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ABSTRACT

This paper examines immigrant people’s relationship with U.S. education. It seeks to identify cultural and intellectual resources of immigrant families. It surveys their needs and educational expectations. Also, it explores how culturally limited teachers can adapt classroom practices to support students of diverse backgrounds. An examination of the history of immigrant education revealed that, despite periodic protests calling for multicultural and multilingual representation, the U.S. government used/s schooling to reproduce Western and, more precisely, Anglo Protestant culture and norms. Today’s policy continues in step with Anglo tradition, as English language learning comprises U.S. education’s top priority for immigrant students. A critical review of the literature revealed multiple themes. First, immigrant families and students carried high educational expectations regardless of socioeconomic resources. Immigrant parents generally expected their children to succeed in the culture of school while remaining loyal to their cultural heritage and first languages. This two-sided expectation created conflicts for some immigrant students who became more adapted to U.S. norms than their parents. Second, multiple studies found that immigrant parents experienced a disconnected relationship with their children’s schools. Obstacles to their involvement included: lack of English literacy, little experience with formal schooling, and lack of institutional knowledge. Third, multiple studies identified cultural and intellectual resources of households in which immigrant children participate. These studies proposed cultural adaptations for educators and their classrooms. Last, this literature review suggests that immigrant students’ engagement in school depends on an open climate where their backgrounds can be acknowledged.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Rationale

Schooling in the United States originated within Anglo-Protestant culture (Spring, 2008). Today, U.S. public education continues to function as a mainstream institution that purportedly favors Anglo American learners (Delpit, 2006). That said, how does Anglo-centered education affect the voluntary and involuntary immigrant peoples that comprise so much of our nation’s population? These people evolved different lenses on the world, different epistemologies, and unique ways to think and speak and view the world. How do these people experience U.S. public schooling?

Public education expects immigrant students to learn the culture of school, which is correspondingly the culture of power. The culture of school is not all bad. In fact, many voluntary immigrants relocate to the United States so that their kids can attend better schools, learn English, and gain greater opportunity (Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba, 1991). Furthermore, skills taught in school are skills needed to go to college and get high paying jobs.

However, many immigrant students do not succeed in school. Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba (1991) believed that low-achieving immigrant students are disadvantaged by an education system that blames their failure solely on socioeconomic conditions. These authors observed teachers of Mexican immigrant students, whose Anglo-centered vision prevented them from detecting the gifts of their students, “teachers are not prepared for the challenges of teaching children, who from their perspective seem to be failures, when in fact these children possess a wealth of knowledge and skills which can be harnessed
and transformed into creative ideas” (p.136). Students possess multiple intelligences that teachers can tap to connect with students. Yet often these intelligences are overlooked.

Another problem for some immigrant students arises out of U.S. education’s goal to develop autonomous and independent learners. Autonomy and individuality is a Western ideal that conflicts with cultures that value collective orientations (Rogoff, 2003). Many classroom and homework activities require students to work alone. For students whose families and cultures endorse collective social orientations, school’s independent-minded direction creates discontinuities. Making the transition from a family life of social interaction to a school life of independent solitary thought and reflection can strain a student emotionally. Richard Rodriguez’ (1983) autobiography depicted a vivid example of conflicting interests between school and home culture. He described his own emotional struggles when he transformed from a Mexican American boy who knew only the love and intimacy of his family to a dedicated student of a school environment that enforced English speaking and solitary study. His life changed drastically and he accepted his life of independent study as inevitable, an unavoidable prerequisite to success in American life. Rodriguez’ family changed their lives for his success in school and at his teacher’s request they began speaking English at home.

However, Rodriguez’ conversion to what he called a scholarship boy, who retained information like a sponge and had nothing original to say, was not entirely respected by his family and Mexican community. His parents and family friends placed on him a double standard. They placed on him the responsibility to maintain fluency in his Mexican culture and language while at the same time succeeding in school. The
longer Rodriguez spent in school the more he became interested in books and learning, but also the more he lost his connection to Mexican culture and language.

Immigrant students experience conflicting pressures from all sides as they cross borders between home and school. Yet schools could lessen conflicts by learning to accommodate immigrant students to a greater extent. Often it seems that schools assume the existence of a static culture, a superior one that all students should assimilate into. School, in a different sense, is a place where nation formation occurs. It is a place where immigrant students’ life experience and customs could be fodder for the enrichment of all students. In a dynamic perspective, nations are ideologically constructed and reconstructed over time to create belonging for new groups of people. This may be an unavoidable evolution, which occurs with or without the help of schools. However, for what purpose should U.S. public schools work against the tides?

Description of Controversies

Bilingual education is a good place to start this discussion, because language is closely related to culture, and the debate is whether or not U.S. public schools should reflect multiple cultures in curriculum and content. Everyone does not view bilingual education positively. Even some English as a Second Language speakers think its disadvantages, in terms of social justice, outweigh its benefits. Rodriguez (1983), a second-generation Mexican American writer, viewed bilingual education as a setback for immigrant students trying to become part of the whole nation. The problem is that classifying people, or identifying their difference can perpetuate their position as other. Being other could be okay, but when your language and culture is connected to generational poverty, unequal rights, and negative stereotypes, it may be more trouble
than it is worth for some ESL immigrant students who would rather blend into their surroundings than be classified for their otherness.

However, there are other views on bilingual education that sit on the side of preserving culture through language. For writer and professor bell hooks (1994) language is a powerful tool deeply rooted in ones’ identity. Identity development through language is not just for individuals, but for groups of people, who make up communities. By sharing a common language rooted in their native culture, communities gain solidarity, support networks, and secure greater rights and resources for their families’ needs.

However, U.S. schooling largely assumes the primacy of Standard English. Command of Standard English is needed to assert ones’ self or cultural group in society. In other words, without command of this global language, students will be denied many opportunities in life. For Rodriguez (1983), greater opportunities are worth the sacrifice of non-acknowledgement of native languages in the classroom. According to him, immigrant peoples will continue to be oppressed if they cannot function in the culture of power. For hooks (1994) languages are sacred and provide a renewable source of personal power and growth. In her view, the repression of ones’ native language is also the repression of historical foundations and truths. She asserted colonialists have used Standard English as a weapon in the past,

Standard English is not the speech of exile. It is the language of conquest and domination; in the United States, it is the mask which hides the loss of so many tongues, all those sounds of diverse, native communities we will never hear, the
speech of the Gullah, Yiddish, and so many other unremembered tongues (hooks, 1994, p.168).

Standard English may be sufficient for commerce, but it does not have the ability to express all the ways of knowing of the world’s people. Diversity in thought may prove to be crucial as diversity in ecosystems as we move into the future and confront environmental and social change. Western thought may need to look to alternative epistemologies in order to veer onto a less destructive path. hooks’ (1994) encouraged teachers to open space in their classrooms for expression of students’ native languages or vernaculars of English. She respects her students’ unique, essential way of knowing and believes that this can come about only through access to the language of their culture.

In a similar vein, content and structure of U.S. public schooling favors students accustomed to white middle class norms (Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1991). For example, highly educated white men from Europe and North America developed the notion of intelligence upheld by U.S. education (Rogoff, 2003). Federal government requires that intelligence exams be administered to all public school students and their scores returned to federal offices in order to monitor schools’ and teachers’ loyalty to what the nation state holds to be best practices and best intelligence. Yet not all schools and classrooms are populated by white middle class students, and not all kinds of work in the world depends on academic intelligence. It is not uncommon for classrooms to be composed of nearly all Spanish language speakers (Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba, 1991). With a class make-up like this, does it make sense for teachers to continue enforcing white middle class ideologies?
John Dewey (1938/1997) stressed that classroom learning depends on a curriculum that is anchored in students’ prior experience and knowledge. Many educational anthropologists have conducted studies that seek out “funds of knowledge” of immigrant students and families, with the goal of transferring this knowledge to classroom teachers so that they can better connect with the life experience of their immigrant students. Similar to hooks’ (1994) assertion that languages are connected to alternative ways of knowing, these ethnographers believe that immigrant students and families contain intelligences that are not immediately visible to many educators in U.S. schools. They believe that teachers should actively tap into their students’ gifts and funds of knowledge of which they bring to the classroom through their life experience and cultural heritage (González et al., 1993). For example, most middle class children in the U.S. miss the opportunity to work alongside their parents to accomplish tasks, and so miss out on knowledge of the adult world. Rogoff (2003) stated that, rather than working with their children on real tasks, middle class European American parents create “specialized situations to prepare children for later entry in mature activities” (p.140). Mexican immigrant parents, on the other hand, commonly engage their children in household tasks and responsibilities, in which they learn important skills and contribute to the upkeep of the household (Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba, 1991). However, the structure and norms of schooling “is usually organized to keep children away from adult settings and to “prepare” them to enter mature roles by giving them nonproductive, specialized exercises” (Rogoff, 2003, p.140). This classroom dynamic of skills and drills to prepare students for the adult world may not make complete sense for students accustomed to making real contributions to their families. The question in this case
becomes how to make a classroom alive with relevant and essential learning? This is a question, that if put into practice, could benefit all students.

Students, who are members of the dominant Anglo American culture, often assume the supremacy of their way of life. With layers upon layers of bureaucratic back-up that reinforce the existing social structure, members of the dominant class have to exert almost no effort whatsoever to maintain their privileged position within society (Apple, 1993). However, we could also consider that majority-group students have “been miseducated to the extent that they have only been exposed to majority discourses” (Nieto, 1999, p.xix). Efforts for a national curriculum surged forth in the last few decades in the U.S., in competition with similar efforts in Japan and England (Apple, 1993). The national curriculum assumes the primacy of a knowledge base built largely on Western ideals. Advocates for an official knowledge in the U.S. see it as a way to support social cohesion, national identity, and the ability to measure all students’ achievement objectively. However, antagonists do not see objectivity in a national curriculum at all. Apple (1993) quoted Johnson (1991) to help falsify this notion of objectivity,

This nostalgia for "cohesion" is interesting, but the great delusion is that all pupils—black and white, working class, poor, and middle-class, boys and girls—will receive the curriculum in the same way. Actually, it will be read in different ways, according to how pupils are placed in social relationships and culture. A common curriculum, in a heterogeneous society, is not a recipe for "cohesion," but for resistance and the renewal of divisions. Since it always rests on cultural foundations of its own, it will put pupils in their places, not according to “ability,”
but according to how their cultural communities rank along the criteria taken as the “standard.” A curriculum which does not “explain itself,” is not ironical or self-critical, will always have this effect. (p. 79-80)

Apple (1993) insisted that social justice will come about only with a subjective curriculum rather than an objective one. By subjective, Apple (1993) meant that curriculum used in schools should be critically examined by teacher and student alike to identify its “roots in the culture, history, and social interests out of which it arose” (p.232). In this view, social cohesion can only happen through the acknowledgement of differences and inequalities in society. If the federal government mandates that public schools need to focus on the teaching of official knowledge, then it follows that students from outside the culture of power will score lower on standardized examinations than students from the culture of power. Schools and neighborhoods are still unofficially segregated in many parts of the U.S., financially, racially, and ethnically. And for multiple reasons, underprivileged schools’ average test scores are lower than schools composed of privileged classes, which provides reason for greater federal involvement (Apple, 1993). The federal government, then, seeing that test scores are drastically low, offers the school funding with the requirement that they purchase curriculum from specified providers that is largely limited to official knowledge with narrow room for creativity, inventiveness, and subjectivity of teachers and students.

Under the premise of multicultural education, some educators advocate that teachers create space in their classrooms so that students can take on the role of teacher and so the teacher can learn about their students (Nieto, 1999). This means giving students the stage to communicate their values, interests, life stories and culture. Igoa
(1995), an elementary ESL teacher, saw this space as a vital need of her immigrant students. Igoa encouraged her newly immigrated elementary students to produce cartoon filmstrips in which they depicted scenes in their life. This activity provided students with opportunities to share their lives with their new school community, and in this way began to develop a personal relationship with their new country. Igoa believed this activity to be a prerequisite to their ability to concentrate on learning and adapting to the dominant culture. She asserted that they needed to be accepted for who they were first.

Teacher and writer Lisa Delpit (2006), although a strong advocate of student-centered education, warned about overlooking the importance of teaching skills of the culture of power. Delpit (2006), freshly out of college, was excited to get into the public schools and teach her students the exciting new progressive literacy pedagogies she had learned. The pedagogies gave supreme importance to teaching language fluency before grammatical skills. After months of teaching her dominantly African American class using this holistic approach to literacy instruction, Delpit (2006) began to see that her students were not progressing as she had expected. Through talking with experienced African American teachers at her school, she began to realize that fluency-first literacy education may not be practical for all students. It had not occurred to her before that her African American students were already very fluent with their lively vernacular of English, and generally more fluent, vocal, and descriptive than her white students. What they lacked, however, were the skills to put pencil to paper and communicate their ideas to the culture of power in a grammatically acceptable way.

Delpit (2006) stressed the necessity of minority students’ literacy in the culture of power, however only in order to secure greater rights and cultural legitimacy in society.
She spoke highly of a Native Alaskan teacher who explicitly taught her Native Alaskan students standard English in a creative way. The teacher conducted Anglo education and told her students repeatedly that they needed to learn these skills of the dominant culture so that they could get into colleges and have greater opportunity. The students and teacher would sit around a formal dining table and try to imitate the Standard English dialect and propriety of Anglo Americans. They dissected texts and analyzed the formula of Standard English, then try to reproduce it in their own writing. They compared the relative conciseness of their own culture’s language to the wordiness of standard book English. By approaching official knowledge in this comparative manner, the teacher subjectified it, as Apple (1993) advocated, and acknowledged that standard English is just another language and culture, not the only.

However, many Americans take pride in the cultural heritage of this nation and believe public schools should reproduce a similar reverence. Arthur Schlesinger Jr., a prominent author of U.S. history textbooks, purported that multiculturalism in school curriculums would cause divisions that would weaken the nation. He declared,

Our task is to combine due appreciation of the splendid diversity of the nation with due emphasis on the great unifying Western ideas of individual freedom, political democracy, and human rights. These are the ideas that define American nationality—and that today empower people of all continents, races, and creeds” (Schlesinger, Jr., 1998, p. 147).

Further, Schlesinger believed that school curriculums should remain centered around core Anglo Protestant values, and likened these values to a glue that allows an extremely diverse population to live together.
Americans that identify passionately with mainstream American culture become repulsed by the idea to teach other nations’ histories in school. Why should their children’s’ education be affected by immigrants who voluntarily move to this country? Shouldn’t immigrants adapt to this country’s values and norms? Wouldn’t Mexican schools continue teaching their traditional way if Americans moved there?

Others believe that the reproduction of U.S. nationalism is not appropriate given our international demographics. The U.S. has its fingers in too many international pies, so to say, for schools to ignore international curriculum. Rather, a curriculum of comparative international history and ideas could open all students’ eyes, more appropriately, to the global world that they have inherited. Writer and performance artist Guillermo Gómez-Peña (1993) builds his creative work around border issues, cross-cultural identity, and U.S./Latino cultural relations. In 1991, as the world neared the 400th year anniversary of Columbus Day, he had this to say,

For the moment, a major issue is haunting our consciousness: the need to demystify the quin-centennial “celebration” of the alleged discovery of America, a blatant euphemism for the genocide that made “America” into the United States and Latin America into a subsidiary of Europe. It is my hope that 1992 will mark the end of many unnecessary bi-national pilgrimages and the beginning of a new society beyond Columbus, one in which Europeans and North Americans will no longer be our managers, bankers, law enforcers, and landowners, but our trustworthy partners (p.33).

Gómez-Peña (1993) advocated for an honest dialogue between people of all cultures to see what kind of new and possibly synergistic ideas and forms develop through cultural
hybridization. Should the youth whose ancestors were “conquered peoples” or “discovered peoples” be expected to celebrate the work of Columbus, or esteem modern United States foreign policy? What if the students are from nations that the U.S. military currently drops bombs on? What should Mexican American students think about the method in which the U.S. acquired California from Mexico?

Palestinian youth described at one U.S. high school have experienced antagonism from other students and teachers since 9-11 (El-Haj, 2007). These transnational students wish that Palestine could gain nationhood so that they could return to their homeland. First and foremost they identify being Palestinians, and secondly Americans. They all are thankful for their U.S. citizenship, which allows greater standards of living, freedoms, and ability to cross borders. However, they do not agree with U.S. foreign policy, and have spoken out at their high school, which promoted war in its school newspaper and facilitated war fundraising events. El-Haj found evidence in her interview with these Palestinian youth that the U.S. is past the point of realizing its ideal of one national identity. With so many different beliefs represented in the U.S., it does not make sense for public schooling to assume a stance that strives for a unification of beliefs and ideas. Instead, education for democratic citizenship should “be increasingly connected to civil, social, cultural, and political rights that afford people the possibility of participating effectively in society” (El-Haj, 2007, p.296). The problem is not that these students are lacking the willingness to participate in society; the problem is the dominant society is not willing to accommodate that conversation. The Palestinian immigrant population reserves the right to be loyal to their homeland. However, it is safer to live, work, and have families in the U.S., so they do. The Palestinians’ double-sided loyalties conflict
with some Americans’ nationalist ideals. El-Haj (2007) called for a major shift in worldview so that all sides can benefit from each other,

For an increasing number of young people, transnationalism shapes their identities, political sensibilities, and capacity to participate both in this society and on a global stage. The commitment to and engagement with transnational issues must not be taken as a sign of disloyalty or a problem for citizenship, but as an opportunity to help all of us think about rights and justice across national borders. (p. 311)

Definition of Terms

There are a few mysterious terms that emerge again and again in this paper. One of them is “funds of knowledge.” The “funds of knowledge” framework arose out of disagreement toward the deficit model. The deficit model suggests, “working-class minority households lack worthwhile knowledge and experiences” and “are often viewed as units from which the child must be rescued, rather than repositories of knowledge that can foster the child’s cognitive development” (González et al., 1993, p.11). The “funds of knowledge” framework, on the other hand, assumes that culture of households is participatory, and that students learn valuable skills through their engagement at home. González et al. (1993) emphasized a dynamic definition of culture, which the funds of knowledge framework depends on,

Viewing households within a processual [sic] view of culture, that is, a view of culture as process rather than as a normative end state, emphasized the lived contexts and practices of the students and their families. In this way, culture was constructed as a dynamic concept and not as a static and uniform grab bag of
tamales, quinceañeras, and cinco de mayo celebrations. Instead, teachers learned how households network in informal market exchanges. They learned how cross-border activities made mini-ethnographers of their students. And most importantly, they learned that students acquire a multi-dimensional depth and breadth from their participation in household life. (p.10)

Numerous studies discussed in this paper examined immigrant families and communities to pinpoint funds of knowledge. The researchers believe, that by illuminating funds of knowledge, teachers will be able to accommodate immigrant students to a greater extent.

Similarly, some studies used the terms “social capital,” “human capital,” and “cultural capital” to describe supportive elements in student’s lives. Social capital is, for example, networks of friends and family that can provide food, shelter, childcare, and job referrals (Martinez-Cosio & Iannacone, 2007). Human capital is similar to socioeconomic status. For example, financial, class, and educational backgrounds of parents explain both human capital and socioeconomic status. Cultural capital equates to cultural orientations that advantage immigrant groups’ adaptation to school and mainstream society (Zhou & Bankston, 1994). Educational researchers often investigate human, cultural, and social capital to help explain school success or failure of immigrant students.

Another ambiguous term found repeatedly in this paper is “internationalism.” Internationalism is another process-oriented term used to describe the dual lives of immigrants. Immigrant families and communities are constituted by social interconnection across borders (Macias, 1990). Therefore, their community exists both in the U.S. and in their country of origin. Children of transnational families experience a
range of conflicts and opportunities since they “are raised in homes with ties to two nations, two languages and two cultures” (Sánchez, 2007, p.260).

It will also be important to know the difference between voluntary and involuntary immigrant groups. This paper focuses on voluntary immigrant groups and their children, as opposed to involuntary immigrant groups. Voluntary immigrant groups chose to move to the U.S., involuntary immigrants did not. For example, most African Americans’ ancestors did not choose to emigrate to the U.S. The reason for focusing only on voluntary immigrants is because they more recently emigrated to the U.S. Therefore, this paper also is limited to educational aspects of recent immigrants, which includes first, second, and third generation immigrants and their families. First generation immigrants were born outside the U.S. Second-generation immigrants have parents that were born outside the U.S., but they were born in the U.S. And third-generation immigrants’ parents were born in the U.S., however their grandparents were born outside the U.S. The distinction between voluntary and involuntary immigration is not as straightforward as the duality suggests when we consider refugee peoples who voluntarily chose to emigrate from their countries to escape persecution or genocide. For example many Cambodians and Vietnamese immigrated to the U.S. in the mid 1970’s to escape genocide (Zhou & Bankston, 1994). These people did not choose to be uprooted from their home countries, rather they did so to save their own lives. Similarly, many voluntary immigrant people choose to escape poor economic and health conditions in their home countries. The poor conditions are often the result of systematic and global forces, which created vast inequities across the world. For example, Micronesian immigrants immigrate to Hawaii to get health care and higher paying jobs. However,
they are escaping poor economic and environmental health conditions that are in large part due to a history of almost constant colonial and military take-over by European nations and the U.S., and nuclear fallout from U.S. military testing there (Okamoto et al., 2008).

This paper often uses the term “ethnographic study” to signify a type of study. In the field of education ethnographic studies are conducted by educational anthropologists who go out in the field to observe schools, classrooms, families, etc. Often their results are qualitative, which means they use narrative descriptions rather than statistics. Quantitative studies, on the other hand, employ statistics and numerical descriptions to analyze their results and describe their findings.

Many studies discussed in this paper used the term “Latino.” Latinos and Latinas are people that originate from nations where Spanish and Portuguese languages dominate (Pearsal, 2002). Similarly, “Hispanic” is a term that generalizes people from Spanish-speaking countries, especially Central and South America (Pearsal, 2002). Also, the term “Anglo American” is used consistently throughout this paper. The term Anglo American generalizes white, English-speaking, non-Hispanic Americans (Pearsal, 2002).

The last term that needs clarification is “educational expectations” or “educational aspirations.” This paper analyzes numerous studies that surveyed the educational expectations of various immigrant youth. Educational expectations are how far in school students expect to go. Researchers assumed that educational expectations correlate with eventual educational attainment.
Statement of the Research Question

Teachers in present day United States run classrooms where students originate from a plurality of backgrounds. The U.S. has a rich history of immigration and cultural diversity has increased since Europeans settled in the early 1600’s. Today, less than 10 percent of teachers in the U.S. are of color, and yet over 40% of students are of color (Delpit, 2006). The numbers of white teachers continue to reflect the dominant Anglo-Protestant culture’s management of education. There is controversy as to whether teachers should reorient curriculum to accommodate the cultural backgrounds of their minority and immigrant students. Some Americans firmly believe that all students should be taught a unified curriculum, that immigrant students should unquestionably assimilate to the dominant culture and language so that the United States and all its multicultural inhabitants can meld into one homogeneous culture with emotional ties to the nation state. Others argue that immigrant students’ success in school depends on the extent to which public schools account for their backgrounds, histories, and life experience.

This paper is an attempt to identify multiple viewpoints on culturally inclusive education by first examining governmental and immigrant education movements and ideologies of the past. Next, this paper will compare and critique studies that examined cultural differences among student populations and approaches toward accommodating multiple cultures in schools. It seeks the opinions of immigrants themselves, as well as the findings of academics, anthropologists, and classroom teachers to answer the questions: What do children of various nationalities need to succeed in school? What expectations do immigrant students and their families have of school? How can
culturally encapsulated teachers learn about funds of knowledge that their students bring with them to the classroom? And how can teachers adapt their classroom practices to support students of diverse backgrounds?

Summary

Chapter one explained the rational for a review of literature regarding immigrant education, compared various opinions on the subject, defined terms, and stated questions that will guide this research. Chapter two discusses the history of U.S. education in relation to various immigrant populations. Chapter three reviews studies based on four different themes: Funds of Knowledge and Cultural Characteristics, Transnational Experience and Citizenship, Bridging Home and School Cultures, and Educational Expectations and Achievement of Immigrant Students. Chapter four reviews the findings from chapter three, provides classroom implications, and proposes suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER II: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Introduction

This chapter examines U.S. education’s historical interaction with various immigrant groups. The story begins in the 1800’s, when the first major waves of immigrants flooded the nation, and ends in present day U.S. After so many years, so many wars, so many immigration waves, the U.S. has become increasingly pluralistic in demographics. Yet, to this day, educational policy continues to reflect Anglo Protestant tradition. Anglo, the global culture of commerce, English, the crucial language of success. This disposition toward education, of course, has its ups and downs.

Immigrant Education

There are a variety of opinions and ideas under debate in the current U.S. education scene regarding the concept of multiculturalism in the classroom. There is demand that minority groups be represented through both curriculum content and process. There is controversy as to whether historically marginalized minorities should be immersed in language and culture of the dominant class, or whether they should study an ethnocentric cultural history and language. In order to understand schooling today, it is necessary to consider the U.S. government’s use of schooling throughout its history, to see how it has addressed differences in beliefs and lifeways of immigrant populations.

Early immigrant groups to the U.S. conflicted with the Anglo Protestant-dominated education system. Between 1820 and 1860 approximately two million Irish Catholic immigrants flooded into the nation (Spring, 2008). To compare, the total population in the U.S. in 1860 was 31 million people. Public schools, at the time, religiously taught Protestant beliefs, values, and morals. However, the new Irish
immigrants were strongly rooted in Catholicism traditions. As a result, English Protestant school boards openly rejected Irish Catholic tradition, and denied their cultural inclusion in public schools. If Irish Catholic children were to attend public schools they would learn Protestant values along with the other children. In 1888, after decades of religious conflict with the Protestants, Irish Catholics established their own parochial school system, which provided an alternative to public schools. Until the 1930’s Catholics referred to public schools as Protestant schools (Spring, 2008).

In the early 1900’s over a million people from Southern and Eastern Europe immigrated to the United States. Hysteria abounded about the new Europeans bringing elements of corruption with them. The U.S. government began an education campaign to assimilate these new immigrants to the American Way as quickly as possible. Public schooling started providing urban immigrant ghettos with greater social services, after school activities, and healthy food to curb this population from straying off the American Way (Spring, 2008).

In 1848 the U.S. won the Mexican-American War. The U.S. had conquered half of Mexico’s total land, which included what is today California, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, and Texas. Along with the land, the U.S. gained many indigenous and Spanish/indigenous blooded residents. What to do with these new Mexican residents? They were not necessarily white, but California classified them as Caucasian. Texas classified them as non-white. In 1855, California required that all schooling be conducted in English. In 1870, Texas passed the same law. In 1918, Texas made it a criminal offense to instruct in a language other than English in school. However, some schools in Texas and California, were entirely composed of Mexican
students, so English-only instruction was not possible. Like Irish immigrants, Mexican Americans came from Catholic backgrounds and cared about their cultural heritage. In the 1880’s private Mexican schools were founded that taught Mexican traditions, history, and Spanish language. In 1929, a Mexican American group called the League of United Latin American Citizens advocated for bilingual education and maintenance of Mexican cultural tradition in public schooling. In 1930, California re-classified Mexican Americans as Indians and, under the “Separate but Equal” Supreme Court Decision of 1895, they became eligible for segregated education (Spring, 2008).

During the 1930’s Americans faced with a nation-wide economic depression became blameworthy of the immigrant populations that lived in their communities. Much the same argument that is heard today was expressed then, that Hispanic workers were burdening the country by competing for jobs and costing citizens tax dollars. Across the nation, in California and the Southwest, school districts created Americanization schools, to segregate Hispanic children, with the motto that they needed to learn the ways of Americans before they should be able to enter classrooms with American children. In reality, the separation was to quell white angst toward Hispanics.

In 1934, in one small town near San Diego, the local school board decided to create an Americanization school and separate the Hispanic students (Alvarez, 1988). The Hispanic families were furious and embarrassed. Their children were U.S. citizens, born in the United States, so they felt they had the right to attend the same public school as other Americans. The Hispanic families found lawyers and fought their case in the California State Supreme Court. The judge ruled the Americanization school unconstitutional and deemed that the best method to teach Hispanic students the ways of
Americans was to school them with Americans, not separate them. The Hispanics in this town were let back into the main school with white Americans, however this case did not change the prevalence of segregated schools in other Californian towns (Alvarez, 1988). These Hispanic families desired for their children to school with other American children so that they could become part of the fabric of the nation. They did not want to be separated and classified in such a demeaning manner. They were committed to building their lives in this country not to live separate from other citizens (Alvarez, 1988).

However, in present day, some California schools are made up of what sociologists call minority-majorities. For example, in the 1980’s, Lima High School in Los Angeles contained an 80% Latino student body. Yet the school and its teachers continued to teach as if the student body consisted of 80% white middle-class students (Patthey-Chavez, 1993). The school was taking a strict assimilationist approach, yet the inner-city neighborhood in which these students lived was a Latino enclave, with a vibrant culture of its own, much different than white middle-class culture. The school and neighborhood culture of these students represented a major discontinuity. To contrast, the Hispanic families in the small Californian town in the 1930’s were a numerical minority. Their families wanted their children to learn alongside white middle-class children, who represented a majority in the town and the school. However, in the 1980’s at Lima High School, there were few middle-class white students, if any. And the inner-city Latino students’ life experience was shockingly different than the white middle-class students raised in Californian suburbs.

During the Civil Rights era, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Native Americans fought for greater representation of their culture and language in the public
school system. In 1968, East Los Angeles Mexican American students staged a school boycott and demanded bilingual programs, Spanish-speaking teachers, Mexican history and culture classes, and Mexican food served in the school cafeteria (Spring, 2008). A Mexican American civil rights organization called La Raza Unida was formed in 1967, which fought to preserve the culture and language of the Mexican American community. During this time, a Texas senator, Ralph Yarborough, advocated for bilingual education, in an attempt to gain Hispanic support for his re-election (Spring, 2008). Through his work in a senatorial subcommittee on bilingual education, he was able to pass bilingual legislation, which became the Bilingual Education Act of 1968. The Bilingual Education Act guaranteed that public schools would create programs to preserve the cultures and languages of Hispanic and Native American citizens. This meant that students could learn both English and Spanish or a Native American language in school. However, in the 1980’s, during the Reagan Administration, support for bilingual education fell. The Secretary of Education appointed opponents of bilingual education to the National Advisory and Coordinating Council on Bilingual Education (Spring, 2008). The appointees believed that the best way for non-English-speaking students to learn English was to immerse them in English, rather than through a bilingual program. The appointees also sought to give more power to local officials, which was a policy that “undercut the power the Hispanic community had gained by working with the federal government” (Spring, 2008, p.439).

In the 1850’s Chinese began emigrating to the U.S. to participate in the California gold rush. The Hawaiian Islands also experienced major influxes of Japanese, Filipinos, and Koreans between 1868 and 1930 (Spring, 2008). Throughout time, Asian
populations in Hawaii settled on the mainland. They worked as agriculturalists, laborers, merchants, restaurant owners, and domestic servants and established enclaves in West Coast cities (Morgan, 1979/2003). Most famously, Chinese immigrants made huge contributions to the construction of the transcontinental railroad. Yet, like for Mexican American people of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, Asian immigrants experienced discrimination, hate, and segregation. San Francisco, home base of the California gold rush, had the most established Chinatown in the U.S. during this period. However, the white rulers and politicians of the city did all they could to make them feel unwanted. In 1872, California created a law that denied public education to Asian Americans (Spring, 2008). In 1884, the Imperial Chinese Consulate challenged the San Francisco school board on behalf of a Chinese American girl, who was born in the U.S. In response, the San Francisco School board tightened regulations prohibiting Chinese students from enrolling in public schools. In 1885, California, in response to pressure by the federal government, provided segregated public schooling for Chinese Americans. The first segregated Chinese public school was opened in San Francisco in 1885 (Spring, 2008).

