

Copyright
by
Julio Noboa
2003

The Dissertation Committee for Julio Noboa Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

**Leaving Latinos Out:
The Teaching of U. S. History in Texas**

Committee:

Sherry L. Field, Supervisor

Mary S. Black, Co-Supervisor

José E. Limón

Maggie Rivas-Rodriguez

Mary Lee Webeck

**Leaving Latinos Out:
The Teaching of U.S. History in Texas**

by

Julio Noboa, B.A., M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Austin
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

**The University of Texas at Austin
December, 2003**

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated
to my parents who inculcated in me enduring values,
to my wife who inspired, challenged and encouraged me from beginning to end,
to my three children who taught me that parents are the first teachers, and
to the children and youth of Texas who have yet to learn
the legacy of our Latino heritage.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation was facilitated, guided and inspired by many teachers and mentors at every level of my formal and informal education. Many professors at the University of Texas at Austin both within and outside the Department of Curriculum and Instruction made invaluable contributions to the ultimate quality of this dissertation. I am very grateful to those who served in my committee: Dr. José E. Limón, Dr. Maggie Rivas-Rodriquez, Dr. Mary Lee Webeck, and most particularly Dr. Sherry L. Field who helped guide me through the final critical stages of this effort, and especially Dr. Mary S. Black, who provided wisdom and affirmation from the very beginning of its conception.

Leaving Latinos Out: The Teaching of U.S. History in Texas

Publication No. _____

Julio Noboa, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2003

Supervisors: Sherry L. Field

Mary S. Black

The primary purpose of this investigation was to explore the factors that influence content choices made by U.S. history teachers in Texas public schools. The ultimate objective was to gain understanding of how these factors affect the extent to which Latinos, in comparison with African Americans and American Indians, are integrated into the historical narrative taught in the classroom. Qualitative methods were primarily used including personal interviews and a focus group with U.S. history teachers in San Antonio. These were combined with other methods including participant observation and content analyses of textbooks, curriculum standards, and course content surveys related to the teaching of U.S. history.

Relevant findings from component studies were integrated to provide a more holistic documentation of the representation of Latinos in

the teaching of U.S. history in Texas. The areas of investigation included: a) perspectives and practices of teachers, b) current and recently adopted textbooks, c) textbook adoption testimony, and d) the curriculum standards, Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS).

These various studies functioned as constituent components which were integrated into the overall design of the larger investigation and the analysis of its data. Though each component study had a purpose specific to its particular focus, each contributed towards constructing a larger mosaic of interrelated parts which taken together achieved the ultimate objectives of this overall investigation.

What makes this effort unique is the intent to conduct a comprehensive review of the standards, textbooks, and classroom practices used in the teaching of U.S. history in order to determine the status of Latino representation. It's significance is underscored by the growing size and historical importance of the Latino population in Texas and the nation, and by the influential role Texas has played at the national level in the selection of history textbooks and in the establishment of social studies curriculum standards.

All the findings from this investigation consistently revealed that Latinos are indeed underrepresented in the teaching of U.S. history in Texas. Policy recommendations to remedy this problem are suggested and addressed to key educational actors including classroom teachers and the Texas Education Agency.

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction	1
A. Background of the Problem.....	1
B. Problem Statement.....	11
C. Purpose of This Research.....	12
D. Overview of Methodology.....	15
E. Myself as Researcher	18
F. My Initial Assumptions	22
G. Significance of Study.....	22
Chapter II: Review of Previous Research.....	26
A. Significant Literature on These Topics.....	26
B. My Own Relevant Research.....	42
C. Applicable and Relevant Theory	58
Chapter III: Methodology	64
A. Theoretical Perspectives	64
B. Overview and Sources of Validity.....	68
C. Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)	69
D. Textbooks	72
E. Textbook Testimony.....	79
F. Teachers' Perspective & Preference.....	84
Chapter IV: Data from TEKS, Textbooks & Testimony	98
A. Latinos in the TEKS	99
B. Latinos in U.S. History Textbooks	110
C. Testimony from 2002 Textbook Adoption.....	139

Chapter V: Data on Teachers' Perspectives.....	155
A. Individual Interviews.....	155
B. Focus Group.....	168
C. Content Checklists.....	189
Chapter VI: Interpretations & Implications.....	193
A. Brief Summary of Findings.....	193
B. Comparison with Existing Theory.....	206
C. Limitations.....	211
D. Implications.....	213
E. Policy Recommendations.....	215
F. Recommendations for Future Research.....	218
Appendix CoC: Checklist of Critiques.....	221
Appendix FGQ: Focus Group Guide.....	222
Appendix HCL: High School Checklist.....	224
Appendix IQ: Interview Questions.....	225
Appendix LI: Letter of Intent.....	227
Appendix MCL: Middle School Checklist.....	228
Appendix TEKS: Four Levels in TEKS.....	229
Appendix TT: Three Textbook Tables.....	230
References.....	231
Vita.....	241

I. Introduction

A. BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

There has long been a keen interest and often divisive debate in this nation about the teaching of history in our public schools. Part of this interest is based on the indisputable importance attached to learning history in every society, especially in modern, complex, industrial societies, where a shared sense of history is considered essential for social cohesion (Nash, et al, 1997; Levine, 1996; Loewen, 1995; Schlesinger, 1991).

Contributing to this interest is the well-founded and documented concern that the upcoming generations of students are not gaining an adequate, let alone quality, level of knowledge and understanding of our nation's history. Since the 1983 National Commission on Excellence report, *A Nation at Risk*, there have been several books and research reports decrying this problem. Among them, E.D. Hirsch's best selling book, *Cultural Literacy*, claimed that students were not obtaining a common store of knowledge which make communication and social cohesion possible (Hirsch, 1987).

That same year, the First National Assessment of History and Literature, issues a report, *What Do Our 17-Year-Olds Know?*, which revealed the results of an assessment test given to 8,000 students nationwide. The average score on the test that covered "the basic facts of

American history,” was only 55% correct answers. Then in 1990, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the “Nation’s Report Card,” published results of their first comprehensive test of American history given to 16,000 students. Among their findings: only 5% of high school seniors taking the test could interpret more challenging historical ideas and information (Nash, et al, 1997, 109-10).

The *NAEP 1994 U.S. History Report Card*, consisted of a study of students’ achievement levels in U.S. history in grades 4, 8, and 12. This National Assessment of Educational Progress reported that the *Proficient* achievement level was reached by only 17% of fourth graders, 14% of eighth graders and 11% of twelfth graders. Although at grades 4 and 8, over 60% of students reached the *Basic* achievement level, fewer than half of grade 12 students had demonstrated this ability (Beatty, et al, 1996, xi).

The most recent Nation’s Report Card: US History 2001, showed students reaching Proficient levels for fourth and eighth graders were higher in 2001 than in 1994, however, the performance of twelfth graders remained stable. As in 1994, only 11% of high school seniors performed at or above the Proficient level, whereas that level was achieved by 18% of the fourth-graders, and 17% of eighth graders. Despite increases at two grade levels, even among those who had the highest scores, students who achieved Proficient levels still represent less than one-fifth of the test-takers (M.S. Lapp et al, 2002).

In addition to the above concerns, the importance of teaching history has intensified over the last few decades because educators,

scholars and leaders have focused on issues of diversity and especially on the exclusion of minorities and women from our nation's historical narrative. An entire multicultural education movement has developed and grown, generating a powerful political and intellectual reaction from conservatives. Multicultural education has become a controversial topic of often acrimonious public debate affecting all levels of education (Nieto, 1992; Banks, 1997; D'Souza, 1991; Levine, 1996; Schlesinger, 1991).

Energizing this debate on cultural diversity in the classroom is the relative absence or under representation of minorities, and particularly Latinos in social studies textbooks. Since 1949, when the American Council on Education (ACE) conducted the first major study of over 300 textbooks, and into the mid 1990's, many studies have documented and confirmed that women and minorities have been relatively excluded or marginalized in social studies textbooks (Committee on the Study of Teaching Materials in Intergroup Relations, 1949; Garcia, 1993).

One of the most intense debates in our diverse nation, often fueled by considerable political influence, is that thorny issue of how minorities and women are represented in the curriculum. This is especially controversial for history textbooks (Garcia, 1993; Loewen, 1995; Nash & Dunn, 1995; Lerner, Nagai & Rothman, 1995; Schlesinger, 1991).

Although four decades after the ACE study scholars noted discernible increases in the quantity and diversity of minority representation, there had not been a dramatic improvement in the quality of that treatment (Garcia and Goebel, 1985; Garcia 1993).

Along with other states like California and Florida, with significant minority populations, Texas is one of the largest and most influential markets for textbook adoption in the nation (Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Salvucci, 1995; Bywall, 1998). Aside from the specific textbook treatments of Latinos and other minorities, there has long been a keen and controversial interest in the content and quality of textbooks per se (Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991; Sleeter & Grant, 1991). Although the actual role that textbooks play in the classroom has also been of some attention and dispute, most educational researchers and historians agree that textbooks establish a foundation for what is considered valuable, relevant, useful, or even official knowledge (Rigberg, 1991; Apple & Christian-Smith, 1991).

Thus, the centrality of textbooks in the entire process and politics of public schooling has been recognized for decades in our nation and in others the world over.

Nowhere in the curriculum is the influence of divergent and often antagonistic views more evident than in the social studies, and particularly in history. It is in the telling of history that a people or nation synthesize the values, aspirations, struggles and experiences which are worthy of memory and recognition. It is perhaps, the most complete and comprehensive piece of cultural legacy that one generation attempts to leave for the next.

Although originating within education and academia, the heated political debates over such approaches as bilingual education, multiculturalism, and afrocentrism reveal just how easily these issues

spill over into the public domain, often without the benefit of reasoned analyses. And so it is with textbooks.

Well funded and organized fundamentalist Christian groups, such as Mel and Norma Gabler's Educational Research Analysts, the National Association of Christian Educators, and Citizens for Excellence in Education have for decades wielded influence at every key level of textbook adoption in Texas and other major states. Textbook publishers must negotiate with conservatives today as they had to back in the 1970's with more liberal-progressive groups. Among those focusing on textbook issues at that time was the Council for Interracial Books for Children (CIBC) which alerted parents and educators about the negative treatment of minorities in textbooks (Garcia, 1993). As part of the larger "Cultural Wars" about values, diversity, and "political correctness," the issue of including women and racial/ethnic minorities in history curricula and textbooks has also generated much journalistic commentary (Gonzales & Rodriguez, 1998; Stille, 1998; Wilentz, 1997).

A body of scholarly research has also been produced, much of it qualitative, but some with considerable quantitative data, that focuses primarily on the representation of women and Blacks in history textbooks (Garcia, 1993). Not as frequently or thoroughly investigated, however, is how Latinos, Asians, Native Americans, and even some White ethnics are portrayed and presented in these textbooks read by millions of students (Garcia, 1980 & 1993).

Nevertheless, the textbook treatment of Latinos in particular has been more thoroughly researched over the last two decades, especially in

area of social studies and U.S. History (Garcia, 1980; Sleeter & Grant, 1991; Salvucci, 1991) .

Researchers have found that in some texts, African Americans and American Indians received more attention than did Hispanics and Asian Americans (Glazar & Ueda, 1983). Hispanics in particular, and the pivotal events which mark their history in the United States, have been omitted, misrepresented, and stereotyped in textbooks published, even during the decades (1970s--1990s) in which their national presence was being more widely recognized (Jesus Garcia, 1980; Cook, 1985; de Varona, 1989; Sleeter and Grant, 1991; Arries 1994).

In a more recent study, Cruz (2002) analyzed the content of history textbooks at the fifth grade level as well as the eighth and eleventh grade texts when U.S. history is taught. The representation of both Latino and Latin Americans were noted and comparisons were made among these, the “most popular and state-adopted” textbooks used in Florida, another state with a large and influential Hispanic population.

Cruz found that:

Despite recent efforts, initiatives, and legislation mandating multicultural and global perspectives in education....The findings of this study overwhelmingly conclude that Latinos and Latin Americans are frequently omitted from the story of the United States and are often depicted in pejorative and stereotypical ways. (Cruz, 2002, 336.)

The need to provide history students with reliable information about Hispanics is underscored by the phenomenal growth of this population, especially in the last decade. The 2000 Census confirmed that the 35.3 million Hispanics in the U.S. constitute over 12.5% of the

general population. This surpasses, for the first time in history, the number of African Americans in our nation and represents for Latinos an increase of nearly 60% from the 1990 census (Zabarenko, 2001). Among the significant changes noted by demographers is that Latino populations are no longer limited to the larger states such as Texas, California, and New York, but are now showing unprecedented growth in cities and small towns of Midwestern and southern states such as Iowa and Georgia (Christian Science Monitor, 2001).

These demographic realities have long been predicted and even anticipated by some policy makers and textbook publishers. However, the extent to which the “Browning of America” had influenced the development of curriculum standards for the social studies, varies from state to state.

Over the last fifteen years, since about the mid-1980’s, many states have joined the effort to establish standards in the social studies. Among them are larger states with significant Latino populations including New York, California, Illinois and Texas. The impetus for establishing educational standards was generated in 1990 with the adoption of National Education Goals by President George Bush and the National Governors’ Association. These goals were signed into law by President Bill Clinton in March 1994 in the Goals 2000, Educate America Act (Nash & Crabtree, 1996).

The very concept of establishing standards found broad support among the American people, as well as elected officials from both political parties at every level.

In Texas, the standards movement took several forms, most notably the development of a new curriculum, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills or TEKS, which represented the first curriculum revision by the Texas Education Agency (TEA) in over ten years. There was much discussion and debate surrounding the development and adoption of TEKS which was officially approved on July 11, 1997. Much of the conflict was due in large measure to the fundamental importance accorded to TEKS for teaching, testing, textbook selection and teacher training.

Educational policy and practice in Texas is to be guided by the curricular standards established in TEKS, designed to “serve as a basis for instructional materials, state assessments, and educator preparation and development.” (TEA, 1996, p. i).

For every TEKS content area, a diverse team of teachers, parents, college faculty, curriculum specialists and business people were selected to produce the written standards. The social studies writing team consisted of 35 members with 21 Euroamericans, 9 Hispanics, 4 African Americans and one American Indian. Seventeen of them were teachers while the rest included 6 social studies coordinators, 5 instructional administrators, 4 university academics, 2 parents and one business person (TEA, 1997b).

Notwithstanding extensive citizen involvement, or perhaps as a direct result of it, there was very intense controversy surrounding the establishment of TEKS, especially in the areas of social studies, notably history. Dividing the State Board of Education along traditional

conservative vs. liberal perspectives, the TEKS controversy caused several delays and rewrites in social studies, and other subject areas. State board of education members Joseph Bernal and Robert Offutt, for example, openly expressed opposing viewpoints on the TEKS and their process of adoption (Bernal, 1997; Offutt, 1997).

Even a national figure, Diane Ravitch, former Assistant U.S. Secretary of Education and veteran of the culture wars, got involved. She visited with TEA staff members and made proposed improvements to the TEKS curriculum. She also remarked on how the rewrite in the TEKS could affect the selection of curriculum and textbooks across the nation considering that other states look to Texas as an example. “That gives Texas more importance than any other state in the country” (quoted in Ramos, 1997a).

Less than a year passed before the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, a Washington D.C. think tank, in 1998 ranked Texas’ history and geography curriculum among the best in the nation. Texas, along with Colorado and Indiana received an “A” grade in Geography standards and a “B” grade in History standards, as did California and Massachusetts. Virginia received the only “A” grade in History, but obtained only a “D” in Geography. Texas was the only state to receive an A and B grade in both social studies areas. “Texas was held up as the example,” declared Matt Mauer, spokesman for the Fordham Foundation (Hoholik, 1998).

Thus, it seems that in the arena of social studies standards, Texas has obtained national recognition for the clarity, content, and comprehensiveness of its TEKS. However, the extent to which this

reputation is warranted in the TEKS' treatment of Latinos and other minorities, is still an open question.

Yet, despite the obvious influence of established state curriculum standards, and the impact this has on textbook selection, it is at the classroom level that students actually engage with the curriculum. That applied curriculum, and the particular content and approaches used to deliver it, is invariably determined by the individual classroom history teacher.

Several studies have documented the important role history teachers play in selecting content, using instructional methods, and utilizing educational materials including textbooks, maps, and audiovisuals. These and other investigations have also identified some of the factors which influence history teachers' curricular and instructional decisions including structural conditions in the school, community and student characteristics, as well as their own beliefs, values, social class, knowledge, and training.

For example, in terms of content choice, a 1989-90 survey conducted by the National Center for History in the Schools at UCLA, found that high school U.S. history teachers spend more classroom time teaching about the twentieth century than the earlier history of the nation. The main teaching tool for most of the 481 teachers were survey textbooks, and few were frequent users of such materials as biographies, documents or literature of the period (Thomas, 1992).

Since the history teacher is a pivotal decision-maker as to what is ultimately taught and how, a full comprehension of how U.S. history is

taught in Texas, as in any other, must include a better understanding of the teachers' role as curricular gatekeeper.

B. PROBLEM STATEMENT

Due to its mixed methods approach, this investigation is directed by several interrelated problem statements, each pertinent to its specific study. However, this investigation is guided in its efforts and objectives by a single fundamental problem statement that can be expressed thus:

What is the relative quantity and quality of Latino inclusion and representation in the teaching of U.S. history in the public schools of San Antonio, Texas?

Though this problem statement cannot be fully and definitively answered by this exploratory investigation, it does serve to generate a corpus of useful data and some analyses that contributes towards formulating a complete and accurate response to this vital question.

Other interrelated questions more specific to the component studies of this multi-faceted inquiry can be expressed thus:

1. Whereas Texas has obtained national recognition for the clarity, content, and comprehensiveness of its TEKS, to what extent do these standards reflect a complete, inclusive, and comprehensive view of our nation's multicultural history, and of Latino presence within it?
2. Given the influence of Texas in the standards and selection for textbooks in the national market, how to what extent are Latinos represented in the U.S. history textbooks adopted in that very state wherein they have had the most intense cultural history and significant influence?

3. Given that US history textbook selection is a very politicized and ideological process involving a multitude of issues, what kinds of issues directly related to Latino representation were expressed in the discourse and testimony of the public hearings?

4. Whereas it is the U.S. history teacher who ultimately decides what content is covered in the classroom, what are the factors which influence these content choices?

5. Given that U.S. history teachers content choices are influenced by several factors, which of these interact to help or hinder the inclusion of Latinos in the classroom curriculum?

C. PURPOSE OF THIS RESEARCH

The primary purpose of this investigation was to explore the factors that influence content choices made by U.S. history teachers in Texas public schools. The ultimate objective was to gain understanding of how these factors affect the extent to which Latinos, and other traditionally under represented ethnic and racial minorities, are integrated into the historical narrative taught in the classroom. Qualitative methods were primarily used by way of personal interviews and a focus group with U.S. history teachers, as well as participant observation. These were joined with other methods involving content analyses of history curriculum standards, of textbooks and of course content surveys related to the teaching of U.S. history.

Relevant findings from five component studies were combined to provide a more holistic documentation on the representation of Latinos in the teaching of U.S. history in Texas. The areas of investigation included: a) the perspectives and practices of teachers, b) current and

recently adopted textbooks, c) the textbook adoption process, and d) the curriculum standards (TEKS), Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills.

These various studies functioned as constituent components which were integrated into the overall design of the larger investigation and the analysis of its data. Though each component study had a purpose specific to its particular focus, each contributed towards constructing a larger mosaic of interrelated parts which taken together attempt to achieve the ultimate objectives of this overall investigation.

For example, the major purpose of the study on the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) was to determine the quantity and quality of Latino presence in these curriculum standards and to compare and contrast that to how African Americans and American Indians are represented (Noboa, 2000c).

Given the demographic, political, historical and cultural realities of Texas, it was useful to determine the extent to which ethnoracial minorities and especially Latinos, are mentioned and/or represented in the content of U.S. history curriculum standards of the TEKS. It would also be significant because the TEKS are used as a basis for selecting textbooks, designing standardized tests, training teachers, and instructing students (TEA, 1996, i).

The purpose of the textbook study was to determine how and to what extent Latinos (Hispanics) in general as well as their three largest groups--Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and Cuban-Americans--are represented in the most widely used U.S. history textbooks in the state of Texas. While seeking to quantify the amount of Latino representation in

these texts, this research also investigated the qualitative extent to which that representation is accurate, objective and complete (Noboa, 2000b).

The research on the US history textbook adoption process in Texas during 2002 was designed to document the kinds of critiques made regarding Latino representation in U.S. history textbooks from oral & written testimony. It also provided an opportunity to compare and contrast the representation of Latinos in two recently adopted textbooks (Noboa, 2003a).

The purpose of the study on teaching, consisting of personal interviews with U.S. history teachers, was to examine their beliefs and perceptions regarding the content of their courses. Also examined were some of the factors which impact this content, and how these relate to teachers' content choices. Special attention was focused as well on the extent to which, and the context in which, participants mention women, minorities, and especially Latinos regarding their presence in the curriculum (Noboa, 2000a).

The primary purpose of the final research study involving a focus group was to continue exploring, but with a different approach, the factors that influence content choices made by U.S. history teachers. The ultimate objective was to gain a better understanding of how these factors affect the extent to which ethnic and racial minorities, and especially Latinos, are integrated into the classroom's historical narrative (Noboa, 2003b).

Thus, these five studies work together in concert in an attempt to provide a more holistic view of how U.S. history is taught in Texas. They

also reveal, albeit within the limited scope of each, some of the patterns of representation or exclusion specifically related to Latinos and other ethnoracial minorities in the state's curriculum for U.S. history.

D. OVERVIEW OF METHODOLOGY

As stated above, this mixed methods investigation consisted of several, mostly qualitative approaches, namely personal interviews, focus groups, and participant observation. Content analyses were also used for textbooks, testimony, curriculum standards and course content checklists.

Personal interviews were conducted with twelve US history teachers, mostly in their classrooms at the end of the school day. The participants were selected because they were articulate, outstanding teachers who had a variety of backgrounds and experience. Participants included both men and women representing the three major ethnoracial groups in the city: Anglo, Latino and African American. The interviews were audiotaped and their responses were analyzed.

Similarly, the focus group consisted of four US history teachers, representing all three ethnoracial groups who had a wide variety of teaching experiences, but were also quite articulate and opinionated.

This focus group session was audiotaped and later transcribed for analysis.

The participant observation was used during the Texas textbook adoption process of 2002. This researcher obtained information and

guidelines and actually participated in the public hearings, providing testimony before the Texas Board of Education. He also observed the process from that perspective, taking the opportunity to meet, converse with and establish rapport with other individuals and organizations providing testimony that day.

Becoming an actor within the process permitted this researcher to better understand not only the public testimony process itself, but also the concerns, perceptions and motivations of other participants, especially the Latinos who participated or were present.

The content analyses were conducted on several key documents related to the teaching of US history in Texas. First among them, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills curriculum guidelines were analyzed for the relative presence of Latinos, African Americans and American Indians, specifically among the groups and individuals actually mentioned by name. This analysis was completed for both the eighth grade and high school level courses in US history.

Content analyses were also used for US history textbooks which were scrutinized for the quantity and the quality of Latino representation. Three major textbooks recently in use during the last decade were thoroughly analyzed in terms of the number of pages as well as the accuracy and objectivity of the Latino related content. Two other textbooks up for adoption in 2003 were also content analyzed for quantity and quality, but in more general terms, using a contrast-comparison approach.

Participants of the personal interviews and of the focus groups filled out a course content checklist indicating the frequency with which they covered in class certain individuals, groups, concepts, or events. These checklists were analyzed to reveal more specifically, which of the topics were the most and least covered.

Finally, content analyses was used to review the testimony presented during the 2002 textbook adoption process regarding Latino representation. The focus being to identify the kinds of issues being raised regarding that representation by groups and individuals, both Latino and non-Latino.

Much of the validity of this particular mixed method investigation will emerge from the data itself. Greater validity is demonstrated from having consistent or comparable ideas, concerns, issues, and perspectives emerge from various sources such as interviews, focus groups, and public testimonies. The extent to which the findings from the content analyses of textbooks and TEKS, for example, reflect or support the findings from several other sources of data derived through different methods, can be one clear indication of this investigation's validity.

E. MYSELF AS RESEARCHER

Born in New York City of immigrant Puerto Rican parents, I was raised in a thoroughly bilingual and bicultural environments at home, in school and in my surrounding community. Moving to Chicago at a very young age, and attending that city's public schools from Kinder through

high school, also gave me opportunities to learn and develop my ideas and world view in multicultural, multi-racial, and multi-ethnic contexts.

That experience in diversity, especially in my schooling and in my various employment experiences, stimulated my interest in issues of cultural diversity, and eventually led to my decision to major in anthropology at the University of Illinois in Chicago where I obtained a BA degree in that discipline. Later, I attended Northwestern University in Evanston, IL where I completed graduate coursework in both anthropology and education, obtaining a Masters of Arts in Education.

As my formal education advanced, my employment opportunities were enhanced, and I worked in the areas of educational advocacy, social service management, and educational administration both in government agencies, and in non-profit community based organizations. Most of these experiences offered, to a greater or lesser extent, opportunities to conduct investigations, usually with my colleagues, regarding the issues, conditions, problems and resources which existed in predominantly Latino schools and communities of Chicago.

After moving to San Antonio, Texas in the mid 1980's I worked in drug prevention education at the elementary school level. In this capacity I designed and implemented a curriculum tailored for students at a low-income inner-city public school based on extensive research on available resources and community characteristics. Later, working for another organization, Communities in Schools, I conducted some literature research on drop-out prevention and managed a program at the middle and high school levels.

My most extensive work experience with educational research was at the Tomás Rivera Center (TRC), integrated at that time within Trinity University. There, serving as Research Writer, and later Research Editor, I worked closely with scholars, predominantly in the area of educational policy, as it affects the Latino communities at the local, state and national levels. In consultation with these demographers, sociologists, and educational policy experts, I helped write and edit reports, policy papers, and legislative briefs.

At the TRC, I also had the opportunity of conducting research on the status of immigrant students in Texas and wrote a report published by the Center, *They come to learn: Hispanic immigrant students in Texas* (Noboa-Polanco, 1991).

That same year I also collaborated with a historian at Trinity University, Dr. Linda Salvucci, in the analysis and critique of adopted textbook representations of Mexico, Mexicans, and Mexican Americans. We each provided testimony regarding our findings to the Texas State Board of Education (Salvucci, 1991; Noboa, 1991a).

Having experienced the adoption process and observed it closely as a participant allowed me to gather data and gain insights on how the process works and the extent to which ideological politics plays a significant role within it. This enabled me to write and present a paper on this topic at the Southwestern Social Science Association conference that year (Noboa, 1991b).

The following year was a pivotal one for the adoption of textbooks in Texas, especially in the subject areas of English and Social Studies.

Drawing from my experience with the public testimony process, we organized for the purposes of providing testimony, a group of predominantly Latino scholars, historians, an educational psychologist, and several teachers, as well as college students and even 8th grade students. Under the name of MASA, the Multicultural Alliance of San Antonio, we reviewed several English and history textbooks in the context of their coverage of women, but especially of Latino themes, authors, events, or individuals (Texas Education Agency, 1992).

Based on my experiences, and using some of the data generated from the efforts of MASA, I gathered more information from a variety of sources for a paper presented at the 1993 conference of the Society for Applied Anthropology on how textbooks portrayed women, minorities and Latinos (Noboa, 1993).

Working with the University of Northern Iowa as an Instructor and Clinical Supervisor for nine years provided ample opportunities to do classroom observations and cross-cultural teacher training. Together with my colleague, we often reflected on the challenges of preparing Anglo student teachers from Iowa to effectively instruct in classrooms with predominantly Latino and other racially, ethnically and socially diverse students. From these reflections and from qualitative data we collected, we wrote and presented several papers at Teacher Education conferences (Canning & Noboa, 1997; Canning, Noboa & Salazar-Guenther, 2002).

During the last few years, while working on my doctoral studies, I have also had opportunities to conduct a variety of investigations, most

notably a study conducted on the curriculum and school climate during the World War II years at Lanier High School. Located in the traditional Mexican American barrio of San Antonio's west side, Lanier High School served as a fruitful topic for research. Combining district archival records, yearbooks, newspapers, and interviews with former students, I was able to create a historic and contextualized portrait of Lanier.

Originally presented at a conference on Latinos in World War II, this paper is now a chapter in an upcoming book to be published by University of Texas Press (Noboa, 2003c).

Other topics I investigated included afrocentrism in US schools, the debate over multiculturalism, and the effects of an anglocentric curriculum on Latino students.

My most recent and intense research activity is directly related to the several component studies which comprise this dissertation. These have already been alluded to and will be more fully described in the subsequent chapters.

F. MY INITIAL ASSUMPTIONS

My initial assumptions were tested through the variety of research approaches employed. Based on personal experience as well as formal interviews and informal conversations about schooling with Latinos from many occupations and professions, it was assumed that Latinos would likely be underrepresented in the curriculum.

It was also assumed that racial and ethnic minorities in general would not be fairly represented in social studies teaching, although it was also expected that of all the groups, African Americans would be the most or the best represented in textbooks, curriculum guidelines, and other curriculum materials.

Other assumptions made were concerning the role of teachers as gatekeepers of classroom knowledge and specifically that many would express having some conflict with adopted textbooks or with established curricula, standards, or high-stakes testing.

All of these assumptions were confirmed by the data gathered from this investigation, yet as will be discussed later, the research also generated a wealth of data that provides insight and understanding far beyond the scope of these initial assumptions.

G. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

There are several key demographic and educational realities which lend significance to this investigation. One primary factor is the phenomenal growth and the wide distribution of Latinos throughout the nation as documented by the 2000 Census. Latinos are no longer limited to certain regions of the nation nor are they concentrated only in the large cities. Americans will increasingly be attending school with Latinos, or working in some professional or occupational capacity with Latinos as colleagues or as clients.

Latinos and especially the largest Latino national origin group, Mexican Americans, but also in a more regional sense, Puerto Ricans and Cubans, have had a long history of residential presence, cultural influence and even political activity in this nation. However, the general public is often very misinformed about Latinos, and as in decades past, although not as blatantly, there still persist numerous negative and demeaning stereotypes about Latinos mostly perpetrated by print and electronic media.

While these portrayals have been challenged in recent years, the most powerful media continues to significantly exclude Latinos, and underrepresent their presence and influence in our nation's society, history and culture.

The combination of these two realities--that Latinos are now the largest minority group in the nation and that they are systematically underrepresented in the media--places an enormous responsibility on the educational system.

Aside from the many challenges already burdening public education, especially in the arena of Latino education (high drop out rates, poor achievement, low test scores, etc.) there is also the unwelcome challenge of being the most reliable source on Latinos for the general American public. Since the film industry, television, newspapers, magazines and even the print industry have all done a dismal job of educating the American public about who Latinos are, it unfortunately falls to an already overburdened public school system to somehow fill this information gap.

Thus, the question arises: *To what extent are public schools teaching American students accurately or objectively about Latinos?*

This investigation focuses on US history, the master narrative for our nation's social studies, and how it is taught in a state, Texas, that has one of the most historical and significant Latino presence. It also studies how history teachers cover Latinos in a city, San Antonio, with a long history of Latino political organization and cultural development.

Thus, going beyond mere anecdotal information, this investigation documents the representation of Latinos in the teaching of US history in a state and city where their presence and influence is already well recognized and undeniable. One implication is clear: If Latinos are underrepresented in the history curriculum of a state and city wherein they have arguably the greatest concentration of presence and power, what can be expected of other states or regions of our nation?

Given that Texas is now serving as a model for curriculum standards, especially in the area of social studies, and that it is also the model for the use of high stakes, standardized tests as the ultimate administrative tool for evaluating students, teachers, schools and even districts, then it is imperative to document what effect these curriculum standards and testing have on the curriculum in general, and especially on the coverage of Latinos and minorities.

Texas is also a very important and influential state for the adoption of textbooks used throughout the nation, and the determination of their final printed content. Thus it is useful to document as well how Latinos are represented in the textbooks adopted in Texas.

Finally, the significance of this study also draws from the decades-long “Culture Wars” (Nash, Crabtree & Dunn, 1997; Levine, 1996), most specifically, the struggle of women and minorities to be duly recognized in the historical and cultural narratives being expounded to millions of public school students throughout the nation. The debate over multiculturalism at every level of schooling has generated many alarmist books and much discussion, but also has stimulated maturity, growth and sound research among advocates of multicultural education.

It is my hope that this investigation will provide useful data for those who seek to understand the attitudes, policies, and practices which hinder or help educators provide an accurate and objective representation of Latinos and other racial/ethnic minorities in our nation’s history.

II. Review of Previous Research

A. SIGNIFICANT LITERATURE ON THESE TOPICS

Several topics have relevance to this investigation, and some of that literature, for example, on curriculum standards and the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills, has already been covered in the previous Background section. This section will discuss the three bodies of literature most directly pertinent to this investigation, namely: 1) the textbooks treatment of Latinos, ethnoracial minorities, and women; 2) the role of classroom teachers and the factors influencing their content choices; and 3) the rationales and approaches for multicultural education.

1. Latinos, Minorities & Women in History Textbooks

The entire issue of racial/ethnic as well as gender representation in textbooks came to a political climax during the intense debate surrounding the National History Standards first published in 1994. Gary B. Nash led the effort to develop a set of standards for both American and world history in response to gubernatorial, presidential and congressional mandates. However, upon their release, the standards were vigorously condemned as un-American, politically correct, and extremely revisionist by conservative critics led by Lynne Cheney and Rush Limbaugh (Nash & Dunn, 1995).

In their attempt to dissipate some of the lies and misinformation about the writers, content, nature, and intent of the standards, Nash & Dunn point out that the critics focused almost exclusively on the “examples of student achievement”. In doing so, critics counted names mentioned in the suggested and optional activities and incorrectly treated these examples as if they were part of a textbook. These critics then railed against the excessive inclusion of minorities and women at the expense of white males, despite of the fact that most of the names mentioned in the U.S. history guideline examples were white males. This national controversy and others regarding curriculum and textbooks in states such as New York, California and Texas illustrate the highly charged atmosphere that currently exists about what history should be taught.

Nevertheless, the foundations of this debate are rooted in a justifiable response to the negative and inaccurate way women and minorities were depicted for decades in textbooks, especially before the 1960’s. Garcia (1993) provides a brief historical overview of the prevailing policies and practices regarding textbook content beginning in the 19th century. Back then, textbooks were written at a time, as William Reese put it, when “public schools taught children and then adolescents that America was Christian, republican, and the greatest nation on earth.” Writing in this context, textbook authors created an ideal fantasy world of heroes and villains where, according to Ruth Elson, “Individuals are to be understood in terms of easily discernible, inherent characteristics of

their race and nationality as much as in terms of their individual character.” (both quoted in Garcia, 1993, 1)

Schoolbook Negroes were depicted as foolish, childlike, and requiring supervision and providing assistance to Whites from their menial positions. American Indians were more often described as cruel, vengeful and barbarous than alert or brave. Latin Americans had all the bad qualities of the Spaniards, but none of their virtues such as courage, firmness or patience. Clear distinctions were also drawn between Northern and Western Europeans versus those from the East and South, with the best or most virtuous being those that most closely resemble the Anglo-American racial and cultural prototype (Garcia, 1993).

