

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

---

Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching,  
Learning and Teacher Education

Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher  
Education

---

2010

## Education in the New Latino Diaspora

Edmund T. Hamann

*University of Nebraska-Lincoln*, ehamann2@unl.edu

Linda Harklau

*University of Georgia*, lharklau@uga.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/teachlearnfacpub>



Part of the [Bilingual, Multilingual, and Multicultural Education Commons](#), [Education Policy Commons](#), [Politics and Social Change Commons](#), [Social and Cultural Anthropology Commons](#), [Social and Philosophical Foundations of Education Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

---

Hamann, Edmund T. and Harklau, Linda, "Education in the New Latino Diaspora" (2010). *Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education*. 104.

<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/teachlearnfacpub/104>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications: Department of Teaching, Learning and Teacher Education by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Published (as Chapter 9) in *Handbook of Latinos and Education: Theory, Research, and Practice*, edited by Enrique G. Murillo, Jr., Sofia A. Villenas, Ruth Trinidad Galván, Juan Sánchez Muñoz, Corinne Martínez, and Margarita Machado-Casas (New York & London: Routledge, 2010), pp. 157–169. Copyright © 2010 Taylor & Francis Group. Used by permission.

## Education in the New Latino Diaspora

Edmund T. Hamann  
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Linda Harklau  
University of Georgia

In 2002 Hamann, Wortham, and Murillo noted that many U.S. states were hosting significant and often rapidly growing Latino populations for the first time and that these changes had multiple implications for formal schooling as well as out-of-school learning processes. They speculated about whether Latinos were encountering the same, often disappointing, educational fates in communities where their presence was unprecedented as in areas with a long-standing Latino presence. Only tentative conclusions could be provided at that time since the dynamics referenced were frequently novel and in flux.

In this chapter we revisit their inquiry in light of 6 subsequent years of research and outcome data. We begin by defining and elaborating on the concept of “new Latino diaspora,” tracing its origins, and noting the diverse populations and contexts it represents. Next, we turn to an analysis of educational outcomes in new Latino diaspora communities in light of two competing hypotheses. The first would suggest that in areas where there has been little history of anti-Latino institutionalized racism and little record of Latino school success or failure, educational improvisation might lead to better outcomes than in areas with long established racialized patterns of weak Latino educational outcomes. Alternatively, the second would suggest that racialized patterns of interaction with and schooling for Latino communities in California, Texas, or Chicago are carried into and recreated in new settings, leading to similar or even poorer educational outcomes. We conclude with a review of emergent scholarship and suggestions for further work that might shed light on education in the new Latino diaspora and, in some instances, on Latino education more generally.

### Revisiting the Concept of a New Latino Diaspora

The term *diaspora* refers to “people settled far from their homeland” (Merriam-Webster, 2003) with the connotation of being forcibly expelled by religious, political, or economic forces (Brettell, 2006). It has become a key, if somewhat imprecise, construct in recent anthropological and sociological scholarship on global migration, transnationalism, and ethnicity (Brettell, 2006; Lukose, 2007). The term *new Latino diaspora* was first used in the late 1990s (see Murillo & Villenas, 1997). As Hamann and colleagues (2002) explain, the term denotes the fact that “Increasing numbers of Latinos (many immigrant and some from elsewhere in the United States) are settling both temporarily and permanently in areas of the United States that have not traditionally been home to Latinos—for example, North Carolina, Maine, Georgia, Indiana, Arkansas, rural Illinois, and near resort communities in Colorado” (p. 1). These locales mostly contrast with the nine states of the traditional Latino diaspora—Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, and Texas (National Taskforce on Early Childhood Education for Hispanics, 2007)—that have longstanding Latino populations as well as many newcomers, although the mentioning of Colorado and Illinois on both lists highlights some of the limitations of defining *new* and *traditional* using state borders.

The rise of the new Latino diaspora in the United States can be attributed to changing patterns of U.S. labor markets where several industries in particular are driving Latino immigration and in-migration to new, often rural areas, including agriculture, construction and landscaping, assembly and manufacturing, and poultry and meat processing (Kandel & Cromartie, 2004; Schmid, 2003; Zuñiga & Hernández-León, 2005). No matter what the draw, these newcomers are more likely to be young and more likely to have children than existing residents (Schmid, 2003); hence, the character and quality of their educational experiences in the new diaspora become especially significant. Compared to more established Latino communities, current "new" Latino diaspora locations tend to be characterized by higher proportions of Latinos who speak Spanish as a first language and struggle with English (Singer, 2004). They also have substantial numbers of undocumented parents (Pew Hispanic Center, 2006), although most children of undocumented parents are themselves documented (National Task Force on Early Childhood Education for Hispanics, 2007; Passel, 2006).

Hamann et al. (2002) suggested that in the new Latino diaspora, newcomer Latinos were confronted with "novel challenges to their senses of identity, status, and community" (p. 1) and that responses by non-Latino established residents were improvisational, as local norms of inclusion/exclusion and assimilation/accommodation were lacking. In short, the new Latino diaspora was defined by *who* (Latinos), *where* (places where Latinos have not previously lived in significant number), and *encountering what* (improvised inter-ethnic interaction). Each of these can be further considered.

While *who* gets counted as Latino (or Hispanic) is mainly a topic for other entries in this handbook, it is worth mentioning four dynamics here. First, as Oboler (1995) noted in her study of Peruvian newcomers to the United States, newcomers from Latin America who come to the United States often arrive thinking of their ethnic identity in nationalistic terms (e.g., Peruvian) and are surprised by the racialized nature of the Latino/Hispanic identity in the country. The relatively small initial number of Latinos in new diaspora communities tends to facilitate the formation of a pan-ethnic Latino identity. Nevertheless, although members of the new Latino diaspora may embrace a pan-Latino identity, it is not automatic that they will, nor that, if they do, they will continue to feel a pan-Latino solidarity. Referencing a *new Latino diaspora* in some ways measures the semiotic taxonomies of the host society as much as the self-identity of the diaspora's ostensible members.