In 1975, 150,000 refugees from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos immigrated to the U.S. Sudden population shifts overwhelmed school districts that were not prepared to accommodate this many English as a Second Language (ESL) students. To make things more difficult, the refugees originated from diverse cultures. For example, included in this group were students from preliterate tribes that had no formal educational experience whatsoever, and also children of well-educated parents. By 1986, the SE Asian refugee
population in the U.S. exceeded 800,000 people. Finnan (1988) listed several common problems that schools faced in attempting to integrate the new population,

- Refugee students take too much time from teachers and other students suffer.
- Too few resources are available to help meet the student’s special needs.
- Tensions between refugee students and other students exist.
- Federal funds for programs are inadequate and may be available only in the short term, thus creating a financial burden for districts. (p.121)

In the 1960’s through the 1980’s multiculturalists advocated for the integration of the histories and cultures of marginalized groups into public school curriculum and textbooks (Spring, 2008). The multiculturalists believed that the integration of multicultural history and culture into the mainstream curriculum would empower oppressed groups by building their self-esteem and helping them understand historical methods of cultural domination. African American leaders took this idea further and advocated for the establishment of Afrocentric schools, that is, schools that see the world through lenses of Africans and African Americans, instead of a white Anglo-American Protestant vision. In the 1990’s Afrocentric public schools were created or considered in Miami, Baltimore, Detroit, Milwaukee, and New York (Spring, 2008). Advocacy for multicultural education was not without counterarguments. Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. (1998), for example, believed that multicultural education would work to disunite America. He believed that the Anglo tradition was to thank for creating the laws and governance that allow so many different cultures to live within the same nation. Therefore, he firmly believed that Anglo Protestant culture should remain the main culture of school.
No Child Left Behind legislation was passed in 2001 to ensure that all children received an equal educational opportunity (Spring, 2008). Under No Child Left Behind Act, states are allocated special federal funding based on the numbers of limited English proficient and recent immigrant students they have (DiCerbo, 2006). According to Spring (2008), “No Child Left Behind favored a monolingual and monocultural society as opposed to a multilingual and pluralistic society” (p.489). In 2001, George W. Bush and the majority of Congress voted against bilingual education. The majority of policy makers in Washington believed the role of U.S. schooling was to teach English only and not support the preservation of other cultures’ languages. Spring (2008) observed that, prior to No Child Left Behind, a federal office in Washington D.C. was called Office of Bilingual Education. Now, the title of the same office reads, Office of English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement for Limited English Proficient. The tables have turned. Marginalized and dominated groups can no longer seek assistance from the federal government in getting their cultures represented in public schooling as they did in the Civil Rights Era. Now, the federal government has taken a hard-lined monocultural and monolingual stance, and, through standardized testing and yearly state and school accountability report cards, local schools become pressured to conform to a national curriculum (Spring, 2008).

In 2004, almost a million immigrants were admitted to the United States as lawful permanent residents (DiCerbo, 2006). Approximately one third came from Mexico, El Salvador, and Dominican Republic. Another third immigrated from India, Philippines, China, and Vietnam (DiCerbo, 2006). One in five of these immigrants were of school age. Also, it was estimated that for every four immigrants, one is undocumented. An
estimated 1.6 million undocumented immigrant children live in the U.S. and an estimated 3 million immigrant children were born in the U.S. to undocumented parents (DiCerbo, 2006).

All school-aged children that reside in the U.S. are eligible to receive public schooling. DiCerbo (2006) noted, “In the 1982 Plyler v. Doe decision, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that, under the Fourteenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, the state does not have the right to deny a free public education to undocumented immigrant children” (p.1). Metropolitan areas in the United States, especially California and New York, have lots of experience adjusting to new waves of immigrants. However, today, immigrants are settling in smaller towns and states not accustomed to immigrants. These areas’ schools must scramble to accommodate the new limited English immigrant students. Currently, U.S. public schooling’s primary goal for immigrant education is to teach English, so that the students can enter mainstream academic programs as soon as possible (Spring, 2008). DiCerbo (2006), listed several factors that schools’ consider when creating educational programs for immigrant students, “their age on arrival, previous schooling, home language and literacy, family education and aspirations, economic circumstance, whether their immigration was voluntary or involuntary, and current level of English language proficiency” (p.1).

Summary
This chapter discussed U.S. education’s Anglo Protestant origins. It discussed how Irish Catholic immigrants, whose culture and religion differed from Anglo Protestants’, felt the cultural constraints of the public school system wear on them. As U.S. forces conquered the Southwest, Mexican Americans became part of the nation. In former Mexico, schools were required to teach only in English. However, many schools were attended by entirely Spanish-speaking students. Later, Mexican Americans were segregated into separate Americanization schools, where they were to be Americanized. Chinese immigrants on the West Coast experienced similar discrimination. At first, California denied them public education. Then, the federal government ordered their Constitutional right to public education, and naturalized Chinese Americans were given access to segregated public education. In the Civil Rights Era, African Americans, Native Americans, and Mexican Americans fought for cultural and lingual representation in public schools. Their efforts earned them cultural and bilingual education in some schools. However, in the 1980’s the Reagan Administration pulled the plug on bilingual education. English acquisition and literacy was to be public schools’ main goal for immigrant students. However, also during this period, multiculturalists advocated for a curriculum that would simultaneously build-up the self-esteem of historically marginalized groups and shed critical light on methods of cultural domination. Mainstream society considered these educational efforts to be too radical, so they did not bear many fruits. However, as conservatives watched in horror, a few Afrocentric schools were developed in a few cities. Finally, in 2001, No Child Left Behind sailed through Congress. This Act served to reinforce a national curriculum that emphasized
English acquisition and dominant cultural reproduction for all, especially immigrant students.

The next chapter discusses studies that examined various elements of immigrant education. Through these studies an in-depth look at the lives of immigrants as they engage in U.S. schooling is portrayed. Also, these studies depict the efforts taken by public schools and teachers to accommodate immigrant students’ needs.
CHAPTER III: INTEGRATIVE REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter reports on studies that investigated aspects of immigrant education with the goal of improving schooling for this increasingly diverse cohort. The first section discusses studies that examined funds of knowledge and cultural characteristics of immigrant groups, families, and students. This research was conducted to gain greater understanding about various immigrant groups’ cultures and expectations, so that teachers can improve their practices in regards to these students’ needs. The second section reports on studies that investigated the experience of people that have ties to two nations, languages, and cultures. This section also discusses studies that speculated on appropriate forms of civics education for international students, who may be at odds with a U.S. nationalist approach. The studies in this section are helpful because they uncover the controversies that face immigrant students as they construct identity within their new nation. The third section discusses studies that explored immigrant parents’ relationship to their children’s schools. These studies uncovered the educational expectations of immigrant parents, as well as common barriers that they face in participating with schools and society. These studies provide insight for teachers trying to lessen discontinuities between home and school. Finally, the fourth section reports on studies that examined differences in educational expectations and achievement of various immigrant groups. These studies specifically examine social, human, and cultural factors that influence expectations and achievement. Their overall goal is to identify factors that educators could influence to improve immigrant students’ success in school.
Funds of Knowledge and Culture Characteristics

The nine studies presented here examined funds of knowledge and cultural characteristics that exist within immigrant families and communities. Often, their objectives were to identify characteristics that could enhance teacher’s knowledge of immigrant student backgrounds.

The first four studies in this section address discontinuities between home, school, and peer worlds, as well as obstacles that various immigrant students face. The first study observed 14 second-generation Mexican American students, their families, and teachers to investigate the role of culture on achievement motivation and the relationship between learning abilities observed at home and academic performance at school. These authors found that the students performed an impressive array of skills and leadership roles at home, while at school their talents and skills were largely overlooked by teachers, who were primarily frustrated by the students’ fickle attendance patterns (Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba, 1991). The second study interviewed and observed high school students to investigate conflicts between school, family, and peer worlds. The study identified four main dynamics that describe the relative ease or unease when students cross borders between school, family, and peer worlds (Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1991). The next study narrative presents work by Valdés (1998), who followed two newly immigrated Latino students from middle school until post-secondary years to examine their struggles regarding English language acquisition. The study found that segregated ESL programs limited immigrant students’ ability to adapt to their new countries because of their isolation from native English speakers. In the fourth study, Okamoto et al. (2008) interviewed Micronesian immigrant youth living in Hawaii to examine social factors that
add or detract from their wellbeing. The study found that poverty, racism, drugs, and violence face the Micronesian immigrant youth and that they find strength in their cultural heritage.

The next four studies in this section describe cultural and familial resources that support immigrant students’ success in school. Zhou & Bankston (1994) investigated the social capital available to second-generation Vietnamese students in New Orleans. They found that inner city Vietnamese students overcame socioeconomic limitations through strong adherence to traditional family values, strong work ethic, and a high level of ethnic involvement. The next study presented here analyzed the combined affect of familism and parental educational attainment on the academic achievement of Mexican origin and Anglo American adolescents. The study’s results suggested that strong family affinities among Mexican origin students promote higher-levels of academic achievement, but only if parental education level is also high (Valenzuela & Dornbusch, 1994). In the seventh study, Villenas & Moreno (2001) interviewed Latina mothers and daughters in North Carolina to explore the teaching and learning that occurs through their consejos (advice), cuentos (stories), and la experiencia (experience). The authors found that Latina mothers conveyed a paradoxical mix of lessons in their advice, stories, and experiencias to their daughters, which simultaneously included both patriarchal and feminist ideologies. The next study narrative presents a case study in which Espinoza-Herald (2007) examined the cultural resources present in an academically successful Mexican American woman’s life. The author found that the Latina attributed much of her educational success to her mother’s continual encouragement, which occurred through a family literacy practice called “Dichos.”
The last study of this section stands alone. In it, Kagan & Madsen (1972) experimented with Anglo American city children and rural Mexican children to explore differences in cooperative and competitive behaviors. The authors found irrational behaviors among both groups: Anglo American children remained in conflict to the extent that they lost toys, and Mexican children avoided conflict to the extent that they lost toys. Now that the introductions for this section are complete we begin the first study.

Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba (1991) conducted an extensive three-year ethnographic study of 14 second-generation Mexican American students from 11 families living in a community near the San Francisco Bay Area. They investigated the role of culture on achievement motivation and the relationship between learning abilities observed at home and academic performance at school. The authors found a general disconnect between the Mexican American students’ home and school roles. At home the students were observed acting out several leadership roles, while at school, many of their intelligences, abilities, and dispositions were overlooked. The ethnographers observed student learning patterns in three different settings: home, classroom, and play. Interviews with community members, teachers, and parents were conducted throughout the three years; and they made observations of the community at large in order to understand the student’s interaction within a larger context.

Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba (1991) observed a range of academic performance among their subjects. Some of them were chronically absent and chose not to participate in classroom activities, while others played the part of model students, and most managed. The chronically absent students lost respect from their teachers and parents
and began hanging out with older boys in front of the community center. The model students were able to keep respect at home and at school, through switching between the two roles. All the students’ parents desired that they speak Spanish when at home. Sometimes when their children spoke English they would ignore them. However, parents participated in ESL night classes at their children’s school so that they could help them with their homework. Many parents, though, felt that their children could function within the school system better than they. The teachers blamed the students’ lack of school success on parents’ inability to help them with their homework.

Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba (1991) found that the students’ classroom teachers did not adapt to their talents and cultural dispositions in the classroom. At home the students were observed running errands to the store to buy groceries for their parents, acting as translators for their parents, watching and feeding their younger siblings, and helping with other chores around the house. Children were expected to be respectful, obedient, and helpful around the house. In play, the students recited stories to each other, invented and carried-out games, and showed a great capacity for companionship and sharing. The students rarely did anything alone. When they went to the store for their parents they always invited a friend or a sibling first.

Most of the students’ parents worked long hours. Some students had to stay home from school and take care of their younger siblings on occasion, others slept in because their parents weren’t around in the morning to nag them to go to school. Parents also commonly used their kids as cultural brokers and translators when they visited the bank or doctor. Teachers interviewed were very concerned at the extent that some parents kept their kids home from school. Yet the teachers did not consider learning opportunities
inherently provided as students lead their parents through the outside institutional world of banks and health departments.

Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba (1991) observed students respond to authoritative directives from their parents with regard to chores. However, once the child was on task they were allowed autonomy and trust to figure it out on their own. The students often asked and received clarification of instruction. In the classroom, this freedom to construct solutions to problems independent of the teacher was absent. Instead of giving students greater responsibility to solve problems, teachers administered greater rote drills in attempts to combat what they thought were learning deficits. Also, the ethnographers found that their subjects’ sense of self-worth at school was dependent on their participation in learning activities that did not undermine their collective skill in sharing.

Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba (1991) concluded, “it is apparent that neither these children nor their families are deficient in any way except for opportunities to participate in the mainstream culture system” (p.159). They called for greater opportunities for parent involvement so that greater understanding can be established for what learning is in the United States. Also they suggested that teacher education programs must transform the cultural deficit models that they have perpetuated so that teachers can see their ethnic students as bearing wealths of knowledge and creative ideas rather than doomed to failure due to their socioeconomic status.

This study’s results gained credibility through the in-depth nature of its methodology and the extent to which the authors observed 11 different Mexican immigrant families in a range of settings over a period of 3 years. Although this ethnographic study took place in only one California community, the cultural dynamics
that the authors found as Mexican immigrant students moved between home, play, and school carry transferability because these same dynamics could most likely be found in other American towns with Mexican immigrant populations. Also, the study clearly detailed its methodology and therefore could be replicated by other ethnographers to confirm transferability of the findings. Another strength of this study’s findings was their similarity to findings of other studies that also examined disconnects between home and school culture for immigrant students. Last, the study’s introduction and discussion were comprehensively anchored within history and theory regarding the situation of Mexican immigrant families. The next study narrative also discusses discontinuities between home, school, and peer worlds for students of various cultural backgrounds.

In an ethnographic study Phelan, Davidson, & Cao (1991) observed and interviewed 54 students from four different high schools to investigate students’ interrelationships between school, family, and peer worlds and how these affected their engagement with learning. The study found four general dynamics that describe the extent of ability or inability of students to cross borders between school, family, and peer worlds. Core to the authors’ theoretical framework was the assumption that “each world contains values and beliefs, expectations, actions, and emotional responses familiar to insiders” (Phelan et al., 1991, p.225).

The authors conducted three in depth interviews with each of the 54 students, observed students in classroom environments, interviewed teachers, viewed students’ school records to measure achievement, and conducted open-ended informal interviews with 10 of the 54 students. During interviews, students were questioned about their “perceptions of classrooms and schools, the importance and influence of friends and peer
groups, and family conditions that are significant to their lives” (Phelan et al., 1991, p. 227). Special emphasis was given to students’ acknowledgement of school factors that enhanced or detracted from their engagement with learning. Classroom observations focused on students’ interactions with teachers and peers. Teacher interviews gained information regarding teacher perceptions of students’ academic potential, social interaction, and family background.

Phelan et al (1991) used four typologies to describe their subjects’ movement between worlds:

Type I: Congruent Worlds/Smooth Transitions

Type II: Different Worlds/Boundary Crossings Managed

Type III: Different Worlds/Boundary Crossings Hazardous

Type IV: Borders Impenetrable/Boundary Crossings Insurmountable (p.228).

The authors stressed that these patterns are not necessarily static for students, that temporary conditions at home, school, or within peer-group affiliations can momentarily affect strategies used to navigate worlds.

The students that fell into Type I were frequently white and middle class. They benefited from strong educational support from parents, friends easily participated with them between worlds, and school culture aligned harmoniously with their personal and parent’s values and expectations. However, not all white middle class students in this Type received good grades. One student had low academic expectations of himself, thinking C’s were good enough for him. Surprisingly, his parents supported him in this expectation, along with his teachers, who did not worry about him because they knew his parents who they thought were nice and supportive. Though this group seemed problem
free in its movement between home, school, and peer worlds, the authors identified
problematic patterns too. The problem was that they seemed overly content with their
situation and did not venture outside their comfort zones to engage with cultures that
were different from themselves. Their cultures provided everything they needed to
succeed in mainstream society and everyone shared the same values (Phelan et al., 1991).
One student interviewed from this group talked condescendingly about students from
minority groups that ganged together and did not seem to come to school for academic
purposes. He carried the expectation that minority students should make the first effort to
cross into his realm, rather than he, taking action to assist students coming from different
worlds. Another student believed that lower-academic achieving students in his class
were to blame for an unchallenging curriculum. The authors worried that, although
teachers often consider Type I students to be the well behaved ones doing just fine in
school, they may be constricted later in life due to their inexperience in working with
diverse people.

Type II students were characterized by their ability to manage in multiple worlds:
friends, family, and school, but these students felt that they had to alienate the three
realms. For example, they were embarrassed of their parents when they came to school
for parent night. Or, they did not bring their friends over to their house because of their
parents’ strict rules. These students’ participation in school was limited by their
conscious effort not to get caught by their other cultures, which they lead different lives
within (Phelan et al., 1991). This group was often overlooked by teachers, who saw well
behaved students on task, getting great grades, but failed to acknowledge the real person
behind the model student façade. In general, these students desired more opportunities
for classroom student-to-student interactions so that they could overcome feelings of alienation and make friends in schools plagued by cliques. However, although Type II students experienced difficulties regarding the cultural discontinuity of their multiple worlds, they employed strategies such as academic diligence, joining extracurricular clubs, and associating with academically motivated peer groups in order to meet friends, succeed in school, and satisfy parents.

For students that fell into the Type III group it was hazardous to transition across worlds. These students needed a benevolent climate in order to transition from one world to the next. For example, these students did not do well in classrooms that were teacher and textbook centered because they thought it was too different from their home and peer cultures, which valued social and empathetic relationships above all else. For example, a fourth generation Mexican American student showed such dedication in caring for her friends that, often times, she sacrificed her attendance in class to help her friends finish their homework. School was an institution that threatened and pressured her to become independent and not reliant on her friends, which she felt was the most important thing in her life. She earned good grades and was well liked by her teachers in classes where student-student interaction was the norm and where she could express her beliefs and cares, and F’s in classes that were constantly teacher centered. Also, she responded especially well to teachers that bothered to care about her life, because these efforts on behalf of her teachers reflected the values of her peer and home culture.

Although this student’s disposition towards her peer, home, and school worlds did not promote academic success in the school realm, she was not without virtue, nor responsibility. She served as leader of her peer group, organizing outings and events,
mediating disagreements, and also took care of her younger sisters and monitored their schoolwork. Her mother, too, encouraged a strong social nature in her daughter, which seemed to conflict with aspects of school culture, especially deadlines, attendance, and cold, remote, pedagogical styles (Phelan, et al. 1991).

Although most students that fell into Type III experienced conflicting interests in the school realm, Phelan et al. (1991) asserted that it was also possible for students to function successfully in school while having problems transitioning back into home and peer worlds. This dynamic is similar to the experience of Richard Rodriguez (1983), who described his alienation from his family and Mexican customs as he became more and more invested in the world of school. This experience is prevalent for students who face home environments that are not supportive of individualized homework activities.

For students in Type IV, transitions between school, home, or peer worlds were nearly impossible. One second-generation Mexican American student, classified as Type IV, lived in a Mexican barrio and grew up close to her family’s cultural roots. This student experienced extreme repulsion at school and, alternatively, chose to associate with a network of youth that were openly defiant of school culture.

This student asserted that white students rarely gave her the time of day at school, and that they were quiet, which does not fit with her culture. She stated that Mexicans acted spontaneously, they don’t think and plan ahead prudently like white people. They were loud and talkative in her neighborhood, which clashed in a school environment. And she expressed frustration that she never had a teacher that acknowledged successes and strengths of Mexican culture in class (Phelan et al., 1991). This student was in trouble with the law and school and had been an accomplice in gang activities carried out
by male friends. She believed her popularity in the Mexican-American crowd was more important than her success in school. She believed that school was hard for her because her parents were not educated, so they could not help her with her work. However, her mom always nagged her to get better grades so that she could go to college. The authors maintained that the combination of Sonia’s peer groups’ strong resistance to school norms and the failure on the part of her school to provide an inclusive environment created the insurmountable boundaries (Phelan et al., 1991).

Through this study, Phelan et al. (1991) acknowledged four dynamic types, which illustrate various inner and outer struggles of students. The study exemplified that teaching is much more than dispersing content objectives to students. In this manner, teaching is a problem that involves engaging a group that represents a diverse set of psycho/social processes. A universal finding was that students from all types expressed need for social acceptance in their worlds. The authors proposed that all student types could benefit from classroom frameworks that allowed for student-student interaction, empathetic mediation between students, and opportunities for expression of ideas.

Grouping students into typologies can be risky business. However, Phelan et al. (1991) succeeded in their demarcation of students by remaining generic in their classification, which provided opportunities for transferability of their findings to other contextually similar settings. Students either easily moved between worlds, managed to move between worlds, were hazarded by moving between worlds, or could not successfully move between worlds. Students’ beliefs and attitudes, school records, classroom observations, and teacher interviews supported placement into these groupings. Students were not placed into these against their will; rather their own
thoughts supported their placement within them. By naming four general typologies, Phelan et al. identified potentially common controversies that exist between home, school, and peer worlds that could lend teacher awareness about inner experiences that could affect their students’ learning. Another asset of this study was the detailed accounts of students’ lives, which lent credibility to the authors’ proposal that similar cases exist in other schools too. Knowledge of the inner-lives of these case study students provides teachers with reference to potential tensions that their students may face at school and that create barriers to learning. The next study narrative identifies English language acquisition as a barrier immigrant students face when they cross borders into U.S. schools, and specifically into what the author called ESL ghettos.

In a seven-year case study, Valdés (1998) followed two newly immigrated students from middle school until post-secondary years to examine their struggles surrounding English language acquisition. The study found that segregated ESL programs limited immigrant students’ exposure and association with native English speakers, and that “ESL ghettos” created stagnant educational conditions. The study took place in 1991 at a middle school in the greater San Francisco Bay Area that had recently experienced a major influx of non-English background students, especially from Mexico. The author described the surrounding town as a middle-class suburb that had been essentially transformed overnight into a Mexican immigrant barrio. Many members of the local white community were not happy about the changing demographics and worried that the new immigrant students would lower standards in the schools and bring gangs, violence, and interracial romance. It was under these conditions that Valdés begun her observations and interviews at the middle school she called Garden.
Lilian and Elisa were the authors’ two case study subjects. Lilian, a blonde, blue-eyed 12 year-old girl from a small town outside Guadalajara, Mexico and Elisa, a dark complexioned 13 year-old girl that recently immigrated from a rural village in Honduras. Lilian and Elisa knew few words of English when they first arrived in the U.S., however they could both read and write in Spanish. Nonetheless, their home situations differed greatly.

Lilian lived in a crowded three bedroom apartment that included: mom, dad, older brother, older sister, twin younger brothers, baby sister, uncle, aunt, baby cousin, and two adult cousins. Her dad had lived in the U.S. as a migrant worker on and off for ten years and in 1991 was able to bring his family legally to the U.S. He worked for a gardening service and struggled to make rent on their $800 dollar apartment. Lilian’s mom knew little English, had a baby girl, and cleaned houses to earn money. She knew very little about the importance of education in American culture because the rural village she came from offered little chance of social mobility, and she assumed schooling in the U.S. was the same. Lilian’s older 17-year old brother was in a gang and had been shot in the shoulder. Lilian’s mom did not understand what gangs were and what it was like for her children on the street. Lilian also became involved in gangs and began wearing gang colors to school. The author stated that Lilian became involved in gangs because her neighborhood had become her real world rather than her school, which had failed to understand and support her. Lilian eventually dropped out of high school and moved in with a 28 year-old man and his mother. When this study was published Lilian worked at a fast food restaurant and had a new baby. She reported long-term goals of going back to school to become a beautician.
Elisa, on the other hand, had lived with her grandmother in Honduras for several years while her mom had established herself in the U.S. When Elisa got to the U.S. she was very homesick and lonely. Her mom worked long days at multiple low-wage jobs and would come home at night. Elisa’s mom required that Elisa and her younger sister come home directly after school. Elisa’s mom was much more knowledgeable of American norms and the importance of education than Lilian’s parents. For example, Elisa’s mom required Elisa to only speak English when at home and to only watch English language television shows. Also, Elisa’s mom acted on the words from her boss who advised her to become involved in her children’s school events. However, Elisa’s mom lacked grammatically correct English skills and also did not have a high school degree, which extremely limited her job prospects and work within her children’s school.

Valdés’ (1999) main purpose for this case study was to explore why ESL students failed to learn enough English to succeed in school. She observed Elisa and Lilian attend the ESL programs at Garden middle school and checked in with them as they went through high school, and for Elisa, community college. In 1991, at the start of this study, Garden middle school had experienced a shocking sudden influx of non-English speakers. The largely white middle-class school scrambled to accommodate the new students. They created a segregated ESL program, which included beginning ESL, intermediate ESL, advanced ESL, and transition-to-mainstream ESL. Students from sixth, seventh, and eighth grade were placed into the groups depending on their ability level. The ESL tracks were segregated because the students spent the entire day in their ESL classrooms separated from English speaking students. Valdés (1999) believed that this procedure largely slowed the speed at which ESL students became fluent in their new
language. However, the best educational practices for the new immigrant students was limited by both teachers and parents in the school who were resistant towards allowing non-proficient English speakers into the same classrooms with proficient English speakers out of fear of lowering standards.

Elisa and Lilian were placed into the beginning ESL class their first year. Alongside non-English speakers, the beginning ESL class also housed intermediate and advanced ESL speakers that were troublemakers. In year two Elisa moved into intermediate ESL, but Lilian stayed in beginning because of behavior problems, which included a defiant attitude. Elisa’s schedule: intermediate ESL homeroom, sheltered math, P.E., lunch, sheltered science, and cooking. All of these classes were made up of solely English language learners, so there was still no chance of Elisa interacting with English proficient students.

Elisa continued through high school, and with the help of the author, transferred schools so that her ESL record would not follow her, so that she could enroll in a college bound track. Later in high school she moved to Miami with her family and enrolled in exclusively mainstream classes. However, her ESL record came back to haunt her when she moved back to California after high school to attend community college. The community college required non-English-background students to complete a three-part ESL sequence prior to enrolling in college-level courses. Although Elisa earned a C + average in her mainstream high school English courses, the teachers at the community college “still do not want to be made uncomfortable by these students’ slightly flawed English” (Valdés, 1999, p.12).
Valdés’ (1999) consternation mainly arose out of the long-term segregated tracks that many non-English speaking immigrants experience. One major concern of mainstream teachers and parents was the fear that their students and children would be negatively affected by students whose English was not perfect. However, in the interest of best practices for immigrant students, this study exemplified the possibility of ESL ghettos, which stagnate immigrant students’ educational potentials, undermine their goals, and prevent adaptation.

By investigating language in particular, Valdés described a major, and sometimes unnecessarily overbearing, obstacle that non-English speaking immigrant students face as they seek a place and an identity in a new country. This study also provided extensive theory and background surrounding ESL education and immigration in the U.S. The case study gained credibility from the author’s method of in-depth interviews and tracking of two students over several years. Also, the findings of the study are transferable to other schools, settings, and grade levels that serve ESL students. For example, the study exemplified that ESL tracking transferred to different settings as the author compared Elisa’s treatment and obstacles in four different schools: middle school, two high schools, and community college. The study is auditable by outside parties only in that they could interview teachers at Garden school that worked there in 1991, or interview Elisa and Lilian to confirm accuracy of the author’s descriptions and conclusions. However, it is doubtful that outside auditors could experience the same level of intimacy as the author, since this the interview process took place over many years. This study could be improved by a counterexample of an ESL program that empowers immigrant students in
their adaptation to mainstream classes. The next study narrative focuses on the troubles that a population of Micronesian immigrant youth face in Hawaii.

In an ethnographic study Okamoto et al. (2008) interviewed Micronesian immigrant youth living in Hawaii to examine the risk and protective factors that add or detract from their wellbeing. The study found that poverty, racism, drugs, and violence face the Micronesian immigrant youth and that they find strength in their cultural heritage. The authors held nine different focus groups in which 41 youth (13 boys and 28 girls) participated. The youth originated from different islands in Micronesia: 24 from Chuukese, 15 from Marshallese, and 2 from Pohnpeian. Interviews were conducted during the focus groups that focused on school, family, culture, violence and substance abuse. All interviews were audio taped and transcribed verbatim. Then, the authors reduced and combined common themes from the interviews and drew relationships to existent theories relevant to culture, risk, and protection.

Okamoto et al. (2008) found several notable repetitions in the interviews that fell into the themes of school, family, culture, violence and substance abuse. One was migration. Most of the families migrated to Hawaii from Micronesia to obtain health care, better jobs, or to improve quality of life in general. All the youth in the study had lived in Hawaii for duration of four to nine years.

One of the main ecological stressors that arose was crowded housing conditions. Most of the Micronesian youth lived with their families and extended families in crowded low-income apartments. They also tended to move a lot, which was hard on the families, because the kids had to move away from their friends. However, sometimes community
conditions required families to move, which included gang violence, substance abuse of children, and trash and dirty diapers scattered around outside.

The Micronesian youth reported, also, that they experienced lots of racist comments directed at them from their classmates at school. Their classmates teased them for the way they spoke English and called them names such as “microscope” and “Microsoft” (Okamoto et al., 2008, p.138). Also, teachers offended them by claiming the learning content was “simple” when the Micronesians could not come up with an answer.

Fighting was also a common theme in the interviews. Micronesian and Samoan youth were known for fighting against each other at school. Some of the Micronesian youth were embarrassed by their ethnic groups involvement in fighting and gangs. Some believed that if the teachers and students knew more about Micronesian culture there would not be so much fighting. Also, fighting and rivalries existed between newly immigrated Micronesians and youth who had resided in Hawaii for a longer time.

Substance abuse was another problem that faced the Micronesian youth at school and in their low-income housing communities. They reported that sixth graders in their communities drank alcohol, smoked cigarettes, and chewed tobacco. They explained that the young ones did drugs to emulate their older siblings. The parents told their children not to do drugs, but they did not know what else they could do. Some youth believed that in order to keep drugs away they would need to “keep the drug people away” or get better police enforcement (Okamoto et al., 2008, p. 142).

The authors identified “cultural buffers” that many of the youth held in high esteem. These were traditional Micronesian cultural activities that provided a sense of community and cultural pride. They mentioned celebrating their culture around the time
when other people celebrate Christmas. The authors felt that these events and gatherings among the Micronesian community were healthy for their development.

The authors also acknowledged a high school that had established an after school drug and violence primary prevention program. Some of the youth that participated in this program considered it a social space where they could meet friends and relate through familiar customs, traditions, language, and culture, while at the same time, being away from home. Finding their culture in a venue separate from their homes was valuable for them because it also allowed them a safe space to learn the social norms of the mainstream community.