Little interest was demonstrated by researchers on the representation of minorities in textbooks during the first half of the 20th century until 1949 when the American Council on Education sponsored the first major review published in this century (Committee on the Study of Teaching Materials in Intergroup Relations, 1949). The Committee examined over 300 textbooks used nationwide at all levels during the 1940's to determine their treatment of the topic: “intergroup relations.”

Michael Kane (1970) reports that these textbooks in the 1949 study were found to be “distressingly inadequate, inappropriate and even damaging to intergroup relations” (p.1). Just a few years later, Morton Sobel (1954) focused his review to 15 seventh grade social studies texts. He concluded that in terms of how they dealt with nationality, social class, race and religion, some stereotypes about minorities persisted but that they were not necessarily derogatory. Comparing 48 textbooks used

during the 1950's and early 1960's, Lloyd Marcus (1961) concluded that the treatment of African Americans and other minorities had made some uneven gains since 1949.

In 1969, James Banks reviewed 36 history textbooks used in fourth through eighth grades for their treatment of race relations and of African Americans. Using a thematic analysis of 11 categories including discrimination and achievement, he also compared the frequency of themes in six textbooks from 1964 and 1968. Banks found that many authors failed to explain prejudice and discrimination and rarely depicted violence. He also found that the treatment of African Americans had significantly improved since 1964, and that 1968 texts relied less on stereotypes (Banks, 1969).

Using the criteria from Marcus' 1961 study, Michael Kane (1970) examined 45 social studies textbooks published in the 1960's. Although he also noted some improvement, he also discovered that Asians, Chicanos, Puerto Ricans, and Native Americans received very uneven treatment. In a yearlong study conducted by the Dallas chapter of the American Jewish Committee, the group examined 5th and 8th grade level history textbooks on the official adoption list for Texas in 1975. The group of educators and lay persons recognized that progress has been made in removing racial bias. However, they still found glaring examples of ethnocentrism, stereotyping and negative characterizations of African Americans, Chicanos, and Native Americans (Simms, 1975).

In her study of textbook treatment of U.S. history, Frances Fitzgerald (1980) found that in terms of minorities, the coverage

represented a compromise between diverse constituents and interest groups. Jesus Garcia (1980) examined 20 U.S. history texts published in the 1970's and found that although authors used a variety of themes when chronicling the historical role of Native Americans, some key issues such as treaty rights and land policy were covered only superficially.

Upon examining six secondary level U.S. history textbooks published in the 1970's, Nathan Glazar and Reed Ueda (Glazar & Ueda, 1983) found that African Americans and Native Americans received more thorough treatment than do Hispanics and Asian Americans. Then in an attempt to identify changes in the treatment of African Americans over time, Garcia and Goebel (1985) compared a group of five textbooks written between 1956 and 1975 with another group of 10 textbooks written in the 1980's. They found that the breadth of coverage had increased beyond slavery, Reconstruction, and the civil rights movement to include such topics as Black churches and organizations. However, the depth of coverage on these and other topics still remained superficial.

Clearly, these studies and others show that there has been a discernible increase in the quantity and diversity of descriptions found in history textbooks in reference to minorities and women. There has not been, however, as significant a gain in the quality of these increasingly diverse representations, according to Garcia (1993).

Based on the studies he had reviewed, Garcia also asserts that:

“....the treatment of minorities in textbooks has not improved dramatically in the social sciences..... Moreover, there is little or no content suggesting a global connection to cultural diversity...

Thus readers are provided with a limited view of multiculturalism.”(Garcia, 1993, 7)

A review of textbook representations of Latinos should include recognition of the obvious and ever-present global connections U. S. Hispanics have to Latin America. In that context, Cook (1985) notes that like the mass media, social studies textbooks present “an incomplete or biased portrait of the countries making up Latin America” (p. 1). Gallup polls indicate that it is a region about which Americans are poorly informed (Glab,1981). News programs focus on spectacular events like hurricanes, coups, and sometimes U.S. foreign policy there, but “It is rare to find stories on the arts, humanities, or culture of Latin America” (Glab, p. 69).

In a survey of ten high school texts, Fleming (1982) noted that little recognition was given to cultural characteristics of Latin American nations. Their histories were presented primarily in the context of U.S. foreign policy, their views were rarely considered and negative stereotypes of Latin America and its citizens were created or reinforced.

From another contextual perspective, Salazar (1991) examined 11 textbooks on the very history of American education and another 7 textbooks on Western educational history. The earliest text was published in 1874, and the rest are published throughout every decade of the twentieth century up to 1988. In none of the seven texts on western education was any mention made of Hispanic topics, people or contributions. Among the eleven American education texts, no more

than two pages were devoted to Hispanics, and these books ranged from 400 to 600 pages long.

Yet, Salazar notes that the first functioning university in the Americas, established in Mexico by 1553, helped set the pattern for universities that followed throughout the region. She further notes that the first school activities in what is now the United States occurred in provinces of New Spain such as Florida, California and Texas. Neither of these two historical facts are mentioned in these 17 texts, nor are any of educational leaders and developments that occurred in the Southwest and throughout Hispanic America up to modern era.

Thus, the treatment of Latinos in U.S. history textbooks occurs within a general context of omission, distortion and/or under representation regarding the wider Hispanic history and heritage in the Americas as a whole.

In one of the earliest and most thorough studies focusing primarily on Hispanic coverage in textbooks, Jesus Garcia (1980) examined ten secondary U.S. history textbooks published in 1978 and 1979. He begins with the assertion that overall, the literature indicates that since the early 1960's the depiction of Hispanics has become more balanced, realistic and sensitive to ethnic perspectives.

Garcia did both a quantitative and qualitative analysis of data, using seven key questions about the quality of information regarding Hispanics, and then counting the number of sentences responding to each question. He also categorized and counted these sentences

according their focus on either Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans or Cuban Americans, as well as Hispanics in general.

Garcia found that only limited descriptions of Hispanics were provided and that none of the texts adequately addressed the key questions asked. More attention was devoted to providing background on the problems than on the accomplishments of these three groups. Further compounding the problem-oriented focus of these texts, was the shallow and distorted portrayal of Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans.

While confining much discussion to such topics as unemployment, drugs, violence or even prejudice, Garcia found that textbooks omit serious discussion of other pivotal topics such as the Mexican American role in the development of the Southwest, or the issues underlying U.S. Puerto Rican relations.

In a 1986 report based on the analysis of thirty-one history textbooks, five historians working for the People for the American Way concluded that:

“Overall the treatment of Hispanics....perpetuates their invisible roles in building the nation. Hispanics.....have long been ignored or casually mentioned in conventional U.S. history textbooks” (de Varona, 1989, 3).

Linda K. Salvucci (1991) scrutinized ten textbooks approved for use in the state of Texas between 1986 and 1992. Five texts covered pre-Civil War U.S. history at the eighth grade, and the other five were used in the post-Civil War high school history course. Looking closely at how each text dealt with Mexico, Mexicans and Mexican Americans during key eras

and events, Salvucci found that the texts presented very mixed images. Whereas some texts treated a few events and eras adequately, no one textbook or series by the same publisher sustained its occasionally successful treatment of the three topics across time. Mexican and Mexican American perspectives are almost never elaborated, even for pivotal events such as the Mexican American War. Things Mexican are only characterized as problems for the United States, and some of the old nineteenth century racial stereotypes still persist.

Published that same year was a study by Sleeter and Grant (1991) who examined fourteen social studies textbooks used at the elementary level and published from 1980 to 1986. They found that Hispanics are featured in 3% or less of the pictures in nine books, and in 8% of pictures in three books. In the narrative itself, Hispanics, mainly Mexican Americans, are mentioned only briefly and incidentally, and then mostly in discussions of early colonization, settlement of the Southwest, and the Mexican American War. Mexican perspectives are not stated with clarity and authority as are American views, and there is no analysis of the socioeconomic nor the cultural factors that fostered the conflict between both nations. In some texts, Hispanics appear in more recent times only as illegal aliens living in urban areas.

Focusing on two fifth grade textbooks published in 1988 and 1991, and approved for adoption in Texas schools, Arries (1994) also discovered considerable omissions, distortions and stereotyping in the coverage of Mexican Americans and Mexicans. Both the text and illustrations present a biased view of four key events: the Alamo battle,

the War for Texas Independence, the War with Mexico, and the civil rights movement.

Beyond the elementary and secondary levels, even post-secondary textbooks provide a less than adequate coverage of Hispanics. In her review of four college level American history textbooks published in 1984 and 1985, Vicki L. Ruiz (1987) found that with the exception of one text, the textbooks mention Hispanics, particularly Mexican Americans and Puerto Ricans, the two largest groups, only in passing. One text has a single page dealing with Hispanics out of a 919 page book. Another devotes two paragraphs out of a total of 867 pages, and the third contains three paragraphs in a book that is 1,343 pages long.

It is clear from the above overview that at every level of schooling from elementary through college, American history textbooks generally have done little justice to the topic of Hispanics in terms of the quantity and the quality of coverage.

What considerable progress has been made from the first half of the 20th century is worth noting. However, more research in this area of textbook evaluation needs to be done on texts published during the 1990's in order to better determine to what extent this progress has continued. Moreover, this research could also indicate where authors and publishers currently are in this regard and where they need to go in order to significantly improve the treatment of Latinos in U.S. history textbooks.

2) Teachers' Role and Influencing Factors

Several studies have documented the important role history teachers play in selecting content, using instructional methods, and utilizing educational materials including textbooks, maps, and audiovisuals. These and other investigations have also identified some of the factors which influence history teachers' curricular and instructional decisions including structural conditions in the school, community and student characteristics, as well as their own beliefs, values, social class, knowledge, and training.

In terms of content choice, a 1989-90 survey conducted by the National Center for History in the Schools at UCLA, found that high school U.S. history teachers spend more classroom time teaching about the twentieth century than the earlier history of the nation. The main teaching tool for most of the 481 teachers was a survey textbook, and few were frequent users of such materials as biographies, documents or literature of the period (Thomas, 1992).

Among the structural conditions, there are a variety of factors that have been found to limit and direct how and what history teachers instruct. The sheer teaching load and multiple preparations means that there's less time for teachers to plan for and grade more challenging lessons given to students (Morrissett, 1981; Shaver, et al, 1978). There are also a variety of structural constraints that affect social studies teachers, such as ineffectual leadership, lack of materials, and limited development opportunities (Little, 1989).

Many teachers perceive that the community prefers conservative approaches to teaching that emphasizes content transmission (Fawcet & Hawke, 1982; Jarolimek, 1981). It is also a perception among teachers that students lack interest in social studies (Eslinger & Superka, 1982), and some even use this as a rationale for covering the basics and not engaging students in more complex inquiry activities (McKee, 1988; Stake, et al., 1978).

Considering the influence of their beliefs and background, history teachers are not just “passive transmitters of knowledge” (Elbaz, 1981, p. 43), they bring their own individual attitudes and experiences and apply these in making decisions about what content they cover in the classroom (Ben-Peretz, 1990).

In a recent study, Romanowski (1997) found that beliefs, life experiences, family and social class, school climate, community, students, and testing all exert a significant impact on history teachers’ curriculum decisions. In an earlier study, Romanowski (1995) had investigated how U.S. history teachers used their textbooks and the factors that influenced their use of the textbook. He found that “textbook knowledge does not pass perfectly from text to student” (p. 26); rather it is the manner in which the teacher manages the textbook and other materials that determine what students ultimately learn.

He identified his four major findings as: 1) Teachers view the textbook as a starting point which needed to be supplemented with additional sources. 2) Teachers believe it is important to raise democratic ideals through the teaching of history, including such values

as justice, equality, freedom, civil rights, and antiracism. 3) Teachers indicated that the beliefs of students and the community influenced their approach to the textbook, and teaching U.S. history, and 4) There is a wide range of teacher's abilities to discuss and critique the biases and omissions of the textbook (Romanowski, 1995).

Another factor that is influencing U.S. history teachers in their curricular choices and approaches is the growing diversity of the student body, their community, and American society at large. The push for including women and minorities is being increasingly reflected in textbooks, supplementary materials, relevant readings, and instructional activities. Some of the literature presenting the rationale for a more multicultural approach to teaching U.S. history is briefly reviewed below.

3. Multicultural Education: Rationales and Approaches

One very powerful motivation driving the multicultural movement is that the mainstream curriculum has been, and despite some recent changes, largely continues to be Anglocentric, Eurocentric, patriarchal, and class biased (Nieto, 1992; Spring, 1997; Banks, 1999; Levine, 1996).

Another factor energizing multicultural education, as documented in a previous section, is that textbooks have a long history of marginalizing racial and ethnic minorities, as they do women, and continue to misrepresent or under-represent them in their narratives until quite recently (Sobol, 1954; Marcus, 1961; Banks, 1969; Kane, 1970;

Simms, 1975; Fitzgerald, 1980; Garcia, 1980; Glazer & Ueda, 1983; Garcia and Goebel, 1985; Garcia, 1993).

Contributing to the controversy over multicultural education is its multiple meanings in practice and in the professional literature itself. Yet there is a consensus developing among scholars about what are the major goals of multicultural education. Banks (1999) identifies two of them:

1. "to increase educational equality for both gender groups, for students from diverse ethnic and cultural groups, and for exceptional students." (22)
2. "to help all students....develop the knowledge, skills and attitudes they will need to survive and function effectively in a future U.S. society in which one out of every three people will be a person of color." (23)

Other goals identified by Banks include:

3. "to help individuals gain greater self-understanding by viewing themselves from the perspectives of other cultures." (2)
4. "to provide students with cultural and ethnic alternatives" so as to counter the negative effects an Anglocentric curriculum has on many students of color. (2)
- 5 "to reduce the pain and discrimination that members of some ethnic and racial groups experience because of their unique racial, physical, and cultural characteristics." (3)

There are also certain assumptions made by multicultural scholars and practitioners that many critics fail to recognize. Among them are:

- Race, culture, ethnicity and social class are salient parts of U.S. society

- Ethnic and cultural diversity enriches the nation and increases opportunities for diversifying problem solving approaches.
(Banks, 1999)

A national survey was conducted by Louis Harris and Associates with Hispanic, African American and White students from rural, suburban and urban areas. These diverse students responded to several questions related to multicultural education: the availability of these courses, their interest in taking them, their opinions on the emphasis their schools placed on them and their evaluations of how well their teachers taught about tolerance.

One of the most significant findings was that just over 70% of students nationwide expressed an interest in learning more about cultural events that people celebrate in different parts of the world. Less than half (45%) students responded that they were satisfied with the emphasis their schools placed on teaching multiculturalism. Yet, of the nearly 40% who were dissatisfied, most would prefer their schools to place more, rather than less, emphasis on multicultural education.

In a previous survey on violence and social tensions, students had indicated that social relations among students from different racial, ethnic and economic backgrounds are improved when teachers do a good job of teaching tolerance. When asked to rate teachers on how well they are teaching tolerance in this subsequent survey, less than half the students (44%) said their teachers did an average job. About one-fourth of the students felt their teachers did well, but almost one-fifth said teachers did a poor job of teaching tolerance.

These and other findings, according to the project directors, provide an important and encouraging message to educators about three key aspects that must be considered:

1. the level of student interest in multicultural programs,
 2. the need to expand these programs and,
 3. the likely benefit to both students and teachers if multiculturalism is given greater attention in the schools.
- (Lietman, Binns, & Steinberg, 1996)

As a relatively new field of theory and practice, multicultural education does need more research, experimentation, and ultimately, greater refinement. Yet, it is a sound, worthy practice that requires dedication and often courage just to maintain, let alone expand and improve.

Although findings from empirical research on the effects of multicultural education are sparse, there are encouraging discoveries from those that do exist:

- Negative racial and ethnic attitudes toward others can be changed through deliberate intervention, but the process is long range.
- Establishing a closer fit between teaching styles and culturally different learning styles has positive social and academic consequences.
- Alternative instructional means can be used to achieve common outcome expectations without compromising the educational standards and quality of anyone.
- Some instructional techniques are more effective than others for some members of ethnic and cultural groups.

- Instructional initiatives that work well for groups of color generally benefit Anglo students, too. However, the converse is not true. Educational interventions that are successful with Anglo students often have negative consequences for culturally different students.
- The procedures of teaching and learning are important targets of intervention for multicultural change. They are as significant as the content and substance of teaching, if not more so.
- Culturally sensitive teaching techniques that work well with diverse students appear to be effective across age, gender, school settings, and subjects. (Gay, 1994)

B. MY OWN RELEVANT RESEARCH

Several research efforts, prior to those which comprise this dissertation, provided relevant background information on two topics: 1) creation and content of the world history TEKS curriculum standards, and 2) the impact anglocentric curriculum and mass media have on Latino students.

1. Creation and Content of World History TEKS

With “Missing pages from the human story: World history according to TEKS,” I had the opportunity to investigate the content of the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills curriculum standards for world history, as well as the process by which these and other social studies standards were written and established (Noboa,1998).

The world history course is described briefly in the TEKS:

“World History Studies is the only course that offers students an overview of all of human history....(it is) the only course that allows students the opportunity to examine major ideas and themes over time and over space. The major emphasis is on the study of significant people, events, and ideas from the earliest time to the present....By attempting to explain the past, world history helps students to understand the present, thus enabling them to make informed decisions and to develop an appreciation of their own heritage.” (TEA, 1996)

Beginning with the assumption that global influences and challenges are perhaps greater now than ever before for our state and nation, the research was motivated by the following fundamental question: *To what extent are the TEKS for world history preparing students to “make informed decisions” about future global challenges?*

More specifically, the research was guided by the following specific question: *To what extent does the TEKS for world history present an accurate, inclusive and objective overview of “significant people, events, and ideas from the earliest time to the present?”*

Answering that question required considerable detailed review of the contents of the TEKS world history curriculum standards, and it did generate much useful and relevant data. But before discussing these findings about the content, however, we will briefly review some vital information about the curriculum development process which this research also uncovered.

The creation of the TEKS involved a three year long process of written drafts, hearings and rewrites that was profoundly influenced by political, religious and ideological considerations (TEA, 1997a; TEA, 1997b; Bernal, 1997; Offutt, 1997).

All curricular areas were rewritten including English, math, science, technology, fine arts, foreign languages and social studies. It was the first major curriculum rewrite in over ten years for the Texas Education Agency and involved many Texas citizens with 127 serving in review panels, 350 in writing teams, and no less than 18,000 providing oral or written testimony.

As stated above in the Background section, for every TEKS content area, a diverse team of teachers, parents, college faculty, curriculum specialists and business people were selected to produce the written standards. The social studies writing team consisted of 35 members with 21 Euroamericans, 9 Hispanics, 4 African Americans and one American Indian. Seventeen of them were teachers while the rest included 6 social studies coordinators, 5 instructional administrators, 4 university academics, 2 parents and one business person (TEA, 1997b).

Although there clearly was an effort by TEA to include racial and occupational diversity in this social studies writing team, it would have been difficult to ascertain the political or ideological perspectives of participants within this writing team, and how the writing process was influenced by these perspectives.

However difficult it was to access certain aspects of the writing process, the contents of the TEKS, whose review comprised the major focus of the study, was more clearly evident than the process which engendered them.

The TEKS consists of a collection of Knowledge and Skills Areas (KSA), each with statements, specifying a topical area of knowledge or

skills to be mastered by the student. Each KSA includes stated expectations by which to evaluate students' proficiency in that topical area.

In the TEKS for world history, there are a total of 27 KSAs, including three in social studies skills, four in culture, and ten in history proper. Within those ten areas of history four deal with specific cultures and civilizations, and it was these four which were the first set of KSAs whose content was reviewed for the purpose of the research.

There were four KSAs, KSA #3 through #6, that together encompassed the actual scope of the strictly historical segment of the course. Of these four areas, three had to do with Europe, and the fourth one, lumped together all the civilizations of literally the rest of the world.

The KSAs are entitled thus:

#3 The Western Roman Empire and early Western Europe

#4 The European Renaissance & the Reformation

#5 The European Expansion

#6 Civilizations of Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, Mesoamerica, and Andean South America (TEA, 1997c).

Whereas a natural Eurocentric focus and greater attention to Europe than other continents could be rationalized on the basis of the Western nature of our society and of the European foundations of U.S. government, however, the obvious relegation of all other civilizations to only one KSA cannot. Given that students are exposed to European and/or Western ideas, culture, literature, achievements, and civilizations throughout the curriculum in every subject area, especially in social

studies, this aspect of the world history TEKS does not expose students enough to nonwestern civilizations about which they know relatively little or nothing.

In addition to the sheer misbalance of coverage, there are some important civilizations of the Mideast, including those in Mesopotamia, Ancient Egypt, and Islamic civilizations which cannot be covered adequately if at all, given the description of K&S #6.

This Eurocentric focus to the exclusion of other vital areas of world history knowledge is also evident in several other KSAs most notably in the KSA #8 which deals with Revolutions and reads thus:

“The student understands causes and effects of major political revolutions since the 17th century.

The student is expected to:

- (A) identify causes and evaluate effects of major political revolutions since the 17th century, including the English, American, French, and Russian revolutions;
- (B) summarize the ideas from the English, American, French, and Russian revolutions....
- (C) evaluate how the American Revolution differed from the French and Russian revolutions....; and
- (D) summarize the significant events related to the spread and fall of communism, including worldwide political and economic effects. (TEA, 1997c)

Whereas the four revolutions cited are very significant and worthy of study, they were all Western revolutions, again showing an obvious Eurocentric bias; but even more importantly, there are several pivotal

revolutions, all occurring in the Third World within the last century, that are excluded.

Not mentioned by name are the Chinese, Cuban, and Vietnamese revolutions, all socialist or communist, but also nationalist struggles against what they perceived as imperialist domination by Western powers. Although they could conceivably be covered under the description of section D; their very exclusion by name raises suspicions about the political agendas at work in their exclusion.

Also missing are the African and Latin American revolutions for national liberation, again against European powers, revolutions which have shaped the history of these two huge land masses for decades if not centuries. Most notably excluded also are both Mexican revolutions of the 19th and 20th centuries.

Absent as well is the Indian Revolution, also against a European empire, but the only deliberately nonviolent revolution for national liberation in recent history.

Given the importance these Third World revolutions have had on world history, politics, and culture, and their undeniable impact on our own nation, as in the case of the Cuban, Mexican and Vietnamese revolutions, it is inexcusable to exclude them from any course in world history. The message communicated to students then is that the causes, effects and ideas of these Third World revolutions are not significant enough to be mentioned or seriously studied in the context of world history.

These were some of the findings about the contents of the world history TEKS, a foundational curricular document used as a basis for textbooks, teaching and teacher training. Considering all the findings, revealing obvious biases, exclusions, and subsequent distortions of world history, this research effort arrived at the following conclusions:

1. TEKS World History Studies is clearly Eurocentric in its approach to world history. The contributions and achievements of many significant non-European civilizations are either minimized or missing.
2. Texas students will have no basis for knowing or understanding the most significant revolutions that occurred in the Third World, including in our own hemisphere, during the last two centuries.
3. Students in Texas, but especially Mexican American students, who represent over 1/3 of our public school population, would have no opportunity outside of the brief Mesoamerican coverage, to learn anything about Mexico, let alone modern Mexico, in the context of world history, despite Mexico's direct relevance to Texas and American history. This parallels the underrepresentation and misrepresentation of Mexico and Mexican Americans in the entire history curriculum in Texas for decades.
4. Texas students will not learn about Third World resistance to European imperialism nor about the historical foundations for many of the global issues that still create destructive tensions today, some of which led up to the September 11 attacks.
5. Students will gain no knowledge of how the U.S. and other Western powers supported dictatorships, toppled democratic governments, and exploited the labor, resources and markets of Third World nations. (Noboa, 1998).

Thus, returning to the specific question that guided this content analysis research effort: *To what extent does the TEKS for world history present an accurate, inclusive and objective overview of "significant*

people, events, and ideas from the earliest time to the present?” The answer is “to a very limited extent.”

2. Anglocentric Curriculum and Mass Media

The other study which served as a contextual antecedent to those comprising this dissertation, focused on the effect Anglocentric curricula and mass media have on Latino students. Entitled, *Growing up Latino in Anglocentric schools: The impact of school and media curricula*, the inquiry was guided by two related research questions. The first question guiding this inquiry was responded to through a review of the relevant literature in the sub-discipline of Educational Anthropology. It asks:

How and to what extent are Latino students' attitudes towards ethnic identity and their responses towards schooling impacted by a predominantly Eurocentric or Anglocentric school curriculum?

The second question guiding this inquiry was based on the recognition that there is a “societal curriculum”, which in concert with to the “school curriculum” exerts an undeniable influence on Latino students, as it does on all students (Cortés, 1997). Thus, in order to provide a wider context from which to consider the primary question, a secondary question was also formulated:

What kinds of images and messages about Latinos are Latino students, and the general American public, being exposed to through English language television and major films?

These two questions, though seemingly distinct and involving different disciplines, are interrelated in significant ways. Most notably, the societal curriculum as expressed in the most powerful media of television and films provides the cultural and informational context in which schooling takes place for all students. If the media messages provide negative images and stereotypes of Latinos, schools become the only other institutional source, outside the home and the community, which could either support or contradict the misinformation Latino students receive about themselves as a group.

The bulk of literature reviewed in this inquiry was focused on the primary question while the secondary question involved fewer sources, mainly from the growing literature on Latino media studies. Nevertheless, this secondary question will help frame the school experience of Latinos in the wider context of the most powerful mass media they consume outside of school. So we will begin there.

It is not enough to consider the “home” or “community” culture when discussing the transcultural implications of schooling for Latino students. Like all others, Latino students are media consumers of music, film, magazines, and television, and as such are profoundly influenced by this mass media in multiple ways. One of those ways, is how they view and think about diversity (Cortés, 2000).

Whatever that media tells them about who they are, and whatever aspects of that media culture they have internalized, Latino students bring to school along with their home language and culture.

In a national survey conducted in March, 1998, Children Now asked questions about television viewing by children of four ethnoracial groups, especially as it related to perceptions of race and class broadcast on TV (Children Now, 1998). The four groups were: African Americans, Euroamericans, Asians and Latinos. Several findings regarding television viewing in connection with race in general and Latinos specifically, are interesting and relevant, especially the last one listed here:

- Children of all races watch a great deal of television including a wide variety of different kinds of programs.
- 71% of White Children see people of their race 'very often' on television compared to 42% of African American children, 22% of Latino children and 16% of Asian children.
- Across all races, children are more likely to associate positive characteristics with White characters and negative characteristics with minority characters.
- Children have great faith in media's power and its potential. Over 80% of children of every race believe that media can teach children "that people of their race are important."
- All races agree that Latinos are the most likely to be portrayed negatively on entertainment programs (ibid).

A 1997 study by the National Council of La Raza (NCLR), one of the premier and largest national Latino civil rights organization, arrived at the following two conclusions:

- Hispanics are almost invisible in both the entertainment and mass media
- When Hispanics do appear, they are consistently and uniformly portrayed more negatively than other race and ethnic groups. (National Council of La Raza, 1997).

The “Watching America” study on thirty years of television (from 1955 to 1986) by the Center for Media and Public Affairs revealed much about Hispanic representation on TV:

- Hispanics have remained at only about 2%, going from bad in 1950’s at 3%, to even worse in the late 1980’s to a mere 1%.
- During 1955--86 period: 11% of White characters were criminals, only 7% of Black characters were, but 22% of Latino characters were thus portrayed.
- In fact, “despite being outnumbered three to one, Hispanic characters have committed more violent crimes than Blacks’ on television (NCLR, 1997).

Another NCLR study of fictional programming for the 1992-93 TV season revealed that:

- Black representation nearly tripled from 6% in 1955-->86 to 17% in 1992-->93.
- Hispanic representation dropped from 2% to 1%. (Thus by the 92-93, there were 17 Black TV characters for every one Latino)
- Latinos were twice as likely as Whites and three times as likely as Blacks to be portrayed in negative roles (Latinos=18%; Whites=8%, and Blacks=6%) (ibid).

Some of the most prevalent media stereotypes about Latinos as TV characters were identified through several studies by NCLR. Too often Latinos are portrayed as:

- low SES, very poor, and/or lazy
- failures, or characters who experience lack of success
- people who do not have to be taken seriously
- untrustworthy, “deceivers or tricksters” (ibid)

The impact this media have on Latino students could not be ignored, although it is probably difficult to measure without further study precisely how these media distortions impact these students' sense of self-esteem, ethnic identity, and personal motivation. However, given the well documented misrepresentation of Latinos in the most powerful mass media, the primary question gains even more importance, and it becomes even more imperative to determine what happens to Latinos students' self concept and interest in schooling when the curriculum excludes them or provides only token attention.

Again, this question was:

How and to what extent are Latino students' attitudes towards ethnic identity and their responses towards schooling impacted by a predominantly Eurocentric or Anglocentric school curriculum?

This question was primarily answered from the literature in educational anthropology. The following collected statements are a set of observations and conclusions made by educational anthropologists based on extensive fieldwork in specific schools and communities.

Patthey-Chavez collected ethnographic data in a Los Angeles high school from 1986-1989. The school demographics were 80% Latino student population; with a predominantly Anglo teaching staff.

Among the revealing discoveries she made about the cultural clashes occurring at that school is the following:

“.....the high school is an arena in which the boundary between Latino and Anglo culture is being negotiated, with “minority” and “majority” in conflict over the extent to which their versions of a cultural identity are to be reproduced in the American educational system.” (Patthey-Chavez, 1993, 33).

With the exception of one Cinco de Mayo celebration organized by a Chicano counselor, all the extracurricular activities in the school had, according to Patthey-Chavez, a “distinct American flavor.” Trophies were proudly displayed for track and football, but the school did not focus resources on their soccer team and never “got its soccer coaching together” despite the fact that the team had some virtuoso players, and was of high interest to Latino students (ibid, 51).

Patthey-Chavez observed that the school personnel operated in a “semiotic bubble” they worked hard to maintain every day. This bubble kept them separated and shielded from the predominantly Latino community surrounding the high school. She describes teachers as having a singular cultural mission: “to preserve and inculcate an American identity through the practices of an all-American high school.” When the faculty’s Americanization agenda conflicted too greatly with that of its students, the students would either “pull back in silence, refuse to ratify it, or even push it out through disruptive behavior.” (ibid, 54)

This reliance on mainstreaming socialization practices are likely to cause, according to Patthey-Chavez, increased conflict with students who “simply accepted that their teachers came from a different universe.” As a result students become more apathetic towards both academic and extracurricular activities of the school.

Thus, in the face of an Anglo-Americanizing cultural mission, many Latino students either withdrew or acted out, neither response being constructive nor conducive to academic achievement. The administration

and teachers evidently were not aware of or sensitive to the source of the problem; or perhaps did not have the knowledge and skills to help Latino students cope successfully with these cultural contradictions and discontinuities.

Margaret Gibson also discusses how many Latino students resist school authority as a way of maintaining their ethnic identity in response to the acculturation pressures within the schools.

“Schools today, as in the past, convey to minority youngsters that to be successful in school and to be ‘true Americans’ they must give up their minority identities....The point I wish to emphasize is....the perception on the part of many minority children that school learning is associated with acculturation and, in turn, that acquisition of cultural competencies in the ways of the majority group means, ultimately, the loss of their distinctive ethnic and cultural identities. Hence, to maintain their identity many minority youngsters believe that they must resist school authority.”
(Gibson, 1989, 130-1)

However, Gibson discovered as well that some Latino and minority students did achieve within the academic environment by pursuing the bilingual- bicultural strategy of what she labels “acculturation without assimilation”:

By way of contrast, at least some of the minority students who do well in school, both immigrant and nonimmigrant, pursue a strategy that I have labeled *acculturation without assimilation*. They see acquisition of skills in the majority-group language and culture in an *additive* rather than a *subtractive* fashion, leading not to a rejection of their minority-group identity but to a successful participation in both mainstream and minority worlds.” (ibid, 131)

In the context of a discussion about achievement motivation among Hispanic immigrant students, Suarez-Orozco also discusses assimilative pressures and critiqued some theoretical models of cultural discontinuity used to explain school failure among Latinos:

“....in the case of the Hispanic American it has been argued simplistically that a somehow asphyxiating cultural matrix orienting individuals heavily to the family is responsible for crippling achievement motivation....Such reasoning typically leads to variants of an ‘assimilative’ genre, where cultural diversities are eventually truncated. Rodriquez’ tale is one such version (Rodriquez, 1982). Achievement in his case was only possible at the expense of turning away from his family and his community. The price of his achievement was a severe sense of alienation from his group....” (Suarez-Orozco, 1989, 113).

Like Gibson, Suarez-Orozco also observed that some Latino students, more specifically Central American youth, had found ways to succeed in academics while maintaining a firm ethnic identity in the context of family and community:

“.....the kind of radical acculturation advocated by Richard Rodriquez and others as required for motivation and school success is not the only alternative. Some Central American youth, among who I worked, became very successful in the Anglo-American idiom without having to give up their ethnic identity....On the contrary, their dreams and deeds were embedded in a socio-cultural matrix of family and community cooperation, affiliation and mutual nurturance.” (ibid, 114)

While the very existence of some Latino students who develop a bicultural and bilingual strategy for success is encouraging, the fact remains that the vast majority of them have difficulty, given the Anglocentric pressures and curriculum, to make this strategy work for

them. The high drop out rates of Latinos students, the relatively few who complete a college education, and the cultural alienation of many of those who do achieve academically, are all indicators of the underlying cultural discontinuities between educational institutions and Latino students.

The fact that the mass media also does a dismal job of representing Latinos objectively or realistically, if at all, creates an overall cultural climate that places an undue burden on the Latino families and communities to provide historical and cultural context for their children and youth. Given the social and economic challenges already facing these communities and families, few resources are left to deal with anything but issues of survival, safety, and security. Therefore, few Latino students are able to access the resources necessary to gain, develop and maintain a healthy and productive ethnic self concept.

If the mass media consistently portrays Latinos rarely or negatively, then one of the few arenas for Latino students to obtain objective, authentic, detailed information about who they are as a people is in school. Unfortunately, most schools are evidently not up to this task.

The methods employed in both of these studies, namely content analyses, targeted literature reviews, and some participant observation, provided good opportunities for this researcher to refine these approaches which would later be used in the mixed methods combined within the dissertation investigations.

These two studies also helped provide this researcher with a wider environmental context for understanding the role of the mass media and the school curriculum in the representation of Latinos. They also provided a deeper sociological understanding as to why it is important for schools to become not only more multicultural in their practice, but to also pay increased attention to how the largest minority group in America is being taught about in the curriculum.

C. APPLICABLE AND RELEVANT THEORY

There are two theoretical foundations for understanding the overall issues and topics explored through this dissertation's investigation. One is the collection of ideas and concepts which define multicultural education, some of which were described above in the *Background of the Problem* section.