Comparatively, in most sites in the new Latino diaspora, those of Mexican descent form the majority of Latinos, and *Latino* verges on becoming a short-hand for *Mexican* (Wortham et al., 2002). Yet as large Dominican and Guatemalan populations in Rhode Island (Portes, Guarnizo, & Haller, 2002), large Salvadoran populations in metropolitan Washington, DC (Portes et al., 2002), and Central American populations in post-Katrina New Orleans (Campbell, 2005; Lovato, 2005) make clear, Mexicans are not always the dominant Latino group in new Latino diaspora settings. Moreover, who is *Mexican* can be a complicated question as non-Spanish-speaking or limited-Spanish-speaking indigenous Mexicans from Oaxaca, Chiapas, and elsewhere make up a new portion of the transnational migration stream, including into new Latino diaspora locations like Hillsboro, Oregon (Zehr, 2002). (See also Villenas, 2007, p. 421, for a discussion of nation-state identities, like Mexican and American, that obscure indigenous identities.)

Third, with relocation across the United States in connection with jobs becoming the norm for all, but particularly for educated professionals and the military, third and fourth generation Chicanos are now living in places that historically have had few Latinos. In 2001, for example, the U.S. military was 15.3% Hispanic and made up more than one fifth of all Marines (Pew Hispanic Center, 2003), so it follows that in communities with large military facilities a military-related Latino population exists. Counting Latino U.S. Marines' training in North Carolina as participants of an education in the new Latino diaspora seems to make sense. More generally, it makes sense to count established Latinos (e.g., Tejanos) as part of the new Latino diaspora when

they are located away from the nine traditional Latino gateway states. At the same time, however, this discussion highlights the fact that up to this point new Latino diaspora locales have been of interest primarily because of their new immigrant populations whose linguistic and ethnic outsider status is clear. In a country with a powerful drive towards assimilation, the perceived linguistic, ethnic, and racial distinctiveness and thus diasporic status of third or fourth or fifth generation Latinos in their adopted communities is a much more open question.

Fourth, all the original cases in *Education in the New Latino Diaspora* (Wortham et al., 2002) reference emergent Latino communities and presume that Latino children are growing up in Latino families. While this assumption is often safe, it is not always so. Transracial and transnational adoptions often locate Latino children away from Latino communities and reference points. According to a November 5, 2006, the *New York Times* story (Lacey, 2006), Americans adopted 18,298 Guatemalan babies in 2005. When these babies end up with Anglo parents in Vermont, Kentucky, or Maryland, should they be counted as part of the new Latino diaspora? Are these children treated as Latinos by their adoptive parents or siblings? By their larger communities? Villenas (2002) notes of Latina parenting in North Carolina, that Latina mothers raise them using *dichos* (aphorisms/stories), tell them to be *al pendiente*, (on guard), and hope *se comporten bien* (that they comport themselves well). If adoptive parents do not do that, should we talk about adoptive parent practices as part of education in the new Latino diaspora?

Writing about Latinos in the southeastern United States, Villenas and Murillo noted that in that part of the new Latino diaspora, "There is no Alamo to remember, nor occupied territories to claim, nor a legendary Aztlán to recreate" (cited in Villenas, 2002, p. 30). As we consider *where* to locate the new Latino diaspora, is this paucity of a history and related claims to place and precedent important? Answering "yes" would obviate at least some of the need for explaining the improvisation of inter-ethnic interaction and the intermittent resistance of the established non-Latino community. But if we want to also locate the new Latino diaspora in the Midwest, Great Plains, Northwest, and non-Mid-Atlantic Northeast where there are some Latino memories and histories, do we risk being complicit in established communities' erasure of Latino histories (an erasure that explains the surprised and improvised reaction to the newcomers) if we call these places new?

In her compilation of historic *corridos* (folksongs) created by Mexican migrants and immigrants in the 19th and early 20th centuries, folklorist Herrera-Sobek (1993) notes references in song to steel work in Pennsylvania and work with sugar beets in Kansas and Michigan. Likewise, McConnell (2004) traces the beginnings of recruitment of Mexican labor in the rural upper Midwest to the 1917 Immigrant Act that curtailed supplies of European-origin labor. While resulting Latino communities were disrupted by the depressions of 1920-21 and 1929 when many of those of Mexican origin left or were forcibly repatriated, recruitment and migration flows renewed during labor shortages in World War II and subsequent years.

Gouveia, Carranza, and Cogua (2005) propose the phrase re-emerging Latino communities. Acknowledging that Nebraska's Latino population was estimated at 125,000 in 2005, they also point out that Nebraska's 1980 Census Count tallied 28,000 Latinos (many were third and fourth generation with ties to the railroad and/or sugar beet industries). Describing Nebraska's new demographic reality and the fact that in many communities Latino newcomer/established resident interaction has been improvised and tentative should not obscure the long-time presence of Latinos in that state. Does our desire to call these sites "new" obscure these histories? Yet would excluding them from our list, mean we overlook locations where there is now much improvised interaction (despite modest-sized antecedent populations)?

Conversely, in the original crafting of the concept of new Latino diaspora, it was not made clear whether the arrival of new Latino nationalities to a setting that has hosted other Latino groups should be included. Put tangibly, should the new arrival of a large Mexican-origin population in New York City be counted as part of the new Latino diaspora? There is not

much of a history of a Mexican presence there, although there is long history of Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and other immigrant groups (from Latin America and the rest of the world). Clearly, Mexican newcomers are now an important population there, and the scholarship on their negotiation of this new setting includes the negotiation of schooling (e.g., Cortina & Gendreau, 2003). Does our desire to exclude New York because it is a traditional diaspora site limit a substantial piece of the new story?