Okamoto et al. (2008) derived recommendations from their interview data that they believed could support Micronesian youth and their families. Since it was believed that many of the problems come from the factor of recent immigration, the authors asserted that schools and social agencies should locate newly arrived Micronesian families and provide them with social services that would prevent common downfalls. Some of the prevention tactics they proposed were financial assistance, job training and placement, and culturally specific, drug and violence prevention programs. The authors also strongly advocated for culturally relevant transition services for the Micronesian youth. They believed that it is unreasonable for the youth to adapt instantaneously to the social norms of their non-Micronesian peers and therefore need first to experience culturally relevant education and understanding among teachers and schools. Along with this, the authors asserted that teachers, students, and communities need to be educated on why Micronesians are now migrating to the U.S. and conceded that some are moving here “because they need advanced health care that can better assist them in coping with
the long-term ramifications of American nuclear testing during the post-World War II era” (Okamoto et al., 2008, p.145). Interventions also need to be placed within community, students, and teachers that subdue racial stereotyping, especially that which Micronesian youth commonly experience.

This study concentrated on a newly arrived immigrant population to the U.S. that may seem obscure to mainland residents. The authors called significance to their study because it exemplifies the “modern day effects of historical colonization” (Okamoto et al., 2008, p.145). For instance, until 1986 most of the Micronesian islands were under the colonial control of the United States and before that, Japan, Germany and Spain. For over 120 years the Micronesian islands have been imposed on and continually bombarded by colonial powers, which wreaked havoc on the islands’ people, culture, and economy. Now, today, conditions are so bad that Micronesians are seeking better quality of life and medical service on the Hawaiian Islands, which, no less, was another nation colonized by the U.S. (Langer, 2008). The authors placed this study into a global context that helps us to consider migratory issues amongst a complex historical background in which blame for immigrant and refugee people’s dire situations cannot fully be placed on them and their newly independent nations, but also on historical colonialist nations like the U.S. that today remain privileged keepers of peace and democracy.

Another strength of this article was that the interviews were not translated to Standard English but included excerpts in the youths’ English vernacular. This glimpse provided a sense of the person behind the voice, which is part of the goal behind an ethnographic study. However, this also lent a casual tone to the article, which may dissuade some policy makers from giving it due consideration. Since all interviews were
tape recorded, the findings of this study are auditable to outside parties. Although this study concentrated on populations of a specific immigrant group that reside on the Hawaiian islands, the findings may also be transferable to other newly arrived immigrant communities that live in low-income housing projects. For example, preventative social services that preempt reoccurring problems could be useful in other contextually similar settings in the U.S. where similar problems exist. The authors could improve their study by describing existent structures within the school and community that could provide beneficial platforms for cultural and preventative program startups. The next study examined social capital within an inner city Vietnamese community that lends educational advantages to its youth.

In an ethnographic study Zhou & Bankston (1994) investigated the social capital available to second-generation Vietnamese students in New Orleans. They found that, although New Orleans Vietnamese live in some of the poorest ghettos in the city, their children generally succeed in school due to cultural orientations, which include strong adherence to traditional family values, strong work ethic, and a high level of ethnic involvement. Beginning in 1975, Associated Catholic Charities helped 1000 Vietnamese refugees establish in East New Orleans. By 1990, approximately 5,000 Vietnamese lived within Orleans Parish. The Vietnamese people in this study lived in a neighborhood called Versailles. Versailles experienced an extensive demographic makeover between 1970 and 1990. In 1970, 99 percent of the neighborhood’s residents were white, whereas in 1990, the racial composition was 43 percent Vietnamese and 46 percent black. The authors used census data, newspapers reports, and community interviews to describe the background characteristics of Versailles. Then they distributed a 98-question survey to
198 Vietnamese students at the local high school. Through these efforts the authors hoped to draw connections between immigrant community cultural patterns and adaptation of the second generation.

The Vietnamese students attended a public school made up of 77 percent black, 20 percent Asian (mostly Vietnamese), and 3% other. Seventy percent of the Vietnamese families in Versailles lived in Block Three, which the authors described as “the poorest part of a poor area in a poor city in a poor state” (Zhou & Bankston, 1994, p.828). The median family income in Block Three was $12,790. However, 81 percent of Vietnamese families were married-couple families. Likewise, only 6 percent of Vietnamese households were single-female-headed households, compared to 42 percent of black families, and 17 percent of white families in the area. On the other hand, Vietnamese parents had low-level educational attainment. Eighty percent of students surveyed said their fathers had gone no further than high school. Most parents were agriculturists and fisherman in Vietnam. In New Orleans the parents worked in low-pay, blue-collar work. The authors, seeing the extent of socioeconomic limitation of these families, proposed that Vietnamese second generation youth would only advance through being supported by their whole communities.

The authors found that the Vietnamese community aimed to incorporate into mainstream middle class America. Currently, they lived in an inner-city ghetto with few material resources. However they had the benefit of intact families and a highly interconnected community. The Vietnamese put strong faith in education to bring their community into the middle class. Therefore, as a community, they strongly supported the
youth in educational efforts and monitored closely their achievements. The Vietnamese community put parents and youth under close public scrutiny,

If a child flunks or drops out of school, or if a boy falls into a gang or a girl becomes pregnant without getting married, he or she brings shame not only to himself or herself but also to the family. On the contrary, if a child makes good grades or wins awards in school, the community honors both the individual and the family. (Zhou & Bankston, 1994, p.828)

The surveyed Vietnamese students reported that their parents emphasized obedience, industriousness, and helping others. On the other hand, their parents condemned egotism, individualism, and popularity. Vietnamese youth were required to respect their elders and only make decisions after parental approval. Vietnamese parents in Versailles desired that their children avoid becoming too American, and did not want them associating with non-Vietnamese youth in the neighborhood, or dating non-Vietnamese. Zhou & Bankston (1994) stated, “these Vietnamese family values constitute a source of direction to guide children to adapt to American society the Vietnamese way” (p.831).

The Mary Queen of Vietnam Catholic Church served as a community center for the Vietnamese community. The church hosted after school youth programs, a Saturday open-air market, and three civic organizations: the Vietnamese American Voter’s Association, the Vietnamese Educational Association, and the Vietnamese Parent-Teacher Association (Zhou & Bankston, 1994). The church allowed a common space where the community could support each other and form group efforts.

The authors concluded that Vietnamese youth were able to steer clear of disruptive factors typically found in urban ghettos through their strong cultural
orientations and adherence to traditional family values. Drug use and fighting were a problem at the local public school in Versailles, yet teachers conceded that Vietnamese were not part of the problem, and were generally hard working and well disciplined students. The authors reported that, “in the spring of 1994, nine graduating seniors in the high school under study were awarded Louisiana Honors Scholarships based on academic excellence; seven of them were Vietnamese” (Zhou & Bankston, 1994, p.828). Given that less than 20 percent of the school body was Vietnamese, winning seven out of nine scholarships showed that something about being Vietnamese was advantageous in the school setting. The authors used a regression analysis and found that academic achievement of Vietnamese youth was not significantly influenced by family structure (living with both parents, \( r = -0.119, p > .05 \); number of siblings, \( r = 0.001, p > .05 \); having both parents working, \( r = 0.005, p > .05 \); father’s education, \( r = 0.162, p > .05 \)). This result evidenced that Vietnamese students’ relative high success in school was not just because of intact family structures, number of siblings, having both parents working, or father’s education. Instead, the authors concluded that Vietnamese youth were supported on a community-wide level, not only through their families.

One strength of this study was that it used several auditable means to collect information about Versailles, including documents, ethnographic observation, interviews, and an extensive survey of 198 Vietnamese youth. Also, the study exemplified transferability by focusing on community-level social capital, which could benefit other immigrant groups that reside in other contextually similar communities. The study gained dependability by confirming the relative high academic success of Vietnamese students in the face of low socioeconomic conditions, which is a pattern widely found in
other studies, and then seeking out community influences to explain the pattern. Also, the study benefited from a strong discussion about Vietnamese immigrants’ historical context and brought light to what it means to be refugee people. What strategy might a displaced people use to succeed in a ghetto of a new and foreign land? The Vietnamese people arrived in the U.S. with very limited resources. This study was conducted 20 years after the first major wave of Vietnamese immigration in 1975. The authors found that the Vietnamese community had overcome many obstacles and established a highly interconnected social network that emphasized and enforced traditional values, and whose youth succeeded in school. The next study narrative discusses how family affinities among Mexican origin students promoted their success in school.

In a correlational survey study Valenzuela & Dornbusch (1994) used data collected by the Families, Peers and Schools Research Project at Stanford University to analyze the combined affect of familism and social capital on the academic achievement of Mexican origin and Anglo adolescents. The findings suggested that strong familism attitudes among Mexican origin students promoted higher-levels of academic achievement only if parental education level was also high (Familism x ParEd, r = .14, p < .01). The authors’ definition of familism consisted of three elements: structural, attitudinal, and behavioral. Structural elements involved the spatial and social aspects of the student’s families. For example, whether or not they lived close to or with extended family members and whether or not their nuclear family was intact. Attitudinal elements referred to the amount the students cared about their family’s wellbeing and interests. And behavioral elements included the degree of affinity students held with different family members. None of the three elements of familism, alone, showed significant
correlation to academic achievement of Mexican origin students (behavioral, \( r = -.04, p > .05 \); structural, \( r = .03, p > .05 \); attitudinal, \( r = .03, p > .05 \)). The main reason Valenzuela & Dornbusch (1994) chose to investigate the affect of familism on achievement was to rebuke prior studies, which suggested Mexican origin students’ school achievement was negatively impacted by strong family affinities. Also, they wanted to combat modernization literature that promoted immigrant student socialization toward individualism. The authors’ hypothesized that, “a strong familistic orientation in combination with high human capital is associated with higher academic performance” (Valenzuela & Dornbusch, 1994, p. 22).

The authors’ data set consisted of 3,158 adolescents that attended school in the San Francisco Bay Area: 2,666 Anglo and 492 Mexican origin. The original survey questioned students about their grades and curriculum track (academic achievement), gender, parents’ education (social capital), how often they spoke on the phone with relatives that did not live with them (familism behavior), how many adult family members lived within 20 minutes from their home (familism structure), their attachment to family relationships (familism attitudes), number of siblings, intact or non-intact household structures, and parental school involvement. The authors wanted to identify which conditions of familism favored academic achievement of both Anglo and Mexican origin youth. Also, they were interested in the interaction between familism and parental education on academic achievement.

Valenzuela & Dornbusch (1994) found that Mexican origin students’ academic achievement was supported by the combination of high familism attitudes and high-level parental education, as opposed to low familism attitudes and high-level parental
education (males: high ParEd and low familism, \( r = 2.79, p < .001 \); high ParEd and high familism, \( r = 3.35, p > .01 \)). Conversely, the combination of high-level familism and low-level parental education, as opposed to low-level familism attitudes and low-level parental education, corresponded to slightly lower academic achievement among Mexican origin students, but this was not a significant correspondence (males: low ParEd and low familism, \( r = 2.83, p > .01 \); low ParEd and high familism, \( r = 2.81, p > .01 \)). Anglo students’ academic achievement, on the other hand, was not predicted by the combination of familism attitudes and parental education, however parental educational status alone predicted their achievement (Anglo ParEd, \( r = .27, p < .001 \)). Mexican origin students’ grades were not significantly predicted by either familism variables or parental education alone. However, interestingly, parent involvement strongly predicted the grades of both Mexican origin and Anglo students (Mexican origin, \( r = .20, p < .001 \); Anglo, \( r = .10, p < .001 \)). Parental involvement indicated that parents helped with homework, asked about their son or daughter’s school life, participated in school programs, went to son’s or daughter’s sports events, and helped choose courses.

This study boasts reliability in that it used a large data set generated from surveys, in which further trials could be repeated in different settings. However, the survey’s reliability depended on honest responses from the subjects surveyed. The surveys themselves were objective and the data was accessible to the public. Valenzuela & Dornbusch (1994) believed that their findings challenged “the dominant myth that academic achievement is obstructed by collective orientations” (p.34). The conclusions of this study can be generalized to other settings, but we must first reconsider the implications of the results. The authors found that when Mexican origin students’
parents were well educated, then strong family affinities actually benefited academic achievement. However, they also noted that the Mexican origin students that were part of the highest achieving category were a numerical minority (n=30 males, n=31 females), all of which were high on familism and parental education. The authors did not discuss the implications for the majority of Mexican origin students in the study, whose parents attained less than a high school degree, and who did not benefit academically from family affinities. The authors found a strong positive relationship of good grades and parental education, which exemplified the internal validity of the study. However, that, by far, the majority of Mexican origin students surveyed did not benefit from “familism” is reason for concern. Does this mean that, for most Mexican origin youth, undereducated parents negatively or neutrally affect their success in school? Or are there other independent variables that were not considered? In any case, the authors’ results support a deficit theory, which suggests that undereducated parents lack positive supports for their children, since the only youth that benefited from close family relations were those with educated parents. The next study narrative looks into moralistic themes in which Latina mothers impart to their daughters.

In an ethnographic study Villenas & Moreno (2001) interviewed Latina mothers and daughters in North Carolina to explore the teaching and learning that occurred through their consejos (advice), cuentos (stories), and la experiencia (experience). The authors found that Latina mothers conveyed a paradoxical mix of lessons in their advice, stories, and experiencias to their daughters, which simultaneously included both classic patriarchal “woman of the home” ideologies and feminist ideologies that advocated for self-reliance (Villenas & Moreno, 2001, p.671). The authors collected oral life histories
of 11 Latina women living in Hope City, North Carolina between 1994 and 1996. At the
time of the ethnographic study, Hope City had recently become a new Latino settlement,
at the disapproval of many of its white residents. The authors felt that the Latina mothers
of Hope City were relevant subjects because they had the direct experience of mothering
across borders and resisting a racially hostile environment. Under these conditions the
authors wanted to see the pedagogies that the mothers would teach their daughters.

Villenas & Moreno (2001) found that the mothers taught their daughters “to be
submissive, rebellious, and conforming, all at the same time” (p.673). They used a
framework based on third space feminism, funds of knowledge, and educación (manner
and moral values) to explore these seemingly contradictory teachings. The Latina
mothers wanted their daughters to be good daughters, good wives, and good mothers,
however they also wanted their daughters “to practice a decolonizing otherness,” which
allowed them to love themselves and defy patriarchal oppression toward women. The
interviewed Latina mothers expressed disdain toward U.S. women’s casual stance toward
premarital sex. They warned their daughters never to get pregnant before marriage.
The authors explained that these sexual views came with the Spanish colonization of
America. The male colonialist needed to quell women’s power by putting them in their
places. Today, Latina mothers help upkeep the colonialist attitude toward what is right
behavior for a woman, which consists of a strong sense of heterosexuality and no sex
before marriage. In this view, women are to be feminized and domesticated, and their
bodies associated with reproduction.

As well as the strong commitment to disengaging their daughters’ sexuality, the
Latina mothers exerted a strong commitment to keeping house. They believed that the
house was the woman’s terrain and kept great pride in maintaining a well-functioning home space. Some Latina mothers in the community disgraced women, who failed to keep up a home. However, the authors acknowledged that the Latina mothers derived power from their deep domestic connection to the home. For example, one mother explained, “my mother in-law always told her son, “This house is for Nora and no one else. She has her sons. The day that you stop supporting her, or something else occurs, you are a man so you can pack your things and leave to find another place.”” (Villenas & Moreno, 2001, p.680).

The Latina mothers advocated that their daughters become self reliant so that if their husband left them they could support themselves and their kids both emotionally and economically. One of the mothers, Marsiela, described the respect she held for the women in her family because of the hard work and obstacles they overcame in their lives. For example, her grandmother had 18 children, became a widow, and was left alone to support and raise nine children. Marsiela also explained how her own mother had helped her obtain formal schooling, which was rare for girls in her community. Her mother was involved outside the home in community work, too, and this gave Marsiela an impression that greater opportunities exist for women. The authors labeled Marsiela as a product of a matriarchal family, centered on women’s experience. Marsiela related that her grandmother’s consejos concerned, “the benefits of not marrying the father of their children … that it was better because that way you did not have to worry about the burden of a man who did not take part in childrearing anyway” (Villenas & Moreno, 2001, p.684).
The analysis of this study depicted first generation Latina mothers morally rooted to what the authors called patriarchal gendered ideologies. However, they also found semblance of transformation and expectations for their children to have different opportunities. Villenas & Moreno (2001) candidly presented the dialogue of these women and applied a feminist framework to its analysis. The candid narratives provided the study with credible information, which could provide educators with a general sense of home life and expectations of Latino parents. This information could also help teachers to interact with Latino parents. The author’s analysis stepped into complex and intellectual terrain based on feminist and colonial frameworks, which attempted to explain the systematic origins of the Latina mothers’ beliefs and moralities. This analysis provided the study with a sense of meaning-making and theory, and did not limit the transferability of the facts, which the interviewers found existent in the Latina mothers’ lives. Last, the morals and epistemologies of the women gained dependability because other ethnographic studies have interviewed Latina mothers and daughters about similar questions. For example, the results of this study can be assessed alongside the next study narrative, which similarly discusses the supports that a Mexican immigrant mother provided her daughter.

In a case study, Espinoza-Herald (2007) examined the cultural resources present in one academically successful Latina’s life with extra emphasis on mother-daughter interactions. The author found that the Latina attributed much of her educational success to her mother’s continual encouragement, which occurred through a family literacy practice called “Dichos.” Espinoza-Herald (2007), one decade prior, conducted an ethnographic study which compared the life factors and differentiated academic success
of a U.S. born Mexican American student and a Mexican immigrant student. She
decided to conduct a follow-up case study on the Mexican immigrant student, Carla, who
immigrated with her family to the United States when she was a child. Carla was
enrolled in a doctorate program at the time of this study, however she was first a high
school dropout, who managed to get her life back together. Espinoza-Herald (2007),
struck by Carla’s positive attitude in the face of difficulty, decided to examine the
cultural resources, or funds of knowledge, she used to get from dire straits to the ivory
tower. This report was the result of 12 interviews with Carla that “consisted of a series
of open-ended questions gauging her sense of personal accomplishment; activities she
was involved in after high school graduation; family support; cultural traditions,
acculturation, and identification with Mexican and U.S. cultures; and the roles played by
peers, mentors, and others in her achievements” (Espinoza-Herald, 2007, p.266).

Espinoza-Herald (2007) found that Carla’s mother was a driving force in her life.
Carla’s mother barely spoke English and did not attend higher education before
emigrating to the U.S., however through what the author termed, Dichos, she was able to
help her daughter in the new hardships she faced. In this study, Dichos was described to
be nurturing words of advice passed through generations from elders to youth. The
Dichos that Carla’s mother recited in times of Carla’s hardship with higher education
allowed Carla’s mother, who had no experience with higher education, to connect on a
helpful level with Carla. Espinoza-Herald (2007) identified Dichos as funds of
knowledge that were key for Carla in finding vital support and encouragement from her
family. Some of the Dichos that Carla’s mom employed (translated to English) were:
“Yes you can!; The Sayings of Our Elders are Small Gospels; Tell Me Who You Keep

Through these short statements Carla derived inspiration and motivation. Carla’s mother was familiar with hardships, not exactly the hardships that Carla faced in higher education, but hardships none the less. Carla, her family, and ancestors had lived in a borderland region for generations. The Dichos were useful tools that borderland people had developed over time in response to the hardships they faced as they attempted to find identity and livelihood on both sides of the border (Espinoza-Herald, 2007). These Dichos imply the importance of maintaining close familial ties across generations. They provide a sense of strength that a young person can find within their family history, “Yes you can!” (Espinoza-Herald, 2007, p.264). You come from strong, resilient, and adaptive people, “the sayings of your elders are small gospels;” listen to the Dichos, they have relevance to your life, they will be relevant to your children’s lives too (Espinoza-Herald, 2007, p.266). Carla’s mom encouraged her to find a peer group that could influence her in positive ways and help her navigate through the University school system. She did not say this in so many words, she said, “Tell me who you keep company with and I will tell you who you are” (Espinoza-Herald, 2007, p. 269). When Carla was concerned with the pressures of school she came home to her mother for help, “Do not fret…get busy,” her mother told her (Espinoza-Herald, 2007, p. 270).

Broadly, this case study identified Dichos as a fund of knowledge for one Mexican immigrant family. However, Espinoza-Herald (2007) asserted that this is a common tradition in Latino culture that educators should give due consideration before discounting the role of immigrant parents in the education of their children. Often times,
because Mexican immigrant students’ parents do not speak English and lack academic skills, educators reason they will not be able to support their children in school. This study proved otherwise. The timeless and universal quality of the Dichos and Carla’s reverence of her mother as a caring role model provided the most important empowerment for Carla as she faced an oftentimes difficult and confusing process in the U.S. school system. Espinoza-Herald (2007) encouraged educators to open up their consideration of literacy to include, “verbal exchanges and discussions, folktales and dichos,” as practices that could have positive impact on academic motivation and achievement of students (p. 273). The author recommended that teachers connect with parents on the basis of dichos and cultural values to create common ground between home and school.

This study provided a compelling example of “funds of knowledge” and their applicability to the educational success of immigrant students (Espinoza-Herald, 2007). The author detailed the mother and daughter’s life history and philosophical positions, which were influenced by the hybridized time and space of borderlands. The study gained credibility due to the author’s close and long-term relationship with the interviewed mother and daughter, and relevance because of the current low educational success rates among Latino populations in the U.S. Dichos were shown to be a vital component of Carla’s rebound and success in school and could provide a common link to what matters in many students lives. This study evidenced dependability because it could be compared with other similar studies that have charted the significance of family-based literacy practices. However, the extent to which this study’s results are auditable to an outside party are questionable, since it would require a similarly close and long-term
relationship with Carla and her mother. The last study of this section describes an experiment that tested the competitive and cooperative differences between Mexican children from rural Mexico and inner city Anglo American children from Los Angeles.

In a quasi-experimental study Kagan & Madsen (1972) conducted experiments on Anglo American city children and rural Mexican children to explore differences in cooperative and competitive behaviors. The authors found irrational behaviors among both groups: Anglo American children remained in conflict irreverent of the fact that they were losing toys, and Mexican children avoided conflict to the extent that they allowed peers to keep all toys. Kagan & Madsen (1972) conducted their experiment in two locations. The Anglo American sample was gathered from elementary schools and daycare centers in Los Angeles. The Mexican sample came from a small town called Nuevo San Vicente on the Baja California peninsula in Mexico. There were 80 children from each group involved in the study: 40 aged 10 – 11 and 40 aged 7 – 9. The samples were also evenly represented by male and female genders. The authors conducted their experiments with the children on location.

Their experiments consisted of competitive and cooperative activities with specified rewards. For example, Experiment One consisted of a large wooden box with a hinged lid that could only be opened with the use of four hands. Therefore, cooperation would be needed to open the box. Experiment One had two treatments and involved two children per trial. In treatment one, the two children observed as the authors placed two identical toys inside the box and shut the lid. The authors then told the children that if they can open the box they can each have a toy inside. In treatment two, only one toy was placed inside the box and one child was designated as the toy receiver. However, the
toy receiver would still need their peer to open the box. The authors timed the children in how long it took them to open the box for both treatments. They found significant differences between treatment numbers one and two (p < .001), however they did not find significant difference between cultural groups. This experiment failed to support the authors’ hypothesis that Mexican children are better able to cooperate and more willing to support peers than Anglo American children.

Experiment Two tested the children for evidence of competition and rivalry. For the competition treatment, the children could either take away a peer’s toy and keep it, let the peer keep the toy, or let the peer keep the toy out of default, by not asserting a decision. In the rivalry treatment, peer one decided whether peer two got to keep his/her toy. However peer one would not get the toy, either. Or, like in treatment number one, peer one could let peer two keep the toy out of default, by not asserting a decision.

Overall, children from both groups took the toy more often in the competitive treatment than in the rivalry treatment (p < .001). The authors found a significant difference, too, between cultural groups in this experiment. Under the rivalry treatment 78% of Anglo American children took the toy from their peer, just so their peer would not get a toy either. Only 36% of Mexican children, on the other hand, took their peer’s toy under the rivalry condition (p < .01). The authors also found that Mexican children avoided making a definite decision twice as often as Anglo children under the rivalry treatment (Anglo, 8%, Mexican, 22%; p < .10). The authors speculated from these results that Anglo children feel little conflict in ousting their peers’ out of a toy, while Mexican children may feel an impulse toward rivalry, but act on it to a lesser extent than their Anglo counterparts.
In Experiment Three, pairs of children faced-off on a checkers-like game board where they alternated turns moving one marker. A forward movement of the marker counted as a conflict move, sideways was neutral, and back was submissive. The Anglo American children were far more likely to respond to a take move with a forward conflict move than Mexican children (Anglo, 72%, Mexican, 14%; p. < .005). Alternatively, 8 of 12 Mexican children responded to initial take moves by moving sideways, whereas only 2 of 15 Anglo children did likewise (Anglo, 28%, Mexican 65%; p. < .01). The authors found that the Anglo American children’s competitive spirit ended up limiting their groups’ overall toy attainment. Whereas the Mexican American children’s neutral avoidance tendencies increased their groups’ overall attainment.

In Experiment Four, the authors found further evidence to suggest the irrationality of Anglo American children’s competitive dispositions. In this experiment each child had a marker on the same chess-like board. They moved the marker forward to their goal, which would grant them a toy. However, now they could block their opponents’ moves. The authors found that Anglo American children were more likely than Mexican children to block each others’ moves, in order to prevent each other from earning toys (p. < .001). Conversely, Mexican children more often moved sideways to allow their opponents to pass, even when it meant that their opponent would take more than half the toys. Twelve out of 16 Anglo American pairs blocked each other so much that neither child received a toy, whereas no Mexican pairs lost a toy because of blocking (p. < .001). Kagan & Madsen (1972) concluded,

The present experiments demonstrate that Mexican children avoid and Anglo-American children remain in conflict to an irrational extent. That each culture is
producing children who are systematically irrational in opposite direction suggests the possibility of cultural therapy. In the present experiments, no attempt has been made to determine the institutions and child-rearing practices responsible for the observed cultural differences. If causal relations can be established, the possibility exists of making systematic changes that would provide children of both cultures alternatives to irrational behavior. (p. 58)

Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba (1991) found extensive ethnographic data to suggest that sharing is an important value among Mexican Americans and their children, and that their culture does not preclude competition, but seeks to support equality in opportunities to lead and win within competitive activities. Kagan & Madsen (1972), the authors of this experimental study, assumed that having more toys for oneself was the best outcome, and considered it problematic that some Mexican children permitted their peers to have more toys than them. What perplexed Kagan & Madsen (1972) was the evident lack of self-interest many of the Mexican children exemplified. However, the act of sharing, from an alternative perspective, could be seen as self-interest too. In a small, relatively isolated Mexican community of 800 people, sharing may be more associated with self-interest than the act of winning and hoarding toys through combative means.

The methods of this study showed internal validity in that the dependent variables changed considerably when independent variables were applied. However, it remains questionable as to whether the experiments’ results are generalizable across all populations of Mexican and Anglo youth. Also, the study was published in 1972. Considerable changes in cooperative and competitive behavior of Mexican and Anglo youth may have occurred since then.
Discussion of Themes

This section discussed nine studies that examined funds of knowledge and cultural characteristics of Mexican, Vietnamese, Filipino, Micronesian, and Honduran immigrants and their families. Some of the studies also discussed Anglo American and white middle class funds of knowledge and cultural characteristics. Some important themes arose. For one, some immigrant parents promote English language at home, while others promote their native language at home. For example, Valdés (1998) interviewed a Honduran immigrant parent that required her children to speak English at home and to only watch English language television while at home. The parent, a low-wage working mother, knew how difficult it was to get jobs without English literacy, so she did all she could to support her children’s English language acquisition. On the other hand, Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba (1991) observed Mexican immigrant parents who ignored their children if they spoke English at home. These parents desired that their children retain fluency in Spanish, so enforced a home Spanish language environment. Another theme was teacher’s beliefs that immigrant parents were incompetent in supporting their children’s educational success (Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba, 1991). This view aligns with a deficit model outlook. Multiple studies found that immigrant parents lacked information about their children’s schools (Espinoza-Herald, 2007; Phelan et al., 1991; Valdés, 1998; Valenzuela & Dornbusch, 1994). In response, authors proposed that schools reach out to immigrant parents so that they can become more involved in their children’s educations. Also, multiple studies found that immigrant families and communities contained funds of knowledge that supported students, and that these supports were often invisible to teachers. For example, Espinoza-Herald (2007)
identified family-literacy practices that a Mexican immigrant mother used to support her daughter’s educational success. The mother’s English language skills and knowledge of U.S. schooling practices were minimal, however through “Dichos” she provided crucial motivational support for her daughter. Also, inner-city Vietnamese students in New Orleans succeeded in school through community and cultural supports, even though their parents were of low socioeconomic status (Zhou & Bankston, 1994).

Another theme was that collective student-student classroom activities worked well for some immigrant youth. For example, Delgado-Gaitan and Trueba (1991) observed Mexican immigrant students whose sense of self-worth at school was dependent on participation in learning activities that did not undermine their collective skill in sharing. Phelan et al., (1991) interviewed Latino immigrant students that got A’s in student-centered classrooms and F’s in teacher-centered classrooms. Also, multiple studies found that educationally successful immigrant students benefited from peer group interactions at school (Espinoza-Herald, 2007, Phelan et al., 1991). And Valdés (1998) found that Latino immigrant ESL students’ educational progress was limited by lack of social interactions with native English speakers at school.

Discontinuities between home and school were another theme in the studies. Some immigrant students’ parents worked long hours, some students had to baby sit their younger siblings during schools hours, some were involved in gangs, some lived in overcrowded apartments, and many immigrant parents were uneducated and lacked English skills. Phelan et al. (1991) pointed out that some students come from home and peer worlds that make school worlds hazardous. For example, one Mexican American high school student that grew up in a Southern California Mexican barrio had developed
an oppositional relationship to school. Her peer group’s values did not mesh well with school, and she did not feel acceptance from other students and teachers while at school. This student was also frustrated that her school never taught Mexican history and culture in class. Similarly, Okamoto et al. (2008) advocated for culturally inclusive curriculum that addressed Micronesian issues so that Micronesian immigrant students entering Hawaiian schools could feel represented.

A last theme was that white middle class students experienced relative ease in negotiating boundaries between home, school, and peer groups (Phelan et al., 1991). This finding supports the theory that U.S. public schooling practices favor middle class Anglo American learners. Two studies reported white middle-class students and parents who believed immigrant student enrollment at their schools would lower quality of education for all (Phelan et al., 1991, Valdéz, 1998). Alternatively, Phelan et al. (1991) proposed that white middle-class students were too isolated from other cultures, and that they would become miseducated due to lack of exposure to alternative ideologies.

The next section of this chapter reports on studies that deal with issues for transnational families and their children. Also, some of the studies discuss civics education in relation to immigrant students who have ties to multiple nation states.

Transnational Experience and Citizenship

The studies presented in this section examined the experience of transnational youth, that is, youth who have ties to two nations, languages, and cultures. Some of these studies advocated a framework that suggested the process of education is part of a larger
process of nation formation. Within this framework, the U.S. does not have a static
culture, one that immigrant students must assimilate into. Instead, they are members of a
dynamic global community that participate in public dialogue that imagines, constructs,
and reconstructs symbolic boundaries to include new people and ideas (El-Haj, 2007).
Inherent in this ideology is a strong commitment toward democracy and civic
participation. This section also includes studies based around civics education in relation
to life experience of immigrants.

