the time of choosing and implementing bilingual education programs. Following Cummins' (1999) assertion that experimental and quasi-experimental studies, as necessary as they are to prove the validity of bilingual education, are not enough to evaluate the quality of bilingual programs, I believe that it is essential to build a coherent theoretical framework in order to assess the potential of such programs and neutralize the negative discourse against them. In such a theory, it becomes indispensable to include elements of race and culture and an explicit theory of language.

Examining the research literature, I use the relatively recent case of Massachusetts' Question 2 to explore the relevant role of ideology and socio-political expectations at the time of probing the continuation of bilingual education. In 2002, the mid-term elections in Massachusetts included a ballot question, Question 2, to decide about the future of the bilingual programs offered in the state up to that moment. The case of Massachusetts clearly exemplifies the role of ideology and politics in shaping education policy in general and bilingual education in particular.

LANGUAGE AND EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Prior to the twentieth century, the U.S. government had actively imposed the use of English among Native Americans and the inhabitants of the incorporated territories of the Southwest. By the 1880s, the Bureau of Indian Affairs implemented a policy of forced Anglicisation for Native Americans sending Indian children to boarding schools. Such policies did not succeed in eradicating the children's native languages, but it did instil in them a sense of shame that guaranteed the exclusive use of English for future generations (Crawford, 1998; McCarty, 2002).

In order to ensure linguistic and cultural control of the new territories on the Southwest, the U.S. government adopted two different strategies. The first one entailed delimiting state borders to favor an English-speaking majority by splitting Spanish-speaking communities. The second strategy involved the deferral of the recognition of statehood until English-speaking settlers had sufficiently populated the new territories. For this reason, California was accepted as a state in 1850, Nevada in 1864, Colorado in 1876, and Utah in 1896. In the case of New Mexico, which, at the time of its incorporation in 1848, included Arizona, it took the Federal government 60 years to grant full statehood to the two states contained in this territory (MacGregor-Mendoza, 1998).

However, it was not until the approval of the Nationality Act in Texas in 1906 that English was officially designated as the only language to be taught in schools. In addition, the Nationality Act required all immigrants to speak English in order to be eligible to start their process of naturalization (Perez, 2004). This justification of the imposition of English was based on the explicit connection between English and U.S. national identity and on the *empirically-determined* correlation between bilingualism and inferior intelligence (Schmid, 2001). In 1917, Congress passed the Burnett Act, which required all new immigrants to pass a literacy test and prohibited immigration from Asia, except for Japan and the Philippines. Such a measure reveals the closeness between racial prejudice and linguistic restrictions. At this time, the previous tolerance toward German speakers turned to hostility (Schmid, 2001; Wiley, 2002). Not much later, President Theodore Roosevelt (1926) emphasized the connection between English acquisition and loyalty to the U.S. with the following statement,

> We have room for but one language in this country and that is the English language, for we intend to see that the crucible turns our people out as Americans, of American nationality, and not as dwellers in a polyglot boarding house. ([1919] 1926: XXIV, 554 as cited in Crawford, 2001)

The hostile climate against languages other than English would result in the drastic reduction of any type of bilingual instruction in the U.S. According to Crawford (1998), the restriction of language use had two intentions. The first purpose was to deprive minorities of their individual rights in order to frustrate worker solidarity. The second one was to institute a perception of the United States as an exclusively Anglo community. Such an ideological strategy was to remain quite constant until the 1960s.

However, the Supreme Court refused to back those restrictive practices. The first legal case that had a noticeable impact on education policy was Meyer

vs. Nebraska, 262 US 390 in 1923. Meyer, a German parochial instructor, was accused of violating a Nebraska law enacted in 1919 that prohibited instruction in any foreign language. The Supreme Court ruled that the law violated the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution by limiting individual inalienable rights (Tollefson, 2002a).

In 1927, in the case Farrington v. Tokushige 273 U.S. 284, the Supreme Court invalidated the law that banned foreign language instruction without a permit in schools in Hawaii. The Supreme Court ruled that prohibiting schools to teach in a language other than English violates constitutional rights protected under the Fifth Amendment (Cordasco, 1976; DelValle, 2003; Tollefson, 2002a).

Following these precedents, courts kept on affirming the right of citizens to learn and teach their language of preference. In 1949, Mo Hock Ke Lok Po v. Stainback, the judge sentenced that parents have the right to have their children taught in the language they choose (Cordasco, 1976; DelValle, 2003).

In 1954, in the case Brown vs. the Board of Education of Topeka, the Supreme Court advanced a major shift in educational policy by declaring that enforced segregation of schools inherently promotes inequality and ordering its immediate desegregation. In a second part of this sentence in 1955, the Supreme Court added the recommendation "with deliberate speed" (as cited in Urban & Wagoner, 2003). In its ruling, the Supreme Court acknowledged for the first time the unequal, disadvantageous, and unfair educational situation of people of color in the U.S. and prescribed action to correct the situation (Urban & Wagoner, 2003).

The Brown vs. the Board of Education sentence motivated the African American community in their struggle for civil rights. They launched an intense campaign of political activism that eventually provoked other similar rulings against segregation in public schools, such as the Little Rock integration decision in 1957 (Urban & Wagoner, 2003). The social movement that started at this point would culminate with the passage of the Civil Rights Act

in 1964, which outlawed discrimination. At the same time, Title VI, the part of the Civil Rights Act that pertained to education, became the paramount initiative for bilingual education in the United States. Title VI allowed funds to be withheld from school districts that maintained segregation or did not promote integration (DelValle, 2003; Urban & Wagoner, 2003).

The Civil Rights movement helped to intensify the actions of the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC). This organization was created in the 1920s with the goal of fighting the discriminatory treatment of Mexican Americans in public schools and to promote a better education for the Mexican American community. Other groups in defense of ethno-linguistic minorities were also established, such as the Mexican American Legal Defense Fund (MALDEF), which was formed under the advice of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). Along with the struggle for desegregation of Mexican American students, these organizations fought to gain recognition for the fundamental language and cultural differences between their communities and the 'Anglo-White' mainstream. The lack of any reference to multiculturalism in an all-English curriculum fostered low academic achievement in such communities (Urban & Wagoner, 2003).

In the 1960s, ethno-linguistic minorities experienced a pronounced increase in numbers. The lack of access to a meaningful education hindered the possibility of full participation in society for these non-English speaking students and blocked their upward mobility. Both facts motivated Congress to pass the Bilingual Education Act of 1968, also known as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Crawford, 1989).

The Bilingual Education Act has been considered the most important law in recognizing linguistic minority rights in the history of the United States. The law did not force school districts to offer bilingual programs, but it encouraged them to experiment with new pedagogical approaches by funding programs that targeted principally low-income and non-English speaking

populations (Crawford, 1989, 2004; DelValle, 2003; Ricento, 1998).

Title VII represented the first bilingual and bicultural education program that was approved at the federal level. It offered supplemental funding for those districts that developed special programs to meet the needs of students whose English was not proficient. It granted funding for planning and developing bilingual programs and for defraying the costs of training and operating those programs (Schmid, 2001). The main idea was to provide part of the instruction in the student's native language in order to ease her/his transition into the mainstream. Such approach is known as "transitional bilingual education" (Cordasco, 1976; DelValle, 2003). As the first federal law in the United States that dealt with issues of language, the passage of the Bilingual Educational Act provoked people to express language attitudes and beliefs that had little to do with instruction and a lot to do with ideological positions (Crawford, 2004).

In 1974, the Bilingual Education Act was amended to explicitly define bilingual educational programs, identify goals, and stipulate the requirement of feedback and progress reports from the programs. At the time, the lack of a systematic means of determining success of such programs was considered one of the failures of bilingual education (Bangura & Muo, 2001). In addition, the terms of eligibility were broadened by eliminating the low-income requirement that was included in the Act of 1968 (Crawford, 1989).

The same year, the Supreme Court ruled in Lau v. Nichols, 414 US 563, 565. This ruling reinforced the mandate that it was the school district's responsibility to provide the necessary programs and accommodations to children who did not speak English. In this case, a group of approximately eight hundred Chinese students in San Francisco raised a case of discrimination against their school district. These non-English speaking students argued that they were left in a "sink or swim" situation by being taught exclusively in English, a language they could not yet fully understand (Schmid, 2001; Wiley, 2002). The Supreme Court rea-

soned that the responsibility to overcome language barriers that impede full integration of students falls on the school boards and not on the parents or children; otherwise, there is no real access for these students to a meaningful education (Cordasco 1976, Crawford, 2004). The importance of this decision is clear, considering that, in a related previous sentence in 1973, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals had argued,

> The discrimination suffered by these children is not the result of laws passed by the state of California, presently or historically, but is the result of deficiencies created by the children themselves in failing to know and learn the English language. (as cited in Wiley, 2002, p. 55)

Notwithstanding, the Supreme Court did not base the decision on the Constitution, but on Title VI, which prohibits discrimination on the grounds of race, color, or national origin. As a result, the Supreme Court did not address the question of whether there is a constitutional right to educational assistance for language minority students, and it implied that there is no constitutional right to bilingual education (DelValle, 2003; Schmid, 2001).

The Lau ruling did not mentioned any specific remedies; it just mentioned 'appropriate action.' In 1975, the Office of Civil Rights released a series of guidelines by which school districts should abide in order to comply with the Supreme Court Lau decision. These guidelines were named the 'Lau Remedies' and essentially promoted transitional bilingual education programs. The Lau remedies were to be withdrawn in 1981 (Crawford, 1989; DelValle, 2003). That year, in the case Castaneda v. Pickard the Fifth Circuit established three requirements to define what appropriate action meant when implementing programs to help language minority students overcome language barriers: The program (1) must be based on sound educational theory, (2) must have sufficient resources and personnel, and (3) must prove to be effective in teaching students English. These requirements offered ample leeway for districts re-

luctant to implement bilingual education programs (DelValle, 2003).

In the eighties, the Reagan administration led a major campaign against bilingual education and in favour of a "back to basics" education. The Reagan administration defined the United States as a "nation at risk of balkanization" and blamed non-English speaking communities for such a risk (Crawford, 1989). As early as 1981, the senator S.I. Hayakawa introduced a constitutional amendment aimed at adopting English as the official language of the United States. Later, in 1983, he founded U.S. English, a non-profit organization that promotes English as the official language of the United States and discredits bilingual education (Padilla et al., 1991).