The other relevant theoretical foundation is critical race theory, specifically those premises which address the distinctions which characterize the varied experiences of different ethnic and racial groups in America. Critical race theory holds that although there are some commonalities of experience and struggle between, for example, African Americans and Latinos in America, each group has a distinct history and separate set of concerns vis a vis the Anglo power structure.

1. Multicultural Education: Four Approach Theory

Beginning with the concepts of multicultural education, the results or findings of this investigation could be interpreted in the context of how, and to what extent the teaching of U.S. history in Texas has been influenced by and has responded to the presence of Latinos and other minorities in the student body and the body politic of the state.

One very useful concept, expressed by one of the founders of the multicultural education movement, James A. Banks, is that of the four approaches to curriculum transformation used by educators in response to the realities of growing cultural diversity in the schools.

These four approaches are conceived by Banks as actually being four levels, each one more effective than the last, with the fourth representing the highest and most transformative approach to integrating cultural content into the school or university curriculum.

These are:

1. Contributions Approach

Focuses on heroes, holidays, and discrete cultural elements

2. Additive Approach

Content, concepts, themes, and perspectives are added to the curriculum without changing its structure.

3. Transformation Approach

The structure of the curriculum is changed to enable students to view concepts, issues, events, and themes from the perspective of diverse ethnic and cultural groups.

4. Social Action Approach

Students make decisions on important social issues and take actions to help solve them. (Banks, 1999, 31)

This concept of different levels of approaches to cultural content integration could be quite useful to this investigation given that the content analyses of the TEKS, the textbooks, the textbook testimonies, and the teachers' self-described classroom practices, could each be characterized as representing one approach, or a combination of these.

This will help provide a basis for further analyses and comparisons across each of these key aspects of the U.S. history curriculum. For example, the data could reveal that although teachers may be inclined to use a Transformation Approach, the TEKS guidelines or the textbooks could be written using an Additive or a Contributions Approach.

2. Critical Race Theory

The other relevant theoretical concepts come from the field of critical race theory (CRT), which according to Delgado and Stefancic is a movement consisting of:

....a collection of activists and scholars interested in studying and transforming the relationship among race, racism, and power. The movement considers many of the same issues that conventional civil rights and ethnic studies discourses take up, but places them in a broader perspective that includes economics, history, context, group-and self-interest, and even feelings and the unconscious. (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, 2-3)

There are a several tenets or propositions which most CRT scholars agree upon although there are a considerable variety of beliefs and specific issues which the CRT movement encompasses. Among those are:

1. racism in our society is normal, not an aberration, therefore it is difficult to cure or address
2. our system of white-over-color ascendancy serves important material and psychic purposes
3. race and races are products of social thought and relations, and do not correspond to any significant biological or genetic realities
4. each race or ethnic group has its own origins and ever evolving history, with the dominant society creating shifting images and stereotypes of each group over time and circumstance
5. no person has a single, easily stated unitary identity, but rather has conflicting, overlapping identities, loyalties, and allegiances
6. because of their different histories and experiences with oppression, Black, Latino, Asian, Indian writers and thinkers may communicate to their White counterparts certain matters that they otherwise are unlikely to know (ibid, 6-9)

The first two tenets closely relate to this investigation because they could help explain the motivations and the mechanisms underlying the exclusion process. The fourth tenet, also could help explain the differential representation of Blacks versus Latinos in textbooks as well as in the mass media.

Another useful concept generating considerable controversy both within and outside the CRT movement, but which this researcher has observed and confirmed in consultation with professional colleagues, is

that of the Black-White Binary. It is an unstated paradigm or mindset that limits, frames and effectively distorts our discussion, understanding, and resolution of racial and ethnic issues.

Delgado and Stefancic provide the following clear description of it:

That paradigm, the black-white binary, effectively dictates that nonblack minority groups must compare their treatment to that of African Americans to gain redress. The paradigm holds that one group, blacks, constitutes the prototypical minority group. "Race" means quintessentially, African American. Other groups, such as Asians, Indians, and Latino/as, are minorities only in so far as their experience and treatment can be analogized to that of blacks. (ibid, 67-8).

The implications of this paradigm for the teaching of US history are many. Suffice to point out for now, is given that the experience of discrimination against Latinos as quite distinct from that of Blacks, especially when issues of language and land are concerned, an approach to history that defines oppression and the struggle against it only in Black terms, would clearly ignore or not account for the Latino experience as being distinct, let alone significant enough to include in the curriculum. Civil rights and voting rights are examples of issues common to both Blacks and Latinos, but for Latinos, issues of language, culture, territory, borders, citizenship, and immigration have much greater significance than they do for Blacks.

Latinos have suffered discrimination, for example, on the basis of distinct language and citizenship, which for most African Americans are not even relevant issues. The struggle for equity has taken different forms and strategies for each racial and ethnic group, and it would limit

the scope of any history curriculum to include only those struggles which relate exclusively to the Black experience.

Both these sources of theory, multicultural education and critical race theory, will be employed to help provide perspectives as well as interpretations of the findings generated from this investigation.

III. Methodology

A. THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

As discussed above in the previous chapter, there are two major theoretical perspectives which will be utilized to organize and interpret the various forms of data generated from this combination of studies, namely Multicultural Education and Critical Race Theory.

When considering Multicultural Education in its theoretical aspects, Sleeter and Grant point out that this approach, more than others, has experienced a mixing of theory and ideology that can cause confusion (Sleeter and Grant, 1994).

They clearly define ideology simply as “what ought to be” and contrast that with theory, defined as “why things are as they are, and under what conditions things change in the desired direction (ibid,176). Using as an example the concept of cultural pluralism, one of the two main components of Multicultural Education, Sleeter and Grant demonstrate how it is both an ideological component as well as a theoretical concept.

In its ideological function, cultural pluralism is a belief that has been defined in a variety of ways, nevertheless,

“Although these definitions vary, all suggest that cultural pluralism includes the maintenance of diversity, a respect for differences, and the right to participate actively in all aspects of society without having to give up one’s unique identity.” (ibid, 170)

As a theory, cultural pluralism is one of the two kinds of theories, which according to Sleeter & Grant, support the ideology of Multicultural Education. Basing their discussion on the work of William Newman (1973), they summarize four main theories related to this concept.

Briefly, the four theories are:

1. Assimilation: Over time the values and lifestyles of the minority group are replaced by those of the dominant group.
2. Amalgamation: The melting pot concept whereby all groups are combined and synthesized to become a distinct new group.
3. Classical Cultural Pluralism: Over time, minority groups persist in maintaining their values and lifestyles.
4. Modified Cultural Pluralism: Minority groups will assimilate into the dominant group, but the degree of assimilation will vary, and some will continue to retain unique cultural characteristics.
(Sleeter & Grant, 1994, 176--80).

As each is considered the authors explain that the first theory, Assimilation is obviously inaccurate, because distinct groups still exist and continue to differentiate themselves from the dominant group. Amalgamation has not occurred yet either, and the Classical Cultural Pluralism, though a better model than the first two, still does not account for the fact that considerable assimilation has and still does occur.

Thus, they conclude that Newman's Modified Cultural Pluralism model is the best of the four theories; it more accurately explaining the realities of minority-majority dynamics in this nation over time.

This is directly relevant to this investigation because it provides a convenient method of measuring and comparing how the curriculum,

more specifically the guidelines, textbooks, and teaching of U.S. history conforms to one or two of these models. It is significant to determine whether the overall teaching of U.S. history promotes assimilation, amalgamation or any of the two forms of cultural pluralism.

In addition to these theoretical multicultural models about group dynamics, also of relevance to this investigation are what James Banks describes as the five “Dimensions of Multicultural Education.” One dimension of particular significance to this effort is “Content Integration,” defined thus:

“....the extent to which teachers use examples, data, and information from a variety of cultures and groups to illustrate the key concepts, principles, generalizations, and theories in their subject area or discipline.”
(Banks, 1999, 14-15)

While characterizing this as a “narrow conception of multicultural education,” and that too often multicultural education is viewed only as content integration, Banks does clarify that this dimension has more relevance to social studies and language arts than to math or physics.

Among the concepts we may use to analyze the data gathered from this investigation, will be precisely this “Content Integration” dimension of multicultural education, keeping in mind that this dimension by itself, not a full indicator of how multiculturally students are being taught.

Finally, the last theoretical concept from multicultural education to be used in our analysis is that of the four approaches to multicultural education as described in the previous chapter, and defined by Banks (Ibid, 30-32). Our intent is to note at which of the four levels instruction

is being imparted by textbooks, curriculum guidelines and classroom teaching.

In addition to multicultural education, there are a few key concepts from Critical Race Theory with significant relevance to educational issues in general, and specifically to our investigation.

One such concept is that of the “master script.” Critical race theory views the “official school curriculum” as an artifact designed to “maintain a White supremacist master script.” (Ladson-Billings, 1999, 21)

She quotes Swartz (1992) for a precise description of how “master scripting” functions:

“Master scripting silences multiple voices and perspectives, primarily legitimizing dominant, white, upper-class, male voicings as the “standard” knowledge students need to know. All other accounts and perspectives are omitted from the master script unless they can be disempowered through misrepresentation. (Swartz, 1992, 341)

In the context of our investigation, I will try to ascertain the extent to which data from the specific vehicles for knowledge transmission, namely the TEKS curriculum guidelines, the adopted textbooks, and classroom teaching, are “master scripted” to exclude or misrepresent minorities, most particularly Latinos.

Taken together, this collection of theoretical concepts from Multicultural Education and Critical Race Theory, will provide us with a theoretical tool kit with which to better organize, understand and interpret the data gathered from these studies.

B. OVERVIEW AND SOURCES OF VALIDITY

Described below are the methodologies used in each of the four component studies, each of which focused on a specific area of study. These four areas are: TEKS, Textbooks, Textbook Testimony, and Teachers' Perspectives & Preferences. Included within each description is a brief discussion of design, data collection, data analysis, and also participants when applicable. For a complete discussion and analysis of the data itself and its implications, please refer to *Chapter IV, Data from TEKS, Textbooks and Testimony*, and *Chapter V, Data on Teachers' Perspectives & Preferences*.

Before describing methods used for each area of study, there are several points regarding validity which should be clarified. There will be two major sources of validity for all of these studies; they revolve around the specific procedures used to gather data for each study as well as the results of the data itself.

The procedures affect validity in the sense that certain steps were taken and instruments were used that are sound and that are described in sufficient detail so as to be replicated by another investigator. In the case of TEKS, textbooks, and the textbook testimony, these documents are readily available, and if their content is approached and analyzed in a manner similar to what we utilized, we are confident that the resulting data will also be comparable if not identical to that which we generated.

For both the individual interviews and focus groups, the procedures and instruments are also, in my opinion, sound. Naturally,

given the nature of our participation selection process, the resulting data may vary, especially in terms of participants' preferences, but I expect that overall the influence of certain structural factors and the relative underrepresentation of minorities, especially Latinos, from the classroom's historical narrative, will be confirmed regardless of the specific participants.

This confirmation of data is the other source of validity; it derives from the data itself and is related to the degree to which the data from content analyses of different key documents (TEKS, textbooks, course content checklists) demonstrate similar patterns of Latino and minority exclusion when compared to each other. This case for triangulation is also strengthened when the public testimony on textbooks as well as the views of U.S. history teachers in both the individual and focus group interviews, concur or agree on some fundamental issues regarding textbook representations and the influential role of TEKS, TAKS testing, or time restrictions.

Any other issues of validity specific to the particular method will be discussed below whenever appropriate within the related area of study.

C. TEXAS ESSENTIAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS (TEKS)

The ultimate goal of this study was to review and document the representation of Latinos in the TEKS for U.S. history (USHTEKS) at both the high school and middle school level. Another objective is to compare

and contrast this representation with that of African Americans and American Indians. In Texas, the first part of U.S. history (before 1877) is taught in 8th grade and second part is taught in the Junior year of high school.

For this content analysis investigation, we used a system based on four levels, each labeled with a key word, to identify the significance and specificity of that representation and make comparisons among the three groups targeted:

Level 1: Individual. The specific name of an individual is mentioned, i.e., Martin Luther King, César Chávez, Sagajewea.

Level 2: Group. The group is specified by name, i.e., Cherokee or Native Americans

Level 3: Event. An event, issue, concept is included which implies presence of a group, i.e., Mexican American War, Emancipation Proclamation, Trail of Tears.

Level 4: Category. The group is implied categorically by some generic term, i.e. “racial minority groups” or “immigrants”

In this context, Latino or Hispanic was used interchangeably and refer to persons of Spanish or Latin American descent. Terms such as Mexican American, Cuban, Puerto Rican, will be used to designate specific national origins whenever appropriate, and will be noted when observed in the TEKS.

There are a total of 32 knowledge and skills areas (KSA) in the first part of U.S. history, and 26 in the second. The 32 KSAs for the first part of U.S. history, are distributed thus: history-9; geography-3; economics-

3; government-4; citizenship-4; culture-4; science, technology and society-2; and social studies skills-3.

For the second part, the 26 KSAs are: history-7; geography-4; economics-3; government-3; citizenship-2; culture-2; science, technology and society-2; and social studies skills-3. (TEA, 1997b, September)

Not every KSA was relevant to the specific goals of this inquiry; thus our discussion will be limited to those in which there is mention of any item associated with either of the three target groups. Despite the critical approach of this inquiry, the TEKS is overall a well organized system of scope and sequence which provides an excellent framework for social studies. This review will focus on the content of the TEKS and only make reference to its structure when it serves to restrict or define the content.

By way of procedure, the entire content of USHTEKS at both levels were reviewed and wherever there was mention of any individual, group, event, date or concept related to the Latino or Hispanic experience the entry was noted, counted and categorized. The same search was conducted for African American and American Indian as well.

The count was then tallied for all four levels and three groups. The results for the TEKS for U.S. history, Part I, (through Reconstruction) was shown on Table 1, Part II was likewise shown on Table 2, and finally both counts are combined in Table 3; please refer to Appendix TEKS to view all three tables.

In addition to the count itself, each instance or item that mentioned either of the three groups at whichever level, was specifically

identified and discussed as part of the final data analysis. Please refer to Chapter IV. A. Latinos in the TEKS for a full discussion of the data and its implications.

D. TEXTBOOKS

1. Data Gathering

Three of the six U.S. History textbooks adopted by TEA and in current use for high school were reviewed for their Latino representation in this content analysis study. The ScottForesman text was selected in particular, because it was the officially adopted textbook by Northside ISD, thus the text being used by the sixteen teachers I interviewed. The other two texts were selected because they were also published by major, well-established national textbook companies, and would appropriately serve as comparables. The three reviewed textbooks are:

They are:

1. The Story of America Vol. 2: 1865 to the Present. by John A. Garraty. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Austin: TX, 1992.
2. American Journey: The Quest for Liberty Since 1865. by J.W. Davidson, M.H. Lytle, and M.B. Stoff. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs: NJ, 1992.
3. American Voices: A History of the United States, Volume II: 1865 to the Present. by Carol Berkin, et al. ScottForesman, Glenview: IL, 1992.

Since both quantitative and qualitative data will be gathered from each text, the use of Garcia's (1980) model is well suited for the task.

Following Garcia's approach, the quantitative data consists of counting the number of sentences in the textbook with content relating to each of the three largest national origin Latino groups in the U.S., namely, Mexican-American, Puerto Rican, or Cuban-American. A fourth category of Hispanic (Latino) would be used for sentences relating to Hispanic Americans as a general group and/or of other Latin American nationalities.

These sentences will also be categorized by the type of content they cover. There are seven general topics in Garcia's system, and each sentence will be categorized according to the extent to which they:

1. describe why each group immigrated to the U.S.
2. describe when each group immigrated and where initial contacts began.
3. give a historical perspective to the problems and accomplishments associated with each group.
4. describe key events and issues which are crucial in gaining an understanding of the group.
5. provide content that notes each group's shared and unique characteristics and experiences.
6. include descriptions of leaders and their contributions to the American scene.
7. include content describing other experiences of the group.
(Garcia, 109)

By identifying topical categories for these Latino-related sentences, Garcia establishes a quantitative foundation which could help guide the qualitative assessment of the content describing each Latino group.

It's important to note that in this textbook content analysis sentences that serve as captions to paintings, illustrations, tables, etc. are included in the total number of sentences counted as are direct quotations from leaders or from literary sources not part of the main narrative. Also note that some texts may contain sentences, pages and entire sections directly discussing Mexico, Cuba, Panama, and/or other Latin American nations, or Latin America as a region. These are not included in the sentence count above, although it would be a worthy task for future research. This effort is focused on the presence of Latinos living in the United States.

The quantitative data will be displayed on a table indicating the number of sentences categorized by topic and by national origin group. Thus, each textbook will have a unique quantitative profile based on the number of sentences it contains related to Latinos also broken down by specific group and topic. Those topics and groups receiving the most and least attention could then be determined and compared among the various textbooks.

The very identification of Hispanic-related material is a task in itself and requires several steps to ensure it is adequately done. Garcia suggested a procedure for doing this that can be summarized as follows:

1. Turn to the index of each text, note pages listed under each target group, review these pages, and identify the content.
2. By skimming the text, identify and review non-indexed pages that describe each group, and classify them.
3. Review all identified data and match it with appropriate question.

4. Classify under the general group “Hispanic” all sentences which describe more than one of the three groups (Garcia, 110).

I added an additional step between Garcia’s step 1 and 2, which would be to look in the index for events, organizations, concepts or any other item which related to the experience of Latinos as a whole or any of the three national origin groups. These, of course, would then be reviewed, categorized, and included with all the other sentences.

2. Data Analysis

Quantitative: The amount of content, specifically the number of sentences, for each of the seven topical categories of information, will be noted. Special attention will be focused on those areas which receive the most or the least attention. Also analyzed was how the quantity of content is distributed among the four target groups, as well as whether there are differential distributions of content among the seven questions for each group. This will permit me to determine, for example, if coverage of the three groups differs widely in the amount of content used to describe when, how and why they immigrated to the United States.

Qualitative: The qualitative analysis, though not exactly replicating Garcia, is consistent with his approach. For this study I will note the extent to which individual sentences or entire paragraphs, pages or sections, meet the following five criteria:

1. Factual accuracy
2. Inclusion of key leaders, dates, events, issues, contributions
3. Presentation of Hispanic views or perspectives

4. Agency attributed to Hispanic leaders, organizations, or people.
5. Connections made between past & present.

Although the very nature of the information expressed in these sentences may make some criteria more or less relevant, at least one of the five criteria will provide an appropriate basis for an assessment of quality. Also, every sentence or group of sentences in a paragraph or page, could actually reflect two or more of these criteria, making these more meaningful to the authentic and complete telling of Latino history in the U.S. Conversely, some sentences may meet none of these criteria.

It is important to emphasize that both quantity and quality have value in assessing how well these U.S. history textbooks cover the presence, experience and contributions of Latinos. While no formula will be devised for balancing or integrating quantitative and qualitative aspects of each textbook, both will be noted, described and discussed, and a final assessment will consider both the number of sentences as well as their level of quality.

3. Method of Presentation

This report will include information on each of the textbooks reviewed and an overall assessment as to how accurately and objectively each textbook covers Latino content. The discussion on qualitative content and analysis will be presented using the five thematic criteria, and noting how well each of the sentences or groups of sentences fulfill these.

The quantitative content will be presented in table form, similar to the format used by Garcia. The following is a sample excerpt from a larger table which shows how this data will be presented for one textbook and three topics. The figures represent the number of sentences for each topic and group, with H=Hispanic/Latino, MA=Mexican American, PR=Puerto Rican, and CA=Cuban American. Notice that subtotals by topic and by group could thus be calculated and compared across the three textbooks.

Table of Sentences for Textbook A

	H	MA	PR	CA	Subtotals
Topic #1	7	11	5	4	27
Topic #2	5	3	2	0	10
Topic #3	7	9	4	3	23
ETC.....					
Subtotals	19+	23+	11+	7+	60+

This study could provide a basis for making concrete suggestions for enhancing, supplementing, or correcting the information about Latinos that millions of American children and youth will be obtaining from U.S. history textbooks for decades to come.

4. A Contrast Comparison Study

In addition to these three textbooks I also reviewed two high school textbooks currently up for adoption. It consisted of a contrast-comparison of textbooks by two of the same publishers whose earlier texts I had already reviewed, namely Holt R&W and Prentice Hall. I presented testimony on the results of this brief study before the State Board of Education in Austin, TX on September 11, 2002.

The two textbooks are:

Boyer, Paul & Stuckey, Sterling. (2003). The American nation, Austin, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Cayton, Perry, Reed & Winkler. (2003). America: Pathways to the Present. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

This was not as thorough an analysis as was the above detailed review of the three textbooks. The purposes of this study was simply to compare and contrast in the most general way, how each textbook represents Latinos.

Thus the steps were:

1. From chapter headings in the table of contents, do targeted reading of sections which would likely include information about Latinos.
2. Look at the index for terms such as Latino, Hispanic, Mexican American, Puerto Rico, Chicano, etc. and read these sections as well.
3. Review all other chapters and sections of the text to ensure that any Latino related text or graphics have been identified.

4. For each event, individual, concept, etc. noted in the text, document the specific item by name and note it's length.
5. Consider the accuracy, objectivity, and overall quality of each item.
6. Compare and contrast the quantity and quality of the data presented related to Latino/Hispanic topics by each textbook.

Once the data was collected and comparisons made, then a written report was prepared which emphasized the most salient characteristics of each text regarding its Latino representation, and made specific comparisons between both on that regard. This report was then presented orally and typed copies were also distributed to SBOE members present that day. Please refer to *Chapter IV. B. Latinos in U.S. History Textbooks* for a full discussion of the data from all five textbooks reviewed.

E. TEXTBOOK TESTIMONY

Like the TEKS and the textbook analyses above, this is also primarily a content analysis study. However, due to the nature of the data, namely oral and written testimony, the investigative task consisted of identifying topics or themes related to the representation of Latinos in U.S. history textbooks being considered for official adoption by the state of Texas.

This component study was significant in that it focused on the public testimony process, one of the most powerful influences on

decisions regarding textbook adoption in Texas, as in California and other states. It is as much a political as it is a pedagogical arena for competing world views as to what constitutes accuracy and comprehensiveness in textbooks for history and social studies. Therefore, to look at what is said about Latino representation facilitates a better understanding of the political context in which decisions about textbook adoption are made.

Testimony, in both oral and written form, were presented in several dates from July through September, 2002. The oral hearings were held in Austin and were conducted in a public forum with the State Board of Education (SBOE) members as formal recipients of the testimony. As such, board members were free to ask questions and they did so quite often, making comments as well, in response to the testimony brought forward. This gave speakers additional time beyond the allotted three minute maximum, to further clarify and extend their arguments.

The procedure for this study was to identify one date, in this case, July 17, 2002, review the oral testimony for that day, noting who made any remarks related to the Hispanic, Latino, Mexican, Mexican American experience, and also identify the specific theme or topic being addressed.

In addition to the speaker and the topic, we also noted for each Latino related item, whether the particular issue had to do with either of three types of critiques or a combination thereof.

From previous experience as a participant and from having reviewed other testimony, we noticed that there are at least three basic types of critiques made in these hearings, which we conveniently label

the “ABCs” of textbook criticism. These served as a useful criteria for our categorizing of the many critiques presented, with the clear understanding that some testimony may include two or all three of these.

The three types of critiques are:

Accuracy: the content is incorrect as a matter of fact in terms of dates, names, the actual occurrence of events, or other knowledge

Bias: the content expresses a partisan, political, religious or ideological perspective, usually to the exclusion of other views

Content: there is significant content missing or present which results in inaccuracy, bias and/or misrepresentation of historical facts

Keeping these three types of critiques in mind, we reviewed both the oral and written testimony related to Latino/Hispanic concerns, and determined how many of each type were presented.

In order to facilitate in the task of identifying speakers, themes, and types of critiques, we developed a “Checklist of Critiques by Type, Theme and Speaker” and utilized a separate one for the oral and written testimonies presented in July, 2002. Please refer to Appendix CoC to see the checklist instrument.

Under the “Who” column, not only was the speaker’s name and affiliation noted but we also used key letters to indicate whether the speaker was a P=professor, S=student, T=teacher, R= representing an organization, and C=private citizen, not openly affiliated.

Finally, in addition to the content analyses of both oral and written testimony, I also took the opportunity of providing testimony on September 11, 2002, and also on that date, submitted copies of my full

testimony to the members of the State Board of Education (SBOE). The testimony was concerning a contrast and comparison I had made in terms of the Latino content of two U. S. history textbooks up for adoption.

My testimony regarding these textbooks used specific examples from both texts to illustrate my findings that one textbook was superior to the other in the quality and quantity of its Latino representation. I also indicated in my testimony some of the key features that distinguish adequate from inadequate textbook coverage of Latinos.

Please refer to *Chapter IV.B. Latinos in U.S. History Textbooks* for a full discussion of this and other textbook analyses.

I also made critical statements about the absence of Latinos, Hispanic, Mexican, or any such term, in the entire TEKS for U.S. history.

The testimony I provided was based on my own research studies, and was presented deliberately to become part of the official public record of Texas, given the relevance of the findings to Latinos in history textbooks. The presentation of findings at that time was also motivated by the fact that it had been almost a decade since there were public hearings on U.S. history textbooks and at least seven years will pass before that opportunity would come again.

Being a participant in the process, and being involved in testimony provided insight not only into the process, but also into the personalities, organizations, themes, issues and agendas being explicitly or implicitly expressed on that day. It was a mini-participant observation approach

which did yield much valuable information not available from even a detailed review of the oral and written testimony.

I also had the opportunity of meeting other Latinos also engaged with this process, including professors, university students, and private citizens, who presented varied types of critiques, and even brought guest speakers, including a Mexican American veteran in a wheelchair, to emphasize their arguments in favor of Latino inclusion. We also took time to familiarize each other with our work in this and related areas, and to discuss strategies for networking and continued advocacy.

Thus, providing testimony combined elements of participant observation with action research in the sense that in addition to participating in the textbook adoption process and observing it from the inside, I also made an effort to effect some eventual change in policy by connecting with colleagues and joining their voices in speaking directly to the primary source of decision making power in Texas education, the State Board of Education.

In terms of accessing documents for this study, the Texas Education Agency made available through its web site a full transcript of the oral testimony presented on all three days in which they occurred. I was also able to obtain a copy of the written testimony associated with the July 17 hearing by sending a written request for this printed material. These were the two main documents used in this study, and the results of the content analyses from both were collected, tallied, compared and discussed.

F. TEACHERS' PERSPECTIVES & PREFERENCES

There were three methods used in this study of the perspectives, preferences and practices of selected U.S. history teachers---1) individual interviews, 2) a focus group, and 3) a checklist survey. All participants were from the Northside Independent School District, the largest in the San Antonio metropolitan area, and one in which over 50% of the students are Latinos, mostly Mexican Americans.

Individual Interviews were used with twelve middle and high school U.S. history teachers. A focus group session was held with four other teachers later. Before each interview or the focus group session, each of the sixteen participants filled out a course content checklist of specific historical items they covered always, sometimes or never in their course. Methods for each of the three components will be described below.

1. Individual Interviews

Purpose and Problem Statements

The purpose of this investigation was to examine the beliefs and perceptions selected U.S. History teachers have regarding the content of their courses. Also examined will be some of the factors which impact this content, and how these relate to teachers' content choices. Special attention was focused as well on the extent to which, and the context in which, participants mention women, minorities, and especially Latinos (or

Hispanics, Mexican-Americans, etc.) regarding their presence in the curriculum.

From the above, three problem statements could be formulated thus:

1) What are the content choices made by these U.S. history teachers?

2) Are these choices influenced by their own beliefs and/or by external factors over which they have little or no control?

3) How do these teachers regard the presence of women, minorities, and especially Latinos in the curriculum content?

Methods & Instruments, Participants & Entry

A series of audio-taped interviews were conducted, supplemented by written notes. Participants were 12 United States history teachers from both genders and three ethnoracial groups, all with varied length and type of experience. They included teachers instructing the first part of U.S. history (to Reconstruction) at the 8th grade, and those teaching the second part in high school.

All were from the same large public school district in San Antonio, Texas, a district encompassing both urban and suburban communities, with a racially and economically diverse student body that contains over 50% Mexican American students.

Most participants were interviewed individually in a private room on their campus usually after school or during their planning period. One was interviewed at her home. Each signed a standard consent form

which, among other things, explained the purpose of the study and clarified their role and rights as participants.

A set of 21 initial questions were used with most participants and additional follow-up questions were individualized to probe further into relevant topics (see Appendix IQ).

These questions related to four general areas: Experience and Background (years of experience and subjects taught); Structural Conditions (administrative support, textbooks, standards, testing); Content Choices (content preferences and issues); and Ultimate Goals (personal satisfaction, what students gain, why teach history).

Entry to district and access to participants was not difficult. This was partly facilitated by the fact that I serve as a Clinical Supervisor for student teachers placed in this district for six years. After permission was secured from the district's administrative office, the district social studies supervisor sent out a brief memo to all campus social studies coordinators informing them of my investigation. I then made follow up calls to these coordinators and arranged to call and/or e-mail potential participants they identified as current or recent U.S. history teachers.

Working Hypotheses & Data Analysis

Audiotapes, checklists, and notes were reviewed, relevant data was organized and labeled, and specific findings were extracted and documented for analysis and reflection.

Much of this study is exploratory and therefore, no precise hypotheses were being tested, especially given the small sample size.

Nevertheless, at least three working hypotheses were posed regarding teachers perceptions of the structural conditions which affect their choice of content. These are:

1. Most participants will perceive that there is more content to be taught than what time and circumstance permit them to teach.
2. At least 1/3 of participants will identify specific eras, events or individuals of special interest to them which circumstances do not permit them to teach about well.
3. At least 1/2 of the participants will mention perceived problems or deficiencies with either the TAAS test (Texas Assessment of Academic Achievement), the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), and/or the adopted textbook.

The analysis of data from each interview was approached in five ways:

1. The three hypotheses will be compared to findings.
2. The general pattern of responses to selected questions by all participants will be noted.
3. The extent to which participants mention women and minorities
4. The extent to which Latinos are mentioned.
5. The correlation four participant variables (gender, ethno-race, grade level, experience) have on selected participant responses.

Please refer to *Chapter V.A Individual Interviews* for a complete report and analysis of the findings.

2. Focus Group

The primary purpose of this study was to comprehend more completely, the factors that most influence the content choices made by U.S. History teachers in Texas. Four other closely related routes of investigation will also be pursued in this study: a) to identify the individuals, groups, eras, events, and movements to which teachers dedicate the most time and effort in their course, b) to determine the extent to which racial and ethnic minorities are integral to the historical narrative teachers cover, c) to measure the relative presence of Latino/Hispanic people and events in the historical landscape teachers present, and d) to identify the factors which influence the integration of minorities, and the resources and strategies teachers utilize to do so.

Ultimately, this study is partly a response to the need for understanding how U.S. history teachers engage with the content of their courses, and how these decisions affect the coverage of ethnic and racial minorities, especially Latinos.

Research Questions

The main research question guiding this study was:

How do structural and environmental factors influence the extent to which secondary U.S. History teachers in Texas integrate Latinos and other racial/ethnic minorities into the historical narrative taught in the classroom?

Several sub-questions were also pursued from the data:

Sub-question A:

What factors do teachers feel serve to facilitate or frustrate their ability to fully integrate racial and ethnic minorities in their curriculum?

Sub-questions B:

To what extent do history teachers regard Latinos/Hispanics as significant to the historical narrative they present?

- a. How much time do they spend on Latino topics?*
- b. What Latino individuals, groups and related events do they cover?*
- c. Why do they value this inclusion or not?*
- d. Do they feel they are doing an adequate job?*

Sub-questions C:

To what extent do teachers believe in the importance of integrating racial and ethnic minorities into the content they cover?

- a. Why do they value this or not?*
- b. Do they feel they are doing an adequate job?*

We may not be able to answer each question completely if at all from the data generated, for this reason, special attention was focused on the wording of the questions and the intent to do follow-up questions in order to cover all the identified topics.

Design

To answer these questions, data was gathered by means of one or two focus groups each consisting of 4 to 8 U.S. History teachers of various backgrounds from the Northside ISD in San Antonio, Texas.

Focus groups offer certain advantages which could enhance the qualitative value of the data generated. In addition to simply finding responses to the research questions, this study will also attempt to understand where there is consensus versus controversy, if any, among

history teachers regarding critical factors which impact on their instructional content and approach.

Using focus groups also allowed for interaction among participants and thus stimulate the flow of ideas, opinions, and perspectives in a friendly, collegial setting. In comparing focus groups to individual interviews, Madriz (2000) states that, "...the clear advantage of focus groups is that they make it possible for researchers to observe the interactive processes occurring among participants." (p. 836)

This could provide an opportunity for authentic expression to occur which will contain a rich collection of data ranging from simple complaints and frustrations to more fundamental issues of pedagogy or ideology. In a stimulating environment, perhaps spontaneous expressions of profound insight might be captured, as well as obvious errors of fact. All of these will have significance.

The design consisted of having 4 to 8 U.S. history teachers gathered in a comfortable room. Seating will be arranged in a circular, semicircular layout, or at least around one table, so as to maximize face-to-face interaction among participants. The moderator would either sit close to or among the participants.

As participants walked in, I and my two assistants welcomed them with refreshments, ask each to sign in, fill out a content checklist, and obtain and read over a letter of invitation that explains the purpose of the study and clarifies the conditions of their participation and legal rights. Please refer to Appendix LI.

Once all participants have gathered, and after a few introductions, the moderator will begin the discussion, using prompts generated from the six research questions. The session will last from 90 to 120 minutes, and will be audio taped. Some note taking will also be done, providing resources are available. The audiotaped session will then be transcribed and the notes typed out for analysis.

Attempting to systematize the myriad of choices researchers make when using focus groups, Fern simplifies the process by indicating that there are "...three different research purposes, three moderating styles, three group sizes and three gender or minority mixes to choose from." (Fern, 2001, 1)

In terms of research purposes, he discusses how focus group research can be adopted for three different research tasks: exploratory, experiential, and clinical, and how each of the three can be used to test or generate theory or to effect more practical applications.

Given the definitions Fern utilizes, the experiential type focus group is probably the best approach for this study. In the experiential approach, the researcher attempts to "draw out shared life experiences rather than those that are unique or unshared." (Ibid, 8) In term of theory application of experiential focus groups, Fern clarifies that it is most useful for triangulation (comparing results across different methods), and confirmation (comparing gathered information with the researcher's prior beliefs)(Ibid). Clearly, since this effort is based on previously conducted individual interviews which yielded specific results, the experiential approach will better serve the objective of achieving

triangulation by comparing the results of the focus group with the individual interviews.

Participants and Sampling

Participants will be randomly selected from a list provided by the Northside ISD in San Antonio, Texas. Northside ISD is currently, in terms of student enrollment, the largest school district in San Antonio, and the fifth largest in Texas. It encompasses a wide variety of ethnoracial groups and socioeconomic lifestyles, with Latinos comprising a majority of the student body. Given the student demographics, US history teachers from this district will likely have had considerable contact with Latino students as well as with Latino professional colleagues.

