



Citizenship and Education in the Homework Completion Routine

ARIANA MANGUAL FIGUEROA

Rutgers University

This article draws from a 23-month ethnographic study of mixed-status Mexican families living in the New Latino Diaspora to examine how citizenship status impacts undocumented parents' and children's participation in everyday activities. Specifically, the analysis illustrates how mothers and sons in two families negotiate school and home definitions of citizenship during Homework Completion Routines. During this recurrent educational activity, family members socialized one another to identities that were inextricably linked to migratory status. [language socialization, citizenship, participation, homework, report cards]

In the 1982 decision *Plyler v. Doe*, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down a Texas law withholding funds from schools that admitted “undocumented school-age children of Mexican origin residing within the School District.” The court concluded that the law violated the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. In the closing opinion, Justice Brennan wrote that the Texas law was “directed against children, and imposes its discriminatory burden on the basis of a legal characteristic over which children can have little control” (*Plyler v. Doe*, 457 U.S. 202 [1982]). The legacy of *Plyler v. Doe* has been contradictory: on the one hand, it protects the rights of undocumented children to an education; on the other hand, this educational access comes at the price of invisibility, as educators may not inquire as to the legal status of students and their families. The “don’t ask don’t tell policy” established after *Plyler v. Doe* has meant that educators and researchers have comparatively little knowledge about the specific needs and experiences of undocumented students and their families. Over 25 years after *Plyler v. Doe*, as debates about federal immigration reform rage, and as radical state laws threaten the civil liberties of Latino communities, we still know little about how the “legal characteristic” of living in the United States as an undocumented migrant shapes parents’ and children’s everyday lives.

This article examines the role of citizenship status in the lives of one important subset of the migrant population: mixed-status Mexican families. In 2008, 8.8 million people living in the United States were members of mixed-status families (Passel and Cohn 2009). Mixed-status families are comprised of different combinations of undocumented migrant and U.S. citizen members, as well as members in various stages of applying for U.S. citizenship (Fix and Zimmerman 2001). Of the 8.8 million mixed-status family members, 5.5 million were children; approximately 1.5 million of these children were undocumented migrants like their parents and the other 4 million were U.S. citizens (Chaudry et al. 2010). 6.8 percent of U.S. public school students live in mixed-status families (Passel and Cohn 2009).

I address two questions in this article: When are parents’ and children’s perceptions of migratory status, and the challenges and opportunities afforded by their varying statuses, expressed during everyday interactions? How do parents and children in mixed-status families demonstrate the relevance of citizenship status as they participate in Homework Completion Routines (HCRs)? In the following section, I review the literature on socialization during homework activities and provide an overview of the term *citizenship* to help establish a context for these inquiries. I then turn to a description of the research site and

methodology. Finally, I present my findings and discuss their implications for educators and researchers.

Indexing Identities during Everyday Educational Activities

Language socialization studies attend to the interrelated processes of language acquisition and socialization (Ochs and Schieffelin 2008) and take up the question of which childrearing practices may be particular to or generalizable across groups and settings (Garrett and Baquedano-López 2002; Ochs 2002). This article examines socialization practices that transpire across settings (home and school) and within a family (across citizenship statuses). I chose to study mixed-status families because they explicitly grappled with the tensions that arose from their varying migratory statuses. These ongoing negotiations provided insight into which aspects of behavior and language use constituted shared family practices and which forms of participation were unique to members living in the United States as undocumented migrants or citizens.

Learning the norms for group membership and participation is a process that occurs across the lifespan; adults and children are agentive social actors who coconstruct the social world in which they are taught and learn (Ochs and Schieffelin 2008). Routine exchanges between experts and novices of all ages provide opportunities for individuals to socialize one another to shared norms for language use and behavior (Baquedano-López 1997; Jacobs-Huey 2007). Indexicality lies at the heart of socialization because by making connections between oneself and one's sociocultural context, and expressing them through language, people come to act in the world in culturally specific ways (Ochs 1996). As we will see, when children brought school documents into the home, they prompted family discussions about the definition of citizenship and indexed the relationship between members' migratory status and their participation in society.

Homework completion is a recurrent educational activity during which family members both acquire and impart a set of normative expectations about what it means to be a successful student. Parent-child interactions around homework organize long sequences of activity in the home in which family members negotiate their roles as well as the relative status of the activities themselves (Wingard 2007). The ways that family members approach homework depend on their historically contingent dispositions to schooling (Delgado-Gaitan 1992) and reflect their perceptions of their own future prospects for employment opportunities and interpersonal relationships (Scharf and Stack 1995). The ways in which children complete homework reveal their ideas about the purpose of the task and of schooling, demonstrating how these perceptions align with or diverge from teachers' intentions (LaCasa et al. 2002). Within the unfolding activity of homework completion, family members provide opportunities for and impose constraints on one another's participation in the tasks (Gutiérrez and Arzubia in press).

Public schools in the United States have historically been charged with educating a citizenry capable of democratic participation (Westheimer and Kahne 2004) and homework assignments are a material link through which teachers attempt to extend the reach of the public sphere into private space; by sending school documents home, teachers seek to structure parent-child interactions during sequences of learning activities beyond the school day. Yet for undocumented students attending public schools, their ability to become full participants in the democratic process remains uncertain. For example, while undocumented students attend compulsory K-12 schooling, they are barred from the most conventional mode of participation in a democratic society—voting in political elections once they turn 18 years of age. At the same time, their U.S.-born siblings are entitled to *jus soli* citizenship that is granted to individuals born within U.S. borders (Bloemraad et al. 2008). Social movements of the last half-century, led in part by Mexican

American and Chicana/o activists, have led to a conceptual and political expansion of the criteria for belonging and participation in U.S. civic life; this broadened notion of “cultural citizenship” includes both documented and undocumented members of the Latino community (Flores and Benmayor 1997). Despite these gains in civil rights for Latinos with varying migratory statuses, state-defined juridical categories and local understandings of citizenship continue to shape mixed-status families’ inclusion in and exclusion from participation in schooling processes.

Although there is a growing body of research on language use and learning among Mexican children and families living in the United States, citizenship status is largely absent from ethnographic studies involving young children. With the exception of Bhimji’s 2005 study of Mexican families’ uptake of immigration policies through reference to *la migra* (immigration officers) at home, we know little about how parents and children make sense of migratory status on a daily basis. At the same time, the educational literature on undocumented Latino youth tends to focus on the way that migratory status limits their opportunities for postsecondary study. These studies show how some undocumented students, confronted with legal barriers that make it prohibitively expensive to access a higher education, become politically active (Bloemraad and Trost 2008; Gonzales 2008). By focusing on youth activism in exceptional circumstances like marches and protests, this important work overlooks the role of citizenship in routine activities.

