

## Chapter 2

# Latino Education, Civic Engagement, and the Public Good

LISA GARCÍA BEDOLLA

*University of California, Berkeley*

Latino students in the United States face a number of challenges. It is estimated that almost one in two Latino students currently drops out of high school.<sup>1</sup> Although more than 40% of Latinos enter some sort of postsecondary educational program, fewer than 20% complete a 4-year degree. These educational challenges negatively affect Latinos' ability not only to achieve socioeconomic mobility but also to engage in politics and therefore to be represented in the policymaking process at a level commensurate with their proportion of the electorate. The result is a catch-22. Large numbers of Latino children have their opportunity structures determined by educational policies that are created and implemented with little input from Latino community members. The failure of those educational policies to effectively address the unique challenges Latinos face within the educational system makes it unlikely for Latinos to achieve educational success and therefore to achieve the socioeconomic status (SES) that would lead to their increased engagement with U.S. politics.

The strong relationship between education and civic engagement is what leads Fraga and Frost (2010) to describe the U.S. school system as a “center of democratic governance” (p. 119). For immigrant communities, schools also serve to foster political socialization and incorporation. This chapter considers schools' democratic roles from an input perspective—the degree to which those making education policy are representative of the population as a whole—and an output perspective—the degree to which schools produce equitable outcomes and, therefore informed, democratic citizens. At the heart of this analysis is the normative contention that education policy should result from a truly inclusive democratic decision-making process and therefore that its success should be judged by the equity of its outcomes. We will see below that for Latinos<sup>2</sup> in the United States, neither the inputs nor the outputs can be defined as equitable.

*Review of Research in Education*

March 2012, Vol. 36, pp. 23-42

DOI: 10.3102/0091732X11422666

© 2012 AERA. <http://rre.aera.net>

In the concluding section, I explore the normative implications of these inequities within the context of the wider public good. I argue that Latinos' current educational trajectory has the potential to lead the United States to become an increasingly bifurcated society, with a shrinking group of elites that have access to educational opportunities and a growing set of mainly Latino and African American nonelites who have limited access to educational success and therefore few opportunities for socioeconomic mobility. In their book *The Latino Education Crisis*, Patricia Gándara and Frances Contreras (2009) also raise this concern and argue that the challenges Latinos face in education are detrimental to all Americans. I support their contention and emphasize the important political and policy consequences this educational inequality has for American society as a whole.

### THE STATE OF LATINOS IN EDUCATION

Latinos comprise the fastest growing segment of the school-aged population in the United States. According to the Pew Hispanic Center, the number of Latino students in the nation's public schools nearly doubled during 1990 to 2006, accounting for 60% of the total growth in public school enrollment over that period (Fry & Gonzales, 2008). In 2001, Latino children made up just less than 17% of U.S. public elementary and secondary school students; by 2008, that number had grown to just more than 21% (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). There are now approximately 11 million Latino students in America's public schools. In 2010, Latino children became the majority of the school-aged population in the country's most populous state, California. On the regional level, by 2008 Latino children constituted a growing proportion of the student population across U.S. regions, including 38% of public elementary and secondary students in the West, 20% in the South, 15% in the Northeast, and 9% in the Midwest (National Center for Education Statistics, 2010). The growth in the Latino student population is expected to continue, increasing 166% by 2050. Thus, by 2050 there will be more school-aged Hispanic children in U.S. schools than school-aged non-Latino White students.

Yet Latino children face significant challenges in terms of their educational attainment. Latino students are increasingly likely to attend racially segregated schools and to live in poor neighborhoods (Orfield & Lee, 2007; Suárez Orozco & Suárez Orozco, 2009). The national dropout rate for Latino youth is more than twice the national average (Chapman et al., 2010). In 12th grade, Latinos average only an 8th-grade reading level (Suárez Orozco & Suárez Orozco, 2009). Latino college graduation rates have remained stagnant for almost three decades; the result is that Latinos have the lowest college attendance rates of all racial/ethnic groups in the United States (Gándara & Contreras, 2009; Pérez Huber, Huidor, Malagon, Sanchez, & Solorzano, 2006). Even though second-generation Latino children often achieve greater academic success than their parents (Kasinitz, Waters, Mollenkopf, & Holdaway, 2009; A. Portes & Rumbaut, 2001), recent longitudinal work suggests a movement toward "third-generation decline"—in other words, worsening Latino academic success in the third generation and beyond (Telles & Ortiz, 2008). As

Gándara and Contreras (2009) show, these disturbing trends cannot be attributed simply to immigration and Latino immigrants' lower educational levels. Their work, along with those of Telles and Ortiz (2008) and Farkas (2003), strongly suggests that low Latino educational attainment is not simply a matter of difficulties with immigrant integration but rather of structural inequalities in terms of the educational opportunities afforded to Latino students, regardless of nativity.

These structural inequalities are especially evident when considering Latino college-going rates. Carnoy (2010) calls low Latino college graduation rates in California a "college graduate crisis" that will have detrimental long-term effects on the state's economy. He points out that even though in 2005–2006 almost half of students in California's public schools were Latino, Latinos made up only about 15% of the bachelor's degrees awarded by the state's public and private universities (Carnoy, 2010). About 70% of California Latinos who do decide to enroll in college enter 2-year institutions, and very few of those community college students end up transferring to 4-year colleges (Carnoy, 2010). The problems are similar at the national level. According to Fry (2004), much of the difference in college completion rates between Latinos and Whites can be attributed to the fact that similarly prepared Latino high school students tend to select less competitive institutions than their White counterparts. For example, Fry (2004) finds that among the best prepared college students, nearly 60% of Latinos attend nonselective colleges and universities, in comparison with 52% of White students. Less competitive colleges, in turn, have lower graduation rates. Among students entering 2-year institutions "minimally qualified" for college, Latino students obtained bachelor's degrees at less than half the rate of Whites. Fry (2004) argues the problem is that Latino "pathways" to higher education are different from those of Whites. He finds that if Latinos were to graduate from college at the same rate as White students, their college completion rate would increase 42%.

Kelly (2005) estimates that the lack of a college completion among Latinos will, by 2020, result in a 2% decrease in national per capita income. In high-Latino states such as California, Texas, and New York, that effect will be significantly greater, leading to double-digit decreases in per capita income. Since most states' taxation systems depend heavily on income taxes, these changes can be expected to have nontrivial effects on state revenue and service provision. They also will have an impact on the federal tax base. Thus, Latino college completion rates have important economic consequences for society as a whole.