The principal reasons to criticize bilingual education were derived from Keith Baker and Adriane de Kanter's (1981, 1983) evaluation of bilingual education programs. By compiling and analyzing the results of previous studies, they concluded that bilingual education was not an effective means to meet the needs of language minority students. However, their evaluations were rapidly contested by critics who pointed out that the authors had left out significant variables in their analysis, and, if these variable had been included, "the results from the meta-analysis [would have] consistently yielded small to moderate differences supporting bilingual education" (Padilla et al., 1991, p. 126).

In 1994, under the Improving America's Schools Act, the Bilingual Education Act was reauthorized. The law made explicit its main purpose: "developing bilingual skills and multicultural understanding" (as cited in Crawford, 2004, p. 19). For the first time, bilingual education was not only considered a resource to help immigrants become fluent English speakers, but also a potential asset to improve the country's prospects, a way to "develop our Nation's national languages resources, thus promoting our Nation's competitiveness in the global economy" (Crawford, 2004, p. 20).

The result of this extension was the promotion and establishment of developmental bilingual education, which

included "two-way" bilingual programs. These programs continue to serve mainstream and language-minority students. Both groups of students benefit from the opportunity to acquire and fully develop their skills in a second language (Crawford, 2004). Shortly after the passage of the Improving America's Schools Act, in the fall of 1994, Proposition 187 was passed in California, a policy that made it illegal for children of undocumented immigrants to attend public schools. The proposition was declared unconstitutional, but it fuelled the drive to pass new initiatives toward limiting the rights of and benefits previously accorded to immigrants (Crawford, 2004).

In 1996, the House of Representatives approved the designation of English as the nation's official language and banned the use of other languages by government agencies and officials. The bill did not pass in the Senate. In 1998, Proposition 227, promoted by multimillionaire Ron Unz, was adopted in California. Proposition 227 ended the bilingual education programs throughout the state of California, which were substituted with English-only instruction models (Crawford, 2004). Similar propositions that eliminated instruction in any language other than English were approved in the year 2000 in Arizona and in 2001 in Colorado (Crawford, 2001, 2004).

This wave of anti-bilingualism policies reached its peak with George W. Bush's No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2002. The law, which was a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), did not officially ban bilingual programs, but it imposed a high-stakes testing system that promoted the adoption and implementation of English-only instruction. Furthermore, all references to bilingual education in the previous ESEA were eliminated in the new legislation (Crawford, 2004).

As all of the above mentioned policy changes toward the restriction or exclusion of bilingual education were passed, evidence about the beneficial effects of bilingual education increased (Crawford, 2004; Krashen, 1996). Greene (1998) reported in a meta-analysis summarizing the scholarly research on

bilingual education that children with limited English proficiency who are taught using at least some of their native language perform significantly better on standardized tests than similar children who are taught only in English. This conclusion was based on the statistical combination of eleven studies. These studies were selected for the quality of their research design from a total of seventy-five studies reviewed. They included standardized test score results from 2,719 students in thirteen different states, 1,562 of whom were enrolled in bilingual programs. Further studies show that providing instruction in the students' native languages does not only facilitate English acquisition but also strengthens content knowledge attainment (Cummins, 2000; Krashen, 2004; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Detractors of bilingual education argue that the use of the native language delays the acquisition of English and that it is more efficient to place students in all-English programs where they may receive language support (Baker, 1998). However, further studies have shown that it may take up to seven years to master academic English (Hakuta et al., 2000; Krashen, 2004). In any case, as Donaldo Macedo (2000) contends, if standardized test results and supposed low literacy skills are used as the empirical evidence that bilingual education does not work, such a line of reasoning could also be applied to foreign language departments in schools all over the country, and, nevertheless, no one advocates for their elimination.

Bilingual education has also been blamed for retarding the process of assimilation for immigrants. However, this claim cannot be based on any empirical data. In the first place, such a vision overlooks the fact that linguistic minorities in the U.S. are not only comprised of recently arrived immigrants and their children but also of enslaved and indigenous peoples, including inhabitants of those territories that have been annexed to the U.S. (Wiley, 2002). The most probable rationale of such an argument is to be found in the fact that the origin of most immigrants has shifted from Europe to Asia and Latin-America. Such a shift has trig-gered feelings about the unity of the nation, the endangered dominant ethnic identity, and the gradual decline of the English language. Samuel Huntington (2004) and Patrick Buchanan (2006) equate 'Anglo-Protestant culture' to the 'American Creed,' and identify multiculturalism and the retention of other (Hispanic) cultural values, including language and bilingual education, as a threat to the 'American way of life.' Martinez (2007) claims that such a discourse longs for a return to the days in which being White was a requisite in order to be eligible for citizenship. He argues that the end of bilingual education is part of a global strategy to curtail immigration from Third World countries, especially Mexico.

Certainly, the discourse against bilingual education transcends educational empirical research. Henry Giroux (2001) affirms that, in the United States, the discourse of monolingualism attempts to portray minorities as a threat to the American way of life and as an excuse to attack multiculturalism, bilingual education, affirmative action, welfare reform, or any other sign of diversity and 'the Other.' Furthermore, Lilia Bartolomé (2008) argues, "the practice of forbidding the use of non-English languages has constituted the more prevalent contemporary language practice in the US," (p. 378), explaining that language education itself is being used as an instrument of discourse and ideological power (Wiley, 2002).

In summary, ideological positions about American identity and White supremacy result in the association of bilingualism with inferior intelligence and a lack of patriotism in the United States. The word 'bilingual,' beyond denoting 'speaker of two languages,' has come to symbolize an immigrant, typically a Latino or Latina, who does not—and refuses to—speak English correctly and, therefore, who cannot be considered 'American' (Spolsky, 2004; Tollefson, 2002b). All these ideological forces and assumptions played an important role at the time voters came to the polls to decide whether or not to continue implementing bilingual programs in Massachusetts, as is examined in the next section.

THE CASE FOR MASSACHUSETTS: QUESTION 2

The struggle of the Latino community in Massachusetts "led to the first state-mandated, transitional bilingual-education program in the United States in 1969" (Uriarte & Chavez, 2000, p.1). In the 1970s, Boston bore witness to one of the most bitter school desegregation cases in the United States. The city school's committee refused unashamedly to comply with the federal court's mandates to desegregate public schools. Eventually, the federal district judge Arthur Garrity had to develop several plans and policies to override the refusal of desegregation of the Boston School Committee. The practices that were developed at that point included extensive Bilingual Education programs (Urban & Wagoner, 2003).

Educational practices moved toward the measurement of outcomes early in Massachusetts. In 1993, the Educational Reform Act was approved. It established the Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System (MCAS) as the official and primary measure of students' achievement. The adoption of standardised tests as a reliable indicator of students' progress was and still is in question for many educators, especially with regards to those children who do not belong to the dominant class, race, and culture (Uriarte & Chavez, 2000).

Bilingual education, although insufficiently funded, was widespread in Massachusetts. In the mid-term elections of 2002, among the referendum questions, a question about the suitability of bilingual education programs in the State was included on the ballot. The English Language Education in Public Schools, Question 2, was an initiative of Ron Unz and the U.S. English group under the slogan "English for the Children" (Berriz, 2005). The rationale for such an initiative was based on the assertion that "the public schools of Massachusetts have done an inadequate job of educating many immigrant children, requiring that they be placed in native language programs whose failure over the past decades is demonstrated by the low English literacy levels of those children," and the

assumption that "immigrant children can easily acquire full fluency and literacy in a new language, such as English, if they are taught that language in the classroom as soon as they enter school" (Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 2002).

Massachusetts residents voted overwhelmingly in favor of Question 2. The proposition replaced the law that provided transitional bilingual education in the State "with a law requiring that, with limited exceptions, all public school children must be taught English by being taught all subjects in English and being placed in English language classrooms" (Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 2002). Bilingual programs were immediately substituted with sheltered English immersion (SEI) programs whose main purpose was to teach English language acquisition and content instruction at the same time. English language learners could be included no longer than one year in SEI programs. After that period, they would be placed into mainstream classes. Parents or guardians were given the option to apply for a waiver not to be included in SEI programs or to place their children in a bilingual program exclusively when one of these conditions were met: (1) the student is already able to speak English; (2) the student is at least ten and the school principal and teachers firmly believe it is in the students' best interest; or (3) the student has special physical or psychological needs (Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 2002).

In addition, the law also established an annual standardized test—the Massachusetts English Proficiency Assessment (MEPA)—as a requirement to measure the progress of English Language Learners (ELLs) (Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 2002). However, Wright & Choi (2006) argue that **the accountability and penalization of schools for low scores in standardized tests end up being a burden for all students**, who then have to endure a type of "narrow-instruction" (p. 47) that may prepare them for today's immediate testing needs but not for tomorrow's education opportunities. They propose that students should

be excluded from high-stakes tests in English until they have obtained enough proficiency in English, and, equally, ELLs should not be reclassified into mainstream classrooms until they have fully developed sufficient English skills as to assure their future academic prospects (Wright & Choi, 2006).

In the case of Arizona, where similar legislation had been passed in 2000, Wright (2005) noted, the state had developed certain procedures so that ELL scores did not make up part of the accountability formula in schools. These procedures, which might have been presented as some type of advantage or accommodation for ELL students, in fact represented an advantage for those administrators trying to cover the real performance level of these students within such language-restrictive educational policies.

Additionally, the new law in Massachusetts did not establish any special requirement or certification for teachers to educate ELL students other than being fluent in English. Contrary to this approach, Wright and Choi (2006) state that teachers should be provided with specific training and be supported throughout the school year. They argue that SEI classes should be taught by certified teachers to ensure proper attention for these students. Furthermore, in their research in Arizona, they found that, after the implementation of SEI, teachers felt confused about what was and was not allowed in class according to the new laws and felt they had not received guidance about what type of instruction is appropriate for ELLs. In fact, when students are placed into mainstream classes whose teachers do not necessarily have the adequate knowledge to meet their unique needs, they often struggle and fall behind academically (Facella et al., 2005).