Defining such a wide portion of the country as the new Latino diaspora may also obscure important regional differences in Latino educational enrollment patterns and their impact. In much of the new Latino diaspora, notably the South and Pacific Northwest, the growth in Latino populations is occurring concurrently with growth in the population generally, although not necessarily growth in student populations. In 1995-96 Virginia counted 1,079,854 students, of whom 34,597 were Hispanic. Washington state counted 956,572 students, of whom 74,871 were Hispanic (National Center for Education Statistics, 1998). A decade later in 2005-06, Virginia enrolled 1,193,378 students (+113,524), of whom 91,557 were Hispanic (+55,960). Washington's student population grew to 1,020,311 (+63,739) and its Hispanic population to 139,005 (+65,134; National Center for Education Statistics, 2007). In other words, while increased Hispanic enrollment accounted for half the growth in Virginia's student population, it accounted for all of the increase in school enrollment in Washington. This in spite of the fact that Washington's non-Hispanic total population grew in that period from 5.13 million (Campbell, 1996) to 5.73 million (U.S. Census Bureau, 2007). These demographics also bring into relief another trend: Latino and non-Latino households increasingly differ in terms of the likelihood of including school-age children. Part of the educational reception of Latinos in the new Latino diaspora is likely shaped by many non-Latino established residents not having children and a racialized aversion to paying taxes or otherwise supporting other people's children. In contrast, in Iowa recently, immigration is credited for being the reason that the state's total population is not declining even as non-Latino school enrollments fall substantively (Grey, 2006).

Thus the context for inter-ethnic interaction in the new Latino diaspora varies. In some places, growth of the new Latino diaspora helps explain the proliferation of classroom trailers (as existing facilities are inadequate for the growing enrollment) and the shortage of teachers, particularly those trained in TESOL (Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages). In other places, the growth of the new Latino diaspora is the reason that schools have not closed and that teaching lines have not been discontinued; they are the reason for the stability of the school (although they are not necessarily viewed as such).

Rural and metropolitan areas also vary in terms of how they have become part of the new Latino Diaspora. In many Southern and Midwestern small towns, the new Latino diaspora is characterized by very sudden and rapid increases in Latino school age students (Kochhar et al., 2005). Often these rural areas have not experienced such dramatic demographic changes since White settlers first entered the area (Hamann, 2003; Kochhar et al., 2005). In these settings, Latino immigration to the region has consisted primarily of first generation immigrants who are more likely to be novice speakers of English (Kochhar et al., 2005).

In many cases Latino students in new diaspora communities are encountering improvisational educational responses, particularly in regard to language issues. Many teachers in new diaspora communities are untrained in TESOL and home-school communication is hampered in many cases by a lack of bilingual educators or translators (Bohon, MacPherson, & Atilas, 2005). Dalla, Gupta, Lopez, and Jones (2006) report, for example, that in 2004 of Nebraska's 22,000 educators, fewer than 200 were trained in TESOL. Even when TESOL programs and other pedagogical responses to newcomers exist, they may be thought of as "elaborate experiments" (Grey, 1993)—albeit experiments that suffer from a lack of a "control" population. In other words, the improvisation of programs and teaching methods is applied to all. Grey (1993) also notes that these experiments are led or managed—particularly at the school and

district administration level – by those untrained and unfamiliar with newcomers (i.e., educational leaders who do not know what they do not know). Some new Latino diaspora locations serve as reluctant experiments, resulting in inadvertent or even intentional flouting of educational laws set in place to protect the rights of language minority students (see Beck & Allexsaht-Snider, 2002) and half-hearted teacher professional development efforts (Zehr, 2005).

Finally, we again face complications revisiting the *encountering what* dimension of defining the new Latino diaspora. While the notion of a new Latino diaspora might imply a blank slate for the local negotiation of inter-ethnic relationships and educational policies and practices, local interaction can never be entirely free of outside influence. Indeed, the general mobility of the U.S. population as well as a common pattern of secondary migration of Latino immigrants from established to new diaspora areas make it all but inevitable that some individuals will carry with them thoughts, scripts, and experiences that have been extant nationwide or in the traditional Latino diaspora. Moreover, even in the absence of inter-ethnic contact, local communities are immersed in nationally circulating images of Latinos in mass media (Berg, 2002; Mastro, 2003; Mastro & Behm-Morawitz, 2005) as well as ideologies concerning linguistic and cultural diversity and educational policy (see Ricento, 2000). For example, national media coverage of California's Proposition 227 seems to explain why some educators in northern Georgia turned away from bilingual education although they had initially embraced it (Hamann, 2003).

More optimistically, traditional Latino diaspora locations have also exported more promising educational innovations. With support of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Cassin Educational Initiative Foundation, and several other philanthropies, the Cristo Rey High School model from Chicago has been or will be replicated in Baltimore, Birmingham, Indianapolis, Omaha, and Portland, among other cities. The original Cristo Rey is a bilingual Catholic high school in Chicago's Pilsen and Little Village neighborhood with dramatically reduced tuition that makes ends meet by having students work one day a week as temp workers through a complex and highly successful internship program. Cristo Rey takes only low-income students. In Chicago this has consisted of 99% Latino enrollment. In the new sites – where the internship model is being replicated but not necessarily the bilingual component – Latino and African American students are expected to be the main enrollees (Zehr, 2006).

Even with all these caveats, we hold on to all three words: *new*, *Latino*, and *diaspora*. It is still true that in large swaths of the United States inter-ethnic interaction related to the education of Latinos is primarily a new phenomenon and the habits and expectations that will steer that interaction are still far from set. In these settings, people with ancestries tracing from Mexico, Central America, Puerto Rico, Ecuador, and the Dominican Republic, view themselves and/or are being viewed as belonging to a singular, inclusive pan-ethnic identity: i.e., Latino.