Low Latino educational attainment also has significant political consequences. Over the past three decades, political behavior studies have consistently shown that Latino political engagement lags behind that of Anglos and African Americans across every form of political participation—voting, engagement in protest activity, contacting elected officials, signing petitions, and volunteering (Abrajano & Alvarez, 2010; Fraga et al., 2006; Ramakrishnan & Baldassare, 2004). Political behavior studies looking at other populations have found SES—education, income, and occupation—to be the best predictor of voting. Among Latinos, SES explains much of the difference in political engagement, especially when studies take into consideration Latinos' youth (relative

to other groups), lower levels of educational attainment and SES, and the more than 40% of Latinos who are noncitizens. This is why the Latino proportion of the electorate is always significantly less than their proportion of the overall population. For example, in the 2010 elections, Latinos made up only 8% of the electorate even though they comprise 15% of the population. Thus, Latino educational attainment has an important impact on the population's political engagement.

### **POLICY INPUTS: EDUCATION LEVELS, CIVIC ENGAGEMENT, AND POLICY INFLUENCE**

Since U.S. education policies are products of the political process at the state, local, and national levels, it is important to consider which groups are able to influence the products of that policymaking process. This influence can take a number of forms, each of which poses particular challenges and opportunities for Latinos. These forms include the following: voting for school boards, group-level or individual-level lobbying of decision-making bodies, participation in Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) and other school-based groups, volunteering at school, and individual lobbying within schools and districts.

#### **Voting and School Board Representation**

As mentioned above, Latino levels of electoral participation are lower than those of Whites or African Americans. This is true even after taking into consideration Latinos' relative youth, lower SES, and nativity. Scholars argue that feelings of group-linked fate and the broader social and institutional context also play important roles in explaining Latino political engagement (Fraga et al., 2006; García Bedolla, 2005; Hardy-Fanta, 1993; Ochoa, 2004). Within the realm of education policy, a critical aspect of the institutional context is the electoral rules that govern school board elections, particularly who gets to vote in school board elections. A number of localities in Maryland currently allow noncitizen parents with children enrolled in school to participate in those elections, given their high salience for that population. Similarly, Chicago's schools are run by local school councils that are composed of six parents, two community representatives, two teachers, and the principal. Parents and community representatives are elected every 2 years by parents and residents. U.S. citizenship is not required for participation in these elections (Marschall, 2006).<sup>3</sup> With more than 40% of Latinos in the United States currently noncitizen, allowing this type of participation on the part of parents could serve to make them feel much more engaged in the education policymaking process and, potentially, make the process much more accountable to their children's needs (García Bedolla, 2006).

The second key aspect of the electoral context is whether school board members get elected within at-large or single-member districts. In an at-large election, all qualified voters within a particular district are able to select school board members (Fraga & Frost, 2010). The exact mechanisms for choice vary, but in general voters are able to vote for a number of candidates and those who receive the highest

number of votes win the election. In a single-member election, districts are divided into geographically defined representational units. Voters from that geographic area then select one representative to serve that representational unit. Studies have consistently shown that Latinos are less likely to be elected to school boards that use at-large electoral systems (Fraga & Frost, 2010; Fraga, Meier, & England, 1986; Meier & Gonzalez Juenke, 2005; Meier & Stewart, 1991; for one California study that found no effect, see Fraga & Elis, 2009). Meier, Gonzalez Juenke, Wrinkle, and Polinard (2005) also find that the electoral structure under which representatives get elected to school boards affect their policy preferences once in office, particularly their support for hiring Black and Latino administrators.

Because of the large number of noncitizen community members and their low levels of electoral participation, Latinos always make up a significantly smaller proportion of the electorate than they do of the population. As a result, to elect their preferred candidate within an at-large system, Latinos must establish broad city or districtwide coalitions. In contrast, within a single-member system, it is much easier for Latino voters to have the electoral clout needed to elect their preferred candidate. Given that, it comes as no surprise that Latino representation on school boards has been found to be higher within single-member district systems even after controlling for population size, political resources, demographics, particularly nativity, and variation in participation levels (Fraga & Frost, 2010).<sup>4</sup>

Latino representation on school boards is important because it has been shown to have significant effects on hiring and education policies within districts. On the policy side, Leal and Hess (2000) found that more Latino representation on school boards resulted in greater support for bilingual education programs. Theobald (2004) finds more program resources go to English language learners (ELLs) when the school superintendent is Latino. On the staffing side, more Latino representation on school boards leads to more hiring of Latino administrators and teachers (Fraga & Elis, 2009; Leal, Meier, & Martinez-Ebers, 2004; Meier & Gonzalez Juenke, 2005; Meier & Stewart 1991; Ross, Rouse, & Bratton, 2010). This increase in Latino teachers, in turn, has been shown to have a positive impact on student outcomes.<sup>5</sup> Hess and Leal (1997) find that a greater number of minority teachers led to higher levels of college attendance among all students. Ross et al. (2010) find Latino school board representation in Texas had a substantive direct effect on the hiring of Latino administrators and teachers. They also find representation has a strong indirect positive impact on Latino student performance. Similarly, work by Nieto (1999), Valdés (1996), and Valenzuela (1999) suggests that the presence of Latino teachers had significant and positive impacts on their Latino students' educational success. Marschall (2006) and Shah (2009) also demonstrate that Latino representation on Chicago's local school councils led to greater parent involvement in schools, which had an important positive impact on Latino students' academic performance.

Neiman, Reyes, Fraga, and Krimm's (2010) in-depth study of school board representation in California provides a number of important insights on this topic. The first is quantifying the low level of Latino representation that exists on school boards.

In California, where Latinos make up a majority of the student population, two thirds of California districts have no Latino representation on their school boards. Only about 15% of school board members in the state are Latino. Although they find Latino representation increases with the proportion of Latino students within the district, they show that the majority of districts where Latinos made up between half and two thirds of the student population had no Latino representation on their boards.