As has been mentioned previously, the explicit goal of the approved anti-bilingual education measure was to teach English as rapidly and effectively as possible, in just one year, by exposing children exclusively to English instruction. However, although children are able to master general linguistic skills more quickly, it is estimated that students need between four and six years to become academically proficient in a

second language (Hakuta et al., 2000; Pray & MacSwan, 2002; Genesse et al., 2005). In addition to linguistic skills, it is necessary to pay attention to the long-term academic evolution of ELLs. Once students enter mainstream classes, the previously acquired academic knowledge and skills are vital. Non-native students will not only need English proficiency to succeed in school, but also sufficient content instruction to excel in their academic lives (Berriz, 2005). In this regard, a number of longitudinal studies have estimated that those students placed in bilingual programs perform better in content instruction classes than those placed in other programs. For that reason, bilingual education may contribute to reducing the achievement gap between ELLs and their native-English speaking peers (August & Hakuta, 1997; Thomas & Collier, 1997).

Question 2 enforced the minimization of the use of the students' native language in schools. Initially, instructors were banned from using any language other than English in class under the penalty of being fired. This rule was later modified in order to allow teachers to use a student's native language in SEI classes to help the student complete a task, to clarify a point, or to respond to a question (Berriz, 2005).

However, researchers argue that proficiency in a second language is best acquired when the literacy in the first language is developed appropriately. In other words, the first language skills operate as the basis of a common ground that facilitates the acquisition of the second language. The belief that the more time students spend in a second language context the quicker they learn a second language does not have empirical support. The first language serves as a bridge to the second one to ease the transition and instil better future learning (Genesee, 1999; Genesee et al., 2004; Krashen, 1996). In addition, other studies report that a student's level of literacy in the first language may be a strong predictor of that student's potential to achieve proficiency in the second (Slavin & Cheung, 2005).

A report from the National Institute of Child Health (2000) suggests,

If language-minority children arrive at school with no proficiency in English but speaking a language for which there are instructional guides, learning materials, and locally available proficient teachers, these children should be taught how to read in their native language while acquiring oral proficiency in English and subsequently taught to extend their skills to reading in English. (p. 324)

Krashen (1996) contends that, in order for SEI programs to be effective, it is necessary that they provide comprehensive input in the language to be learned, which entails that all materials and resources used in the classroom should be adapted to meet the instructional needs and learning abilities of ELLs. In any case, a number of studies have shown that bilingual education programs that are properly set up and correctly run provide a significant advantage over all-day English programs for children acquiring English literacy (Cummins, 2000; Greene, 1998; Krashen, 1996; Wiley & Wright, 2004). ELLs perform better in programs that are designed with their needs in mind, programs that foster challenging activities, language development, and appropriate assessments (Genesee et al., 2004). In this sense, it is essential for "districts and schools [to] avoid the use of one-size-fits-all scripted curricular programs which are not designed for ELL students, and which cannot account for differences in English language proficiency or academic ability" (Wright & Choi, 2006, p. 49).

In summary, laws that limit the use of bilingual education and restrict the use of languages other than English in schools lack the support of empirical data. Therefore, it is questionable whether or not they improve the quality of the education that ELLs receive and ultimately "reduce drop-out rates, improve literacy acquisition rates, and promote social and economic advancement" (Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 2002). On the contrary, they create confusion about the appropriate instructional strategies for teaching ELLs and endanger the academic progress of these students

(Krashen, 2004; Wright & Choi, 2006). Even worse, these laws generate a sense of rejection and inadequacy in non-native students that impedes their social progress and prepares them for a subordinate role in society (Berriz, 2005; Bartolomé, 2008).

As was the case in the national arena, all available empirical data in favor of the application and strengthening of existent bilingual programs went completely overlooked in Massachusetts. In November 2002, almost 70 percent of the population of Massachusetts voted in favor of Question 2 and against bilingual education. The reasons for such overwhelming support of Question 2 transcend the alleged empirical reasons about the lack of effectiveness of bilingual education. As Capetillo-Ponce & Kramer (2006) observed, "what posed as a referendum on bilingual education may have been, in reality, a referendum on broader socio-political and economic aspects of Massachusetts's society" (p. 275). Voters in Massachusetts did not judge the effectiveness of bilingual education; they pronounced a judgment about the suitability of offering bilingual education (Rivera, 2002).

The debate about such suitability was not decided exclusively by people affected by bilingual education. Whereas 93% percent of the Latino population voted against Question 2 (Berriz, 2005; Capetillo-Ponce & Kramer, 2006), a White majority electorate made a decision about the type of instruction that ethnolinguistic minority students should receive regardless of any empirical factors, instead basing this decision on political and cultural assumptions (Berriz, 2005; Markey, 2008).

The increasing immigration from Third World countries, especially from Latin America and Asia, the widespread belief that the use of other languages represent a serious threat to the unity of the nation and the dominance of English, and the feeling that bilingual education represents a gratuitous "extra-privilege" for a group of '*assimilation-resistant*' immigrants (mainly Latinos) played a crucial role in the vote on Question 2 in Massachusetts (Capetillo-Ponce & Kramer, 2006).

Using the slogan "English for the children," supporters of Question 2

based their campaign on the concealment of a confusing and uncomfortable political issue. Behind this seemingly innocent and eloquent phrase they hid an open confrontation between a supposedly unifying American identity and what they deemed divisive multicultural and multilingual ethnic communities. This simplification of such a complex question appealed to the mainstream, White suburban voter in Massachusetts (Markey, 2008).

In contrast, the campaign for bilingual education was founded on the slogan "Don't sue teachers," a slogan that came across as corporatist and not centered on students. In addition, supporters of this campaign refused to bring cultural and racial issues into the debate, thinking that their message would appeal to White suburbanites, most of whom ultimately ended up voting in favor of Question 2 (Markey, 2008).

Immediately after the referendum, the Boston Public Schools' (BPS) administration dismantled all bilingual programs in the district. The dismantling happened without any time to plan a curriculum, acquire relevant materials, and train teachers. However, the ideological considerations prevailed over considerations of the necessary requirements to adapt and implement a new instructional program (Berriz, 2005).,In contrast with the delayed response to desegregation in the 1970s, such an accelerated process of policy implementation had as its result "that the type of instruction that most ELLs are receiving constitutes little more than a contemporary version of 'sink or swim' submersion—a type of instruction that is illegal" (Berriz, 2005, p. 12). Recently, a state report has revealed that in 2008, only a little more than fifty percent of Hispanic males graduate from high-school within four years (The Boston Globe, 2009). Such data shows the inadequacy of the education system that in 2002 was imposed on these children. No doubt the consequences of Question 2 are lived day in and day out by linguistic minority children cultural and linguistic experiences are silenced (De los Reyes, Nieto, & Diez, 2008). These students must become skilled at navigating a school

system that tags them with a presumed disadvantage from the beginning: their language.

CONCLUSION AND FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Often, bilingual education has been blamed for the lack of academic skills and educational opportunities of minority language students. However, those shortfalls are mainly a result of socio-economic structures of schools and in our society. Exploring the existing research literature makes it clear that the current negative vision of bilingual education is a response more to highly politicized questions about preserving *the* American ethnic identity and the *whitewashing* cultural melting pot than to empirical facts. As Crawford (2004) notes, "bilingual education has aroused passions about issues of political power and social status that are far removed from the classroom" (p. xvii).

Research has sufficiently stressed the benefits, both psychological and educational, for students to be placed in classrooms where they are able to develop their skills in content subjects taught in their native languages and, at the same time, develop their knowledge of a second language. Not only does such an approach ease the transition between one language and another without having students lose ground on content subjects, but it also strengthens the students' cognitive skills. Bilingual education may also have a positive effect on students' confidence and self-esteem because it strongly values their previous knowledge by actively incorporating it into daily instruction (Crawford, 1989, 2004; Cummins, 1984, 2000; Padilla, 1991).

However, in order for bilingual education to be at the forefront of education policy, it is necessary for advocates and researchers to face and respond to some of the following questions that remain unanswered:

The Bilingual Education Act was not a flawless law. Its purpose was vague, and the means by which programs were to be implemented were also left unclear (Crawford, 2004). In this regard, it is necessary to build a theory establishing

clear minimum requisites to implement a solid bilingual program and disseminate it. In many of the states where anti-bilingual propositions have triumphed, parents found it hard to define what a bilingual program actually consists of, how it could be implemented, and how to differentiate it from other approaches (Del Valle, 2003; Capetillo-Ponce & Kramer, 2006). This recommendation is consistent with Wright and Choi's (2006) argument that

> for any instructional model to be successful and for any kind of instruction to be effective, there needs to be: (a) clear guidelines on what the model is (and what it is not), (b) an established curriculum and accompanying curricular materials, (c) training in the proper implementation of the model and instructional use of the curriculum and materials, and (d) support for this model and curriculum at the school and district level. (p. 40)

Both schools and families would benefit from the information about quality language instructional programs and potential alternatives. This point would also satisfy those who claim that families have a right to choose how their children should be educated. Of course, families should have the possibility of exercising genuine choice based on sound knowledge and solid data and not on others' ideological motivations.

Questions of power, race, and ethnicity need to be brought up in the debate and made explicit. Only explicit references to such questions will help problematize assumptions about language such as (1) the validity of competence in English as an indicator of national loyalty; (2) the presumed neutrality of Standard English; and (3) the sufficiency of willpower for its mastery (McGroarty, 2002). Strategies to defend bilingual education have to be reconsidered, and cases like California, Arizona, and Massachusetts need to be scrutinized to extract important lessons. If issues that are beyond mere educational research make an essential part of the debate about education programs, such questions need to be

tackled no matter how uncomfortable they are. The inherent racist and oppressive discourses behind the anti-bilingual education argument need to be explicitly exposed and denounced. In such an open debate lies a real opportunity. McGroarty (2002) asserts that Americans strongly value both greater acceptance of pluralism and greater emphasis on choice and individualism as expressive of an individual's uniqueness. These concepts are at the core of the divergence between democracratic and meritocratic principles. Bilingual education can certainly be presented as a balancing force between them.

Language rights need to be demystified and the theory of the 'additional privilege' deconstructed. Language rights are not an 'extra-advantage' but the factor that helps adjust an uneven playing field. In this regard, it becomes essential to stress the positive effects of language rights in reducing the potential for linguistic and social conflict. Language is a powerful force for mobilizing public opinion to affect not only language policy, but also broad issues of state formation, politics, and administration. Establishing "a system of language rights can protect all citizens from leaders who wish to use language for destructive and unscrupulous aims" (Tollefson, 2002c, p.331).