By examining the discursive and material traces of citizenship status in the everyday talk of mixed-status families, this article takes up a call for language socialization researchers to attend to the ways that contemporary social policies shape language use and interaction in immigrant communities (Baquedano-López and Kattan 2007). As I track the tensions produced when parents and children encounter multiple definitions of the term *citizenship*, I highlight the diverse identities that can exist within a single family as well as members’ varied understandings of the juridical categories and social typologies that they encounter in the United States. Recognizing this heterogeneity within the family unit prevents us from reproducing essentializing notions of historically marginalized groups (Gutiérrez and Rogoff 2003). This examination of HCRs identifies the moments when school documents brought into the home prompt undocumented mothers and their children to explicitly discuss their sense of the possibilities and limitations of their participation in U.S. civic life. Although routine schooling events like assigning homework and sending home report cards presuppose that families share, or at the very least understand, the teacher’s normative framework for engaging in and assessing children’s learning, this study contributes to a body of ethnographic research showing that mainstream educative conventions do not necessarily align with socially and economically disenfranchised groups’ language and literacy practices (Heath 1983; Philips 2001; Valdés 1996; Valenzuela 1999; Zentella 1997).

The Emerging Latino Community of Millvalley, Pennsylvania

The data presented here form part of a 23-month multisited ethnographic study (Marcus 1995) conducted in an emerging Latino community in a Southwestern Pennsylvania city I call Millvalley. (Millvalley and all other proper nouns used throughout this article are pseudonyms.) Millvalley forms part of the New Latino Diaspora (Wortham et al. 2002) of the U.S. Rust Belt. Although the city has a history of European immigration—immigrants labored in the coal and steel industry of the region—the presence of Latino immigrants in the area is quite recent. The 2006 American Community Survey reported that Latinos totaled 1.8 percent of Millvalley’s population; Mexicans comprised 1,537 of the 5,466 Latino residents. Yet service providers like Doctor Correa, founder of the first

bilingual health clinic in Millvalley, estimated that there are ten- to 15-thousand Latino residents (personal communication, D. Correa, September 10, 2008).

A 2008 article in a local newspaper reported that 273 English as a Second Language (ESL) students enrolled in the Millvalley Public School District (MPSD) during the 2004–05 school year. Two years later, the number had risen to 485 and it is projected to reach 1,085 students in the 2010–11 school year. As the number of ESL students grew, employing itinerant teachers to provide language services proved insufficient and the MPSD was legally mandated to permanently house its ESL programs within selected schools. According to Ned Tieran, the director of ESL for the MPSD, ESL programs for Spanish speakers opened in the Brickyard neighborhood public schools in 2008–09 (personal communication, N. Tieran, August 29, 2008). All of the children who participated in this study attended school in Brickyard.

Ethnographic Engagement in the Lives of Mixed-Status Families

I first met the families in June 2008, when I began attending meetings organized by the Immigration Advocacy Network (IAN). Although I didn't know it at the time, my role in these meetings facilitated my ability to establish trusting relationships with the families. I volunteered as a simultaneous translator for Spanish-speaking families and English-speaking Millvalley government and law enforcement officials during public forums that IAN organized. The goal of these meetings was to petition local government to institute a "don't ask, don't tell" policy for immigrants. By the fall, IAN members had come to know me as *la traductora* (the translator).

I began asking IAN members if they knew of families in which the parents and older children were born in Mexico and who might be interested in participating in this study. I presumed that mixed-status families would have this composition because demographic trends in emerging communities show that adult and adolescent migrants tend to be born in their country of origin while younger children tend to be born in the United States (Passel and Cohn 2009). Once they were referred to me, I met with parents and explained my interest in understanding the relationship between citizenship and socialization. As they talked with me about their family's migratory status, I discovered that the national trend was reflective of mixed-status families living in Millvalley. I recruited families through the "snowball method" (Ritchie et al. 2003).

I invited four families to participate in this study to be able to collect rich interactional data over a sustained time period (Schieffelin and Ochs 1986). In all four families, the parents and eldest sibling were undocumented migrants who crossed the border from Mexico into the United States without legal permission while the younger siblings were U.S.-born citizens. Two families had undocumented adolescents enrolled in grades eight and ten and two families had younger undocumented children in second and third grade. Although the HCRs examined here recurred often in the home of the two families with undocumented children, this collaborative activity did not occur in families with undocumented youth. This article focuses on the two families with undocumented children; discourses of citizenship entered the everyday lives of families with adolescent migrant youth in unique ways that lie beyond the scope of this article.

I occupied both insider and outsider roles in the cultural spaces of the families' homes. The families and I shared an interest in their children's educational experiences and an awareness of our minority status as members of a growing Latino community. These commonalities were helpful as we developed relationships based on trust and camaraderie. At the same time, the families and I differed in at least two significant ways: first, they

shared an experience of crossing the U.S.–Mexico border without legal permission while I was born into a Puerto Rican family with U.S. citizenship. Second, the migrant parents and children were linguistic and cultural strangers with tenuous social and economic positions in the United States while I was a comparatively privileged individual fluent in the language and customs of U.S. civic life.

I found that the parents viewed me as a resource who could broker relationships between themselves and others. They often asked me to accompany them into public settings to help them access the goods and services that they needed. I took seriously families' appeals for me to participate in their lives as an advocate and I decided that, because I was studying language use and because the families had come to know me as *traductora*, I would agree to translate for them when asked. (As a volunteer in the larger Millvalley Latino community, I also translated for a number of Spanish-speaking families that had legal resident status.) Translating for mixed-status families was accompanied by the risk of being asked to account for their members' migratory status. In these moments—when an accountant requested a worker's visa or a social service provider asked for their social security number—I was acutely aware of my responsibility in maintaining confidentiality. I often asked the families to assist me in rehearsing their preferred responses before translating. Moreover, I never discussed the families' migratory status with teachers, community members, or anyone else.

I conducted participant-observation in the Millvalley Latino community, in the homes of the four families, and in the Brickyard neighborhood schools that their children attended. I chose these sites because I wanted to understand the role of citizenship status in shaping participants' socialization in both formal and informal educational settings. The visits to the focal families' homes typically lasted around five hours, starting when I met the parents or children at school and ending after dinnertime. I did not predetermine which activities I would observe; I documented the families' participation in activities the parents and children routinely conducted after school. I recorded over 45 hours of interactions carried out at home, wrote field notes for each visit, and collected artifacts such as school documents and children's drawings. My observations in schools and public settings were recorded through extensive field notes.