The Neiman et al.'s (2010) study is unique in that it also explored the policy preferences and impact of Latino school board representatives. In line with previous work, in their study Latino school board representation led to increases in the number of Latino administrators and teachers within the district. They also found that Latino school board members tended to have different policy priorities from White members. In particular, Latino school board members were more likely to say they were concerned with advocating for the needs of immigrant students, making the district more responsive to community needs, and increasing the numbers of students of color attending college. Given their unique policy focus, it is perhaps not so surprising that Neiman et al. (2010) found that having more than one Latino on the school board was associated with a small decline in high school dropout rates, even after controlling for district characteristics.

Who serves on school boards, then, has important consequences for district and school staffing, as well as determining the types of policy programs that district is likely to pursue. The importance of school board representation for the Latino community is reflected in the fact that 35% of Latino public officials in the United States are serving on school boards (Fraga & Elis, 2009). Yet, because of their general underrepresentation within the electorate, Latino parents are less likely to have a formal say in their representation on those boards than the parents of other students. That lack of political voice, in turn, makes it less likely that those school districts will pursue those education policies that are known to be of greatest benefit to the academic success of Latino children.

### **Other Forms of Engagement in Education Policymaking**

Individuals also can influence school policy by lobbying local school boards, district offices, or school administrators about a particular policy issue. Although little empirical work has explored this more informal type of political influence, an in-depth study of other types of nonelectoral political activity in California would suggest that Latinos, and especially immigrant Latinos, are less likely than other groups to be involved in this type of civic engagement. Ramakrishnan and Baldassare (2004) find that the poor, immigrants, and members of racial/ethnic groups are less likely to engage in every form of participation they explored, including volunteering, writing to elected officials, contributing money to campaigns, and attending rallies. Interestingly, they found Latinos more likely than any other group to attend meetings, particularly those associated with issues of education.

This is echoed in results from the Latino National Survey, which showed that education was a very high priority for Latinos; 74% of respondents reported that they had attended a PTA meeting, and more than half reported having volunteered at their child's school (Fraga et al., 2010). Although attending a PTA meeting is not the equivalent of attending a school board meeting or lobbying a school principal about an issue, it does suggest a high level of collective engagement among Latino parents that could translate into influence over the education policies that govern their children's education. As Ramakrishnan and Baldassare (2004) point out, Latino parents represent an untapped resource for civic involvement, particularly around schools. That involvement, in turn, could easily shift toward electoral politics, as has been found to have occurred in studies of Latina mothers' process of political engagement (García Bedolla, 2005; Ochoa, 2004; Pardo, 1998).

Yet, because of Latinos' low SES, relative youth, and high levels of noncitizenship, they are less able to select their first-choice representatives for school boards and less likely to influence the policymaking process at the local level. From a descriptive standpoint, Latinos are significantly underrepresented on school boards, among school administrators, and among school teaching staff. Studies have shown this underrepresentation can have an important impact on student outcomes. As Shah (2009) and Marschall (2006) demonstrate, Latino descriptive representation is also important in terms of making parents feel more welcome within the school environment, thus increasing their levels of volunteerism and involvement within their children's education. At the very least, it is clear that the education policymaking infrastructure does not reflect the student population it is serving.

### **POLICY OUTPUTS: EDUCATIONAL POLICY, EQUITY, AND IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION**

Echoing Jonathan Kozol's (1991) findings from almost a decade before, in 2000 the American Civil Liberties Union sued the state of California on the behalf of low-income students from across the state. Popularly known as the *Williams* case, in honor of plaintiff Eli Williams, a student from San Francisco, the suit alleged that the State of California and its agencies had denied thousands of California children their fundamental right to an education under the California constitution by failing to give them the basic tools necessary for that education. Some of the experiences children had had, as noted in the suit, included a math class that had been interrupted by rats, classrooms so hot that students fainted, insufficient textbooks, classrooms so crowded that there were not enough seats for all the students, classes that went an entire school year without ever being assigned a teacher, and schools where the bathrooms were either nonfunctional or so dirty that they posed a health risk to students. These conditions tended to be found in the state's low-income schools; the students attending these schools were overwhelmingly students of color.

In the case settlement, the state agreed to make significant investments in the educational infrastructure, to guarantee that all students had access to textbooks, and

to ensure that all students would be taught by qualified and credentialed teachers. The settlement also established a facility repair process, whereby these types of violations must be rectified within 30 days of reporting. Although California's budget crisis has resulted in challenges to the implementation of the settlement, particularly the state's commitment to fund long-term needs within the educational infrastructure, the existence of the facility reporting process has ensured that deficiencies that pose an immediate threat to students are addressed within the 30-day time frame. The settlement also has improved student access to textbooks and qualified teachers, providing an important baseline of standards for all students.

The expert testimony amassed in support of the plaintiffs' case in *Williams* showed the significant differences that exist in the quality of education received by low-income Latino and African American students in the state compared with their more affluent White counterparts (Oakes, 2004). These gross inequities have a significant effect on Latino educational attainment but are not unique to Latinos. The two areas of education policy that are specific to the Latino case are (a) schools' ability to serve the needs of ELLs and (b) schools' ability to provide Latino immigrant and U.S.-born children with a civic education that will pave the way for them (and their parents) to become engaged members of the polity.

### **Educating English Language Learners**

Not all Latino students are ELLs; a significant proportion of the Latino student population has no difficulty with English. For these English-proficient Latinos, their educational opportunity structure is limited by a lack of state investment in their education and their concentration in schools that possess inadequate facilities, unqualified teachers, and a non-college-preparatory curriculum. Also, as Gifford and Valdés (2006) point out, when non-ELL Latino students attend schools with a high proportion of ELL students, they face the additional burden of serving as English language informants and translators for their classmates, while still having to keep up with their own schoolwork.

Although not all Latino students are ELLs, Latinos make up a large proportion of ELL students. Nationally, Spanish speakers make up 73.1% of the ELL student population; the next largest group is Vietnamese speakers, who comprise 2.7% (Batalova & McHugh, 2010). As a result, any initiative designed to improve Latino academic achievement must address the challenge of accelerating the acquisition of academic English by Latino ELL students (Gifford & Valdés, 2006, Rumberger & Gándara, 2004). In their report prepared for the *Williams* lawsuit, Gándara and Rumberger (2009) highlighted the significant achievement gap that exists between current and former ELLs and English-only students.<sup>6</sup> They find that by 11th grade, former and current ELLs were found to be reading at the levels English-only students achieved between 6th and 7th grades—a gap of 4.5 years. This finding is all the more striking given that many of the most academically challenged English learners likely have dropped out of school by 11th grade (Rumberger & Gándara, 2004). The same differences can be seen when looking at outcomes from the California High School Exit



Exam, a standards-based, criterion-referenced test. Rumberger and Gándara (2004) find that after two opportunities to pass the test, only 19% of ELLs from the 2004 graduating class had passed the text, compared with 48% of all students.