In order to bring these issues to the table, it will be necessary to count on the expectations and actions of politicians and school districts. Politicians want to offer a quick solution to learn English, which is the reason why sheltered English immersion programs, like the one implemented in Massachusetts, place students in mainstream classes in just one year. Bilingual education advocates need to spearhead and organize a grassroots movement with the intention of propagating the multiple benefits of bilingual education and its effects on creating a more respectful and inclusive school climate. The advantages of bilingual education are not limited to newcomers. All students could be able to attain proficiency in two languages in the same manner as affluent students enrolled in prestigious bilingual programs (Berriz, 2005). Indeed, the implementation of

bilingual education would represent a qualitative jump in the pursuit of equal opportunity and real integration. In order to do so, teachers, parents, and community organizations need to play a fundamental role in the movement to push reforms that bring bilingual education back to the forefront of education for democracy.

Unfortunately, until these assumptions and attitudes are challenged, the debate about bilingual education will linger in a dead end street. The main focus will be obscured with questions of American loyalty and assimilation, without taking into account the betterment of democratic institutions and the role of education as "the great equalizer." The real conditions of millions of students in our classrooms will remain purposefully ignored, and, what it is worse, they will be blatantly blamed for their low achievement in society. In the end, it also seems obvious to argue that any and all education reforms should be intended to benefit every student in every school. With that approach in mind, politicians, school administrators, teachers, parents, and the community at large should have access to empirical findings that point to strategies that improve not only students' English proficiency but also their chances of developing their academic potential to the fullest. It is essential to spell out, as James Crawford (2004) asserts, "*there is no contradiction between promoting fluent bilingualism and promoting academic achievement in English; indeed, these goals are mutually supporting*" (p. xv).

David Nieto is a doctoral candidate in the John W. McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies at UMass-Boston. He has a background in Applied Linguistics, and his main research interests are Language and Education Policy, Language Rights, and Immigration.

REFERENCES

Baker, K. & de Kanter, A.A. (1981). Effectiveness of bilingual education: A review of literature.   Washington DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation.

Baker, K. & de Kanter, A.A. (1983). *Bilingual Education: A reappraisal of federal policy*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Press.

Baker, K. (1998). "Structured English Immersion: Breakthrough in Teaching Limited-English-Proficient Students." In: *Phi Delta Kappan*. 80 (3), pp. 199-204.

Bangura, A. K., & Muo, M. C. (2001). *United States Congress and Bilingual Education*. New York: Peter Lang.

Bartolomé, L. (2008). Understanding Policy for Equity in Teaching and Learning: A critical Historical Lens. Language Arts, 85 (5), May 2008, pp. 376-381.

Berriz, B.R. (2005). "Unz Got Your Tongue: What Have We Lost with the English-Only Mandates?" Radical Teacher, 75, Winter 2005, pp. 10-15.

Brisk, M.E. (1998). Bilingual Education: From Compensatory to Quality Schooling. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Buchanan, P.J. (2006). *State of Emergency: The Third World Invasion and Conquest of America*. NY: Thomas Dunne Books.

Capetillo-Ponce, J. & Kramer, R. (2006). Politics, Ethnicity, and Bilingual Education in Massachusetts: The case of Referendum Question 2. In Torres, A. (ed.) (2006). *Latinos in New England*. Philadelphia:Temple University Press.

Cardasco, F. (1976). *Bilingual Schooling in the United States: A Sourcebook for Education Personnel*. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Crawford, J. (1989). *Bilingual Education: History, Politics, Theory, and Practice*. Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services, Inc.

Crawford, J. (1998). Anatomy of the English-Only Movement: Social and Ideological Sources of Language Restrictionism in the United States. In: Kibbee, D.A. (Ed.) 1998. *Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights. Selected Proceedings of the Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights Conference, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*, March 1996. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Crawford, J. (2001) *Bilingual education in the United States: Politics vs Pedagogy,* paper presented at I Jornadas Internacionales de Educación Plurilingüe, Ayuntamiento Victoria-Gasteiz, Pais Vasco, Spain, Nov. 2001. Retrieved on July 12, 2008 from: http://www.elladvocates.org/documents/RCN/vitoria.htm

Crawford, J. (2004). *Educating English learners: language diversity in the classroom*. Los Angeles: Bilingual Educational Services, Inc.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingualism and Special Education: Issues in Assessment and Pedagogy*. Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, power, and pedagogy: Bilingual children in the crossfire*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

De los Reyes, E., Nieto, D., Diez, V. (2008). "If Our Students Fail, We Fail. If They Succeed, We Succeed: Case Studies of Boston Schools Where Latino Students Succeed." Boston: Mauricio Gastón Institute. Retrieved December 05, 2008 from: http://www.gaston.umb.edu/articles/delosreyes_2008_Boston_Casestudies.pdf

Del Valle, S. (2003). *Language Rights and the Law in the United States: Finding Our Voices*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Facella, M.A. Rampino, K.M. & Shea, E.K. (Spring 2005). Effective Teaching Strategies for English Language Learners. Bilingual Research Journal, 29: 1, p. 209-221.

Fix, M. & Passel, J.S. (2003). U.S. Immigration: Trends and Implications for Schools. Presentation for the National Association for Bilingual Education, NCLB Implementation Institute. New Orleans, LA, January 2003. Retrieved on July 12, 2008 from: http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410654_NABEPresentation.pdf

Genesee, F. (Editor). (1999). Program alternatives for linguistically diverse students, Washintong DC: US Department of

Education, Center for research on education, diversity and excellence.

Genesse, F., Lindolm-Leary, K., Saunders, W., & Christian, D. (2005). English Language Learners in U.S. Schools: An Overview of Research. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 10(4), 363–385.

Giroux, H. (2001). English Only and the Crisis of Memory, Culture, and Democracy. In: Gonzalez Duenas, R. (Ed.) (2001). *Language Ideologies: Critical Perspectives on the Official English Movement. Volume 2: History, Theory, and Policy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Greene, J.P. (1998). A Meta-Analysis of the Effectiveness of Bilingual Education. Tomas Rivera Policy Institute.

Hakuta, K., Butler, Y.G., and Witt, D. (2000). How long does it take for English learners to attain proficiency? Santa Barbara, CA: Linguistic Minority Research Institute.

Haugen, E. (1972). The Ecology of Languages. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Huntington, S. (2004). "The Hispanic Challenge". *Foreign Policy*. March-April 2004, pp. 1-16.

Krashen, S. (1996). Under Attack: The Case Against Bilingual Education. Culver City, Calif.: Language Education Associates.

Macedo, D. (2000). The Colonialism of the English Only Movement. *Educational researcher*, Vol. 29, No. 3, pp. 15-24.

Markey, C. F. (2008) "The Controversy Over Question 2 and Ending Bilingual Education in Massachusetts: The Public Discourse, Why It Passed, and What We Can Learn From It" *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the MPSA Annual National Conference, Palmer House Hotel, Hilton, Chicago,* Retrieved July 12, 2008 from: http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p266481_index.html

Martínez, G.A. (2007). Immigration and the Meaning of United States Citizenship: Whiteness and Assimilation. Washburn Law Journal, April 2007, Vol. 46, pp. 335-344.

Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (2002). Question 2. English Language Education in Public Schools. Retrieved December 5, 2008 from: http://www.sec.state.ma.us/ele/ele02/elebq02/bq02full.htm#q2anc

McCarty, T.L. (2002). Between possibility and constraint: Indigenous language education, planning, and policy in the US. In: Tollefson, J.W. (Ed.) (2002). *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

McGroarty, K. (2002). Evolving influences on educational language policies. In: Tollefson, J.W. (Ed.) (2002). *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (2000). Report of the National Reading Panel. Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction (NIH Publication No. 00-4769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office

Nieto, S. (1992). Affirming diversity: The socio-political context of multicultural education. In Fraser, J. (Ed.) (2000). *The School in the United State: A documentary History*. Boston: McGraw-Hill

Padilla, A., Lindholm, K., Chen, A., Durán, R., Hakuta, K., Lambert, W., and Tucker, R. (February 1991). The English-Only movement: Myths, Reality, and implications for Psychology. *American Psychologist*. Vol. 46 (2), pp. 120-130. American Psychological Association.

Perez, B. (2004). *Becoming Biliterate: A Study of Two-Way Bilingual Immersion Education*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Pray, L.C., and MacSwan, J. (2002). Different question, same answer: How long does it take for English learners to acquire proficiency? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, April 4.

Ricento, T. (1998). The Courts, The Legislature, and Society: The Shaping of Federal Language Policy in the United States. In: Kibbee, D.A. (Ed.) 1998. *Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights. Selected Proceedings of the Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights Conference, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*, March 1996. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Rivera, L. (2002). Latinos in Massachusetts: Education. Boston: Mauricio Gastón Institute. Retrieved July 12, 2008 from: http://www.gaston.umb.edu/articles/atinos_%20ma_lit_review.pdf

Roosevelt, T. (1926). *Works* (Memorial Ed.). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Schmid, C.L. (2001). *The Politics of Language: Conflict, Identity, and Cultural Pluralism in Comparative Perspective.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Schmidt, R. (2000). *Language Policy and Identity Politics in the United States.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Slavin, R. and Cheung, A. (2005). A synthesis of research of reading instruction for English language learners, Review of Educational Research 75(2): 247-284.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, M. & Páez, M. (Eds.) (2002). *Latinos. Remaking America.* Cambridge, MA and Berkeley, CA: David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies at Harvard University and University of California Press.