Capps et al. (2005, p. 8) noted that 55% of elementary school students with immigrant parents have parents who were born in Mexico (38%) or elsewhere in Latin America (17%). They then remark (p. 13) that the states with the fastest growth between 1990 and 2000 in children of immigrant elementary students include:

1st	Nevada (+206%)
2nd	North Carolina (+153%)
3rd	Georgia (+148%)
4th	Nebraska (+125%)
5th	Arkansas (+109%)
6th	Arizona (+103%)
7th	South Dakota (+101%)
8th	Oregon (+96%)
9th	Colorado (+94%)
9th	Iowa (+94%)

Eight of these states (all but Colorado and Arizona) have not historically hosted a substantial Latino population. What else should they be called if not *new Latino diaspora*?

Finally, we hold on to the concept of a new Latino Diaspora mostly because it has unfortunate predictive power. Hispanic (the term of most government datasets) appears to be a predictor in new Latino diaspora states of lesser academic success, as the next section traces.

### **Educational Outcomes in the New Latino Diaspora**

Are Latinos in the new Latino diaspora subject to the equivalent obstacles and hazards as those that have hindered Latino achievement in traditional Latino locations? One way to answer that question would be to ask the families themselves whether they believe they are better off in new diaspora schools. Wortham and Contreras (2002), for example, report that Latino families in one rural New England community found the quality of schools to be higher than those they had previously attended in Texas border communities. Parents also found the area and schools to be freer of dangers for their children, such as drugs and gang violence. Thus Latino families may be judging the quality of schooling their children receive more by comparison to previous educational experiences in established Latino communities or in Mexico (Zuñiga & Hamann, 2006) than by comparison to the educational experiences of other ethnic and racial groups at the same school.

Another potential source for optimism is provided by Stamps and Bohon (2006), who found that Latinos living in new gateway (Suro & Singer, 2002) metropolitan areas in the United States tend overall to have higher educational levels than counterparts in established areas. However, they caution that this result may be because of in-migration to new gateway areas by more highly educated Latinos in search of economic opportunities.

In spite of these encouraging signs, large education achievement datasets such as high school graduation statistics tell a different story. Table 1 (next page) allows us to see how well Latino students were doing in a number of new Latino diaspora locations in 2005–2006. The third column shows the percentage of these state's public (pre)K–12 enrollment that is Latino. Comparing column 3 to column 5, in none of the states listed is the Latino high school graduation rate close to what one would predict based on total Latino enrollment.

As Table 1 illustrates, none of the states in this cross-section of the new Latino diaspora have Latino high school graduation rates that come close to the proportion of their Latino enrollments, and the Deep South seems to be the weakest. This can be partially explained and predicted by the national age distribution of the Latino population. For instance, according to the April 2006 U.S. Census population estimates, the number of Hispanic 5- to 9-year-olds was 4,090,814. The population of 10- to 14-year-olds was 3,942,042 (96.4% of the 5- to 9-year-old range) and of 15- to 19-year-olds was 3,622,784 (88.6% of the 15- to 9-year-old range). However, the steeply pyramidal ratios of Latino graduates to total Latino enrollments in the states named here range from just 39% in Alabama (the lowest) to only 67% in Rhode Island (the highest). These ratios are more disappointing when one notes that new Latino diaspora parents tend to have higher education achievement levels than Latino parents in the traditional diaspora (National Task Force on Early Childhood Education for Hispanics, 2007) and that parent education levels are generally a strong predictor of parent involvement and student academic achievement (although working class minority parents can participate effectively in their children's schooling, e.g., Dauber & Epstein, 1993).

Moreover, Table 1 obscures some of the negative story because it compares how Latinos fare only to students who graduate from other groups within the same state. Students, for instance, in southeastern states with some of the lowest high school graduation rates in the country (Editorial Projects in Education, 2007), have a worse chance overall of finishing high school than counterparts in midwestern states such as Iowa that rank high nationally in school

**Table 1.** Hispanic Enrollment and High School Graduation Rates as Percentage of Total

State	Hispanic enrollment (2005-06)	Percentage of all enrollment	Hispanic high school graduates (2005-06)	Percentage of all HS grads
Alabama	20,479	2.8	404	1.1
Arkansas	32,132	6.8	998	3.7
Delaware	11,100	9.2	322	4.6
Georgia	135,010	8.7	2,590	3.7
Idaho	33,599	12.8	1,260	8.0
Indiana	59,387	5.7	1,636	3.0
Iowa	28,145	5.8	999	3.0
Kansas	55,117	12.1	2,019	6.7
Nebraska	32,887	11.5	1,194	6.0
North Carolina	118,505	8.4	2,864	3.8
Oregon	85,461	15.9	2,717	8.3
Rhode Island	26,559	17.3	1,153	11.7
Virginia	91,557	7.7	3,556	4.8
Washington	139,005	13.6	4,893	8.0

Source: Data are derived from Sable & Garafono, 2007

completion. But in these low graduation states (i.e., with lower White and African American graduation rates), Latinos proportional success is not better. If anything, it seems worse.

Another troubling indication from schooling in the new Latino diaspora comes from the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB, 2007), which found that between 1997 and 2006 Hispanic scores on the SAT or ACT had declined in 8 of the 14 new Latino diaspora SREB member states and that test score gaps between Hispanics and Whites had widened in all 14 of those states.<sup>1</sup> Recently, the Tomás Rivera Policy Institute (2004) sharply criticized the educational treatment of Latinos in Georgia, North Carolina, and Arkansas. It noted, for example, that in Northwest Arkansas, "Hispanics have experienced difficulty making their way to local universities. While they now make up almost one-third of the K-12 student population in the public school system, the University of Arkansas in nearby Fayetteville has a 1 percent Latino student population" (p. 18). In aggregate, Latinos in the new Latino diaspora do not fare as well in school as their non-Latino peers.

### Emerging New Latino Diaspora Education Research

As this review suggests, the state of research on education in the new Latino diaspora is still in its formative stages, and at present we have more questions than answers. One question that remains to be explored, for example, is how the more limited political power of new diasporic Latino communities affects educational experiences and opportunities (see Bullock & Hood, 2006). (As evidence that Latinos in the new Latino diaspora have less political power, consider that none of the 21 members of the 110th Congress's [2007-08] Congressional Hispanic Caucus come from non-traditional, i.e., new, Latino diaspora states.)

