

Graduate School of Education

GSE Publications

University of Pennsylvania

Year 2001

Education and Policy in the New Latin Diaspora

Edmund T. Hammond *

Stanton Wortham †

Enrique J. Murillo Jr‡

*Brown University,

†University of Pennsylvania, stantonw@gse.upenn.edu

‡California State University,

Copyright ©2001. Reproduced with permission of Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc., Westport, CT. Postprint version. Published in *Education in the New Latino Diaspora: Policy and the Politics of Identity*, edited by Stanton Wortham, Enrique G. Murillo, and Edmund T. Hamann (Westport, CT: Ablex, 2001), pages 1-16.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons@Penn.

http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/120

Education and Policy in The New Latino Diaspora

Edmund T. Hamann, Brown University

Stanton Wortham, University of Pennsylvania

Enrique G. Murillo Jr., California State University

The New Latino Diaspora

Increasing numbers of Latinos (many immigrant, and some from elsewhere in the US) are settling both temporarily and permanently in areas of the US that have not traditionally been home to Latinos—e.g., North Carolina, Maine, Georgia, Indiana, Arkansas, rural Illinois and near resort communities in Colorado.¹ Enrique Murillo and Sofia Villenas have called this the New Latino Diaspora (Murillo and Villenas, 1995). Newcomer Latinos are confronted with novel challenges to their senses of identity, status, and community. Instead of arriving in settings, like the Southwest, where Latinos have lived for centuries, those in the New Latino Diaspora arrive in unfamiliar places where long-term residents have little experience with Latinos. In the New Diaspora, then, Latinos face more insistent questions about who they are, who they seek to be, and what accommodations they merit—questions that are asked both by themselves and by others.

These questions about identity often get addressed through formal and informal policies of mediating institutions (Lamphere, 1992; Levinson and Sutton, in press)—notably schools (Goode *et al.*, 1992)—that are key sites for the enactment of status hierarchies and other scripts for inter-ethnic interaction. In these New Latino Diaspora sites, the scripts for inter-ethnic interaction

are contradictory, emergent, and very much in flux, but their consequences are often predictable. Anglo hosts are often suspicious of Latino newcomers, and few Latino Diaspora schools so far are able to help Latino schoolchildren overcome the economic and social barriers they face. The most common educational accommodation to their needs is to pull them out of content classes for ESL work, a practice that often disrupts their acquisition of content knowledge.

The initial schooling records of high school completion rates, representation in higher school tracks, and other ways of measuring Latino school achievement in New Diaspora sites seem similar to the unsatisfactory Latino experiences in the Southwest and in cities like Chicago and New York. New Latino Diaspora students are often placed in less-preferred spaces—sometimes literally in closets. And they are often taught by less credentialed teachers, who are themselves stigmatized by peers through an academic ‘caste-system’ that looks down on bilingual/ESL education (Grey, 1991).

The emergent patterns in the New Latino Diaspora seem inauspiciously familiar, but we do not have much data. We know a lot about the education of U.S. Latinos in areas like the Southwest (e.g., Foley, 1990; Vasquez *et al.*, 1994; Suárez-Orozco and Suárez-Orozco, 1995; Romo and Falbo, 1996 and Valdés, 1996) and Chicago (e.g., Guerra, 1998). But, with the partial exception of some studies that emerged from the Changing Relations Project (e.g., Grey, 1991), the literature includes very little about the educational experiences of newcomers in the New Latino Diaspora. Nor are there any comparative analyses of the overlaps and dissimilarities in educational policies and experiences in New Latino Diaspora locales. This volume provides data on these issues.

The nine substantive chapters in this volume present ethnographic case studies from various New Latino Diaspora locations in order to explore how Diaspora Latinos find themselves constructed by members of the receiving communities and how they assert their identities in

response. Because the authors of the proposed papers variously identify as Anglo, Chicano/a, Latino/a, and/or Mexican national (and differ along other key dimensions as well), the collection of papers presents a polyvocal perspective on the New Latino Diaspora.

The New Latino Diaspora represents a unique socio-historical location. Like most immigrants and many other U.S. Latinos, most New Diaspora Latinos regularly face racism and the burdens of being working class and speaking a minority language. They confront a segmented labor market that they are usually expected to enter only ‘from the bottom’ (Spener, 1988). Unlike the majority of immigrants arriving in the US at the beginning of the 20th century, however, many of the Latino newcomers are coming directly to rural locations that are unaccustomed to outsiders of any type, or that have conceptualized difference only in dichotomous terms into which the newcomers do not readily fit (e.g., White and Black). And in some cases, despite the challenges and obstacles that they face, members of the New Latino Diaspora do not face conditions where anti-Latino discrimination is deeply endemic—because the Latino presence is too new. Because of the unique conditions they face, Diaspora Latinos do not easily fit most models of minority children in school. The chapters in this volume describe both familiar and unfamiliar predicaments and opportunities faced by Diaspora Latinos as they move into rural America outside the Southwest.