I coded the field notes and video logs for grammatical patterns, recurring topics, and themes in the participants' speech. I focused on the ways in which families referenced migratory status through talk to develop a series of constructs about how citizenship was understood in everyday life. I then triangulated these schemas with other data (Goetz and LeCompte 1981) including interviews with family members, the districtwide ESL director, and school staff. Conversation analysis methods for transcribing recordings focused my attention on the ways that ideas referenced through talk develop over the course of unfolding social interactions (Schegloff 2007). However, these recordings and transcripts are not objective artifacts of social situations; I decided who was included in the recording and transcribed the details that I deemed relevant to my research questions (Goodwin 1994; Ochs 1979).

Findings

The data presented below were collected in the homes of two families, the Utuado-Alvarez family and the Marinero-Chavez family. The eldest, undocumented children in both families attended Ridge Elementary School and were enrolled in or recently exited from the ESL program; José Utuado was in second grade and Pedro Rios was in third grade at the time of the study. The HCRs examined here took place on two occasions: during a visit to the Utuado-Alvarez family home on April 23, 2009, and during

Table 1.
The Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez Families

Utuado-Alvarez Family		Marinero-Chavez Family	
Carlos Utuado, father	49 years old undocumented migrant	Ignacio Marinero, (step)father	approx. 27 years old undocumented migrant
Marta Alvarez, mother	36 years old undocumented migrant	Inés Chavez, mother	25 years old undocumented migrant
Anaya Cela, eldest daughter	13 years old lived in Chiapas, Mexico	Pedro Rios, eldest son	9 years old undocumented migrant
José Utuado, eldest son	7 years old undocumented migrant	Fani Marinero, middle child	4 years old U.S. citizen
Igor Utuado, youngest son	4 years old U.S. citizen	Ignacio Marinero, youngest son	2 years old U.S. citizen

a visit to the Marinero-Chavez family home on April 21, 2009. These instances are typical examples of HCRs that recurred throughout this study. Of the 12 visits that I made to the Utuado-Alvarez home, the HCR occurred seven times; of the ten visits that I made to the Marinero-Chavez home, I witnessed three HCRs. The kinds of conversations presented below are representative of discussions that took place when children brought home school documents—homework, report cards, letters to parents from school officials, and parent volunteer forms—which prompted family members to discuss the way that migratory status shaped their participation in schooling processes. Table 1 briefly introduces the family members by name, kinship relationship, age, and migratory status.

The afterschool routines in the Utuado-Alvarez and Marinero-Chavez homes were quite similar. Marta Alvarez would meet her youngest son Igor at the bus stop, then pick up José from Ridge Elementary School at 2:45 pm. Her husband, Carlos Utuado, would arrive home from his day job at an industrial cleaning facility shortly after she arrived. Marta and Carlos would converse while she prepared José's snack in the kitchen. Once José sat down to eat, Carlos would go into the bedroom to sleep before leaving for his and Marta's nighttime job cleaning movie theaters. Less than a mile away, Inés Chavez would leave work at a department store, pick up her young children from daycare, and meet Pedro at home when his bus dropped him off. Her husband, Ignacio Marinero, would arrive from his job at a hotel and talk with Inés in the kitchen as she prepared Pedro's snack. Once the snack was ready, Ignacio would retreat into the bedroom.

The HCRs had a predictable sequence comprised of three segments that I call the opening, homework completion, and closing. The opening occurred when the mothers unzipped their son's book bag and took out its contents. Marta and Inés always took the time to read the school documents before moving to the homework tasks. Sometimes they would discuss the documents in Spanish with the father or a neighbor; on other days, they asked me to translate the documents from English into Spanish. José and Pedro shared the same academic calendar and received their report cards at the same time. Discussions about grades and academic progress were embedded within the HCRs. Examples 1, 3, and 4 occurred during the opening.

The homework completion segment entailed an exchange between mother and son as they collaborated on school assignments. The mothers spoke in Spanish and would try to sound out the written words in English; while they could sometimes decode the text, they rarely understood its meaning and would turn to their children or to me to translate. Written assignments were completed in English. Once this was accomplished, the closing segment ensued as the mother referred back to the document examined in the opening

and commented on it in Spanish to her child, a family member, or me. She would then instruct her son in Spanish to put his materials back in his book bag. Example 2 is part of a closing segment.

The HCR in the Utuado-Alvarez Family

Example 1 occurred during the opening of an HCR in which Marta was talking about José's most recent report card. She explained to me that José had gotten "puros Ss, dos Ns nada más" [pure Ss, only two Ns] for his "citizenship grade." The MPSD parent handbook offered the following explanation of the citizenship grade:

The report card is the most familiar way of communicating student progress . . . The letter grades A, B, C, D and E are used to indicate academic progress. A citizenship mark is also given for the students' behavior in each class. Citizenship marks are represented by the letters O for outstanding; S for satisfactory; and N for needs improvement [n.d.:23–24].

Marta seemed less concerned with academic progress grades, as she did not mention them at all.

Example 1:

- 1 Marta: ((hands me the report card))
- 2 Ariana: Ahh oka:::y
- 3 Marta: *Cómo lo ves?*
What do you think of it?
- 4 Igor: ((calls Ariana's name two times))
- 5 Marta: Igor
- 6 Ariana: *Espera, espera. Okay, so. Las Ss sí son buenas. Ah ok. Este::: es una*
Wait, wait. Okay, so. The Ss are good. Ah ok. This is a
7 *marca se llama ciudadanía. La marca. Citizenship. Y a mi me han dicho*
grade that is called citizenship. The grade. Citizenship. And I've been told
8 *otros niños que significa comportamiento.*
by other children that it means behavior.
- 9 Marta: ((nods))¹

Marta's talk about the report card marked her attempt to participate in José's education in a manner sanctioned by the school via the report card document, evaluating her child's behavior based on the school's criteria. At the same time, she requested some assistance in interpreting the citizenship grade. When Marta handed me the report card and invited me to assess José's performance by asking, "¿cómo lo ves?" [what do you think of it?] (line 3), she positioned me as a knowledgeable interlocutor with the authority to evaluate José's academic progress. I began by using the key on the report card to interpret the meaning of the S and I offered an additional gloss for "citizenship," explaining that, based on my conversations with the other children, it was synonymous with behavior. Because of my research interests in José's understanding of the term *citizenship*, I also asked him to explain what it meant (line 10).