One might hypothesize that a lack of obvious political power would manifest itself in lower educational achievement, but that does not seem to describe the new Latino diaspora in comparison to traditional settlement areas. According to the National Task Force on Early Childhood Education for Hispanics (2007) in the Northeast, Midwest, and South, both U.S.-born and immigrant Latino parents are more likely to have earned a college degree than the national average for Latinos. Also in the South and Midwest, Latino children of both immigrant parents and native-born parents are also more likely to have parents who have finished



high school than the national average for Latinos (National Task Force on Early Childhood Education for Hispanics, 2007). If there is a link between accrued political power and group educational achievement, the nature of that link is not yet satisfactorily depicted.

Another issue to be addressed in future research is: How does the particular lack of Latino educators in new diaspora communities matter? Meier and Stewart (1991) long ago identified a correlation between the proportion of Latino educators, administrators, and board members, on the one hand, and how Latino students fared, on the other. They did not claim that Latino children need Latino teachers to learn well (although they did not argue against there being value to this match either). Rather they claimed that employment of Latino educators was a good proxy for measuring the available upward mobility for local Latinos.

Using Meier and Stewards lens, there is reason for pessimism. For example, four of Nebraska's five majority Latino school districts employed no Latino teachers in 2005-06 (of 402 teachers) (Nebraska Department of Education, 2006) and only 1% of Georgia's teachers and administrators were Latino in 2005-06 (Georgia Department of Education, 2006). One proposed remedy to the lack of Latino educators has been to provide paraprofessionals from the local community with training and support to earn teacher certification (see Dalla et al., 2006), but thus far such programs have generated only a very finite supply of Latino teachers.

Another area that remains to be addressed more thoroughly is the role of race and racialized identities in Latino students' school experiences in the new diaspora. As we have noted throughout this chapter, Latinos are entering communities with historically very different racial dynamics; e.g., the Southeast with a history of experiencing race as a Black and White dichotomy (see Gilpin & Beck, 2006), and the rural Midwest dominated by non-Hispanic White descendents of European settlers, with American Indians as the "other" population (Kandel & Cromartie, 2004). As a result, established, historicized, and racialized Chicano or Latino communities or identities may not yet exist in the new diaspora in the same way they do in the Southwest, for example (Bohon et al., 2005). However, work in new Latino diaspora communities thus far already shows considerable ambivalence, paternalism (Richardson Bruna & Vann, 2007; Richardson Bruna, Vann, & Perales Escudero, 2007), xenophobia (Rich & Miranda, 2004), and some troubling processes of racialization and subordination underway (Millard, Chapa, & McConnell, 2004). We have yet to fully reckon with how Latino students entering new diaspora communities are positioned and position themselves racially, and how such positioning might affect their socialization into particular life and career pathways in and out of school.

We might also want to investigate the potential role of civic and religious organizations in Latino communities and youth adaptation and education. Such organizations have historically played a vital role in the educations of immigrant youth in new communities (Berrol, 1995). We might ask if and how such organizations are being formed and how they contribute to the educations of Latino youth in new diaspora communities. Arbelaez (2000), for example, provides an example of how civic life in one Omaha Latino community centers around church activities and is coordinated with parish legal, educational, health, and counseling services. Such work could also show how education and *educación* (Villenas, 2002) are interwoven to symbolic processes used by Latinos in new and perhaps tenuous diasporic communities to maintain a collective memory about another time and place or to reattach successive generations to the culture and traditions of homelands (see Brettell, 2006).

In the new Latino diaspora and the traditional one, a comparatively small number of schools absorb most of the growth in Latino enrollment (Fry, 2006). Sometimes, as in Lexington, Nebraska, Anglo enrollment declines (from 1,591 to 664 between 1989 and 2005) as Hispanic enrollment grows (in this case from 75 to 1,988; Nebraska Department of Education, 2006). Gouveia and Stull (1997) reported that the influx of new families to Lexington in the late 1990s was also accompanied by a significant increase in student turnover. One particularly urgent issue is to find ways for these small town and rural schools, accustomed to highly stable

populations and strong informal social networks, to adapt school-home communication and record keeping for a new student population that is more mobile and largely unconnected to existing informal networks.

In her blog for *Education Week*, Mary Ann Zehr (2007) noted that there was little research on how immigrant students and ELLs were faring in the Great Plains and then pointed to Lourdes Gouviea's work at the University of Nebraska-Omaha's Office of Latino and Latin American Studies (OLLAS) as an important exception (citing Gouviea, 2006, and Gouviea & Powell, 2007). Zehr seemed unaware of pioneering older work from Mark Grey in Garden City, Kansas in the early 1990s and current work by Richardson Bruna in a meatpacking town in Iowa (e.g., Richardson Bruna & Vann, 2007; Richardson Bruna, Vann, & Perales Escudero, 2007). Conceding that there are exceptions to Zehr's claim, that she makes such a claim was hardly surprising. Media accounts of newcomers and schooling, precipitated in some instances by ICE raids and the recent nationwide debate about an overhaul of immigration laws, clearly are more numerous and visible than scholarly works. Moreover, the scholarly works that do exist are not necessarily easily found, not least because of the abundance of research on the four fifths of Latino children who do not reside in the new Latino diaspora.<sup>2</sup> Zehr's claims are also unsurprising given the relative neglect of homegrown scholarship on diaspora communities. The preponderance of media attention and funding in recent years for work on the new Latino diaspora has gone to agencies and scholars from outside the affected communities, and this work may not always reflect a full understanding of the history or social contexts of new diaspora areas. We are also lacking in work that is explicitly comparative in nature (although see Stamps & Bohon, 2006). In preparing this review, for example, we encountered several studies that, while conducted in new diaspora areas, were nonetheless of limited value in elucidating how educational experiences might be similar to or different from the abundant existing research from established Latino settlement areas.