Education and Policy

The contributors to this volume focus on institutional settings, like schools, in which Latinos adopt identities and have identities imposed on them. But education and schooling are not seen as fully synonymous here (e.g., Hansen, 1990; Borofsky, 1987). As Levinson and Holland explain:

Anthropologists have long recognized the existence of culturally specific and relative definitions of the educated person. Although the degree to which cultural training is formalized, situated at a remove from the activities for which it is intended, and provided on a mass scale may vary, anthropologists recognize all societies as providing some kind of training and some set of criteria by which members can be identified as more, or less, knowledgeable. Distinct societies, as well as ethnic groups and microcultures within those societies, elaborate the cultural practices by which particular sets of skills, knowledges, and discourses come to define the truly 'educated' person. (1996:2)

In the cases presented here, what knowledge and skill are sought after varies according to one's perspective. Host community members (typically Anglos) and newcomer Latinos often differ in their views of education. Both see schooling as a vehicle for education, and there is some overlap in their goals for schooling (e.g., English literacy skill acquisition, graduation), but there are also some differences. Though few acknowledge it, host community members often distinguish between what constitutes an 'educated' Latino and an 'educated' Anglo. An 'educated' Latino, for instance, may be constructed as one who knows how to work hard and not complain, while an 'educated' Anglo may know how to shape a corporate vision and engineer profitable practices.

Latino newcomers also bring cultural identities, experiences, and ways of knowing to their new locations. Using these, they create models of what knowledges, skills, and dispositions are worthy of respect and have utility. As Villenas shows in her chapter, the resulting construction of what it means to be educated matches neither the construction of 'educated' that was extant in the Mexican city or village, of origin, nor the constructions of 'educated' offered by the new host society.

With their dynamic, hybrid visions of education, Latino newcomers often confront a contradiction in their host communities. On the one hand, they encounter an ideology that values equal treatment and self-determination. On the other hand, the practices through which host communities respond to newcomers often conflict with these values. Some members of host communities overtly denigrate the newcomers and fantasize about returning to a pre-Latino state. But many do not. Even most of these, however, nonetheless participate in educational policies and practices that often label and constrain Latino students.

Borrowing from Levinson and Sutton (in press) and Shore and Wright (1997), we treat policy as more than just formal dictates and resource allocations sent from above. Policy also includes locally created and contested action. Four of Levinson and Sutton's arguments inform this book:

- Policy serves as a legitimating charter for the techniques of administration and as an operating manual for everyday conduct; it is the symbolic expression of normative claims worked into a potentially viable institutional blueprint. Instead of separating them entirely, we examine policy formation and implementation as a dynamic, interrelated process. (p. 2)
- In all the scholarly discourse around policy, there is little evidence of the sociocultural perspective: a locally informed, comparative account of how people make and engage with policy. (p. 6)
- In the processes of policy formation, problems are constructed for solution and thus the needs of individuals and societies become subject to authoritative definition. (p. 17)

- Among public policy arenas, educational policy is unique in its power to determine who has the right to become an ‘educated’ person. (p. 17)

Policies, both formal and improvised, start as the identification of problems. They embed constructions of the *status quo*, beliefs that the *status quo* is inadequate, and theoretical propositions about how specific actions will bring changes. A common element of the sites considered here is that the presence of Latino newcomers was constructed as a *problem*. Once policies are articulated, they start to delimit understandings of how the problem can be solved. Conceptualizing newcomers as problems in particular ways (e.g., *they* need to be Americanized, *they* have deficits which need to be remedied, *they* should be given little support because they are stealing *our* jobs, *they* need to learn English), host communities articulate views of who the Latinos are and what types of treatment they deserve.

Newcomers, too, engage in formal and informal policy formation. They construct views of themselves and Anglos, partly in response to Anglos’ constructions of them. Using Levinson and Sutton’s inclusive construction of the idea of policy, even acts like dropping out or sending ones children back to Latin America to be raised by relatives (e.g., Hagan, 1994; Trueba, 1999) are a type of educational policy. As they explain (in press:5), “Even outright resistance to a policy can be seen as a kind of [appropriated version of policy] insofar as it incorporates a negative image of policy into schemes of action.” The chapters in this volume describe various cases of the interplay between Latino and Anglo construals of “the problem” in New Latino Diaspora sites.

Schooling, the Political Economy, and the Public Sphere

Educational policy at the local level is always challenged by demographic change. In the New Latino Diaspora, these challenges almost always involve local businesses’ “externalization

of indirect costs” (Hackenberg, 1995:238) and the “Latinization of low-wage labor” (Griffith, 1995:129). The businesses that lure newcomer labor to the Latino Diaspora have left it to the existing social service infrastructure—i.e., schools, health care providers, municipal offices, etc.—to negotiate the added costs and complications of serving new populations (González Baker *et al.*, 1999:99). Externalization of indirect costs can cause resentment on the part of service providers, though more often than not those sentiments are directed at the newcomers rather than at the businesses precipitating the changes. Along with this resentment often come overt acts of newcomer exploitation, such as landlords over-pricing substandard housing because of housing shortages and employers’ use of fear to intimidate workers from seeking medical assistance or workman’s compensation for work-related injuries and illness. Most of the chapters describe, or at least hint at, such dynamics across the Latino .Diaspora.