The first study examined a primary school in rural Mexico to gain insight into
prior school experience of Mexican immigrant children. The author found that the school
adhered to a national curriculum, textbooks were politically radical, and that classroom
activities included abundant verbal interactivity and group orientations (Macias, 1990).
In the second study Patthey-Chavez (1993) investigated cultural conflicts in a Los
Angeles inner-city high school that had a majority (over 80%) Latino population. The
author found that the school’s structure and curriculum reproduced Anglo middle-class
norms, which the Latino students rarely bought into. The third study observed and
interviewed “skilled” social studies teachers to construct a civics education framework
for teaching multicultural democracy (Marri, 2005). In the next study Torney-Purta,
Barber, & Wilkenfeld (2006) used IEA Civic Education study data to examine
explanations for citizenship education achievement gaps between Latino and non-Latino
9th graders. The study found that non-Latino students scored higher on civic knowledge
and were more likely to vote than Latino students. However, Latino students were more
likely to show positive attitudes toward immigrant rights than non-Latino students. The
next presents a long-term case study in which Sánchez (2007) met with three second-
generation Mexican American youth to examine the learning processes that occur outside of school for transnational students. The study identified issues particular to transnational youth and documented the creation of a transnational children’s book.

Finally, in the last study El-Haj (2007) explored Palestinian American high school students’ notions of citizenship, national belonging, and the role of public school as a possible context for political identity development. The study found controversies between the Palestinian youth’s political perspective and the one endorsed by the school.

Introductions complete, the first study narrative about schooling in Mexico begins next.

In an ethnographic study Macias (1990) examined a primary school in Mexico to gain insight into pre-immigration educational experience of Mexican immigrant students. The author found that teachers followed a national curriculum, textbooks were politically radical and international in scope from a U.S. perspective, and that classroom activities were characterized by student verbal interactivity and group orientation. The author used a transnational perspective to consider and discuss immigrant children’s educational development as they move across borders. Macias (1990) conducted fieldwork at a primary school (grades 1 – 6) in a town called San Felipe, which was a rural community of 1500 residents and about an hour drive from Guadalajara. Most families in San Felipe had at least one family member living in the United States. Because emigration to the states was so prevalent in this town, the author called it an immigrant-sending community. Some of the students at the primary school had already been to the U.S., attended schools there, and returned to San Felipe. The author observed and interviewed over 300 students, their teachers, and parents over a several month period in 1986-1987.
The author’s goal was to document content, structure, and processes of the school and then to discuss the relevance of this information to U.S. school curriculum and methods.

The author found three kinds of schools in Mexico: federally-run schools, state-run schools, and church-run or private schools. All schools’ curriculum, however, followed the same standard requirements issued by the Secretaría de Educación Pública. The primary school in San Felipe was a federally-run school, which is common for rural schools in Mexico. All federally-run schools get the same textbooks.

Macias (1990) broke the Mexican curriculum into three categories: standardization, core content, and adaptation. Every SEP School in the country gets the same curriculum. The author noted that the first grade textbook used a holistic method that integrated all subjects. Once students got to third grade, however, curriculum became more differentiated, with different textbooks for Spanish, math, social studies, and science, which were the core content areas. Arts and crafts were relatively uncommon because of both lack of time and materials. However, physical education occurred on a regular basis. Likewise, due to lack of space and resources, there were no special education classrooms in the school. Sometimes teachers stayed after school to tutor students that needed extra help.

Standard-issue textbooks and their proposed activities sometimes posed obstacles. Teachers often needed to adapt the lessons to fit the backgrounds and material resources of their students. For example, one teacher described a math problem that talked about garbage trucks, which the students had no idea about because they had never been to a city. Also, the textbooks often proposed learning activities that required materials that parents could not afford, so teachers would have to adapt it somehow, and have their
students construct their own learning materials from scratch. In this way, students learned how to be very resourceful in school.

The author stated that the school’s math curriculum was more advanced than U.S. elementary school math curriculum. Teachers reported that students schooled in the U.S. often returned to Mexico behind in math. Teachers also reported, however, that some of the math problems were not grade-level appropriate. Macias (1990) was impressed by the international scope of a sixth grade social studies text book, which included a diverse assortment of Mexican, Spanish-language, and international literary figures including: “José Vasconcellos, Octavio Paz, Juan Ramón Jimenez, Gonzalo Celorio, Martín Luis Guzmán, Miguel de Cervantes, José Martí, Fedor Dostoyevsky, Khalil Gibran, Franz Kafka, and Jules Renard” (p.302). The author was also surprised by radical content he found in the social studies curriculum, “This “radical” content—at least as so characterized from a Mexican or U.S. conservative viewpoint—portrays Mexico’s national development in terms of colonialism, imperialism, and capitalism, presenting these issues in a nationalistic, critical light” (Macias, 1990, p.302). The radical curriculum was not without protest by Mexican conservatives and business groups that claimed the curriculum was not good for business.

The author found that instructional time in the classroom consisted of a high level of student participation, vocalization, and group orientation. Teachers often encouraged students to speak loudly, because they thought that their rural town needed more confident public speakers. In the same way, they encouraged students to be assertive at school. The students also engaged in an abundance of tactile activities, especially when
they had to construct their learning materials, like rulers, and compasses in order to complete textbook activities.

Macias (1990) discussed the implications of these findings for U.S. immigrant-receiving schools. The author proposed that U.S. educators should be more aware of the pre-immigration educational experiences of their students, rather than assuming inferiority of all immigrant children’s prior schooling. Also, U.S. educators should research national curriculum frameworks, like Mexico’s, to begin to understand the concepts and ideas that students already know.

This study was exceptional because it observed a school in Mexico. Most studies only look at U.S. classrooms. How do immigrant children experience education in their original countries? This is an important question, given the increasing numbers of Mexican immigrant students enrolling everyday in U.S. schools. The only weakness of this study was that it only observed one rural school, which was described as high quality. Therefore, we have no idea if other schools in Mexico demanded as much from their students, or used similar instructional approaches. However the study’s research methods gave the study credibility, in which the author became immersed in San Felipe for several months and observed and interviewed over 300 students, their teachers, and parents. Also, the study’s results could be audited and confirmed by an outside party by going to San Felipe and conducting similar observations and interviews. The next study narrative describes a study that examined cultural conflicts at a Los Angeles high school.

In an ethnographic study Patthey-Chavez (1993) investigated cultural conflicts at a Los Angeles inner-city high school with a majority (over 80%) Latino population and an almost all Anglo American staff. The author found that the school’s structure and
curriculum inappropriately reproduced Anglo middle-class norms, while the Latino student body remained passive and rarely bought into the school’s academic and extracurricular programs. Patthey-Chavez (1993) proposed a need for greater negotiations between the Latino community and middle-class Anglo teachers and administrators about appropriate cultural reproduction that is more representative of the actual student body.

The author, a city college professor in the Los Angles area, interviewed and observed students and teachers at Lima high school between 1986 and 1989. The school boasted that it contained students that spoke 34 languages, however the school was dominated by its Latino population (Chicanos, immigrants from Mexico, Guatemala, and El Salvador). The author described the surrounding area as a Latino enclave, which middle-class Americans described as like being in another country, with beggars and vendors on every street corner and Spanish text dominating every sign. Near the enclave, but adequately separated, was the financial area of Los Angeles, where business people sped into work every morning. The author was a local of the area, a professor at Los Angeles City College, and had comparative experience in education in Mexico, the U.S., and Switzerland. Through these life experiences and close observation and interaction with Lima high school and the surrounding community, the author created a vivid and ironic picture of a high school attempting to reproduce a white middle class American conception of school spirit, while over 80% of their students did not care to participate in that vision.

Patthey-Chavez (1993) introduced this study with a discussion of theoretical frameworks and a detailed description of the context of Lima high school. First, the
author discussed the theory of cultural reproduction in schools. Public schools could be an ideal place where teachers and students come together under one roof to negotiate and resolve cultural discontinuities on a daily basis. At Lima high school, however, teachers rarely interacted with students outside of class. Rather, the teachers retreated directly to the teacher lounge right after class, and after school, returned directly to their middle class neighborhoods. The ESL classrooms were crowded, chaotic, and heavily bound to a required grammar-based curriculum. Most teachers did not want to know about the reality of their students’ lives. They thought that by only concentrating on academics they would avoid teacher burnout. However, the author offered, “the irony is that, by closing themselves off from most of their students, they closed themselves off from a crucial source of information, a source that could improve their effectiveness as a teacher” (Patthey-Chavez, 1993, p.47). The system of the school was largely positioned to turn a blind eye to student’s real life issues and responsibilities that prevented them from participating fully in school. On top of this, the school district believed in the suitability of a uniform curriculum to teach a heterogeneous school population.

The first thing the author noticed at Lima high school was the high degree of fashion present. The author had expected the students to look like poor immigrants with shabby clothes, but instead found an abundance of fashion and realized the resourcefulness and creativity of these low-income students. The style of the students represented a cultural theory, that of oppositional identities. The students obviously cared about an identity that was different from mainstream American identities. The author proposed that most of the students were opposed to the mainstream identity that Lima High supported. The Latino students may have felt that the schools’ middle class
cultural reproduction threatened their group solidarity. However, the majority of faculty and administrators held tightly to their vision of what high school should be. Patthey-Chavez (1993) summed up this dynamic,

Although it may very well have been true that 34 languages were represented at Lima High, the vast majority of Lima’s students spoke Spanish, and the predominant culture at Lima was that of the Spanish-speaking students. The impression that I got was that the school was working very hard to evoke Ellis Island in its portrayal of itself to the outside world. In so doing, it was establishing an assimilationist frame. It portrayed itself as a port of entry for educational opportunity and the American way, a port of entry that students, but for a few miscreants, were eagerly passing through. (p. 50).

The school made a lot of assumptions when it took on an assimilationist attitude, including that Anglo American culture was best, and that everyone should aspire to be like mainstream America. This was clearly not the attitude among the majority of students at Lima High.

Lima High invested hugely in extracurricular activities and sports, yet the schools academic record was not good (approx. 90% of students’ academic ability measured two grades below grade level and had a 40-50% dropout rate). The author portrayed a high school yearbook crisis at Lima, in which the majority of students were not willing to pay $33.00 for a yearbook. The yearbook sponsor appealed to the students at an in-school assembly to show greater school spirit and buy the yearbooks, however he did not take into account the limited financial resources of most of the students. Patthey-Chavez (1993) explained that the Latino students did not share in a discourse with Lima High
School. Teachers spoke to them in a way that was meant to “reinforce, reproduce, and maintain their [the teachers’] previous social identities” (Patthey-Chavez, 1993, p.53). The teachers and staff expected them to act in an American way and this conflicted with many students’ interests. The author concluded that a mutual discourse needed to be established between the Latino community and the American school. Spanish language acquisition, on the part of the school faculty, would not improve the situation alone. The author asserted that teachers and administrators first needed to gain an understanding of their students’ backgrounds. Then, they needed to reorient themselves and renegotiate their role in these students’ lives. What was high school for? Obviously middle-class, Anglo-approved extracurricular activities and high school glee was not vitally relevant to these Latino students’ school achievement. Their identities needed to be represented in the institution of school. Not until then would they be able to concentrate on learning the skills that would be important for their lives. The author believed that U.S. public schooling needed to let go of assimilationist ideologies, and reconsider what it meant to educate a culturally heterogeneous population for the future. The Latino majority at Lima High School in Los Angeles needed their realities acknowledged and represented in their school life. They felt conflicted in school because it seemed abstract and pointless.

This ethnographic study vivified numerous cultural conflicts between teachers and students at Lima High School. In this ironical portrayal of a minority-majority public high school in Los Angeles the author brought theory to life through sharing dialogue of teachers and students. The study also gained credibility from the fact that the author lived and worked in the surrounding community, had compared educational practices in multiple nations, and spent extensive time during a three-year period investigating Lima
High, its teachers, and students. However, the author’s interpretation of the dynamics at play within Lima High remains open to debate. The author asserted a strong sense that Latino students’ failure and disengagement was largely due to discontinuities between home and school culture. Here, the author peered through a theoretical framework based on U.S. public schooling’s tendency toward Anglo cultural reproduction and offered vivid examples. The findings of this ethnographic study could be transferable to other minority-majority public schools in the U.S. that remain insensitive to the backgrounds of their students. The next study narrative describes a study that attempted to lay ground rules for an appropriate multicultural civics curriculum.

In a case study of three secondary social studies teachers Marri (2005) constructed a framework for teachers teaching multicultural democracy units. Also, the author examined obstacles the teachers faced in working toward classroom-based multicultural democracy. The study found that the teachers’ curriculum was dominated by communication and critical thinking skill attainment and overlooked the aspect of social action in its portrayal of democracy. Also, the teachers failed to consider diversity as representative of more than just ethnic/racial classifications.

The author observed each teacher’s classrooms for four-weeks, interviewed the teachers three-times each, and collected and analyzed the teachers’ classroom materials. The author used the following criteria to select the teachers, who were supposed to be “skilled” social studies teachers: “(a) they provided equitable opportunities for all students to learn through integrating multiple sources of information, (b) they used multiple perspectives in their teaching, (c) they encouraged students to expand learning beyond the classroom, and (d) they were involved in professional development activities”
(Marri, 2005, p.1040). Marri (2005) was largely concerned with the question of who participates in democracy and on whose terms?

The author built this study on an established framework called Classroom-based Multicultural Democratic Education, which is divided into three main components: critical pedagogy, building a community, and thorough disciplinary content. Critical pedagogy encourages students to consider multiple histories, perspectives, and society’s inequities. It also teaches critical thinking skills by comparing multiple textual and media sources and encourages students to think about who their actions benefit. Also, critical pedagogy requires that students consider and propose social actions that they could take to change the status quo for a more just society. Building a community was described as discussion, problem solving, mediating, and positive-relationship skills in group settings. Also, it is about becoming acquainted with people different from yourself whether it be age, culture, gender, religious, ethnicity, linguistic, sexual-orientation, class, ability, race, etc. Thorough disciplinary content is teaching students the codes of power and the official canons of knowledge that are assumed in many schools, colleges, and universities. Teachers, under this framework, are supposed to compliment mainstream academic knowledge with transformative knowledge that adds alternative perspectives into the equation that challenge mainstream assumptions.

Marri (2005) found that the teachers emphasized effective communication, data interpretation skills, and critical thinking skills in order for their students to understand codes of power. One teacher emphasized discussion skills, which she considered a crucial skill needed to participate in a democracy. She also stressed that students acquire in-depth knowledge of political processes so that they can back up their comments, learn
deliberative skills, and appreciate other’s perspectives. All of the teachers incorporated the state-mandated curricular goals and requirements into their lesson planning, however they “extended the curriculum beyond this “official curriculum” by infusing it with their own curricular goals in keeping with their views of citizenship” (Marri, 2005, p. 1048). One teacher commented on the ability of her students to take content and compare and contrast it to other things that might be happening in current events.

Marri (2005) pointed out some deficiencies of the teachers too. One teacher taught a class which consisted entirely of upper middle-class white students. The teacher explained that she did not teach multiple and critical perspectives because her classroom lacked diversity. The author believed that this was an unreasonable stance because it ignored “the importance of preparing all students to be thoughtful, active, and effective citizens in an increasingly diverse United States” (Marri, 2005, p.1050). Also, the teacher limited her conception of diversity to race/ethnicity and did not consider other forms of diversity such as age, culture, gender, religious, ethnicity, linguistic, sexual-orientation, class, ability, and race. The other two teachers largely ignored these other forms of diversity too, which the author identified as a major obstacle for their effectiveness as teachers of multicultural democracy.

The other major criticism that Marri (2005) asserted was that none of the teachers promoted social action in their classrooms. The author explained that the Classroom-based Multicultural Democratic Education framework was based on a tenant that students work towards becoming active citizens. The teachers supplemented social action skills with critical thinking skills, which the author said was only the first stage of the critical pedagogy continuum, with the last being group social action. Marri (2005) assumed that
schools served as vehicles for social change rather than centers for social reproduction. Therefore the author was disappointed to see that the three teachers largely ignored this crucial aspect of multicultural democratic education. However, this acknowledgment identified a need for future transformation among educator practices.

This study provided a solid platform for multicultural democratic education and constructed several themes that can be deliberated and transferred to other classrooms and schools in the future. Also, by basing observations on an established framework (Classroom-based Multicultural Democratic Education) the study gained both transferability and confirmability. Another quality rested in the author’s objectivity. She did not endorse all the practices of the teachers that she classified “skilled” and identified obstacles they needed to overcome. However, the teachers who went above and beyond state curriculum requirements showed that the struggle for civics curriculum that addressed the needs of all students was a huge and complex problem above and beyond the experience of one teacher to solve. By peering into the classrooms of these teachers the author identified two commonly overlooked components of multicultural democratic education based on critical pedagogy: that of a limited view of diversity and the glazing-over of social activism. The next study narrative describes a study that examined differences in civic engagement between Latino and non-Latino 9th graders.

In a correlational study Torney-Purta, Barber, & Wilkenfeld (2006) used IEA (International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement) Civic Education study data to examine possible explanations for citizenship education achievement gaps between Latino and non-Latino 9th graders. The study found that Latino students scored lower on civic knowledge and were less likely to vote than non-
Latino students (civic knowledge, $r = -3.643$, $p < .01$; voting, $r = -.432$, $p < .01$).

However, Latino students were more likely to show positive attitudes toward immigrant rights than non-Latino students (Latinos, $r = .759$, $p < .01$).

The authors focused their analysis on two themes, which surrounded urban and low-income students. One theme, positive development, which sought to identify personal and environmental assets that promoted positive development among Latino students. The other focused on civic participation and political socialization of Latino students, which sought to identify assets that enhanced positive outcomes in these fields.

Torney-Purta et al. (2006) analyzed a U.S. sample of 9th grade outcomes from a test, which the IEA Civic Education study administered in 1999 ($N = 2,811$). Out of the entire sample, 380 of the students were Latino, 2,373 were non-Latino, and 58 students were excluded from the analysis. The test surveyed students’ “civic knowledge, expectations of informed voting, and attitudes toward immigrant rights” (Torney-Purta et al., 2006, p. 114). The IEA study also surveyed one teacher from each school on their approach to classroom climate, use of interactive activities, and use of official curriculum ($N = 124$).

The authors measured both individual and school–level factors that could influence Latino students’ outcomes on the civics-based questions. They measured Latino and non-Latino response to attitudes towards immigrant rights to see if any correlation existed between students who felt strongly about their rights and civic knowledge and voting expectations. Torney-Purta et al. (2006) also conducted a treatment where they controlled for low Latino enrollment schools and high Latino enrollment schools. They did not control for socioeconomic status, however they did control for average parental education and location of school, suburban or urban.
Torney-Purta et al. (2006) found that Latino students scored lower than non-Latino students on both civic knowledge and expectations to vote (Latinos: civic knowledge, \( r = -3.643, p < .01 \); voting, \( r = -.432, p < .01 \)). They also found that Latino students from schools of high Latino enrollment scored considerably lower than Latino students from schools with low Latino enrollment (High-Latino school: civic knowledge, \( r = -11.9, p < .01 \); voting, \( r = -.443, p < .01 \)). However, Latino students were more likely to show positive attitudes towards immigrant rights than non-Latino students in all schools (Latinos: \( r = .759, p < .01 \)). The authors found several positive assets that increased the scores of Latino students. For the civic knowledge portion of the test these included: Speaks English at home \( (r = 6.769, p < .01) \), Suburban School \( (r = 7.203, p < .01) \), Reads National news in the newspaper \( (r = 2.999, p < .01) \), Discusses political topics with parents \( (r = 3.432, p < .01) \), Perception of open classroom climate \( (r = .724, p < .01) \), and Studies political topics in the classroom \( (r = 5.239, p < .01) \). Torney-Purta et al. (2006) asserted the most useful results for education policy to be the significant increases in both civic knowledge and voting expectation scores when school effects were added to the multilevel analysis. These were the most useful for policy because they were aspects that teachers and administrators could influence. For example, on the civic knowledge portion of the test, Latino students that attended High Latino enrollment schools scored considerably higher if they perceived an open classroom climate and/or studied political topics in the classroom \( (r = .724, p < .01; r = 5.239, p < .01). \) The strongest independent variable that influenced likelihood of positive attitudes towards immigrant rights was Latino ethnicity \( (r = .759, p < .01) \). However there were other independent variables that influenced positive outcomes too, including: Born outside the
U.S. ($r = .527, p < .01$), Discusses political topics with parents ($r = .178, p < .01$),
Perception of open classroom climate ($r = .158, p < .01$), and Studies political topics in
the classroom ($r = .512, p < .01$).

Torney-Purta et al. (2006) found strong internal validity in their analysis of the IEA Civics Education Study data. However, the authors did not discuss the methodology used by their data source to assess students’ civic knowledge. Nonetheless, given that the data source used reliable and objective methods to collect their data, Torney-Purta’s findings could be generalizable across educational settings. The authors advocated that their results and recommendations be transformed into educational policy. Possible avenues for policy reform included “mandating a curriculum rich in conceptual content for all students, developing and teaching towards standards, and encouraging open and respectful discussion in all classrooms” (Torney-Purta et al., 2006, p. 122).

This study surveyed data from a large sample of students ($N = 2,811$) and identified strategies that could increase Latino students’ engagement with civics education. The authors did not interpret their finding that Latino students endorse immigrant rights more so than Non-Latino students as evidence for the need of a multicultural civics curriculum. Also, the article does not consider immigrant communities as agents of political change, whose inclusion necessitates political change of the nation state. The next study narrative discusses a case study of three transnational Mexican American youth.

In an ethnographic study Sánchez (2007) met with 3 second-generation Mexican American youth over a period of three years to examine the learning process that goes on outside of school for transnational students. Of particular interest to the ethnographer
was how the youth used different language and literacy practices to represent themselves and negotiate their border-crossing lives. The study described issues particular to transnational youth and documented the creation of a children’s book, which explored stereotypes and cultural authenticity theory. The Mexican American subjects were all female, ages 16, 16, and 13 at the start of the study. They met with Sánchez at a community center in the Bay Area every Monday to help her conduct primary research on the lives of transnational students. The subjects were born in California to parents that did not graduate high school. They all lived in an inner-city ethnic enclave of the Bay Area. All of their dads worked six days a week in construction. Every year the subjects traveled with their immediate family to Mexico to visit their extended families in the towns their parents emigrated from.

Over the three-year period Sánchez (2007) and the three Mexican American youth participated in a study that focused on their own lives as well as other transnational people’s lives. They used the first meetings for brainstorming. The young women used video, photography, note-taking, and poster-making to organize their ideas, observations and experiences. Sánchez saved all creations, including rough drafts and brainstorms, and audio-recorded all sessions. The subject earned twenty dollars per week to be “participator researchers” in the study. They decided to save their earnings for a two-week research based trip to visit their families in rural Mexico with Sánchez. During the trip to Mexico each subject served as a guide when the group visited their respective family’s homes. Everyday they kept journal records, video interviewed people, took observational notes, and participated in family activities like washing clothes the old fashioned way, sweeping the floors, and recreating in the plaza at night. Back in the Bay
Area the three youth used their notes, interviews, and experience to create a children’s book about transnational children and families that focused on themes found on both sides of the border. Sánchez audio recorded the entire dialogic process of the making of the children’s book and saved all materials. Sánchez considered herself a key participant in the making of the book because she had an analytic and academic lens, which the young women did not have.

The three Mexican American youth wanted to make a children’s book so that they could share with the world what it’s like to be transnational. Sánchez (2007) analyzed their work using a framework concerned with cultural authenticity. Sánchez used this framework because she felt the need to move beyond an attitude of mere appreciation of cultural differences to one that supported an active re-imagining of society that ensured greater voice and rights for marginalized cultures. The cultural authenticity framework was similar to the one presented by El-Haj (2007), that promoted active civic participation and dialogue in order to reform a nation to be inclusive of all people and ideas. Both of these frameworks endorse a perspective that sees U.S. culture as open to change, and both believe strongly in the power of dialogue. Sánchez (2007) hoped that the Mexican American young women would create a work to inspire interest in authentic reality of transnational folks, without sacrificing or taming it down for the mainstream culture. Sánchez (2007) identified conditions that she thought increased the authenticity of her subjects’ children’s book project, which could be useful criteria for any teacher working with students who are studying their own or other people’s culture, working as part of a group whose members had similar yet dynamic transnational experiences; the collaborative nature of co-authoring and co-illustrating that held
each paragraph and scene accountable to the entire group; the 2 years of research on Latino transnationalism that preceded the making of the children’s book; and finally, responding to a children’s picture book that the youth found during their research that did not seem to accurately nor authentically represent travel to a Mexican rural community (p. 267).

The Mexican American subjects wanted to create a book that would touch the hearts of all Mexican American transnationals and validate their unique cultural resources and customs. Also, they pledged to counter the view that Mexican-American children will lose their English and not learn anything when they miss school to visit their family in Mexico.

The creators of the children’s book, which they titled *Remembering My Roots and Living My Traditions* decided to put Spanish text above English text to give respect to their first language (Sánchez, 2007). The authors also privileged Spanish language by including words that were not translatable, for example *caldo*, could be translated to “chicken soup” but does not quite infer the same thing, *caldo*, which is made from scratch directly after killing a chicken. They included major celebrations that were central to their experience in Mexico, like *Quinceanera*. A commonality among the young women was that their family’s practiced strong narrative traditions in which stories were told again and again. They believed these family narratives were more valuable than anything material.

The young authors identified themes found in these family narratives and included them in the book, which included comical close calls while crossing borders, humor, sacrifice, migration, and religion. The book was largely about longing for
Mexico, their parent’s home, and wanting to be in two places at one time. Uprooting from their homes in the U.S. each year and going to Mexico supported their roots and customs, but Mexico became memory once back in the U.S. In the book, a Mexican American child character says, “I do not want to leave but I do not want to stay” (Sánchez, 2007, p. 269). They included this because it is a common theme that the three authors observed in their parents who longed to return to Mexico, but were torn, also, by providing better opportunity for their kids in the U.S. This powerful nostalgia is part of the reason why they think their parents so often tell stories based on memories.

Although Sánchez’s (2007) study was based on only three youth, it gained credibility because the creative product was the result of several interviews and life experience viewed through a cultural authenticity framework, which was described in detail. Inherent in the cultural authenticity framework was a conscious effort on behalf of the creators to make thoughtful decisions regarding stereotyping and generalizations. The authors essentially attempted to identify positive generalizations about transnationals. In this way, their project was aimed to be transferable to other Mexican transnationals’ life experience. The study’s confirmability is limited to the audio recordings that Sánchez kept of her subjects’ dialogue, video interviews, and creative documents. However, these documents allow for an outside party to follow the young women’s thought process as they made their decisions about how to address cultural authenticity.

This study provides a reference for teachers planning to teach units on culture. The cultural authenticity framework could provide critical thinking and dialogue for students in this process. Also, the power of media to spread a message seems significant;
so what message do you want to send to help the world? However, also to consider, is if the cultural authenticity framework would allow students to report on other people’s cultures in an authentic way. Sánchez mentioned that the authors’ experience as being transnationals added to the book’s cultural authenticity. For example, would it be appropriate for middle-class white students to attempt to create a culturally authentic text about another ethnic group? How can educators present these kinds of projects and frameworks to groups that don’t share common backgrounds, or that share only one common background?

Both Sánchez (2007) and El-Haj (2007) encouraged transnational youth to use media to explain their stories to the world. Both the Mexican American and Palestinian American youth in these studies strived to provide a counterexample to widespread stereotypes projected on their culture by the mainstream media. Sánchez (2007) believed her subjects’ children’s book was successful in this way. The last study narrative discusses a study about a group of Palestinian American’s high school experience.

In an ethnographic study El-Haj (2007) created a youth group for Palestinian American high school students to explore their notions of citizenship, national belonging, and the role of public school as a possible context for exploring their identities and affiliations. The study found controversy between the Palestinian youth’s political perspective and the one endorsed by the school. The author formed the youth group with three other Arab American colleagues after hearing news of tension against Palestinian American students at an urban high school. The goal of the youth group was to create a space in the 3,500 student populated school where Palestinian American youth could explore their knowledge, experience, and stories through different media (writing,
photography, and video) in order to educate the public. Also, as a group, they surveyed “the limited and limiting images of Palestinians and Arabs in contemporary media and political discourse” (El-Haj, 2007, p. 291). The author collected data while participating in the youth group meetings. Also, the author invited four students (two males and two females) to be focal participants in the study. The four main subjects in the study were all U.S. citizens, because they were all born in the U.S. However, a few had spent most of their lives living in Palestine’s West Bank, and the others had only visited, but still identified as being Palestinian. The author shadowed the four students at school and at community and family events and conducted several interviews with each subject. The author also interviewed teachers and administrators at the students’ school.

El-Haj (2007) learned that the Palestinian American students experienced racial harassment from both students and teachers after 9/11. The author was notified of racial wars at the high school after Russian immigrants and Palestinian immigrants had gotten into repeated fights. Some Palestinian American students believed they were getting in trouble so much because of media’s post 9/11 depiction of Arabs. In interviews the students told the author about specific experiences with teachers where they had felt disrespected, including one where a teacher refused to acknowledge Palestine as an existent “thing” (El-Haj, 2007).

El-Haj (2007) found that the students identified passionately as Palestinians, “these youth acknowledged that their U.S. citizenship was legally important, but they identified as being Palestinian, as belonging to an imagined community that is engaged in a struggle for liberty and an independent nation-state” (El-Haj, 2007, p.292). They stood for the pledge of allegiance out of respect, but did not recite it because they disagreed
with U.S. foreign policy. The Palestinian American students were found to be politically mindful and motivated to participate in civic discussions about practices and viewpoints at their high school. They were especially disturbed when the school began a fundraiser to raise money for the Iraq war. The students were worried about supporting efforts that would hurt other Arab communities abroad (El-Haj, 2007).

El-Haj (2007) concluded that the Palestinian American students did not have full rights because of being Arab in a sensitive time. For example, a student told of how a secret service agent searched his house. The author recommended future democratic education in public schools that yields “participation and engagement, rather than national identification” (El-Haj, 2007, p.312). In a nation that contains an abundance of transnational populations, El-Haj proposed that the best way to find peace is to practice open dialogue with one another. She also asserted the need to reassess our idea of nation states as “organizing boundaries for people’s personal and political sense of belonging” (El-Haj, 2007, p.287).

This study contains interest because it depicts the lives of a seemingly obscure group of American immigrants. Many American people would not readily consider the political situation of Palestinian Americans. The U.S. government, allied with Israel, helps repress Palestinian’s struggle to regain their homeland on a daily basis. What do Palestinian Americans think about U.S. foreign policy? El-Haj (2007) answered this question and posed a larger question about nation formation. With so many Americans with ties to two nations, isn’t it counterproductive to expect transnational Americans to shed their previous affiliations and assimilate into an American nationalist identity?
This study’s findings evidenced credibility because they were the product of an in-depth ethnographic process in which ethnographers from multiple backgrounds came together to work closely with the Palestinian high school students. The ethnographers pulled evidence from multiple sources, including newspapers, students, teachers, and community members to help understand the social environment and ethnic rivalries at play within the school. The findings of this study and the conclusions of the author are transferable to other settings in the U.S. and abroad that contain transnational populations. This study is especially relevant for transnationals with ties to non-allied or “enemy” nations.