Rumberger and Gándara (2004) argue that this achievement gap can be attributed to the following seven inequitable conditions that negatively affect California ELL students' opportunities to learn.

*Inequitable Access to Appropriately Trained Teachers*

English learners require teachers with specialized training. Yet Rumberger and Gándara (2004) find English learners in California are significantly more likely than any other students to be taught by uncredentialed teachers. Rumberger and Gándara (2004) found that in 2001–2002, although 14% of teachers statewide were not credentialed, 25% of EL teachers were not fully certified. Access to specially trained teachers is especially important to students who are likely to have experienced family trauma, such as family separations (as a result of immigration) or experiences of war, and who have varied educational backgrounds (Suárez Orozco, Suárez Orozco, & Todorova, 2008).

*Inadequate Professional Development Opportunities to Help Teachers  
Address the Instructional Needs of English Learners*

The instructional demands placed on EL teachers are intense, yet they are given little support for these activities. Gándara, Rumberger, Maxwell-Jolly, and Callahan (2003) found that in 1999–2000, teachers reported only about 7% of their professional development time was focused on the needs of ELLs. In schools with more than 50% of English learners, teachers reported only 10%. Of the more than \$50 million the state provided to the University of California to provide professional development to teachers, only 16% was earmarked for professional development in the area of English language development, despite the fact that EL students make up 25% of the state's student population and comprise some of the most disadvantaged of the state's students.

*Inequitable Access to Appropriate Assessment to Measure ELL Achievement, Gauge  
Their Learning Needs, and Hold the System Accountable for Their Progress*

Rumberger and Gándara (2004) find that the state's current accountability system is of little use for monitoring the academic progress of English learners, largely because the only measures of achievement for ELL students are tests administered in English. They cite the reports of several research and professional organizations stating that "testing students in a language in which they are not yet proficient is both invalid and unethical" (p. 2041). This does little good from the standpoint of accountability or in terms of helping teachers enhance instruction. Given it is understood to take at least 4 years for individuals to become English proficient, they argue,

The burden is on the state to demonstrate that test scores for English learners who have been in the United States for less than four years are valid, yet the state has not made any attempt to obtain information to shed light on this question. (Rumberger & Gándara, 2004, p. 2042)

### *Inadequate Instruction Time to Accomplish Learning Goals*

English learners have been shown to spend less time on academic tasks than other students. Yet studies have consistently shown a direct relationship between increased time spent on academic tasks and increased achievement. This is the result of students spending time in structured immersion programs when they first arrive at school, being “pulled out” of regular classes for English language development, being assigned to multiple periods of English as a second language classes in high school, and being given shortened day schedules in cases where courses are unavailable and the result of ELL students being more likely to attend year-round schools whose academic calendars include fewer school days. Rumberger and Gándara (2004) argue all these factors negatively affect the opportunities ELL students have to access academic coursework and subject matter content.

### *Inequitable Access to Instructional Materials and Curriculum*

All students need appropriate instructional materials. ELLs need two types of additional materials: (a) developmentally appropriate materials in English that are tailored to meet their language development needs and (b) appropriate texts and curriculum in their native language. Rumberger and Gándara (2004) show that large numbers of teachers with ELL students reported having neither of these types of materials.

### *Inequitable Access to Adequate Facilities*

Teachers of ELLs were almost twice as likely as teachers of English speakers to report working in facilities that are not conducive to teaching and learning. Teachers in schools with a high proportion of English learners were 50% more likely to report bathrooms that were not clean and open throughout the day and to have seen evidence of cockroaches, rats, or mice at their schools (Rumberger & Gándara, 2004).

### *Intense Segregation Into Schools and Classrooms That Place Them at High Risk of Educational Failure*

The distribution of ELL students across California is uneven, leading to a significant concentration of these students within a small number of schools. In 2000, almost two thirds of English learners from Grades 1 to 4 were in classrooms where more than 50% of the students were English learners (Rumberger & Gándara, 2004). This adversely affects ELL students’ ability to become English proficient because they lack linguistic models in English (Gifford & Valdés, 2006).

Rumberger and Gándara's (2004) report focused on California schools, but many of the factors that they identify are true for Latino ELL students across the country. Although it is true that different states are more and less successful in educating these students, overall the picture is not a positive one. As Suárez Orozco and Suárez Orozco (2009) point out,

Newcomer immigrant students enter an education system shaped by school reform policies that fail to consider their particular needs or realities. In the No Child Left Behind high-stakes testing climate, immigrant children are expected to achieve educationally in ways that are contradicted by the realities of academic language learning in American classrooms today. Newcomer students who enter midway through their educational career in early adolescence, for example, are expected to master a new academic language (something that typically takes five to seven years under optimal circumstances), while also learning all of the explicit and implicit curriculum their native-born peers have been exposed to over the course of their entire educational experience. Given the dual pressures of this condensed time frame—of mastering that body of information, while often attending less than optimal schools—the odds are stacked highly against new arrivals. (pp. 328–329)

It is important to remember that a significant proportion of those new arrivals are Latinos. Again, even though the Latino population is diverse in terms of national origin and generation, two thirds of the Latino school-aged population is made up of immigrants or the children of immigrants (Suárez Orozco et al., 2008; Suárez Orozco & Suárez Orozco, 2009). But as these studies have shown, the current education policy environment is not responsive to the needs of these students. In California, it took a lawsuit for some of these issues to be addressed, and 4 years after the settlement, progress remains quite slow. The current budget climate only exacerbates what was an already difficult situation, raising more questions about schools' ability to address the needs of these students. Given Latino students comprise a large and growing number of the students that schools are serving, and given the depth and duration of the current budget crisis, we run the risk of constraining the educational potential of an entire generation of Latino students.