In the case of Latino newcomers, many who speak Spanish as a first and sometimes only language, an immediate is communication. This might mean hiring bilingual paraprofessionals for the school setting. Typically, however, the changes and needed responses are much more profound, extending beyond school sites into the larger community and proving to be much more complex than just a need for language interpreters. San Miguel (1987:xv) has claimed that the acrimonious debates about bilingual education (perceived as accommodation to Latinos) need to be replaced by a focus on schools’ unwillingness or inability to meet the diverse needs of Mexican-descent children.

Latino students, parents, and laborers in the New Latino Diaspora bring to their encounter with established residents beliefs about their own identities, about the identities and beliefs of established residents, and about the political economy in which they are intertwined. Tied to these are cultural beliefs about child rearing, household responsibility, and family values. As Valdés

(1996), Delgado-Gaitan (1990), Vasquez *et al.* (1994), Villenas (this volume) and others have noted, Latino parents frequently have different conceptualizations of parent and school responsibilities than the middle-class Anglos who set most US public school policy. In general, schooling in traditional Latino Diaspora locations has not been responsive to Latinos and has not encouraged Latino parental input into schooling (e.g., San Miguel, 1987:217). Nor have Latino newcomers' skills been consistently appreciated and used as building blocks for subsequent education.

In the Southwest and other areas with higher density of Latinos, there have been important exceptions to the generally inadequate treatment educational institutions have given to Latinos. For example, the Latino parent involvement group described by Delgado-Gaitan (1990) provides newcomer parents an opportunity for authentic input into the schooling of their children. The high schools described by Lucas, *et al.* (1990) and some of the districts described by Dentler and Hafner (1997) are responsive to newcomer Latino student needs. The 'funds of knowledge' work at the University of Arizona (Moll *et al.*, 1992; Gonzalez *et al.*, 1995; Moll and Gonzalez, 1997) has helped educators build on students' existing skills and knowledge. All of these examples could be instructive for educational policies and policy implementation in the New Latino Diaspora, but they have not been adopted so far.

If 'best practices' that lead to high achievement among Latinos are known (e.g., Lucas, 1997; Walqui, 1999), why is it that they are so inconsistently pursued in existing Diaspora locations and New ones? The answers are complex. Shor's (1986) cynical observation that schooling in a capitalist society is 'successful' to the extent that it conveys to students stratified expectations would suggest that schools do not want to remedy inadequacies in the education available to Latino newcomers. A quite different explanation could claim that the problems of any

inadequate current practice are ephemeral, that they will be remedied as soon as educators learn what is needed. Several chapters in this volume do describe how host schools struggled to find resources and knowledge as the process of demographic change unfolded. But this cannot suffice as an explanation. Something also seemed to interfere with educators' efforts to find the best practices noted above, or kept them from feeling that these were viable, in their communities. In many cases this interference came from host community stereotyping of Latinos.

Established residents in New Latino Diaspora locales are influenced by various large-scale projects for and against newcomers. For example, national debates about bilingual education and its purported implications for cultural identity are known to many host community residents, and inform their reactions to newcomers, even though their understanding of bilingual education is generally limited. Concerns about illegal immigration and job displacement also inform some host community responses to newcomers. As Suárez-Orozco summarizes: "Anti-immigrant sentiment—including the jealous rage that 'illegals are getting benefits instead of citizens like my friend'—is intertwined with an unsettling sense of panic in witnessing the metamorphosis of 'home' into a world dominated by sinister aliens" (1998:296-297).

Furthermore, ostensibly sympathetic responses to newcomers often do not lead to more favorable outcomes, because they can be less sympathetic than they first appear.² The pro-immigration script described by Suárez-Orozco (1998) is common in New Latino Diaspora locales (e.g., Hamann 1999). In that script Latino newcomers are constructed as hard-working, loyal, religious, family-oriented and willing to take work no one else wants. The script simultaneously reiterates the mythology of the U.S. being attractive and fair to immigrants, a view espoused by many host community members, and one that rationalizes assimilative projects. But the alleged virtues of immigrants also constrain, as they deny newcomers the prerogative to

complain about working conditions, inadequate housing, and racism at school, and to seek work and opportunities that others *do* want (because to do so would be disloyal and confrontational).