Discussion of Themes

This section discussed six studies that examined characteristics of transnational students’ lives and their implications for the classroom. Some important themes arose. For one, U.S. public school curriculum tends to be centered on white middle-class norms. Patthey-Chavez (1993) observed an inner-city high school with an 80 percent Latino student body that inflexibly refused to accommodate the Latino culture within the culture of the school. Instead this school’s curriculum and extracurricular activities dogmatically reflected middle-class norms and assumptions of the faculty and administration. Macias (1990) went to Mexico to examine their school system. He found an internationalist social studies curriculum, a rigorous math curriculum, and classroom activities with lots of student vocalization and collective work. His study provided a counterexample to U.S. educator’s often-held assumption of the inferiority of immigrants’ prior schooling. Furthermore, U.S. social studies curriculum tended to be more nationalist in scope than
Mexico’s. This limited perspective of our place in the world may not align well with some Mexican immigrant student’s prior learning.

Torney-Purta et al. (2006) found that non-Latino students scored higher on civic knowledge and likelihood to vote, but that Latino students exerted more interest in immigrant rights. This finding indicated the need for a curriculum that is more international in scope. All students should know about the world events that cause human migrations across borders. Marri (2005) suggested a critical pedagogy for multicultural democracy curriculum. Students would examine inequities in society and ask the question, who participates in democracy and on whose terms? Marri (2005) asserted that multicultural democracy should not be restricted to classrooms with students of marginalized groups, but should be taught in all white middle-class classrooms too.

The overall theme of this section created an oppositional framework to static nationalist ideologies. In other words, these studies supported the notion that schools serve to re-imagine society to welcome newcomers. They should not require newcomers to assimilate to stuck norms. El-Haj (2007) called for citizenship education centered on participation and engagement, rather than national identification. The Palestinian Americans in her study did not agree with U.S. foreign policy, yet center-stage at their high school were fundraiser efforts to support the war in the Middle East. Patthey-Chavez (1993) called for a mutual discourse between the Latino community and Lima high school. A mutual discourse would support a re-imagining of school curriculum, culture, and practices to better reflect the school’s Latino population. Torney-Purta (2006) found that an open classroom climate and the study of political issues positively influenced civic participation and knowledge of Latino students. Marri (2005) suggested
a multicultural democracy curriculum focused on educating for social action. Sánchez (2007) asserted that mere appreciation of differences was not enough, that schools need to focus on re-imagining the status quo. All of these studies ask the question, what does it mean to be American? Their response is that the answer is so complicated that it requires an ongoing discussion. They advocate that public schools should be venues for civic discussions. For these authors, schools are centers of cultural reproduction, they are like little Americas, forming and reforming to include new people and ideas.

The next section explores issues concerning immigrant parent involvement in schools. Immigrant parents face multiple barriers that restrict their full involvement in society. Many of these studies collected opinions and views of parents with the goal of narrowing discontinuities between home and school for immigrant students.

Bridging Home and School Cultures

The seven studies presented here examined the relationship between schools and immigrant parents. Multiple studies advocated for schools to involve and welcome immigrant parents to a greater extent. These studies also asserted that students’ community and cultural backgrounds should influence educational reforms. Overall, the studies acknowledged the educational importance of parental involvement, but found limitations due to immigrant parents’ lack of social literacy.

The first four studies focused on institutional and community-based programs that have helped bridge home and school cultures. In the first study González et al. (1993) examined how gaps between home and school can be mended through teacher home research visits. The study found the visits to be highly valuable for teachers trying to connect social and intellectual home resources with the classroom. In the next study
Delgado-Gaitan (1994) observed how Latino parents founded a community organization to discuss their children’s education. The study found that Latino parents, through meeting regularly to discuss educational issues, were able to secure greater educational opportunities for their children and greater community participation for themselves. Although the third study did not directly involve immigrant parents, it focused on an alternative source of community adult support: non-family informal mentors. The authors found that few Mexican origin adolescents had informal adult mentors, however the ones who did benefited greatly (Stanton-Salazar & Spina, 2003). In the fourth study Martinez-Cosio and Iannacone (2007) documented the role of a school-parent coordinator that worked at an urban elementary school in Los Angeles. The study found that the school-parent coordinator helped immigrant parents access resources, become involved in schools, and create ethnic and language based community meetings.

The last three studies in this section focused on immigrant parents’ expectations and attitudes about education. These begin with a study in which Lahman & Park (2004) interviewed Korean and Chinese immigrant parents to explore their relationship with U.S. schools. The authors found a general communication gap between immigrant parents and teachers. Immigrant parents also showed concern that their children were becoming too Americanized. In the next study Li (2006) surveyed middle-class Chinese immigrant parents to examine their perspectives on literacy learning, homework, and school-home communication. The author found that the parents provided their children with a variety of extra math and literacy homework, but that their instruction did not align well with practices at school. In the last study Orozco (2008) explored low-income Latino immigrant parenting values. The author found that the Latino immigrant parents
were very interested in their children’s educational futures, but needed greater opportunities to participate in schools. The first study narrative of this section begins next with a study about the value of teacher home visits.

In an ethnographic study González et al. (1993) examined how gaps between home and school could be mended through teacher home research visits that attempted to establish “confianza” with Latino families and sought out alternative funds of knowledge from those sanctioned by school culture. The study found the teachers’ ethnographic home visits to be highly valuable for their development as teachers of ethnically diverse classrooms, yet very difficult to manage on top of their already cramped schedules. The authors worked through a theoretical lens that opposed the deficit model. They believed that the deficit model mentality has blocked minority students from reaching their full potentials, “this emphasis on so-called disadvantages has provided justification for lowered academic expectations and inaccurate portrayals of these children and their families” (González et al., 1993, p.2). The researchers in this study tried-on a more optimistic lens as they observed working-class minority families to identify the social and intellectual resources that they do bring to school with them and seek to use them as a foundation for classroom learning.

Four elementary school teachers from predominantly working-class, Mexican neighborhood schools, two Anglo American and two Mexican American, all bilingual in Spanish, visited the homes of three Latino students each to meet parents, identify funds of knowledge, and ask parents questions regarding attitudes on literacy, parenting strategies, family and residential histories, and daily activities. The teachers’ purpose was to collect useful information rather than instruct parents on how to better support their children.
The teachers also conducted a single interview with each student. Teachers tape-recorded interviews and took notes during their time in student’s houses. House stays lasted from 2 – 3 hours. After house observations, teachers spent a couple hours writing notes about their visit. The teachers also kept personal journals of their personal transformations throughout this process (González et al., 1993).

The teachers participated in bi-monthly lab meetings in which they met with an anthropologist and two graduate students in education to discuss their notes and interpret their findings together. At first, the anthropologist and graduate students visited the teachers’ students’ homes and reported back to the teachers, but they found that their presence in the households was inauthentic and imposing. They found that the teachers could collect more useful information because they could more naturally connect with emotional and empathetic aspects of the visit, not just conceptual/intellectual aspects. The anthropologist and graduate students, then, instructed the teachers on research methodologies and helped interpret their ethnographic findings (González et al., 1993).

González et al. (1993) found four main benefits that came out of this study: “the emergence of teachers as qualitative researchers, …increased access to school felt by parents, …changed relationships between teachers and the students whose households they visited, …and the emergence of curriculum units based on the household funds of knowledge” (p.20). One of the most important findings of this process for the teachers was that they could now view their students in a brighter light. One teacher esteemed her experience in this study, because she was able to lose her fatalistic view that some of her economically poor students had limited opportunities in life. The four teachers began to see culture of households as a process rather than a static state. They identified that
schools downplay culture by their focus on tangible surface markers, such as Cinco de Mayo. The teachers built on their notions of their students’ culture. For example, “they learned how households network in informal market exchanges. They learned how cross-border activities made mini-ethnographers of their students. And most importantly, they learned that students acquire multi-dimensional depth and breadth from their participation in household life” (González et al., 1993, p.10). They saw that their students’ experience was not akin to either Anglo or Mexican culture, but one in between that was metaphorical to the border state. The teachers found that they should approach their students’ culture looking for the ways that they process their experiences and form understanding of the world, rather than look for authentic and static artifacts and traditions.

The teachers were at first overwhelmed by the task of reflexive observation, especially since it was time-consuming on top of their already busy schedules as full time teachers. However, they found that keeping journals was extremely valuable because it showed the steps they went through as they transformed to see their students coming from rich cultures with funds of knowledge rather than being deficit and lacking opportunities in life. The professional anthropologist and graduate students strongly encouraged the teachers’ participation as ethnographic researchers. They believed the teachers needed direct involvement in making sense of their students’ funds of knowledge in order to apply useful educational reforms to their own classrooms. They found that it was very important for the teachers to participate in their own social construction of knowledge and pedagogical theory, rather than being dependent on academic research for answers (González et al., 1993).
Although the teachers of this study reported impressive personal transformations, the study was not without problems. González et al. (1993) reported the following problems: First and foremost, the teachers lacked adequate time to conduct these lengthy home visits and extensive reflections. Second, the teachers put themselves in the role of confidante with the families, and were contacted by parents in need of advice and resources in times of crisis. Third, there is no straightforward way to assess this ethnographic practice for evidence of positive change.

Another aspect of this study was that it purposely overlooked a deficit model framework, which asserts that people who are generationally poor have limited opportunities in life. The deficit model framework may seem based in reality; however, this study took the stance that it is counterproductive for educators to view students having limited opportunity because of their social and economic status. Rather, to counter one’s own tendency toward a negative self-fulfilling prophesy, it may be more productive to seek-out funds of knowledge that students do have and build on those, rather than to be hung up on the ones they lack.

Another aspect of this study to consider is the socio-economic position of the researchers themselves. The teachers and researchers in this study speak from a superior standpoint. As highly educated models of society the researchers look-in at family life of economically lesser households and acknowledge the families’ skills, histories, and interactions. They bring light to their students’ parents’ positions in society, which are often working-class service or factory positions and describe them in an esteemed way that could come off as patronizing. Wow, they make light bulbs on an assembly line, or they know how to stock a store. Though, these characteristics are valuable to know,
because if the parents have these experiences than it is assumed the students may too, the teacher ethnographers should be careful about glamorizing positions viewed to be low on our economic hierarchy. Also, the study did not mention that it member checked its interpretive conclusions with parents. It missed this collaboration. Other similar ethnographic studies stressed final collaboration with members of the actual cultural group under study to make sure interpretive findings were in line with cultural authenticity of the group (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994). The next study narrative discusses a study about a group of Latino parents that founded an organization to become more involved in their children’s educations.

In an ethnographic study Delgado-Gaitan (1994) observed how Latino families built community with each other and with their children’s schools. Over a five-year period the ethnographer observed contexts in which Latinos parents and students participated, which included: school events, teacher/parent conferences, and school-site council meetings. The study found that Latino parents, through meeting regularly to discuss educational issues, were able to secure greater educational opportunities for their children and greater community participation for themselves. A total of 157 activities that involved parents and teachers were observed. The ethnographer also interviewed Latino parents at all sites and interviewed parents that were invited to events but did not attend. Interviews with teachers and administrators that worked with Mexican American Spanish-speaking students were conducted too.

After Delgado-Gaitan (1994) had compiled over thirty case studies she met with a group of Spanish-speaking parents to confirm, clarify, and revise what she had learned. This group of Spanish-speaking parents decided that they would begin meeting regularly
under the name of COPLA: Comite de Padres Latinos. The ethnographer sat in on COPLA meetings and documented the steps the parents took to become more involved in their children’s schools. COPLA met to discuss their worries and frustrations in interacting with teachers and school administrators. In the first meetings the parents found they shared a common feeling of being isolated from the schools, and feeling guilty because they didn’t know the right thing to do in regard to their children’s education. They dispelled beliefs that they held that, in the past, blocked their participation in school activities: not being able to participate because they didn’t speak English, having minimal formal education so not being able to help their kids with school work, and having a reputation for being unmotivated.

COPLA decided that they would organize to secure greater educational opportunities for their children. Delgado Gaitan (1994) observed COPLA transition through three stages. In stage one COPLA worked to establish dialogue within the organization and with teachers and administrators in the district. Through increased dialogue with teachers and administrators the organization was able to get bilingual students accepted into the gifted program. Several satellite COPLAs had been established at various sites by the end of stage one.

In stage two COPLA strengthened as it developed formal regulations as an organization. The parent group gained influence in the hiring of school personnel and also gained strength through partnerships with other Latino advocacy groups. In phase three COPLA negotiated with schools administrators to gain educational improvements like the hiring of Spanish-speaking teachers.
This article exemplifies the possibility of creating a public space that can form solidarity among Spanish-speaking parents. As a group they dispelled their fears and shortcomings and set out to secure greater educational opportunities for their children. This study provided a step-by-step framework for how one Latino community succeeded in overcoming isolation to become more visible and involved in their children’s education.

The methodology of the study was credible because it detailed the creation of a parent organization and laid down a series of main steps that the parents took to establish their legitimate place within their children’s schooling. These steps could be transferable to immigrant parents in other districts who feel disenfranchised from their children’s schooling systems. The next study narrative discusses a study about the value of mentor relationships for Mexican origin youth.

In an ethnographic study Stanton-Salazar & Spina (2003) explored the social networks and help-seeking practices of San Diego Mexican origin youth. The authors paid special attention to the value of adult non-family informal mentors and role models, which whom some fortuitous youth connected with. The authors found that few Mexican origin adolescents actually had access to informal adult mentors, but the ones who did benefited greatly.

Stanton-Salazar & Spina (2003) observed and interviewed 75 Mexican origin high school students in 1991. The students were enrolled at Auxilo High School, which served students from the three major Latino neighborhoods in San Diego. The authors divided students into groups based on gender, acculturation level, and academic
achievement. The interviews asked the students about their achievement in school and to describe their social support networks.

The authors found that mentor and role model relationships provided the low-income Mexican origin youth with critical information, coaching, and inspiration during times when they needed extra support. The authors also found that the informal mentor relationships relied on serendipity and were sometimes more transient than would be best for the youth. The authors proposed the institutionalization of social offices that would provide stable and willing mentors to Mexican origin youth.

Stanton-Salazar & Spina (2003) argued against other studies that had labeled Latino immigrant communities as having strong familial and community support. They found, instead, that many Mexican origin youth felt isolated and alienated from the adults in their community. The authors proposed that, “in contrast to the more communitarian character of many Mexican immigrant enclaves, the social character of many acculturated youth frequently becomes susceptible to the most excessive and vulgarized aspects of “utilitarian individualism” (Stanton-Salazar & Spina, 2003, p. 241). In other words, many of the students the authors interviewed were at varying levels on the acculturation spectrum. The authors recognized that newer Mexican immigrant communities were more likely to have family and community supports built in than more acculturated Mexican immigrant communities, which express individualistic norms of the dominant U.S. culture. In response to this pattern of isolation, the authors found that adult non-familial informal mentors are key in de-alienating youth. Adolescence, the authors suggested, is a purgatorial time between childhood and adulthood when everything is up
in the air. The most pressing task for adolescents is to find an identity that will grant them status as a unique individual.

Identity formation for immigrant adolescents may be even more confusing than for non-immigrant students because of dual cultural influences and conflicts. The authors asserted that non-familial adult role models can provide youth with someone to look up to that made it through the trials of adolescence. The adult role model provides the youth with a guidance system that helps to lead the youth while at the same time allowing experimentation. A youth that had connections with a mentor expressed that they “make you want to keep going. You look up to those people and say I want to do what they are doing, if not better” (Stanton-Salazar & Spina, 2003, p. 244).

The authors advocated for school and community efforts to recruit more adult mentors for youth. Teachers, they said, could put on anthropological goggles, visit student’s communities and homes, and mine local cultural, social, and intellectual resources to strengthen school/community relationships. The authors also suggested that mentors could be trained and paid. Part of their training would include,

a critical understanding of and appropriate ways of responding to the accumulated distress of students, which may be manifested verbally or behaviorally in the form of distrust, social distance, and unsponsored self-reliance. Professionals who work with youth must also be willing to confront conventional perspectives that blame children and their families for societal ills, and to address their own distress patterns and assumptions wrought by working in an environment that systematically and surreptitiously forces them to play host to class and racial exclusion. (Stanton-Salazar & Spina, 2003, p. 251).
Clearly, mentor relationships are a huge learning experience for both the adult mentor and the youth.

This study highlighted an ancient practice between youth and elders that help youth find identity within their communities. Mentors and adult role models are a plenty, we just need to find them. This study convincingly advocated the importance of mentors and provided an interesting distinction between acculturated and new Latino immigrant community dynamics. These findings are transferable to other similar communities and enclaves where immigrant youth are in need of adult role models. The next study narrative discusses the role of a parent-school coordinator.

Martinez-Cosio and Iannacone (2007) conducted an ethnographic study that documented the role of one school-parent coordinator at an urban elementary school in Los Angeles. The study found the dynamic position of the school-parent coordinator to represent conflicting interests, simultaneously being an institutional employee of the school and an advocate for minority rights. The first author spent 15 months, 3 – 4 days a week in the parent room at the K-5 elementary. The second author was a participant in the study, as she was the parent room coordinator. The first author took extensive notes on the daily dynamic of the parent room. She interviewed 15 out of the 30 parents who regularly participated in monthly parent room meetings, 13 Latino and 2 African American. All interviews were tape-recorded and twelve were conducted in Spanish. The parents interviewed were selected because they had played leadership roles in parent room or were active participants. The first author also took extensive notes on conversations she had with parents at school events hosted by the parent room, teacher/parent interactions observed, and daily discussions with the parent room
coordinator about her philosophy on parent involvement and challenges she faced. The analysis of the first author’s data was member checked for accuracy by participating parents and the parent room coordinator.

This study was conducted through a cultural capital framework, which suggests that the institution of public education reproduces social inequality through its validation of specific traits, tastes, and styles of elite culture. The parent room coordinator advocated for greater parental involvement among underserved groups. She believed that, first, cultural resources of immigrant and minority parents needed to be validated. Once that need was met, then they could begin participating in school governance and influence decisions that would secure resources for their children and communities. The parent room coordinator supported parents’ cultures by helping parents organize language- and ethnic-based meetings and secure financial resources for Mexican history nights and Vietnamese language classes. Also, she organized cross-racial/ethnic networks through the creation of a parent room leadership board that met once a month to organize community events. The group organized literacy nights that brought in 600 parents and 800 children over 9 nights (Martinez-Cosio & Iannacone, 2007).

The authors identified three main tensions that the parent room coordinator faced: tensions over resources, conflict over power sharing, and tensions over institutionalized decision making. First and foremost, the parent coordinator found conflict in working as an institutional agent while at the same moment attempting to secure greater resources and influence for parents and students of underserved communities. She worked for the school, yet helped parents understand injustices they experienced in school interactions. She used the parent room “as a safe space where parents could decode and rehearse
unfamiliar codes of the culture of power, helped parents learn how to read the school budget, their rights under Title I funding, and their role as members of governance committees” (Martinez-Cosio & Iannacone, 2007, p. 362). The parents influenced the school board to finance translation services and childcare for parent involvement activities. However, administrators showed resistance arguing that resources were too scarce to provide such services.

The second tension, power sharing, most evidently occurred between teachers and parents. Often was the case that teachers were not willing to provide volunteer opportunities for parents. The parent coordinator served as a neutral mediator in these conflicts and helped teachers identify participatory processes in the classroom that could benefit from parental volunteers. She believed strongly in “supporting democratic practices that allow the underserved to participate as equal partners and not as social service clients”, making access to volunteer opportunities a social justice issue (Martinez-Cosio & Iannacone, 2007, p. 366).

The third tension, over institutional decision making, occurred as teachers and administrators reluctantly loosened their historic monopoly of school governance. Martinez-Cosio and Iannacone (2007) implied that administrators often worked from a position that assumed equal access to public resources for all people. This conception made administrators more unwilling to share power of governance with immigrant parents, since they believed things were already, more or less, equal. Martinez-Cosio and Iannacone (2007) stressed that the best way for underserved people to overcome institutional inequities was to participate in the processes of that institution. The parent room coordinator, employed by the higher powers of the school and serving the
underserved was, ironically, a position bound to bite the ankles of a reluctant administration.

The parent room coordinator stated that the room she ran was non-efficient and so went against strategies based on efficiency that were valued by school administration. Her non-efficiency doctrine was based on the difficult and complex nature of the issues she worked with. She sought additional funding for events designed to challenge cultural practices that privileged the elite culture. These events, that went against the grain of dominant culture, cost the school money, teacher time, necessitated development of culturally appropriate practices, and required time for parents and staff to comprehend difficult and complex issues based around social justice. Language barriers also ate time.

While the parent room coordinator in this study identified as an advocate for underserved peoples against unequal institutional forces, it is important to acknowledge the privileged position that she herself held and its room for potential error. The study assumed that the parent room coordinator was purely objective, there to interpret the culture of power to a diverse group of immigrant and minority parents. However, as the authors acknowledged in their discussion, the parent room coordinator’s position relied on their ability to interpret correctly (Martinez-Cosio & Iannacone, 2007). In the same light, the parent room coordinator sought to educate immigrant and underserved parents to navigate within the bureaucracy of the culture of power. This act is essentially socialization to American culture, an end that some immigrant peoples seek to avoid. Yet, in encouraging parents to present cultural events to the community, the parent room coordinator sought a healthy balance of home culture and crucial socialization needed to function as active participants in dominant U.S. society. This study had credibility
because it was co-authored by an ethnographer and the parent room coordinator. Through this co-authorship it gained an insiders perspective as well as an outsiders perspective, which may have helped in visualizing the study through a larger contextual lens. The study also provided the educational community at large with a model for the establishment of parent room coordinators, as well as the ups and downs of the position. In this way, the study and its results are useful to other similar settings where immigrant parents remain disconnected from their children’s’ educational institutions. The next study narrative discusses a study about middle-class Korean and Chinese immigrant parents’ relationship to U.S. education.

In an ethnographic study Lahman & Park (2004) interviewed Korean and Chinese families whose kids attended preschool to find out about their relationship to U.S. schools. The authors found a general communication gap between immigrant parents and teachers. The immigrant parents were unsure of their school expectations and the teachers were afraid to offend the immigrant parents with their classroom practices. Immigrant parents also showed concern that their children were becoming Americanized.

The ethnographers/teachers interviewed and observed 17 participants that consisted of three Korean families and two Chinese families, who had recently immigrated to the U.S. and three preschool teachers. The interviews were conducted in the parents’ first language and then translated to English. The ethnographers also observed school and home interactions to give context to the interviews. After all interviews were completed, the two ethnographers individually coded the interview data for emerging themes and then compared their findings. The emerging themes they held in common were written into the final report.
Lahman & Park (2004) found concern about language barriers among both teachers and parents. The Chinese and Korean parents expressed a desire to help in their children’s classrooms, but felt that their lack of English prevented them from doing so. The teachers said they felt intimidated by not being able to communicate easily with the parents. Also, teachers expressed guilty consciences because, while they tried hard to be sensitive to the parents’ cultural views, they worried that they would be inadvertently insensitive.

The Chinese and Korean parents said they sent their children to school so that they would make a quick and easy transition in the U.S. They wanted their children to acquire English and relate with U.S. peer groups, however they expressed concern that they would become too Americanized. The teachers worried that they would inadvertently offend the parents by teaching them or their children U.S. values. One teacher exemplified a cultural value difference in a conflict she had with a Korean parent. The parent worried that her child was becoming too Americanized because he was saying “mine” and “yours” all the time instead of “ours’, as they did in Korea. This was an issue of different perspectives on ownership: individual ownership, which is common in the U.S. and collective ownership, common in Korea.

Lahman & Park (2004) identified three conflicting values that the parents and teachers needed to work together to resolve:

1) English language acquisition, while important and desired, may also undermine the culture of the family

2) Socialization with US peers, while seen as beneficial, may cause the child not to understand key elements of Korean and Chinese socialization
3) Teachers, while trying to be sensitive to the parents’ views, may inadvertently be showing the family how to acculturate to mainstream US views (p. 140). The ethnographers recommended that teachers working with diverse groups practice active listening, cooperative learning, and open communication.

This study, while identifying some important themes among these groups, lacked authority because of the minimal number of subjects that the authors’ conclusions were derived. Also, all of the families were upper-middle class in their native nations. Therefore, conclusions made from this study may or may not be transferable to other socio-economic groups. However, the authors’ details of specific miscommunications between immigrant parents and teachers were helpful in seeing the reality behind this subject. The next study narrative discusses middle-class Chinese immigrant parents’ home practices and attitudes towards U.S. education.

In a quantitative study Li (2006) surveyed 26 middle-class Chinese immigrant parents to examine their perspectives on literacy learning, homework, and school-home communication. The author found that the parents provided their children with a variety of extra math and literacy homework, but that their orientation toward math and writing instruction did not align well with practices at school. Correspondingly, parents desired to know more about school math and writing practices, but were relatively more familiar with school reading practices. The author distributed a questionnaire to 60 middle-class Chinese immigrant parents whose children attended a Chinese language school in a suburban city of Western New York state. Out of the 60 surveys distributed, 26 complete surveys were returned. The surveys consisted of six parts: demographic information, perceptions of child’s reading, perceptions of child’s writing, perception of child’s math,
perception of child’s homework, and communication with school. The parents surveyed had lived in the U.S. for an average of 10 years. They were highly educated, 88 percent with college or post-graduate educations, and 70 percent had white-collar professions. Sixty-nine percent of parents spoke both English and Chinese at home, while 31 percent spoke only Chinese at home.

Li (2006) found that the Chinese parents held great importance in their children’s reading development. A staggering 88.5 percent reported their children read everyday at home and 84.6 percent used public libraries to get books for out-of-school readings. The author surveyed parents on their approach to reading instruction. Largely, parents were oriented to a phonics-based, bottom-up approach, with 81 percent indicating that beginning readers should learn the sound of letters before starting to read. Similarly, 62 percent believed that sounding-out letters helped their children to learn new words. Li (2006) also found the parents to be highly involved with their children in a variety of reading events including, “reading aloud to the child, reading with the child, helping with comprehension, teaching the children reading strategies, and reading in their native language, Chinese” (p.34).

All the parents wanted their children to practice writing outside of school. Seventy-five percent of parents reported that their children were involved in English writing activities including: writing stories, reflections on movies, letters, poems, and/or diaries. Li (2006) found that parents’ perspective on writing development followed a bottom-up approach similar to their perspective on reading. The parents’ orientation to writing reflected “a product-oriented writing approach that emphasizes well-formed, grammatically correct sentences” (Li, 2006, p.35). Eighty-four percent of parents
believed that grammatically and syntactically correct writing constituted good writing. The same percentage of parents emphasized writing neatly. However, only 40 percent of parents believed that good spellers are good writers. Parents reported their children’s writing strengths were grammar, vocabulary, spelling, sentence structure, and organization of ideas. However 54.5 percent believed their children were weak in coming up with their own ideas for writing and only 42.3 percent reported that their children reread and revised their writing. Last, parents were available to help with their children’s writing tasks, with 69.2 percent providing feedback and offering ideas for writing, and 77 percent helping children spell correctly.

The author found that parents were largely dissatisfied with math education at their children’s’ school. Only 26.9 percent gave an approval rating, while 50 percent disapproved of the way Math was taught in American schools. The parents believed “math instruction was different from that in China, many believed math instruction in American schools was “easier” and “insufficient” in content and depth, but believed that U.S. schools were better at focusing on student interests and motivation and on encouraging creativity” (Li, 2006, p.37). Many parents believed that the best way to teach math was through drills and practice (37.5 percent), which U.S. schools did not do enough of. Also, they believed U.S. math instruction needed to have higher level of difficulty. The majority of parents supplemented their children’s school math with workbooks and extra math assignments.

Overall, approximately half of parents thought their children received enough homework, and the other half believed their children received too little homework. No parents believed their children received too much homework from school. Sixty-one
percent of parents reported that they helped their children with homework. Parents felt that they were more familiar with their children’s school reading instruction than math and writing instruction. Ninety-two percent of parents reported that they would like to know more about writing instruction in school. Parents were much more likely to attend parent/teacher conferences than PTO meetings, with 96% of parents having attended parent/teacher conferences, versus only 57 percent of parents having attended at least one PTO meeting. Likewise, parents did not often communicate with teachers or volunteer at the school.

Li (2006) concluded that these middle class Chinese immigrant parents prioritized education and preferred skills-based approaches to literacy and math learning. However, although parents advocated for a skills-based approach, in actuality they practiced a variety of literacy activities with their children, which the author believed were similar to literacy orientations of many European American parents. The author was surprised that almost half of parents thought their children received enough homework from school, given that their educational expectations were so high, especially in the area of math. She speculated that this could be due to recent educational reforms in China that have lessened homework for Chinese students. She also speculated that the parents, having attained middle-class status, might have felt more secure about their children’s educational progress. Or, U.S. education might have upped homework levels due to recent standardized testing reforms. Overall, Li (2006) concluded that the parents desired to know more about instructional practices and materials used at their children’s schools. The author called on schools to reach-out to Chinese immigrant families to inform them of school practices and invite them to participate in the school setting. Collaboration
between school and home would support greater continuities in math and writing instruction, which were the two subject areas the author found most discontinuities.

One weakness of this study was that it only surveyed middle-class Chinese immigrant parents who had lived in the U.S. for an average of ten years, so its findings are not transferable to all Chinese immigrant parents. However, the author asserted that the middle-class Chinese population is growing in the United States, so studies like this are important to address this group’s unique educational needs. The other weakness is that the author did not collect real evidence of academic achievement. The study would gain further credibility if students’ grades or scores on tests were analyzed in relation to parental home practices, to see if discontinuities in home and school instruction techniques lessened students’ achievement. The next study narrative describes a study about Latino parents’ educational and parenting values.

In a qualitative case study Orozco (2008) examined low-income Latino parenting values through analyzing 18 parents’ conversations from a live call-in radio talk show produced by Radio Bilingüe. The author found that the Latino immigrant parents were very interested in their children’s future through education, but needed greater opportunities to participate in schools. Orozco (2008) examined 11 hours of archival radio programming that included 11 hour-long talk shows. The talk show, entitled *La Placita Bilingüe*, was directed toward low-income Latino immigrant parents and hosted conversations about best parenting techniques and practices. The author’s data analysis consisted of 18 immigrant parents’ contributions to the radio talk show. Orozco’s (2008) overall goal through this study was to support greater home-school partnerships for low-
income Latino immigrant families by gaining fundamental knowledge about how they view their parenting roles.

Orozco (2008) found four main themes within the radio conversations: “(1) the special place of children; (2) saber es poder – knowledge is power; (3) querer es poder – where there is a will, there is a way; and (4) the importance of culture and of being bilingual” (p.26). The first theme consisted of the children’s central importance in the parents’ lives. Both mother and fathers reported that their children’s needs came first. For example, if the parents developed an unhealthy relationship, they would separate so the children would not be negatively influenced. Also, parents sacrificed money to benefit the child. For example, one parent told a story about offering her husband money for new shoes, in which case the father said, “no, no, my children are always first” (Orozco, 2008, p.26). Also, one father described how he scheduled a time in his busy schedule to play with his daughters.