- 10 Ariana: *Tú qué sabes de esto, José? What is citizenship*
What do you know about this, José? What is citizenship=
- 11 Marta: ((takes a bite of José's snack))
- 12 José: Ah Mami
- 13 Marta: ((chuckles)) *Dile pues dile*
Tell her then tell her
- 14 Ariana: =in your class?

- 15 José: Umm
 16 Igor: What? What? José? ((stops walking in circles flying the paper plane))

Figure 1.
Citizenship grade.



- 17 José: Citizenship. Um. It's a game that you call citizenship bingo?
 18 Ariana: Oh, and you play in your class?
 19 José: ((shakes head no))
 20 Ariana: In your class, does your teacher? She gives you a grade for citizenship. What does
 21 that mean?
 22 José: I don't go on the citizenship line
 23 Ariana: Oh

Marta encouraged José's participation in our coconstruction of the report card's meaning by insisting that he answer my question (line 13). Even Igor, who was always present but almost never participated in the HCR, stopped playing and pressed José for an answer (line 16), echoing the *what* of "what do you know about this?" that I posed. Figure 1 depicts the moment when we looked at José and awaited his interpretation. After repeating the word and pausing to think, José tentatively stated that citizenship was a game. I related this idea of a "game" to José's participation in class but he rejected this explanation (line 19). José emphatically asserted, "I don't go on the citizenship line!," taking the abstract concept of citizenship and relating it to concrete activities he was familiar with. Although he was not able to offer up a clear explanation of citizenship, he demonstrated his understanding in negative terms (I do *not* go) related to his membership within a group (symbolized by forming a line). José concluded that he did not go on the citizenship line, which, in his own terms meant that he did not belong to that social category.

José's correlation between citizenship and standing in a line is consistent with other moments in which he experienced a difference between himself and his brother Igor. According to Marta, José's awareness of social distinctions surfaced in other contexts where he had to form a line. For instance, when they visited the doctor, he and Igor stood on two different lines—Igor waited in one line for insured patients (as a U.S. citizen he received Medicaid coverage) and José stood on a different line for uninsured patients (he was not eligible for health insurance as an undocumented migrant). José would ask why that was the case and Marta would explain it in terms of birthplace: Igor stood on one line because he was born in the United States and José stood on another because he was born in Mexico. This suggests that the way that the state differentiated

between the siblings impacted the way in which the children made sense of the world and their place within it. José had come to understand the relationship between certain actions and social identities, and he expressed them here in terms of group membership and line formation.

After enlisting my help in interpreting the report card and listening to José's explanation of the citizenship grade, Marta ended this exchange by explaining that José did not get an S in science because he did not turn in his homework.

- 24 Igor: ((calls Ariana's name three times))
 25 Marta: *Cállate*
 Shut up.
 26 Ariana: *Significa su comportamiento, sobresaliente, satisfactorio, o necesita mejorar. Así*
 It means his behavior, excellent, satisfactory, or needs improvement. So
 27 *que el sacó todo satisfactorio*
 then he got all satisfactory
 28 Marta: *Nada [más]=*
 Just that
 29 José: [Igor] [can I have yours?] ((referring to his paper plane))
 30 Marta: *=[en ciencia no] que lo lleva, el homework es el problema*
 in science, he doesn't take, his homework that's the problem

Here, Marta regained her role as the primary interpreter of José's progress and identified the cause of the low grades that we had just discussed. Marta's interpretation aligned with the statement in the Ridge Elementary School handbook that "Children must complete 90% of assigned homework or the grade will be lowered one letter grade in that subject. Lack of science homework in grades K-3 will result in an unsatisfactory citizenship grade" (n.d.:2). Completing science homework posed challenges for Marta and José on other occasions; Marta told me that the assignments and due dates for the science homework were unclear. Science homework involved choosing a topic of interest and developing an experiment or conducting research and was due on a monthly basis. These amorphous assignments were more difficult to complete than the packets of math and language arts worksheets that José was required to turn in every Friday.

Marta then transitioned into the homework completion segment of the HCR, working with José on one page from his English language arts packet. Together, they spent the next half-hour combining words into contractions and writing them in designated spaces on a worksheet. When they were done, Marta announced that she wanted to make an appointment to see José's teacher. I responded in Spanish and offered to write a note to the teacher in English on Marta's behalf. Example 2 occurred as Marta explained to José what could result from the meeting.

Example 2:

- 1 Marta: *Quiero hablar con tu maestra (.) y si no le voy a tener que decir que te*
 I want to speak to your teacher and if not I'm going to have to tell her to
 2 *mande a México (.) si no logras entender (0.3) Ya ésta es la definitiva*↓
 send you to Mexico if you're not able to understand. Now this is for real.
 3 José: ((looks down and shakes head no))
 4 Marta: *Sí. (0.2) Si tú ↑ no logras entender (0.3) que cuando te digan siéntate,*
 Yes. If you're not able to understand that when they tell you sit down,
 5 *no hables, que te manden a México (.) definitivamente* ↓ *Eso le voy a*
 don't talk, they should send you to Mexico definitively. That's what I'll
 6 *decir a la maestra* ↓ *Yo le voy a mandar el dinero a la maestra para que*
 tell the teacher. I am going to send the money to the teacher so that she
 7 *te compre el boleto de avión. Y te vas.*
 can buy you the plane ticket. And you're off.

Marta continued to participate in the process of evaluating and supporting José's learning by taking the initiative to meet with his teacher to learn about how José could improve his

grades and delineating a series of consequences resulting from his poor behavior. In conversations that I had previously translated between Marta and José's teachers, they had encouraged Marta to punish José for poor behavior by taking away videogames or special outings. Here we see that Marta's frame of reference is quite different than the one advocated by school authorities. Instead of proposing repercussions that took away the fun things José liked to do on a daily basis, Marta linked his grades to future consequences for his ability to live and participate in U.S. life.

Marta began by stating that when she spoke to José's teacher she would have no choice but to tell her to send him to Mexico (lines 1–2). Throughout her explanation, she related two actions: José's "lograr entender" [come to understand] with her "mandarte a México" [send you to Mexico] in lines 2 and 4–5. In so doing, she also portrayed José as the link between two public domains: school (José's behavior in class) and immigration policy (José's undocumented status). Marta aligned herself with the teacher as an authority figure by insinuating that she would instruct the teacher to send José to Mexico and by stating that she would give the teacher the money to buy a plane ticket (lines 1, 6, and 7). Marta granted the utmost authority to the teacher by depicting her as the intermediary between the United States and Mexico and by asserting that the teacher could, and in fact would, buy José's plane ticket to Mexico at Marta's request.