If circumstances do not permit a strict random selection of participants and obtaining them becomes difficult, then we will contact the social studies supervisor in each campus to generate interest and obtain participants.

San Antonio is a city that is deliberately bilingual and bicultural, with significant historic, economic, and cultural ties to Mexico and Mexican Americans who currently comprise about 53% of the metropolitan population.

Although this Hispanic numerical majority is not typical of most US cities, there are many urban, suburban and increasingly small town areas where a Latino presence is either long-standing, or suddenly increasing. Given the particular social and cultural history of San Antonio, as well as the legacy of Chicano/Mexican American political activism and organizing unique to this city, it would be interesting to note the extent

to which that Mexican American/Latino/Hispanic heritage is reflected in the history taught in its public schools.

It is important to the study that there be some gender, ethnic, racial, and professional diversity among participants; thus the randomization will stratified as much as possible to achieve this. In addition to being high school U.S. history teachers, all participants will be from schools with a student population that is at least 1/3 Latino or Hispanic.

Other specific criteria for selecting participants includes teachers who a) have taught US history for at least 2 years; b) have taught at least 2 years in Texas public schools; and c) are certified to teach U.S. history in Texas. At least two focus groups of these participants will be recruited and interviewed. One focus group will consist of eighth grade US history teachers, the other group will contain high school level teachers.

As stated above, each focus group will consist of from 4 to 8 participants. Given that the dynamics of smaller groups are considerably different than those in larger ones, Morgan states that the usual practice is to use “moderate sized” groups of 6 to 10. (1988, 43).

In terms of random sampling, Krueger clarifies that focus group researchers use “purposeful” sampling whereby participants are selected based on the purpose of the study. This investigation will proceed to select participants and also randomize, if at all possible, in the manner suggested by Krueger: “....the researcher often assembles a pool of potential participants and then selects randomly from within this pool of

qualified individuals. This level of randomization is regularly done, and it helps minimize selection bias.” (1998, 71)

Data Collection

The audiotape, and the transcript generated from it, will provide the major vehicles for data collection and preservation. The moderator will also take notes after the session, to document certain overall aspects of the session not easily perceived from a detailed transcription. If possible, notes taken by a colleague or collaborator during the session will also be typed out for review and analysis.

According to Krueger (1998), there are several steps which researchers should take in the collection of data so as to ensure that the subsequent analysis is systematic. He identifies six specific steps which this research effort will attempt to complete; they are summarized below:

1. Sequencing the questions to allow maximum participant insight
2. Sound process for capturing and handling data
3. The proper coding of data, specifically the use of axial coding
4. Participant verification of data collected
5. Debriefing between moderator and assistant moderator immediately after the focus group
6. Sharing both preliminary and later reports with participants and stake holders. (10-11)

Data Analysis

According to Morgan (1988), there are two basic approaches to analyzing focus group data: the systematic coding via content analysis, and the essentially qualitative ethnographic summary. In this study, the

attempt will be to use both approaches, relying more on the coding and analysis of the content as a foundation. Morgan asserts that:

These are not, however, conflicting means of analysis, and there is generally an additional strength that comes from combining the two. (Morgan, 1988, 64)

Thus, the analysis per se will involve reviewing and coding the transcripts first, in light of the research questions being considered. Then a more ethnographic approach will be used to provide a synthesis of groups' characteristics and responses as a whole. Quotes from participants that either articulate a consensus view or which provide a unique perspective will be selected and considered. They further serve to expand our understanding of teachers' responses.

In a chapter titled, "The Analysis Process," Krueger provides a considerably detailed step-by-step overview of the analytical process. With a few exceptions, i.e. "Discuss options with sponsor," this study will intend to adhere to most of the steps he outlines, dealing with a comprehensive set of factors including note-taking, recording, and labeling notes and tapes (1988, 41-52).

Validity & Generalizability

The search for consensus among participants, across diverse backgrounds is one aspect of attempting to establish validity in this study.

In addition, previous research results from the study of individual interviews, and from other research on history teachers, will also serve as

sources of validation for the results and process of this investigation. This will create opportunities to use triangulation.

In discussing the advantages of linking focus groups with individual interviewing, Morgan states that,

“...there are reasons to conduct focus groups before and after individual interviews, and even circumstances in which one would want to alternate back and forth between the two methods.”
(1988, 31)

In this effort, an initial study of individual interviews with US history teachers will help strengthen whatever findings are made regarding emerging themes and influential factors.

Given the nature and process of conducting focus groups, this study will not attempt to ensure generalizability, since it is a rather select group of participants who are not chosen by pure randomization. Krueger suggests, however, the concept of “transferability” whereby the receiver of the study can decide if the methods, procedures, and participants are relevant, the extent to which this study’s findings can transfer to another environment (1998, 69-70).

3. Course Content Checklists

Each of the sixteen participants filled out either one of two checklists consisted of a collection of individuals, concepts, eras, or documents which are relevant to either the 8th grade or high school U.S. history course. About 85% to 90% of items on both checklists were taken directly from the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills. The other items

focused on women and/or minority leaders, groups or relevant events not mentioned in the TEKS.

Participants marked “A” for those items always taught, “B” for those sometimes covered, and “C” for those never taught. For a copy of each checklist, please refer to Appendix MCL and Appendix HCL.

It is important to note that of the individuals mentioned in both checklists, Anglo males dominate the list, as is reflected in the TEKS. The high school checklist, for example, has 42 individuals identified by name, five are African American, six are Latinos, four are Anglo women, and 27 are Anglo males.

The procedure was to focus on the items marked “C”, those never or hardly ever taught about or covered, according to the respondent, in his/her course. Although the analysis of A or B marked items may be of secondary interest, our primary focus is to determine what specific individuals, organizations, events, or concepts are consistently excluded.

Focusing in on what is excluded or hardly ever taught permits us to observe patterns in teachers’ decision making regarding content coverage as well as to determine what group or groups are most excluded and whether or not this exclusion occurs consistently by all or most participants.

IV. Data from TEKS, Textbooks and Testimony

Data generated from three of the four major areas of study in this mixed method investigation will be described in this chapter. Data from the fourth area: *Teachers' Perspectives and Preferences* will be described in the following chapter. Specific methods were utilized to generate different sets of data for each area of study. The following is a list of the first three areas and the methods associated with each:

A. Latinos in the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills, (TEKS), the curriculum standards for U.S. history textbooks and teaching.

Method: Content Analysis

B. Latinos in five U.S. history textbooks.

a. Three textbooks in use for ten years up to Spring, 2003.

b. Two textbooks recently adopted for use beginning Fall, 2003.

Method: Content Analysis

C. Testimony regarding Latino representation during the U.S. history textbook adoption process in July and September, 2002.

Methods: Content Analysis and Participant Observation

The data generated for each of the first three major areas will be described below, beginning with the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS). which, as mentioned above, function as the standard curriculum guidelines and thus, the basis for textbook selection, teacher training, and standardized testing.

A. LATINOS IN THE TEXAS ESSENTIAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS

The major focus of this component was to investigate the presence and representation of Latinos in the U.S. History Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (USHTEKS). Although primarily focused on the quantity and quality of Latino representation, this study also compared how that representation compares to that of African Americans and American Indians.

The content covered in this focused review of the USHTEKS will include the guidelines for both the 8th grade and high school courses comprising the first and second parts of U.S. History, Part 1: Before 1877, and Part 2: After 1877 to the present.

For this content analysis, as described above in the previous chapter on Methodology, we used a system based on four distinct levels to clearly identify the significance and specificity of that representation and thus facilitate comparisons among the three groups targeted. These three groups are: Latinos, American Indians and African Americans.

These four levels thus provide a method of organizing and presentation the data relevant to making comparisons of how three groups are represented.

Level 1: Individual. The specific name of an individual is mentioned, i.e., Martin Luther King, César Chávez, Sacajewea.

Level 2: Group. The group is specified by name, i.e., Cherokee or Native Americans

Level 3: Event. An event, issue, concept is included which implies presence of a group, i.e., Mexican American War, Emancipation Proclamation, Trail of Tears.

Level 4: Category. The group is implied categorically by some generic term, i.e. “racial minority groups” or “immigrants”

In this context, “Latino” or “Hispanic” will be used interchangeably and refer to persons of Spanish or Latin American descent. Terms such as “Mexican American,” “Cuban,” and “Puerto Rican,” will also be used to designate specific national origins whenever appropriate.

As mentioned in the Introduction, there are two one-year U.S. history courses required of all Texas public school students. The first part is taught in 8th grade and begins with the early colonial period through Reconstruction. In high school, the second part consists of a one credit course covering U.S. history since Reconstruction to the present.

The Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) consists of a collection of Knowledge and Skills Areas (KSA), each with statements specifying a topical area of knowledge or skills to be mastered by the student. Each KSA also includes stated expectations by which to evaluate students’ proficiency in that topical area.

There are a total of 32 KSAs in the first course of U.S. history, and 26 in the second. The 32 KSAs for the first part of U.S history, are distributed thus: history-9; geography-3; economics-3; government-4; citizenship-4; culture-4; science, technology and society-2; and social studies skills-3.

For the second course, the 26 KSAs are: history-7; geography-4; economics-3; government-3; citizenship-2; culture-2; science, technology and society-2; and social studies skills-3. (TEA, 1997b, September)

In section “1” below the content of the first course in U.S. history TEKS will be reviewed and analyzed wherever there is mention of any individual, group, event, date or concept related to the Latino experience in what is now the United States. The second course is similarly reviewed in section “2”, and in section “3” the representation of African Americans and American Indians in both courses will be reviewed.

Most of the data generated from these content analyses is fully described below, yet it is also summarized in Appendix TEKS, which documents the representation of all three groups in the four levels.

1. U.S. History Through 1877

Beginning with the nine KSAs focusing on history proper, there are only two instances where items relevant to Latinos are mentioned. The first occurs in #2 A History and relates to the fact that Hispanics in the Americas had their beginnings with the Spanish explorers, conquistadors, missionaries and settlers, although this is only implied by the wording: “The student is expected to: Identify reasons for European exploration and colonization of North America.”

Geographically, North America includes all of Mexico, and more importantly, there were regions in the southeast coast, in Florida, and especially in the Southwest, where Spaniards were the first to explore, map, and even establish permanent settlements. Still the expectation is

for students to identify the “reasons” for European exploration and colonization which assumes they know who did it, when and where as well as why.

The second item occurs in #6D: “The student is expected to: explain the major issues and events of the Mexican War and their impact on the United States.” These events and issues invariably involve Mexicans and among them those who at the end of the war became the embryonic Mexican American community.

There is mention of the “westward expansion” in this area of history as well as “Manifest Destiny,” however, both are presented outside of their relationship to American Indians and Mexicans. There is no recognition that these groups were viewed as inferior by the advocates of Manifest Destiny and that they suffered a tremendous loss of land, liberty and even life, as a result of this expansion.

Both instances which relate to the Latino experience cited above are at the third level of representation, since the Hispanic presence is directly implied by the events identified, without there being any specific mention of the group itself.

There are four references to “racial and ethnic groups” from the 17th through the 19th century in the areas of culture, KSA #24 and three of the student expectations of this area. Summarizing these, the student understands the relationships among these groups, identifies their reasons for immigration; identifies ways in which their conflicts were resolved and analyzes the contributions they made to our national identity.

All these are worthy objectives for study, however, aside from the contributions statement, it's relevant to note that they are classified under "culture." The dynamic relationships among racial and ethnic groups, their reasons for immigration and their conflicts are not simply a matter of culture, but of history, with all the other factors that implies. So, these very historical phenomena are decontextualized from the historical discussion that relates to wider events, conflicts, and developments and instead placed in "culture," as if they were tangential and not central to the history of the nation.

Nevertheless, since Latinos are categorized as an ethnoracial minority, there are four instances of Level 4 representations in #24, thus providing opportunity or space for Latinos to be included. But, like for all level 4 mentions, this inclusion is only potential since teachers are not specifically directed to cover Latinos, Hispanics, or Mexican Americans, let alone give their experience any significant attention.

Outside of these 6 indirect and potential references to the Latino experience, there are no other KSAs where the Latino presence is even implied. There certainly are some KSAs where the teacher could include aspects or examples of the Latino experience, for example, Culture #27A: "describe developments in art, music, literature, drama, and other cultural activities in the history of the United States."

Still, teachers could conceivably cover key eras and genres, without consciously including any Latino contributions. However, it would be difficult to exclude African Americans as easily, due to their foundational influence on U.S. music and dance.

Thus, we can conclude that from the above review, that there is no direct mention at all of Latinos as a people in the entire first part of US History TEKS, although their presence or experience do have a few opportunities to be included.

2. U.S. History Since 1877

Within the seven KSAs dedicated to history there are four potential items where the Latino experience could be included. In #1C: “explain the significance of the following dates: 1898, 1914-18, 1929, 1941-1945, and 1957,” the first date, 1898 refers to the Spanish American War. This conflict involved both Puerto Ricans and Cubans and brought both groups of Latinos, especially the former, into the direct orbit of influence, and direct control, of the United States. The resultant migrations of both groups and the historical, political, and cultural relations between the U.S. and Puerto Rico as well as that between our nation and Cuba, was an eventual result of the Spanish American War (Gonzalez, 2000).

Of course, all of this is a Level 3 mention, since the Cuban and Puerto Rican experiences are only tangentially implied by the date 1898 and its reference to this military conflict.

The second item occurs in #2C, and is a Level 4 mention since Latinos are categorically both a minority as well as immigrants: “analyze social issues such as the treatment of minorities, child labor, growth of cities, and problems of immigrants.” Here there is an opportunity to deal with some the specific problems and issues that affect Latinos in the

context of U.S. History. But again, this is still optional from the teacher's perspectives, since Latinos are not directly specified.

The third and fourth items with potential Latino mention in the history KSAs are in #7 "The student understands the impact of the civil rights movement." These occur specifically in section B "identify significant leaders of the civil rights movement, including Martin Luther King,;..." and D: "identify changes in the United States that have resulted from the civil rights movement such as increased participation of minorities in the political process."

That the civil rights movement should be mentioned is positive and necessary, but also to be expected; its absence would have been obviously glaring. However, section B ends quite abruptly, with a semi-colon after the name of Martin Luther King, as if it were mistakenly or deliberately left unfinished. For every other similar student expectation in the TEKS, several names are always mentioned, whereas here, there is not even a list of names. Is it that the writers could not think of any others; or is it that they could not agree upon appropriate examples?

Whatever the reason, the opportunity exists to include Latino civil rights leaders such as Cesar Chavez, Antonia Pantoja, and Willie Velasquez. Section B thus is a Level 3 mention, whereby the event, the civil rights movement, implies the presence and participation of Latinos.

However, it should be noted that the term "civil rights movement" usually implies only the African American struggle for civil rights; thus further making it unlikely that teachers will even consider the Latino

movement which was not as dramatic and occurred in separate regions of the U.S. among different national origin groups.

Section D is a Level 4 mention since it implies Latinos categorically as one of those “minorities” who have increased their participation in the political process as a result of the civil rights movement. In addition to these four indirect mentions of Latinos in the history KSA in this second part of U.S. History TEKS, there two others in geography, and four in culture where, as in the first part, Latinos are indirectly alluded to categorically as immigrants and as an ethnoracial group.

In geography, #9A, students are expected to: “analyze the effects of physical and human geographic factors on major events including the building of the Panama Canal.” Clearly that process involved Panamanians and classifies as a Level 3 mention. It is also relevant to a very recent and significant event: the U.S. transfer of the Panama Canal’s control to Panama on December 31, 1999.

Students are expected in the next KSA, #10B to: “analyze the effects of changing demographic patterns resulting from immigration to the United States.” This is an obvious possibility for including Latinos, a Level 3, considering that they already are, as documented by the 2000 Census, the largest ethnoracial minority in the United States, due in large measure to immigration.

Under the umbrella of minority groups adapting to life in the U.S. and contributing “to our national identity,” Culture KSA #21 has three relevant sections, A, B and C. These require students to explain actions taken by these groups to expand economic opportunities and political

rights; explain Americanization efforts; and analyze these groups' contributions that have helped shape the national identity. All four can generate much knowledge about the Latino experience, but since Latinos are implied rather than specified, these are Level 4 mentions, as were the four similar KSA for culture in the first part of USHTEKS.

From the above review of the second part of USHTEKS, it is clear, as was the case in the first part, that again there is no direct mention of Latinos or any national Latino sub-group, in the entire scope of TEKS for U.S. History, let alone the mention of a single Latino individual. The second part, however, did contain in its contents as many as ten indirect potential references to Latinos categorically as a racial, ethnic or immigrant group, or by virtue of the event or process identified.

With six in the first and ten in the second, there are certainly opportunities for U.S. History teachers to integrate even under the TEKS as written, aspects of the Latino experience in the curriculum. Unfortunately, these remain as opportunities only, since teachers are not directed to cover Latinos in the written guidelines.

The undeniable fact remains that no mention is specifically made at all of Hispanics, Latinos, Mexican Americans or any Latino group in the entire TEKS for US History. Neither is there a single Latino/Hispanic individual named therein. Is this merely a coincidence, a case of neglectful oversight, or deliberate policy?

That question is beyond the scope of this study. Nevertheless, in the next section, we will review these TEKS to determine how African

Americans and American Indians are mentioned, and make comparisons with the representation of Latinos.

Please refer to the Appendix TEKS for tables on Latino, African American and American Indian representation in both parts of USHTEKS.

3. African Americans and American Indians

In the first part of USHTEKS, through Reconstruction, given the historical importance of slavery and the Civil War, as expected African Americans receive the most attention with 12 relevant items. American Indians have 5 items, most of which are indirect references.

On African Americans, there is a Level 1 reference to Frederick Douglass in Citizenship #23 B, among other “significant political, social, and military leaders.” No American Indian or Latino leaders are mentioned by name. African Americans are named as a group, a Level 2 mention, and referred to as both “slaves and free blacks” in History #7B, which draws specific attention to them thus: “compare the effects of political, economic, and social factors on slaves and free blacks.” This is in the context of KSA #7, which makes reference to factors leading up the Civil War.

In addition, there are at least seven Level 3 references to African Americans in the following KSAs and topics: History #7C: “impact of slavery”; History #8B: the Emancipation Proclamation; History #9C: the impact of Reconstruction on different groups in the South; Economics #13B: “growth of the slave trade, and the spread of slavery;” Government #17B: the impact of the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments; Government

#19B: impact of the Dred Scott v Sanford case; and Culture #25A: “the historical development of the abolitionist movement.”

The three Level 4 references made concerning African Americans are all in the area of Culture #24, and sections C and D which deal with the relationships between racial and ethnic groups, how their conflicts were resolved and the contributions they made to our national identity.

Three of the five references to American Indians are contained in this KSA #24, all are Level 4, categorical, as were the four for Latinos in this area.

The only specific Level 2 mention of an American Indian group was in History #5G wherein “Cherokee Indians” are named in the context of their resettlement. That same section also contains a Level 3 reference to “federal and state Indian policies.” Thus, the overall numbers of indirect references to American Indians and Latinos are comparable, although no specific Latino group is named.

It is also interesting to note that the term “Indian” is used instead of either “Native American” or “American Indian”, and that “blacks” (with a small “b”) is used to refer to African Americans, yet nowhere in the TEKS is there any mention of “whites” as a category. However, we can assume that European immigrants are included as racial-ethnic minorities or immigrants.

Like in the first part of USHTEKS, in the second part, African Americans not only receive more attention but have three (Level 1) specific individuals mentioned: W.E. B. DuBois in History #4B; Martin Luther King in History #7B; and Shirley Chisholm in Citizenship #19B.

The African American presence or experience is also directly implied in #7 with the civil rights movement and the Civil Rights Act of 1964; whereas in section #7D, they are implied categorically, as are Latinos, as one of the “minorities” which increased participation in the political process. There is also mention in Culture #20 B of the “Harlem Renaissance,” in direct reference to a pivotal African American cultural and intellectual development.

In conclusion, American Indians, are the least represented of the three groups. African Americans, are represented the most, are mentioned by name as a group, and are accorded, as they should be, some place in the historical narrative. More importantly, unlike the other two groups, African Americans have four significant individuals identified as worthy of knowing in Texas classrooms.

By contrast, given their relative numbers and influence, Latinos are the most under represented of these three groups in these TEKS for U.S. History. There’s no reference ever made to them as Latinos, Hispanics, Mexican Americans or any specific national-origin group. Neither is any individual Latino mentioned by name, although opportunities for this do exist within the content and structure of TEKS.

B. LATINOS IN UNITED STATES HISTORY TEXTBOOKS

Three of the six high school U.S. History textbooks officially adopted by TEA and used for ten years until recently (Spring, 2003) were reviewed in this study. They are:

1. The Story of America, Vol. 2: 1865 to the Present. by John A.Garraty. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Austin: TX, 1992.
2. American Journey: The Quest for Liberty Since 1865. by J.W. Davidson, M.H. Lytle, and M.B. Stoff. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs: NJ, 1992.
3. American Voices: A History of the United States, Volume II: 1865 to the Present. by Carol Berkin, et al. Scott Foresman, Glenview: IL, 1992.

As described in detail above in the Methodology section, each textbook was reviewed, and every sentence related to the Latino experience was counted, and categorized by topic and by national origin.

Using selected elements of the method used by Jesus Garcia (1980), the seven topical areas are:

1. describe why each group immigrated to the U.S.
2. describe when each group immigrated and where initial contacts began.
3. give a historical perspective to the problems and accomplishments associated with each group.
4. describe key events and issues which are crucial in gaining an understanding of the group.
5. provide content that notes each group's shared and unique characteristics and experiences.
6. include descriptions of leaders and their contributions to the American scene.
7. include content describing other experiences of the group?
(Garcia, 1980,109)

There were four categories of Latino identity utilized in this analysis, reflecting the three largest national origin groups in the United States. Each is indicated in the tables in the following way:

H/L= Hispanic or Latino in general

MA= Mexican American

PR= Puerto Rican

CA= Cuban American

Frequency tables were produced for each of the three books, using the seven topics and three national origin groups as well as Latino or Hispanic in general. Reproduced below are these three tables which also include totals for each category, and for the overall number of sentences in each textbook. Please refer to Appendix TT to view all three tables on one page.

<<<<<----->>>>>

Textbook Table 1
Sentences by Topic & Hispanic National Origin
in Garraty/Holt R&W

Topics	H/L	MA	PR	CA	Totals
1: Why Imm	-0-	5	1	1	7
2: When/Where	3	9	1	2	15
3: Prblms/Accmp	35	32	6	5	78
4: Events/Issues	21	12	5	4	42
5: Chrcts/Exprns	15	43	31	2	91
6: Leaders	-0-	27	5	-0-	32
7: Other Exprns	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Totals by Origin	74	128	49	14	265

<<<<<----->>>>>

Textbook Table 2
Sentences by Topic & Hispanic National Origin
in Davidson/Prentice Hall

Topics	H/L	MA	PR	CA	Totals
1: Why Imm	1	7	-0-	1	9
2: When/Where	-0-	24	6	2	32
3: Prblms/Accmp	20	20	-0-	10	50
4: Events/Issues	7	17	4	-0-	28
5: Chrcts/Exprns	26	90	6	2	124
6: Leaders	-0-	132	1	-0-	133
7: Other Exprns	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Totals by Origin	54	290	17	15	376

<<<<<----->>>>>

Textbook Table 3
Sentences by Topic & Hispanic National Origin
in Berkin et al/Scott Foresman

Topics	H/L	MA	PR	CA	Totals
1: Why Imm	- 0 -	7	- 0 -	- 0 -	7
2: When/Where	6	5	2	- 0 -	13
3: Prblms/Accmp	11	20	- 0 -	- 0 -	31
4: Events/Issues	10	7	8	- 0 -	25
5: Chrcts/Exprns	14	58	6	1	79
6: Leaders	- 0 -	21	4	- 0 -	25
7: Other Exprns	-0-	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -	- 0 -
Totals by Origin	41	118	20	1	180

<<<<<<----->>>>>>>

1. Discussion of Textbook Tables

Table 1: Garraty/Holt

As reflected in their population numbers, Mexican Americans, or Mexican origin Hispanics have the largest number of sentences directly

related to their history in the U.S., 128, followed by Puerto Ricans, 49, and then Cuban Americans, 14. There are 74 sentences also focusing on Hispanic Americans as a group. (Please refer to Appendix TT for a view of all three tables on one page.)

For both Mexican Americans (43) and Puerto Ricans (31), and in the sub-totals (91), the topic category which received most attention was #5 dealing with unique characteristics and experiences of the group. This was followed by topic 3, providing historical perspectives on the group's problems and accomplishments. For Cuban Americans, however, topic 3 had the most sentences, followed by topic 4, significant events and issues.

This same pattern, with topic 3 receiving the most attention followed by topic 4, is reflected in sentences dealing with Hispanics as a group.

There are several sections related to Cuba and Latin America in this text especially one on the "Revolution in Mexico", pp. 280-81. Two other sections worthy of note in this text comprise the final chapter: "Latin America and the Caribbean", pp. 595-609; and "Latin America: 1960s--1990s," pp. 610-621. All these sections do provide some basic information which increases student's understanding of this region's relationship with the United States and the issues this has generated.

Table 2: Davidson/Prentice Hall

More sentences, as expected, are related to the Mexican American experience (290), however, to such an overwhelming extent, that it goes beyond their proportion of the Latino population overall. Thus, Puerto Ricans receive very little attention in this text (17), at a similar level to Cubans (15), despite their considerably larger numbers.

In terms of the topics covered for Mexican Americans, leaders (topic 6) have more sentences (132) than any other category of information, followed by topic 5, unique characteristics and experiences (90). Sub-totals for the two topics with the most sentences follows that same pattern. It is significant to note that this predominant and laudable attention given to Mexican American leaders does not carry over to Puerto Rican (1) and Cuban (0) leaders, who are practically left out of the narrative altogether.

Of the 54 sentences related to Latinos as a whole, almost half (26) are about topic 5, followed by topic #3, problems and accomplishments. Ten of the 15 sentences related to Cuban Americans are on topic 3. Whereas for Puerto Ricans, a different pattern exists: the 17 sentences cover three topics in a more balanced proportions with topic 5 and #2, (when and where migration occurred), having 6 sentences each and topic 4, (significant events and issues) with 4 sentences.

Thus, for each of the three national origin groups, a distinct pattern emerges in terms of the distribution of sentences over topical areas, and neither of these three patterns is similar to that of sentences

which relate to Latinos as a whole. The most obvious and revealing aspect of this sentence distribution is the overwhelming number of sentences dedicated to Mexican Americans in comparison to that of Puerto Ricans, Cubans and to Hispanics as a group.

Table 3: Berkin/Scott Foresman

As reflected in both other textbooks, and consistent with their larger proportion of the Latino population, Mexican Americans (118) received more attention than the other two groups. Here, as in the other two texts, considerably fewer (20) sentences are dedicated to Puerto Ricans, but unlike the other two, only one sentence is focused directly on Cuban Americans.

In terms of topics, for Mexican Americans (58), Hispanics in general (14), in the sub-totals (79), topic 5, unique characteristics and experiences, had considerably more sentences than any other topic. Overall, topics 3, 4, and 6 also had 25 or more sentences each.

In addition to the sentences in the main body of the textbook, there were special, optional reading sections which covered aspects of the Latino experience. Under the category of “American Literature” or “Source Readings,” there were several passages written by Hispanic authors. Among those was a piece on p. 488 by Puerto Rican writer, Piri Thomas; another literary selection on p. 638 was by Cuban American, Pulitzer Prize winner Oscar Hijuelos; on p. 642, a passage by the late Mexican

American educator, Tomás Rivera; and on p. 882-83, there is a poem by Mexican American poet, Teresa Polomo Acosta.

Cuban revolutionary leader, José Martí, is featured with a short bio and poem on p. 312, and the Mexican novelist, Mariano Azuela, has an excerpt of his novel printed on pp. 314-315. There is also an interesting section on Diego Rivera, the Mexican muralist on pp. 484-85; and on p. 828, is a section, “Highlights of American Life,” on the South American educator, Jaime Escalante and his work as documented in the film, *Stand and Deliver*.

Perhaps the most significant of these optional readings, in terms of U.S. Latinos, is a statement by César Chavez accompanied by a large color photo of him with a caption and discussion questions, on pp. 720-21.

All of these optional readings do much to enhance the students’ understanding of the Hispanic experience, but the extent to which teachers use these resources beyond the text itself is not certain, and therefore are not part of the sentence count included in the above table. In a qualitative sense, as well as quantitative, these sections and their associated suggested activities do make a difference in the overall presentation of Latinos in the textbook and should be considered when making comparisons with other textbooks.

Finally, in terms of quantity, it should be noted that this text also has a “Biographical Dictionary,” beginning on page 936 which includes the biographies of four Hispanic Americans: César Chavez, William Velasquez, Lauro Cavazos, and Antonia Coello Novello, the latter two being the first Hispanic cabinet appointees to lead their departments.

Contrast and Comparison of Tables

There is considerable variation among the three texts in terms of the total number of sentences dedicated to the Latino experience in the narrative, captions and quotes. The Davidson text has over twice as many of these sentences (376) as does the Berkin text (180), although if the optional readings related to Latinos in the latter text were counted in Berkin, the difference would not be so dramatic.

In the Garraty text most of the 265 Latino related sentences are, like in the other two textbooks, focused on Mexican Americans; this is to be expected, reflecting both demographic and historical realities. Yet these Mexican American sentences in Garraty (128) represent about 48% of the total. In the Berkin textbook, the Mexican related sentences (118) represent about 66% of the total sentences in that text, and in the Davidson textbook, the Mexican American sentences, (290) represent about 77% percent of the total sentences related to Latinos.

In terms of Puerto Ricans and Cubans, the second and third largest groups, the three textbooks also differ in their relative coverage. In the Garraty text, almost 19% of the sentences are related to Puerto Ricans, and about 5% are about Cuban Americans. The Berkin text dedicates about 11% of its sentences to Puerto Ricans, and a mere .6% or just over one-half percent to Cuban Americans, in essence, only one sentence. The Davidson text has only about 5% of its sentences related to Puerto Ricans and about 4% to Cuban Americans.

Thus the Garraty textbook does a better job of presenting a more balanced distribution of attention to these three groups commensurate with their relative populations than do the other two textbooks.

In terms of the distribution of sentences by topical areas, both the Berkin and the Garraty textbooks had more sentences regarding topic 5, the shared, unique characteristics of Latino groups, followed by topic 3, a historical perspective on the groups' problems and accomplishments.

In contrast to this the Davidson text has more sentences describing leaders and their contribution to the American scene, topic 6, then followed by topics 5 and 3 in terms of sentence count.

In this regard it is important to note that of the 133 sentences in Davidson regarding Hispanic leaders, all but one were about Mexican American leaders, again illustrating the unbalanced treatment of Puerto Ricans and Cuban Americans in this text.

2. Visuals in the Three Textbooks

In addition to the sentences from the narrative and other sources, there are also some significant visuals related to Latinos in the three textbooks. All the Latino related visuals of each text are number-listed and briefly described below with page numbers indicated as well. A final section will compare these across textbooks.

Visuals in Garraty/Holt, R&W

1. America's Hispanic Heritage: A "Portfolio" of ten items, mostly paintings, depicting aspects of the Hispanic cultural and historic heritage, accompanied by informative captions and a five sentence text, 26-29
2. Painting by Gentilz depicting a Southwestern Spanish-style settlement with caption to accompany text on the settling of the Southwest, 89
3. Color painting by Walker: "California Vaqueros" in full dress, 106
4. Two maps: One of the Greater Antilles: Cuba, Haiti/Dominican Republic, Jamaica, and Puerto Rico; and another of Puerto Rico by itself, showing three major cities on the island, 216
5. Color photo: Group of Cuban immigrants waving U.S. flags, 552
6. Two photos: One b&w photo of Mexican braceros in the field, and another color photo of César Chavez, smiling, including the NFWA symbol in the background with a "Huelga" sign, 558
7. Two photos: Both b&w of two children at New York's Puerto Rican Day Parade; one photo shows a boy with baseball suit, cap and bat, the other a girl holding a Puerto Rican flag, 560
8. One bar graph: Selected Characteristics of Hispanic Americans and Non-Hispanic Americans. Five groups, MxAm, CA, PR, Central/South Americans, and Non-Hispanic Americans, are compared along four measures: Average Years of Schooling; Average Family Income, Percent Unemployed, Percent of Families Below Poverty Level. The chart is quite colorful, accompanied by a caption, and with an identified source and date for the information: Current Population Reports, 1987, 561

Overall, the paintings and the photographs depicting Latino people, leaders, and historic periods are quite authentic. The "portfolio" of mostly Hispanic American paintings was well done and the bar graph illustrated a considerable amount of accurate information.

Visuals in Davidson/Prentice Hall

There are a variety of visuals that accompany the narrative, among them are photographs, maps and a painting. These are:

1. A color painting, without title or name of artist, of a scene of vaqueros with horses in a corral, 103
2. Map: the Spanish American War in the Caribbean, 269
3. Map: the U.S. in the Caribbean: 1898-1917, 286
4. B&W Photograph: of Mexican Americans on strike, the pecan shellers in San Antonio, led by Emma Tenayuca, shown in the photo and mentioned in the caption, 423
5. Photograph: Dr. Hector P. Garcia, founder of the American G.I. Forum, with President L. B. Johnson, 571
6. Photograph, color: Of a Mexican American mural on the wall of a building in an apartment project, 572
7. Map of the U.S.A.: of the Hispanic Population in the US, with all 50 states color coded by percentage of Hispanic population, 678
8. Photograph: of Gloria Estefan, Cuban American pop, and salsa star.

Most of the visuals related to Hispanics in this textbook are either photographs or maps. The latter are quite accurate, especially useful is the population map on page 678, showing Latino population by state.

However, there is a problem in that over 3.5 million U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico are excluded from the count since the island of Puerto Rico is not shown, as it should be, albeit as a “territory” of the U.S.

The photographs are not remarkable except for the B&W of Mexican American pecan shellers on strike, including their leader, Emma Tenayuca, a distinguished union organizer in San Antonio in the late 1930s.

Visuals in Berkin/Scott Foresman

A wide variety of visuals were distributed throughout the text, representing different time periods, leaders, and visual styles. Among them:

1. An illustration: of Louisiana's Spanish Governor Bernardo de Gálvez, who helped fight the British during the American Revolution, 24.
2. Map: of the military events of the American Revolution includes caption on Gálvez, 53.
3. Color Photo: of César Chavez, larger size, 72.
4. Color Map: Caribbean during the Spanish American War, 294.
5. Color Cartoon: of Puerto Rico as a little girl attempting to enter the U.S. house while being threatened by a big brown wolf, 297.
6. B&W drawing: of Cuban American rebels at a meeting in NYC, 313.
7. B&W photo: poor Mexican American working woman, 336.
8. Sepia photo: Mexican Americans herding sheep (Depression), 444.
9. B&W photo: Mexican American teens learning food catering, 481.
10. Color photo: César Chavez with other union members, 715.
11. Color map and graph: the map of the U.S. with Alaska and Hawaii, shows the relative population of Hispanics in each state. The graph illustrates the number of immigrants arriving in the U.S. from 1950

through 1985 from four sources: Mexico, Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Other Hispanic Countries, 864.