The Perspectives of Newcomers

Informed by the ‘funds of knowledge’ (Moll *et al.*, 1992; Gonzalez *et al.*, 1995, Moll and Gonzalez, 1997) that they bring with them to their new contexts, as well as the habits and experiences of immigrants who have preceded them to the new site (Hagan, 1994), Latino newcomers adopt various beliefs and behaviors once they arrive in New Latino Diaspora communities. They may imagine themselves as part of their new community (Chavez, 1994; Anderson, 1983), or feel detached and tentative, or actively excluded from it. Schools can be key sites for the construction of community identity and inclusion (e.g., Pugach, 1998; Peshkin, 1994; Bissinger, 1991), but they can also be sites that exclude Latino newcomers through the persistence of non-responsive policies and the failure to build on newcomers’ existing funds of knowledge.

Many newcomers resist both the virulent and ‘benevolent’ forms of racism they encounter by affirming their own identities as immigrants or minority group members. (Benevolent racism refers to the policies and practices of those who allege good intentions but whose actions have discriminatory consequences [see the chapters by Villenas and Wortham]. For some newcomers, affirmation of identity involves a rejection of majority values and institutions, i.e., what Ogbu (1987) calls the cultural inversion model. At the school level, many ‘pushed-out’ (Trueba, 1991) Latino students would fit in this category. While rejecting majority values and institutions might be a healthy response to discrimination, with respect to identity development and cultural preservation, such a stance often leaves minority students vulnerable to serious economic and social problems.

Some Latino newcomers manage to affirm their own cultures without overtly rejecting majority values and institutions. Pugach (1998) describes Latina students in a New Mexico bordertown who create Latino model of school success that is nonetheless accepted by the mainstream. In some cases, however, managing to become bicultural means conforming to majority practices in school but affirming immigrant ones at home. This is akin to the strategy pursued by Sikh students in Britain documented by Hall (1995) and the strategy attempted by the Portuguese immigrant students studied by Becker (1990; cf. also Gibson, 1997).

Becker note, however, that newcomers' attempts at situational manipulation of ethnic identity—for example, attempting to have a mainstream rather than immigrant identity at school—were not always recognized by members of non-newcomer groups. Teachers and non-Portuguese students continued to compartmentalize the Portuguese newcomers as immigrants and to articulate negative stereotypes about them. Despite the immigrant students' use of accentless English at school, their imitation of popular clothing styles, and other efforts to reject their stigmatized immigrant identity, they were identified as having limited potential and limited school aspirations. Grady's chapter describes how students' bids for acceptance can vary according to the topic of the class, with art, a subject that embraces self-expression, proving to be more receptive than others. Wortham's chapter describes how gender can influence both the bids for acceptance that are attempted, as well as the way they are received.

Some newcomers react to racism by internalizing negative stereotypes of their home cultures. They try to assimilate to the mainstream culture, using a replacement orientation—with new cultural competencies permitting abandonment of their original culture (e.g., Keefe and Padilla, 1987).

Whatever strategy they adopt, newcomers' identity maintenance and construction projects do not occur in isolation from Anglos' attempts to uphold the 'mainstream' cultural order. The majority often 'racializes' immigrant groups. Historically, this racializing has often meant identifying immigrants as biologically distinct and inferior. But if such overtly racist ideologies have largely lost favor, the social construction of immigrants as less deserving and/or as missing knowledge, lacking skills, and being inferior remains powerful, if tacit. The application of a cultural deficit ideology to Latinos has been criticized in the research literature for at least 30 years (e.g., Carter, 1970; Erickson, 1987; Vasquez, *et al.*, 1994), but according to Valdés (1996) and Valencia (1997) it still remains commonplace among many mainstream educators. In their chapter, Beck and Allexaht-Snyder note that a cultural deficit ideology is consistent with a colonialist ideology, with the colonizer assuming all their attributes are superior to those of the colonized. In accordance with the racializing process and the promulgation of cultural deficit ideologies, members of the mainstream, individually and through the institutions they lead, often exclude newcomers from positions of power in the workplace, the community, and the schools.

As migration streams feeding Diaspora locations mature (Massey *et al.*, 1987; Tienda, 1989), newcomers attracted by employment often settle in and bring their families to Diaspora locations without feeling attached to their new location (Anderson, 1983; Chavez, 1994). Political involvement and residential stability are more likely if newcomers imagine themselves as part of their new community, but that is difficult to accomplish and often resisted by local Anglos. Limited housing options, financial vulnerability, and (for some) the risk of deportation all contribute to residential mobility.

Meier and Stewart (1991) have found that Latino students' performance at school correlates with the community political power of Latinos and with Latinos' presence as instructors

and administrators. The implications of this finding for New Latino Diaspora locations are dramatic, as newness to community, lack of citizenship, and other factors inhibit Latino newcomers' political participation. Because of Latinos' recent arrival in the region and their lack of political power, nearby teacher-training institutions usually have developed few Latino-oriented recruiting initiatives and student support networks. This limits the regional supply of Latino educators and helps perpetuate the dynamic described by Meier and Stewart

Unlike past generations of immigrants, members of the New Latino Diaspora are often close enough to home and connected enough to robust transnational labor movements that it is easy for them to retain strong ties to their home countries (Hagan, 1994). Guerra (1998) even suggests that many Latinos now live in 'transnational communities'—communities that cannot be adequately defined using a single geographic reference, or even a single nation. In the case of Mexican newcomers, lingering sending-community ties are facilitated by the Mexican government's formal attempts to remain salient to expatriates through programs like *Mexicanos en el Extranjero* (Mendez Lugo, 1997; Goldring, 1998). Those in migrant sending communities who depend on financial remittances also have a stake in keeping newcomers connected to their sending communities.