The second theme was attributed to the importance of knowledge in empowering low-income Latino immigrant parents. Orozco (2008) commended the ability of the radio show to bring important information to under-educated Latino immigrants. It provided information that could improve their lives including information about social services like “Head Start, ESL classes, GED classes, counseling and support groups, and even programs at the community college” Orozco, 2008, p.28). The radio show provided a forum for parents to discuss and solve health worries. For example, parents were worried about the correct way to clean the skin under their male children’s foreskin. Potty training strategies, sex education, AIDS, healthcare, divorce, and breastfeeding pros and cons, were other subjects discussed on the show. These conversations provided a
way for parents that did not have access to health insurance to access crucial health-related information.

The third theme suggested that economic, political, and social obstacles could be overcome through hard work, time and education. One divorced Latina mother of three children invested much time and energy supporting her children’s education through volunteering at their school and enrolling them in extracurricular opportunities and sports.

The fourth theme concentrated on the importance of retaining Spanish language and culture. The parents required that their children speak Spanish while at home, but encouraged their English-speaking outside of the home. Many of the Latino immigrant parents spoke little English. As their children develop English skills in school, parents risk becoming disconnected to their children through language barriers. The irony is that parents wish for their children to succeed in school, but the institution of school often lessens the strength of familial bonds. Often immigrant parents experience paradoxical role reversals when their children become more adapted than the parents to the culture of power. The author believed that this role reversal dynamic could be healed though social services that provide immigrant parents with increased knowledge, skills, and competence in relation to mainstream society. Also, the author claimed parental involvement in schools is a good way for parents to gain social literacy and participatory opportunities.

Orozco (2008) made light of the success of the radio program in bringing together dialogue between low-income Latino immigrant parents. These parents, many of whom were illiterate in both Spanish and English, were able to express themselves in the radio
forum because they felt honored and respected. The author advocated similar forums to be founded for Latino parents to discuss educational concerns and become involved more in school and asserted that an atmosphere of honor and respect went a long ways in welcoming the parents’ voices. Overall, Orozco (2008) asserted that “involvement is a two-way process where parents are knowledgeable about what is taking place with their children’s education, and educators understand, embrace, and seek input from the communities from which the children come (p.34).

The study method’s weaknesses were that it generalized its findings from a relatively small sample of parents (n=18). Therefore, it surely does not include all educational and parenting perspectives of low-income Latino immigrant parents. Also, the author speculated that responses may have lost some credibility due to the public-nature of the radio program. However, the study showed strengths too. It offered concrete and transferable suggestions for schools to welcome involvement and input from Latino parents and provided insight into role reversal dynamics and pressures of Latino immigrant families.

Discussion of Themes

This section discussed seven studies that examined home/school relationships of Latino, Korean, and Chinese immigrant parents. One of the studies also considered the value of non-family mentors for Latino adolescents. Some important themes arose. For one, many immigrant parents expressed feelings of isolation (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Lahman & Park, 2004; Martinez-Cosio and Iannacone, 2007; Orozco, 2008). They did not participate in their children’s schools because they could not speak English, or they did not have high school degrees, or they were not familiar with the school system.
Multiple studies advocated the need for greater school/parent partnerships so that discontinuities between cultures could be addressed (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Lahman & Park, 2004; Martinez-Cosio & Iannacone, 2007; Li, 2007; Orozco, 2008). The study by Martinez-Cosio and Iannacone (2007) documented the role of an institutionalized parent/school coordinator. The parent/school coordinator successfully helped immigrant parents build a culture within the school system, but not without controversy. The parent/room coordinator felt much resistance from administrators in her attempts to secure greater resources for immigrant families.

Another common theme in these studies was a general rebuttal against the deficit model, which suggests low-income parents have nothing positive to give towards their children’s educations. Multiple authors advocated the need for schools to form relationships with low-income immigrant parents by first and foremost validating the cultural resources that they do have (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Martinez-Cosio & Iannacone, 2007; Orozco, 2008). As Orozco (2008) acknowledged, immigrant parents often face role reversals when their children become better able to function under mainstream language and norms than they. This role reversal dynamic creates self-esteem issues for both the parents and the child. Latino and other immigrant parents in these studies advocated that schools could help them by providing translation services, childcare during parent night meetings, greater numbers of Spanish-speaking faculty, and opportunities to volunteer in classrooms (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Martinez-Cosio & Iannacone, 2007).

The educational concerns of middle-class Chinese immigrant parents were different than the low-income Latino parents’. However they shared similarities too. Li
(2006) found educational concerns of middle-class Chinese parents were largely academic. These parents were concerned with understanding the curriculum and methods of their children’s schools so that they could align out-of-school educational tasks more appropriately for their children. Half of these parents were not satisfied with the U.S. school system, and felt that their children needed to be challenged more. Still, these parents could relate to a certain extent with Latino parents who did not entirely understand the school system. However, the Chinese immigrant parents of Li’s (2006) study differ in that they were middle-class and highly educated. Nonetheless, we can generalize from these studies that most all immigrant families could benefit from better communication practices between school and home.

The next section of this chapter examines educational expectations and achievement of various immigrant groups. Most of these studies used statistics to analyze large national data sets. Through these studies the authors hoped to identify strategic leverage-points on which to focus educational reforms.

Educational Expectations and Achievement of Immigrant Students

This section reports on eight studies that examined factors that influence educational expectations and educational achievement of immigrant students. The studies assume that educational expectations are, in general, reliable indicators of future educational attainment. The purpose of these studies was to identify influential variables that could be manipulated by educators to provide greater learning outcomes for various immigrant students. Also, some of the studies found evidence to falsify the model
minority stereotype of Asian Americans by looking at the factors that influence their overall group success.

The first three studies examined factors that influenced educational attainment of immigrant and non-immigrant students. In the first study Buriel & Cardoza (1988) analyzed the affect of Spanish language proficiency and literacy on the achievement of three generations of Mexican American high school seniors. The authors found that Spanish language background did not affect achievement of first and second-generation students but had some influence over achievement of third generation students. The second study explored interpersonal and cultural factors to explain the generally higher academic performance of East Asian elementary students as compared to Anglo American students. They identified several influential factors in the East Asian students’ lives that supported their greater academic success (Schneider & Lee, 1990). In the third study Pearce & Lin (2007) used NELS data to explore cultural and structural variables associated with Chinese American post-secondary educational attainment. The study found that both Chinese American and White American culture supports education as a pathway to success, however the study also exposed notable differences between the two cultures.

The final five studies examined factors that influence educational expectations of immigrant and non-immigrant students. The fourth study of this section used NELS data to explore how students form and maintain educational expectations between eighth and twelfth grades. The study found that, Hispanic and African American students’ educational expectations fell significantly by tenth grade, whereas White Americans and Asian Americans remained more stable (Kao & Tienda, 1998). In the next study Goyette
& Xie (1999) analyzed NELS data to explain differences in educational expectations between Asian American ethnic groups and White Americans in the 10th grade. The study found that all Asian American ethnic groups held higher educational expectations than whites, and identified a variety of influential factors. The next study interviewed Korean American students in New York City. Half of the students were high school dropouts, the other half, Ivy league hopefuls. The author investigated differences in educational expectations between the two groups and found that Korean Americans’ parental expectations differed very little between the two groups, but that the differing success stories were in large part due to school/home barriers and lack of access to educational support (Lew, 2006). In the next study Chang et al. (2006) surveyed a multi-ethnic sample of high school seniors to find out their life goals. To the authors’ surprise, they found very little differences between ethnic groups in their future plans, suggesting that these high school seniors’ life goals and aspirations did not mirror disparities in society. In the final study, Feliciano (2006) investigated whether group-level pre-migration educational status influenced educational expectations of second-generation immigrant students. The study found that pre-migration educational status did, in fact, influence educational expectations of second-generation students. Introductions complete, the first study narrative begins with a study about the affect of Spanish language ability on the academic achievement of Mexican American students.

In a correlational study Buriel & Cardoza (1988) analyzed the affect of Spanish language proficiency and literacy on the achievement of three generations of Mexican American high school seniors. The authors found that Spanish language background did not affect achievement of first and second-generation students but had some influence
over achievement of third generation students. Students’ educational aspirations had the greatest correlation to academic achievement for all generations.

The authors used data from the High School and Beyond longitudinal study, which had conducted a national survey of high school sophomores and seniors in 1980. Buriel & Cardoza (1980) extracted a subsample from the data set that included only high school seniors that identified as Mexican, Mexican American, or Chicano. Students were considered to be first generation if they were not born in the U.S., second generation if born in the U.S. with at least one parent born in Mexico, and 3rd generation if both parents were born in the U.S. The authors analyzed the following variables: students educational aspirations, mother’s educational aspirations for their child, Spanish oral proficiency (speaking), Spanish literacy (reading and writing), home language environment, parents’ education, and family income. The dependent variables of the study were the students’ scores on standardized math, reading, and vocabulary tests, which were conducted by the HS&B longitudinal study. The authors hypothesized that students whose home language was Spanish would score worse on the standardized tests than students whose home language was English. However, they also hypothesized that students with Spanish literacy skills would score higher than students without.

Buriel & Cardoza (1988) first found no significant difference between generational groups in math, reading, and vocabulary test scores, and no significant difference in educational aspirations, which were uniformly high among all groups (no p – values given). The authors did find significant differences between first and second-generation parental SES and third generation SES. Fathers and mothers of third generation students had more education than their first and second-generations
counterparts (fathers: $F(2,1046) = 4.05, p. < .01$; mothers: $F(2,1144) = 7.57, p. < .001$).

Also, family income of third generation students was greater than their first and second-
generation families ($F(2,1262) = 10.66, p. < .0001$).

The authors found that home language differed significantly among all groups ($F$
$(2,1130) = 57.44, p. < .0001$). Expectedly, first generation students were more likely to
speak Spanish at home, followed by second generation, then third generation. The
authors’ analysis revealed a pattern of home language transfer from Spanish to English
over three generations. However, in both Spanish oral proficiency and literacy skills,
first generation and second-generation students were equals. Third generation students’
Spanish oral proficiency and literacy was significantly lower, however (Spanish oral
$.0001$). This finding was expected since third generation Mexican American students’
parents were born in the U.S., whereas first and second-generation students’ parents were
not and so had a closer connection to Spanish language.

In affirmation of the authors’ hypothesis, third generation students who spoke
Spanish at home scored lower on reading and vocabulary tests (Reading: Spanish mother
tongue, $\beta = -1.6, R^2 = .174$; Spanish oral proficiency, $\beta = -1.5, R^2 = .186$;
Vocabulary: Spanish mother tongue, $\beta = -1.26, R^2 = .166$). However, third generation
students that were literate in Spanish, meaning those that could read and write in Spanish,
scored higher on reading tests than their Spanish illiterate counterparts (Spanish literacy
proficiency: $\beta = .826, R^2 = .200$). First and second-generation students’ test scores
were slightly affected by language proficiency and literacy, but were primarily affected
by their own and their mother’s aspirations (Second generation vocabulary test: Student’s
aspirations, β = 2.93, R^2 = .253; Spanish literacy, β = 2.10, R^2 = .293; Spanish oral proficiency, β = -2.63, R^2 = .336; First generation vocabulary test: Students aspirations, β = 4.55, R^2 = .200; Mother’s aspirations, β = 2.44, R^2 = .234). Third generation students’ test scores were most positively influenced by their own aspirations as well (Reading: β = 2.0, R^2 = .121; Vocabulary: β = 1.86, R^2 = .120).

Buriel & Cardoza (1980) concluded, “personal aspirations are by far the most potent predictors of achievement for all three generations of Mexican American students” (p.186-187). The authors also highlighted that SES did not account for increased achievement among students of any generation. And Spanish language background had little affect on first and second-generation achievement. However, the authors speculated that their findings may not be generalizable to all Mexican American high school students, since their sample only consisted of high school seniors; many first and second-generation students who experienced serious Spanish/English language barriers may have already dropped out by senior year.

The authors suggested a theoretical framework that described voluntary immigrants as naturally having inflated aspirations and hopes for their new lives in a new country. Third generation students’ achievement was also largely affected by personal aspirations, however they were also positively affected by Spanish language literacy. The authors mused that, since foreign language classes are often prerequisites for higher education, third generation Mexican Americans enrolled in Spanish language courses are more likely to be college bound. The authors also introduced “ghettoization theory,” which suggests that 3rd generation students that still speak Spanish at home commonly live in low-income barrios where Spanish is the common language (Buriel & Cardoza,
These third generation students may be affiliated with generational poverty, which generally creates lowered expectations. However, although the authors found universally high aspirations among all students, they proposed that some student’s expectations for achieving them might be low. Chang et al. (2006) made a similar proposal after they found that, although high school seniors from multiple minority groups reported similarly high aspirations, Hispanic students’ aspirations lacked concreteness because they were not aware of the specific steps needed to reach their goals.

Although this study analyzed data from 1980 its findings gained validity because of its large sample size of over one thousand Mexican, Mexican American, and Chicano students. Also, the study uncovered strong internal validity, as its independent variables, including students’ aspirations and Spanish language literacy and proficiency, produced strong variations in test scores. Also, the study was reliable and objective, since the authors used a national data set, which is publicly accessible. However, the authors claimed significant and non-significant differences between first, second, and third generation immigrants, but left out probability values to explain non-significance. This issue caused the paper’s results section to lose some transparency. The next study narrative describes a study that explored why East Asian elementary students performed higher academically than white students.

In an ethnographic study Schneider & Lee (1990) explored socio-cultural and interpersonal factors to explain the generally higher academic performance of East Asian elementary students in comparison to their Anglo counterparts. They found several characteristics in East Asian students’ lives that supported their greater academic success,
which were either non-existent or less pervasive in Anglo students’ lives. The authors selected two Illinois elementary schools to observe that had at least twenty Chinese, Japanese and Korean students in grades six or seven. The two elementary schools were K-8: one located in a suburban area, the other in urban Chicago. The sample consisted of 46 East Asian and 49 Anglo students. The East Asian students were represented by 27 Korean Americans, 15 Chinese Americans, and 4 Japanese Americans. Between September 1982 and June 1983 the authors spent 90 days observing in the schools, interviewing teachers and students, and participating in school activities. They also sent a questionnaire home with students to get responses from their parents about demographics, immigration history, language use at home, and language study. The authors also accessed the students I.Q. test scores, grades, and standardized test scores from prior and present years. Parent interviews were conducted at their homes and at their places of work and at least one parent of each student were interviewed. Last, each student responded to three essay prompts: my home, my school, and my future.

Schneider & Lee (1990) confirmed that the East Asian students of their sample achieved higher academic scores than the Anglo students. To find out why, first they analyzed socioeconomic status of both groups. They found similar incomes between parents of the two groups, however East Asian parents tended to work longer hours at non-professional or service jobs, whereas a greater percentage of Anglo parents worked less hours for a higher wage. Asian American parents’ lower status jobs did not mirror the high educational expectations they kept for their children, however. Interviewed East Asian parents suggested that education supports all that is important in life, “I think education is most important because if you have education, you have a more satisfied life
with your family and society ... I think college is the least education a person should have” (Schneider & Lee, 1990, p.368). Twenty-four of the 35 East Asian parents reported that they faced discrimination in employment opportunities. This assertion influenced many parents’ high educational expectations for their children. They believed that higher education was the only way to overcome discrimination obstacles, “I think there will be discrimination against my children because they are minorities … Therefore I tell my children to study for two hours when white children study for one hour. If they ask me the reason, I tell them I will let them know later” (Schneider & Lee, 1990, p.370). All of the East Asian parents interviewed said they would not be satisfied by a C grade, whereas only 67% of Anglo parents exerted similar expectations. The authors found, too, that many East Asian students associated their parents’ honor, pride, and happiness with good grades. In other words, they did not want to make their parents feel bad by getting a B or a C.

Teacher and peer educational expectations of East Asian students were equally high. Fifteen of the 16 teachers interviewed placed East Asian students into the highest academic achieving groups, when asked to rate their achievement on a one to five scale. Many teachers were quick to stereotype East Asian students as industrious, organized, quiet, and respectful students. However, the authors identified a possible negative stereotype, which the teachers often placed on their East Asian students. Many teachers believed their East Asian students lacked language and social skills and decided that they would be best off in a math profession that would not require verbal skills.

The authors found an abundance of East Asian home/family practices that supported the actualization of their high expectations. More Anglo sixth and seventh
graders reported that their parents tutored them than East Asian students. The authors believed this was because of language deficits of East Asian parents. However, English language deficits did not stop East Asian parents from structurally supporting their children’s educational achievement. Twenty-two out of 37 East Asian parents reported that they prepared their children in writing, reading, and simple arithmetic before they entered kindergarten, whereas only four out of 25 Anglo parents reported doing the same. Also, many East Asian parents purchased textbooks and workbooks so that their children could study when they were not assigned homework, which was often the case in primary grades. Eighty percent of East Asian parents required their children to study academic subjects at home for at least one-hour per day, whereas only 13% of Anglo parents did the same. Also the majority of East Asian parents reported that they established a specific time-period for study and many monitored their children’s progress. More East Asian students were enrolled in private lessons too, including music, martial arts, computer science, and languages. Last, East Asian students in this study were more likely to be grouped into top-level classes than Anglo students. The authors described these top-level classes as all-around better education, because they “tended to challenge students with interesting, explanatory topics … while in the low-level classes they concentrated on mastery of basic skills and on disciplining students” (Schneider & Lee, 1990, p.373).

The authors concluded that East Asian students’ higher academic performance was related to parent, self, teacher, and peer high expectations and the highly structured home environment in which their parents enforce. While academic achievement was a good thing, the authors also identified some areas for concern. Given that these sixth and
seventh graders spent so many hours inside studying, the authors worried that they missed out on developing social and language skills more fully. Although, this was a huge assumption on behalf of the authors that overlooked one of the main purposes for East Asians to strive academically, that of overcoming discrimination through hard work and dedication. The authors pointed out, however, that without social skills East Asian minorities would not be able to penetrate the “middleman ceiling” enforced by dominant Anglo culture. While striving to obtain medical degrees and other less-language based high-level certifications, the authors mused that East Asians would remain the middleman minority figures, which “act as a buffer between the dominant group and the minority groups at the bottom” (Schneider & Lee, 1990, p.374).

The authors’ recommendation for East Asian students to be offered more opportunities to develop needed social skills could be considered differently. For example, the amount of importance people give to extra-familial friendships and playtime may be particular to certain cultures. The results of one study suggested that White Americans placed more importance on friends than did all other minority groups (Eskilson & Wiley, 1999). Close family ties may be not only a cultural resource for East Asian Americans, but also a factor that naturally supersedes an American attitude toward importance of “playing with friends.” However, both theories, one that suggests friends are not that important to East Asians, and the other, which suggests East Asians work too hard and need to play more, are bound to irritate someone because they are generalizations that fail to consider a greater context of human life. We can take from this article a further knowledge about the sources and purposes of high academic expectations of East Asians and try not to over-generalize. Also, the authors made a
strong appeal to teachers to avoid constructing self-fulfilling prophesies that East Asian students are quiet, industrious, helpful, respectful, responsible math whizzes, and to provide all students with greater opportunities to develop social and collaborative skills in the classroom.

This study gained credibility through the multi-dimensional quality of data that the authors collected. The authors spent 90 days observing within two Chicago schools, sent home questionnaires, interviewed parents, and looked-up IQ and test scores of subject students. This information would have given the authors a good idea of the home/school dynamics at play, which may influence the success of students. Also, compared to other ethnographic studies, this one studied a relatively high number of subjects (East Asian: 46; Anglo: 49). However the number of subjects was not great enough to perform reliable regression analyses on the data, in which home practices would be independent variables and test scores would be dependent variables. The authors’ findings displayed dependability, since other studies have found similar socio-cultural and interpersonal factors that have promoted East Asian students’ success in school (Lew, 2006). However, although the authors collected data in both urban and suburban settings, the transferability of the study may be limited to similar demographic characteristics of the two observed schools. The next study narrative describes a study that attempted to debunk the model minority stereotype as is commonly applied to Asian Americans.

In a correlational study Pearce & Lin (2007) used 1988 – 2000 National Educational Longitudinal Study data to explore the cultural and structural variables used by Chinese Americans to attain post-secondary education. Because the “model minority”
stereotype assumes that the minority group’s success is due to assimilation to the dominant culture, this study also investigated whether the pathways that Chinese Americans take in order to succeed in school is the same or different than White Americans. The study found that both Chinese American and White American culture supports education as a pathway to success, however the study also exposed notable differences between the two cultures that suggested Chinese Americans’ high educational attainment is not due to their assimilation to dominant cultural norms.

Pearce & Lin (2007) used NELS data, which repeatedly surveyed individual students beginning in elementary school, through high school, and into post-secondary years. The authors analyzed subjects who were documented in all five NELS trials, which spanned from 1988, when the students were in elementary school until the year 2000, when they were approximately 26 years of age. Their sample consisted of 8,320 white respondents and 202 Chinese American respondents. First, the authors used NELS data to confirm their assumption that Chinese American students attain higher levels of education on average than white students (65% of the Chinese Americans had a bachelor’s degree or higher, opposed to 42.7% of White Americans). Then they used NELS data to compare “social structural” and “cultural capital” existences between Chinese Americans and whites. Social structural variables were distinguished as sex, family income, school district location, family composition, and immigrant status. Cultural capital variables consisted of parent’s education attainment, parental educational expectation, parental school involvement, and parenting style. The dependent variable was Highest Post-Secondary Degree Attained.
The authors introduction discussed a framework that contrasted voluntary and involuntary immigrants. Voluntary immigrants, they proposed, were more likely to “adopt attitudes, preferences, tastes, and styles of the dominant White culture so as to be admitted into and gain a position and status within the dominant cultural group,” while “involuntary immigrant groups may oppose and reject elements of the dominant culture so as to form and maintain a unique group identity and avoid association with dominant (and dominating) culture” (Pearce & Lin, 2007, p.23). The authors identified Chinese Americans as voluntary immigrants; however, they proposed that the ethnic group’s high academic achievement was not fully due to their to their assimilation to the dominant culture. The authors suspected that Chinese culture shared similar attributes with dominant White American culture, for example in the importance both cultures gave to education. In this way, the authors proposed, Chinese Americans could seem like they were assimilating to the dominant White culture, while in actuality they were only practicing their own cultural norms. Pearce & Lin (2007) included cultural capital variables in their analysis to try and see if Chinese and dominant White American pathways to academic success were really the same, as the “minority stereotype” suggested.

The authors found evidence that supported their hypothesis that Chinese Americans hold education in high esteem like whites, but that their educational attainment benefited from different cultural strategies than those practiced by whites. First, the authors used a logistic regression analysis to look at the affect of the social structural variables on both groups’ educational attainment. They found that all social structural variables had influenced the educational attainment of both whites and Chinese
Americans similarly. For example, female students from both groups were more likely to attain a post-secondary education. However, Chinese Americans experienced this affect more strongly than Whites (Chinese: $B = .505$, $p. < .01$; Whites: $B = .267$, $p. < .01$). Family income also showed significant positive influence on post-secondary education for both groups (Chinese: $B = .236$, $p. < .01$; Whites: $B = .321$, $p. < .01$). Students from both groups that attended schools in urban neighborhoods were similarly negatively impacted in their likelihood to attain higher education (Chinese: $B = -.226$, $p. < .01$; Whites: $B = -.076$, $p. < .01$). Also single-parent family compositions negatively impacted both groups (Chinese: $B = -.386$, $p. < .01$; Whites: $B = -1.099$, $p. < .01$). These social structural variables were similar for both groups, which showed that if the authors were going to find differences it would be in the cultural capital variables that they applied to the regression analysis next.

Pearce & Lin (2007) found that the cultural capital variables significantly influenced both groups, but the direction and magnitude often varied. They believed that these differences showed evidence of cultural distinction between the two groups, and debunked the appropriateness of the “model minority” stereotype. For example, one major distinction occurred in the realm of parental involvement in schools. White American students’ post-secondary educational attainment was positively affected if their parents attended a school meeting, however Chinese Americans’ educational attainment was negatively affected (Chinese: $B = -3.087$, $p. < .01$; Whites: $B = .363$, $p. < .01$). The authors noticed also that only 34% of Chinese parents attended school meetings, whereas more than half of the White parents did. The authors proposed that White parents work from a stance that parental participation in their children’s education will benefit them,
whereas Chinese parents “work from the adage, ‘if it ain’t broke … don’t fix it’” (Pearce & Lin, 2007, p.32).

However, not all parent participation exerted negative affects on Chinese Americans’ post-secondary educational attainment. Chinese parents who discussed school activities with their children strongly benefited their children’s education attainment. This affect was five-times stronger for Chinese Americans than for Whites (Chinese: $B = 1.563$, $p < .01$: Whites: $B = .302$, $p < .01$). Another interesting finding was the huge positive influence of employment on Chinese American students’ educational attainment. Chinese American students that had jobs were seven-times more positively influenced than White students that had jobs (Chinese: $B = 1.686$, $p < .01$: Whites: $B = .261$, $p < .01$). Similarly, Chinese American students’ educational attainment was positively influenced if their parents required them to attend to chores on a regular basis, whereas White students’ educational attainment was negatively influenced if their parents made them do chores (Chinese: $B = .151$, $p < .01$: Whites: $B = -.187$, $p < .01$). Last, parental expectations showed positive influence for both groups. However parental expectations of Chinese American parents exerted twice as much influence on their children’s educational attainment than Whites (Chinese: $B = 1.770$, $p < .01$: Whites: $B = .875$, $p < .01$). The authors concluded, “the two cultures, in promoting education, are harmonistic but different” (Pearce & Lin, 2007, p.33).

This study, like the one by Goyette & Xie (1999), relied on data collected by the NELS. The authors’ discussion lost objectivity in that it failed to include an explanation of methodology, biases, and assumptions inherent in the NELS that may have affected their results. For example, one concern for the study’s external validity was that the data
consisted of 8320 white respondents versus only 202 Chinese American students. Were data from all Chinese American students included, or only the ones with proficient English skills, who were able to complete all the survey questions? Also, the time span of the NELS study was between 1988 and 2000, twelve years. The authors’ analysis gained validity in that it only included respondents that participated in all surveys for 12 years. However, White American students may be more grounded in location than Chinese American students, whose parents are first generation in the U.S. Is it acceptable to generalize the results across all second-generation Chinese American youth, or was this sample particular to both proficient English skills and those who were willing and geographically stable enough to participate in post-secondary surveys? Nevertheless, the authors’ discussion of results served to admonish the false image of Chinese Americans being a model minority group. The next study narrative describes a study about how educational expectations change over some students’ high school careers.

In a correlational study Kao & Tienda (1998) used NELS data to analyze how educational expectations were formed and maintained from eighth to twelfth grades among various minority and dominant groups. The study found that, although all groups reported high educational expectations in 8th grade, Hispanic and African American students’ educational expectations fell significantly by tenth grade. The authors’ proposed that these minority groups’ high educational expectations were less concrete than other groups whose educational expectations remained more stable through high school. The authors also found that students’ likelihood to maintain high educational aspirations was related to their families’ higher socioeconomic status.
Kao & Tienda (1998) used the first three panels of the National Educational Longitudinal Survey, which surveyed 24,599 students from 1,052 schools beginning in 1988 when the students were in 8th grade. NELS conducted follow-up surveys in 1990 and 1992, when the students were in 10th and 12th grade. The authors’ analysis consisted of data from subjects represented from all three survey years that fell into either Asian, Hispanic, Black, and White categories. Their main question asked how these different groups varied in educational aspirations throughout the three surveys. Kao & Tienda (1998) also conducted focus-group discussions at Chicago area high schools with white, black, Hispanic, and Asian students. The focus groups were segregated by race to maximize comfort levels and the focus group leaders were of the same race as the youth. The focus groups discussed their educational goals for the future and their limitations. This data was meant to compliment and help interpret the authors’ NELS quantitative analysis results.

Kao & Tienda (1998) found that all groups carried high educational aspirations in the eighth grade. For example, all groups showed a similar percentage of male students that expected to graduate from college (Asians 37.7%, Hispanics 34%, Blacks 41%, and Whites 44.4%). The only major difference between males in eighth grade was that almost twice as many Asians expected to attend graduate school than all other groups (Asians 39%, Hispanics 20.4%, Blacks 22.1%, Whites 22.8%).

A main pattern found in this study was that educational aspirations generally declined between eighth and tenth grades. This was especially true for Hispanic, black, and white students. For example, between eighth and tenth grade, males’ expectations to graduate from college decreased from 37.7% to 32% for Asians, 34% to 25.9% for
Hispanics, 41% to 28.1% for blacks, and 44.4% to 33.1% for whites. The authors interpreted these results to be associated with high school tracking of students into college bound or non-college bound programs. Also students figured in their GPAs and success in high school up to this point. Female students educational expectations mirrored that of males between eight and tenth grades for all groups. Interestingly, the percentage of female and male students that expected to attend graduate school remained relatively stable for all groups between the eighth and tenth grades. Most of the percentage of students that dropped out of the “college graduate” bracket went into the “some college” bracket or “high school graduate” bracket between eighth and tenth grades.

Between 10th and 12th grades educational aspirations for all groups increased. This showed that many of the students that had made it all the way to the 12th grade now believed they would graduate from college or attend graduate school. In 12th grade approximately 50% of male and female Asian students expected to attend graduate school compared to approximately 30% that expected to graduate college. All the other groups had higher percentages of students that expected to be college graduates than students that expected to attend graduate school.

Despite relatively high educational expectations for all groups, the authors were interested in the pattern of many black and Hispanic students failure to maintain high educational aspirations between eight and the tenth grade. They hypothesized that these groups tend to have high hopes in the eighth grade but, unlike whites and Asians, they lacked specific knowledge necessary to bring their goals to fruition. For example, the authors identified through focus group discussions that Hispanic students had trouble
differentiating between different types of white-collar work and did not understand educational requirements for different careers. Asian students, on the other hand, were more precise about their educational and occupational aspirations. For example, the authors referenced one girl that said, “she was going to major in biomedical engineering and go on to medical school, where she planned to become a cardiologist” (Kao & Tienda, 1998, p.378). Hispanic students also identified that they lacked the money to attend college, and that they would have to depend on scholarships. The Asian students in the focus groups reported that they thought their culture overachieves in school not because they are smarter but because they have strong work ethics. The black students were asked if they held oppositional feelings to the white culture of schooling. They expressed feelings of school being white, but more strongly expressed the importance they and their peers held in being successful in school. However, the authors identified that black students were often socially segregated from white peers, so that their educational aspirations could seem relatively high within their own community, but were relatively low when compared to the community at large.

The authors pinpointed socioeconomic status as the main culprit for the divisions in educational aspirations and concreteness of educational aspirations. For instance, parent’s education was found to strongly influence educational aspirations of all groups in all grades (8th grade: $r = .243, p < .001$; 10th grade: $r = .157, p < .001$; 12th grade: $r = .171, p < .001$). The authors believed that higher SES provided more precise knowledge of the steps needed in order to attain higher education and white-collar work.

This extensive study included much more results and information than was reported here. The authors identified an inherent problem with the practice of using
educational expectations as an indicator of actual future educational attainment of students. They found that students may report high educational expectations, but at the same time, lack the knowledge and resources to realistically attain those goals. This study also made some huge generalizations in their clumping of all Asian students into one group and all Hispanic students into one group, and did not control for generational status. However, this study was thorough in all other areas and made constructive use of a youth focus group, which brought depth and helped interpret their quantitative results.

The next study narrative describes a study that explored influential variables that affect educational expectations of students from different Asian American ethnic groups.