Finally, while the role of schools in producing low levels of Latino educational achievement elsewhere in the United States has been underscored, we have yet to explore the place of schools as potential sites for community support and advocacy for Latino families in new diaspora communities. Sink, Parkhill, Marshall, and Norwood (2005), for example, describe how a partnership was established between a community college and school district to provide literacy and academic instruction for Latino families and concurrent Spanish instruction for educators in one North Carolina community. More dramatically, in 2006 when six concurrent U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) raids at Swift Company meatpacking plants in Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Utah, Colorado, and northern Texas led to the deportation of thousands and the division of undocumented parents from their U.S. citizen children, newspapers chronicled how schools became places of refuge for children whose home life had just been turned upside down (e.g., Jacobs, 2006; Lucin, 2006).

## Conclusion

Almost by definition, the concept of a "new" Latino diaspora will continue to change and evolve. The phenomenon presents educational researchers with a tremendous opportunity to trace the evolution of new communities as they become established and enter the second and third generations. Whether new diaspora communities thrive will depend on the evolution of U.S. immigration policy. The signs here are ominous. In 2007 an anti-immigration tide brought down the U.S. Senate's attempt to forge a bill on comprehensive immigration reform. Much of the opposition to the bill came from the South and Midwest, two regions of the country with unprecedented recent Latino immigration and in-migration. In 2008, nativism appears ascendant, or at least powerful, and the prospects that Latino children—immigrant or fourth generation—will be viewed without the paternalism, fear, intolerance, or subordination seems less sure than when these new patterns of migration began.

Yet there remains some promising and innovative educational news coming from the new Latino diaspora as well. Several new Latino diaspora states have crafted “Dream Act” state laws permitting undocumented high school graduates to pay in-state tuition for college (Herrera, Morales, & Murry, 2007). Jacobson (2003) reports that a school readiness pre-K program in Tulsa, Oklahoma, targeting African American and Latino children had particularly favorable effects on Latino youngsters’ test scores. In Siler City, North Carolina, *Time* magazine reporter Paul Cuadros (2006) wrote an inspirational story about a state championship soccer team made up predominantly of Latino newcomers. Hamann and colleagues (2002) once raised the prospect that maybe, away from Florida, California, New York, Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, Illinois, New Jersey, and Colorado—with their entrenched habits of Latino under-education—just maybe, in the new Latino diaspora things would be better. So far that prospect seems too often unrealized. There are success stories, but not yet any large-scale success systems.

## Notes

1. The SREB states where the ACT is the dominant college entrance test include: Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and West Virginia. The SREB states where the SAT predominates include: Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Texas, and Virginia. Texas and Florida are excluded from this calculation (as both are traditional Latino diaspora locations) although the White/Hispanic test score gap widened in both of those states too.
2. According to the National Task Force on Early Childhood Education for Hispanics, 2007, one fifth of the 6,797,303 Hispanic 0- to 8-year-olds counted by the 2000 Census lived in the 41 states of the new Latino diaspora.

## References

- Arbelaez, M. S. (2000). Good Friday in Omaha, Nebraska: A Mexican celebration. Paper presented at the National Association of African American Studies & National Association of Hispanic and Latino Studies 2000 Literature Monograph Series. Proceedings (Culture Section), Houston, TX.
- Beck, S. A. L., & Allexaht-Snyder, M. (2002). Recent language minority education policy in Georgia: Appropriation, assimilation, and Americanization. In S. Wortham, E. G. Murillo, & E. T. Hamann (Eds.), *Education in the new Latino diaspora: Policy and the politics of identity* (pp. 37-66). Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Berg, C. R. (2002). *Latino images in film: Stereotypes, subversion, & resistance*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Berrol, S. C. (1995). *Growing up American: Immigrant children in America, then and now*. New York: Twayne Publishers.
- Bohon, S. A., Macpherson, H., & Atilas, J. H. (2005). Educational barriers for new Latinos in Georgia. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 41, 43-58.
- Bullock, C. S., & Hood, M. V. (2006). A mile-wide gap: The evolution of Hispanic political emergence in the deep South. *Social Science Quarterly*, 87, 1117-1135.
- Brettell, C. B. (2006). Introduction: Global spaces/local places: Transnationalism, diaspora, and the meaning of home. *Identities: Global Studies in Culture and Power*, 13, 327-334.
- Campbell, M. (2005, October 4). Post-Katrina easing of labor laws stirs debate: Foreign workers may form a big part of Gulf Coast reconstruction effort. *Christian Science Monitor*. Retrieved July 16, 2009, from <http://www.csmonitor.com>
- Campbell, P. R. (1996). *Population Projections for States, by Age, Sex, Race and Hispanic Origin: 1995 to 2025, Report PPL-47*. Washington, DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census, Population Division.
- Capps, R., Fix, M., Murray, J., Ost, J., Passel, J. S., & Herwanto Hernandez, S. (2005). *The New demography of America's Schools: Immigration and the No Child Left Behind Act*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Retrieved June 14, 2007, from <http://www.urban.org/publications/311230.html>