Marta's words conveyed certainty—she claimed that this was the defining moment for José's future ("esta es la definitiva" [this is for real], line 2 and "definitivamente" [definitely], line 5). She also implied that being sent back to Mexico was a permanent state, consistent with the claim Marta often made about resigning herself to stay in Mexico if she were deported. José was silent; he only communicated using his body language. In line 3, he conveyed shame (lowering his head) and disapproval (shaking his head no) at the prospect of his mother initiating his reluctant return to Mexico.

This wasn't the only time Marta made this grave threat. During one parent–teacher conference in which I acted as translator, the teacher brought José into the room at the end of the meeting and Marta mentioned his possible return to Mexico. In Spanish, Marta asked José to confirm the statement: "no quieres ir a México con tu abuela y abuelo" [you don't want to go to Mexico with your grandmother and grandfather]. As José began to cry and shook his head no, Marta explained, "sabes que quiero traer a tu hermana y vas a enseñar a tu hermana inglés porque tú sabes inglés" [you know I want to bring your sister and you're going to teach your sister English because you know English]. She concluded that "los niños que no se portan bien no se pueden quedar aquí" [the children that don't behave well can't stay here]. Marta reassured José that everything would be fine as long as he behaved and listened well. These interactions demonstrate how Marta, when called on to evaluate José's behavior, linked her interpretation of his academic achievement to her conception of his future opportunities in the United States.

The HCR in the Marinero-Chavez Family

In the Marinero-Chavez family, migratory status was referenced less directly than in the Utuado-Alvarez family. Inés believed that Pedro and his siblings should be protected from talk about the stresses associated with being an undocumented migrant. Yet the following examples illustrate that her children did not remain insulated from the concept of citizenship and its attendant realities. Examples 3 and 4 occurred during the opening segment of one HCR. Here, Inés and Pedro talked about his report card and the potential consequences of getting poor grades. Pedro received citizenship grades but they were not discussed; instead Pedro drew Inés's attention to the academic progress grades. Ignacio stood beside Inés and I looked on quietly.

Figure 2.
Science class.



Example 3:

- 1 Pedro: *La otra vez era D,D,D,D. Y ahora D,C,C,C. No? Es muy du:ro allí*
The other time it was D,D,D,D. And now D,C,C,C. No? It's very hard there
- 2 *science class°. También no ↑ no le van a entender↓.*
science class. Also you're not going to understand it.
- 3 Inés: *La tarea de ciencia*
The science homework
- 4 Pedro: Come on
- 5 Inés: *En matemáticas va peor*
In mathematics he's doing worse
- 6 Pedro: *Yah right. Tenía como seis Ds la otra vez . . .*
Yah right. I had like six Ds the other time
- 7 Inés: *Vas a reprobar año y no te va dar vergüenza que*
You're going to repeat the grade and won't you feel ashamed that
- 8 *tus demas amigos pasen año ↑ y tú vas a estar allí en ese ↑ lugar?*
the rest of your friends are promoted and you'll be there in that place?
- 9 Pedro: *No cuando me dí el report card ↑ ahora dijo que ahora estoy subiendo*
No when I gave the report card to me now she said that now I'm going up
- 10 *mi maestra°. Solo cuando empezamos cuando nos dió ↑ después como*
my teacher. Only when we started when she gave us, later like
- 11 *dos días↑-*
two days-
- 12 Inés: *No Pedro°*
No Pedro
- 13 Pedro: *Te estoy diciendo algo*
I'm telling you something
- 14 Inés: *Vergüenza te va dar*
You're going to feel ashamed
- 15 Pedro: *Lo que me da vergüenza porqué tú no me dejas terminar nada, como*
What makes me feel ashamed because you don't let me finish anything, like
- 16 *la otra vez*
the other time
- 17 Inés: *No te voy a dejar salir a jugar, te vas a quedar a estudiar*
I'm not going to let you go out to play, you'll stay to study

Inés, like Marta, initiated reading and interpreting her son's report card on taking it out of his book bag. In this example, Pedro and Inés took up competing stances as they articulated different interpretations of the grades. Figure 2 illustrates that they were also physically positioned in opposition to one another. The disagreement concerned the outcome that could result from Pedro's low grades. Although Inés concluded that Pedro was going

to have to repeat the third grade (“*vas a reprobar año*” [you’re going to repeat the grade]), Pedro argued that his grades had improved since the last marking period and that this was not a final evaluation of his progress (“¡No! . . . ahora estoy subiendo” [No! . . . now I’m going up]). Pedro attributed his grades to the difficulty he experienced in science class (lines 1 and 2). At the same time, he asserted that Inés couldn’t understand the content of his science class or the report card. Like Marta and José, Inés and Pedro had trouble interpreting and completing science homework. On other visits they elicited my help in clarifying how and when the assignments were to be completed.

As the interaction unfolded, Inés shifted from suggesting that Pedro should feel shame because of his grades (lines 7) to confidently predicting that he would feel shame in the future if he continued to do poorly in school (line 14). She emphasized the concept of shame, following it with a verb in the future declarative tense (“*vergüenza te va dar*” [you will feel shame]). Inés concluded this exchange by punishing Pedro, refusing to let him play with his friends and insisting that he study. In Example 4, Inés connected the shame that she thought Pedro should feel as a student to the shame that she felt as an undocumented migrant working in menial service industry jobs. Inés began the exchange by referring to recent news programs about immigration raids and deportations that she watched and discussed with her children.

Example 4:

- 1 Inés: *Yo les digo* ((pointing to the children)) *mira, pongan atención eso es lo*
I tell them look, pay attention that is
2 *que puede pasar. A él sobre todo*
what can happen. To him above all
3 ((pointing to Pedro and addressing him)) *Métete a bañar, no te hablo más.*
Get in the bath. I’m not telling you again.
4 Pedro: Why do you have to be mean to me?
5 Inés: *Por ejemplo, ahorita?, no le hecha ganas a la escuela. Él no*
For example, right now, he’s not putting effort into school. He I don’t
6 *sé si el día de mañana va irse querer a lavar baños? Eso es lo que vas*
know if tomorrow he’s going to want to go clean bathrooms? That’s what
7 *hacer si no le hechas ganas a la escuela. ((to Pedro)) No te va dar pena?*
you’re going to do if you don’t try hard in school. Won’t you feel badly?
8 Pedro: ((walks downstairs to the bathroom, looking at Inés))
9 Inés: *Ya se pone a pensar así. ((to me, and chuckles)) Yo me digo, si yo tuviera*
And that gets him thinking. I tell myself, if I had
10 *la mitad de las oportunidades hace tiempo, qué cosa me hubiera sido yo?*
half the opportunities a long time ago, what would have become of me?
11 *Y esta gente que tiene, por ejemplo Pedro, que tiene la oportunidad*
And these people that have, for example Pedro, who has the opportunity
12 *ahorita y no la aprovecha.*
now and doesn’t take advantage of it.