The Boston Globe. (Feb. 6, 2009). "Hispanic males rank lowest for Mass. High school graduation rates." Retrieved from: http://www.boston.com/news/education/k_12/mcas/articles/2009/02/06/graduation_rate_lowest_for_hispanic_male_students/

Tollefson, J. W. (2002a). Introduction: Critical Issues in Educational Language Policy. In: Tollefson, J.W. (Ed.) (2002). *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Tollefson, J. W. (2002b). Language Rights and the Destruction of Yugoslavia. In: Tollefson, J.W. (Ed.) (2002). *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Tollefson, J. W. (2002c). Conclusion: Looking Outward. In: Tollefson, J.W. (Ed.) (2002). *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Urban, W. & Wagoner, J. (2003). *American Education: A History.* Boston: McGraw-Hill

Uriarte, M. & Chavez, L. (2000). Latino Students and the Massachusetts Public Schools. Boston: Mauricio Gastón Institute. Retrieved July 12, 2008 from: http://www.gaston.umb.edu/articles/uriarte%20chavez%20edreport%202000.pdf

Wiley, T. (1998). What Happens After English is Declared the Official Language of the United States? In: Kibbee, D.A. (Ed.) 1998. *Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights. Selected Proceedings of the Language Legislation and Linguistic Rights Conference, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*, March 1996. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Wiley, T. (2002). Accessing Language Rights in Education: A brief history on the U.S. context. In: Tollefson, J.W. (Ed.) (2002). *Language Policies in Education: Critical Issues.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Wiley, T. G. & Wright, W. E. (2004). Against the undertow: The politics of language instruction in the United States. Educational Policy, 18(1), pp. 142–168.

Wright, W. E. (2005). English Language Learners Left Behind in Arizona: The Nullification of Accommodations in the Intersection of Federal and State Language and Assessment Policies. Bilingual Research Journal, 29(1), 1-30. Retrieved from: http://brj.asu.edu/content/vol29_no1/art1.pdf

Wright, W. E. & Choi, D. (2006). The Impact of Language and High-Stakes Testing Policies on Elementary School English Language Learners in Arizona. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 14(13). Retrieved from: http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v14n13/

COMMENTARY

Feminist Ethnography in Education and the Challenges of Conducting Fieldwork: Critically Examining Reciprocity and Relationships between Academic and Public Interests[1]

By Eduardo S. Junqueira, Instituto UFC Virtual, Universidade Federal do Ceará, Brazil

INTRODUCTION

This paper presents a critical analysis of ideas and formulations traditionally organized under the broad theoretical umbrella identified as feminist "critical ethnography." Various authors have proposed critical ethnography as a way to respond to the crisis of representation posed by post-structuralism. In particular, many authors have problematized the unequal relations established between researchers and research participants in the field. Many authors have also seen this problematization as a way to help "liberate" oppressed and minority people and as a path leading to "breaking" the pattern of unequal power relations favoring the researcher in relation to the research participant.

In line with Foucault's ideas, I argue that while the challenge to open up possibilities for less unequal relations between research and research participants requires action, the critical ethnographers offer rhetoric. I reflect on these issues by presenting cases of ethnographers—including myself—that seem to illustrate the challenges faced currently by ethnographic studies in education and by analyzing other key issues currently at play in the ethnography of education.

This paper has three main sections. In the first section, I will present and analyze briefly three cases of ethnographies that illustrate the tensions currently at play in the field. In the second section, I will introduce theoretical notions informed by Foucaultian propositions that illuminate problems and potential strategies to deal with the tensions indicated in the first section. In the third section, I will demonstrate how I dealt with these issues and the limitations of my own work as an ethnographer conducting fieldwork in Brazil.

THE PROBLEM

Patti Lather (1991) and others have indicated that critical ethnography has been too oriented towards the life of the academy and not enough towards the politics of the everyday, including schools. Weis and Fine (2000) have criticized it for reproducing a colonizing discourse of the "Other." Beverly Skeggs (1994) has cited Judith Stacey, who argues, "the involvement and intensity of ethnography make it the most exploitative method because ethnographic methods subject the researched to great risks of exploitation, betrayal and abandonment by the researcher" (p. 88).

Ethnographers have promoted a more balanced relationship with research participants, but they have faced various challenges given the complexity of the issues at play. While Ruth Behar, Sofia Villenas and others "broke their hearts" and became "vulnerable" (Behar, 1996) to create new representational spaces for the "Other" in their narratives, they have also been criticized for over-imposing their fingerprints on their subjects. And while scholars tend to agree that ethnographic fieldwork will contribute to the "critical project" (Quantz, 1992), they have also questioned trade-offs among researchers and participants and have pointed to the need for a long standing working relationship that would give voice to—and generate a meaningful learning experience for—all involved (LeCompte, 1995). The challenges to the enactment of less unequal relationships in the field seem to remain.

Following I will present three cases of ethnographic studies that seem to agglutinate many of the challenges—and problems—faced by these studies. I purposefully chose three cases that were conducted in contrasting historical and contextual moments as a way to demonstrate the enduring character of the issues they raise. Perry Golde wrote "Odyssey of Encounter" back in 1959 (the book was published in 1970). The piece is a self-reflexive account of her trajectory as a White, female American ethnographer in a small rural village in Mexico. Her main goal was to formulate an understanding about residents' artistic pieces of decorative ceramic. Golde (1970) quotes Rosalie Wax's article from 1952 to introduce the concept of "Reciprocity as a Field Technique." According to that concept, "an informant will talk because he and the field worker are making an exchange, are consciously or unconsciously giving each other something they both desire and need" (p. 83). Golde adds, "what was borne in on me repeatedly was that *all* transactions in this village ultimately had to be reciprocal" (p. 83). Since, according to her, she could not reciprocate by helping with hard manual work (e.g., harvest), she "repaid" with money for food, knives, books and medical care.

Golde also acknowledges the existence of less material trade-offs in the field:

For a few individuals, the nature of the return was more psychological than material: the prestige of friendship with me; knowledge of

the world they might gain ... and in a few cases, the freedom some felt to say things without censure or criticism, expecting an understanding and sympathetic listener. If intense sharing was rare, I believe it was because the people were not inclined to introspection or accustomed to verbalizing feelings. (p. 83)

Sofia Villenas' piece titled "The colonizer/colonized chicana ethnographer: Identity, marginalization, and co-optation in the field" contrasts with Golde's, as Villenas presents herself as the daughter of South American parents born and raised in the U.S. Villenas speaks as a chicana Ph.D. student struggling to conduct her ethnographic dissertation fieldwork among Latino immigrant women in North Carolina to reconstitute their experiences and their views about education. While Villenas struggled to find her identity (main stream American, Chicana, woman) and realized she should "benefit" from multiple identities for multiple situations, she volunteered to work as language broker to Latinos (mostly women) who were not yet fluent in English (Villenas, 1996).

One of Villenas' (1996) main motivations to write the piece seemed to be her understanding that "researchers [in the qualitative tradition] are also recognizing that they are and have been implicated in imperialist agendas... and in the exploitation and domination of their research subjects" (p. 713). She argues, "while we continue to push the border of the multiple, decentered, and politicized self as researcher, we continue to analyze and write about *ourselves* in a unidirectional manner as imperialist researchers" (p. 714).

Villenas (1996) claims that she

did not want only to take their [research participants] stories and leave. I also wanted to become involved in some way with their Latino community, either through bilingual tutoring for children with their mothers or through English as a Second Language (ESL) instruction. (p. 719)

She cites other authors to indicate her endorsement of an "ethnography of empowerment" that drew on Freire's philosophy to propose knowledge construction as a result of the interaction between researcher and the researched. The fundamental purpose of this dynamic, according to her, is to improve the living of the community being researched.

Lubna Chaudhry (2000) wrote her piece "Researching 'my people,' researching myself: Fragments of a reflexive tale" almost 50 years after Golde's work (in fact, her research was conducted in 1959 and first published in 1970). In her piece, Chaudhry defines herself as a "critical feminist ethnographer with ... post-colonial, post-structuralist" sensibilities (p. 99) studying Pakistani Muslim immigrant young women. Her narrative evolves around her relationship with Fariha, who was one of her students and also a research participant. Chaudhry demonstrates how, as an ethnographer, she blurred the traditional boundaries of objectivity and the roles of researchers and participants in order to achieve a more "trustworthy" account of the participants' lives, and she elaborates on how this choice also benefited the research participant.

Chaudhry (2000) describes how she answered Fariha's phone calls to her home late at night to talk with Fariha about her troubled love affair with a Muslim young man. At this point, Chaudhry's relation to the young woman expanded beyond the "tradition" of helping her with her papers over the phone (which was more closely related to the research project's main goals), and those conversations then became more personal. According to Chaudhry, on that occasion Fariha "suddenly ask[ed] me what she should do, adding that she counts on me to help her since I know so much about the real world" (p. 101). Chaudhry reveals her discomfort as she switched from confidant to adviser. At one point during the research, Fariha disappeared for a week and got married, ultimately deciding to void the religious union. Prior to officially ending her marriage, Fariha stayed at Chaudhry's apartment, during which time Chaudhry reflected: "Fariha is very quiet and lost in a world of her own. We barely communicate. I see her crying on and off" (p. 103).

Chaudhry (2000) elaborates on her experience with Fariha from the perspective of a feminist, critical ethnographer:

In my attempt to have access to data, I dexterously mobilized my multiple identities. For instance, I got into the older sister mode...when it came to define empowerment for Fariha, however, I set myself apart for the cultural bridge that connects me to her family. Choosing to ally myself with my Western modes of thought, I became the so-called objective 'feminist' detaching myself from my subjectivity as a Pakistani Muslim and from my familial relationship with Fariha. (p. 104)

The three cases presented contain many of the issues that challenge ethnographers' claims of establishing a "new," "less exploitative," more "dialogical" relationship with research participants. The problematic narrative by Golde (1970) seems to speak for itself. At a certain point the author becomes very confessional by admitting that

permeating this first encounter [with the Mexicans in the village] was the anxiety about my future as an anthropologist, which would be measured by my ability to successfully establish rapport... I conceived field work as a trial by fire that would determine whether I deserved acceptance into the professional world. (p. 92)

While the author tried to initiate a critical tradition about the problematics of reciprocity in the field, the practical demands of her role as an anthropologist spoke louder than the desire to enact such critical understandings or to benefit the villagers in meaningful – instead of remedial – ways. As such, the establishment of reciprocity was, primarily, a means to achieve pre-established goals related to the fieldwork development. To achieve such goals, she had to build empathy with the participants by constructing prescribed relationships between herself and the Mexicans to gather the needed information for her

ethnographic study (Golde, 1970).