- Cortina, R., & Gendreau, M. (Eds.). (2003). *Immigrants and schooling: Mexicans in New York*. New York: Center for Migration Studies.
- Cuadros, P. (2006). *A home on the field: How one championship team inspires hope for the revival of small town America*. New York: Rayo.
- Dalla, R. L., Gupta, P. M., Lopez, W. E., & Jones, V. (2006). "It's a balancing act!": Exploring school/work/ family interface issues among bilingual, rural Nebraska, paraprofessional educators. *Family Relations*, 55, 390-402.
- Dauber, S. L., & Epstein, J. L. (1993). Parent attitudes and practices of involvement in inner-city elementary and middle schools. In N. F. Chauvkin (Ed.), *Families and schools in a pluralistic society* (pp. 53-71). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. Education Week. (2007). *Ready for what? Preparing students for college, careers, and life after high school*. Washington, DC: Education Week Research Center. Retrieved July 16, 2007, from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2007/06/12/40sgb.h26.html>
- Fry, R. (2006). *The changing landscape of American public education: New students, new schools*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Georgia Department of Education. (2006). *2005-2006 K-12 Public Schools Annual Report Card*. Atlanta, GA: Author. Retrieved June 19, 2007, from <http://reportcard2006.gaosa.org/kl2/persfiscal.aspx?TestType=pers&ID=ALL:ALL>
- Gilpin, L., & Beck, S. A. L. (2006). Voices from the margins: Black Caribbean and Mexican heritage women and educators in the rural South. *Journal of Praxis in Multicultural Education* 2, 29-44.
- Gouveia, L. (2006). Nebraska's responses to immigration: Nebraska's context of reception, the role of policy and community responses. In G. Anrig & T. A. Wang (Eds.), *Immigration's new frontiers: Experiences for the emerging gateway states* (pp. 143-227). New York: The New Century Press.
- Gouveia, L., Carranza, M., & Cogua, J. (2005). The Great Plains migration: Mexicanos and Latinos in Nebraska. In V. Zuñiga & R. Hernández-León (Eds.), *New destinations: Mexican immigration in the United States* (pp. 23-49). New York: Russell Sage.
- Gouveia, L., & Powell, M.A. (2007). *Second generation Latinos in Nebraska: A first look*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Gouveia, L., & Stull, D. D. (1997). *Latino immigrants, meatpacking, and rural communities: A case study of Lexington, Nebraska*. East Lansing, MI: Julian Samora Research Institute.
- Grey, M. A. (1993). Applying concepts of marginality to secondary ESL programs: Challenges for practitioners and researchers. In *Proceeding of the third national research symposium on limited English proficient student issues: Focus on middle and high school issues*, Washington DC, August 1992 (pp. 831-850). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs.
- Grey, M. A. (2006). State and local immigration policy in Iowa. In G. Anrig & T. A. Wang (Eds.), *Immigration's new frontiers: Experiences for the emerging gateway states* (pp. 33-66). New York: The New Century Press.
- Hamann, E. T. (2003). *The educational welcome of Latinos in the New South*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hamann, E. T., Wortham, S., & Murillo, E. G. (2002). Education and policy in the new Latino diaspora. In S. Wortham, E. G. Murillo, & E. T. Hamann (Eds.), *Education in the new Latino diaspora* (pp. 1-16). Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Herrera, S., Morales, A., & Murry, K. (2007). Navigating the tides of social and political capriciousness: Potential CLD student beneficiaries of the DREAM Act in the Midwest. Paper presented April 10 at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting. Chicago, IL.
- Herrera-Sobek, M. (1993). *Northward bound: The Mexican immigrant experience in ballad and song*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Jacobs, J. (2006, December 17). Mom, kids spend 3 days in agony. *Des Moines Register*. Retrieved Dec. 21, 2006, from: <http://www.desmoinesregister.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=2006612170327>
- Jacobson, L. (2003, October 29). Oklahoma Pre-K program found effective. *Education Week*. Retrieved June 30, 2007, from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2003/10/29/09okla.h23.html?qs=@0+Hispanic+Latino>
- Kandel, W., & Cromartie, J. (2004). *New patterns of Hispanic settlement in rural America*. Washington, DC: United State Department of Agriculture. Economic Research Service.

- Kochhar, R., Suro, R., & Tafoya, S. (2005). *The new Latino South: The context and consequences of rapid population growth*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved June 19, 2007, from <http://pewhispanic.org/reports/report.php?ReportID=50>
- Lacey, M. (2006, November 5). Guatemala system is scrutinized as Americans rush in to adopt. *New York Times*, Section 1, pp. 1, 6.
- Lovato, R. (2005, November 15). Gulf Coast slaves. *Salon.com*. Retrieved June 28, 2007, from [http://dir.salon.com/story/news/feature/2005/11/15/halliburton\\_katrina/index.html](http://dir.salon.com/story/news/feature/2005/11/15/halliburton_katrina/index.html)
- Lucin, K. (2006, December 14). Community prepares to help displaced children. *Worthington Daily Globe*. Retrieved Dec. 17, 2006, from <http://www.dglobe.com/articles/index.cfm?id=3239&section=collections>
- Lukose, R. (2007). Reflections from the field: The difference that diaspora makes: Thinking through the anthropology of immigrant education in the United States. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 38(4), 405-418.
- Mastro, D. E. (2003). A social identity approach to understanding the impact of television messages. *Communication Monographs*, 70(2), 98-113.
- Mastro, D. E., & Behm-Morawitz, E. (2005). A social identity approach to understanding the impact of television messages. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(1), 110-130.
- McConnell, E. D. (2004). Latinos in the rural Midwest: The twentieth-century historical context leading to contemporary challenges. In A. V. Millard & J. Chapa (Eds.), *Apple pie & enchiladas: Latino newcomers in the rural midwest* (pp. 26-40). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Meier, K., & Stewart, J. (1991). *The Politics of Hispanic Education: Un paso pa'lante y dos pa'tras*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Merriam-Webster Inc. (2003). *Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary* (11th ed.). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster Inc.
- Millard, A. V., Chapa, J., & McConnell, E. D. (2004). 'Not racist like our parents': Anti-Latino prejudice and institutional discrimination. In A. V. Millard & J. Chapa (Eds.), *Apple pie & enchiladas: Latino newcomers in the rural midwest* (pp. 102-124). Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Murillo, E., & Villenas, S. (1997). East of Aztlán: Typologies of resistance in North Carolina communities. Paper presented at Reclaiming Voices: Ethnographic inquiry and qualitative research in a postmodern age, Los Angeles.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (1998). Downloadable Tables from the compendium: State Comparisons of Education Statistics: 1969-70 to 1996-97. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved January 29, 2008, from: <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs98/98018/#chap2a>
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (2007). Public Elementary and Secondary School Student Enrollment, High School Completions, and Staff from the Common Core of Data: School Year 2005-06: Table 2. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved January 29, 2008, from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2007/pesenroll06/tables.asp>
- National Task Force on Early Childhood Education for Hispanics. (2007). *Para nuestros niños: A demographic portrait of young Hispanic children in the United States*. Tempe, AZ: Mary Lou Fulton College of Education, Arizona State University.
- Nebraska Department of Education. (2006). *2005-2006 State of the Schools Report A Report on Nebraska Public Schools*. Lincoln, NE. Retrieved January 27, 2008, from <http://reportcard.nde.state.ne.us/20052006/Main/Home.aspx>
- Oboler, S. (1995). *Ethnic labels. Latino lives: Identity and the politics of (re)presentation in the United States*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Passel, J. S. (2006). The size and characteristics of the unauthorized migrant population in the U.S. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center. Retrieved June 19, 2007, from <http://pewhispanic.org/reports/report.php?ReportID=61>
- Pew Hispanic Center. (2003). Pew Hispanic Center fact sheet: Hispanics in the military. Retrieved July 30, 2007, from <http://pewhispanic.org/files/factsheets/6.pdf>
- Pew Hispanic Center. (2006). Estimates of the unauthorized migrant population for states based on the March 2005 CPS. Washington, DC. Retrieved June 19, 2007, from <http://pewhispanic.org/factsheets/factsheet.php?FactsheetID=17>
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E., & Haller, W. J. (2002). Transnational entrepreneurs: An alternative form of immigrant economic adaptation. *American Sociological Review*, 67(2), 278-298.