### **Fostering Student Civic Engagement and Immigrant Political Incorporation**

The public school system in the United States was not designed only to promote literacy and overall academic achievement. It was also meant to foster the development of an informed and engaged citizenry (Tyack, 2001). Currently, 40 state constitutions mention the importance of civic literacy among citizens, and 13 of them state that a central purpose of their educational system is to promote good citizenship, democracy, and free government (Gibson & Levine, 2003). This role for schools is especially important for immigrant youth. Many analysts have discussed the lack of formal institutions of incorporation for this generation of immigrants, largely as a result of the decline of the party system in the United States. Yet, every electoral cycle, tens of thousands of newly naturalized citizens or their 18-year-old U.S.-born children become eligible to vote. Schools comprise one of the few institutions that could facilitate their political incorporation. A recent study looking at the impact

of the KidsVoting program, for example, showed that Latino student participation in this civics-oriented curriculum led to increased participation not only among the students but also among Latino parents (McDevitt & Kiouisis, 2006). Thus, schools could serve as critical engines of civic engagement not only for second-generation Latino youth but also for their first-generation parents. This means that investments in school-based civic engagement efforts could have tremendous positive ripple effects on political engagement within Latino communities.

Other civic engagement studies have looked at youth political engagement from a developmental standpoint and in terms of the roles played by peers, schools, the media, and other socializing agents (Achen, 2002; Atkins & Hart, 2003; Balsano, 2005; Dudley & Gitelson, 2003; Flanagan, Cumsille, Gill, & Gallay, 2007; Gibson & Levine, 2003; Kahne, Chi, & Middaugh, 2006; Kahne & Westheimer, 2003; Lopez & Marcelo, 2008; Nasir & Kirshner, 2003; Pasek, Feldman, Romer, & Jamieson, 2008; Sherrod, 2003; Torney-Purta, Barber, & Wilkenfeld, 2007; Westheimer & Kahne, 2003, 2004; Zaff, Malanchuk, & Eccles, 2008; Zukin, Keeter, Andolina, Jenkins, & Delli Carpini, 2006). This work has found schools to have an important impact on political socialization and has pointed to the importance of parents and neighborhoods in the socialization process (Kahne & Spote, 2008, Niemi & Junn, 1998).

Additional scholarship has looked more specifically at what the content of an effective civics curriculum should be. In 2002, the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement, in consultation with the Corporation for National and Community Service, convened a series of meetings to consult a range of experts about the stated goal of civic education and civic engagement in the United States. The resulting report, *The Civic Mission of Schools*, summarizes this effort and lays out six “best practices” for organizing a civic education curriculum:

1. Provide instruction in government, history, law, and democracy. Formal instruction in U.S. government, history, and democracy increases civic knowledge. This content should not be taught as rote facts but rather in a way that connects government structures to students’ lives.
2. Incorporate discussion of current local, national, and international issues and events into the classroom, particularly those that young people view as important to their lives. This also has been found to improve critical thinking, an important 21st-century competency.
3. Design and implement programs that provide students with the opportunity to apply what they learn through performing community service that is linked to the formal curriculum and classroom instruction. This service also needs to be explicitly linked to the civic realm in order to have the greatest impact on civic engagement.
4. Offer extracurricular activities that provide opportunities for young people to get involved in their schools or communities. Long-term studies of Americans show

that those who participate in extracurricular activities remain more engaged in their communities even decades later.

5. Encourage student participation in school governance. A long tradition of research suggests that giving students more opportunities to participate in the management of their own classrooms and schools builds their civic skills and attitudes.
6. Encourage students' participation in simulations of democratic processes and procedures. Recent evidence indicates that simulations of voting, trials, legislative deliberation, and diplomacy in schools may lead to heightened political knowledge and interest.

Building on this important work, Kahne and Sporte (2008) explore the relationship between civic education and civic commitments among urban youth in Chicago's public schools. As they point out, most studies that attempt to link classroom practices to civic commitments are relatively small, do not entail random assignment, and do not control for prior civic commitments. To address these issues, Kahne and Sporte rely on survey data, but they limit their analysis to students for whom they have baseline data from 2003, so they are able to see change over time when they conduct their more in-depth analysis of their 2005 data. In their study, they control for classroom civic learning opportunities in multiple subject areas, such as English, social studies, and history (including an open climate, service learning, and many of the other Civic Mission of Schools best practices), school supports for students' academic and social development, student involvement in extracurricular activities, their demographic and individual characteristics, neighborhood and family civic context, and students' prior civic commitments.

Kahne and Sporte (2008) find that neighborhood and family contexts, particularly whether parents discussed current events with children, were strongly related to students' civic commitments. Conversely, demographic characteristics and school supports had little impact. Civic learning opportunities and engaging in service learning had a sizable impact; that effect was larger than that of any other measure in the study, including students' prior commitments to civic participation, and remains robust even after controlling for neighborhood, family, and school characteristics. They argue that this suggests "schools appear able to help lessen the participatory inequality that exists in our civic and political life" (Kahne & Sporte, 2008, p. 755). This finding is especially important given studies showing that these civic learning opportunities are not evenly distributed across the student population. Low-income students, students of color, and low-performing students have all been found to have less access to civic learning opportunities (Kahne & Middaugh, 2008; Torney-Purta & Wilkenfeld, 2009).

In relation to the question of academic achievement, Kahne and Sporte's (2008) work indicates that the factors that enhance civic commitments are not necessarily the same as those that foster academic success. In fact, they may be contradictory to one another. Although peer support for academic achievement was found to improve

civic commitments slightly, parental emphasis on academic success was found to have a negative impact on students' civic orientations. Thus, although their work shows that classroom opportunities can enhance students' feelings of civic agency, social relatedness, and political and moral understandings, their findings also suggest mainstream educational reform agendas may be insufficient in relation to student civic development, given their overwhelming emphasis on academic, rather than civic, skill development (Kahne & Sporte, 2008).

For Latinos, this body of research is critical. Although nonprofit organizations and some political entities such as unions and advocacy groups engage in voter mobilization during elections, these efforts are rarely able to reach all eligible voters and often do not focus on low-propensity voters, many of whom are Latino (Michelson, García Bedolla, & Green, 2008). In addition, there is no institutional structure within American politics that is designed to socialize new members into the polity. Political socialization studies from the 1960s and 1970s suggested that this socialization process often entailed a transfer of party identification and political attachments from parents to children (Jennings & Niemi, 1968; Niemi & Jennings, 1991). In immigrant families, children often serve as the translators and public interface for parents, suggesting that the socialization process likely moves in the opposite direction (Wong & Tseng, 2007). Thus, we see again how schools could play a critical role in developing the civic commitments and engagement of Latino immigrants and their children. That, in turn, would positively affect their ability to influence the development of educational policies that address the needs of Latino youth.