Golde (1970) provided a good account of the huge differences and therefore the difficulties posed in this arena when she admitted that "if at times, I felt smug because of my education and training, habitual analytic reasoning, and ability to control my emotions, I also learned to accept an irrationality I shared with the people, to recognize my own susceptibility to social pressures and the need for the people's good will and affection to maintain my own feeling of security" (p. 93). Golde's acceptance of the other's "irrationality," then, configured another strategy to guarantee their sympathy. It became clear that, above all, her analytical training endured, culminating in a tenured professor position at a Western institution where irrationality has not been constituted as a positive value.

Villenas' (1996) claim of her desire to become involved with the Latino communities she studies and to further "ethnography of empowerment" (p. 721) contrasts with her most recent professional biography. Since she received her Ph.D. from North Carolina University, the author has moved to three other universities (Harvard University, The University of Utah and The University of Texas). Villenas' need to relocate, probably to find her professional space and secure an academic career, seems to challenge her aim to establish a "powerful relationship" with local Latino communities given her transitional presence in these sites. These difficulties pose tensions between her need to build and secure a professional career and the way she negotiated her relationship with research participants.

By following a rhetorical construction similar to Golde's, Chaudhry's (2000) piece uses various nomenclature and ideas from feminist critical ethnography that hide instead of reveal the author's perspectives. Here it seems important to inquire into the various choices ethnographers have to frame the content of an article or a book chapter describing a research experience. Given the vast array of possibilities as to how to portray research participants, it seems appropriate to ask why a feminist concerned with ethical is-

sues decides, then, to expose traumatic and private issues of a young woman to construct a narrative about reciprocity in the field. It seems important to ask in which theoretical and ethical bases has the author made a decision to write and publish the deeply personal experience of a participant in her research. How does the rhetorical depiction of that sad episode in a young woman's life meets the critical perspective against essentializing and exploiting the women's issues about which Chaudhry claims to speak? These questions remain to be answered in the article. The piece does not seem to further the reflection towards less unequal reciprocity in ethnographic fieldwork.

LIMITS AND POSSIBILITIES OF "CRITICAL ETHNOGRAPHY"
Economic Frames

Many researchers in feminist ethnography have assumed that the "reciprocity" they enact with participants while in the field constitutes a "good enough" trade-off (for instance, Golde gave food and prestige to the Mexicans in exchange for insights into their lives; Chaudhry offered love counseling and a home in exchange for an "exotic" biography). However, it is not possible to know if research participants agree with these "good-enough" (Luttrell, 2000) trade-offs because they rarely speak about these particular issues. In this case, participants have silenced themselves at the risk of being seen as ungrateful to the "generous" researchers who present themselves as able to provide them with needed benefits. In this sense, researchers seem to be operating in line with a capitalist tradition of trade-offs.

It is important to note that these are not new issues posed to social scientists operating as ethnographers. Golde (1970) herself provided important theoretical roots for the current feminist movement of critical ethnography. According to her, while the ethnographer asks " 'How can I repay these people who give me so much?' ... the issue for the community is, 'What does she give that makes up for the trouble she causes, for the fact that she is not like

us and cannot contribute what we are accustomed to expect?'" (p. 10). Therefore, Golde already indicated a gap between researchers and research participants' epistemologies, goals, understandings and lives back there in the late 1950s.

The will to empower

Skeggs (1994) points out other ways in which reciprocity can take place. She explains that participants can increase their sense of self-worth as they become "objects" of observation. According to her, this "challenges the idea that the researched are *just* objects of a voyeuristic bourgeois gaze" (p. 81). She further elaborates by saying, "I was able to reciprocate in a more positive way by providing support and a mouthpiece against injustices" (p. 81). The author argues that participants' confessions can give the researcher a form of control but this can also constitute a space for support. She adds, "rarely were these women given much listening space or taken seriously" (p. 81).

Skeggs also reveals her dilemma in the writing phase of her dissertation:

My initial concerns to give space and validity to the voices of young working-class women meant that I was writing against all the academic work in which they had been silenced in the past. I realized that I was not just writing for them but about them... I was writing for an entry ticket into academia. (p. 86)

The authors quoted at length on this topic seem to offer a very complex rhetorical discourse about the problems, the mechanics and the limits of reciprocity in ethnographic research. These ideas have been presented in scholarly meetings and have been published in peer-reviewed journals. Authors often use complex reasoning to make their points and frequently their narratives are hard to penetrate, created a self-perpetuating practice within academia. As such, more and more books have been published about the enduring difficulties of finding a solution for the unequal relations between researchers and research participants in the field.

The Obscurantism of Problematization

In *The History of Sexuality*, Michel Foucault (1990) exposes how society never talks about sexuality by talking about it all the time. He not only analyzes such discourses but also analyzes the will that sustains them and the strategic intention that supports them. Foucault concludes that

> rather than a massive censorship... what was involved was a regulated and polymorphous incitement to discourse... [W]hat is peculiar to modern societies, in fact, is not that they consigned sex to a shadow existence, but that they dedicated themselves to speaking of it *ad infinitum*, while exploiting it as *the* secret. (p. 34)

It is in this way, he claims, that the "illicit discourse" about sex became "normalized."

I propose a parallel between the mechanics behind the discourse about sexuality revealed by Foucault and the practice of formulating a rhetorical discourse furthered by critical ethnographers as quoted along this paper. While the challenge to open up possibilities for less unequal relations between researcher and research participants requires actions, critical ethnographers offer rhetoric. However, this rhetoric has been ideologically defined as action. Scholars talk *ad infinitum* about the complexities of the unequal relationship between researchers and participants while it endures. This practice has become praised and has acquired a trade-value not in the research site but in the world of academic careers. The more one problematizes and the more complexity one brings to the discussion, the more one is likely to publish articles and advance in academia.

This practice is also problematic for other reasons. Most accounts of reciprocity in the field have been presented through the lens of the researcher. Where are the voices of the participants? How can the authors know the participants' perspectives on this issue if they do not examine their own accounts of unequal relationships with the close help and assistance of these participants?

Another problem refers to the fact that to speak of "ethical" research in terms of "trade-offs" and "good-enough" methods is to impose a capitalistic/economic frame on this relationship, a frame that in itself is neither ethical nor equitable. When scholars visit communities where they have a potential interest to conduct fieldwork and they offer more or less obvious "rewards," the reciprocal relationship has already been compromised no matter how welcome the bits and pieces would be to the "locals."

From an educational perspective

While the practice of social sciences' theorization plays an important role to feed critical ethnographers' rhetoric, the problem becomes more salient in the field of education, where the traditional quest for applied knowledge asks for another level of scrutiny on the scholarly production about critical ethnography. A meaningful question in such a context inquires into the ways in which educators as ethnographers can transform the fieldwork in an educational experience for both the researcher and the research participants. Or, as was elaborated in a personal communication by Lynn Fendler (2005), "research methods are pedagogical techniques... ethically sound research in education should have pedagogical value. The research should be designed in such a way that everybody involved has a chance to learn something valuable."

Some important questions, then, are: Can the idea of dialogue between ethnographer and participants inspire us? Can this "dialogue" constitute a political project, even if tentative, that generates social legitimacy from participants' recognition and benefit of such a pedagogical experience? I will reflect upon these important questions in a discussion of my own fieldwork in the next section of this article.

LOOKING FOR A COMMON GROUND

In 2006, I conducted extensive fieldwork at a public school in the outskirts of a large city in the northeast of Brazil. At the time, the school was involved in the enactment of a technology-infused learning project. One of my main goals as I entered and as I participated in the field was to indicate to teachers and students that while I expected them to let me "look over their shoulders" I was also available, whatever that meant to them – I was not positioning myself as the one who could offer help, neither was I proposing a "pay back." I thought that assuming such behavior would already position participants in essentialized ways that my ethnographic study was trying to deconstruct. In line with Weis' and Fine's (2000) claims, I was trying not to reproduce the colonizing discourse of the "Other" as the one in need of something that I had to give.

I wanted to signal to the members of the school community that I was available. I walked around the school whenever possible, I never locked myself in any room in the school, and I tried to smile at people. When I had to interrupt and leave conversations, I either gave the other person my email address or told her/him that we could talk more at her/his convenience. I considered that these were reasonable strategies to indicate that anyone was welcome to approach me.

As time passed in the field, student participants started turning to me for "help" with specific school related tasks, either in the classroom or in the computer lab. On those occasions, I tried to engage them in some sort of exchange, instead of simply giving them the answers. Students seemed puzzled about my perspective, and they wondered why I made it so "difficult" for them.

In one situation, I was observing a group of male students at the back of the classroom when they asked me how to write the word *conscientizacão* (consciousness). I waited for one or two seconds hoping that someone else in their group would come up with the answer. They said nothing, so I told them to write it down and Wilson[2] did it without the *s* (*concientização*). Writing this word without an *s* makes a lot of sense, since the *c* makes for the sound of the missing *s*. I did not answer them with a yes or no but I asked them what they thought. They responded with silence. Then, Edison also decided to try, replacing the *c* with an *s* (*consientização*). They were exploring the pos-

sibilities of the language, exchanging similar letters with similar sounds to try to get it "right." Again, I asked what they thought. Another student wrote it with both *s* and *c*, and a silence followed. I asked what they thought about it, and someone said that it looked okay. I asked them to read it aloud and they did, but they were still in doubt, so I said it was correct and they laughed loudly. I then told them to notice how they knew to write the word and to understand that it was just a matter of trying it for a little while. I told them to say it aloud and to pay attention to how they pronounce both the *s* and the *c* when they say it slowly, indicating that they need both letters to match the pronunciation. Wilson looked and pointed at me as he said: "What a great teacher". At that moment, it was clear to me that they had learned something and that students themselves played an important role in the learning experience in which I was also a participant.

In other situations in the field, I felt that I had to be more explicit in my tutoring to achieve some learning. This happened when I perceived that a student was struggling repeatedly to achieve something and that by proposing further questions I was only going to make him or her more confused and distressed. This was the case with one particular computer lab activity involving a web interface learning project. The teacher was not in the room at that moment, and Alex was struggling to transfer files using a floppy disk from another computer to the one with which he was working.

Alex: How [can I] pass it to here?
Researcher: Do you know how to do that?
Alex: No.
Researcher: There are other ways [to do this]. Go to my computer, click on floppy disk and then (inaudible). Then you push it.
Alex: (inaudible)
Researcher: See, to put the title you need to insert it, otherwise you will not find it.