12. Three color photos: of Lauro Cavazos, Dr. Antonio Novello, and of two Texas high school students bringing school supplies to Mexican children, 865.

The photographs comprise the bulk of visuals related to Hispanics in Berkin. Several leaders are highlighted in these photos and the few maps do contain useful and accurate information. The color cartoon on Puerto Rico as a little girl, threatened by a ravenous wolf (Spain) (297) although small, was especially impactful because the caption explains that, contrary to the cartoon's implications, before the Spanish American War, the islanders had been set to gain a parliamentary government under Spain.

Generally, the visuals are realistic and representative portrayals of Latinos.

Comparisons of Visuals Among Textbooks

Looking at the quality of the Latino-related visuals in all three texts, it is reasonable to conclude that Davidson has the weakest presentation and that Garraty offers a larger, more diverse and more authentic collection of photographs, paintings, and illustrations. There are demographic maps and charts in all three texts as well. Garraty has an informative bar graph comparing selective characteristics among Hispanics and non-Hispanics.

Davidson has a small demographic map of the Latino population by state in the U.S. A similar map also appears in Berkin, but it is accompanied by a three dimensional graph showing numbers of immigrants from various nations or regions of Latin America from 1950 to 1985. The Berkin graph is colorful and very useful in terms of historical context and meaning. Overall both Berkin and Garraty have better quality visuals related to Latinos than does Davidson.

3. Qualitative Aspects of Each Textbook

To analyze the qualitative aspects of the written text, that is the narrative itself as well as integrated quotes, we will use the five criteria mentioned in the Methodology chapter, namely:

1. Factual accuracy
2. Inclusion of key leaders, dates, events, issues, contributions
3. Presentation of Latino views or perspectives
4. Agency attributed to Latino leaders, organizations, or people.
5. Connections made between past & present.

Garraty/Holt, R&W

Looking first at the longer sections written about Hispanics in the textbook, on pages 557--559, *Mexican Americans Increase Their Numbers*, the facts presented regarding demographics, leaders, groups and events, are accurate. Key leaders, namely César Chavez, and the nature of his struggle are included in the narrative, and the perspective of Rodolfo “Gorky” Gonzalez is presented in an excerpt from his epic poem, “Yo Soy Joaquín,” “I am Joaquín.” Thus the first three criteria were met.

As far as attributing agency is concerned, again the narrative inclusion of union activism and organizing done by Chavez and by union members, fulfills the fourth criteria. Finally, the connections between past and present are not stated in the text, however, the issues of farmworker rights, and of Chicano identity are still relevant today, thus it is left up to the teacher to make these obvious connections.

Immediately following is another section, *Other Hispanic Newcomers*, which provides background information on Puerto Ricans, Cubans, Central and South Americans in the U.S. Most of the data provided on Puerto Ricans is accurate. However, the authors drew parallels between Puerto Ricans and European immigrants without mentioning the factors which distinguished them, other than the citizenship status of Puerto Ricans. These factors include the colonial status of the island as a U.S. territory seized in the Spanish American War, and the role American corporations played in the island's economy, compelling many Puerto Ricans to emigrate.

Nevertheless, most of the background on Cuban Americans especially regarding their reasons for immigrating, were quite accurate. Overall, the information in the text and on the chart is factually correct.

Key Latino leaders, namely Herman Badillo, and Fidel Castro are presented, and some significant issues and events are included in the narrative. There is no discussion, however, of the perspectives of these leaders, outside of Fidel Castro's self-labeling as a communist and some Cubans opposition to him. Yet, agency is attributed to Castro and other

Cubans, as well as to Badillo and to “many Puerto Ricans (who) were able to improve their lives.” (p. 560)

Some connections are made to the present through the inclusion of demographic information, from 1987, and in statements such as, “Hispanic political influence has continued to grow.” (p. 561) Thus, in this section on “Other Hispanics”, all but the third criteria are fulfilled.

On pages 177-78, there is a literary passage from *Among My People*, a book by Mexican American author, Jovita Gonzalez which describes life in a south Texas Hispanic community. Due to the autobiographical nature of these sentences, one can assume general, but not specific, factual accuracy. That is, the setting and traditions described are accurate, but the specific sequence of events may not, and need not be.

As expected, no key leaders events or contributions are presented, no special agency is attributed, and no connections are deliberately made to the present. However an Hispanic lifestyle perspective is described, and its values are implied. Thus this section fulfills the first and third criteria.

The last significant passage in this text is on pages 295--296, and it focuses on Mexican Americans and Mexican immigrants during the first quarter of the 20th century. Included as part of a section on *Labor in Wartime* (World War I), these sentences do provide some useful and factual information on the reasons and conditions confronting workers of Mexican descent. They also include key events and leaders such as Ezekial Cabeza de Baca who in 1916 was elected governor of New Mexico,

the first Hispanic American governor in the U.S., and also Octaviano Larrazolo, who became the first Hispanic American elected to the Senate in 1928.

No clear Hispanic perspective is presented in this short passage, and no obvious connections are made to the present, but agency is certainly attributed to Mexican American workers and leaders. Thus, these sentences do fulfill the first, second and fourth criteria.

From the above, it is reasonable to consider that the major passages and sections about Latinos in the Garraty textbook, do present overall an authentic and accurate portrait of the Latino experience in the U.S.

Davidson/Prentice Hall

There are several passages or sections which focus on the Latino experience in this textbook. On pages 102-3, the rise of cattle ranching and cowboys is covered. The Spanish, Mexicans and Mexican Americans are credited for their establishment of and involvement in the ranching lifestyle of the West. More details on the Mexican *vaquero*, and his contributions are covered in a special *Life in America* section titled: *Spanish Heritage of the Cowboy*, which included three discussion questions as well as a color illustration. Thus, this section fulfills three of the five qualitative criteria, it is factually accurate (criteria #1), includes key contributions (#2), and attributes agency(#4).

Under a section, *Others Bypassed by Prosperity*, the text discusses on pages 344--46, the economic conditions of Mexican immigrants during the early 1900's. Together with the following section, *Juan--A Solo in Chicago*, the authors provide information as to why Mexicans immigrated and the challenges many of them confronted, especially as single men. The information is accurate, a key event (the Mexican Revolution) is included, an Hispanic perspective is presented, and agency is attributed to Mexican immigrant workers who overcome many obstacles to establish viable communities. The first four criteria were met in this section.

On pages 421-22, the section *Mexican Americans in the 1930s*, dedicates three paragraphs to describe immigration to the Southwest, deportation of Mexican American families, and the involvement of the Mexican American in both agricultural and industrial unions. The facts presented are valid, key events and issues are included, a Latina labor organizer's perspective is quoted, agency is attributed to Mexican origin workers. Again, as in the previous section reviewed, the first four criteria are met.

The section, *Hispanics*, on pages 570-71, followed by one on *Forms of Discrimination*, pages 572--73, represents the most comprehensive treatment of Hispanics in this textbook. There are sub-sections on Cubans, and Puerto Ricans, as well as Mexican Americans in the *Hispanics* section, and on *The fight for equality* and *Gains* in the section on discrimination.

Overall, the information is factual, and two key Mexican American leaders, Chavez, and Jose Angel Gutierrez, founder of the Raza Unida

Party, are included. In a special “An American Portrait” section, a brief biography of Dr. Hector Perez Garcia, Mexican American founder of the American GI Forum, is featured, and also pictured with President L.B. Johnson.

The perspectives of Latinos are certainly presented, especially in response to discrimination and agency is attributed to them as they struggled, generally successfully, to gain their rights. Finally a connection is made with the present in the final few sentences of the Gains section which asks questions still relevant today, such as, “How much should they (Hispanics) adopt the customs of mainstream America?” and “How much should they work to preserve their own ethnic ways.?” (573) Thus, all five qualitative criteria are well fulfilled in these two sections.

In pages 777-79 in a section, “When You’re Small,” César Chavez provides a narrative of the working and living conditions his family confronted as migrant workers during the Depression. Factual accuracy is not at issue, and all the other qualitative criteria are met well by this selection, except for making a direct connection with present conditions.

In another section on *Hispanics* on pages 677--79, the authors attempt to bring the discussion of this group up to date, focusing on cultural influences, population and other demographics. The following section, “*Melting Pot*” or “*Salad Bowl*” the two distinct perspectives on assimilation are discussed briefly ending with a quite a few sentences on the issue of bilingual education. Again, factual accuracy is not a problem and some connections are made with the present and future regarding

the Hispanic presence. However, there is not enough written here to attribute agency, present an Hispanic perspective, or include any key leaders, events, or issues, except for that of bilingual education.

And in this regard, bilingual education is described in one sentence, followed by four sentences presenting opposition to it, and the reasons for this opposition. Nevertheless, not one statement is made to present the arguments in favor of bilingual education. Here is an example of where an Hispanic perspective was sorely needed for balance and accuracy. This bias against presenting balanced information on bilingual education is deplorable, though quite common in the mass media, but is inexcusable in a textbook.

These later sections have certain weaknesses compared to those which appear earlier in this text, and that's unfortunate. If anything, Hispanic influence is likely to grow even stronger in the present and future than what it was in the past.

Nevertheless, despite these weaknesses in these later sections, overall, most of the sections dealing with Hispanics in this textbook provide valid and authentic information to the reader.

Berkin/Scott Foresman

In terms of the textual narrative, there is considerably less than in the other two textbooks, although there were a number of optional readings, discussed above, which were overall of good quality. Among the more significant sections in the narrative itself is one on the growth of cattle ranching and the birth of the cowboy on pp. 173-74. Therein a

few statements are made about how Americans borrowed methods from the *vaquero*, as well as the Spanish words associated with cattle ranching.

These statements are factual and do recognize a key contributions Mexicans make to the economic development of the West.

In the context of a discussion on American imperialism, there is coverage on pages 297--98 of how *Cuba and Puerto Rico came under the American flag*. Most of the events, some in significant detail, are accurate, and there are also some important explanations provided on the evolving citizenship status of Puerto Ricans from 1900 through 1917. Key dates, events and issues are included, although there is no mention of the views of Cuban and Puerto Rican leaders. These revolutionaries had been advocating for independence from Spain for decades and were suspicious of U.S. imperialist tendencies.

However, little or no agency is attributed to Hispanic people or leaders throughout this discussion of imperialism. Finally, there is no discussion of how these events following the Spanish American War are connected with the presence of Puerto Ricans and Cubans in the contemporary body politic and society of this nation today. Thus only the first two qualitative criteria are met by this section.

In a section, *Mexicans migrated to the Southwest* on pages 336--37, the authors provide three reasons why immigrants from Mexico came to the Southwest from 1910 to 1921. More than half of this section, however, is dedicated to relating the experiences of Mexican American leader, Ernesto Galarza, as a new immigrant in Sacramento, California. Most of the information is valid; a key leader, dates and events were

included; Galarza's views are expressed; and agency is attributed to Latinos. Four of the five criteria are met herein. There was one error, the Mexican Revolution was, or began, in 1910, not 1911 as stated on page 336.

Another section on pages 444--45 explained how *Many Mexican Americans were forced to leave the country*, during the early 1930's and Depression years. The job discrimination and forced deportations endured by Mexican Americans during this period are described. The facts are accurate, and some key issues are considered but no connections with the present are made; no agency is attributed in response to these conditions; and no Hispanic perspectives on these issues are expressed. Thus only two criteria are met in this section.

In a short, three-paragraph section, *The New Deal and Mexican Americans* on page 480, the authors describe how the New Deal programs impacted on Mexican Americans, and how other conditions prevented them from fully benefiting from these opportunities. The facts herein are accurately presented and key events are included, but the section is too short to elaborate on any of the other three criteria.

A more comprehensive treatment of *Hispanic Americans*, is provided on pages 714--15, focusing on their various responses to the "turbulent climate of the late 1960s..." (p. 714). Following some basic demographic data in terms of the concentration of the three largest groups, the authors discuss some of the civil rights issues confronted by Hispanic leaders during these years. The facts are accurate; again César Chavez is highlighted as are some key issues and events; Hispanic views

on bilingualism and assimilation are expressed; and agency is attributed to Hispanic leaders and activists. The first four criteria are met well in this section.

The last major section in our review, on pages 863--65, provides perhaps the most comprehensive and updated treatment of Latinos in this textbook. Titled, *The Hispanic American population grew enormously in the 1980s*, the authors begin the discussion with demographic data, especially focusing on legal and illegal migration and population growth. Then in a sub-section on *Increased political power*, the narrative focuses on two high level Hispanic appointees, Lauro F. Cavazos, Mexican American, as Secretary of Education, and Dr. Antonio Coello Novello, a Puerto Rican as Surgeon General. Both were the first Hispanics, and in Novello's case, also the first woman to head their cabinet posts.

Finally, the last sub-section, *Increased voter registration*, focuses on the successes Hispanics have had in national, state and local politics through increased voting and political participation. Willie Velasquez, Mexican American founder of Southwest Voter Registration Project is also included in the discussion. Overall, this final section, enhanced by photographs, maps and graphs, does provide considerable information. Key leaders are included as are certain issues; the views of these leaders are expressed; and agency is attributed. The first four qualitative criteria are well met in these final section and the issues and topics covered, such as illegal immigration, drop-outs, and AIDS are still relevant today.

Qualitative Comparisons Among Textbooks

It is quite difficult to make very specific comparisons among the three texts in terms of quality, yet the extent to which the passages in each text meet the five criteria could help in this task. When comparing the quality of the longer passages related to Latinos in these texts, for example, it becomes evident that most of these in the Davidson textbook meet four or more of the five qualitative criteria.

Averaging out the ratings (on a scale from 1 to 5) for all six major Latino-related sections in the Davidson/Prentice Hall text would yield a 3.67 rating. Doing the same with the sections in the Garraty/Holt text generates a rating of 3.25, and for the Berkin/Scott Foresman text, that rating would be a 2.7.

Yet, these numbers only reveal part of the qualitative aspect. The Berkin textbook, for example, has the courage to deal honestly with certain issues such as discrimination, forced deportations, and political empowerment as well as or better than the other two texts. There is even a discussion in Berkin of “American imperialism” in the context of the Spanish American War. Yet, for all the text about “anti-imperialists” in the U.S. at this time in the Garraty text, it never even mentions “American imperialism” by name, let alone explore it as an enduring concept. Thus the reader is left with the impression that it was only a passing phase in U.S. foreign policy.

Because of these mixed characteristics in each text, it is difficult to clearly declare any of the three texts superior in every way in terms of

quality. Consequently, the above criteria based ratings must be considered in conjunction with other factors, including the kinds of topics textbook authors are willing to tackle and how honestly they do so.

One of the most obvious questions that arises when conducting this type of review, especially if it is about the Latino presence in textbooks, is how much coverage, or how many sentences or pages are enough to consider that this group has been well represented.

While it is possible to make comparisons among textbooks along the quantitative aspects, and arrive at relative numbers in terms of sentence counts, there are no easy answers determining what is enough in an absolute sense. However, if we use the Garraty/Holt textbook as an example, we could calculate that there are about 15 sentences per page on the average since a full page of text is from 25-27 sentences and the vast majority of pages have shorter texts due to illustrations, photos, etc.

Using a conservative estimate of only 15 sentences per page divided into the 265 Latino related sentences in Garraty/Holt would mean that just under 18 pages are dedicated to Latinos in this text. Given that the book is just over 630 pages long, it means that a mere 3% of the book has text focusing on the Latino experience. Without doing the calculations for the other two textbooks, (Davidson/Prentice Hall=376 sentences; Berkin/Scott Foresman=180) it is evident that a few more or less percentage points does not alter the overall obvious conclusion that Latinos are still grossly underrepresented in these U.S. History textbooks given their population and historical significance in this nation.

From this point of departure, it could be argued that speaking of quality may not be relevant, given that even the best quality writing about Latinos consisted of such a small percentage of the overall narrative that may not have a considerable impact on students' understanding anyway. Nevertheless, it is important that the five qualitative criteria be considered, measured and met so that what little information about Latinos does appear in textbooks is at least valuable, authentic, and relevant, and thus establish a foundation for more accurate understanding on the part of both students and teachers.

4. A Comparison of Two New Textbooks

In addition to the thorough analysis of the three textbooks above, I also conducted a less comprehensive, yet quite revealing contrast/comparison of two newly adopted textbooks for U.S. history. These will be in use for at least 7 to 10 years into the future beginning in the Fall, 2003 semester in school districts all over the state.

For this purpose, the two high school level US history textbooks targeted for review of their Latino coverage were:

The American Nation by Paul Boyer and Sterling Stuckey
Publisher: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

America: Pathways to the Present by Cayton, Perry, Reed & Winkler
Publisher: Prentice Hall

The most striking contrast between these is the sheer difference in the scope and depth of coverage. The Holt textbook deals with a wide

variety of topics related to Mexican Americans, some take a few paragraphs, but other topics are described and elaborated in several pages. Among these are some short biographies as well as the Mexican vaquero, immigration, migrant workers, and the Zoot Suit Riots.

There is even a seven page section on the Chicano Movement, (pp. 682--688) which includes quotes, personal testimonials, primary sources, photos, and a map, as well as key personalities, organizations, and events. In this section, the Holt text also explains more complex concepts including non-violence as practiced by César Chávez, and cultural nationalism as espoused by Chicano activists.

This particular section in the Holt text on the Chicano Movement serves as a model, and established a standard much higher than required by the TEKS, of how to thoroughly present an historical topic related to Latinos.

By contrast the Prentice Hall text covers fewer topics related to Latinos, particularly Mexican Americans, and does not enrich its presentation with as many quotes, testimonials, and graphics as does Holt.

Nevertheless, Prentice Hall does dedicate three pages to a section on “Latinos Fight for Change,” (pp. 771 --773) beginning with the 1960’s. Short biographies of Cesar Chavez (p. 773) and Dr. Hector Garcia (p. 703), are included as sidebars. The names of other leaders are briefly mentioned, but there just is not enough words dedicated to the explanation of what they accomplished, what they believed, and the various organizations they founded.

There is also another section on “Mexican Americans” (p. 625--626) which covers the time during and immediately following World War II. Post-war immigration is discussed as are the Bracero program, and the Zoot Suit Riots.

Yet, what is missing here, that is more evident in the Holt text, is the use of various sources other than text, to present a personality or topic.

Overall, the quality of writing is superior in the Holt text, topics are better elaborated and concepts are explained more fully as well. In terms of the Zoot Suit Riots, the Holt text provides a more thorough historical and economic context to this event than does Prentice Hall.

Besides describing what happened, the Holt text (p. 539) mentions that 300,000 Mexican Americans served in the military, and also the fact that 17 earned the Congressional Medal of Honor. The Prentice text (p. 626) leaves out this information and also fails to mention, as does the Holt text, that a citizen’s committee later determined that racial prejudice had motivated the attacks of soldiers and sailors against Mexican American youths wearing Zoot suits. Holt also includes other relevant information not covered by Prentice Hall namely that the Los Angeles police as well as biased newspaper reports had contributed to the attacks and to the general public’s prejudice against Zoot suitors.

There are other ways in which the Holt text provides better, more accurate, complete coverage of Latino topics than does Prentice Hall, but the above serve as the most salient examples. While both textbooks represent a considerable improvement over past textbooks on US history,

it is clear that one publisher has invested more effort, space and resources to presenting the Latinos story than the other.

Without having reviewed the other textbooks for US history that were recently adopted , we cannot speak to their quality or quantity in terms of their Latino content, however, the Holt textbook, The American Nation, does represent a standard by which others can be compared.

There has been much improvement in the representation of Latinos in textbooks over the last two decades. Yet, the range of Latino diversity, in terms of national origin, racial mixture, cultural heritage, and social class has not been clearly presented in any U.S. history textbook we have reviewed. Moreover, the many Latino contributions in the areas of cattle ranching, military, art, law, literature, music and civil rights, have not been adequately expressed in any single textbook.

C. TESTIMONY FROM 2002 TEXTBOOK ADOPTION

The textbook adoption process in Texas is a complex, multiyear project involving writing committees, public hearings, and written testimony as the major vehicles for citizen involvement.

Having provided testimony on several occasions myself, including most recently on September 11, 2002, I have observed that there are recurrent themes and issues as well as specific types of critiques that are repeated regarding the textbooks up for adoption. These issues and critiques are expressed in both the oral as well as the written testimony,

and could provide some insights into what are the kinds of issues that emerge regarding the representation of Latinos in U.S. history textbooks.

Thus, I decided to review the transcripts from one of the three public hearings regarding the U.S. history textbooks up for adoption. The importance of these hearings is underlined by the fact that if adopted, the selected texts will be used beginning Fall, 2003, and continue in use for at least ten years into the future.

Hearings were held in the capital, Austin on three dates in 2002: July 17; August 23, and September 11. A week prior to each hearing date, was the deadline for receipt of written comments, thus the written comments for July 17 were submitted on July 10.

I selected the oral and written testimony for those two July dates for our review and analysis, mainly because both contained a considerable amount of testimony regarding Latino, Hispanic, or Mexican American issues. As with other testimonies, they also contained a wide variety of perspectives from university professors and students as well as from speakers with established educational and ideological organizations.

As mentioned in Chapter III Methodology, there are at least three basic types of critiques made, which we conveniently label the “ABCs” of textbook criticism. These served as a useful criteria for our categorizing of the many critiques presented, with the clear understanding that some testimony may include two or all three of these.

The three types of critiques are:

Accuracy: the content is incorrect as a matter of fact in terms of dates, names, the actual occurrence of events, or other knowledge

Bias: the content expresses a partisan, political, religious or ideological perspective, usually to the exclusion of other views

Content: there is significant content missing or present which results in inaccuracy, bias and/or misrepresentation of historical facts

Keeping these three types of critiques in mind, we reviewed both the oral and written testimony related to Latino/Hispanic concerns, and determined how many of each type were presented.

In addition to this typology of critiques we also noted the themes or issues which were expressed in the testimony and by whom.

1. Oral Testimony: July 17, 2002

There were a total of 67 speakers signed up to testify on July 17, 2002 regarding social studies textbooks, however, due to a variety of circumstances 42 were actually present to testify. Each speaker was allotted only three minutes for their oral presentation, although her/his time could be effectively extended by questions or comments from the State Board of Education before whom they spoke (TEA, 2002a).

Of those 42, only 15 speakers addressed issues related to Latinos, Hispanics, or Mexican Americans or to the history of Mexico or Latin America. Thirteen of those 15 who addressed Latino related issues were of Hispanic descent themselves.

Using four general categories to identify these 15 speakers according to how they self-identified: 6 were college students, 4 were college professors, 3 were representatives of organizations, and two spoke as private citizens. Thus, ten of the fifteen, or two-thirds of those who spoke on Latino issues, were from colleges or universities in Texas, and all of them were Latinos.

Although Latinos have only rarely been involved before in the textbook adoption process in Texas, it seems that here there was significant Latino presence and involvement, and that engagement is being spearheaded by Mexican American college professors and their students.

Given the nature of the testimony, it is possible to quantify the number of desecrate critiques speakers make regarding textbooks. The fifteen who testified on Latino related issues, for example, made approximately 39 specific critiques. As stated and defined above, these critiques can be categorized into three types, with A=Accuracy, B=Bias, and C=Content.

Sometimes a particular critique could involve two or more critiques, for example, both accuracy and bias, (AB) or any combination of two or three types (i.e. AC, BC, or ABC). Using this typology, the 39 critiques were categorized and yielded the following results presented below as a simple formula:

$$29C + 4BC + 3AC + 1AB + 1B + 1ABC = 39 \text{ Critiques}$$

It is important to note that by far the largest number of critiques (29C), were about content alone, more specifically about content that was

missing from the textbook. Another 8 critiques involved missing content, four of which also included issues of bias (4BC), three included problems with accuracy (3AC), and one involved all three types of critiques (1ABC).

Thus overall, 37 of the 39 Latino-related critiques had to do almost totally, or in part, with issues of missing content. Clearly, what is NOT said about Hispanics, and more specifically about Mexicans or Mexican Americans, is by far the largest single type of criticism presented during this day of public hearings when it comes to Latino issues.

There were a variety issues presented by these 15 speakers, and with a few exceptions, most of which had to do with U.S. history or Texas history textbooks. These 39 critiques are listed in the below, beginning with those presented by students first, followed by those from professors, private citizens, and then organizational representatives.

College/Univ. Students

1. Too little coverage of Aztec & Maya Civilizations
2. No mention of Hispanics fighting in World War II
3. Too little coverage of Cesar Chavez
4. No mention of the Delano Grape Strike
5. Too little on pre-Columbian civilizations and Columbian Exchange
6. Not enough on early Spanish settlements in Southwest
7. Not enough on Hispanic civil rights struggle
8. Mexican and Latin American revolutions not mentioned
9. Spanish conquest of Aztecs incomplete and biased
10. Violent conflicts between Anglos & Tejanos not mentioned
11. Hispanics missing: Pancho Villa, Francisco Madero, Ema Tenayuca
12. No mention of Hispanics in Civil War
13. Mexican soldiers cast as evil murderers in Alamo (Bias)
14. No mention of obstacles to Latino voting rights
15. Of 640 pages in textbook, only 40 on women and minorities

Professors

1. Details missing on Olmec, Maya and Aztec civilizations
2. Not enough on Hispanic settlers, Ranchos in New Spain & work ethic
3. Details missing on first battle of U.S. Mexican War
4. Name of Mexican soldiers in last US/Mexico War battle: Niños Heroes
5. Story of Mexican Americans not included adequately in textbooks
6. Mexican Rancheros helped American Revolutionary effort
7. One of the first Long cattle drives in history not included
8. Mexican settlers were already in Texas before Anglos/missing info
9. Spanish-surnamed Tejanos were the only native defenders in Alamo
10. Texas as state, did not exist in 1826 as implied by textbook
11. Mexican Americans marginalized also in textbooks
12. Mexican American students stifled by textbook exclusion
13. Little coverage of Mexico, Latin America, and Hispanic influences
14. Puerto Rico not in US map, labeled as “dependency” but not defined and status unclear.

Private Citizens

1. Textbooks inadequately represent Hispanics
2. No section on Hispanic civil rights movement
3. No mention of litigation required to ensure Hispanic civil rights
4. Four outstanding Mexican Americans missing from textbooks.
(Gus Garcia, Carlos Cadena, Dr. Hector Perez-Garcia, J.A. Gutierrez)
5. Both Hispanic and Non-Hispanics ignorant about Hispanic heroes
6. Spanish names of Alamo defenders not mentioned
7. Juan Seguin’s contributions to Texas Revolution missing

Organizational Representatives

1. Border claims by Texans before Texas Revolution not accurate
2. US payments to Mexico after Mexican American War, incorrect
3. Mexican American heroes missing from textbooks

As stated above and confirmed by this list, the vast majority of the issues or errors presented on this day of testimony were related to what is missing from textbooks related to the Latino experience. In terms of specific topics, there were some issues raised concerning improper or

insufficient attention paid to pre-Columbian civilizations of Ancient Mexico, namely Aztecs, Mayas, Olmecs. However, the majority of critiques addressed the absence of Latinos in the context of U.S. and Texas history.

Especially emphasized was that Hispanics were not being mentioned as contributing combatants in our most significant armed conflicts, especially the Civil War, the Texas Revolutionary War, and World War II. Also mentioned frequently, as missing or minimally covered, was information on the Mexican American civil rights movement.

Finally, although not reflected in the summarized list above, on at least four occasions, Latino college students made clear comparisons between how Latinos versus how African Americans were covered. One had to do with the Civil War, but three specifically mentioned how the African American civil rights movement got adequate coverage, while that of Mexican Americans did not, or was completely excluded in the text.

2. Written Testimony: July 10, 2003

A close review of the materials submitted by July 10, 2003, revealed that for the most part, they are directly related to and supportive of the speakers' presentations on July 17. There were 35 individuals who submitted written documents in support of their statements; 8 were students, 4 were professors, 10 were private citizens, and 13 were organizational representatives.

Almost half of the 35, precisely 17, submitted critiques and comments which wholly or in part addressed issues related to Hispanics, Mexican Americans, Mexico or Latin America. All but four of those 17 were of Hispanic background.

Most of the Latino related issues expressed in writing were identical to those presented orally. However, there were other issues which did emerge from the written documents that for reasons of time and emphasis were not articulated. Moreover, even issues that were mentioned in both public hearings and written comments usually received much more detailed treatment in written form, as expected.

Listed below are the 17 Latino-related issues which were contained in the written comments, but which were not mentioned in the oral testimony.

College/Univ. Students

1. Pancho Villa portrayed as only a villain in both Mexico and U.S.
2. No mention of Cuban and Central American immigration to U.S.

Professors

1. Only 2 Hispanics in hundreds of biographies of key Americans
2. Geographic location and discussion of Mexico is confusing
3. Terms “Latino” “Hispanic” “Mexican American” used without clear explanation
4. Both push and pull factors of Latino immigration ignored
5. Sandinistas, democratically elected, but labeled as “dictatorship”
6. No information on current embargo against Cuba
7. No mention of Central American immigration
8. No mention of “Reagan Wars” in Central America and support for death squads.
9. The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo also included provisions to respect Spanish and Mexican land grants, but Congress voted against it.

Private Citizen

1. Not enough photos of women and minorities, too many photos of white males

Organizational Representatives

1. The nature of Anglo vs Spanish early settlements not contrasted clearly enough
2. “Deaf” Smith got more profile in text than did Zavala and others during the Texas Revolution
3. Failure to mention leaders in “colonial” Texas, such as, Cortez, and Father Hidalgo
4. Spain’s contribution to American Revolution was profound, but not mentioned in any textbook
5. Spanish General Galvez played a key role in defeating British forces in southern coast during Revolutionary War

When considering this list of 17 critiques from the written comments together with the 39 from those generated in the oral testimony, it is abundantly clear that the 56 critiques are overwhelmingly concerned with issues of exclusion or missing content rather than factual accuracy or intentional bias.

It is significant to note that in both oral and written testimony, especially when it comes to Latino exclusion, that presenters emphasized or at least implied that this missing information does affect the overall bias or perspective of the historical narrative and could in some cases even effectively present inaccurate portrayals or interpretations.

Nevertheless, this focus on what is not in the textbook also reflects the reality that despite occasional incorrect factoids or obvious bias,

when it comes to Latinos in history textbooks, the issue is more of under representation rather than misrepresentation.

3. Participant Observations: Textbook Hearings

On September 11, 2002, I had a third opportunity to testify before the State Board of Education (SBOE) in Austin regarding textbooks. In 1991 I had presented a textbook critique with the mentorship of Dr. Linda Salvucci, an historian then at Trinity University.

A year later, the 1992 hearings took place; they provided Texas with the social studies textbooks used until quite recently, Spring, 2003.

For that key hearing I organized an ad-hoc committee, the Multicultural Alliance of San Antonio (MASA), that brought together academic historians, teachers, college students, and even high school students to review textbooks and testify regarding the representation of Latinos and women in Literature and Social Studies texts (Texas Education Agency, 1992).

Thus, by the time I was making preparations for my testimony for September, 2003, I had become quite familiar with the process, and was also becoming more aware of the subtle nuances involved in presenting an effective testimony. I also got a more accurate view of how sophisticated and well-funded were the reviews and testimony of certain politically conservative organizations which had been critiquing textbooks for decades in Texas.

Among those observations I made are that the process for providing testimony, though not inherently difficult, to be done effectively does require initiative, persistence, and attention to detail. For this reason alone, organizations and organized groups such as those by college professors and their students, offer a distinct advantage over any individual's effort to testify.

Providing a written document one week before the testimony of course advantages those who do so, thus giving them extended opportunity to provide much more detailed commentary and recommendations far beyond what three minutes of speaking orally would permit. I also noticed that providing a short, 3 to 4 page summary of main points to the SBOE at the time of testimony, also ensures that these points are not missed. It also provides options of presenting tables, charts, maps, or other visually effective evidence to bolster your arguments.

Thus providing written and visual documentation is a strategic and necessary part of any truly effective testimony, as we learned from our efforts with MASA, especially when circumstances could prevent scholars, students or private citizens from actually attending the hearing in person.

Among those organizations which had been providing testimony on textbooks for decades, many had already a statewide or national reputation. Among those I have heard, and sometimes encountered, are the well-known Mel and Norma Gabler's Educational Research Analysts, perhaps the Godparents of right-wing textbook critics. During the 2002

hearings, other influential conservative organizations, participating with numerous individual presenters and extensive written documentation, included the following:

- Texas Public Policy Foundation
- Texas Citizens for a Sound Economy
- Texas Society--Daughters of the American Revolution
- Austin--The Eagle Forum

It is interesting to note that the Texas Public Policy Foundation(TPPF), according to the testimony of its members, had enough resources to commission 16 reviewers, including academics and other professionals in their fields, who generated a 98 page report. The TPPF spent nearly \$100,000 in this particular review, a through one which discovered and documented 533 textbook “errors”(TEA, 2002).

There were also educational organizations providing testimony, namely the Texas Council for the Social Studies, as well as a few politically progressive organizations including Americans United for Separation of Church and State, and the Texas Freedom Network (TFN). As a watchdog and policy institute opposed to religious right wing influence, the TFN has become thoroughly involved in the Texas textbook adoption process and is a reliable source for related information.

There were also specific Latino professors who either provided individual testimony (Dr. José Limón of UT Austin), or did so in conjunction with their students (Dr. Manuel Medrano of UT Brownsville). Outside of a few Latino academics and their students, however, the only Latino organization that was represented in testimony for the 2002 cycle

was the National Council of La Raza, and even that was more of an individual than an organizational effort.

It cannot be emphasized enough that certain organizations, especially the TPPF and Texas Citizens for a Sound Economy, regularly receive much more media attention and access and were advantaged with more testimony time from the SBOE who asked friendly questions and/or made supportive comments.

The many advantages and the considerable influence religious and politically conservative organizations have in these textbook hearings were clearly evident to me and other observers for years.

What made the 2002 hearings different, however, was that perhaps for the first time, Latino presenters, including myself, were asked friendly questions and were supplemented with supportive statements, not surprisingly, mostly from the Latino SBOE members.

The hearings transcripts document, for example, that one board member, Ms. Berlanga, was so well impressed with my presentation that she requested that I conduct a similar review of all the other U.S. history textbooks, in addition to the two I had already done. She, and to a lesser extent, Dr. Allen, also asked several questions and made comments in response to which I was free to expand on my statements considerably (TEA, 2002b). This opportunity was also provided by both Latino and non-Latino SBOE members to other Latino presenters, especially the professors, thus permitting all of us to further extend our comments, not only about the textbooks per se, but also about the TEKS, and the textbook adoption process itself.

Participating in the September 11 hearing, precisely one year from that now historic date, gave me the opportunity to make more profound comments about the meaning of patriotism and democracy in the context of a truly authentic and multicultural telling of our history. As an honest statement of my beliefs, including the motivations which drive my research, I feel that it's appropriate to include it as significant data:

Love of our nation goes beyond grieving its tragedies and celebrating its victories. It includes adherence to the belief in our highest democratic principles. These very principles compel many of us to be here today, to insure that when the story of America is told and studied in public schools, all the people who helped make our nation great will be included.