The circumstances of displacement from sending communities, the use of geographically diverse family and fictive kin networks as an economic risk-minimization strategy (Stark, 1991), and the uncertainty of economic and cultural opportunities in the receiving community further explain enduring ties to home communities (Ainslie, 1999, Gutiérrez, 1999). Such ties can influence newcomers' educational aspirations and can compel natives of host communities to construct the newcomer population as temporary and in need of only minimal help. Thus a final

dilemma faced by Latino newcomers in the New Latino Diaspora is the ambiguity of whether they are migrants or immigrants, an ambiguity that many newcomers themselves express.

The Chapters

The chapters in this book examine the construction of cultural identity in the New Latino Diaspora by examining educational policymaking, interpretation, and implementation. We focus on education in a broad sense—including not just school practice and school district management, but also popular education, grassroots efforts, and the informal learning that comes from reading newspapers and participating in the public sphere. The chapters vary in their primary focus, with some considering gender, some focusing on families and households, others on K – 12 schools, others on school districts and state departments of education, and still others on formal and informal public community life.

We use ethnography to focus on day-to-day inter-ethnic interaction and to describe host community members' construction of a Latino 'Other' (and Latinos' contributions to and resistance against this construction). Using such ethnographic descriptions, the chapters illuminate how policy mandates have consequences for Latinos and non-Latinos at the local level. The chapters describe the local processes by which official and *de facto* policies are created and responded to. Thus these chapters provide a basis for what Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba (1991) refer to as the ethnography of empowerment, where ethnographic data becomes the rationale for the reform of policy and practice.

The chapters differ on a number of dimensions, among them authors' identities. While all of the authors are now affiliated with institutes of higher education, several had other affiliations when they carried out their fieldwork or gained entry to the field sites. Beck worked for Georgia's

Migrant Education program; Martinez assisted with a school district's Title VII grant; Brunn helped a school district create a language policy for newcomers; Zuñiga, Hernández, Shaddock, and Villareal all worked for the Mexican university partner that offered a range of services to two Georgia school districts; and Hamann made his first foray into his research site as a Title VII grant-writer.

Geography is another source of difference among the chapters. Three of the papers look at Georgia, two at North Carolina, one at northern New England, two at the rural Midwest, and one at the Rocky Mountains. Yet geography is also a source of similarity, as all the studies except Beck and Alleksaht-Snider's describe rural locations (their study describes a state department of education so it does not have fixed site). The largest site described in this volume is a city of 25,000.

The economies of the communities studied are superficially different, with Latino newcomers attracted to work opportunities in the resort industry in the Rockies, meat-packing in Illinois, Indiana, New England, and North Carolina, and a diversity of industries in Georgia, most notably carpet mills. Yet the economic niches in each of these sites are similar: the work is tedious, hazardous, and low-paying. An insufficient number of established community members are willing to take such work, so the work becomes ethnically-typed or marked (Tienda, 1989) with the collective identity of the Latino newcomers tied to the low-status occupations most hold.

Deriving policy recommendations from her ethnographic work with Latino parents, Villenas describes Latina mothers' confusion and frustration with the public schools their children were attending, including the mismatch between values and ideologies at home versus at school. She describes how Latina mothers' views of parenting are changing, but through innovation and

not assimilation. Her chapter then sketches how school policies and practices would need to change to be more accommodating to Latino parents and students.

Beck and Allexaht-Snider describe the Georgia Department of Education's statewide response to the growing presence of Latino newcomers in Georgia. Their chapter draws on Beck's five years of work with the federally-funded but state-administered Georgia Migrant Education program, to give an account of how political changes in the Georgia Department of Education undermined many Latino students' chances at a full education.

The next two chapters describe a partnership between two Northwest Georgia school districts and a private university in Mexico, from very different perspectives. Edmund Hamann investigates the 'window of policy-making opportunity' that opened when one of the Georgia districts conceded it was not sure how to respond to rapid demographic change. He describes how a binational partnership was created between the school district and a Mexican university. Hamann describes 'alternative policymaking moments', when stakeholders who usually are not positioned to influence schooling on a large scale suddenly have the chance to be policymakers.

Victor Zuñiga, Ruben Hernandez, Marioly Villareal, and Janna Shaddock-Hernandez describe their experiences as Mexico-based university professors who were asked to help two Georgia school districts create educational policies for Latino newcomers. Their chapter chronicles their successes and struggles in facilitating a public forum for Latino newcomer families, so that those families could more readily represent their needs and interests to school personnel. Their paper also considers the prospect of Mexican universities assisting U.S. school districts in general, and in the Latino Diaspora in particular.