In other situations, I tried a blend of the two approaches, both helping students with some straight answers and formulating some questions to encourage them to further their own reasoning. The following event took place in the computer lab.

Researcher: Now, Julia, how do you insert a picture [in the web interface]?
Julia: Add material.
Researcher: But today you will insert a new picture, right?
Julia: Right.
Researcher: So insert the picture in the [virtual] backpack.
Julia: (Laughs) Backpack, right?
Researcher: Why is that?
Julia: [Because it is] picture.
Researcher: Which area of the web interface is this? What do you need to do?
Julia: We want to get a picture to put here. We did not do like this. Go (she inserts it).

I usually approached these interactions that I had with participants in the field as very complex events. According to Eisenhart (2001),

Researchers working in the tradition of critical theory have also complained about conventional ethnography. The processes and products of ethnography, they claim, should do more than account for the actions of others; they should empower participants to take greater charge of their own lives… [R]esearchers can contribute to empowerment in several ways: by exposing the power inequities that shape a situation, including the research itself; by actively participating in consciousness-raising about power inequities in one's own and others' lives; and by actively taking steps to change unequal power relations. (p. 219)

Eisenhart's claims followed me through the fieldwork process. I felt guilt for not intervening in some situations to preserve my own interests as I let the participants' actions evolve "as is" so that I could record my data. I knew this was important for my project, but I also knew that there were other ways to do more than "account[ing] for the actions of others" as the author states.

In the very beginning of my work, a girl from the class I observed asked me if "this [research] project would help [her] getting a job." One of the main challenges for teenagers and young adults in Brazil is to enter the job market. This is a difficult task not only because of the weak economy that does not generate enough jobs, but also because many recent high school graduates are not perceived as being "prepared" for the demands of the job positions. In addition to students' concerns about job readiness, teachers told me that parents were extremely concerned about how the school would help their children to secure job positions once they graduate. Although I considered the enactment of the technology-infused learning project very positive at this school, I also knew that many students would need extended periods in the lab and more direct, explicit instruction to help them develop a better sense of some digital technologies used in the project. Hopefully, I thought, this would allow them to apply these experiences in other aspects of their lives, including in future jobs. On those lines, I decided to offer a workshop for select student participants that would qualify them as project assistants for the following year at their own school. In exchange, they would receive certificates of participation and a recommendation letter written by me once they finished their work. I was not very happy with the fact that they would not be paid, but I thought that I would make that point clear and that they would be able to decline the invitation if this did not accommodate their needs.

As I provided them this workshop on the uses of digital technologies, I thought back to Villenas' (1996) claim that we may be implicated in imperialist agendas. I wondered if teaching new digital technology skills was the best thing to do for those students situated in such a context. At that point, it was late in the semester and I would be concluding the fieldwork in two weeks. However, I thought that I could make clear to the participants that I was open to interact with them via email or other media if they felt the desire to contact me for any reasons in the future. I also

told students that if they ever felt the need to talk to me they could write me messages—any messages would be fine. Unfortunately, their initial interest in exchanging brief messages with me decreased after some time. The fieldwork ended in 2006, and I returned to work at this same school in 2007. The students with whom I had worked graduated in December of 2007, and I told them that they could contact me if they had any issues or problems that they wanted to discuss with me. After they left with their training certificates, I continued working at this school in 2008 with a new class.

During my fieldwork, I strived to promote a less unequal and more educational experience with participants, and it was extremely challenging to deal with the real difficulties revealed to me by them in the field (e.g., the extreme scarcity of resources at the school and at students' homes, students' lack of hope about their futures). Like Lareau (1996), I experienced the "tiring anxiety" (p. 219) of intensive fieldwork. I wanted to "help," but most of the time that meant that I had to do things for the participants at their own persistent requests. It was difficult to find time and space to give them various resources and help them find the answers for which they were searching. This was an exhausting process, since I could not skip producing my field observations and field notes and conducting interviews—this data collection was my main reason to be at that school at that period. Also, I encountered many of the participants' problems, problems I knew I was not able to solve, such as their complaints about a lack of prospects in the local job market. These challenges were extremely frustrating for me, and they constituted an extra element of tension in my relationship with teachers and students. These experiences indicated both the immense limits and the few possibilities of establishing a less unequal relationship between researcher and participants.

FINAL THOUGHTS

The analysis presented in this paper indicates that the issue of reciprocity between the researcher and the research participants is still an open wound. This problem is a result of the tension between academic and public interests and the practice of fieldwork, as illustrated more explicitly by vignettes of my own fieldwork experience. In line with this work, Foucault's (1990) concepts of "normalization" and "illicit discourse" provide new dimensions of complexity around this issue.

What seems to make this such a complex issue are the various interests at stake during fieldwork and both the researcher's need to keep these relationships under control (to assure the completion of her tasks) and her fear of losing the difficult to acquire social status as the "knowledgeable" one. These aspects of the experience are closely related to power issues that have long been problematized. It is important that feminist critical ethnographers decide to make a decisive move towards resolving this problem.

First, it is important to acknowledge the paralysis produced by normalizing discourse and to identify who (besides ourselves) our work benefits in the larger society. Then social scientists should engage in a more critical perspective to reposition themselves with regards to their fieldwork. Such acts can contribute to recreating critical ethnography as a pedagogical enterprise where all involved have a chance to engage in dialogue and learn something beyond the already pre-packaged agenda of some ethnographers.

Eduardo S. Junqueira, Ph.D., conducts ethnographic research about the uses of digital technologies in urban and rural public schools in Brazil supported by federal and state research organizations (CNPq and Funcap). Dr. Junqueira works at the Instituto UFC Virtual, Universidade Federal do Ceará. His work has been published in international peer-reviewed journals.

ENDNOTES

1. This article is a reworked version of presentations conducted at the Ethnography in Education Research Forum and at the Conferência Internacional Educação, Globalização e Cidadania, Novas Perspectivas da Sociologia da Educação.

2. All names have been changed to protect participants' identities.

REFERENCES

Behar, R. (1996). *The vulnerable observer. Anthropology that breaks your heart.* Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Chaudhry, L. N. (2000). Researching "my people," researching myself: Fragments of a reflexive tale. In E. A. St.Pierre & W. S. Pillow (Eds.), *Working the ruins. Feminist poststrucutral theory and methods in education.* NY: Routledge.

Fendler, L. (2005). Introduction to the philosophy of education. East Lansing, MI.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality* (Vol. 1). NY: Vintage Books.

Golde, P. (Ed.). (1970). *Women in the field : Anthropological experiences.* Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Lareau, A. (1996). Common problems in field work: A personal essay. In A. Lareau & J. Shltz (Eds.), *Journeys through ethnography.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart. Feminist research and pedagogy with/in the postmodern.* NY: Routledge.

LeCompte, M. D. (1995). Some notes on power, agenda, voice: A researcher's personal evolution toward critical collaborative research. In P. McLaren & J. M. Giarelli (Eds.), *Critical theory and educational research.* New York: State University of New York Press.

Luttrell, W. (2000). "Good enough" methods for ethnographic research. *Harvard Educational Review. 70*(4), 499-523.

Quantz, R. A. (1992). On critical ethnography (with some post modern considerations). In M. D. LeCompte, W. L. Millroy & J. Preissle (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research in education.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Skeggs, B. (1994). Situating the production of feminist ethnography. In M. Maynard & J. Purvis (Eds.), *Researching women's lives from a feminist perspective.* Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis.

Villenas, S. (1996). The colonizer/colonized chicana ethnographer: Identity, marginalization, and co-optation in the field. *Harvard Educational Review, 66*(4), 711-731.

Weis, L., & Fine, M. (Eds.). (2000). *Construction sites : excavating race, class, and gender among urban youth.* NY: Teachers College Press.

BOOK REVIEW

The Trouble With Black Boys... and Other Reflections on Race, Equity, and the Future of Public Education
by Pedro Noguera, Jossey-Bass, 2008, 352 pp.

Review by Jeremy Cutler, University of Pennsylvania

In *The Trouble With Black Boys... and Other Reflections on Race, Equity, and the Future of Public Education,* Pedro Noguera takes a thoughtful yet critical look at the myriad of social, cultural, and political factors that have resulted in the troubling achievement levels for poor and minority students. Noguera critiques the currently pervasive habit of blaming schools, teachers, parents, and especially kids for the educational failures of inner-city public schools instead of acknowledging the larger social and economic inequalities at work in our society that undermine our ability to educate all children. Using many case studies and vignettes, Noguera shows how instead of recognizing the fact that poor children come to school with very different needs, policy-makers have become accustomed to condemning and humiliating urban schools and the poor and minority students who attend them. And in the instances where schools *are* experiencing success in educating poor and minority kids, Noguera argues that remarkably less energy has been focused on studying and replicating those particular schools and techniques. In *The Trouble With Black Boys*, Noguera sets out to correct that: to highlight and build upon reforms that can work in urban schools; and to create ideas that can serve to support and engage the historically vulnerable and marginalized students – poor children, African American males, and recent immigrants.

Noguera's essays are grouped, by chapters, into three main sections. The first section, "The Student Experience," explores the ways in which cultural and structural factors, both in and outside of schools, have a profound effect on school performance. Noguera points out how critical it is to understand both the way in which racial identity is formed in schools, as well as how this identity directly influences academic performance for minority students. These studies are often missing from discussions which address the risks faced by young minority students.

The second section, "The Search for Equity," is largely concerned with the way that the 'traditional' goals of public schools—sorting students, socializing them, and maintaining order and control over them—have inadvertently helped in creating environments that are more susceptible to marginalization, disengagement, and violence among students. Disciplinary measures based on control and exclusion create disadvantages for certain children more than others; few educators have been willing to look at the ways that schools structures have served to reproduce this inequality. Alternatively, in instances when schools have put energy into seeking out and/or replicating successful models, or shown a willingness to study the effects of their own practices, the possibility for progress and more equitable conditions has increased radically.

Finally, the last section, "The Schools We Need," serves to highlight some steps that have proven effective in mitigating the ways that concentrated poverty, racial isolation, and other political factors have traditionally been impediments to school improvement. Some of the suggestions include empowering and involving both parents and community organizations by investing in social capital, and creating a culture that questions the failure of urban schools, rather than expecting and accepting it.