### **CONSIDERING THE FUTURE: LATINO EDUCATION, CIVIC ENGAGEMENT, AND THE PUBLIC GOOD**

As many scholars and political pundits have demonstrated, Latinos' current educational trajectory is untenable. Although Latino students bring important funds of knowledge to the educational process, U.S. schools are failing to adequately take advantage of those resources in order to educate a vast majority of these students (Ríos Aguilar, 2010). This problem is not new; educational reform has been at the core of Latino political organizing since at least the 1930s, reflected in El Congreso de Pueblos de Habla Española's demand (in 1939) for Latino studies programs in universities; the 1968 East Los Angeles "Blowouts" where thousands of Chicana/o students walked out of school to protest their unequal educational access and opportunities; the 1994 California Latino student walkouts to protest a ballot proposition that would, among other things, deny educational access to undocumented students; and recent Latino youth activism around the DREAM (Development, Relief and Education for Alien Minors) Act to bring attention to the educational plight of undocumented youth in the United States (Delgado Bernal, 2006; García Bedolla, 2005, 2009). Although these social movements have had critical effects on the political identification and engagement of generations of Latino youth, they have done little to change the structural inequalities that exist for Latino students within the U.S. educational system.

These structural inequalities have led to “enormous disparities in both academic opportunity and educational achievement between Latinos and others in the United States” (Gándara & Contreras, 2009, p. 304). Gándara and Contreras characterize the fallout from these disparities as a “looming social and economic disaster” (p. 305). Rumberger and Gándara (2004) argue that state government policies are largely to blame for this failure. Suárez Orozco and Suárez Orozco (2009) also emphasize the role that federal immigration policy has had in leading us to the place where we are today. As an example, a recent study by Baum, Jones, and Barry (2010) showed that between 1997 and 2007, the United States deported the lawful permanent resident parents of more than 100,000 children; at least 88,000 of those children are U.S. citizens. Their report shows the tremendous human costs that arise from our current deportation policies. These policies harm children, schools, and communities, while doing little to improve our country’s immigration system.

The lack of Latino political influence is also an important part of the story. Latinos’ lack of educational attainment, in addition to historic exclusion from the political process, particularly for Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans, explains much of the gap in Latino civic engagement (García Bedolla, 2009). We have seen how that gap, in turn, has limited Latinos’ ability to influence the education policymaking process to ensure that public schools serve the needs of Latino students. So then the question becomes, where do we go from here? Suárez Orozco and Suárez Orozco (2009) lay out nine policy prescriptions for the Obama administration to follow in order to support Latino immigrant students; many of the recommendations would also benefit U.S.-born Latinos’ educational opportunities. Their suggestions include (a) rejecting the “sink or swim” approach to immigrant integration, (b) authorizing the DREAM Act, (c) increasing preschool opportunities, (d) promoting rigorous 21st-century education, (e) refocusing and revitalizing teacher preparation, (f) revamping and prioritizing second-language education, (g) reconsidering high-stakes testing, (h) expanding after-school programs, (i) supporting community-based mentoring, and (j) advancing systematic college pathway instruction. Of course, the findings from Rumberger and Gándara (2004) would lead us to add that government would also need to make a significant investment in improving school infrastructure, addressing overcrowding, and ensuring the provision of adequate materials to students. Any policy reform would also need to include a robust civics curriculum designed to be sensitive to students’ cultural needs and that focused on integrating parents into the political process along with their children.

These policy prescriptions should not be seen as “pie in the sky” wishful thinking but rather as an approach to Latino education and integration that is crucial to the future well-being of the American polity. One need only look to the Cuban experience to find a model for how to incorporate an immigrant group into the United States. Cubans were provided with preferential treatment in terms of U.S. immigration policy and the U.S. government invested an estimated \$4 billion in their settlement and incorporation into the United States (García Bedolla, 2009).<sup>7</sup> That investment has paid off handsomely; Cubans are the most successful Latino

national–origin group in terms of income and SES. They are also among the most political active, especially in terms of voting. If the U.S. government were willing to make similar investments in other immigrant populations, the rewards would be large and significant.

Instead, popular discourse around immigrant integration, and the presence of Latinos in the United States more generally, has become increasingly ungenerous and vitriolic. Fundamentally, as a nation we have not come to accept that this population is part of the fabric of American society and will comprise a growing proportion of the American population, even absent continued immigration. Until the American community becomes committed to the education and political integration of all its members, the stark inequalities delineated here will remain and possibly increase—to our collective detriment.

### NOTES

<sup>1</sup>These results are based on a 4-year cohort analysis.

<sup>2</sup>I use the term *Latino* to describe individuals, foreign and U.S. born, who have ancestry in any of the Spanish-speaking countries of Latin America. By using the term, I am not claiming that all *Latinos* have the same background, needs, or interests. In fact, the Latin American–origin population in the United States is quite diverse. Yet I would argue that Latinos comprise a social group, as defined by Iris Marion Young (2000): “a collective of persons differentiated from others by cultural forms, practices, special needs or capacities, structure of power, or privilege,” making it an appropriate object of study (p. 153). Despite the diversity among Latinos, the U.S. educational system is failing to educate a large proportion of that population, and there are important historical and structural reasons underlying this educational inequity, some of which are discussed in this chapter (García Bedolla, 2009).

<sup>3</sup>My intention is not to underplay the complexity of this question, as is evidenced by the recent defeats of similar initiatives in San Francisco and Los Angeles, but rather to raise the issue as one worthy of consideration and debate.

<sup>4</sup>This has been found to be true for African Americans as well. See Meier and England (1984).

<sup>5</sup>It is important to note that in their study of California schools, Fraga and Elis (2009) found having more Latino administrators and teachers had no systematic impact on student outcomes. To my knowledge, theirs is the only study to find that changes in staffing did not affect student outcomes.

<sup>6</sup>Their analysis includes former and current ELL students because, as ELL students achieve English proficiency, they are moved out of ELL status. Including both groups allows for a more accurate comparison between ELL students and their English-only counterparts.

<sup>7</sup>The first wave of Cuban immigrants also arrived with significant human capital, making them better able to maximize the benefits arising from their support from the federal government.