In a correlational study Goyette & Xie (1999) analyzed data from the National Educational Longitudinal Study (NELS) to explain differences in educational expectations between Asian American ethnic groups and whites in the 10th grade. The study found that all Asian American ethnic groups, on average, held higher educational expectations than whites, and identified a variety of influential factors. The authors pinpointed three factors to explore that may explain Asian American students’ higher educational expectations: “(1) socioeconomic and other background characteristics, (2) tested academic ability, (3) parents’ educational expectations for children” (Goyette & Xie, 1999, p. 23). The authors chose not to clump Asian Americans into one homogeneous grouping, because different Asian American ethnic groups represented a variety of cultural heritages and immigrant experiences. Also, from prior research, the authors knew that Asian American ethnic groups varied in average socioeconomic status, a variable that was generally known to impact educational expectations. A total sample of 13,112 students was taken from NELS data. Out of the total, 980 identified as Asian
American, a group that included 204 Chinese, 194 Filipinos, 57 Japanese, 137 Koreans, 163 Southeast Asians, 87 South Asians, and 138 “other” Asians. NELS surveyed each student four times, in 8th grade, 10th grade, 12th grade, and post-secondary. NELS had also surveyed the students’ parents, teachers, and principals. However, the authors used data from only 8th and 10th grade surveys.

Goyette & Xie (1999) confirmed that all Asian American ethnic groups analyzed in this data set showed higher educational expectations than whites: 18.3 years for South Asians, 17.5 years for Koreans, 16.9 years for Chinese, 16.7 years for Japanese, 16.1 years for Southeast Asians, 16.1 years for Filipinos, and 15.6 years for whites. Why though? The authors looked at three factors of socioeconomic and background characteristics, tested academic ability, and parental expectations to help explain the differences. The SES index that included education and financial resources of parents revealed South Asians, Japanese, and Koreans to score the highest (0.81, 0.42, 0.39, respectively) and Filipinos and Chinese notably lower (0.17 and 0.22, respectively). Whites scored lower than all groups except Southeast Asians, who scored well below all groups (whites, 0.08; Southeast Asians, -0.38).

Goyette & Xie (1999) did not find a direct correspondence between SES and standardized test scores of each group. On the math standardized test the rank of ethnic groups was, from highest score to lowest: Chinese (58.3), South Asians (56.9), Southeast Asians (53.8), Japanese (53.2), whites (52.1), and Filipinos (51.8). This finding was surprising because Southeast Asians scored relatively high despite their low SES. Also, Chinese scored highest despite their lower SES. Parental educational expectations differed too. Overall, Asian American parents reported higher educational expectations
for their children than white parents (Asian parents, from 16.0 to 18.1 years; whites, 15.4 years).

Mirroring math test scores, South Asian and Chinese parents reported highest expectations for the amount of time their children would spend in school (18.1 and 17.3 years, respectively). However, Chinese parents’ educational expectations fell almost a whole year below South Asians. Korean and Southeast Asian parents’ educational expectations were close to that of the Chinese (17.1 and 17.0 years, respectively), followed by Japanese and Filipino (16.7 and 16.0 years, respectively). The authors were struck by Southeast Asians’ low SES, but relatively high parental educational expectations, which they commented was “about 1 ½ years above those of the white parents” (Goyette & Xie, 1999, p.29). Later, the authors reported that 1st generation immigrant students in their study had significantly higher educational expectations than third generation students (Second generation: r = -.228, p > .05; Third generation: r = -.346, p. < .01), which could explain some of the effect of high expectations despite low SES for Southeast Asians since 68.3% of SE Asians surveyed were first generation immigrants.

After acknowledging the variations between ethnic groups described above, the authors used linear multivariate regression models to identify specific variables that influenced each ethnic groups’ educational expectations. For example, this method allowed the authors to turn on and off control variables one by one in order to see the extent of their negative or positive affect on the difference between the various ethnic groups’ educational expectations and whites’. The removal of parental expectations, for example, dramatically lessened the difference between Chinese groups’ educational
expectations and whites (Chinese coefficient before removal of parental expectation control: \( r = .660, p < .01 \); Chinese coefficient after removal of parental expectation control: \( r = .393, p < .01 \)). The authors interpreted this result as an indication that Chinese parents’ high expectations significantly influence their children’s relatively high aspirations for their educations (Goyette & Xie, 1999).

Other important relationships surfaced in the authors’ analysis. First, the authors analyzed the affect of ethnicity in their regression analysis and found that Asian American ethnicity groups showed significantly higher educational expectations than whites (Chinese: \( r = 1.407, p < .01 \); Filipino: \( r = .617, p < .01 \); Japanese: \( 1.203, p < .01 \); Korean: \( r = 1.753, p < .01 \); Southeast Asian: \( r = .815, p < .01 \); South Asian: \( r = 2.703, p < .01 \)). Next, they eliminated first generation students from the analysis. This affect had interesting effects on the difference between Southeast Asian and Filipino students’ and whites’ educational expectations (Filipino: \( r = .127, p > .05 \); Southeast Asian: \( r = .368, p > .05 \)). The difference between those ethnic groups and whites was no longer significant, showing that first generation Southeast Asian and Filipino students had higher educational expectations than their 2\(^{nd}\) and 3\(^{rd}\) generation counterparts. However, it should be noted that first generation SE Asian students made up 68.3 % of their group’s sample, leaving only 31.7 % of the 163 total to proceed in the analysis. The first generation Filipino students only made up 39.7% of their groups’ total 194 student sample, yet significantly influenced their relatively high ed. expectations in comparison to whites’. This showed that these two groups’ educational expectations decreased as generations spent in the U.S. increased. However, as the authors’ regression analysis proceeded, Southeast Asians educational expectations climbed and remained significantly
higher than whites after all independent variables were controlled (Southeast Asians: r = .572, p < .01). The Filipino students remained more or less the same, however, showing their group’s relatively higher educational expectations in comparison to whites’ is mostly due to first generation’s swollen expectations (Filipino group coefficient at end of regression analysis: r = .159, p > .05). The authors did not speculate on societal factors that might cause such a decline in educational expectations over generations for this group.

Next, Goyette & Xie (1999) applied socioeconomic and background characteristics to the regression analysis. The authors analyzed the affects of: SES index, father’s education, mother’s education, intact family structures, number of siblings, private school, and urban and suburban school location. Overall, SES and parents’ education (college and high school grad status) had the most significant positive affects on the educational expectations of Asian American students (SES Index: r = 1.003, p < .01; Father graduated college: r = .857, p < .01; Mother graduated college: r = .389, p < .01). Also, Asian American students that were part of non-intact families (divorced or single parent) reported significantly lower educational expectations (Non-intact: r = -.118, p < .05). Increased number of siblings in a family significantly reduced educational expectations too (r = -.073, p < .01). Also, excluding students that attended private schools significantly lowered average educational expectations of Asian American students in the analysis (r = .520, p < .01). However, school location (urban and suburban or rural) showed little overall affect on educational expectations (Urban and suburban excluded: r = .026, p > .05).
Some Asian American ethnic groups were more impacted than others when SES and background characteristics were controlled. For example, the difference in educational expectations between South Asian and white students decreased from 2.170 years to 1.024 years when these factors were accounted for, whereas the same difference for Filipino showed little change (from 0.127 years to 0.130 years). Another interesting feature of these results was that Southeast Asian educational expectations increased hugely when SES and background characteristics were controlled for, going from 0.368 to 1.191 years difference. This difference was noticeably larger than South Asians (1.191 years vs. 1.024 years, respectively). One explanation for this result is that Southeast Asian students whose parents graduated high school and college support higher educational expectations than non high school graduates, who were excluded. Also the remaining Southeast Asian students in the analysis benefited from the removal of the negative influence of number of siblings. Southeast Asian families had the highest average number of siblings per family of all groups at 3.1, a factor that was found to have significant negative influence on educational expectations ($r = -.073, p. < .01$). The authors also made note of the rise in Chinese student educational expectations when SES and background factors were controlled for, though the increase was not as extreme as for Southeast Asians (Chinese: from 0.931 years to 1.059 years). Japanese and Koreans, on the other hand, experienced reduced educational expectations here, and the Japanese no longer significantly different than whites (Japanese: from 0.931 years to 0.436 years; Koreans: from 1.294 years to 0.962 years).

Next, Goyette and Xie (1999) analyzed the affects of academic ability. Students that were never held back a grade in school were excluded from the analysis, which
resulted in significantly lowered overall educational expectations ($r = -0.609, p < .01$).

Not surprising, Asian Americans students’ significantly higher math, science, and reading standardized test scores all had a positive affect on educational expectations (Reading: $r = 0.031, p < .01$; Math: $r = 0.041, p < .01$; Science: $r = 0.010, p < .01$). After academic ability variables were controlled for in the analysis, the difference between educational expectations of all Asian American ethnic groups, excluding Japanese and Filipino, narrowed in relation to that of white students.

Last, the authors applied the influence of parent’s expectation to the analysis. The exclusion of this variable had strong and positive affects on the educational expectations of all Asian American ethnic groups. The difference between educational expectations of Asians and whites narrowed for all ethnic groups. However, Chinese and Southeast Asian students experienced the most extreme declines here (from 0.660 to 0.393 years for Chinese and from 0.906 to 0.572 years for Southeast Asians). This correlation supported the theory that high parental expectations of Chinese and Southeast Asians was a cultural resource for them.

Finally, after the inclusion of all these variables, 8th grade students from Chinese, Korean, Southeast Asian, and South Asian ethnic groups still had significantly higher educational expectations than whites (Chinese: $r = 0.393, p < .01$; Korean: $r = 0.647, p < .01$; Southeast Asian: $r = 0.572, p < .01$; South Asian: $r = 0.649, p < .01$), while Filipino and Japanese did not. Goyette and Xie (1999) refrained from drawing generalizations from their results. However, they did assert the overwhelming pattern that, “ostensibly through different paths and for different reasons, Asian American youths expect to achieve higher levels of education than do their white counterparts,” and went on to say
that, “it is indeed remarkable that so many Asian ethnic groups with diverse cultural heritages converge in this important respect” (Goyette and Xie, 1999, p.33). The authors speculated that immigrant students expect to achieve at high levels because of some unobserved aspects of the immigrant experience that all immigrants share. They also mused that all Asian Americans may practice a similar strategy of overcoming racial discrimination by achieving upward mobility through education. Taylor (1994), in his multicultural history of the Central District of Seattle, highlighted the words of a founder of the Japanese American Citizens League, Saburo Kido, who advocated a similar approach for Japanese American citizens to secure greater civil rights in the 1930’s,

“In technical or commercial vocations, we cannot afford to work with talents inferior to [white] Americans. It is not enough even to be their equals; we must surpass them – by developing our powers to the point of genius if necessary. We believe that the complaints against race prejudice in the matter of vocational opportunities are not justified. They only show that something is lacking in the initiative or ability of the one who complains.” (p. 120)

Taylor (1994) included this quote to contrast African American’s more confrontational strategies to secure civil rights in the 1930’s, a path that many Japanese shied away from for fear of weakening the tenuous rights they already enjoyed. Either way, Japanese American civil rights of this period turned out to be almost meaningless, no matter how hard they worked and studied, West coast Japanese Americans’ rights as U.S. citizens were removed by the U.S. government when they were forced to evacuate their homes, businesses, and farms and relocated to concentration camps during WWII.
Goyette & Xie (1999) could have provided more discussion in their report. Granted, the analysis they conducted was highly racial, which could make any generalizations or assertions made by the authors put to intense scrutiny. However, the racial aspect of their analysis does need some discussion. For example, what is the importance of identifying the determinants of Asian Americans’ high educational expectations? Is it to prove that Asian American’s model minority image is not warranted, nor should be blanketed across the diverse groups that, either first hand or through ancestry, originated within the Asian continent and its many islands? Also, are these racial statistics in danger of getting into the wrong hands? Could this data support educational reform that hurt instead of help immigrant students? The authors rightly asserted the need to analyze Asian American subgroups separately, and the independent variables they addressed exposed strong internal validity in various directions for each subgroup. Through their results they discussed major differences in socioeconomic and background characteristics, academic ability, and parental expectations between the various ethnic groups. However, they did not discuss implications or propose future research in regards to strong patterns they found, for instance, the finding that first generation Filipino students reported significantly higher educational expectations than their 3\textsuperscript{rd} generation counterparts could use some discussion. It would be interesting for the authors to contemplate the societal reasons for these relationships rather than leaving them open for the reader’s judgment.

This study was reliable and objective within the context of NELS data. For example, other researchers could perform the same analysis on the NELS data that Goyette & Xie (1999) did. However, whether or not their results were valid and
generalizable to all Chinese, Filipino, Japanese, Korean, Southeast Asian, and South Asian students depends on the survey methods of NELS. In other words, did NELS survey Asian American students from a diverse range of demographics, and did they survey enough students for these results to be valid? For example, out of the 13,112 students that NELS surveyed, only 57 were Japanese Americans. Were 57 Japanese students a big enough sample size to draw conclusions with? The next study narrative describes a study about the educational expectations of two groups of New York City Korean American adolescents.

In a 3-year ethnographic study Lew (2006) interviewed 72 Korean American students in New York City urban schools, 42 of which attended an elite magnate school, and 30 of which were high school dropouts attending a community-based GED program. The author investigated differences in educational expectations between the two groups to help explain their differing school success stories. The study found that Korean American’ parental expectations differed very little between the two groups, but that the differing success stories were in large part due to school/home barriers and lack of access to educational support.

Through this study, the author pointed out that not all Asian Americans are so called “model minorities”, and that many drop out of high school. Lew (2006) reported that 513,000 Asian Americans attended high school in 1999, while 25,000 dropped out. She believed that these significant numbers deserved further explanation, and so she visited the elite magnate and GED program schools to find out about the discrepancy.

All of the Korean American youth in this study were 2nd generation immigrants. Their parents tended to work in Korean ethnic enclaves as entrepreneur merchants or
employees of Korean merchants. Lew (2006) reported that first generation Koreans used the strategy of becoming merchants to overcome socioeconomic obstacles and racial prejudices in the U.S. However, their second-generation children acted from a different strategy that was aimed at moving beyond their ethnic enclaves and becoming members of the mainstream work force. Their common strategy towards upward mobility involved excelling in secondary education, getting into elite institutions of higher education, and then getting a high-paying job. No matter their relative socioeconomic status within the Korean community, all of the Korean youths’ parents that Lew interviewed advocated this pathway towards success for their children. However, some parents were sterner than others, and not all could afford the time and money to back up their high expectations with private tutors, adult mentors, and attention to their children’s school efforts. Lew (2006) noticed a major difference between socioeconomic status of the Korean American dropouts and the academically successful Korean American students that attended the renowned magnate school. However, although her ethnographic results supported a deficit theory outlook regarding low-income students’ academic achievement, she reminded readers that other researchers have supported ways in which low-income single immigrant parents have been successful in supporting their children’s education. The results of the study reported structural and socioeconomic factors that differed between the Korean American dropouts that attended the GED program and the high achieving Korean Americans that attended the elite magnate school.

The Korean American youth who attended the elite magnate school generally came from middle-class families. Their parents were 1st generation immigrants, most of whom owned businesses in Korean ethnic enclaves where they lived. The youth saw
their parents work too hard at trying to keep their businesses afloat, and almost all of
them expressed that they wanted to use education to get into elite colleges to get great
jobs so that their lives would be easier than their parents’. Their parents shared this vision
for their children and advocated strongly for them to earn high grades. Doing well in
school was of highest priority for both parents and children from middle class Korean
American families.

Most middle class Korean American parents reinforced high educational
expectations by making use of multiple strategies. They used co-ethnic networks found
at church, work, or communities that helped them obtain important information for
navigating the public school system. This came in handy for getting their children
enrolled in the elite magnate school, getting into key college prep classes, and accessing
other services that promoted success. Many of these parents also sent their children to
tuition-based after school academies that supported them academically and prepared them
for college. Last, the parents hired private bilingual counselors that helped their children
with college admissions. In short, these Korean parents invested largely in their
children’s’ educational progress.

Korean American youth who attended the GED program, on the other hand,
lacked many of the aforementioned parental supports, yet their parents or guardians
nevertheless expressed high educational aspirations. Many of these GED students
repeatedly expressed feelings of aloneness and isolation at home and at school. Also,
Lew (2006) observed that these students made school, career, and financial decisions on
their own. Lack of support was often due to their parents’ time-intensive work schedules
at menial jobs. Also many of these students came from broken homes, living with single
mothers or relatives. Unlike the middle class Korean American students, the dropouts felt a strong disconnect between their parents’ expectations and the reality of their lives. The youth thought education was important, but they could not access the structural and institutional support needed for educational success. The dropouts adopted an oppositional position in relation to the world of school and family as a way to adapt to the structural barriers they faced.

Lew (2006) identified several factors that increase Korean American students’ success in school. Though middle-class parents mainly practiced these strategies, they are strategies that could benefit children of working class immigrants too. Lew (2006) proposed that funding be made available to establish outreach programs in public schools, so that working class parents can access some of the same opportunities as middle class. For example, bilingual parent/school liaisons would be an extremely useful resource for first generation immigrant parents trying to understand opportunities available at their children’s schools. Also, Lew (2006) advocated for non-profits to address the need for increased educational support for struggling Asian American youth. Above all, her study showed how not all Asian Americans fit into the “model minority” stereotype and that Korean American high-achievers and dropouts face enormous pressures. The next study narrative describes a study that found that high school seniors from all ethnic groups carried ambitious life goals.

In a correlative study Chang et al. (2006) surveyed a multi-ethnic sample of high school seniors to find out their life goals. The authors were interested to see if life goals of the high school seniors would mirror educational and occupational disparities found in society between different ethnic and gender groups. To the authors’ surprise, they found
very little differences between ethnic groups in their future plans, suggesting that these high school seniors’ life goals and aspirations do not mirror disparities in society.

The authors’ data set consisted of 932 high school seniors: 226 whites, 132 African Americans, 230 Mexican Americans, 127 other Latino, 111 Filipino, and 98 East/Southeast Asian. The participants reported ethnicity, generational status, parents’ education, most important goals 10 years from now, priority of goals, the amount of control they perceived they had in attaining the goals, time frame for goal attainment, long-term educational aspirations, long-term occupational aspirations, and the likelihood they thought of themselves reaching the goals.

Chang et al. (2006) placed the students’ goals into eight categories, in order of most common response: occupation (78.9% of total students mentioned this), education (73.8%), family (33.5%), material (15.9%), self-actualization (11.7%), leisure (6.4%), autonomy (4.9%), and other goals (4%). The authors found that the senior high school students’ goals did not significantly differ between ethnic groups. The authors originally hypothesized that minority group students would prioritize familial goals, especially Mexican American females, they said. Also they expected that whites would report higher levels of personal control over their goals than students from ethnic minority groups. And last, they expected White and Asian American students to report higher levels of long-term aspirations than Mexican American and African American counterparts.

Chang et al. (2006) were surprised to find that nearly all high school seniors from all ethnic groups aspired to attend a 4-year college. Overall, the authors did not find significant variance in the frequency of 10-year goals mentioned between ethnic groups,
with the exception of material goals (Material goals: \( X^2 (5, N = 924) = 16.44, p < .01 \)).

However, females, on average, articulated educational, familial, and autonomy more often than males (Educational goals: \( X^2 (1, N = 924) = 21.64, p < .001 \); Family goals: \( X^2 (1, N = 924) = 7.94, p < .001 \); Autonomy goals: \( X^2 (1, N = 924) = 7.48, p < .001 \)).

The authors also found interesting results when they looked at gender differences between ethnic groups. Females from African American (55% African American males, 84% African American females) and Mexican American groups were much more likely to articulate educational goals (58% Mexican American males, 81% Mexican American females). Also, counter to the authors’ expectations, males from East/SE Asian (38%) and Other Latino (33%) groups articulated familial goals more often than their female counterparts (E/SE Asian females 28%, Other Latino females 26%).

There was no significant difference between ethnic groups in priority of goals. All groups prioritized educational and occupational goals over all other goals, with family goals coming in third. However, females prioritized educational goals to a greater extent than males (\( F (1796) = 14.04, p < .001 \)). All students from all groups, on average, believed they had a high-level of control over their goals for the future. The authors interpreted this result to mean that the youth kept a high-level of confidence in their futures. Also, there were no significant differences between groups in their predicted timeframes of reaching their goals. The authors did find significant differences between ethnic groups in long-term aspirations and expectations. Mexican Americans reported lower long-term educational expectations than E/SE Asians, Whites, and African Americans (p. < .001). The authors indicated that they conducted further analysis and found that the Mexican Americans’ relatively low educational expectations were in
largely due to socioeconomic status. They asserted that this result was not consistent
with “cultural interpretations that centralize the importance of the family “here and now,”
which have typically been used to explain the lower educational expectations of Latinos”
Chang et al., 2006, p.330).

Overall, the authors found relatively little differences in the life goals and
aspirations of ethnic groups. Almost all students surveyed expected to attend a four-year
college. However, oversights on behalf of the authors became apparent. The authors
made unfounded assumptions, which affected the study’s validity. For example, the
authors clumped East and SE Asians into one ethnic group. These national-origin groups
range largely in generational status, SES, and culture, making it inappropriate for such
clumping. Also, the survey took place in the seniors’ last month of high school before
graduation, a time when their life expectations and goals would have potentially been
extremely inflated. The authors showed surprise that their results did not reflect
educational and occupational disparities in society, however, their sample, which was
comprised only of those students that successfully navigated the public school system,
and who were going to graduate from high school, was non-representative of society at
large. Also, the authors did not ask students what forces influenced their goals. If they
had done this they might have found more results suggesting the importance of family in
the youths’ goal setting. In this regard, the authors’ siding with deficit theory models in
their discussion, which asserted the primacy of socioeconomic status in determining
students’ educational success and expectations, was unsubstantiated in the context of
their study, which inferred socioeconomic status from a general question about parental
educational attainment. The final study narrative describes a study that attempted to see
if immigrant students have higher educational expectations if their immigrant group was generally well educated before they emigrated to the U.S.

In a correlational study, Feliciano (2006) investigated whether group-level pre-migration educational status influenced educational expectations of second-generation immigrant students. The study found that pre-migration educational status did, in fact, influence educational expectations of second-generation students. The subjects of the study were second-generation immigrant students who lived in San Diego and Miami / Fort Lauderdale who were originally subjects of a survey conducted by the Children of Immigrants Longitudinal Study (CILS). In 1992 CILS surveyed 5,262 second-generation 8th and 9th graders. Then, in 1995, CILS conducted a follow-up survey of 4,288 (81.5%) of the same youth, which was at a time when they were nearing graduation. Feliciano (2006) also analyzed data from CILS interviews with subjects’ parents, however, due to unequal response among national-origin groups, this data was only used to supplement main findings.

Feliciano (2006) selected only 30 of the 81 national-origin groups included in the CILS because those 30 groups were the only with data of group-level pre-migration educational status. Also, subjects were only included in Feliciano’s analysis if their parents had migrated within a window of ten years before to ten years after the average year their immigrant group migrated to the United States. And also subjects’ parents had to be at least 22 years of age when they immigrated, so that they would have had reasonable time to attain higher education in their home countries. Feliciano used an ND (net difference index) to calculate a comparative measure of pre-migration immigrant and non-immigrant educational attainments. For example, .35 meant that immigrants’
educational status exceeded that of non-immigrants 35% more often. The reason for the 
ND index was to see if immigrant groups of relatively high educational status in their 
home countries carried high educational expectations with them to the U.S. Last, 
Feliciano (2006) used 1990 census data to obtain average post migration socioeconomic 
status of the 30 immigrant groups included in the analysis.

The CILS surveys asked 2nd generation immigrant students if they expected a 
college degree. It also asked the students if they believed they would face discrimination. 
Also, the survey asked students what level of education they thought their parents wanted 
them to attain: no college, college degree, or graduate degree. Feliciano used this data as 
well as other data on immigrant group pre migration education status, group post 
migration SES, and family post migration SES to test her main question: Does group-
level pre-migration educational status influence educational expectations of second-
generation students?

Feliciano’s (2006) findings suggested that, yes, pre migration educational status 
of national origin groups influenced educational expectations of second-generation 
immigrant students (r = 9.834, p. < .01). Also, interestingly, findings suggested that 
group-level pre migration educational status had greater influence on educational 
expectations than group-level post migration SES (r = 1.543, p > .10). Feliciano (2006) 
explained that group level post migration SES did not have a significant affect on 
subjects’ college aspirations because the affect of parental SES was so strong (Parental 
SES: r = 2.154, p < .001). The affect of parental SES was strong because as subjects’ 
parents’ SES increased, they became much more likely to expect a college degree. Fluent 
bilingualism, grade point average, and gender also had high correlations. Fluent bilingual
students were much more likely to expect a college degree than non-fluent bilingual students, as were female students, and students with relatively higher grade point averages (Fluent bilingual: $r = 1.765$, $p < .001$; Female: $r = 1.428$, $p < .001$; Grade point average: $r = 2.264$, $p < .001$). Last, parental expectations were shown to positively influence educational expectations of their 2nd generation immigrant children (Perceives that parent wants respondent to attain college degree: $r = 4.156$, $p < .001$; Graduate degree: $r = 12.238$, $p < .001$).

Though this study found strong correlations suggesting that group pre migration educational status influences educational expectations of 2nd generation immigrant students, the reader should consider a few things concerning its validity. This study made broad averages from government data to find average pre-migration educational attainment of immigrants and non-immigrants in their home countries. Feliciano (2006) made a large leap of faith to rely on the accuracy of data from government agencies and studies that she was not directly involved in collecting. This study also relied on the assumption that educational expectations are an indicator of future educational attainment. In must be noted, too, that Feliciano found other control variables that exerted an even stronger affect than pre migration educational status on 2nd generation immigrant students’ educational expectations. For instance, fluent bilingual students were much more likely to expect college degrees than non-bilinguals, regardless of parents’ educational attainments before migrating to the U.S. Nevertheless, this study used a relatively large data pool to make its analysis, which added validity to its findings’.
The answer to Feliciano’s main question has interesting implications. Her results supported the theory that 2nd generation immigrant students’ educational expectations and success is supported by the success of national origin community on a group wide level. However, quantitative results of this study, taken without deeper consideration, support ethnic and national-origin immigrant stereotypes. For example, Mexico scored lowest on pre migration educational status, with a figure showing that Mexican immigrants were more educated than Mexican non-immigrants 20 percent more often. Whereas India scored highest on pre migration educational status, showing that Indian immigrants were more educated than Indian non-immigrants 85.8 percent more often. This information could reinforce many American’s stereotypes of particular ethnic groups without properly analyzing the complexity inherent in the system. For example, with closer examination we see that this particular analysis included 575 2nd generation students from Mexican origin and only 18 students from Indian origin. Eighteen is a relatively small sample size in this analysis and it remains questionable that we can rightly draw generalizations from the results. Parents of the eighteen students from Indian origin scored highest of all national origin groups in post immigration SES and, conversely, the 575 parents of students from Mexican origin scored lowest of all groups. Stereotyping this data, I take it that Indian immigrants are rich and well educated whereas Mexican immigrants are poor and uneducated. What is interesting now to consider is that out of the 575 2nd generation Mexican immigrant students surveyed, 364 expected a college degree (63.3%). This was a proportionally high figure considering that the group’s pre migration educational status and parental post migration SES was far below any other national origin group analyzed. To make a comparison, 69 percent of 2nd generation Canadian immigrant students
surveyed expected a college degree. That was only 5.7 percent greater than that of the Mexican group, with a much greater parental post migration SES to back them up. Also, 84 percent of students from the Mexican-origin group perceived that their parents wanted them to attain either a 4-year or master’s degree. These other variables suggested that the Mexican group, though faced with socioeconomic obstacles, carried positive expectations for life in the U.S. If we then apply Feliciano’s (2006) assumption that expectations, more often than not, indicate future attainment, then the Mexican immigrant group is bound to see an overall rise in group SES in the future. So, in the framework of this study, the Mexican national origin group is projected to make many educational gains in the future.

Discussion of Themes

This section discussed eight studies that examined factors that influence educational expectations and achievement of immigrant and non-immigrant groups. Some important themes arose. For one, Buriel & Cardoza (1988) found that educational achievement of Mexican American high school seniors was most influenced by personal aspirations. In other words, if the students thought big, they generally achieved big, or at least bigger. However, Kao & Tienda (1998) tracked students’ educational expectations from 8th to 12th grade and found a huge decline between 8th and 10th grade for Hispanic students. Eighth grade students from every ethnic group reported high educational expectations, but by 10th grade Hispanic and black students’ had been drastically lowered, whereas other groups remained relatively stable. The authors proposed that the sharp decline in Hispanics’ educational expectations between 8th and 10th grade was due to a lack of specific knowledge, which was necessary to bring educational goals to
fruition. Kao & Tienda (1998) generalized that Asian Americans’ educational goals tended to be concrete because they were knowledgeable of the exact steps needed to become, say, a doctor, or an engineer. They knew what classes they needed to take in high school to get into the right college to earn the right degree, etc. Whereas, although Hispanic students reported high educational aspirations in 8th grade, by the time they got to 10th grade many could see that they were not on the right educational track to meet their high goals. The authors found that parental SES was the most influential factor on educational expectations of all ethnic groups. This correlation makes sense given that SES is connected to both financial and educational attainment of parents. Higher parental SES would provide students with greater social and structural knowledge of steps needed to reach their goals.

Lew (2006) contrasted Asian Americans’ model minority image with an ethnographic study about Korean high school dropouts. She found that low-income Korean American students experienced discontinuities between high parental expectations and structural and financial supports needed to achieve. These students felt disconnected from their first generation parents, who expected high educational results from their children yet did not understand the reality of their lives in school. On the other hand, Middle-class Korean American students that attended an elite magnate school were highly supported by their parents. These students’ personal educational aspirations were on the same page as their parents’ expectations of them. Like Kao & Tienda (1998), Lew (2006) found strong evidence to suggest parental SES strongly influences educational achievement. Furthermore, Lew (2006) found that Asian Americans are not exempt from the affects of low SES.
However, other studies found that parental SES had little influence over educational expectations and achievement of immigrant students. Goyette & Xie (1999) found that SE Asian and Chinese American students scored high on tests regardless of parental SES. Likewise, these authors found that parental expectations most greatly influenced educational expectations of SE Asian and Chinese Americans students, not SES. Feliciano (2006) also found parental expectations to be hugely influential on educational expectations of immigrant students in general. However, like most other authors, Feliciano (2006) found parental SES to be the most influential factor.

Another pattern was that first and second generation immigrant students tended to have higher educational expectations than their third generation counterparts (Buriel & Cardoza, 1988; Goyette & Xie, 1999). At first glance, this pattern seems similar to the unfounded hopes of Hispanic 8th graders discussed earlier. Yet, these higher educational expectations were not always without structural and cultural supports. Buriel & Cardoza found that personal aspirations had the most potent influence on achievement of Mexican American students. So, in this case, the high hopes of immigrant families and students did have positive affects, and they were able to succeed in the face of socioeconomic limitations. However, if by the 3rd generation, Mexican immigrant families were still living in low-income dominantly Spanish-speaking barrios they would have become, as the authors said, ghettoized. Third generation Mexican American youth living in barrios have a new set of problems. As Stanton-Salazar & Spina (2003) put it, “in contrast to the more communitarian character of many Mexican immigrant enclaves, the social character of many acculturated youth frequently becomes susceptible to the most excessive and vulgarized aspects of “utilitarian individualism” (p. 241). These authors described third
generation Mexican American youth that became isolated from adult relationships in their community, and developed oppositional frameworks towards school and mainstream society. Similarly, Goyette & Xie (1999) found that first generation Filipino immigrant students carried significantly higher educational expectations than their 3rd generation counterparts. Overall, these studies found that first and second-generation immigrant families come with strong will, high hopes, and a strong dependence on community. However, if by the third generation they acculturate independent-minded mentalities without improving their financial lot, immigrant families will have lost an important community support system while at the same time becoming victim to generational poverty. This becomes a situation prone to gangs, violence, and drug abuse.

