

Liberatory Praxis with Latinx Students Through the Synthesis of Humanizing Pedagogies and

Curricula

Melissa A. Cornejo

Peabody College, Vanderbilt University

Introduction

Latinx¹ students have been dehumanized (Freire, 1970) in United States (U.S.) society and school system through a history of racialization and Americanization in curricula, policy, and rhetoric (Barajas and Ronnkvist, 2007; J. González 2011, Kteily and Bruneau 2017; Pulido, 2009; Salazar, 2013; Saldaña, 2013). This paper seeks to address how critical educators (DiAngelo and Sensoy, 2014, p.3) can react and respond to this history by enacting humanizing pedagogies for Latinx students that engage students in liberatory praxis (Freire, 1970). Examples of humanizing pedagogies for Latinx students have been used by some practitioners and researchers, although these practices have largely been utilized individually. This paper argues that the synthesis and incorporation of self-knowledge through ethnic studies and culturally responsive pedagogy, critical thinking skills via conscientização (Freire, 1970), civic engagement (Freire, 1970) and cultivating radical self-love into critical pedagogy and curricula (hooks, 1994; Taylor, 2018) will produce liberatory praxis and humanization.

The Latinx population is the second-fastest growing in the U.S., accounting for 18% of the population, or nearly 58 million people as of 2016 (Flores, 2017). This should be of particular interest to educators who work with youth in urban intensive and emergent areas (Milner, 2012) as 71% of nearly 7 million students who are enrolled in the nation's 60 largest school districts are either Latinx or Black, in contrast to approximately 35% of the nation as whole (De los Ríos et al., 2015, p. 85). Moreover, more than half of Latinx people lived in metropolitan areas in 2014 (Krogstad, 2016) making this of note to practitioners who work with youth in urban intensive and emergent areas (Milner, 2012).

¹ This paper uses Latinx rather than “Latino” or “Latin@” to denote plurality and to be more inclusive of all Latinx identities in a way that does not reinforce a gender binary or the patriarchal Latin roots of the Spanish language. Similarly, this paper does not use “Hispanic” either as it emphasizes Spanish colonialism.

As such, there are scores of learners that are being done a social injustice through their dehumanization and unequal treatment in comparison to their non-Latinx peers and those who are not of color (Luna et al., 2013). The consequences of the dehumanization of Latinx students is far-reaching, as it effects multiple socio-ecological levels through the influence of policy decisions and political rhetoric that directly impact Latinx (-American) experiences in the U.S. education system, and of course carries implications for other students of color, among other populations.

Dehumanization

This paper uses Freire's (1970) concept of dehumanization, as it signals the humanity and personhood taken from a group of people by the majority group, which in the case of the U.S., is White Americans. Latinx (-Americans) are vulnerable to be othered and treated as inferior through the acceptance and perpetuation of American societal norms that have been established and upheld by dehumanizing practices, such as racism, racialization, Americanization, and acculturation. The continuation of dehumanizing Latinx people in the U.S. at a societal and cultural level trickles down to inform and shape how policy is structured to further dehumanize Latinx students. This in turn can inform and shape how Latinx students are treated and perceived by their communities, teachers, peers, and within their classroom and school climate.

Racialization and Americanization

Pulido (2009) explains that American racialized cultural beliefs of Latinx people have created a "cultural baggage" in society and the school setting that reduces Latinx people to culturally deficient criminals (Pulido 2009, p.69). Barajas and Ronnkvist (2007) support this

assertion, and their findings suggest that schools are racialized spaces. Furthermore, academic difficulties faced by students of color are often attributed to their culture, language skills, and home environment which implies their inferiority and white superiority (Salazar, 2013). As such, students of color, including Latinx students, are expected to speak and behave as White middle-class peers do, “*act gringo*,” (Franquiz and Salazar, 2004) or even portray a “raceless persona” (Fordham 1988, as cited in Warikoo & Carter 2009, p.379) in order to successfully navigate the education system. This success through assimilation into the *whitestream* (Grande, 2000) ostracizes the student of color and is at the expense of the student’s cultural and psychological well-being (Ladson-Billings 1995, p. 475). Additionally, Fergus’ (2017) qualitative study of six Mexican students at a predominantly White high school in a Midwest city found that the students that were deemed as “white-looking” by their teachers perceived less difficulty with successfully operating in the school and perceived better opportunities and social mobility than their “Hispanic-looking” peers. The “white-looking” students’ appearances guarded them from the racial discrimination faced by their peers with darker colored skin who did not have the same ability to regulate their identity and affiliation as White-passing students (Fergus, 2017).