### REFERENCES

- Abrajano, M., & Alvarez, R. M. (2010). *New faces, new voices: The Hispanic electorate in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Achen, C. (2002). Parental socialization and rational party identification. *Political Behavior, 24*, 151–170.
- Atkins, R., & Hart, D. (2003). Neighborhoods, adults, and the development of civic identity in urban youth. *Applied Developmental Science, 7*, 156–164.



- Balsano, A. B. (2005). Youth civic engagement in the United States: Understanding and addressing the impact of social impediments on positive youth and community development. *Applied Developmental Science, 9*, 188–201.
- Batalova, J., & McHugh, M. (2010). *Top languages spoken by English language learners nationally and by state*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Baum, J., Jones, R., & Barry, C. (2010). *In the child's best interest? The consequences of losing a lawful immigrant parent to deportation*. Berkeley, CA: The Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Race, Ethnicity, and Diversity.
- Carnoy, M. (2010). *California's impending college graduate crisis* (Policy Brief No. 10-2). Berkeley: Policy Analysis for California Education.
- Chapman, C., Laird, J., & Kewal Ramani, A. (2010). *Trends in high school dropout and completion rates in the United States, 1972-2008* (Compendium Report). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- Delgado Bernal, D. (2006). Rethinking grassroots activism: Chicana resistance in the 1968 East Los Angeles school blowouts. In M. W. Apple & K. W. Buras (Eds.), *The subaltern speak: curriculum, power, and educational struggles* (pp. 141–162). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dudley, R. L., & Gitelson, A. R. (2003). Civic education, civic engagement, and youth civic development. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 36*, 263–280.
- Farkas, G. (2003). Racial disparities and discrimination in education: What do we know, how do we know it, and what do we need to know? *Teachers College Record, 105*, 1119–1146.
- Flanagan, C. A., Cumsille, P., Gill, S., & Gallay, L. S. (2007). School and community climates and civic commitments: Patterns for ethnic minority and majority students. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 99*, 421–431.
- Fraga, L. R., & Elis, R. (2009). Interests and representation: Ethnic advocacy on California school boards. *Teachers College Record, 111*, 659–682.
- Fraga, L. R., & Frost, A. (2010). Democratic institutions, public engagement, and Latinos in American public schools. In M. Orr & J. Rogers (Eds.), *Public engagement for public education* (pp. 117–138). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Fraga, L. R., Garcia, J. A., Hero, R., Jones-Correa, M., Martinez-Ebers, V., & Segura, G. (2006). *Su casa es nuestra casa*: Latino politics research and the development of American political science. *American Political Science Review, 100*, 515–521.
- Fraga, L. R., Garcia, J. A., Hero, R., Jones-Correa, M., Martínez-Ebers, V., & Segura, G. (2010). *Latino lives in America: Making it home*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Fraga, L. R., Meier, K. J., & England, R. E. (1986). Hispanic Americans and educational policy: Limits to equal access. *Journal of Politics, 48*, 850–876.
- Fry, R. (2004). *Latino youth finishing college: The role of selective pathways*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Fry, R., & Gonzales, F. (2008). *One-in-five and growing fast: A profile of Hispanic public school students*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Gándara, P., & Contreras, F. (2009). *The Latino education crisis: The consequences of failed social policies*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gándara, P., & Rumberger, R. W. (2009). Immigration, language, and education: How does language policy structure opportunity? *Teachers College Record, 111*, 750–782.
- Gándara, P., Rumberger, R., Maxwell-Jolly, J., & Callahan, R. (2003). English learners in California schools: Unequal resources, unequal outcomes. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 11*. Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v11n36/>
- García Bedolla, L. (2005). *Fluid borders: Latino power, identity, and politics in Los Angeles*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- García Bedolla, L. (2006). Rethinking citizenship: Noncitizen voting and immigrant political engagement in the United States. In T. Lee, K. Ramakrishnan, & R. Ramírez (Eds.),

- Transforming politics, transforming America: The political and civic incorporation of immigrants in the United States* (pp. 51–70). Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
- García Bedolla, L. (2009). *Latino politics*. Cambridge, England: Polity.
- Gibson, C., & Levine, P. (2003). *The civic mission of schools*. New York, NY: Carnegie Corporation.
- Gifford, B. R., & Valdés, G. (2006). The linguistic isolation of Hispanic students in California's public schools: The challenge of reintegration. *National Society for the Study of Education Yearbook, 105*, 125–154.
- Hardy-Fanta, C. (2003). *Latina politics, latino politics: Gender, culture, and political participation in Boston*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Hess, F., & Leal, D. (1997). Minority teachers, minority students and college matriculation: A new look at the role-modeling hypothesis. *Policy Studies Journal, 25*, 235–248.
- Jennings, K. M., & Niemi, R. G. (1968). The transmission of political values from parent to child. *American Political Science Review, 62*, 169–184.
- Kahne, J., Chi, B., & Middaugh, E. (2006). Building social capital for civic and political engagement: The potential of high school civics courses. *Canadian Journal of Education, 29*, 387–409.
- Kahne, J., & Middaugh, E. (2008). *Democracy for some: The civic opportunity gap in high school* (Working Paper #59). Washington, DC: The Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning (CIRCLE).
- Kahne, J., & Sporte, S. E. (2008). Developing citizens: The impact of civic learning opportunities on students commitment to civic participation. *American Educational Research Journal, 45*, 738–766.
- Kahne, J., & Westheimer, J. (2003). Teaching democracy: What schools need to do. *Phi Delta Kappan, 85*, 34–40, 57–66.
- Kasinitz, P., Waters, M., Mollenkopf, J. H., & Holdaway, J. (2009). *Inheriting the city: The children of immigrants come of age*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Kelly, P. (2005). *As America becomes more diverse: The impact of state higher education inequality*. Boulder, CO: National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York, NY: Harper Perennial.
- Leal, D., & Hess, F. (2000). The politics of bilingual education expenditures in urban school districts. *Social Science Quarterly, 81*, 1064–1072.
- Leal, D., Meier, K. J., & Martinez-Ebers, V. (2004). The politics of Latino education: The biases of at-large elections. *Journal of Politics, 66*, 1224–1244.
- Lopez, M. H., & Marcelo, K. B. (2008). The civic engagement of immigrant youth: New evidence from the 2006 civic and political health of the nation survey. *Applied Development Science, 12*, 66–73.
- Marschall, M. (2006). Parent involvement and educational outcomes for Latino students. *Review of Policy Research, 23*, 1053–1076.
- McDevitt, M., & Kiouisis, S. (2006). *Experiments in political socialization: Kids voting USA as a model for civic education reform* (Working Paper No. 49). Washington, DC: Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement.
- Meier, K. J., & England, R. E. (1984). Black representation and education policy: Are they related? *American Political Science Review, 78*, 392–403.
- Meier, K. J., & Gonzalez Juenke, E. (2005). Electoral structure and the quality of representation on school boards. In W. Howell (Ed.), *Besieged: School boards and the future of education politics* (pp. 199–227). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Meier, K. J., Gonzalez Juenke, E., Wrinkle, R. D., & Polinard, J. L. (2005). Structural choices and representational biases: The post-election color of representation. *American Journal of Political Science, 49*, 758–768.