Inés continued to build on the idea that if Pedro did not get good grades in school and excel academically his future opportunities in the United States would be limited. She moved from a common punishment that curtailed Pedro’s ability to participate in fun activities with his friends, to the narration of a sequence of future events that were particular to him as an undocumented student. Inés drew on three linguistic resources to link Examples 3 and 4: (1) syntactic parallelism that predicted Pedro’s future and cumulatively built from repeating a grade, to being stuck without choices, to working in a menial job (Example 3, line 7, “*vas a reprobar año*” [you’re going to repeat the grade]; Example 3, line 8, “*vas a estar allí en ese lugar*” [you’ll be there in that place]; and Example 4, line 6, “*va irse querer a lavar baños*” [he’s going to want to go clean bathrooms]); (2) using similar syntax characterized by declarative statements and repeated terms for affect (in Example 3, lines 7 and 14 and Example 4, line 7, “*te va dar vergüenza/pena*” [you will feel

shame/ badly]); and (3) linking this all to Pedro's performance in school (Example 3, line 7, "vas a reprobar año" [you're going to repeat the grade] and Example 4, lines 5 and 7, "no le hecha ganas a la escuela" [you don't try hard in school]).

Across the examples, Inés created two parallel frames: being left back in school and working as a cleaner. She correlated bad grades in school to being left back in third grade and correlated being left back to washing bathrooms. For Inés, cleaning bathrooms indexed her identity as an undocumented migrant in the United States because she and her husband worked as custodial staff in a national chain department store and hotel, respectively. She often contrasted her experience to that of U.S.-born workers, asserting that Americans didn't want to do the work that she and her husband had no choice but to do given their migratory status. She correlated being an undocumented migrant with working in low-status jobs within the service industry and having limited educational opportunities. Inés reinforced that Pedro's identity mirrored hers in Example 4, line 2, by claiming that disturbing newscasts about violence in Mexico and raids and deportations in the United States were more relevant to herself and Pedro than to his U.S.-born siblings.

Simultaneously, and yet in a somewhat contradictory fashion, Inés differentiated between her experience as an undocumented migrant in the United States and Pedro's (Example 4, lines 11–12). She placed him in a distinct but proximal class that she did not belong to, referred to as "esta gente" [these people]—her three children of mixed-status who had educational opportunities that would allow them to access the U.S. mainstream. This indicated the tensions at the heart of Pedro's position in the family. He was constrained by his status as an undocumented migrant and yet privileged to be in the United States where he was expected to take advantage of schooling opportunities and the social mobility that such opportunities were thought to provide.

Encountering Citizenship at Home and School

Mixed-status family members talked about citizenship when children brought school documents into the home that prompted parents to evaluate their children's progress. These documents, and the references to citizenship and the judgments of academic achievement contained therein, precipitated parental statements concerning the relationship between their child's migratory status, school achievement, and possible future outcomes as undocumented individuals living in the United States. The HCR was a significant educational activity for two reasons: first, when family members encountered definitions of citizenship circulating in the home, their tacit beliefs about what citizenship meant were rendered visible. Second, when parents were called on to evaluate their children's educational progress according to the school's criteria, they called into question the forms of participation available to their undocumented children in the U.S. mainstream. In other words, these moments indexed the families' broader struggle for integration in the United States by attaining educational success as well as economic and social mobility.

There are homologies in the school and home conceptualizations of the relationship between behavior and citizenship (Bourdieu 1983). These homologies are evidenced in the report card itself (the citizenship grade correlated to student behavior) and in Marta's talk about the report card (José's misbehavior could result in deportation because he lacked U.S. citizenship). In the Marinero-Chavez home, a report card that negatively assessed Pedro's academic progress prompted Inés to predict that his lack of effort would lead to a future ridden with poor outcomes including shame and limited economic mobility, conditions she linked to her migratory status.

When school artifacts entered the domestic space during the HCR, a space largely determined by the family's mixed migratory status, parents literalized the behavioral norm of citizenship into a juridical category. By conflating the juridical category of citi-

zenship and the metaphorical behavioral category defined by the school, both Marta and Inés portrayed learning activities as high-stakes events. The mothers imagined a set of potential consequences resulting from their son's poor conduct. These consequences—being deported or relegated to working in low-skilled, low-status jobs—were not unlike the kind that the parents feared for themselves; they were quite different, however, than the consequences envisioned by school authorities.

Although the relationships among migratory status, schooling, and future opportunities were prominent in the minds of the focal families, the Ridge Elementary School teachers and administrators were unaware of the connotation of citizenship in their correspondence. In an interview with Ned Tieran, the districtwide ESL director, I mentioned that the report card's use of the term *citizenship* generated confusion in the homes of some families. He responded:

That's good for me to know so that . . . next September, that the [parent welcome] letter could be translated with the homework policy. . . . I'm going to um try and do some additional translations of things like that, explanatory wise . . . because it would, it would really be confusing for all the groups, not just the Latinos. Maybe it rings home there a little more because of the situation in a lot of the homes.

Tieran was unaware of whether the language of the documents was intelligible when they were written in English, let alone how the language was interpreted given the discourses of citizenship active in the home. His focus on the language of the document, despite his admission that "the situation in a lot of the homes" might shape parents' understanding, indicates that he attributed the miscommunication to an issue of language proficiency while it was in fact a question of the different way that citizenship signifies in a migrant family's home and in a school bureaucracy.

As Tieran notes, homework and report card documents were sent home in an attempt to align parenting practices with school policy and to "welcome" parents into an educational system that subscribed to particular ways of teaching and assessing their children. The inability of teachers and administrators to anticipate the way these documents would be interpreted in a domestic space saturated with discourses of citizenship had counterproductive effects. This article not only shows how macro categories of citizenship penetrate daily routines but also how insensitivity to this reality can inhibit educators' attempts to communicate with parents in mixed-status families. This research suggests that the use of the term *citizenship* in educational discourse may impact undocumented children's perspectives about themselves as students and about the schooling process. For instance, how might José's encounter with the literal and figurative uses of the term *citizenship* impact his social and emotional well-being or ability to focus on school work while living with the constant threat of being sent back to Mexico against his will? And how might Pedro's understanding of the link between citizenship and opportunity impact his motivation to study if he believes that migratory status foreshadows his own marginalization and is something that he is powerless to change?