But much too often, this has not been the case; in study after study I reviewed for my doctoral thesis, the exclusion, or misrepresentation of racial and ethnic minorities, and especially Latinos, is well documented.

The proper inclusion of Latinos in the U.S. history curriculum and textbooks is not driven nor justified by acquiescence to pressure groups or political correctness--- on the contrary, it is founded on the democratic principle that the story of America cannot be told completely, nor accurately, if Latinos or other minorities are misrepresented or left out." (TEA, 2002 b)

Among the many opportunities for learning I gained from participating and observing the textbook adoption process, is that of personally meeting and informally consulting with Dr. Manuel Medrano, his students and other Latino professors who were there, most of whom testified. I not only listened closely to their testimony, but also talked

over lunch with them about what can be done collectively and collaboratively in the future.

It was obvious to me, for example, that although there was much criticism by my Latino colleagues of most textbooks' poor treatment of the Mexican American civil rights movement, nobody had reviewed the high school level Holt text, and thus discovered, as I did, that they had an excellent and truly outstanding section on this very topic.

The problem is that we were not coordinating our efforts so as to avoid duplication and to ensure maximum coverage of all social studies textbooks.

Recognizing that we do not have tens of thousands to spend on textbook reviews, as does, the TPPF, we concluded that establishing an informal network would at least keep us in communication with each other. Already some academics were attempting to establish such an organization, and the general feeling among most of us was that we had achieved something significant and that we could only do better in the future.

4. Latinos in 2002 Texas Textbook Adoption Process

To conclude this section, we will briefly outline some points which emerge from the testimony and other data regarding the presence of Latinos in this most recent textbook adoption process in 2002.

- a. Latinos did have a recognizable and significant presence in both the oral and written testimony of July, 2002.

- b. Many Latino-related issues and concerns were expressed in both forms of testimony.
- c. Most critiques about Latino representation focused more on what was missing, rather than what was wrong in textbooks.
- d. There was a wide range of Latino related testimony in terms of length and complexity.
- e. Several presenters spoke about the negative effects for both Latino and non-Latino students of having Latinos under-represented in social studies textbooks.

Given the trends I have observed over the last decade in textbook adoption, it is logical to predict that in the future, Latinos as an advocacy group, will continue to have increasing and consistent presence in the textbook adoption process of Texas. Religious right, and conservative groups will probably continue to wield their usual influence, but it will be increasingly challenged by such organizations as the Texas Freedom Network or others unwilling to yield without a fight in this important battlefield of our never ending *Cultural Wars*.

V. Data on Teachers' Perspectives

As described above in the Introduction, and with more detail in the Methodology chapter, the purpose of these two studies was to examine the beliefs and perceptions selected U.S. history teachers have regarding the content of their courses. Also examined were some of the factors which impact this content, and how these relate to teachers' content choices. Special attention was focused as well on the extent to which, and the context in which, participants mention women or racial and ethnic minorities, and especially Latinos (or Hispanics, Mexican-Americans, etc.) regarding their presence in the curriculum.

Data from both the individual interview study and the focus group study will be presented below. These will be followed by a presentation of data from the course content checklists filled by participants of both the individual interviews and the focus group.

A. INDIVIDUAL INTERVIEWS

The first study consisted of individual interviews with 12 U.S. history teachers from the Northside Independent School District. Participants were from both genders and three ethnoracial groups (Anglo, Latino and African American), all with varied length and type of experience. They included teachers instructing the first part of U.S. history (to Reconstruction) at the 8th grade level, and those teaching the second part of U.S. history in high school.

The same set of questions were asked of all participants, with of course, some minor individual variation depending on the participant's response. Please refer to Appendix IQ to access these questions.

Gender and race were important distinctions, as was experience, because these factors were associated with the type of responses provided by participants. Thus these factors will be clearly identified, when appropriate, in the presentation of the data below.

The relevant data was extracted from interviews and notes then organized and analyzed using the five following approaches.

1. The three hypotheses will be compared to findings.
2. The general pattern of responses to selected questions by all participants will be noted.
3. The correlation four participant variables (gender, ethno-race, grade level, experience) have on selected participant responses.
4. The extent to which participants mention women and minorities
5. The extent to which Latinos are mentioned.

Findings relevant to each one of these five ways of looking at the data will be reported below followed by a final section summarizing the findings and briefly discussion their implications.

1. The Three Working Hypotheses

- Most participants will perceive that there is more content to be taught than what time and circumstance permit them to teach.

Supported: Nine of twelve participants mentioned time constraints as the major obstacle to teaching all the required content.

- At least 1/3 of participants will identify specific eras, events or individuals of special interest to them which circumstances do not permit them to teach about well.

Supported: All twelve participants readily volunteered specific areas of personal interest which time constraints prevented them from teaching.

· At least 1/2 of the participants will mention perceived problems or deficiencies with either the TAAS test, the TEKS, and/or the adopted textbook.

Partially Supported:

TAAS Test: 6 had strong critiques, and 6 mentioned both positive & negative effects.

TEKS: 8 made positive statements, 4 critiqued absence of minorities & women, 1 was balanced or neutral.

Textbooks: 4 made positive statements, 3 made negative, 5 were balanced or neutral.

The first two tentative hypotheses were supported by the findings as indicated above. The third hypotheses involved three distinct items. The TAAS test was generally viewed as having an influential and negative effect; six participants voiced strong critiques. The other six made both positive and negative statements regarding a test which has gained importance as being the primary instrument for assessment of students, teachers, schools and even school districts statewide.

The TEKS curriculum standards received a positive appraisal from eight of the participants, while four critiqued it for the absence of women and minorities. In fact the lack of multicultural content was the only criticism made against the TEKS, although some who made this critique,

also agreed that it provided good framework, especially for young and/or inexperienced teachers.

In terms of the textbooks being a valuable resource in their teaching, the participants' responses were quite mixed. Four made definitely positive statements, three made negative statements and the other five were more neutral or balanced in their assessment.

2. General Patterns of Responses

Some of the questions which were of greatest relevance to this inquiry have to do with the teachers' choice of content and some of the factors which influence their choices. Among the conditions which impact on teachers instructional decisions is their perception of students' interest in learning history.

One question (#6, please refer to Appendix IQ) deals with this:

“What approximate percentage of your classroom students demonstrate an interest in learning history?”

Seven of the twelve participants stated that 30% less are interested in learning history at the beginning of the course. However, five of these seven participants, and two others, also reported that a greater percentage of students eventually became more interested in history by the end of the course. These seven teachers reported that there was an increase of from 17% to over 50% more students who gained an interest in learning history. Thus, most participants perceived that a significant

number of students obtained a more positive attitude towards learning history from taking their course.

Several questions, #12 through #16, focused on the teachers' content preferences. For example, #12:

What eras, events, individuals, developments, etc. do you prefer, or enjoy teaching about the most?

The responses were quite varied. They included such items as: the progressive era, the Great Depression, the industrial age, aviation history, Westward movement, Gilded age, colonization period, American Revolution, Manifest Destiny, and the Lewis & Clark Expedition. Wars, figured prominently in these favorite choices, especially World War II, and the Civil War.

Aside from some personal reasons, i.e., interest in aviation because his dad was a pilot in WW II, most teachers preferences were related to the pivotal, and transforming importance of the event or period.

Even most of those that mentioned wars, did so with the understanding that students needed to understand the causes and effects of these conflicts on ordinary people as well as on the nation as a whole.

Another question (#14) asked participants, *“What would you like to teach, cover, include in the curriculum, which, for whatever reasons, you cannot cover in class?”* One follow-up question was, *“What prevents you from covering this material in your class now?”*

In response to the first question there was the expected variety of topics ranging from some already mentioned as favorite items in #12, as

well as such eras or events as: the 1970's: Nixon & Watergate, Spanish colonization, Vietnam, the Cold War, and environmental history.

Three participants mentioned more historical novels, fiction and other literature. Two indicated more hands on and experiential type activities, such as projects and field trips to local sites, museums as something they would like to do. One stated the desire to teach more about ordinary people and how they were impacted by events.

Four others mentioned Hispanics, Native Americans, and/or Blacks and heritage or history as topics about which they would teach more if circumstances permitted.

It was also significant to note that, in response to the second question of #14, nine of the twelve participants clearly stated that lack of time was the main reason why they could not teach about topics, eras, or events they would like to. Two indicated that they had not developed the resources or materials necessary, and one mentioned the TAAS test.

The one who mentioned the constraining effects of the TAAS test also was one of the respondents who most emphatically stated that he would like to teach more about the influence of minority groups, including the Native American removal, and aspects of Hispanic history.

The other most relevant question to the issue of content choice was the last one in this section, #16, which is really a two-part question.

“If you had to power to decide, what overall or specific changes would you make regarding the content covered in your course?” and “What’s preventing you from adopting or implementing these changes now?”

Five participants would bring more minorities and women into the curriculum. Two indicated that they would emphasize more Hispanic history and/or heritage and two others would bring Native Americans more to the forefront of the content being taught. One would add more information on women and ethnic groups.

Three responded that they would cover early colonization and exploration before the English, since this has period which is characterized by Spanish exploits, has been recently eliminated from the curriculum.

Another would change the textbooks and two others suggested structural changes: teach U.S. history as a three, rather than a two-year course, and teach the first and second parts of U.S. history consecutively, instead of being separated by two or three years.

In response to the second part, seven participants indicated again that time constraints were preventing them from implementing these changes. Three identified existing structures such as the TEKS and the TAAS or the established curriculum scope and sequence as barriers. One identified simply traditional viewpoints as the major obstacle.

3. Participant Variables

Four participant variables were considered in terms of their correlation with participant responses to some questions. These were: years of teaching experience, gender, middle school or high school, and ethnoracial group.

Experience

The first questions related to the teaching background and experience of participants. The diversity in terms of years of experience was clearly marked by a bipolar split. Five of the participants had ten years or more experience teaching U.S. history, whereas the other seven had six years or less. Those same five participants also had fifteen or more years teaching social studies while six of the seven other participants had under seven years.

Among the five with greatest years of experience, only one expressed any substantial criticism of the textbook. Those with less experience tended to be mention more often the biases, omissions or shortcomings of the adopted textbooks.

All but one of the five veterans also had only positive statements to make about the TEKS, whereas most of the teachers with less experience indicated that there were weaknesses in these guidelines. Three teachers, one veteran and two newer teachers, indicated that the major problem with the TEKS was the absence of minorities and women.

Although there was general criticism of the TAAS test, there was a tendency of the veteran teachers to balance their critiques with some balanced statement, i.e., more skills are being tested, whereas the newer teachers were more consistently critical of the effects and the construction of the TAAS test.

Gender

In terms of gender, seven of the participants were female of different ages, and including all three ethnoracial groups in the study. Looking at the responses by gender in some key questions, in answer to the textbook question, four of the five males made a disparaging comment. Of the seven females, only one offered a straight critique, two rated textbooks favorably, and four provided mixed reviews.

Among both genders, most respondents agreed that the TEKS provided a sound framework, but differed somewhat in their assessment of the impact of TAAS on their teaching. None of the participants mentioned anything positive or descriptive about the TAAS without also including some critique of its shortcomings. Yet, a simple majority of females (4) made predominantly negative statements about the TAAS, while a majority of males made more balanced statements.

In response to the question on favorite events, eras, etc., four of the five men mentioned multiple wars, and the fifth implied such conflicts by selecting “Manifest Destiny” and the “Westward Expansion.” However, of the four women who mentioned war, three listed only one such conflict.

It is also interesting to note that when asked, #13: “What content or elements of the curriculum are not to your liking, preference, or enjoy teaching about the least?,” only four participants mentioned battles and/or wars, and all of them were female! One even confessed that she was a pacifist.

Middle School vs. High School

The views and beliefs history teachers had towards the textbooks, TAAS, TEKS were not apparently related to whether they taught at the middle or high school levels. Neither was there any discernible pattern in their responses to the content questions that were related to the grade level they teach.

Ethnoracial group

Three of the participants are Latinos, (two females), one is an African American female, and the rest are Anglos. In their assessment of the textbook, only one participant of the twelve, the African American, was directly critical of the exclusion of minorities and women. When responding to the question on the TEKS, only three participants mentioned that minorities or women were missing: these were the African American female, the Latino male, and an Anglo female.

The four minority participants were more consistently critical of the TAAS test than the Anglos, and offered some of most scathing comments:

The Latino male: "...teaching becomes like trivial pursuit, test items are arbitrary, and teaching any content is hit or miss."

The African American female: "...it limits creativity and spontaneity of my students. Can we afford to teach what's not going to be on the TAAS?"

Although no participant mentioned minorities or women when asked to name a favorite event, era, etc., yet, when they discussed why these were of special interest to them, two Latinos and two Anglos made

references to minorities. Throughout the interviews, three of the four minority participants, mentioned the need for minority inclusion, and two of them, the African American female and the Latino male, also did so consistently.

4. References Made to Women and Minorities

There were several unsolicited references or statements made regarding minorities, or issues of diversity during the interviews:

- In response to mainly questions about content, on fourteen occasions, eight of the twelve participants mentioned the exclusion of minorities and women from the TEKS or textbooks.
- On four occasions, four participants mentioned “women” in the content of the curriculum, two are male, two are female.
- Only three participants mentioned either women or minorities when discussing those eras, events, or individuals of special interest to them.

5. References Made to Latinos

From all twelve interviews, on eight occasions, five participants mentioned “Hispanics” and the need to include them in the curriculum.

6. Summary and Implications of Findings

There is much more data which can be extracted and analyzed from the interviews and checklists of this investigation than what is discussed above. Nevertheless, there are some conclusions and implications which can be clearly identified.

In terms of such structural conditions, most participants were critical of the TAAS test, yet satisfied with the TEKS standards upon which the TAAS is supposedly based. They had some critiques of the textbooks as well. This implies that U.S. history do not resist standards per se, but are critical of how these are assessed with the use of a standardized test.

Although responses were not related to the grade level U.S. history teachers taught, gender did play a role in the content participants most preferred to teach. Females were least interested in battles and wars, while males tended to have more interest in these conflicts. Perhaps this reflects the socialization of males towards violence in our culture, whereby they feel more comfortable discussing the details of battles and bloody struggles than are females.

The length of experience did also seem to correlate with participants' views on such structural aspects as the TEKS, TAAS and the textbooks. Those with less experience tended to have significantly more criticisms of these official curriculum constraints than did their more experienced veterans. This could mean that younger teachers have been trained to value more flexible, experiential, cooperative, and student-centered approaches to instruction than the older teachers.

The ethnoracial identity of participants did have some correlation with their responses, there was a greater tendency for the four minority participants to make references to the exclusion of women and people of color from the official curriculum. This is not surprising.

However, although most participants did make statements about the exclusion of minorities somewhere during their interviews, and obviously attach some importance to teaching multiculturally, their responses to the checklist reveal that in actual practice, minorities, like women, are consistently left out as will be discussed in section C below.

Perhaps the most revealing finding from these checklists from individual interviewees, is that of all the names of individuals not taught about in their history classes, Latinos are overwhelmingly the most excluded from the curriculum. The implications of this are clear. Despite the growing numbers and influence of Latinos, and regardless of the pivotal role they have played as individuals and as groups our nation's history, they are still being given little or no attention in the history classroom.

The reasons for this may be quite complex, and probably include the fact that many teachers, being products of our public education system, are themselves uninformed or perhaps even ignorant about Latino history and heritage. Another set of reasons, confirmed by this investigation, is that the standards established for curriculum (the TEKS) the vehicle used to teach it (the textbooks), and the instrument used to assess student learning, (the TAAS test), all contribute to the exclusion of Latinos from the history classroom.

B. FOCUS GROUP

As described in detail in the Methodology chapter, the focus group session consisted of four U.S. history teachers and was moderated by myself using a series of questions, many of which were similar to those used for the individual interviews. There were a few questions deleted and others added in the actual course of the focus group interview, please refer to Appendix FCQ to access the questions actually used. The approximately 90 minute session was audiotaped and later transcribed resulting in 38 pages of text.

I was assisted by a technical person who used a sound board with individual microphones for each participant. Another assistant took rudimentary notes on who was speaking, that is on the order of the speakers, so as to facilitate later identification. The note-taking assistant and I did debrief following the interview, identifying some of the major issues generated in the discussion and also characterizing the general mood of participants as well as the climate of the discussion.

During the entire discussion the climate was cordial, friendly, open, comfortable, and at times quite humorous. The participants' mood throughout, in keeping with the overall climate, was upbeat, positive, and talkative.

These positive conditions facilitated our generating honest and authentic dialogue and were mostly a reflection of the personalities and dispositions of the four participants. We would also like to believe that it was also facilitated by our deliberate effort to reflect on and implement a certain approach to this effort. Among them, was to define the role of

the moderator and have the assistants engage in and also support that role.

Thus, in addition to providing ample refreshments and a modest \$30 gift certificate to Barnes & Noble, there were at least six specific objectives we set for the moderator's role:

1. set a friendly, cordial, respectful and professional climate
2. ask interesting and stimulating questions
3. encourage openness, honesty and authenticity from participants
4. pursue participant-generated themes with probing questions
5. demonstrate appreciation for and valuing of all opinions
6. encourage maximum participation from all

Based on our observations, and on a close reading of the transcript, we could confidently say that for the most part, these objectives were achieved, admittedly in no small measure also due to the characteristics of the participants themselves.

The data will be presented and analyzed from the perspective of five major themes, which don't always function as discrete categories, but which will help us better understand the perspectives and preferences of the participants. Although each major theme will naturally be associated with a specific set of questions, it is important to note that some questions did generate discussions which engaged two or more themes.

The five themes are:

1. Content Preferences: specific eras, events, persons, etc. of greatest interest to participants and their students.
2. Structural Conditions: the Three Ts: TAKS standardized test, TEKS curriculum standards, and Textbooks officially adopted for use, all imposed conditions which influence content choice & methods.

3. Other Factors, Issues, Problems: factors other than the 3 Ts, as identified by participants themselves
4. Recommendations and Solutions: suggestions by participants for overall improvement and specific practices which work well.
5. Coverage of Racial & Ethnic Minorities: what conditions or factors facilitate or restrict the coverage of women and minorities.

Each of the five will be discussed below using the data from both the transcript and tape, seeing that the latter could more accurately convey a sense of emotion and emphasis not always evident from the spoken words. In addition to identifying the responses to theme-related questions, we will also note the extent to which particular responses or views generated convergence (agreement or consensus) or divergence (contradiction or variety) among the participants. In some occasions we may also identify the particular participant by race or ethnicity, when the issues in discussion relate to these factors.

Overall, this data presentation and analysis will pay special attention whenever appropriate, the relevance participant responses have to the coverage of women, minorities, and particularly Latinos in the content of the U.S. history course.

1. Content Preferences

As with the individual interviews, there was wide divergence among participants regarding their response to the first question:

What eras, events, individuals, developments, etc. do you prefer, or enjoy teaching about the most? Why?

Responses ranged from “modern history” with a focus on “space exploration” to the “young years of the republic” with an emphasis on the founding documents. Other favored content included long eras involving a wide range of years, for example, “Civil War to the present” or somewhere shorter ranges: from “World War I....to the Vietnam War” or the “immediate past” or the “antebellum period,”

There were two instances where in the context of favored content, there were statements made with relevance to race or ethnicity, both related to the African American experience. One of the two Anglo teachers mentioned the “Civil Rights Movement” in the context of expressing a preference for contemporary history.

While claiming greater interest in the “Civil War to the present” the African American teacher also mentioned by name the “antebellum period, post Civil War, and Reconstruction era,” all periods with significant African American presence and historical role.

In addition to a divergence of content preferences there was some very focused attention on the “Gilded Age” (early 19th to early 20th centuries), by way of direct disagreement about its historical value and interest. It was all very well-mannered and even humorous at times, but it was perhaps one of the few time in the entire session where participants openly expressed opposing viewpoints, and did so with extended arguments imbedded within their responses to several questions.

There were likewise a wide range of responses to question

#3: What would you like to teach, cover, include in the curriculum, which, for whatever reasons, you cannot cover in class?

The four responses were:

--the entertainment aspect of social history, i.e., Elvis, Beatles, Puff Daddy

--the immigrant experience & their problems, race relations

--the Gilded Age & its issues and problems via social history

--student selected biographies, critical thinking, and technology activities

Despite the apparent diversity of responses, there was openly stated preference for teaching “social history” a term participants used repeatedly, especially as it relates closely to students’ interest as well as their own. One participant, the African American, even identified himself as more of a “social historian” both by choice and preparation.

There were other references to content, and even more so, content related to women and ethnoracial minorities in the context of discussions about structural conditions and student characteristics. These will be covered in the contexts in which they are mentioned.

In terms of reasons why participants favored or disfavored particular content, in response the first three questions, there was more general agreement along key values such as: the historical significance of that historical era or event, the relevance it has for today, and the interest it stimulates among students.

In terms of contemporary relevance and student interest, there was strong consensus that students were more stimulated by more modern

history to which they could relate with greater ease by making connections with their own lives.

2. Structural Conditions: The Three Ts

There was much discussion about: 1. the TAKS standardized test,, 2. the TEKS curriculum standards, and 3. adopted textbooks, all conditions over which US history teachers have little or no control. In fact before actually asking the planned questions about these four factors they emerged from the participants own responses, beginning with question #3 regarding content they would like to cover but cannot for whatever reasons.

The first statement was about textbooks, and made by the self-described “social historian” in the group:

“...but I find that the texts are so politically based...that it just drives to just teach who the Presidents are....”

The lack of time was also mentioned by another participant in response to question but also identified the TAKS test as a limiting factor.

Sensing agreement in the group, I interjected a probing question, #3P, which inquired about the effect of the TAKS test. The implied question was:

What effect will the TAKS state standardized test have on the curriculum content and your teaching?

Most responses were negative about the effects of TAKS. One participant summarized much of the discussion and consensus with the following statement:

....we are going more towards trivia style questions as opposed to critical or analytical thinking skills that will help them not just be good at doing history, but good students period..."

The discussion about TAKS and TEKS, although not specifically solicited, continued as a response to question #4:

What prevents you from covering the material or engaging in the activities you would like in your class?

The TEKS standards to which teachers are "obligated" as district employees to follow, were mentioned first as a limiting factor. Another participant mentioned the TAKS, and its predecessor TAAS test as being "very structured and very limiting on what we could teach..." He also mentioned the numerous TEKS biographies that kids had to know as well as the over twenty pages of glossary terms also under the TEKS.

All this material was "very much proscribed" and it served to ready students for a forty question test, in which much of what they had covered wasn't even mentioned.

There was much convergence about the negative effects of TAKS one participant even conceded that, "I'm not totally against standardized testing, but I think the TAKS is hurting...."

The "social historian" expressed his view this way:

"...(with) the TAKS test, they want (students) to memorize facts, facts, facts..and I don't agree that that's an accurate view of

history..I think its very limiting to students because it doesn't give them an opportunity to start *thinking* about history..."

The TAKS test was also mentioned as a "slow down device" in the context of being an obstacle to making innovative changes in teaching.

There was one positive mention of the TAKS test by one participant in the sense that with it, social studies now has more accountability, as does Math and English, and therefore more attention is given to this formerly neglected subject.

When we arrived at the actual planned question about the TAKS , I decided to ask it anyway, sensing that there were still more thoughts participants had not yet expressed about its effects and implications. Question#10 stated:

What effect does the TAKS test have on your teaching of U.S. history?

Two respondents were quite clear in their assessment of the effects of TAKS. One participant, teaching at the middle school level stated that:

"...there's this tremendous amount of pressure revolving around the TAKS....Last year, 2001-02 was the first year that history actually counted (in terms of) a school's recognized status....it affects everything, the pressure to perform well on it"

Another participant, who put on his "department coordinator's hat" to respond to this question, enumerated four "effects of the standardized tests":

“training for teachers...you’re going to have to know how to analyze...that single sheet of data coming back from the student.”

“it changes the scope and sequence” (changing which high school year U.S. history is taught to coincide with the TAKS)

“accountability of the teacher...and social studies teachers have never faced that kind of accountability.

“allocation of resources, both financially and personnel.. I’ve already had discussions (about) which teacher to put in what class...we need high TAKS scores, and they can deliver them.”

When I asked him to summarize his overall assessment of these combined effects, he responded quickly and unequivocally:

“I see them as negative because they distract from what good teaching is...”

When asked about the TEKS, the curriculum guidelines which set the standards for TAKS, teacher training and classroom teaching, participants had more divergent views. That question #9 asked:

Do the TEKS provide a sound framework for the teaching of U.S. history?

One participant responded with a simple, “I’m going to say no,” and followed up by clarifying that although TEKS may now provide a sound framework,

“ I believe in 3, 4, 5 years from now they will not...And the reason is that they’re going towards people, places, events, rather than cause, effect, linkages, and ...the WHY of history...”

Another participant clearly stated that:

“As of right now, I do like the TEKS. I do think they’re fairly high order thinking...TEKS helps let students know that there’s a possibility this might be on the test...and they feel that it’s important...I would like a little; bit more flexibility, but at least it can give us a framework.”

The middle school teacher also gave TEKS a positive assessment:

“...TEKS are OK at the middle school level...they are thorough and have a balance of knowledge and skills, and they’re both presented well...”

In terms of textbooks, there were two specific questions about this structural factor, over which teachers, at least in Northside ISD, do have some measure of control in that they have opportunities to either serve on a textbook committee, as had one of our participants, or to at least cast a vote on which publisher’s textbook to adopt.

The first question was #8 A:

To what extent do the required or adopted textbooks serve as a valuable resource in your teaching?

There was widespread agreement on this question on two points. One was that the textbooks themselves are limiting or deficient in some way:

“...I really didn’t rely on the book, because I found it too structured, and dumbed down...basically to the lowest common denominator...‘Any teacher could’ was the phrase that you would hear the representatives say. Actually ‘anybody could’. Someone could just walk in, grab a teacher edition and the teach the class, according to publishers...”

On this point, another participant added that:

“..I’ve seen textbooks come and go over the years...there were shortcomings all along..I was rarely impressed...there’s no textbook that teachers can utilize 100% of the time. It’s supplementary... there’s a lot of other things out there...”

Those “other things” were the central item of the participants’ second general point of agreement regarding textbooks. That is, it’s not the textbooks per se that are viewed as valuable, but rather the “ancillary materials,” namely, the maps, charts, videos, websites, software, supplementary readings, and other resources which accompany the purchase of textbooks.

Even the most ardent textbook critic extolled the useful resources contained in the software that came with the textbooks, including test generators and map reading charts, all “very nicely done.”

“I think this latest round of adoption has changed my opinion as to what role a book will play...the book, not much...the ancillaries, specifically the software, a lot.”

One participant, who for the first time had experienced a round of textbook adoption, recalls being directly told by his supervisors, “Don’t look at..” or consider the ancillary materials. “Don’t let that be a part of my judgment (they told me), but that was really a big part of my judgment.”

In response to the second question about textbook content, there was also considerable convergence of opinion, especially in terms of the usual deficiencies often expressed about textbooks. Question #8B was:

How about the content of the textbook itself...What's your opinion about the content, and how effectively that content is covered?

The first respondent, the “social historian,” stated that:

“...it was a limited social perspective on history being presented... Telling of history from one perspective..not dealing with historical debates, the fact that historians themselves disagree as to what really happened, or what was the cause, or effect, or what have you...I find it just one dimensional, myopic, and very limiting...”

Another participant agreed: “Why can’t they put an opposing viewpoint section in that book, you know, what would that hurt?”

The “social historian” later characterized textbooks as providing,

“...a sound byte presentation of history...no substantive discussion of people outside of the mainstream...they’re thrown in or added for color or spice..They’re not part of the text of the book...”

And when I asked him to identify who “they” were, he responded:

“...we’re talking about minorities, we’re talking about Native Americans...(having) no agency in history...Why is it that Chief Joseph is not presented as a primary source? What are his thoughts on what’s going on, as opposed to just.. ‘They chased him, and ran him down,’ and that’s it...You will see in the history textbook his picture, and it gives a little picture, and then they’ve covered minorities in history. And so it’s the sound byte, the tokenist way, or approach (to history)...they’re trying to throw in minorities...and they give them no agency in history.”

It is interesting to note that in this entire discussion of structural factors, and even in other themes, the above was the most extended statement any participant ever made about racial or ethnic minorities in

the teaching of history. It was made by the African American teacher who had already self-identified as the “social historian.”

3. Other Factors, Issues, Problems

There were a variety of other issues generated in the discussion, all of these identified as having an impact on the choice of content and its mode of presentation. Foremost among these were student characteristics, especially related to their interest and skill levels. Also given much attention was the general time constraints, or the sheer lack of time to cover all the required content.

Closely related to the issue of time is the wide consensus expressed by participants affirming the advantages of block scheduling (with 90 minutes of instruction per period), over the traditional daily schedule which consists of seven or eight, 50-55 minute class periods.

In terms of student characteristics, one respondent, in response to question #6 (see Appendix FGQ), shared that:

“But I think the biggest problem I have is the students come in way below grade level. And I think critical thinking is good, but I’m also a believer in building a foundation before you build the roof... and I think that’s the most critical problem that we’re under is some of those kids, whether through social promotion, or whatever, are coming in under grade level, and it’s vastly affecting what we are going to teach.”

Later on in the session, I asked a direct planned question specifically about student characteristics, question #11 asked:

How does the capacity, interest level, or other characteristics of your students influence your choice of content?

The first response to that was from a participant who enthusiastically extolled the importance of making instruction interesting to students, especially because:

“...in social studies...we realize that it’s quite possible we have the lowest student interest of any subject in high school.”

And when I challenged him by mentioning math as a low interest subject, he agreed but added that:

“Can you think of a subject that has more possibilities than history? Think about it...we can do a lot. There’s a lot of flexibility. You know with math, there’s only so many times you can bring in pizza, and say, ‘Hey, let’s do fractions!’ Eventually you’re going to get bored with that. Whereas with history you got roleplays, and simulations, you can do games, you can access primary sources..”

Providing students with choices as a way of sparking interest, was a practice that was widely supported by all participants. One put it this way:

“....and that’s where the enthusiasm has got to come in with the students...let them choose, its their education, not yours.”

Another reinforced the importance of addressing student interest, but added that it had to be balanced with curriculum content:

“I try to balance student influence and curriculum to whatever makes them laugh, or whatever entertains them....I struggle with that because there are certain things I want to impart to them...but the means by which they’re introduced to it...I could care less.”

Another participant summed up his view of student characteristics with two concepts: “the depth of learning,” and the “breadth of information.”

To describe depth of learning he used a metaphor of “pushing a student up a mountainside,” and explained that:

“...the idea is to get them up to the extent of their ability, let them see that there’s far more out there, and push’em.”

Breadth of information was exemplified by a methodology:

“...teach (students) how to set up a cause-effect relationship, and then apply that to anything, across time...And if they can manage that, and most of them can, they’re going to do a good job.”

Student interest also connected with time restrictions, the one other factor participants identified as having a significant influence on what and how they teach. For this participant, it had to do with the pace and the depth at which he covered certain content. Speaking of student interest, he agreed that:

“...it is a big influence because it dictates how fast we go or how slow we go. I don’t slow down because it’s an area that I like. I usually slow down because it’s an area that they have all those questions in. (For example) We spent a lot of time on socialism in America, because that is something they have never dealt with...It wasn’t something that I really wanted to focus on...but they wanted to focus in on it.”

Most participants had, at various points in our discussion, identified time restrictions as causing limitations on what content was

covered, how and to what extent. At one point, there was quite an interest in discussing the pros and cons of “block scheduling.”

After one participant had raised the issue in the context of what were the obstacles hindering innovation, I decided to ask others in what became question #7P:

What are the effects or advantages and disadvantages of block scheduling?

All four participants registered their opinion detailing the obvious advantages of block scheduling, none mentioned any disadvantages. There was perhaps as much consensus on this point as on any other in this discussion. The case was made quite cogently by one participant :

“ I just think it’s imperative that you have that time, especially with an issue, (or) when you talk about skills, or about abstract things to students, you need to be there to..not necessarily direct them, but to let them bounce things off of you...And I just don’t think in 50 minutes, that’s something that could be done....And so much of my class is discussion based, that if I didn’t have 50 minutes of just discussion, or manipulation of materials. It would be...I’d be wasting my time.”

4. Recommendations and Solutions

On several occasions, with or without prompting questions, participants expressed clear ideas about what works, what doesn’t, and what can be done to resolve certain problems.

Perhaps some of the boldest recommendations from participants came in response to question #6, which of course, fulfilled the very intent of the question:

If you had the power to decide, what overall or specific changes would you make regarding the content covered in your course?

One participant stressed the importance of methodology and skills development over covering specific content in teaching history:

“There’s a reason we have encyclopedias...so we will not have to remember all of that stuff...it’s more important to be able to teach a student how to retrieve the data they want, how to manipulate it, and how to build a new structure with the components.”

He would, in fact do away with curriculum content as we know it:

“I would throw out all the Dead White Guys, all the dates, all the battles, and I would bring in a curriculum that stresses the ability to analyze, to synthesize, evaluate, think critically, and problem solve. And (also the ability) to set up a research project and do all those things that they will be doing throughout their lives..Not playing jeopardy.”

Another participant wanted to instruct students to become:

“...more critical thinkers....to be able to present an issue, a position, and then have them really look at all the sides of it.”

Followed by loud laughter, one participant exclaimed, “I have a God complex” and then he explained that:

“..in my infinite wisdom, and this vast experience...I have a problem with periodization.”

Then he went on to suggest a fundamental change that would indeed seem to require divine intervention, given the resources involved, that is, adding a third US history class. He would divide history up to the

18th century in the first course, deal with the 19th in the second, and then have an entire third course for the 20th century until today.

That would, in his opinion, allow time for all the kinds of projects, and innovative, student-centered approaches which most participants had unequivocally identified as characteristic of good history teaching.

In terms of content, this participant also shared his thoughts about the “Dead White Guys” as mentioned by another colleague, and made another linkage between content and the structural limitations of time:

“..Dead White Guys...They are significant, they’re important... however, I think they’ve been overemphasized because of time restrictions that we’ve been in. Because we got to give them what we believe are the hotspots of history, and we got to do this on the quick.”

5. Coverage of Racial & Ethnic Minorities

Upon reviewing participants responses overall, and more specifically in the context of the four themes explored, it is clear that on several occasions references were made to the coverage of women and minorities. In the process, several obstacles which restrict opportunities to bring in this content and perspective were identified and included the three Ts, TEKS, TAKS and textbooks, as well as the ever present factor of time. Even student interest seemed to play a role.

In order to ensure complete discussion on this topic, naturally of special interest to this investigation, we asked this final question, #16:

What is it that hinders or helps your ability to adequately cover the role of racial and ethnic minorities in the teaching of US history?

All four participants responded to this question, and their responses echoed closely other statements which had been made earlier in the discussion. The first participant to respond mentioned time restrictions, but especially textbooks as hindering factors:

“...it would be time constraints and the pressures of covering your content. And the textbook, in terms of racial and ethnic minorities, just glosses over. Many events and many important things are left out.”