While Noguera's book reflects on the general role of race in schools and society, two of the chapters are devoted specifically to issues of immigration. In Chapter 3, "And What Will Become of Children Like Miguel Fernandez?" Noguera conveys his concern for Latino students in schools today. He cites that they have the highest dropout rates and lowest college attendance rates (Garcia, 2001) and are overrepresented in categories such as enrollment in special education and high suspensions from schools, while being underrepresented in positive categories such as honors courses or gifted and talented programs (Meier & Stewart, 1991). Noguera looks at some of the reasons why Latino immigrants have had little success in using education as a means to social mobility and fulfilling the 'American dream. He chronicles the way in which first-generation hopeful immigrants quickly turn into second and third generation Latinos who have become angry and frustrated. These conflicting perspectives raise some interesting questions. For example, Noguera asks, how can the energy and drive of recent immigrants be harnessed in ways that are productive and positive, but at the same time empower them to refuse "a permanent place on the lower rungs of American society" (p. 59)?

Chapter 5, "Latino Youth: Immigration, Education, and the Future," attempts to understand how Latino youth adjust to their life in the United States, as well as how they navigate the specific challenge of growing up in a society that is both politically and socially hostile to their presence. Noguera addresses some of the challenges that take place inside of or in relation to schools, and he suggests some interventions that schools can make to become more supportive and responsive. Noguera presents an interesting comparison be-

tween Latino immigrants of today and European immigrants of earlier generations. Noguera recounts that while the earlier European immigrants encountered hardships and discrimination, their assimilation eventually brought social mobility and racial equality. Further, the author explores some trends which indicate that acculturation and assimilation is actually working against the success of Latino immigrants, and is resulting in the lowering of academic achievement (Suarez-Orosco & Suarez-Orosco, 2001). On the other hand, Noguera illustrates that if schools were to focus more on implementing culturally-relevant curricula and pedagogy for these students, Latino immigrants might be more prepared to navigate the hardships.

The Trouble With Black Boys is a collection of essays; therefore some ideas reappear occasionally and some of the chapters flow into each other more fluidly than others. Taken as a whole, however, Noguera's work is a both forceful and hopeful critique of urban education. The author writes in a style that is exceptionally clear and engaging, which may partly be due to the way that Noguera seamlessly combines his theoretical framework with examples from his practice as a high school teacher, school board president, university professor, and consultant to urban schools. Another factor that makes *The Trouble With Black Boys* such a compelling read is that Noguera proposes specific solutions for addressing these seemingly intractable problems, and usually provides personal data or anecdotes that support the validity of his ideas. For that reason, the book serves as an excellent guide not only for policy makers and academic reformers, but also for teachers, parents, and administrators looking for immediate and practical solutions to the daily struggles in their schools and with their own practice. Although Noguera concedes that a complete effort to improve urban public schools would "address the educational issues in concert with other issues, such as poverty, joblessness, and the lack of public services" (p. 230), Noguera's specific suggestions in this collection serve as a solid and courageous base upon which to pursue eq-uity for students of all races and socio-economic levels.

Jeremy Cutler has been an elementary and middle school teacher, counselor, and Dean of Students for over 10 years in Boston, MA and Washington, DC. During the summer, he also directs an 8-week residential program for boys in Vermont. Jeremy holds a masters degree in Urban Education from Harvard University and is presently pursuing his doctorate in Educational Leadership at the University of Pennsylvania. His research interests include the ways in which schools respond to and plan for students' social and emotional needs, as well as urban school reform. He can be reached at jcut@dolphin.upenn.edu.

REFERENCES

Garcia, E. (2001). *Hispanic education in the United States.* Lanham, MD: Rowan and Littlefield.

Meier, K., and Stewart, J. (1991). *The politics of Hispanic education.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Suarez-Orozco, M., and Suarez-Orozco, C. (2001). *Children of immigration.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

BOOK REVIEW

Learning a New Land: Immigrant Students in American Society
by Carola Suarez-Orozco, Marcelo M. Suarez-Orozco, and Irina Todorova, Harvard University Press, 2008, 426 pp.

Review by Zaynab Baalbaki, University of Pennsylvania

According to the U.S Census, by the year 2040 one third of the U.S. population will be comprised of immigrants. Currently, twenty percent of children come from immigrant households (Rong and Preissle, 1998). Understanding the experiences of immigrant students is vital because of these projected demographic changes. Schools will need to be institutions that can promote positive academic and social experiences for all students. In the book, *Learning a New Land: Immigrant Students in American Society*, Carola Suarez-Orozco, Marcelo Suarez-Orozco, and Irina Todorova paint beautiful portraits of the experiences of young immigrant students based on their interdisciplinary studies. As such, they extend their field of research by offering explanations regarding why academic differences occur among immigrant youth. Suarez-Orozco et al. make sense of these differences and provide possible solutions. The three researchers bring expertise in psychological anthropology, cultural psychology, and cultural health psychology to complete an illustrious longitudinal ethnographic study. The research uses a variety of qualitative and quantitative methods, taking a multifaceted approach that enables a more thorough understanding of the early academic experience of immigrant youth. The authors make their arguments by first laying out their research methods and following up with their theories about the participants' learning trajectories.

To respond to the gap in research on immigrant students, Suarez-Orozco et al. engaged in a five year long study simultaneously in two cities, Boston and San Francisco. They maintained these cities accurately reflect the current immigrant population entering the US from Mexico, Central America (El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras and Guatemala), China, Dominican Republic, and Haiti. The researchers narrow their focus on students who embody the most salient demographic characteristics of immigrants, such as speaking a language other than English and ranging from ages 9 to 14. The authors gathered data from 470 participants through student interviews, parent interviews, standardized test scores, report cards, and case-study portraitures.

The first part of the book describes the research approach and findings on factors that promote or inhibit immigrant students' learning. They begin by describing the patterns in participants' academic achievement and performance. They find that, over the five year study, all the informants experience a drop in their GPA, which is consistent with the data on immigrant and non-immigrant populations (Passel, 2006). Unlike most research that concludes with this finding, Suarez-Orozco et al. continue to look at what affects an outcome like the one described above. They determined that family context is essential in understanding academic achievement. For example, having an employed father is a significant characteristic of successful students.

The researchers further develop their findings by analyzing networks of meaningful relationships that support immigrant students. Critically important support people include parents, peers, extended family, teachers, religious centers, or school faculty. The authors also examine the role of schools and how they help, or fail to help. They find that immigrant students are more likely to attend low-performing schools, further hindering them from achieving academic success. Finally, the researchers focus on the students' additional challenge of learning to speak and write English. They determine that learning this new skill is contingent on multiple factors such as their aptitude for learning a language, motivation, exposure, and quality of instruction.

The second half of the book uses anecdotes to illustrate the personal experience of immigrant students in American schools. The authors develop five categories based on the students' academic trajectories: Rapid Declining Achievers, Slow Declining Achievers, Low Achievers, Improvers, and High Achievers. For example, declining achievers are students whose performance is declining, slowly or rapidly. One particular student, Lotus, was doing well in school when she first entered the school system but then declined because she did not have emotional support from her family or the school. As a result, she became depressed, and her motivation, engagement and performance decreased. On the other hand, improvers are more likely to be girls and often have a mentor or a critical person guiding them. The authors use these profiles and the statistical data to suggest implications for educators and policy-makers.

While the text is strong and convincing, there are a few areas that I would have liked the authors to develop further. The conclusion criticizes current immigration laws and poses questions that policy makers should consider, yet the authors do not offer alternative possibilities. When discussing the downfalls of schools in meeting the needs of immigrant students, the authors suggest what the Gates Millennium Scholarship promotes, the "three R's" (p. 367): Relevant curriculum, rigorous classes, and relationships that promote academic success. I wanted to know more about how specific solutions, such as the "three R's," might be implemented in schools. Also, the authors fail to provide convincing reasons to explain why Chinese immigrants are

overly represented in the High Achievers category. They suggest the possibility that the Chinese have a history of "worshiping education" (p. 357), which adds more pressure on Chinese students to perform well academically. Finally, since data was gathered in major cities, a study in rural areas might be useful to gain a better understanding of immigrant youth. Do immigrants in suburbs and rural areas experience the same academic challenges? Further research in this area may provide a helpful comparison and begin to answer these questions.

As this country becomes more diverse, *Learning a New Land: Immigrant Students in American Society* will prove to be an important text. In the current context of immigration in the United States and the policies surrounding immigration and non-English language use in classrooms, this book is extremely timely. As the daughter of immigrant parents from Mexico and Lebanon, I am personally able to associate with some of the observations the authors noted. Also, as a teacher who previously taught in a third grade, predominantly Latino classroom, I feel the book did an excellent job offering an understanding of the experiences of immigrant youth. Furthermore, the interdisciplinary approach taken by Suarez-Orozco et al. provides a rich account of immigrant youth in the United States. Their use of both qualitative and statistical data to interpret immigrant students' lives on a macro and individual level provides convincing arguments. The authors offer a conceptual model for further research on the academic achievement of immigrant students. Consequently, the volume will appeal to a wide audience including educators, sociologists, anthropologists, and policy makers.

Learning a New Land: *Immigrant Students in American Society* has won Harvard University Press's annual prize for outstanding publication because of its unique approach of incorporating multiples levels of data to explain the experiences of immigrant youth. Suarez-Orozco et al. are able to provide the reader with extensive information to meet the needs of immigrant student. As the authors suggest, as a nation, we need to allow young immigrants to "unleash their great potential to the benefit of all Americans" (p. 377).

Zaynab Baalbaki is a master's student at the University of Pennsylvania in the Education, Culture, & Society program. Prior to attending Penn, she was an undergraduate at the University of Wisconsin-Madison where she double majored in elementary education and sociology and double minored in educational policy studies and Chicano/a and Latino/a studies. Her current research interests include racial equity and diversity in schools and urban education. She can be reached at baalbaki@dolphin.upenn.edu.

REFERENCES

Passel, J. (2006). *Size and characteristics of the unauthorized migrant populations in the U.S*. Washington, D.C.: Pew Hispanic Center. Rong, X. and J. Preissle (1998). *Educating immigrant students: What we need to know to meet the challenges*. Thousand Oaks, California: Corwin Press.

Suarez-Orozco, C, M. Suarez-Orozco, and I. Torodova (2008). *Learning a new land: Immigrant students in American society*. Harvard University Press; Cambridge, MA.