On a lighter note, many of these studies wanted to know why Asian American students generally do better in school than other groups (Goyette & Xie, 1999; Lew, 2006; Pearce & Lin, 2007; Schneider & Lee, 1990). Overall, these authors reported that Asian Americans employed a strategy that used education to gain upward mobility in the face of discrimination. And, as it turned out, both Asian Americans and Anglo Americans prioritized education. Pearce & Lin (2007) speculated that this similarity between the two groups deceives people into thinking Asian Americans achieve so highly in school because of their ability to assimilate into American culture. These authors found evidence to suggest otherwise. For example, they found that Chinese American students whose parents attended school meetings got lower grades than parents that did not attend school meetings. This relationship was opposite for Anglo Americans. On the other hand, both Anglo and Asian American students’ educational aspirations benefited from high parental educational expectations. However, this relationship for SE Asian and
Chinese Americans was much stronger (Goyette & Xie, 1999). However, as Lew (2006) found, parental expectations were much more likely to have a positive affect if they were combined with middle class SES.

In a similar vein, some studies related Asian American parental values and home-practices to their high educational expectations. Middle-class Korean American students in Lew’s (2006) study received private tutoring, hired college counselors, and attended tuition-based after school academies. These students aimed to achieve highly in high school to get into ivy league colleges to get high paying careers. However, Lew (2006) contrasted this model minority image with a group of Korean high school dropouts who were not gifted with similar supports and who developed oppositional relationships to school, their parents, and society. Likewise, Schneider & Lee (1990) reported another set of educational supports that East Asian parents provided for their elementary-aged children. Eighty percent of these parents required their children to do at least an hour of homework per day, compared to only 13 percent of Anglo parents. Also, these authors found that East Asian students’ teachers stereotyped all East Asian students as quiet, industrious, organized, respectful learners. In fact, the East Asian students’ parents, teachers, peers, and themselves all carried high educational expectations of them. This exerted an enormous amount of pressure on these students, but at the same time, propelled them to succeed in school. However, Schneider and Lee (1990) reported, negatively, that East Asian students were often boxed-into images of unsociable math whiz kids, which they worried would limit their opportunities.

Summary
Chapter three reported on studies about immigrant education. First the chapter described studies that investigated funds of knowledge and cultural characteristics of immigrant students and their families. The second section depicted studies that explored transnational experience of immigrant students and appropriate civics education. The third section reviewed studies that examined relationships between home and school for immigrant students and parents. Finally, the fourth section reviewed studies that examined factors that influenced educational expectations and achievement of various immigrant groups. Chapter four concludes this paper with a summary of findings, discussion of classroom implications, and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSION

Introduction

Chapter one and two of this paper discussed implications and history of a U.S. school system built largely on Anglo Protestant tradition. Chapter three critically analyzed studies that took a more in depth look at various issues surrounding immigrant education. This chapter discusses themes, inconsistencies, and conflicts that were found within the studies of chapter three in relation to historical context of education in the United States. Also, this section identifies classroom implications of knowledge gained from these studies, and suggests future research.

Summary of Findings

Multiple studies reviewed in this paper found teachers and schools to be inconsiderate of immigrant students’ home life and background experience (Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba, 1991; El-Haj, 2007; Patthey-Chavez, 1993). Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba (1991) observed teachers that lacked awareness of Mexican immigrant culture, so their classroom practices failed to align with learning dispositions and talents of their students. These teachers blamed incompetent parents for Latino students’ lack of success. However, Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba (1991) found extensive evidence to suggest that the children, who failed in school, were actually highly capable, intelligent, and responsible young people. El-Haj (2007) interviewed Palestinian American high school students and found that they disagreed strongly with foreign policy and civics curriculum endorsed by their high school. The author also found that these students and their families experienced heightened racial harassment from teachers, students, and authorities after 9/11. El-Haj (2007) advocated for civics curriculum that focuses on participation and
engagement of citizens, rather than national identification, since many students in public schools identify with more than one nation. Patthey-Chavez (1993) observed an inner city Los Angeles high school and found that the administration endorsed cultural reproduction of Anglo American middle-class norms amongst a majority Latino student body. The author concluded that the school could bridge home and school cultures by accepting greater input from the Latino community.

Other studies found communication gaps between immigrant parents, teachers, and schools (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Lahman & Park, 2004; Li, 2006; Martinez-Cosio & Iannaccone, 2007; Orozco, 2008; Stanton-Salazar & Spina, 2003). Lahman & Park (2004) interviewed teachers that worried about offending immigrant student’s parents with their teaching techniques. Alternatively, the immigrant parents felt their lack of English prevented them from participating in their children’s classrooms. Delgado-Gaitan (1994) observed a group of Latino immigrant parents that felt isolated and uncertain about how to assist their children with school. These parents created a parent organization called COPLA, which met on a regular basis to dispel fears and secure greater opportunities for their children. Stanton-Salazar & Spina (2003) found that Latino youth, who had acculturated to individualistic norms and who identified with dual cultures, felt alienated from adults in their Latino communities. The authors advocated for the use of informal adult mentors that would provide Latino youth with role model support. Martinez-Cosio & Iannaccone (2007) documented the role of a parent/school coordinator that provided a range of services for immigrant parents, which included: helping parents decode culture of power, advocating for greater parent involvement in classrooms, validating cultural resources of low-income immigrant parents, organizing ethnic and language-based
meetings, helping parents understand their rights under Title-1 funding, and mediating conflicts between teachers and parents. Orozco (2008) found that Latino immigrant parents felt isolated from their children’s schools due to a role reversal dynamic, which stemmed from their children becoming more adapted to U.S. norms and English literacy than parents. Orozco (2008) also found that immigrant parents were interested in participating in their children’s schooling, but needed greater opportunities for such participation. An initial step, which Orozco (2008) advocated, was that low-income immigrant parents’ cultural resources needed to be valued by schools and teachers.

Communication gaps between parents and schools were not only amongst low-income immigrant families. Li (2006) surveyed middle class East Asian parents and found that they generally assigned extra homework to their children. These parents desired to know more about instructional practices and curriculum at their children’s schools so that they could align home study practices with the school’s.

Valdés (1998) observed widespread segregation of ESL immigrant students into what she termed ESL ghettos. Valdés suggested that ESL students would gain greater skills if allowed to participate in class alongside English speaking Americans. The author also expressed frustration that ESL students’ ESL track histories could prevent them from entering mainstream classes at the college level, even if they had already acquired adequate English skills.

Okamoto et al. (2008) observed a population of Micronesian immigrants in Hawaii that suffered from drugs, violence, bad health, crowded living conditions, gangs, and racism. The authors found that Micronesian youth held their cultural heritage in high regard and proposed that schools and other social institutions should fashion their
practices in relation to Micronesian culture. Also, Okamoto et al. recommended preventative social offices to mitigate the negative social pressures that invariably face Micronesian immigrants living in low-income housing projects.

González et al. (1993) observed teachers that visited Latino students’ homes in search of social and intellectual resources that they could incorporate into their classrooms to lessen cultural discontinuities between home and school. The teachers became aware of funds of knowledge in immigrant students’ households that they were not aware of before. Villenas & Moreno (2001) interviewed Latina immigrant mothers that taught their daughters the importance of women’s self-reliance, but also, paradoxically, re-enforced patriarchal views about women as homemakers. This cultural information could be useful for teachers trying to understand the moralistic beliefs that influence their students’ and their parents’ choices. Espinoza-Herald (2007) found funds of knowledge in one Latina immigrant’s home life that greatly influenced her success in school. The funds of knowledge were based on an oral literacy practice called “dichos,” in which the Latina’s Spanish-only speaking mother was able to support her daughter through encouragement.

González et al. (1993) asserted that, too often, schools and teachers assumed a deficit model framework in regards to immigrant students. Also, as Macias (1990) noted, teachers often assumed inferiority of immigrant students’ prior learning and schooling. Macias (1990) found Mexico’s national math curriculum to be more rigorous than U.S. math curriculum. Macias also found Mexico’s social studies curriculum to be much more international in scope than U.S. public school social studies curriculum.
Other studies found results that supported deficit theories of low-income immigrant families. Valenzuela & Dornbusch (1994) found that familism (affinity to family) only benefited Latino students’ academics if their parents’ education level was relatively high. Valdés (1998) observed how a young Latina immigrant’s home life, which included crowded housing conditions, poverty, and gang membership, influenced her decision to drop out of school. And Lew (2006) found that Korean American students lacking social and economic supports dropped out of high school.

Asian immigrants were often stereotyped as model students: quiet, industrious, organized, and respectful (Schneider & Lee, 1990). Multiple studies found that East Asian students’ (Chinese, Japanese, and Korean) educational expectations and achievement was highly supported by home and parental practices (Goyette & Xie, 1999; Lew, 2006; Schneider & Lee, 1990). Zhou & Bankston (1994) studied a Vietnamese immigrant population living in a low-income area of New Orleans and found that Vietnamese students’ success in school was connected to strong work ethics, ethnic involvement, and adherence to traditional values. Also, Vietnamese students benefited from a cultural value that held education as a main means to upward mobility. However, as Lew (2006) made clear, not all Asian American students have access to educational supports, in fact many dropout of high school because of lack of support.

A common danger for both Asian and Latino immigrant students was their alienation from their families and school (Delgado-Gaitan, 1991; Lew, 2006; Phelan et al., 1991; Stanton-Salazar & Spina, 2003). When immigrant youth became alienated from family and school they developed an oppositional frame of mind, and often sought alternative support networks that included gang membership. Multiple studies found that
schools worsen immigrant students’ feeling of alienation by teaching solely towards Anglo middle-class norms, which include individualist orientations and Anglo-centered curriculum that does not reflect immigrant students’ backgrounds (Patthey-Chavez, 1993; Phelan et al., 1991; Stanton-Salazar & Spina, 2003).

Multiple studies analyzed how various social, human, and cultural capitals of immigrant students influenced their educational aspirations and achievement (Buriel & Cardoza, 1988; Chang et al., 2006; Feliciano, 2006; Goyette & Xie, 1999; Kao & Tienda, 1988; Pearce & Lin, 2007). Buriel & Cardoza (1988) found that Spanish literate 3rd generation Latino immigrant students scored higher on exams than their Spanish-illiterate counterparts. However, the same authors found that Spanish literacy skills did not affect achievement of 1st and 2nd generation immigrant students. Pearce & Lin (2007) found cultural differences between White and Chinese Americans to suggest Chinese American success in school was not due to assimilation to U.S. norms. For example, both White and Chinese American cultures supported education as a primary means toward upward mobility. However, both groups showed some key cultural differences to account for their school achievement. For example, White Americans achievement in school was positively correlated to parental attendance at school meetings, whereas Chinese American students whose parents attended school meetings tended to get lower grades. Kao & Tienda (1998) found that students from all ethnic groups carried relatively high educational expectations in the 8th grade. However, the authors found that, by the tenth grade, Hispanic and black students’ educational expectations significantly lowered. Kao & Tienda (1988) mused that Hispanic and black students’ educational expectations lowered between 8th and 10th grade because they generally lacked specific knowledge
necessary to bring their 8th grade goals to fruition. Goyette & Xie (1999) found that parental educational expectations were a strong factor in determining educational expectations of Chinese and SE Asian students. Alternatively, the same authors found that South Asian and White American students’ educational expectations were more affected by parental socioeconomic status than all other ethnic groups. Chang et al. (2006) found relatively elevated life goals among senior high school students of multiple ethnic groups. Almost all students in this survey reported that they expected to attend a four-year college. The authors mused that these results did not mirror inequalities found in society because senior high school students’ outlook on life may be more promising than high school dropouts or, for example, 9th or 10th graders, whose success in school may seem more uncertain. Feliciano (2006) found that group-level pre-migration educational status influenced education expectations of 2nd generation immigrant students. Post-migration socioeconomic status also strongly affected educational expectations of 2nd generation immigrant students.

Another theme of the studies was an exploration of transnationalism. What is it like to have ties to two nations, cultures, and languages? Macias (1990) examined Mexico’s national school curriculum and found collective classroom orientations, an international social studies curriculum, and rigorous mathematics. These practices did not align well with U.S. individualism and nationalist-centered social studies curriculum. Kagan & Madsen (1972) experimented on rural Mexican and Anglo American children to explore the differences in cooperative and competitive behaviors. The authors found irrational behaviors among both groups: Anglo American children remained in conflict to the extent that they lost toys, and Mexican children avoided conflict to the extent that
they allowed peers to keep toys. El-Haj (2007) interviewed Palestinian American high school students to get a sense of their political identification and the extent to which their high school accommodated their political sensibilities. The author found highly complex political sensibilities on the part of the Palestinian youth. They were not able to conscientiously agree to the civics curriculum endorsed at their school, which was nationalistic and outwardly supported U.S. war efforts in the Middle East. Marri (2005) suggested a critical pedagogy for multicultural democracy curriculum that would examine inequities in society and ask the question, who participates in democracy and on whose terms? Torney-Purta et al. (2006) found that non-Latino students scored higher on civics knowledge tests and were more likely to vote. However, Latino students conveyed greater interest in immigrant rights than non-Latino students. The same authors found that Latino students scored higher on civics knowledge exams if they believed their social studies classroom had an open climate and discussed political topics. Sánchez (2007) observed three Latina adolescents construct a children’s book about the experience of transnationals. The children’s book provided a countertext to the idea that immigrant border crossers are criminals.

Classroom Implications

Multiple studies suggested that teachers could support immigrant students better if they considered learning opportunities that students engage in outside of school. For example, Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba (1991) considered Mexican immigrant students’ work as translators and cultural interpreters for their parents to be a unique learning opportunity. González et al. (1993) documented teachers that visited students’ homes to gather information about their social and intellectual resources. Also, González et al.
(1993) found that teachers could benefit their students by keeping a positive attitude about their students’ home life. For example, if teachers see through a deficit model framework, they will likely collect data to support their hypothesis that their students’ home life negatively impacts their school success. However, if they instead search for funds of knowledge, they will more often find useful information to support their students’ classroom learning (González et al., 1993).

Teachers can re-orient classroom environments to support immigrant students, too. Phelan et al. (1991) found that Latino high school students were more successful and comfortable in classes with social atmospheres. Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba (1991) observed Mexican American elementary students and found that their classroom engagement depended on their ability to share. Torney-Purta et al. (2006) found that an open classroom climate and study of political issues influenced Latino student’s civic knowledge and likelihood to vote.

Teachers can support other cultures by providing counterexamples to the views dispensed by required curriculum. Bring texts into the classroom that depict other cultures’ points of views and history. Also, introduce critical pedagogies that ask, for example, who participates in democracy and on whose terms (Marri, 2005)? Investigate cultural authenticity frameworks with students, which seek to explore and dispel stereotypes (Sanchez, 2007). As a class, discuss stereotypes. Watch films, read books, and discuss media’s stereotypes. Also, provide opportunities for students to express and explore relationships through art and media (El-Haj, 2007; Igoa, 1995; Sanchez, 2007). Look outside U.S. borders. Teach an international social studies curriculum. Compare multiple nations’ newspapers in class to see how they differ in talking about the same
events. Promote an open classroom environment, full of dialogue (Torney-Purta et al, 2006). Create classroom civics education activities that promote participation and engagement rather than national identification (El-Haj, 2007). Give students the task of re-imagining society.

Teachers can improve immigrant families’ relationships with schools by personally reaching-out. Provide volunteer opportunities in the classroom for immigrant parents. Often, Latino and Asian American immigrant parents feel alienated from schools. However, the best way to de-alienate them is by providing engagement opportunities (Martinez-Cosio & Iannacone, 2007). Multiple studies found that Asian American parents were highly interested in their children’s education (Lew, 2006; Li, 2006; Schneider & Lee, 1990; Zhou & Bankston, 1994). Schneider & Lee (1990) found that 80 percent of a sample of East Asian parents required at least one hour of homework per day from their children. Li (2006) found similar results, however suggested that the instructional practices at home did not align very well with the instructional practices at school. Teachers could meet with immigrant parents to discuss home educational practices. Teachers and parents could lessen instructional discontinuities by collaborating more and sharing ideas.

Teachers can support immigrant students by showing interest and acknowledging the difficulties immediate in their lives. For example, many newly immigrated families live in crowded housing conditions, where study space is very limited. Respect these constraints when assigning homework, or provide other options. Also, be aware of cultural values of parents and students. Many cultures depicted in this paper identified with collective orientations. For example, accomplishing tasks accompanied by others
was important for Mexican immigrant students that Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba (1991) observed. Arrange classroom activities that fit students’ cultural values.

Teachers can locate social resources that could help immigrant students. For example, Stanton-Salazar & Spina (2003) found that informal adult mentors were a huge help in the lives of Latino adolescents that were lucky enough to have them. Teachers could seek-out or arrange mentor services for their students that could use a role model.

Kao & Tienda (1998) found that Hispanic students held high educational and career expectations in 8th grade, but by 10th grade, their high expectations had lowered dramatically. The author blamed this pattern, partially, on a lack of relevant institutional information. It would be highly valuable for teachers to teach students about different careers and the pathways necessary to obtain those careers. Also, it would be helpful to explicitly discuss with immigrant students the significance of grades and grade-point averages to their future opportunity. All students need to know, early on, about requirements for college and careers. Immigrant students, who are not accustomed to U.S. institutions, may need more explicit instruction in these areas than others.

Last, many schools in the U.S. are composed of so called minority-majorities. Patthey-Chavez (1993) observed a Los Angeles school with an 80% Latino enrollment. However, the school’s image and curriculum reflected white middle-class norms. This school’s image was hugely inconsistent with the Latino students’ reality. Schools and teachers working with minority-majority student bodies should negotiate with the communities they teach to adapt school image and curriculum appropriately.
Suggestions for Further Research

Multiple studies focused on educational aspirations of middle class East Asian students and their parents (Lahman & Park, 2004; Li, 2006). However, as Lew (2006) pointed out, not all East Asian students fall into middle class socioeconomic brackets where parents support their children’s educational success with structural and financial supports. Lew (2006) found significant divides in school achievement of Korean American students from middle and working class households. In the future, studies should investigate East Asian students from lower socioeconomic brackets to a greater extent, so that students who need the most assistance are not overlooked.

Studies reviewed in this paper classified groups of students by racial and ethnic identity. Some studies were more precise than others in their classifications. For instance, Goyette & Xie (1999), in their analysis of differences in educational expectations of Asian American ethnic groups as compared to whites, classified Asian Americans into several ethnic subgroups, which included: Chinese, Filipinos, Japanese, Koreans, Southeast Asians, South Asians, and other Asians. Goyette & Xie (1999) found that all Asian groups showed higher educational expectations than whites, however factors that promoted educational expectations differed significantly between Asian ethnicities. Chang et al. (2006), in their analysis of life goals of different ethnic groups, clumped all Asian ethnicities into one classification: Asian Americans. Given the range of social, cultural, historical, and socioeconomic diversity among Asian American immigrant groups, this clumping may be inappropriate. Researchers in the future would do better to be more precise when classifying students upon ethnic and racial lines.
In an ethnographic study González et al. (1993) detailed the process several teachers went through as they visited their immigrant students’ homes in search of funds of knowledge. The teachers in this study made several discoveries about their immigrant students’ home life that could help in connecting social and intellectual resources with the classroom. However, the authors did not mention member checking their conclusions with the immigrant families, who were observed and interviewed. Given the differences in vision and background between highly educated teachers and low-income Latino immigrant families, cultural interpretations of the teachers could be somewhat skewed if not confirmed with the immigrant families. Future ethnographic studies could enhance their validity by member checking conclusions with study subjects.

Studies reviewed in this paper tended to identify deficits of past or existing educational programs without providing counterexamples of successful programs. For example, Valdés (1998) described a failing ESL program, which segregated a new immigrant population from other American students. This study could have been enhanced with counterexamples of successful ESL programs in existence. In the same way, the study of Okamoto et al. (2008) could improve their report on low-income Micronesian students in Hawaii by describing existent structures within the community that could provide beneficial platforms for cultural and preventative program startups. Ethnographers, who go to the trouble of studying people and communities, could assist betterment by lending their expert opinions toward possible solution making.

Espinoza-Herald (2007) conducted several interviews with a Latina woman, who had overcome many educational obstacles and eventually earned a doctorate degree, to identify funds of knowledge that supported her along the way. The author found that the
Latina woman attributed most of her overcoming of obstacles to the support she received from her mother. Espinoza-Herald (2007) went on to focus on the specifics of the mother/daughter interactions because they provided insight into cultural dynamics, which allowed an English illiterate mother to support her daughter in the pursuit of higher education, a pursuit the mother knew little about. More ethnographic studies, like this one, are needed that tune into funds of knowledge of immigrant households and describe vital practices and alliances between immigrant parents and their children.

Martinez-Cosio and Iannacone (2007) conducted an ethnographic study that documented the role of one school-parent coordinator. This study provided a useful framework for other schools that wish to involve immigrant parents. More studies like this one need to be conducted that exemplify the possibilities and purposes of school-parent coordinators and school-parent rooms so that immigrant parents can gain equal access to participation in their children’s schools.

Many studies investigated characteristics of immigrant education in the U.S., however only one compared an immigrant sending nation’s educational system. Macias (1990) conducted ethnographic research at a primary school in an immigrant-sending community in rural Mexico to see what kind of educational experience and knowledge Mexican immigrant students bring with them to the U.S. This information is vital in the pursuit to connect social and intellectual resources of immigrant students with U.S. classrooms. Rather than assuming inferiority of all immigrant children’s prior schooling, educators would do better to research immigrant-sending nations’ curriculum frameworks to begin to understand concepts, ideas, and social assumptions immigrant students already know.
Last, studies found a gradually declining trend in school engagement among some immigrant groups moving from first to third generation status. Goyette & Xie (1999) observed that first generation Filipino students reported significantly higher educational expectations than 3rd generation Filipino students. Stanton-Salazar & Spina (2003) discovered a pattern, which suggested that acculturated Latino youth became victims of individualism and alienation. These studies suggested that identity formation becomes more difficult as immigrant youth become more acculturated to U.S. norms. This pattern was especially evident for 2nd and 3rd generation immigrant students whose families remained living in low-income immigrant enclaves (Lew, 2006). Future research should focus on identifying ways to prevent immigrant students from becoming alienated from their families. Schools should value immigrants’ cultures and backgrounds so that immigrant students do not feel the need to create separate identities and become strangers in their own homes.

Final Conclusion

Chapter one examined reasons for a review of professional literature regarding education of immigrant students. It claimed U.S. education’s roots in Anglo Protestant tradition and cited examples of classroom situations in which immigrant students’ intelligences were overlooked due to Anglo-centered assumptions. It described discontinuities that immigrant students experience between home and school. It proposed that school is a dynamic place where nation formation occurs, rather than a static culture that all students assimilate into. Then, it discussed and compared several opinions regarding the question of whether or not U.S. schools should reflect multiple cultures in curriculum, practice, and content. Last, it stated the paper’s guiding research questions: What do children of various nationalities need to succeed in school? What expectations
do immigrant students and their families have of school? How can culturally
encapsulated teachers learn about funds of knowledge that their students bring with them
to the classroom? And how can teachers adapt their classroom practices to support
students of diverse backgrounds?

Chapter two examined U.S. education’s interaction with various immigrant
groups and today’s federal policy regarding immigrant education. It described the history
of an education system in which Irish, Eastern and Southern European, Mexican, and
Chinese immigrants were placed in segregated schools, denied public education, sent to
Americanization schools, and/or denied cultural representation. It also discussed events
of the Civil Rights Era in which African Americans, Native Americans, and Mexican
Americans fought for and won cultural and lingual representation in public schools.
Next, it discussed a 1975 immigration wave, in which 150,000 Vietnamese, Cambodian,
and Laotian refugees immigrated to the US and overwhelmed school districts that were
not prepared to accommodate that many ESL students. Then, it described the loss of
federal support for bilingual and bicultural programs in the 1980’s and discussed
advocacy, on the side of multiculturalists, for a curriculum that would increase self-
esteeem of historically marginalized groups and shed critical light on methods of cultural
domination. Then, it asserted that the 2001 No Child Left Behind Act served to reinforce
a national curriculum that emphasized English acquisition and dominant cultural
reproduction. Last, it described today’s recent immigrants and the educational rights of
their children.

Chapter three reviewed professional literature regarding education of immigrant
students. The research in chapter three was organized into four sections: Funds of
Knowledge and Cultural Characteristics, Transnational Experience and Citizenship, Bridging Home and School Cultures, and Educational Expectations and Achievement of Immigrant Students. These sections were used to answer the guiding questions stated in chapter one.

The first section, Funds of Knowledge and Cultural Characteristics, found several themes. One, some immigrant parents promoted English language at home (Valdés, 1998), while others promoted their native language at home (Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba, 1991). Another theme was that immigrant parents lacked information about their children’s schools (Espinoza-Herald, 2007; Phelan et al., 1991; Valdés, 1998; Valenzuela & Dornbusch, 1994). Also, multiple studies found that immigrant families and communities contained funds of knowledge that supported students, and that these supports were often invisible to teachers (Espinoza-Herald, 2007). Another theme was that collective student-student classroom activities worked well for Mexican immigrant youth (Delgado-Gaitan & Trueba, 1991; Phelan et al., 1991). Discontinuities between home and school were another theme in this section (Okamoto et al., 2008; Phelan et al., 1991). Last, white middle class students experienced relative ease in negotiating boundaries between home, school, and peer groups compared with immigrant students (Phelan et al., 1991; Valdés, 1998).

The second section, Transnational Experience and Citizenship, found several themes regarding transnational students’ lives and their implications for the classroom. One, school curriculum tends to be centered on white middle-class norms (Patthey-Chavez, 1993). Also, U.S. social studies curriculum tends to be more nationalist in scope than Mexico’s (Macias, 1990). Another finding was that non-Latino students scored
higher on civic knowledge and were more likely to vote than Latino students; however Latino students exerted greater interest in immigrant rights (Torney-Purta et al., 2006). An overall theme of this section’s literature was a call for participation and engagement and a re-imagining of society, as opposed to acculturation to static nationalist norms (El-Haj, 2007; Marri, 2005; Patthey-Chavez, 1993; Sánchez, 2007; Torney-Purta, 2006).

The third section, Bridging Home and School Cultures, examined home/school relationships of Latino, Korean, and Chinese immigrant parents and reported several themes. One, immigrant parents expressed feelings of isolation (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Lahman & Park, 2004; Martinez-Cosio and Iannacone, 2007; Orozco, 2008). Immigrant parents felt they could not participate in their children’s schools because they lacked English skills, were uneducated, or lacked institutional knowledge of the school system. Another theme in this literature was advocacy for greater school/parent partnerships so that discontinuities between school and home cultures could be addressed (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Lahman & Park, 2004; Li, 2007; Martinez-Cosio and Iannacone, 2007; Orozco, 2008). Another theme was a general rebuttal against the deficit model, which suggests low-income parents are unable to support their children’s education. Multiple authors advocated the need for schools to validate cultural resources of low-income immigrant parents (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Martinez-Cosio & Iannacone, 2007; Orozco, 2008). Also, multiple studies found that Latino and other immigrant parents believed that translation services, childcare during parent night meetings, Spanish-speaking faculty, and opportunities to volunteer in classrooms could better support their participation in their children’s schools (Delgado-Gaitan, 1994; Martinez-Cosio & Iannacone, 2007). Last, middle class Chinese parents were concerned with understanding the curriculum
and methods of their children’s schools so that they could align out-of-school education appropriately (Li, 2006).

The fourth section, Educational Expectations and Achievement of Immigrant Students, reviewed literature that examined factors that influenced educational expectations and achievement of immigrant students and identified several themes. One, educational expectations among Hispanic students decreased significantly between 8th and 10th grade, whereas other ethnic groups remained relatively stable (Kao & Tienda, 1998). The authors blamed this decrease in educational expectations on a lack of institutional knowledge about steps needed in order to bring educational goals to fruition. Multiple studies found strong evidence to suggest parental SES strongly influenced educational achievement of immigrant students (Feliciano, 2006; Lew, 2006). Another study found that parental expectations most greatly influenced educational expectations of SE Asian and Chinese American students (Goyette & Xie, 1999). Another pattern was that first and second generation immigrant students tended to have higher educational expectations than their third generation counterparts (Burial & Cardoza, 1988; Goyette & Xie, 1999). One explanation for this was that immigrant families come with high hopes and a strong dependence on community. However, if by the third generation they have acculturated independent-minded mentalities without improving their financial lot, they will have lost an important community support system while remaining within generational poverty. Multiple studies wanted to know why Asian America students generally do better in school than other groups (Goyette & Xie, 1999; Pearce & Lin, 2007; Schneider & Lee, 1990). Overall, these authors reported that Asian Americans prioritized education in order to gain upward mobility in the face of discrimination. Last,
multiple studies found that middle-class East Asian parents provided their children with many out-of-school educational supports, which greatly influenced their achievement in school (Lew, 2006; Schneider & Lee, 1990). Chapter four included a summary of the findings, implications for classroom practice, suggestions for further research, and a final conclusion.

The No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act seeks to accommodate and insure the success of all students, including documented and undocumented immigrant students. However, the approach of this nationally instituted educational policy presupposes the superiority of Western and, more precisely, Anglo Protestant tradition. NCLB immigrant education policy is highly focused on English language acquisition (Spring, 2008). The acquisition of English is an extremely valuable skill and constitutes a major prerequisite to the study of mainstream school subjects. However, as this literature review suggests, immigrant students’ engagement in school depends on an open climate where their backgrounds can be acknowledged. Several studies described conflicts that face immigrant students who are tied to two nations, two languages, and two cultures. A brand of alienation occurred for many immigrant students, when they became more adapted to U.S. norms than their parents. These students learned English, while their parents remained clued-out to their children’s educational life and institutional practices of their schools. In today’s multicultural and multilingual setting, schools become responsible for initiating dialogue with immigrant parents and providing the necessary supports for their engagement and participation. Furthermore, immigrant parents engagement and participation with their children’s schools depends on cultural validation, that schools reach out and validate immigrant parents for the cultural and intellectual resources that they carry with them. Similarly, immigrant students need this
same validation in the classroom, or at least space to decide if they would like to share their backgrounds. Immigrant students grapple with the problem of how to tie their roots in with this new country. Once they get tied in, and feel a sense of belonging, then they can finally begin learning the mainstream skills and English literacy, which will open many doors.

Age-old learning theory commands that students’ new learning needs to be built on what they already know. For sure, this becomes a challenge when classrooms represent multiple nations, languages, and cultures. How can teachers overcome their own cultural limitations and teach to students originating from places they can only imagine? This literature review suggests that schools and teachers look for answers from the communities and families they serve. By inviting mutual dialogue with immigrant communities, partnerships would be created that would act to bridge home and school cultures.
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