Wortham's contribution is the only one set in northern New England. After noting the frequent disparity between the individualistic orientation of most American schooling and the

household/familial orientation of most Latino newcomers site, Wortham considers the different ways male and female Latino/a adolescents construct personal identities and how these different gendered identities affect those students' school success. U.S. school policy and practice seem to provide a liberating opportunity for many Latinas in Wortham's study, but it seems to limit the horizons of Latino males.

Martinez describes an atypical New Latino Diaspora site, one that is located in a state that has long been host to Latinos (Colorado), but in a community that has not. He describes some educators' attempt to implement an 'ideal' transitional bilingual education program. In this case, district policies and unforeseen circumstances led to a less than ideal program that had negative educational consequences for the Latino newcomers. His chapter illustrates well how the community context that Latino newcomers confront enables the creation of a separate and inadequate school experience for newcomer children.

Based on her ethnographic research with Latino immigrant students at a high school in rural Indiana, Grady describes how these students resisted the official assimilationist curriculum by acquiring an alternative text on "Lowrider Arte" (a magazine of art inspired by the long-time Chicano tradition of customizing 'low-rider' automobiles, one that affirms a Chicano aesthetic). She then describes how this resistance was validated by the school when a mainstream art teacher embraced students' involvement with lowrider art.

Brunn describes his experiences facilitating a rural Illinois district's attempt to develop a language policy. His account of how Latino parents and students were integrated into a formal policy development process, and of the resistance put up by some educators who were skeptical of its recommendations, illustrate both the challenge and the promise of inclusive policy formation in the New Latino Diaspora.

Enrique Murillo's chapter returns to several of the themes broached in this introduction—particularly the role of racialized political economy—by looking at the virulently anti-immigrant construction of Latino newcomers in a North Carolina community where immigrants' only accepted identity was as labor. Murillo then describes how the local poultry-industry's quest to remain 'globally competitive' and its dependence on immigrant labor for work 'no one else wants' has dehumanized Latinos in this town. His conclusions draw together and contextualize many findings from the preceding chapters.

The volume ends with a summative chapter prepared by Margaret Gibson.

Endnotes

1. The term Latino can be defined expansively to include anyone of descent or origin from territories under the neo-colonial (and sometimes overtly colonial) yoke of the Monroe Doctrine (Hayes-Bautista and Chapa, 1987)—i.e., nearly all of Latin America and the Caribbean. That is the definition we use here. However, most members of the New Latino Diaspora were born in or trace their origins to Mexico and Central America. Newcomers from Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and South America seem mostly to be heading to locales with long-established Latino populations—e.g., Miami and New York—though there are exceptions to this trend (e.g., Dominican immigrants in Rhode Island, Colombians in Georgia).

2. Prevalent as patronizing, colonial, and ultimately racist viewpoints may be, however, we must clarify that established members of host communities can act with grace and sincerity toward Latino newcomers. There are those who accept and promote an “additive view of acculturation” (Gibson, 1997: 441) and who thereby ameliorate the social and economic burdens of being a Latino newcomer without trying to convert or condescend toward the newcomer community. It is just that the pool of those who *do* well by newcomers is smaller than those who *mean* well.

References

Ainslie, Ricardo C.

1999 Cultural Mourning, Immigration, and Engagement: Vignettes from the Mexican Experience. *In Crossings: Mexican Immigration in Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco, ed. Pp. 283-300. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies.

Anderson, Benedict

1983 *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Growth and Spread of Nationalism*. New York: Verso.

Becker, Adeline

1990 The Role of School in the Maintenance and Change of Ethnic Group Affiliation. *Human Organization*. 49(1):48-55.

Bissinger, H.G.

1991 *Friday Night Lights: A Town, a Team, and a Dream*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Borofsky, Robert

1987 *Making History: Pukapukan and Anthropological Constructions of Knowledge*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Carter, Thomas P.

1970 *Mexican Americans in School: A History of Educational Neglect*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board.

Chavez, Leo R.

1994 *The Power of the Imagined Community: The Settlement of Undocumented*

Mexicans and Central Americans in the United States. *American Anthropologist*.
96(1):52-73.

Delgado-Gaitan, Concha

1990 *Literacy for Empowerment: The Role of Parents in Children's Education*.
London: Falmer Press.

Delgado-Gaitan, Concha and Henry Trueba

1991 *Crossing Cultural Borders: Education for Immigrant Families in America*.
London: Falmer Press.

Dentler, Robert A. and Anne L. Hafner

1997 *Hosting Newcomers: Structuring Educational Opportunities for Immigrant
Children*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Erickson, Frederick

1987 *Transformation and School Success: The Politics and Culture of Educational
Achievement*. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 18(4):335-356.

Foley, Douglas E.