The Significance of Citizenship

A recently televised conversation in which a second grader in Maryland told the First Lady that her "mom says that Barak Obama is taking everybody away that doesn't have papers" (Condon 2010) underscores a key finding in this article—the effects of migratory status resonate within families and children of all ages are aware of the realities of living as undocumented migrants in the United States. With the recent passage of SB 1070 in Arizona, and with prominent republican senators calling for the repeal of the Fourteenth

Amendment (Preston 2010), educators will have to be even more careful about how their actions alienate undocumented parents and children from participating in public schooling. The Arizona law has resulted in such intense anxiety that Latino student enrollment has decreased as undocumented families moved out of the state for fear of being deported (Kossan 2010). As this fear reverberates through New Latino Diaspora locations like Millvalley, educational anthropologists should conduct research on the ways that such policies shape mixed-status families' relationships to educators and schooling practices within the United States.

The marginalization of mixed-status families from schooling processes occurs in part when everyday teaching and learning practices are conflated with the disciplinary power of the state. To mitigate these effects, educators need to understand families' contexts of reception and go above and beyond translating documents to transforming power relations. Several Millvalley initiatives have helped to foster communication and collaboration between teachers and families: the reorganization of leadership at a Head Start center where the administrator shares the responsibility for making curricular and extracurricular decisions with parents, the hiring of a Spanish-speaking ESL teacher of Mexican-descent at Ridge Elementary School, and Ridge teachers' inclusion of parents and students' home cultures in ritual school events celebrating student diversity. Parents have come to look forward to visiting these people and programs because they have the opportunity to learn more about their children's educational experiences while developing their own sense of belonging and participation in local public institutions. This, in turn, may foster parents' sense of cultural citizenship within the educational institutions that their children attend and may alleviate some of the pressure placed on children as conduits of discourses of citizenship between settings. But the success of such programs will ultimately depend on the ability of educators to understand how migratory status delimits students' and parents' sense of what forms of participation are available to them.

Educators can too easily mistake parents' protective instincts with a lack of interest in their child's education. As the focal parents explained to me on many occasions, they migrated to the United States with their young children in tow so that those children could access social and economic mobility through education. The parents knew little about the limitations for participation that they and their undocumented children would experience on arrival. By interacting with parents, teachers might also learn, for example, that the monthly project-based science homework is particularly confusing when parents have come to expect that homework completion is confined to weekly packets brought home on Monday and returned to school on Friday. Deficit models that offer cultural explanations for a lack of parental participation are often based on a confusion of parents' desire to protect the family from a confrontation with the U.S. legal system with a lack of interest in their children's schooling (Valdés 1996).

By providing a nuanced picture of how family members of all ages make sense of identities and spaces that are saturated with discourses of citizenship, this article hopes to contribute to existing research on Latino families' shared "funds of knowledge" (Moll et al. 1992:133). Family members coconstruct knowledge by participating in everyday activities that are shaped by histories of migration as well as current immigration policies and practices. Children in mixed-status families may acquire "knowledge about" a set of cultural practices such as carpentry or farming, but they also learn about the practice of crossing borders and acquiring *papeles* (immigration papers). In keeping with the funds of knowledge perspective, this article highlights the social networks in which learning occurs. The networks in mixed-status communities are saturated with concerns about citizenship status that are transmitted to children.

We know that the learning experiences that children have at home shape the ways that they approach academic tasks in school (González et al. 2004). This article helps shed light

on the schemas that mixed-status siblings develop as they accomplish educational tasks at home, and can inform future studies of how students' bring those schemas to bear on school activities. Attending to diverse experiences within one family can help us to further understand the complex interactions that transpire in homes where federal and state policies mediate local understandings of kinship. In the future, educational ethnographers who attend to the ways that migratory status variously influences the schooling experiences of mixed-status siblings may help us to deepen our understanding of the explanatory possibilities and limitations of typologies that link migration to academic achievement (e.g., Ogbu 1987; Zhou 1997). Continued research in this area is essential if we are to understand how larger political and juridical processes influence individual experience and if we are to support the efforts of educators and policy makers committed to identifying and addressing the needs of students in mixed-status families.

Ariana Mangual Figueroa is an Assistant Professor in the Graduate School of Education at Rutgers, the State University of New Jersey.

Notes

Acknowledgments. I would like to thank the AEQ editors and anonymous reviewers for their insightful comments on earlier drafts of this article. My gratitude is also extended to members of the Laboratory for the Study of Interaction and Discourse in Educational Research as well as the Linguistic Anthropology Working Group at the University of California, Berkeley and, of course, to the families that participated in this study. It was my great privilege to observe firsthand their openness, strength, and love.

1. I adhered to the following transcription conventions. It is important to note that "the punctuation marks are *not* used grammatically, but to indicate intonation" (Schegloff, 2007, p. 267).

(.)	"micropause"
.	falling, or final intonation contour
?	rising intonation
::	prolongation of the preceding sound
–	stress or emphasis
[a point of overlap onset
CAPS	especially loud talk
o	talk following it was quiet or soft
↑↓	sharper intonation rises or falls
(())	transcriber's description of events
-	cut off prior word or sound
]	the end of a point of overlap
=	continuous utterance

References Cited

- Baquedano-López, Patricia
 1997 Creating Social Identities through *Doctrina* Narratives. *Issues in Applied Linguistics* 8(1):27–45.
- Baquedano-López, Patricia, and Shlomy Kattan
 2007 Growing up in a Multilingual Community: Insights from Language Socialization. *In Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication*. Peter Auer and Li Wei, eds. Pp. 69–100. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bhimji, Fazila
 2005 Language Socialization with Directives in Two Mexican Immigrant Families in South Central Los Angeles. *In Building on Strength: Language and Literacy in Latino Families and Communities*. Ana Celia Zentella, ed. Pp. 60–76. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Bloemraad, Irene, with Anna Korteweg, and Gökçe Yurdakal
 2008 Citizenship and Immigration: Multiculturalism, Assimilation, and Challenges to the Nation-State. *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:1–27.