- Meier, K. J., & Stewart, J. (1991). *The politics of Hispanic education*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Michelson, M. R., García Bedolla, L., & Green, D. (2008). *New experiments in minority voter mobilization: The second in a series of reports on the California votes initiative*. San Francisco, CA: The James Irvine Foundation.
- Nasir, N. S., & Kirshner, B. (2003). The cultural construction of moral and civic identities. *Applied Developmental Science, 7*, 138–147.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2010). *Digest of education statistics, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/>
- Neiman, M., Reyes, B., Fraga, L. R., & Krimm, D. (2010). *Examining Latino representation on California's school boards: Its impact on perceptions of district problems, priorities, and policies*. San Francisco, CA: César Chávez Institute Policy Research Series, San Francisco State University.
- Niemi, R. G., & Jennings, M. K. (1991). Issues and inheritance in the formation of party identification. *American Journal of Political Science, 35*, 970–988.
- Niemi, R. G., & Junn, J. (1998). *Civic education*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Nieto, S. (1999). *The lights in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Oakes, J. (2004). Investigating the claims in *Williams vs. State of California*: An unconstitutional denial of education's basic tools? *Teachers College Record, 106*, 1889–1906.
- Ochoa, G. (2004). *Becoming neighbors in a Mexican American community: Power, conflict, and solidarity*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Orfield, G., & Lee, C. (2007). *Historic reversals, accelerating resegregation, and the need for new integration strategies*. Los Angeles: Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Pardo, M. (1998). *Mexican American women activists: Identity and resistance in two Los Angeles communities*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Pasek, J., Feldman, L., Romer, D., & Jamieson, K. H. (2008). Schools as incubators of democratic participation: Building long-term political efficacy with civic education. *Applied Developmental Science, 12*, 26–37.
- Pérez Huber, L., Huidor, O., Malagon, M., Sanchez, G., & Solorzano, D. (2006). *Falling through the cracks: Critical transitions in the Latina/o educational pipeline* (Report No. 7). Los Angeles: Chicano Studies Research Center, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Portes, A., & Rumbaut, R. (2001). *Legacies: The story of the immigrant second generation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ramakrishnan, K., & Baldassare, M. (2004). *The ties that bind: Changing demographics and civic engagement in California*. San Francisco: Public Policy Institute of California.
- Ríos-Aguilar, C. (2010). Measuring funds of knowledge: Contributions to Latina/o students' academic and non-academic outcomes. *Teachers College Record, 112*, 2209–2257.
- Ross, A. D., Rouse, S. M., & Bratton, K. A. (2010). Latino representation and education: Pathways to Latino student performance. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly, 10*, 69–95.
- Rumberger, R. W., & Gándara, P. (2004). Seeking equity in the education of California's English learners. *Teachers College Record, 106*, 2032–2056.
- Shah, P. (2009). Motivating participation: The symbolic effects of Latino representation on parent school involvement. *Social Science Quarterly, 90*, 212–230.
- Sherrod, L. R. (2003). Promoting the development of citizenship in diverse youth. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 36*, 287–292.
- Suárez Orozco, M., & Suárez Orozco, C. (2009). Educating Latino immigrant students in the twenty-first century: Principles for the Obama administration. *Harvard Educational Review, 79*, 327–340.

- Suárez Orozco, M., Suárez Orozco, C., & Todorova, I. (2008). *Learning a new land: Immigrant students in American society*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Telles, E. E., & Ortiz, V. (2009). *Generations of exclusion: Mexican Americans, assimilation, and race*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Theobald, N. (2004). *Muéstrele el Dinero!: Assessing the linkage between Latino school superintendents and English language learner program resources*. Paper presented at the Latino Politics: State of the Discipline Conference, Texas A&M University, College Station.
- Torney-Purta, J., Barber, C. H., & Wilkenfeld, B. S. (2007). Latino adolescents' civic development in the United States: Research results from the IEA Civic Education Study. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 36*, 111–125.
- Torney-Purta, J., & Wilkenfeld, B. S. (2009). *Paths to 21st century competencies through civic education classrooms: An analysis of survey results from ninth graders* (A technical assistance bulletin). Chicago, IL: American Bar Association Division for Public Education.
- Tyack, D. (2001). Schools for citizens: The politics of civic education from 1790–1990. In G. Gerstle & J. Mollenkopf (Eds.), *E Pluribus Unum? Contemporary and historical perspectives on immigrant politics*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Valdés, G. (1996). *Con Respeto: Bridging the distances between culturally diverse families and schools*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S. Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2003). Reconnecting education to democracy: Democratic dialogues. *Pbi Delta Kappan, 85*, 8–14.
- Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*, 237–269.
- Wong, J. S., & Tseng, V. (2007). Political socialisation within immigrant families: Challenging parental socialisation models. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 34*, 151–168.
- Young, I. M. (2000). Structure, difference, and Hispanic/Latino claims of justice. In J. J. E. Gracia & P. De Greiff, (Eds.), *Hispanics/Latinos in the United States: Ethnicity, race, and rights* (pp. 147–165). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zaff, J., Malanchuk, O., & Eccles, J. S. (2008). Predicting positive citizenship from adolescence to young adulthood: The effects of a civic context. *Applied Development Science, 12*, 38–53.
- Zukin, C., Keeter, S., Andolina, M., Jenkins, K., & Delli Carpini, M. (2006). *A new engagement? Political participation, civic life, and the changing American citizen*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.