Another participant admitted having relatively few opportunities to gain the knowledge about racial and ethnic minorities, even from his college or university training. Not having this was an obstacle:

“It’s not YOUR curriculum, so if you don’t have that background knowledge, if you don’t have that comfort zone, I think a lot of teachers have trepidation introducing it in their class.”

One participant informed us that in his entire high school and college experience, speaking of his teachers and professors,

“...not one of them was anybody other than a white guy, specifically in my history classes. I don’t think I ever had a minority person who was a teacher...not one.”

Then he shared his view that:

“....it is entirely possible to teach US history from a minority point of view...Strictly...All you have to do is decide which minority you want to talk about...Because when Europeans first came here, THEY were minorities.”

After his comments generated some general laughter, he mentioned two obstacles to the coverage of minorities: 1. the lack of

proper teacher training or continuing education for teachers, and 2. textbook content.

To make his point about textbooks he used an old “Men and Nations” book, and after commenting on the chauvinistic nature of the title itself, he informed us that of the 40 plus chapters in this world history book, only four were about “non-European, non-US history.”

The fourth participant responded to this question by decrying the influence of what he called “traditionalists” under whose direction,

“the contributions of the bottom of society are undervalued in the context of the foundation of history...”

According to this respondent, no real progress will be made in addressing what another participant called “a lot of inertia,”

“until we overcome the devaluing of those individuals, whether it’s some ethnic minority, racial minority or gender type of thing....”

He also agreed that teacher training is part of the problem:

“I was in graduate school before I could actually begin to look at and evaluate gender issues, class issues, racial issues on that level because otherwise it was still with, you know, the Dead White Guys.”

In the course of his final statements, other participants also interjected “testing” and “textbooks,” once again, as having, like did teacher training, a limiting or restricting influence on their ability to teach about racial and ethnic minorities.

One very significant observation must be made, however, regarding the coverage of Latinos. With all the discussion that emerged about ethnoracial minorities, again by direct or indirect prompting, *not once*

was the term “Latino” “Hispanic” “Mexican American” or any other such term ever mentioned by any participant in this entire wide ranging discussion. And although the names of Chief Joseph, Booker T. Washington, and WEB DuBois were specifically mentioned, *not once was the name of any specific Latino individual uttered throughout the discussion.*

In fact, it had been our intent NOT to use any term for Latino groups or individuals by name in the questioning, and only do so after any one of the participants had done so. Significantly, that opportunity never arose.

That this should happen is quite surprising, when it was obvious that even the moderator and two assistants were Latinos, as well as one of the four participants; that is, of the seven people in the room, four were Latinos. It is also important to note that this discussion occurred in San Antonio, Texas, a city and state more infused with Latino influence than most others in the nation and in the largest urban-suburban school district in town, Northside ISD, wherein over half the student population is Latino.

This raises certain possibilities that perhaps there was deliberate avoidance operating as an underlying norm among participants. This contrasts directly with the fact that these Latino related terms and names were mentioned and discussed by several US history teachers involved in the companion study, the individual interviews.

Whatever can be speculated about the reasons for this phenomena of exclusion, it is perhaps useful to posit that perhaps Latinos are so

absent from the standard curriculum, when compared to African Americans and American Indians, that there exists in the minds of teachers, even those who are aware of minority underrepresentation, a clear disconnect between US history and the Latino experience.

That Latinos should be absent by direct reference from this discussion wherein references were made about not only African Americans and American Indians, but “Asians” as well, perhaps speaks to the very thoroughness of Latino exclusion or underrepresentation from every important vehicle for the teaching of US history.

C. CONTENT CHECKLISTS

1. Checklists from Individual Interviews

As mentioned above and in the Methodology chapter, participants had been asked to fill out a course content checklist with names of individuals, events, groups, documents, etc., the vast majority of which, (85%-90%) were taken directly from the TEKS guidelines. Please refer to Appendices MCL and HCL to view the 8th Grade and high school U.S. history content checklists. Participants marked “A” for those items always taught, “B” for those sometimes covered, and “C” for those never taught.

It is important to note when we make this analysis, that of the individuals mentioned in both checklists, Anglo males dominate the list, as is reflected in the TEKS. The high school checklist, for example, has

42 individuals identified by name, five are African American, six are Latinos, four are Anglo women, and 27 are Anglo males.

From the checklists, there were a total of 45 items, which were marked as “C” by participants. Of these, the overwhelming majority, 35 of them, were minorities or women. Thus, when it comes to having to leave something out, for whatever reasons, it is minority individuals and groups, as well as women who are excluded from the curriculum.

The three organizations on the list least covered by participants were: The National Organization of Women (NOW), the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF), and the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC).

From the checklists, it is also interesting to note that of the fourteen names of individuals which were marked “C” three or more times, two were African American males: Alex Hailey, and Benjamin Benneker. What is especially revealing is that of these fourteen most excluded names, twelve were Latinos! They include such historical figures as Bernardo de Galvez, David G. Farragut, Fa. Junipero Serra, Ponce de Leon, Hernan Cortez, Henry B. Gonzalez, William C. Velasquez, and Benito Juarez.

2. Checklists from Focus Group Participants

Before beginning the focus group session, as the four participants came into the room and were greeted, each was asked to fill out the same course content checklist as did the individual interviewees. One

participant filled out the middle school checklist, three filled the high school one.

Analyzing these responses again from the perspective of what was usually left out, or “not covered”, namely items marked C, the results were consistent with those from individual interviewees.

Looking at all four checklists, we counted 37 items in total marked C for the category of “Individuals, Groups and Organizations” The majority of those, 20 items, were of Latino individuals (18) or organizations (2).

The organizations least covered by focus group participants were the same as ones also excluded by the individual interviewees, namely LULAC, MALDEF and NOW.

For the “Eras and Events” section, there were only four Cs given, evidently most items in this category were well covered. However, predictably, of the four events not covered, one was the “Indian Wars and Removal,” and two were Latino-related, namely the “Chicano Movement” and the “Cuban Revolution.”

The results of both sets of course content checklists only confirm two recurring patterns of exclusion already noted in TEKS, textbooks, and teaching: 1. That women and minorities are given less attention and coverage and 2. that among ethnoracial minorities, Latinos are the most disproportionately underrepresented in the teaching of U.S. history.

It is also important to note that this occurs even in the classrooms of most of these sixteen outstanding teachers, selected for their instructional excellence and innovative approaches. What we could

expect in terms of Latino coverage from less dedicated or prepared teachers, is a difficult question to answer, but one that needs to be addressed.

VI. Interpretations and Implications

A. BRIEF SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FROM ENTIRE STUDY

As a mixed method investigation, the findings from this effort are derived from a variety of studies and sources, yet the underlying focus for each component was the same: To identify, document, and analyze the presence or representation of Latinos in the teaching of U.S. history in Texas. This mixed approach was utilized based on the sound and verifiable assumption that many factors impinge on how and what is taught in the U.S. history classroom, including the TEKS curriculum standards, the adopted textbooks, and the TAKS standardized tests, as well as the teachers' own perspectives, preferences and preparation.

As more fully described in the above chapters, we decided to conduct separate but related studies in four general areas:

1. TEKS statewide curriculum standards
2. Textbooks officially adopted by the state
3. Testimony presented in the most recent (2002) textbook hearings
4. Teachers' perspectives and preferences.

Below, is a brief summary of the major and most significant findings from each of these areas of study.

1. Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)

A thorough investigation on the content of the TEKS for U.S. history at both the high school and middle school was conducted to

determine the mention or presence of Latino individuals, groups, events, experience, and concepts, or mention of a generic category into which Latinos as a group belong, such as “immigrant” or “ethnic minority.”

The same search of both TEKS standards were done for African Americans and American Indians, and the findings were classified, tallied, discussed, and displayed on three tables. Table 1 displays the findings from the first part of U.S. history TEKS, Table 2 contains findings for the second part, and Table 3 combines data from both tables. Please refer to Appendix TEKS to view all three.

Among the most significant findings were that:

- (a) In all the TEKS for U.S. history not once is any Latino individual mentioned by name, and neither is any individual American Indian, whereas four African American individuals are thus mentioned.
- (b) Nowhere is the term Latino, Hispanic, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, or any other group name for Latinos ever mentioned. Only once in these TEKS is any term for African American or American Indian used.
- (c) There were ten events or concepts mentioned which had some direct relation to or clear association with African Americans, for Latinos there were six, and for American Indians, there were two.
- (d) In terms of categories mentioned in the TEKS into which either of the three groups could be classified, Latinos had ten, African American had eight and American Indians, had seven.

It should be kept in mind that although Latinos had ten items in general finding (d), since this refers to generic terms such as “immigrant” and “ethnic minority” it does not guarantee that U.S. history teachers will necessarily cover Latinos, and if so, it does not specify the extent to

which, nor how, Latinos will be brought into the narrative. All this means is that the possibility exists for Latino coverage, but their inclusion in the classroom narrative depends on how well Latino immigration, or Latinos as significant minorities, are covered in the textbooks. It also depends on the preferences or preparation of the teacher.

The events which are Latino-related, such as the Mexican American War, or the Spanish American War, in general finding (c) also do not compel the teacher to bring in the perspective or experiences of say Puerto Ricans or Cubans during the latter conflict or of Mexicans or Mexican Americans in the former. Thus, again, only the possibility of this kind of coverage exists, depending on the textbook content, and the teachers' knowledge and decisions, as well as other structural factors.

Perhaps the most surprising or significant findings are (a) and (b). It is quite astounding that in Texas not one Latino individual is even mentioned by name in the entire TEKS for U.S. history at both levels, whereas four African Americans were thus named. It is also surprising that with all the various terms for Latino groups here in the United States, that not one is present in these entire TEKS.

Given the three realities that 1)there is an officially sanctioned discussion of civil rights, immigrants, and ethnic minorities in the Texas TEKS for U.S. history; 2) that these curriculum guidelines are for the most Latino influenced state in the nation; and 3)yet no Latino individuals nor groups should be deemed worthy of specific mention, taken together it raises serious questions, if not outright suspicions, of deliberate, rather than merely accidental exclusion.

Yet to posit deliberate intent is only conjecture, what isn't in question is that the exclusion of Latinos from the U.S. history curriculum standards for Texas, astounding as it may seem, is now a demonstrated fact.

2. Textbooks for U.S. History

There were two separate studies of U.S. history textbooks, each one involving content analyses and comparisons among the texts. The first study involved three textbooks and was more thorough in its identification, classification, and analyses of both textual and visual content related to the Latino experience. The second study involved two textbooks and provided a more general overview of Latino related content in both for the purposes of contrast and comparison.

For the first study, three of the six high school U.S. History textbooks officially adopted by TEA and used for the last ten years until recently (Spring, 2003) were reviewed. They were:

1. The Story of America, Vol. 2: 1865 to the Present. by John A. Garraty. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Austin: TX, 1992.
2. American Journey: The Quest for Liberty Since 1865. by J.W. Davidson, M.H. Lytle, and M.B. Stoff. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs: NJ, 1992.
3. American Voices: A History of the United States, Volume II: 1865 to the Present. by Carol Berkin, et al. Scott Foresman, Glenview: IL, 1992.

As described in detail above in the Methodology section, each textbook was reviewed, beginning with the index and table of contents

and every sentence related to the Latino experience was counted, and categorized by topic and by national origin.

The information on each text was then summarized on a table.

In terms of overall quantity, that is the number of sentences dealing with the Latino experience, that number ranged from a total of 376 sentences in the Prentice Hall textbook to 180 in the Scott Foreman text. The Holt text had 265 sentences. (Please refer to Appendix TT for a view of all three tables.)

As expected, the vast majority of these sentences had to do with Mexican Americans in all three texts. In fact in all textbooks, there was the same pattern of coverage as measured by the number of sentences, with Mexican Americans having the most, followed by Latinos in general, then Puerto Ricans, and finally Cubans with the least amount.

In a sense, this almost reflects the population demographics of each group since Cubans are the smallest of the three most populous Latino national origin groups, and Mexican Americans are the largest.

Of the seven general topical areas within that Latino coverage, the three that received the most attention by these textbooks were: Characteristics and Experiences, Problems and Accomplishments, and Leaders. The topic with least coverage, and this was consistent with all three texts, was the reasons why Latinos immigrated to the United States, and when this occurred and where did they reside in the nation.

In terms of quantity, it is important to note just what percentage of the entire textbook narrative is dedicated to Latinos. Given that Prentice Hall had 376 Latino related sentences and Scott Foresman had 180, if we

use the Holt textbook as an example, its 265 sentences related to Latinos would yield just under 18 full pages of full text. Given that the Holt book is just over 630 pages long, it means that a mere 3% of the book has text focusing on the Latino experience. Without doing all the calculations for the other two textbooks which have approximately the same total number of pages it is evident that a few more or less percentage points does not alter the overall obvious conclusion that Latinos are still grossly underrepresented in these U.S. History textbooks given their population and historical significance to this nation.

When assessing the qualitative aspect of these three textbooks, we used the five criteria mentioned in the Methodology chapter, namely:

1. Factual accuracy
2. Inclusion of key leaders, dates, events, issues, contributions
3. Presentation of Latino views or perspectives
4. Agency attributed to Latino leaders, organizations, or people.
5. Connections made between past & present.

There was considerable variety in the qualitative aspects of these textbooks. Thus, it was quite difficult to make clearcut comparisons among these three textbooks in terms of quality. What proved helpful was to document the extent to which the passages in each text met the five qualitative criteria. When comparing the quality of the longer passages related to Latinos in this texts, for example, it becomes evident that most of these in the Prentice Hall textbook meet four or more of the five qualitative criteria.

Averaging out the ratings (on a scale from 1 to 5) for all six major Latino-related sections in the Prentice Hall text would yield a 3.67 rating.

Doing the same with the sections in the Holt text generated a rating of 3.25, and for the Scott Foresman text, that rating would be a 2.7.

Yet, these numbers only reveal part of the qualitative aspect. The Scott Foresman textbook, for example, has the courage to deal honestly with certain issues such as discrimination, forced deportations, and political empowerment as well as or better than the other two texts.

Because of these mixed characteristics in each text, it is difficult to clearly declare any of the three texts superior in every way in terms of quality. Consequently, the above criteria based ratings must be considered in conjunction with other factors, including the kinds of topics textbook authors are willing to tackle and how honestly they do so.

Nevertheless, it is very important to note a clear pattern emerges when considering quantity and quality together. The text with the most pages related to Latinos, the Prentice Hall, also has the highest quality rating, whereas the text with the lowest quality rating, the Scott Foresman, also has the smallest number of Latino-related pages. Thus all three texts fall into the same qualitative-quantitative continuum as displayed below:

	Qualitative Rating	Quantity of Pages
Prentice Hall	3.67	376
Holt, R&W	3.25	265
Scott Foresman	2.7	180

It is significant to note the irony that among these three textbooks, the one with the lowest rating in terms of both quantity and quality of

Latino representation, namely Scott Foresman, happens also to be the textbook officially adopted by Northside ISD, the largest district in a predominantly Hispanic San Antonio, and a district with over 50% Latino students.

The second U.S. history textbook study involved a contrast comparison of two textbooks revealed that in terms of both quantity and quality of information related to Latinos. For this purpose, the two high school level US history textbooks targeted for review were:

The American Nation by Paul Boyer and Sterling Stuckey

Publisher: Holt, Rinehart and Winston

America: Pathways to the Present by Cayton, Perry, Reed & Winkler

Publisher: Prentice Hall

The most striking contrast between these is the sheer difference in the scope and depth of coverage. The Holt textbook deals with a wide variety of topics related to Mexican Americans, some take a few paragraphs, but other topics are described and elaborated in several pages.

By contrast the Prentice Hall text covers fewer topics related to Latinos, particularly Mexican Americans, and does not enrich its presentation with as many quotes, testimonials, and graphics as does Holt.

Overall, the quality of writing is superior in the Holt text, topics are better elaborated and concepts are explained more fully as well.

It is clear that one publisher has invested more effort, space and resources to presenting the Latinos story than the other.

Considering the major findings from both textbook studies, we can make some general statements. There has been much improvement in the representation of Latinos in textbooks over the last two decades. Yet, the range of Latino diversity, in terms of national origin, racial mixture, cultural heritage, and social class has not been clearly presented in any U.S. history textbook we have reviewed. Moreover, the many Latino contributions in the areas of cattle ranching, military service, the arts, law, literature, music and civil rights, have not been adequately expressed in any single textbook.

3. Textbook Testimony

With this study of testimony presented in 2002 regarding the U.S. history textbooks being considered for adoption we intended to document the extent to which Latino issues are discussed and to ascertain the level of Latino participation in these influential discussions.

We selected the oral and written testimony presented in July, 2002, for our review and analysis, mainly because both contained a considerable amount of references regarding Latino, Hispanic, or Mexican American issues. As with other testimonies, they also contained a wide variety of perspectives from university professors and students as well as from speakers with established educational and ideological organizations.

Thus, I conducted a systematic content analyses of both the oral and written testimony which generated considerable data covered fully in Chapter IV.

I also got involved as a participant-observer during the September 11 public hearings in Austin to gain further insight on the process itself and to observe and engage with other Latinos presenting testimony that day. The findings from these two efforts can be summarized thus:

- a. Latinos did have a recognizable and significant presence in both the oral and written testimony of July, 2002.
- b. Many Latino-related issues and concerns were expressed in both forms of testimony.
- c. Most critiques about Latino representation focused more on what was missing, rather than what was wrong in textbooks.
- d. There was a wide range of Latino related testimony in terms of length and complexity.
- e. Several presenters spoke about the negative effects for both Latino and non-Latino students of having Latinos under-represented in social studies textbooks.

Given the trends I have observed over the last decade in textbook adoption, it is logical to predict that in the future, Latinos as an advocacy group, will continue to have increasing and consistent presence in the textbook adoption process of Texas.

4. Teachers' Perspectives and Preferences

As fully described above in Chapters III and V, this was a three-part study consisting of individual interviews with a dozen U.S. history teachers, a small focus group of four teachers, and sixteen course content checklists.

In terms of the individual interviews, there is a wealth of data which was extracted and analyzed from the interviews. Despite the variety of findings discussed above, there are some logical conclusions and implications which can be clearly identified.

In terms of structural conditions over which teachers have little or no control, most participants were critical of the TAAS standardized statewide test, yet generally satisfied with the TEKS standards upon which the TAAS is supposedly based. They had some critiques of the textbooks as well. This implies that U.S. history does not resist standards per se, but are critical of how these are assessed with the use of a standardized test.

The issue of time, that is the lack of sufficient time to cover the required content, let alone that which teachers prefer, was consistently repeated as a major problem closely related to the difficulty in including women and minorities, let alone doing this adequately.

Although responses were not related to the grade level U.S. history teachers taught, gender did play a role in the content participants most preferred to teach. Females were least interested in battles and wars,

while males tended to have more interest in these conflicts. Perhaps this reflects the socialization of males towards violence in our culture, whereby they feel more comfortable discussing the details of battles and bloody struggles than were females.

The length of experience did also seem to correlate with participants' views on such structural aspects as the TEKS, TAAS and the textbooks. Those with less experience tended to have significantly more criticisms of these official curriculum constraints than did their more experienced veterans. This could mean that younger teachers have been trained to value more flexible, experiential, cooperative, and student-centered approaches to instruction than the older teachers.

The ethnoracial identity of participants did have some correlation with their responses, there was a greater tendency for the four minority participants to make references to the exclusion of women and people of color from the official curriculum. This is not surprising.

There were several unsolicited references or statements made regarding minorities, or issues of diversity during the interviews:

- In response to mainly questions about content, on fourteen occasions, eight of the twelve participants mentioned the exclusion of minorities and women from the TEKS or textbooks.
- On four occasions, four participants mentioned "women" in the content of the curriculum, two are male, two are female.
- Only three participants mentioned either women or minorities when discussing those eras, events, or individuals of special interest to them.

- On eight occasions, five participants mentioned “Hispanics” and the need to include them in the curriculum.

Although most participants did make statements about the exclusion of minorities somewhere during their interviews, and obviously attached some importance to teaching multiculturally, their responses to the course content checklist revealed that in actual practice, minorities, like women, are consistently left out, as will be discussed below.

In terms of the focus group, perhaps the single most significant finding is that in the entire hour and a half session, despite ample opportunities to do so, especially since women and minorities were discussed and some ethnoracial groups were even mentioned by name, not once was the term Latino, Hispanic, Mexican American, or any other similar name ever mentioned by participants.

Other findings confirmed that such structural conditions as the TEKS, TAKS standardized tests, textbooks and the lack of time, were very influential in determining teachers’ content choices. As in the individual interviews, the TEKS elicited a variety of views, including the lack of women and minorities. Most participants viewed the textbooks as inadequate and outdated. Of all structural conditions, the TAKS standardized tests were the most thoroughly criticized for their distortion of the entire curriculum, their negative effects on time and scheduling, and the restrictions it placed on the teaching of history itself.

Lack of time and student characteristics, such as lack of proper skills or sufficient interest, were also cited as obstacles to using the innovative instruction and teaching the required or preferred content.

Overall, the responses from focus group participants and individual interviewees concurred on some very significant points, most important among them for our investigation was that structural factors over which teachers have no control exerted a hindering influence on teachers' ability to include women, minorities, and Latinos into the course narrative.

In terms of the course content checklists filled out by the sixteen participants, perhaps the most revealing finding is that of all the names of individuals and groups not taught about in their history classes, Latinos are overwhelmingly the most excluded from the course curriculum.

B. COMPARISON WITH EXISTING THEORY

Looking at the findings from the perspective of multicultural education theory (MET), and critical race theory (CRT) there are specific areas of correspondence with the findings from the data. Below we will briefly review what implications these theories have, whenever appropriate, to our findings from the TEKS, textbooks, textbook testimonies, and teachers perspectives' and preferences.

The findings about the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) have a close relationship with Banks' four distinct approaches to public schools' attempts at teaching multiculturally. The TEKS does not encourage students to decide about social issues let alone take actions to solve them. Nor does the TEKS structure the curriculum to enable

students to view history from a diverse ethnic or cultural perspective. Thus neither the Social Action nor the Transformation approaches are used.

Given the intent of the TEKS, there is no focus on heroes or holidays per se at least not Latino heroes or significant holidays, thus it does not use the Contributions Approach. If anything the TEKS seems to utilize an Additive Approach whereby multicultural content is “added to the curriculum without changing its structure.” Even in this approach, however, when it comes to Latinos, specific content is absent or minimal in the TEKS, and only the possibility of Latino inclusion exists under some generic category such as “immigrant” or “ethnic minority.”

In terms of CRT, the underrepresentation of ethnic minorities in the TEKS confirms the CRT concept that racism is a normal, and not an aberration, thus making it more difficult to address. It also confirms that the CRT concept of the “black-white binary” is operating since the African American civil rights movement is viewed as the ONLY civil rights movement worthy of mention and study, and that all other struggles by ethnoracial minorities are somehow subsumed under that experience.

From the data gathered regarding textbooks, with the underrepresentation of minorities and especially Latinos, the CRT concept of racism the normal state-of-affairs is confirmed. Although through the efforts of many activists in the textbook adoption process, there has been some considerable improvement, it also confirms that changing textbooks regarding their more subtle racist elements, is difficult work.

On the other hand, some textbooks have begun to reflect part of the CRT concept which holds that “each race or ethnic group has its own origins and ever evolving history,” since there are separate sections in most of these texts which deal with the Latino experience. This also means that the “black-white binary” which affects the TEKS, does not exert much influence over the way textbooks cover African Americans and other ethnoracial groups.

When considering textbooks in the light of Multicultural Education Theory, specifically Banks’ four approaches, it is clearly evident that overall U.S. history texts use both the Contributions and Additive Approach in their presentation of content related to racial and ethnic minorities, particularly Latinos. There is little or no content in textbooks which provides students with Latino perspectives, although the events covered do provide ample opportunity, let alone obligation, to do so. Neither is there any attempt in these texts to encourage students to make decisions or take action on important issues; on the contrary students, are asked to memorize dates, names, and other factoids with little or no opportunity to evaluate options or differing perspectives.

Thus, neither the Transformation nor Social Action approaches are evident in the U.S. history textbooks used for the last ten years or those to be used in the coming seven years.

In terms of the textbooks testimony, many speakers pointed out and decried the relative absence of Latino representation in textbooks, but some also mentioned the exclusion of any Latino perspectives from the textbook narrative. Whereas, textbooks were incomplete in their

application of Bank's Contributions and Additive approaches, according to speakers, textbook's did not make any attempts at utilizing the Transformation or Social Action approaches. Thus the testimony was, for the most part, in close agreement with the findings and interpretations of our own textbook analyses.

There were also key statements made which related well with several CRT concepts. Among them, speakers confirmed that the CRT concept which holds that each ethnoracial group has its own origins and ever-evolving history. Many spoke to that effect, and even made statements contrasting the Latino experience, especially the Mexican civil rights movement, with that of African Americans. Another CRT concept holds that Latino and other ethnics, due to their distinct experiences, may communicate to their "White" counterparts, "certain matters that they (Whites) otherwise are unlikely to know." This was demonstrated on several occasions when Latino professors and students, myself included, pointed out historical events, facts, or perspectives which constituted new information for most Anglo board members present, who admitted not knowing about these before.

When considering the teachers' perspectives and preferences from both the individual interviews and the focus group, there are several MET and CRT concepts which are quite evident. In terms of Banks' four approaches, teachers consistently criticized the textbooks for barely including women and minorities, and when included it was just done so with the Contributions or Additive approaches. Essentially, it was the same critique made by many speakers in the textbook hearings; namely

that there was no attempt to utilize the Transformation approach, that is no inclusion in the textbooks of the perspectives of racial and ethnic minorities.

On several occasions, teachers did express recognition consistent with the CRT contention that “each race or ethnic group has its own origins and ever evolving history.” There was also some indirect confirmation of the normalcy of racism in our society, and the difficulty in addressing it, a fundamental CRT premise. One opinion which emerged more clearly during the focus group session was that teacher training and courses in colleges and universities, did not adequately prepare future teachers with the background information and skills to combat racism or ethnic prejudice.

Considering all the data from these component studies as a whole, there were tendencies identified by our analyses as well as by textbook testimonies and teachers’ perspectives that the teaching of U.S. history takes either an Assimilation or Amalgamation view of how minorities adapt to the U.S. lifestyle. According the Sleeter and Grant (1994), these two views assume that eventually the values and cultural traditions of minorities will be replaced by that of the dominant group or be incorporated into a larger social synthesis.

On very few occasions, and sometimes most notably in textbooks, were the Classical or Modified Cultural Pluralism views upheld whereby minority groups maintain their values and lifestyles.

C. LIMITATIONS

As with every investigation, there are some obvious limitations with this collection of studies. Whereas the TEKS study was quite complete in its coverage of both documents related to the teaching of U.S. history, not all the textbooks currently being used nor up for future adoption were reviewed and analyzed due to time limitations. However, we are confident that the general findings about the underrepresentation of Latinos can be verified if the same approach to review and analyses were replicated with the other textbooks not reviewed. A complete review of all textbooks will probably not be contradictory to the fundamental findings and conclusions derived from our review of selected texts.

In terms of the textbooks testimony, only one of the three days of oral testimony was reviewed, and one of three sets of written testimony was reviewed. It's likely that other themes, topics, and actors were involved as well as some of the same organizations or individuals on the other two dates. Nevertheless, since our focus was specifically on issues related to Latino representation, we believe that the July testimonies were exemplary of the kinds of issues raised in regards to Latinos in August and September. As a participant observer in the September hearing, it was clear to me that this was the case.

Perhaps the most obvious limitations of this entire investigation were evident in the three-part study of teachers' perspectives and preferences. Not because of the methodology per se, but because the

numbers were not large enough, nor were the participants randomly selected so as to permit definite generalizations about the attitudes of U.S. history teachers in the Northside ISD, let alone the city or the state.

In the case of the focus group, we would have preferred at least two, but logistics did not allow this to happen in the allotted time frame.

However, this study did provide a sound foundation for the later development of a larger survey which could be more widely distributed and randomized within gender, ethnoracial, and experience categories to permit generalizations and comparisons. It is also a useful model for conducting additional focus groups on the same or similar topics. That sound foundation and useful model we believe is due to the wealth of information we obtained from both the interviews and the focus group regarding structural, personal, and social factors which influence teachers' content choices. With this knowledge we could design a much more targeted and meaningful survey and have more significant focus group discussions around identified issues and concerns which emerged from the responses of teacher's themselves.

Finally, in terms of the course content checklists, we believe with this investigation, it has been pilot tested well, and could perhaps with minor changes, be ready for much wider distribution that will permit a greater degree of generalization about teachers' content choices in the actual classroom. This is important because, regardless of what the TEKS or textbooks say, and despite the restricting influence of the TAKS standardized test, history teachers always exercise a measure of flexibility and choice when it comes to what is covered and how.

D. IMPLICATIONS

Taken together, the implications of this multifaceted investigation are clear. Despite the growing numbers and influence of Latinos, and regardless of the pivotal role they have played as individuals and as groups in our nation's history, they are still receiving little or no attention in the history classrooms of Texas, a state in which their presence has endured for centuries.

The reasons for this may be quite complex, and probably include the fact that many teachers, being products of our public education system, are themselves misinformed and perhaps even ignorant about Latino history and heritage. Some teachers in our study, honestly and openly admitted to having such limitations in their ability and inclination to cover Latino topics.

Another set of reasons, confirmed by this investigation, is that the standards established for the U.S. history curriculum (the TEKS) the vehicles used to teach it (the textbooks), and the instrument used to assess student learning, (the TAKS), all contribute each in their own way to the exclusion of Latinos from the history classroom.

One of the most significant findings from this investigation is the powerful influence exerted by structural impediments to Latino curricular inclusion, and not only the TEKS, TAKS, and textbooks, but also teacher education and in-service training which do not prepare classroom teachers with the knowledge, skills and attitudes for effectively instructing in an inclusive, multicultural way.

Among the implications of this study are that Texas students from Kindergarten through 12th grade, will have at best an incomplete and spotty knowledge of Latino history, contributions and perspectives from their public schooling. Meanwhile, the mass media that impacts their thinking most powerfully, namely television and films, continues to exclude, marginalize or criminalize the image of Latinos in their minds.

What makes this more destructively ironic is that over a third of those K-12 Texas students are themselves Latinos whose self-esteem, ethnic identity, and informed citizenship are eroded and damaged.

What this ultimately means is that there are entire generations of American students, now graduated and in leadership, influential or pivotal roles in our society, who have little or no knowledge of the history, culture, contributions, experience and perspectives of what is today the largest ethnic minority group in America. What this implies for race relations, social cohesion, and cross-cultural interaction is difficult to ascertain.

Obviously, Americans have other sources of information about Latinos than their formal schooling, and that is precisely the problem. When the mass media, and its most powerful vehicles, television and films, consistently present stereotypes, misinformation and distortions of who Latinos really are, then the burden falls on schools, colleges and universities to fulfill their responsibility of public education, and in the most basic sense, play their proper role in this regard.

What this investigation has shown is that in Texas, a most Latino infused state, the system of public education has failed in its most

fundamental duty of educating the public about a large group of people with whom Texans have lived, worked, and shared a wider community for over a century.

For educated Latinos who have sought and obtained alternative and authentic sources of information on their history and heritage, the failure of public schools to do so is a frustration and an obstacle. It is, nevertheless, one that can and has been overcome. But for millions of Latinos, who don't complete their formal education and who don't actively seek out alternative sources of information, there is a huge gap of ignorance about their own history, identity, and potentialities which affects not only their self-esteem, but their entire world view.

In short, all Americans, our entire civil society, and especially Latinos, are diminished and immeasurably harmed by this widespread ignorance about the largest, and one of the oldest, most influential pan-ethnic group in our nation.

E. POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

When it comes to history education in Texas, as in every other state, there are many influential actors and institutions, some officially sanctioned, others self-appointed. Below in bullet format, are some policy recommendations for some key actors and institutions who could contribute to resolving this problem of Latino exclusion in the teaching of U.S. history.

Texas Education Agency

- Convene a panel of academics and teachers to revise and rewrite portions of the TEKS so as to specify items of significance related to Latinos in history and social studies.
- Articulate clearly in the mission statement and the education code, and apply consistently through the TEKS and the standardized tests that one of the goals of history and social studies education is to foster increased understanding of all racial and ethnic groups and their pivotal roles in our history.

Textbook Publishers

- Continue to improve on the quantity and quality of information, questions, exercises, and projects related to Latinos in textbooks as well as in ancillary materials.
- Incorporate more Latino perspectives through speeches, letters, biographies, works of literature and art, or any other primary and authentic sources.

Academic Historians and Teacher Educators

- Take an interest in how history and social studies are taught in the public school classroom and actively participate by bringing into public testimony the benefit of your wider knowledge and deeper understanding.
- Keep educating yourself through all forms of media about the realities and significance of Latinos in the history, culture, and society of our nation, and share this information, and your insights from it, with your students.

- Ensure that teacher training programs provide an accurate, objective, and thorough background on Latino topics related to each subject area, especially history, social studies and language arts.
- Ensure that methods and strategies for effective instruction of Latino learners are integral to teacher training courses at Texas colleges and universities.
- Review curriculum, textbooks and ancillary readings used in teaching U.S. history at the college/university level for Latino inclusion, and develop training and resources to facilitate that inclusion at both graduate and undergraduate levels.
- Develop resources and rewards for professors to author more authentic, accessible, objective, and interesting U.S. history textbooks for public schools in Texas.
- Encourage, facilitate and fund academic research on issues related to teacher education, social studies teaching, and the integration of Latinos into the public school curriculum.

Classroom Teachers

- Educate yourself about Latino history and culture through books, films, drama, art, and a variety of media and share the most useful and authentic information with your students.
- Develop innovative and interesting methods of engaging students with aspects of the Latino experience so that students can gain understanding about what is universal and what is unique about that experience.

- Attend workshops, conferences and other training and professional venues to widen your horizons and improve the quality of your teaching about the Latino experience.
- Once you have developed your skills and obtained significant information, find formal and informal ways of sharing this with your colleagues and encourage them to expand their own knowledge and abilities.
- Become an advocate and an activist for disseminating objective and authentic information about Latinos in your campus, district and community, especially through the school library and public library systems.

F. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Given the nature of this investigation consisting of a bundle of studies, there are a wide variety of ways to expand or refine this research, even responding to just the initial questions which motivated this effort, let alone others that have emerged.

One obvious path is to replicate this investigation with all of its components, or an expanded version of it, in another state such as California, New York or Florida that have significant Latino population, presence and influence. Researchers could at least, begin with a thorough review of any state's official curriculum standards for U.S. history and/or other social studies courses.

Here in Texas, researchers could use our methods to review all of the currently adopted textbooks and complete a detailed assessment as

to their individual strengths and weaknesses regarding Latino and minority representation. This could be useful to classroom teachers and administrators who make decisions about book purchases for the district or the classroom.