1990 *Learning Capitalist Culture: Deep in the Heart of Tejas*. Philadelphia, PA:
University of Pennsylvania Press.

Gibson, Margaret A.

1997 *Complicating the Immigrant/Involuntary Minority Typology*. *Anthropology &
Education Quarterly*. 28(3):431-454.

Goldring, Luin

1998 *The Power of Status in Transnational Social Fields*. *In Transnationalism From
Below*. Michael Peter Smith and Luis Eduardo Guarnizo, eds. Pp. 165-195.

New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Gonzalez, Norma, Luis C. Moll, Martha Floyd Tenery, Anna Rivera, Patricia Rendon, Raquel Gonzales, and Cathy Amanti

1995 Funds of Knowledge for Teaching in Latino Households. *Urban Education*. 29(4):443-470.

González Baker, Susan, Frank D. Bean, Augustin Escobar Latapi, and Sidney Weintraub

1999 U.S. Immigration Policies and Trends: The Growing Importance of Migration from Mexico. *In Crossings: Mexican Immigration in Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco, ed. Pp. 81-105. Cambridge: Harvard University, David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies.

Goode, Judith G., Jo Anne Schneider, and Suzanne Blanc

1992 Transcending Boundaries and Closing Ranks: How Schools Shape Interrelations. *In Structuring Diversity: Ethnographic Perspectives on the New Immigration*. Louise Lamphere, ed. Pp. 173-213. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Grey, Mark A.

1991 The Context for Marginal Secondary ESL Programs: Contributing Factors and The Need for Further Research. *The Journal of Educational Issues of Language Minority Students* 9:75-89.

Griffith, David

1995 *Hay Trabajo: Poultry Processing, Rural Industrialization, and the Latinization of Low-Wage Labor*. *In Any Way You Cut It: Meat-Processing and Small-town America*. Donald D. Stull, Michael J. Broadway, and David Griffith, eds. Pp. 129-

151. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Guerra, Juan C.

1998 *Close to Home: Oral and Literate Practices in a Transnational Mexicano Community.*

New York: Teachers College Press.

Gutiérrez, David G.

1999 Ethnic Mexicans and the Transformation of “American” Social Space:

Reflections on Recent History. *In Crossings: Mexican Immigration in*

Interdisciplinary Perspective. Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco, ed. Pp. 309-335. Cambridge,

MA: Harvard University, David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies.

Hackenberg, Robert A.

1995 Joe Hill Died For Your Sins. *In Any Way You Cut It: Meat-Processing and*

Small-town America. Donald D. Stull, Michael J. Broadway, and David Griffith,

eds. Pp. 232-264. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Hagan, Jaqueline María

1994 *Deciding to Be Legal: A Maya Community in Houston.* Philadelphia: Temple

University Press.

Hall, Kathleen

1995 “There’s a Time to Act English and a Time to Act Indian”: The Politics of

Identity Among British-Sikh Teenagers. *In Children and the Politics of Culture.*

Sharon Stephens, ed. Pp. 243-264. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hamann, Edmund T.

1999 *Anglo (Mis)Understandings of Latino Newcomers: A North Georgia Case Study.*

In Negotiating Power and Place at the Margins: Selected Papers on Refugees and

Immigrants, Vol. VII. Juliene Lipson and Lucia Ann McSpadden, eds. Pp. 156-197.
Washington, DC: American Anthropological Association.

Hansen, Judith Friedman

1990 [1979] Sociocultural Perspectives on Human Learning. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Hayes-Bautista, David E. and Jorge Chapa

1991 Latino Terminology: Conceptual Basis for Standardized Terminology. American Journal of Public Health. 77:61-68.

Keefe, Susan E. and Amado M. Padilla,

1987 Chicano Ethnicity. Albuquerque, NM: University of New Mexico Press.

Lamphere, Louise

1992 Introduction: The Shaping of Diversity. *In Structuring Diversity: Ethnographic Perspectives on the New Immigration*. Louise Lamphere, ed. Pp. 1-34.
Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lamphere, Louise, Alex Stepick, and Guillermo Grenier, eds.

1994 Newcomers in the Workplace: Immigrants and the Restructuring of the U. S. Economy. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Levinson, Bradley A. and Dorothy Holland

1996 The Cultural Production of the Educated Person: An Introduction. *In The Cultural Production of the Educated Person: Critical Ethnographies of Schooling and Local Practice*. Bradley A. Levinson, Douglas E. Foley, and Dorothy C. Holland, eds. Pp. 1-54.
Albany: State University of New York Press.

Levinson, Bradley A. and Margaret Sutton

In press Policy as/in Practice: Developing a Sociocultural Approach to the Study of Educational Policy. *In Policy as Practice: Toward a Comparative Sociocultural Analysis of Educational Policy*. Ablex Press.

Lucas, Tamara

1997 Into, Through, and Beyond Secondary School: Critical Transitions for Immigrant Youths. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Lucas, Tamara, Rosemary Henze, and Ruben Donato

1990 Promoting the Success of Latino Language-Minority Students: An Exploratory Study of Six High Schools. *Harvard Education Review*. 60(3):315-340.