- Bloemraad, Irene, and Christine Trost
2008 It's a Family Affair: Inter-Generational Mobilization in the Spring 2006 Protests. *American Behavioral Scientist* 52(4):507–532.
- Bourdieu, Pierre
1983 The Field of Cultural Production, or: The Economic World Reversed. *Poetics* 12(4–5):311–356.
- Chaudry, Ajay, Randolph Capps, Juan Pedroza, Rosa Maria Castañeda, Robert Santos, and Molly M. Scott
2010 *Facing Our Future: Children in the Aftermath of Immigration Enforcement*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.
- Condon, Stephanie
2010 Second Grader to Michelle Obama: "My Mom Doesn't Have Any Papers." CBS News, May 19. http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-503544_162-20005436-503544.html, accessed June 14, 2011.
- Delgado-Gaitan, Concha
1992 School Matters in the Mexican-American Home: Socializing Children to Education. *American Educational Research Journal* 29(3):495–513.
- Fix, Michael, and Wendy Zimmerman
2001 All under One Roof: Mixed-Status Families in an Era of Reform. *International Migration Review* 35(2):397–419.
- Flores, William V., and Rina Benmayor
1997 *Latino Cultural Citizenship: Claiming Identity, Space, and Rights*. Boston: Beacon.
- Garrett, Paul, and Patricia Baquedano-López
2002 Language Socialization: Reproduction and Continuity, Transformation and Change. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 31:339–361.
- Goetz, Judith Preissle, and Margaret D. LeCompte
1981 Ethnographic Research and the Problem of Data Reduction. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 12(1):51–70.
- Gonzales, Robert G.
2008 Left Out but Not Shut Down: Political Activism and the Undocumented Student Movement. *Northwestern Journal of Law and Social Policy* 3(2):219–239.
- González, Norma, with Luis Moll, and Cathy Amanti, eds.
2004 *Funds of Knowledge: Theorizing Practices in Households, Communities, and Classrooms*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Goodwin, Charles
1994 Professional Vision. *American Anthropologist* 96(3):606–633.
- Gutiérrez, Kris, and Angela Arzubiaga
In press An Ecological and Activity Theoretic Approach to Understanding Diasporic and Non-Dominant Communities. *In Research on Schools, Neighborhoods, and Communities: Toward Civic Responsibility*. William Tate and Carol Camp Yeakey, eds. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Gutiérrez, Kris, and Barbara Rogoff
2003 Cultural Ways of Learning: Individual Traits or Repertoires of Practice. *Educational Researcher* 32(5):19–25.
- Heath, Shirley Brice
1983 *Ways with Words: Language, Life, and Work in Communities and Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jacobs-Huey, Lanita
2007 Learning through the Breach: Language Socialization among African American Cosmetologists. *Ethnography* 8(2):171–203.
- Kossan, Pat
2010 Schools: Immigrant Families Leaving Arizona because of New Immigration Law. Arizona Republic, May 28. <http://www.azcentral.com/arizonarepublic/news/articles/2010/05/28/20100528arizona-immigration-law-schools.html>, June 14, 2011.
- LaCasa, Pilar, Amalia Reina, and María Alburquerque
2002 Adults and Children Share Literacy Practices: The Case of Homework. *Linguistics and Education* 13(1):39–64.
- Marcus, George E.
1995 Ethnography in/of the World System: The Emergence of Multi-Sited Ethnography. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 24:95–117.
- Moll, Luis C., with Cathy Amanti, Deborah Neff, and Norma González
1992 Funds of Knowledge for Teaching: Using a Qualitative Approach to Connect Homes and Classrooms. *Theory into Practice* 31(2):132–141.

- Ochs, Elinor
 1979 Transcription as Theory. *In* *Developmental Pragmatics*. Elinor Ochs and Bambi B. Schieffelin, eds. Pp. 43–72. New York: Academic.
- 1996 Linguistic Resources for Socializing Humanity. *In* *Rethinking Linguistic Relativity*. John Gumperz and Stephen Levinson, eds. Pp. 407–438. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 2002 Becoming a Speaker of Culture. *In* *Language Acquisition and Socialization: Ecological Perspectives*. Claire Kramsch, ed. Pp. 99–120. London: Continuum.
- Ochs, Elinor, and Bambi B. Schieffelin
 2008 Language Socialization: An Historical Overview. *In* *Encyclopedia of Language Education*, vol. 8: Language Socialization. 2nd edition. Patricia A. Duff and Nancy H. Hornberger, eds. Pp. 3–15. New York: Springer.
- Ogbu, John
 1987 Variability in Minority Responses to Schooling: Nonimmigrants vs. Immigrants. *In* *Interpretive Ethnography of Education: At Home and Abroad*. George Spindler and Louise Spindler, eds. Pp. 255–280. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Passel, Jeffrey, and D’Vera Cohn
 2009 *A Portrait of Unauthorized Immigrants in the United States*. Washington, DC: Pew Hispanic Center.
- Philips, Susan
 2001[1970] Participant Structures and Communicative Competence: Warm Springs Children in Community and Classroom. *In* *Linguistic Anthropology: A Reader*. Alessandro Duranti, ed. Pp. 302–317. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Preston, Julia
 2010 Citizenship from Birth is Challenged on the Right. *New York Times*, August 6. <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/08/07/us/politics/07fourteenth.html?scp=1&sq=birthright%20citizenship&st=cse>, accessed June 14, 2011.
- Ritchie, Jane, Jane Lewis, and Gillian Elam
 2003 Designing and Selecting Samples. *In* *Qualitative Research Practice: A Guide for Social Science Students and Researchers*. Jane Ritchie and Jane Lewis, eds. Pp. 77–108. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scharf, Amy, and Carol Stack
 1995 What’s School about for Kids?: Meanings and Uses of Homework in Young People’s Lives. Report, R117G10036. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement.
- Schegloff, Emmanuel A.
 2007 *Sequence Organization in Interaction*, vol. 1: A Primer in Conversation Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schieffelin, Bambi B., and Elinor, Ochs, eds.
 1986 *Language Socialization across Cultures*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Valdés, Guadalupe
 1996 *Con Respeto: Bridging the Distances between Culturally Diverse Families and Schools: An Ethnographic Portrait*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Valenzuela, Angela
 1999 *Subtractive Schooling: U.S. Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Westheimer, Joel, and Joseph Kahne
 2004 What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy. *American Educational Research Journal* 41(2):237–269.
- Wingard, Leah
 2007 Constructing Time and Prioritizing Activities in Parent-Child Interactions. *Discourse and Society* 18:75–91.
- Wortham, Stanton, with Enrique G. Murillo, and Edmund T. Hamann, eds.
 2002 *Education in the New Latino Diaspora: Policy and the Politics of Identity*. Westport, CT: Ablex.
- Zentella, Ana Celia
 1997 *Growing up Bilingual: Puerto Rican Children in New York*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Zhou, Min
 1997 Segmented Assimilation: Issues, Controversies, and Recent Research on the New Second Generation. *International Migration Review* 31(4):975–1008.