Using our methods and instruments, many more focus groups could be convened in Texas and other states and certainly more individual interviews could be conducted with U.S. history teachers as well. Based on the themes, issues, and factors which have emerged from this investigation, a survey could be developed and disseminated widely through four to six states with the largest Latino population, and also in states with the least. The results of these findings, with all their possible discoveries under statistical analyses, would be both fascinating and quite useful as well for educational policy, curriculum development, teacher training, and targeted activism.

Focusing more on the structural impediments to Latino inclusion, more research could be conducted on the extent to which Latinos are represented in the teaching of U.S. history at public and private colleges and universities, especially those with a reputation for diversity and/or with significant numbers of Latino students.

Research should also be conducted to determine the extent to which teacher training and certification programs in academia are preparing teachers with the adequate knowledge, skills and attitudes to effectively instruct Latino or other students of color.

Finally, similar methods to those used in this investigation could be utilized to research the quantity and quality of Latino representation in

the Language Arts curriculum from early childhood to secondary levels in both textbooks and ancillary materials, such as trade books and computer resources.

There are certainly other research efforts that can derive methodologies, instruments, and deeper understandings generated from this investigation. If despite its limitations, this research effort could inspire more serious investigation on these pivotal topics, then it would have achieved an even higher purpose than originally intended.

Appendix CoC
Checklist of Critiques by Type, Theme, Speaker

Who	Themes, Topics, Issues, Concerns	Accuracy	Bias	Content

Appendix FGQ

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW GUIDE

Questions Actually Asked

1. What eras, events, individuals, developments, etc. do you prefer, or enjoy teaching about the most? Why?
2. What content or elements of the curriculum are not to your liking, preference, or enjoy teaching about the least? Why?
3. What would you like to teach, cover, include in the curriculum, which, for whatever reasons, you cannot cover in class?
- 3P. What effect will the TAKS state standardized test have on the curriculum content and your teaching?
4. What prevents you from covering the material or engaging in the activities you would like in your class?
5. [Not Used] ~~Of all the content you have to cover, what would you skip, eliminate, or spend less time on, if you had a choice? Why?— (ALREADY ANSWERED)~~
6. If you had the power to decide, what overall or specific changes would you make regarding the content covered in your course? Why?
7. What's preventing you from adopting or implementing these changes now?

7P. What are the effects or advantages and disadvantages of block scheduling?

8A. To what extent do the required or adopted textbooks serve as a valuable resource in your teaching?

8B. How about the content of the textbook itself...What's your opinion about the content, and how effectively that content is covered?

9. Do the TEKS provide a sound framework for the teaching of U.S. history?

10. What effect does the TAKS test have on your teaching of U.S. history?

11. How does the capacity, interest level, or other characteristics of your students influence your choice of content?

12. [Not Used] ~~What do you want your students to gain from your course?~~ (NOT ESSENTIAL)

13. [Not Used] ~~How many (what approximate percentage) of your students demonstrate an interest in learning history at the beginning of the course? How many at the end?~~ (NOT ESSENTIAL)

14. What conditions or factors help or hinder your ability to adequately cover current events, such as 9-11?

15. [Not Used] ~~Had you the power, what other changes would you make in the teaching of U.S. History and Why?~~ (ANSWERED)

16. What is it that hinders or helps your ability to adequately cover the role of racial and ethnic minorities in the teaching of US history.

APPENDIX HCL

Content Checklist for U.S. History High School
Please mark next to each name or term either an “a”, “b” or “c”
regarding its place in your course curriculum:

a=always taught b=sometimes covered c=not covered

Individuals, Groups and Organizations

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Henry Cabot Lodge | <input type="checkbox"/> John J. Pershing | <input type="checkbox"/> Susan B. Anthony |
| <input type="checkbox"/> W.E.B. DuBois | <input type="checkbox"/> Eugene Debs | <input type="checkbox"/> H. Ross Perot |
| <input type="checkbox"/> George Wallace | <input type="checkbox"/> Pedro Albizu Campos | <input type="checkbox"/> Douglas MacArthur |
| <input type="checkbox"/> George Marshall | <input type="checkbox"/> George Patton | <input type="checkbox"/> Andrew Carnegie |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Martin Luther King, Jr. | <input type="checkbox"/> Shirley Chisholm | <input type="checkbox"/> Georgia O’Keeffe |
| <input type="checkbox"/> John Steinbeck | <input type="checkbox"/> Theodore Roosevelt | <input type="checkbox"/> Woodrow Wilson |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Franklin D. Roosevelt | <input type="checkbox"/> Herbert C. Hoover | <input type="checkbox"/> Harry S. Truman |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Dwight D. Eisenhower | <input type="checkbox"/> John F. Kennedy | <input type="checkbox"/> Clarence Darrow |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Richard M. Nixon | <input type="checkbox"/> James E. Carter | <input type="checkbox"/> Ronald W. Reagan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> George H. W. Bush | <input type="checkbox"/> William J. Clinton | <input type="checkbox"/> Malcolm X |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cesar Chavez | <input type="checkbox"/> Luis Muñoz Marin | <input type="checkbox"/> Alex Hailey |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Eleanor Roosevelt | <input type="checkbox"/> Henry B. Gonzalez | <input type="checkbox"/> Antonia Pantojas |
| <input type="checkbox"/> William C. Velasquez | <input type="checkbox"/> Lyndon B. Johnson | <input type="checkbox"/> Gloria Steinem |
| <input type="checkbox"/> American Indian Movement | <input type="checkbox"/> N.O.W. | <input type="checkbox"/> Black Panthers |
| <input type="checkbox"/> N.A.T.O. | <input type="checkbox"/> L.U.L.A.C. | <input type="checkbox"/> C.I.A. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> the Chicago Seven | <input type="checkbox"/> M.A.L.D.E.F. | <input type="checkbox"/> K.K.K. |

Eras and Events

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Spanish American War | <input type="checkbox"/> Chinese Revolution | <input type="checkbox"/> World War I |
| <input type="checkbox"/> World War II | <input type="checkbox"/> Civil Rights Movement | <input type="checkbox"/> Prohibition |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Progressive Era | <input type="checkbox"/> Indian Wars & removal | <input type="checkbox"/> Red Scare |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Japanese Amer internment | <input type="checkbox"/> the Holocaust | <input type="checkbox"/> Watergate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cold War | <input type="checkbox"/> Vietnam War | <input type="checkbox"/> Great Depression |
| <input type="checkbox"/> growth of labor unions | <input type="checkbox"/> rise of big business | <input type="checkbox"/> Chicano Movement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> women’s movement | <input type="checkbox"/> 1960’s youth revolt | <input type="checkbox"/> Cuban Revolution |
| Battles, invasions, etc.: Argonne Forest ___/ Midway ___/ Normandy ___/ | | |
| Tet Offensive ___/ Bataan March ___/ Bay of Pigs ___/ | | |

Key Concepts and Documents

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> political parties & machines | <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Expansionism | <input type="checkbox"/> industrialization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> atomic weapons | <input type="checkbox"/> Wilson’s 14 Points | <input type="checkbox"/> Truman Doctrine |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Treaty of Versailles | <input type="checkbox"/> 16th & 17th Amendments | <input type="checkbox"/> Marshall Plan |
| <input type="checkbox"/> baby boom | <input type="checkbox"/> Civil Rights Act of 1964 | <input type="checkbox"/> discrimination |
| <input type="checkbox"/> affirmative action | <input type="checkbox"/> immigration | <input type="checkbox"/> communism |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fascism | <input type="checkbox"/> socialism | <input type="checkbox"/> imperialism |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Third World | <input type="checkbox"/> Sherman Anti-Trust Act | <input type="checkbox"/> New Deal |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Open Door Policy | <input type="checkbox"/> Dollar Diplomacy | <input type="checkbox"/> Social Security |
| <input type="checkbox"/> McCarthyism | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Brown vs Bd of Ed.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <i>U. of C. vs. Bakke</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 19th, 24th & 26th Amends | <input type="checkbox"/> consumerism | <input type="checkbox"/> the internet |

APPENDIX IQ

Interview Questions for U.S. History Teachers

Experience

1. What part of U.S. History are you currently teaching?
2. What other courses or classes are you currently teaching as well?
3. How many years have you been teaching U.S. History? Social Studies?
4. What other social studies courses have you taught in the past?

Conditions

5. To what extent do you have ready access to all the materials and technology you need to teach?
6. What approximate percentage of your classroom students demonstrate an interest in learning history?
7. To what extent does the required or adopted textbooks serve as a valuable resource in your teaching?
8. Is the U.S. History curriculum provided by your school district well designed?
9. A. Does the TEKS provide a sound framework for the teaching of U.S. history?
 B. What effect does or will the TAAS test have on your teaching of U.S. history?
10. To what extent do your administrators provide you with the support required to do your job well?
11. Are you satisfied with the opportunities offered by your school and/or district for professional development?

Content Questions

12. A. What eras, events, individuals, developments, etc. do you prefer, or enjoy teaching about the most? B. Why?

13. A. What content or elements of the curriculum are not to your liking, preference, or enjoy teaching about the least? B. Why?

14. A. What would you like to teach, cover, include in the curriculum, which, for whatever reasons, you cannot cover in class?

B. What prevents you from covering this material in your class now?

15. A. Of all the content you have to cover, what would you skip, eliminate, or spend less time on, if you had a choice? B. Why?

16. A. If you had the power to decide, what overall or specific changes would you make regarding the content covered in your course? B. Why?

C. What's preventing you from adopting or implementing these changes now?

Ultimate Goals

17. What personal satisfaction do you obtain from teaching U.S. History?

18. What do you want your students to gain from your course?

19. Why is it important for students to learn what you have to teach them?

20. Had you the power, what overall changes would you make in the teaching of U.S. History and why?

21. Is there anything else you would like to say regarding the teaching of U.S. History?

Appendix LI

Letter of Intent

Dear Participant:

You are invited to participate in a study whose purpose is to examine the attitudes and perceptions selected United States history teachers have regarding the content of their courses. I am a doctoral student in Curriculum Studies at the University of Texas at Austin. This study fulfills part of the requirements for my doctoral dissertation, and relates to other research I have conducted on history textbooks and on the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) for secondary social studies.

From this investigation we hope to gain a better understanding of how those who teach U.S. history perceive the content of their courses and the factors which influence the content choices they make.

You are being invited because you currently teach U.S. history at the secondary level. You will be one of 12 to 20 history teachers selected to participate in this study. The participants in this study will join one of several focus groups with a demographic cross-section of US history teachers in the Northside ISD.

If you decide to participate in this study, our expectation is that you are willing to engage in an open and frank discussion with the moderator and your colleagues, and freely express your opinions, perceptions, preferences and recommendations.

We will be audiotaping the focus group session, and will direct participants to use only first names when referring to each other. The audiotapes themselves will be accessible only to myself, and will be kept in a secure location. The identities of all participants in the audiotape will be kept confidential throughout the process and in the written dissertation which will integrate the findings of this study.

We ask that just prior to engaging in a group discussion, that each participant fill out a brief background sheet and a course content checklist. Neither the name nor the campus of the participant will be requested or recorded in these two documents.

The focus group session itself is estimated to last from 60 to 90 minutes. As a token of our appreciation for your time and effort, we would like offer you a gift certificate of \$20.00 to Barnes & Nobles.

You are under no obligation to participate in this study. Your decision to participate or not will have no affect on your future relations with the University of Texas at Austin or Northside ISD.

If you have any questions, please ask me now; or if your questions should later arise, reach me at 210-521-2348 or at jnpapr@aol.com You could also contact my faculty sponsor, Dr. Mary Black, at 512-232-3528 or at msblack@mail.utexas.edu. We will be happy to answer any questions you have or listen to your comments.

Please keep this copy for your reference.
Julio Noboa, Doctoral Student
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
College of Education

APPENDIX MCL

Content Checklist for U.S. History Middle School Please mark next to each name or term either an “a”, “b” or “c” regarding its place in your course curriculum:

a=always taught b=sometimes covered c=not covered

Individuals, Groups and Organizations

<input type="checkbox"/> William Penn	<input type="checkbox"/> George Washington	<input type="checkbox"/> Thomas Jefferson
<input type="checkbox"/> Benjamin Franklin	<input type="checkbox"/> Samuel Adams	<input type="checkbox"/> King George III
<input type="checkbox"/> Marquis de Lafayette	<input type="checkbox"/> Benjamin Benneker	<input type="checkbox"/> Thomas Paine
<input type="checkbox"/> Patrick Henry	<input type="checkbox"/> James Madison	<input type="checkbox"/> Alexander Hamilton
<input type="checkbox"/> Juan Ponce de Leon	<input type="checkbox"/> Christopher Columbus	<input type="checkbox"/> Hernán Cortez
<input type="checkbox"/> John Adams	<input type="checkbox"/> Abigail Adams	<input type="checkbox"/> Paul Revere
<input type="checkbox"/> Hernando De Soto	<input type="checkbox"/> Bernardo de Gálvez	<input type="checkbox"/> John Marshall
<input type="checkbox"/> Iroquois Confederacy	<input type="checkbox"/> Chief Pontiac	<input type="checkbox"/> Andrew Jackson
<input type="checkbox"/> Thirteen Colonies	<input type="checkbox"/> Spanish Colonies	<input type="checkbox"/> Cherokee Indians
<input type="checkbox"/> Sequoyah	<input type="checkbox"/> American political parties	<input type="checkbox"/> John C. Calhoun
<input type="checkbox"/> Henry David Thoreau	<input type="checkbox"/> Native Americans	<input type="checkbox"/> Fa. Junípero Serra
<input type="checkbox"/> Mexican Americans	<input type="checkbox"/> López de Santa Anna	<input type="checkbox"/> African Americans
<input type="checkbox"/> Henry Clay	<input type="checkbox"/> Daniel Webster	<input type="checkbox"/> Jefferson Davis
<input type="checkbox"/> Ulysses S. Grant	<input type="checkbox"/> Robert E. Lee	<input type="checkbox"/> Abraham Lincoln
<input type="checkbox"/> Benito Juarez	<input type="checkbox"/> Frederick Douglass	<input type="checkbox"/> Harriet Tubman
<input type="checkbox"/> Elizabeth Cady Stanton	<input type="checkbox"/> Underground Railroad	<input type="checkbox"/> Sojourner Truth
<input type="checkbox"/> Simón Bolívar	<input type="checkbox"/> Sacajawea	<input type="checkbox"/> David G. Farragut

Eras and Events

<input type="checkbox"/> European Exploration	<input type="checkbox"/> French and Indian War	<input type="checkbox"/> English colonization
<input type="checkbox"/> Spanish colonization	<input type="checkbox"/> American Revolution	<input type="checkbox"/> African slave trade
<input type="checkbox"/> Treaty of Paris	<input type="checkbox"/> Philadelphia Convention 1787	
<input type="checkbox"/> War of 1812	<input type="checkbox"/> Trail of Tears	<input type="checkbox"/> Mexican War
<input type="checkbox"/> Lewis & Clark Expedition	<input type="checkbox"/> abolitionist movement	<input type="checkbox"/> Reconstruction
<input type="checkbox"/> Great Awakenings	<input type="checkbox"/> expansionism	<input type="checkbox"/> Reform movement
Battles of: Lexington___/ Concord___/ Saratoga___/ Yorktown___/ Fort Sumpter___/ Gettysburg___/ Vicksburg___/		

Key Concepts and Documents

<input type="checkbox"/> Mayflower Compact	<input type="checkbox"/> Magna Carta	<input type="checkbox"/> Common Sense
<input type="checkbox"/> Declaration of Independence	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Constitution	<input type="checkbox"/> Bill of Rights
<input type="checkbox"/> Articles of Confederation	<input type="checkbox"/> democracy	<input type="checkbox"/> culture
<input type="checkbox"/> Federalist Papers	<input type="checkbox"/> mercantalism	<input type="checkbox"/> equality
<input type="checkbox"/> representative government	<input type="checkbox"/> urbanization	<input type="checkbox"/> immigration
<input type="checkbox"/> free enterprise system	<input type="checkbox"/> industrialization	<input type="checkbox"/> Monroe Doctrine
<input type="checkbox"/> Emancipation Proclamation	<input type="checkbox"/> civil disobedience	<input type="checkbox"/> racism
<input type="checkbox"/> Gettysburg Address	<input type="checkbox"/> Northwest Ordinance	<input type="checkbox"/> slavery
<input type="checkbox"/> separation of powers	<input type="checkbox"/> Manifest Destiny	<input type="checkbox"/> ethnicity
<input type="checkbox"/> church & state separation	<input type="checkbox"/> role of religion	<input type="checkbox"/> women's rights
<input type="checkbox"/> Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo	<input type="checkbox"/> 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments	

Appendix TEKS Four Levels of Representation

Level 1: Individual. The specific name of an individual is mentioned, i.e., Martin Luther King

Level 2: Group. The group is specified by name, i.e., Cherokee or Native Americans

Level 3: Event. An event, issue, concept is included which implies presence of a group, i.e., Mexican American War, Emancipation Proclamation, Trail of Tears.

Level 4: Category. The group is implied categorically, i.e. “racial minority groups” or “immigrants”



Table 1: U.S. History TEKS through Reconstruction

	Individual	Group	Event	Category	Totals
African American	1	1	7	3	12
American Indian	0	1	1	3	5
Latino-Hispanic	0	0	2	4	6



Table 2: U.S. History TEKS From Reconstruction to the Present

	Individual	Group	Event	Category	Totals
African American	3	0	3	5	11
American Indian	0	0	1	4	5
Latino-Hispanic	0	0	4	6	10



Table 3: Both High School and Grade 8 U.S. History TEKS

	Individual	Group	Event	Category	Totals
African American	4	1	10	8	23
American Indian	0	1	2	7	10
Latino-Hispanic	0	0	6	10	16

APPENDIX TT

Table 1:Garraty/Holt R&W
Sentences by Topic & Hispanic National Origin

Topics	H/L	MA	PR	CA	Totals
1: Why Imm	-0-	5	1	1	7
2: When/Where	3	9	1	2	15
3: Prblms/Accmp	35	32	6	5	78
4: Events/Issues	21	12	5	4	42
5: Chrcts/Exprns	15	43	31	2	91
6: Leaders	-0-	27	5	-0-	32
7: Other Exprns	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Totals by Origin	74	128	49	14	265

<<<<<----->>>>>

Table 2: Davidson/Prentice Hall
Sentences by Topic & Hispanic National Origin

Topics	H/L	MA	PR	CA	Totals
1: Why Imm	1	7	-0-	1	9
2: When/Where	-0-	24	6	2	32
3: Prblms/Accmp	20	20	-0-	10	50
4: Events/Issues	7	17	4	-0-	28
5: Chrcts/Exprns	26	90	6	2	124
6: Leaders	-0-	132	1	-0-	133
7: Other Exprns	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Totals by Origin	54	290	17	15	376

<<<<<----->>>>>

Table 3: Berkin et al/Scott Foresman
Sentences by Topic & Hispanic National Origin

Topics	H/L	MA	PR	CA	Totals
1: Why Imm	-0-	7	-0-	-0-	7
2: When/Where	6	5	2	-0-	13
3: Prblms/Accmp	11	20	-0-	-0-	31
4: Events/Issues	10	7	8	-0-	25
5: Chrcts/Exprns	14	58	6	1	79
6: Leaders	-0-	21	4	-0-	25
7: Other Exprns	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Totals by Origin	41	118	20	1	180

References

Apple, M.W., & Christian-Smith, L.K. (Eds.) (1991). *The politics of the textbook*. New York: Routledge.

Arries, Jonathan F. (1994, April). Decoding the social studies production of Chicano history. *Equity & Excellence in Education*. 27 (1), 37-44.

Banks, James A. (1969) A content analysis of the Black American in textbooks. *Social Education*, December, 954-63.

Banks, James A. (1997). Multicultural education: Characteristics and goals. in J. Banks & McGee Banks, C.A. *Multicultural education: issues and perspectives*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, 3-31.

Banks, James A. (1999). *An introduction to multicultural education*. Second edition. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Beatty, A.S., et al. (1996, April). NAEP 1994 U.S. history report card: Findings of the National assessment of Educational Progress. Washington D.C: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Dept. of Education.

Ben-Peretz, M. (1990). *The teacher-curriculum encounter: Freeing teachers from the tyranny of texts*. Albany, New York : State University of New York Press.

Berkin, Carol, et al. (1992). *American voices: A history of the United States, volume II: 1865 to the present*. Glenview, IL : Scott Foresman.

Bernal, Joe. (1997). Everyone had a fair say in new class curriculum. *San Antonio Express-News*, August 12.

Boyer, Paul & Stuckey, Sterling. (2003). *The American nation*, Austin, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Canning, C. and Noboa, J. (1997). *White Teachers in a Multicultural Society*. Association of Teacher Educators Annual Conference. Washington, D.C., February 17.

Canning, C., Noboa, J., and Salazar-Guenther, M. (2002) Reflecting Latino Culture in Our Classrooms: A Quick Start for Teachers. Association of Teacher Educators Annual Conference. Denver, CO. February.

Cayton, Perry, Reed & Winkler. (2003). America: Pathways to the Present. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Children Now (1998). A different world: Children's perceptions of race and class in the media. Oakland CA: Children Now. (Children and the Media Program).

Christian Science Monitor. (2001). Hispanics spread to hinterlands. March 26.

Committee on the Study of Teaching Materials in Intergroup Relations. (1949) Intergroup relations in teaching materials. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education.

Cook, Kay K. (1985, September). Latin American studies: ERIC digest no. 19. ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Sciences Education, ED 264161.

Cortés, Carlos E. (1997). Chicanas in film: History of an image. in Clara E. Rodriguez, (Ed.) Latin looks: Images of Latinas and Latinos in the U.S. Media. Boulder, CO: Westview Press., 121--141.

----- (2000). The children are watching: How the media teach about diversity. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cruz, Bárbara C. (2002). Don Juan and rebels under palm trees: Depictions of Latin Americans in US history textbooks. Critique of Anthropology. Vol 22(3).

Davidson, J.W., Lytle, M.H. and Stoff, M.B. (1992). American journey: The quest for liberty since 1865. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Delgado, R. & Stefancic, J. (2001). Critical race theory: An introduction. New York: New York University Press.

de Varona, Frank. (1989). Hispanics must be included in our textbooks. Paper. National Association of Bilingual Administrators Conference, Miami, Fl, May 11. ERIC ED 314318.

D'Souza, Dinesh. (1991). Illiberal education. New York: Free Press.

Elbaz, F. (1981). The teachers' practical knowledge. Curriculum Inquiry, 11 (1), 43-71.

Eslinger, M. & Superka, D. (1982). Social studies teachers. in The current state of social studies: A report of Project Span. Boulder, CO: Social Science Consortium.

Fawcett, V. & Hawke, S. (1982). Instructional practice in social studies. in The current state of social studies: A report of Project Span. Boulder, CO: Social Science Consortium.

Fern, Edward F. (2001). Advanced focus group research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fitzgerald, Frances. (1980) America revisited. New York: Vintage Books.

Fleming, Dan B. (1982, July/August) Latin America and the United States: What do U. S. history books tell us? The Social Studies. (73), 168-171.

Garcia, Jesus. (1993, September). The changing image of ethnic groups in textbooks. Phi Delta Kappan. 75 (1), 29-35.

Garcia, Jesus. (1980, November). Hispanic perspective: Textbooks and other curricular materials. The History Teacher. 14 (1), 105-120.

Garcia, J. & Goebel, J. (1985) A comparative study of the portrayal of Black Americans in selected U.S. history textbooks. Negro Educational Review, July/October, 118-127.

Garraty, John. (1992). The story of America, Vol. 2: 1865 to the present. Austin, TX: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gay, Geneva. (1994). A synthesis of scholarship in multicultural education. Urban Education Monograph Series. Seattle: NCREL Urban Education Program.

Gibson, Margaret A. (1989). School persistence versus dropping out: A comparative perspective. in H.T. Trueba, G. Spindler & L. Spindler (Eds) What do anthropologists have to say about dropouts? New York: The Falmer Press.

Glab, Edward, Jr. (1981) Latin American cultural studies: Information and materials for teaching about Latin America. rev. ed. Austin: University of Texas, Institute of Latin American Studies. ED 216 943.

Glazer, Nathan & Ueda, Reed. (1983) Ethnic groups in history textbooks. Washington D.C.: Ethics and Public Policy Center. 60.

Gonzalez, Juan. (2000). Harvest of empire: A history of Latinos in America. New York: Viking.

Gonzales, P. & Rodriguez, R. (1998) Justice, truth, part of human rights. San Antonio Express-News, December 7.

Hirsch, E.D., Jr. (1987) Cultural literacy: What every American needs to know. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Hoholik, Suzanne. (1998). State gets praise for TEKS plan. San Antonio Express-News, February 24.

Jarolimek, John (1981). The social studies: An overview. in H. Mehlinger and O. Davis (Eds.) The social studies 80th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: NSSE.

Kane, Michael B. (1970). Minorities in Textbooks. Chicago, Quadrangle Books. 1.

Krueger, Richard A. (1998). Analyzing and reporting focus group results. [Focus group kit 6]. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lapp, M.S., Grigg, W.S., & Tay-Lim, B.S.H. (2002) The Nation's report card: U.S. history 2001. Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Just what is critical race theory, and what's it doing in a nice field like education? in L. Parker, D. Deyle, and S. Villenas (Eds.) Race it...race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Lerner, R., Nagai, A.K., & Rothman, S. (1995) Molding the Good Citizen: The Politics of High School History Texts. Westport, Connecticut: Praeger.

Levine, L. (1996). The opening of the American mind: Canons, culture, and history. Boston: Beacon Press.

Lietman, R., Binns, K., & Steinberg, A. (P.D.s) (1996). Students voice their opinions on: Learning about multiculturalism. Part IV. The Metropolitan Life Survey of The American Teacher. New York: Louis Harris & Associates, Inc.

Little, Judith. (1989). Conditions of professional development in secondary schools. Paper. 1989 AERA Annual Meeting.

Madriz, Esther. (2000). Focus groups in feminist research. in N.K. Denzin & Y.S. Lincoln, Eds., Handbook of qualitative research, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc., 835-850.

Marcus, Lloyd. (1961) The Treatment of Minorities in Secondary School Textbooks. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith.

Mckee, Sandra. (1988). Impediments to implementing critical thinking. Social Education. 52 (6).

Morgan, David L. (1988). Focus groups as qualitative research. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Morrisett, Irving (1981). The needs of the future and the constraints of the past. in H. Mehlinger and O. Davis (Eds.) The social studies 80th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: NSSE.

Nash, G.B., & Crabtree, C. (1996). National standards for United States history. Basic Edition. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, National Center for History in the Schools.

Nash, Gary B., Crabtree, C., & Dunn, R.E. (1997) *History on trial: Culture wars and the teaching of the past*. New York: Alfred A. Knoff.

Nash, G.B., & Dunn, R.E. (1995, January). *History standards and culture wars*. *Social Education*. 59, 5-7.

National Council of La Raza (1997). *Hispanics in the media*. in Clara E. Rodriguez, (Ed.) *Latin looks: images of Latinas and Latinos in the U.S. media*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press., 21--35

Newman, W.N. (1973). *A study of minority groups and social theory*. New York: Harper & Row.

Nieto, Sonia. (1992). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education*. New York: Longman Publishing Group.

Noboa, Julio. (1991a) *Mexican Americans and Hispanics in U.S. history textbooks: Grades 9 to 12*. Testimony presented at the Texas Board of Education, Austin. July 9, 1991 and November 7, 1991.

----- (1991b). *The Textbook Adoption Process in Texas: Social Studies and Cultural Diversity*. Southwestern Social Science Association, San Antonio, TX. March 30.

----- (1993). *Latinos, Minorities, and Women in Literature and History Textbooks*. Society for Applied Anthropology, Menger Hotel, San Antonio, TX, on March 10.

----- (1998). *Missing pages from the human story: World history according to TEKS*. World History Association of Texas Conference, Texas Lutheran University. April 4.

----- (1999). *Growing up Latino in anglocentric schools: The impact of school and media curricula*. Unpublished Manuscript. Spring.

----- (2000a) *U.S. history teachers engaging with the content of their teaching*. University of Texas at Austin, Spring. Unpublished manuscript.

----- (2000b) Latino presence and perspective in U.S. history textbooks. University of Texas at Austin, Summer. Unpublished manuscript.

----- (2000c) Looking for Latinos in U.S. history TEKS. Paper. First Conference on Curriculum & Pedagogy, Camp Balcones Springs, Austin, TX. November 10.

----- (2003a) Latinos in the U.S. history textbook adoption process of Texas, 2002. University of Texas at Austin, Spring. Unpublished study.

----- (2003b) What to teach: How U.S. history teachers make content choices. University of Texas at Austin. Summer. Unpublished study.

----- (2003c, submitted). On the westside: A portrait of Lanier high school during World War II. In Maggie Rivas-Rodriguez, (Ed.), U.S. Latinos and Latinas in World War II, University of Texas Press.

Noboa-Polanco, Julio (1991) They come to learn: Hispanic immigrant students in Texas. The Tomás Rivera Center. Fall. Trinity University, San Antonio, TX.

Offutt, Robert. (1997). TEKS improved, but students lost best curriculum. San Antonio Express-News, August 26.

Patthey-Chavez, G.G. (1993, March). High school as an arena for cultural conflict and acculturation for Latino angelinos. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 24 (1), 33--60.

Romanowski, Michael H. (1995). American history by the book: Teachers using textbooks. Paper. AERA, 1995. Eric ED 396 978.

Romanowski, Michael H. (1997). Teachers' lives and beliefs: Influences that shape the U.S. history curriculum. Paper. AERA, 1997. Eric ED 409 288.

Ramos, Cindy (1997). Debate gets political on school curriculum. San Antonio Express News, June 30, p. 8.

Rigberg, B. (1991, Winter). What Must Not Be Taught. Theory and Research in Social Education. 19 (1), 14-44.

Ruiz, Vicki L. (1987, February). Teaching Chicano/American history: goals and methods. The History Teacher. 20 (2), 167-177.

Salazar Davis, Norma. (1991). Recovering the Hispanic past: Historiography in a void. Paper. Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, April 6. ED 333092

Salvucci, Linda K. (1991, February). Mexico, Mexicans and Mexican Americans in secondary-school United States history textbooks. The History Teacher. 24 (2), 203-222.

Sewall, G.T. & Emberling, S.W. (1998, Nov/Dec) A new generation of history textbooks. Society. 36 (1), 78-85.

Schlesinger, Arthur M., Jr. (1991). The disuniting of America: Reflections on a multicultural society. Knoxville, TN: Whittle Direct Books.

Shaver, James, et al. (1978). An interpretive report of the status of precollege social studies education based on three NSF funded studies. Eric. ED 164363.

Simms, Richard L. (1975) Bias in textbooks: Not yet corrected. Phi Delta Kappan, November, 201-2.

Sleeter, C.E., Grant, C.A. (1991). Race, class, gender, and disability in current textbooks. in Apple, M.W., & Christian-Smith, L.K. (Eds.) The Politics of the Textbook. New York: Routledge.

----- (1994). Making choices for multicultural education. 2nd Ed. New York. Macmillan Publishing Co.

Sobol, Morton J. (1954). An analysis of social studies texts in relation to their treatment of four areas of human relations. Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University.

Spring, Joel (1997) Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States. (2nd Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Stake, Robert, et al. (1978). Case studies in science education. Volume 2. Design, overview, and general findings. Eric. ED 166 059

Stille, Alexander. (1998). The Betrayal of History. The New York Review of Books. June 11, 15-20.

Suarez-Orozco, Marcelo M. (1989). Central American refugees and U.S. high schools: A psychosocial study of motivation and achievement. Stanford, CA:Stanford University Press.

Swartz, E. (1992). Emancipatory narratives: Rewriting the master script in the school curriculum. Journal of Negro Education, 61, 341.

Thomas, Jeffrey. (1992). Teachers of U.S. history emphasize twentieth century. Humanities, March-April.

Wilentz, Sean. (1997). Don't know much about history: A battle report from the front lines in america's cultural wars. New York Times, Book Review, November 30, 28-29.

Texas Education Agency. (1992) Written comments concerning textbooks to be reviewed by the state textbook social studies committee 1992 adoption. Division of Textbook Administration, TEA.

Texas Education Agency. (1996). Social studies: Texas essential knowledge and skills. (Second Draft, July 1). Austin, TX: Author.

Texas Education Agency. (1997a). Scholars endorse curriculum proposals (Press Release: July 9) Austin, TX: Author.

Texas Education Agency. (1997b). Chapter 113: Texas essential knowledge and skills for social studies. (September, 1997, Original) Austin, TX:Author.

Texas Education Agency. (1997c). Chapter 113: Texas essential knowledge and skills for social studies. (Second Reading Final Adoption: Draft, July 2) Austin, TX: Author.

Texas Education Agency. (2002a). Public testimony before the state board of education. Proclamation 2000. Textbook hearing #1:July 17, 2002. Austin, TX: Author.

Texas Education Agency. (2002b). Public hearing on textbooks before the state board of education: September 11, 2002. Austin, TX: Author.

Thomas, Jeffrey. (1992). Teachers of U.S. history emphasize twentieth century. *Humanities*, March-April.

Zabarenko, Deborah. (2001). U.S. census reports more multicultural population. *Reuters*. March 12.

VITA

Julio Noboa was born in Bronx, New York on May 9, 1949, the son of Simonita Noboa and Julio Noboa Gonzalez, both from the historic town of Aguada, Puerto Rico. His family moved to Chicago, and after obtaining a diploma from Lane Technical High School in 1967, he entered the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle. He received a Bachelor of Arts degree in Anthropology from that institution in 1974.

After working as a bilingual math teacher for two years, he was employed as a Leadership Trainer for four years at the Latino Institute. The Latino Institute was an educational policy and advocacy organization working in the Latino communities of Chicago. There he provided cultural orientation to teachers, and trained cadres of English and Spanish-speaking parents in the areas of leadership and educational advocacy.

In 1979, he obtained a fellowship to Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois in the discipline of Educational Anthropology and earned a Masters of Arts degree in Education, graduating in 1981.

During the early 1980's he worked in a variety of positions in educational administration in the nonprofit sector, most notably as Division Director at the Association House of Chicago. After moving to San Antonio in 1985, he worked in Communities-in-Schools, managing a dropout prevention program at the secondary level. From 1989 through 1993, he worked as Writer, Research Editor, and finally Assistant Director at the Tomás Rivera Center, a nationally recognized Latino educational policy institute then at Trinity University.

He began his doctoral studies at University of Texas at Austin in Spring, 1997. Later, as a graduate student he conducted research on Lanier High School during World War II and wrote a paper which will

comprise a chapter in an upcoming book about Latinos and Latinas in World War II to be published in 2004 by the University of Texas Press.

He has presented papers on numerous occasions in educational conferences at the regional, statewide and national levels, and has provided in-service training to teachers and librarians on Latino history and heritage.

Most recently, he holds a tenure-track position with the University of Northern Iowa, as a Clinical Supervisor and Instructor.

Permanent Address: 9654 Silver Moon, San Antonio, TX 78254

This dissertation was typed by the author