Massey, Douglas S., Rafael Alarcón, Jorge Durand, and Humberto González,

1987 Return to Aztlán: The Social Process of International Migration from Western Mexico. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Meier, Kenneth J. and Joseph Stewart, Jr.

1991 The Politics of Hispanic Education: *Un Paso Pa'lante y Dos Pa'tras*. Albany: State University Press of New York.

Mendez Lugo, Bernardo

1997 El Migrante Mexican en EU: De Actor Local a Actor Global. *Mexico and the World* 6(Sept. 97). (<http://www.netside.net/mexworld/Issue6/Art2/lugo.html>).

Moll, Luis C., Cathy Amanti, Deborah Neff, and Norma Gonzalez

1992 Funds of Knowledge for Teaching: Using a Qualitative Approach to Connect Homes and Classrooms. *Theory Into Practice*. 31(1):132-141.

Moll, Luis C. and Norma Gonzalez

1997 Teachers as Social Scientists: Learning About Culture from Household

Research. *In Race, Ethnicity, and Multiculturalism: Policy and Practice*. Peter M. Hall, ed.
Pp. 89-114. New York: Garland Press.

Murillo, Jr., Enrique and Sofia Villenas

1995 *East of Aztlan: Typologies of Resistance in North Carolina Communities*.
Unpublished paper, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

Ogbu, John U.

1987 Variability in Minority School Performance: A Problem in Search of An
Explanation. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly* 18(4):312-334.

Peshkin, Alan

1994 [1978] *Growing Up American: Schooling and the Survival of Community*.
Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Pugach, Marleen C.

1998 *On the Border of Opportunity: Education, Community, and Language at the
U.S. — Mexico Line*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Romo, Harriet D., and Toni Falbo

1996 *Latino High School Graduation: Defying the Odds*. Austin: University of Texas
Press.

San Miguel, Guadalupe

1987 "Let Them All Take Heed" Mexican Americans and the Campaign for
Educational Equality in Texas, 1910-1981. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Shor, Ira

1986 *Culture Wars: School and Society in the Conservative Restoration, 1969-84*. Boston:
Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Shore, Cris and Susan Wright, eds.

1997 *Anthropology of Policy: Critical Perspectives on Governance and Power*. London: Routledge.

Spener, David

1988 *Transitional Bilingual Education and the Socialization of Immigrants*.
Harvard Educational Review 58(2):133-153.

Stark, Oded

1991 *The Migration of Labor*. Cambridge: Basil Blackwell.

Suárez-Orozco, Carola and Marcelo Suárez-Orozco

1995 *Transformations: Migration, Family Life, and Achievement Motivation Among Latino Adolescents*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Suárez-Orozco, Marcelo M.

1998 *State Terrors: Immigrants and Refugees in the Post-National Space*. *In* *Ethnic Identity and Power: Cultural Contexts of Political Action in School and Society*. Yali Zou and Enrique T. Trueba, eds. Pp. 283-319. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Tienda, Marta

1989 *Looking to the 1990s: Mexican Immigration in Sociological Perspective*. *In* *Mexican Migration to the United States: Origins, Consequences, and Policy Options*. Wayne A. Cornelius and Jorge A. Bustamante, eds. Pp. 109-147. San Diego, CA: Center for U.S./Mexican Studies, University of California.

Trueba, Henry T.

1991 From Failure to Success: The Roles of Culture and Cultural Conflict in the Academic Achievement of Chicano Students. *In Chicano School Failure and Success: Research and Policy Agendas for the 1990s*. Richard R. Valencia, ed. Pp. 151-163. London: Falmer Press.

1999 The Education of Mexican Immigrant Children. *In Crossings: Mexican Immigration in Interdisciplinary Perspective*. Marcelo M. Suárez-Orozco, ed. Pp. 253-275. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, David Rockefeller Center for Latin American Studies.

Valdés, Guadalupe

1996 *Con Respeto: Bridging the Distances Between Culturally Diverse Families and Schools, An Ethnographic Portrait*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Valencia, Richard R., ed.

1997 *The Evolution of Deficit Thinking: Educational Thought and Practice*. London: Falmer Press.

Vasquez, Olga, Lucinda Pease-Alvarez, and Sheila M. Shannon

1994 *Pushing Boundaries: Language and Culture in a Mexicano Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Villenas, Sofia

1997 *Una Buena Educación: Latino Education and Cultural Conflict in North Carolina*. Paper Presentation. American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting. Washington, DC.

Walqui, Aída

1999 *Access and Engagement: Program Design and Instructional Approaches for Immigrant Students in Secondary School*. Washington: Center for Applied

Linguistics.

Wortham, Stanton

1997 The Unintended Tracking of Latino Schoolchildren in Rural New England.

Paper Presentation. American Anthropological Association Annual Meeting.

Washington, DC.