- Ricento, T. (2000). *Ideology, politics, and language policies: Focus on English*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Rich, B. L., & Miranda, M. (2004). The sociopolitical dynamics of Mexican immigration in Lexington, Kentucky, 1997 to 2002: An ambivalent community responds. In V. Zuñiga & R. Hernández-León (Eds.), *New destinations: Mexican immigration in the United States* (pp. 187-219). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Richardson Bruna, K. (2007). Traveling tags: The informal literacies of Mexican newcomers in and out of the classroom. *Linguistics and Education*, 18, 232-257.
- Richardson Bruna, K., & Vann, R. (2007). On pigs & packers: Radically contextualizing a practice of science with Mexican immigrant students. *Cultural Studies of Science Education*, 2, 19-59.
- Richardson Bruna, K., Vann, R., & Perales Escudero, M. (2007). What's language got to do with it?: A case study of academic language instruction in a high school 'English Learner Science' classroom. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 6(1), 36-54.
- Schmid, C. (2003). Immigration and Asian and Hispanic minorities in the New South: An exploration of the history, attitudes, and demographic trends. *Sociological Spectrum*, 23, 129-157.
- Singer, A. (2004, February). The rise of new immigrant gateways. *Living Cities Census Series*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution: Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy.
- Sink, D. W., Parkhill, M. A., Marshall, R., & Norwood, S. (2005). Learning together: A family-centered literacy program. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 29, 583-590.
- Southern Regional Education Board. (2007). *Improving SAT and ACT scores: Making progress, facing challenges*. Atlanta, GA.
- Stamps, K., & Bohon, S. A. (2006). Educational attainment in new and established Latino metropolitan destinations. *Social Science Quarterly*, 87, 1225-1240.
- Suro, R., & Singer, A. (2002). *Latino growth in metropolitan America: Changing patterns, new locations*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Tomás Rivera Policy Institute. (2004). *The new Latino South and the challenge to public education: Strategies for educators and policymakers in emerging immigrant communities*. Los Angeles.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2007). Table 3: Annual Estimates of the Population by Sex, Race, and Hispanic or Latino Origin for Washington: April 1, 2000 to July 1, 2006 (SC-EST2006-03-53). Washington, DC.
- Villenas, S. (2002). Reinventing educación in new Latino communities: Pedagogies of change and continuity in North Carolina. In S. Wortham, E. G. Murillo, & E. T. Hamann (Eds.), *Education in the new Latino diaspora* (pp. 17-36). Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Villenas, S. (2007). Diaspora and the anthropology of Latino education: Challenges, affinities, and intersections. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 35(4), 419-425.
- Wortham, S., & Contreras, M. (2002). Struggling towards culturally relevant pedagogy in the Latino Diaspora. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 1(2), 133-144.
- Wortham, S., Murillo, E. G., & Hamann, E. T. (Eds.). (2002). *Education in the new Latino diaspora: Policy and the politics of identity*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Zehr, M. A. (2002, March 27). Ore. School district reaches out to new arrivals from Mexico. *Education Week*. Retrieved June 29, 2007, from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2002/03/27/28hillsboro.h21.html?qs=@0+Hispanic+Latino>
- Zehr, M.A. (2005, May 11). Influx of new students can outpace teacher preparation: But training programs don't always find a receptive audience. *Education Week*. Retrieved June 29, 2007, from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2005/05/11/36teachers.h24.html>
- Zehr, M. A. (2006, November 8). Cristo Rey schools receive \$6 million to expand network. *Education Week*. Retrieved July 30, 2007, from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2006/11/08/11briefs-2.h26.html?qs=cristo+rey>
- Zehr, M. A. (2007, March 19). Immigrants and ELLs on the Great Plains. *Learning the Language Blog at Education Week*. Retrieved June 28, 2007, from [http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/learning-the-language/2007/03/immigrants\\_and\\_ells\\_on\\_the\\_gre\\_1.html?qs=Latino](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/learning-the-language/2007/03/immigrants_and_ells_on_the_gre_1.html?qs=Latino)
- Zuñiga, V., & Hamann, E. T. (2006). Going home? Schooling in Mexico of transnational children. *CON-fines de relaciones internacionales y ciencia político*, 2(4), 41-57.
- Zuñiga, V., & Hernández-León, R. (Eds.). (2005). *New destinations: Mexican immigration in the United States*. New York: Russell Sage.