Americanization practices since the turn of the twentieth century such as segregation in public schools and the use of corporal punishment, detention, and fines to deter students from speaking Spanish in U.S. schools (Saldaña 2013) and public spaces (J. González, 2011, p.104) have contributed to the dehumanization of Latinx people. The Americanization movement began with the incorporation of Southwestern states that historically have had high Latinx populations (Montejano, 1987; R. Valencia, 2002). The basis for Americanization was that immigrants and people of color could not “melt” into the “melting pot” of U.S. dominant culture, but instead had to shed their culture and language to assimilate and enter the mainstream dominant White culture

(Saldaña 2013). G. Gonzales (1997) asserts that Americanization was utilized not only to eliminate linguistic and cultural differences but to eradicate entire cultures which were seen as undesirable. Educators in favor of Americanization promoted the superiority of White middle-class values and the inferiority of Mexicans by reinforcing stereotypes that people of Mexican or Latinx heritage were dirty, lazy, irresponsible, lacked ambition, promiscuous and prone to criminal activities (G. Gonzales, 1997). This practice taught Mexican students that their culture, language, community, and heritage, and thus identity, were undesirable, pushing them to favor assimilation (G. Gonzales, 1997). In addition, this ideology assigned negative value to aspects of the students' identities and thus themselves (Reyes 2016) and it also promoted a loss of the Spanish language and Latinx culture (Saldaña 2013). Moreover, many English-speaking students were segregated into Mexican-only remedial classrooms and schools if their last name appeared to denote Latinx heritage (Saldaña 2013).

G. Gonzalez (1997) insists that Americanization lasted until the 1930's however, it persisted through the 1950's and 1960's for the Mexican American teachers that Saldaña (2013) interviewed about their memories of language oppression and cultural exclusion in Texan public schools. The teachers spoke to their experiences of racialized cultural violence that they faced as Mexican, working-class, Spanish speakers. For example, many received physical punishment for speaking Spanish in public spaces such as schools and were forced by teachers to Anglicize their names (Saldaña 2013; J. González, 2011). Even more disturbing than physical punishment, Mexicans and those thought to be Mexican were lynched in Texas and California as recently as 1917 (J. González, 2011). Americanization dehumanized Mexican students' perception of self in relation to their culture, identity, and language as well as physically and emotionally (Saldaña 2013; Reyes 2016).

Political Rhetoric

Latinx people have been dehumanized by policy and political rhetoric that inspires fear and “meta-dehumanization” (Kteily and Bruneau, 2017). Kteily and Bruneau’s (2017) research on meta-dehumanization found that traditionally advantaged groups respond aggressively toward minority groups, as the majority group feels dehumanized by the minority group. Examples of meta-dehumanizing policy include Georgia’s Board of Regents Decision Policy 4.1.6, 2010 and Arizona House Bill 2281 (Torres 2012; Trivette and English, 2017). The Georgia Board of Regents decision bans undocumented students, three-quarters of whom are Latinx (R. G. Gonzalez, 2009), from being admitted to Georgia’s top five public universities (Trivette and English, 2017). Similar laws affect undocumented students across the South, such as Alabama and South Carolina, who also ban undocumented students from admittance while other states like Arizona and Indiana ban undocumented students from receiving in-state resident tuition (Educators for Fair Consideration 2014; Thangasamy and Horan, 2016; Trivette and English, 2017).

Meanwhile, the Arizona House Bill 2281 banned the Mexican-American Studies program in the Tucson Unified School District, eliminating culturally responsive, relevant and sustaining pedagogies that humanized Latinx students (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2001, Paris 2012, Palos, “Precious Knowledge,” 2011). In addition, political rhetoric and the usage of the terms “alien,” “illegal,” and “laborer” dehumanize and other immigrants and narrow people into broad categories that do not acknowledge their personhood (Hamann and Reeves 2012).

Curriculum as Colonizer

Latinx students have been dehumanized through race-neutral curricula and policies (de los Ríos, 2013, p. 59-60; de los Ríos et al., 2015, p. 87) and color-blind perspectives in curricula and schooling (Howard, 2010; de los Ríos et al., 2015). These practices combine to create tools that preserve hegemony in U.S. schools, act as a form of social control and reproduction (Bowles and Ginitis 1976; Pinar 2004; de los Ríos, 2013), and reinforce acculturation, Americanization, and the promotion of *whitestream* (Grande, 2000) values and epistemologies (de los Ríos, 2013, p. 60; de los Ríos et al., 2015, Urrieta, 2009). Apple (1982; 1990) and Bernstein (1975) explain that formal schooling is not race-neutral or a color-blind process, but includes informal and hidden curricula which sustain economic, political, societal and cultural order (de los Ríos, et al. 2015). DiAngelo and Sensoy (2014) explain that “education is a political project embedded within a network of social institutions that reproduce inequality” (p.4).

Moreover, Franquiz and Salazar’s (2004) concept of “*acting gringo*” and Fordham’s (1998, as cited in Warikoo & Carter 2009, p.379) notion of a “raceless persona” are reinforced by Tyack (1974) who found that schools are a tool for depositing white supremacist as well as White Anglo-Saxon Protestant ideals. An example of race-neutral curricula includes the banning of the Mexican-American Studies program in the Tucson Unified School District as well as social studies textbooks which portray inaccurate histories, such as slaves as immigrants (De los Ríos et al., 2015). Lastly, de los Ríos (2013) argues that mainstream curriculum has historically and contemporarily promoted the de-Indigenization, assimilation, and Americanization of Latinx students into the dominant white culture (p.60).

Humanizing Pedagogies and Curriculum as Liberatory Praxis

In *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire (1970) states that “Liberation is a praxis: the action and reflection of men and women upon their world in order to transform it” (p. 79). The transformation he describes arrives in the form of humanizing pedagogies and the process of humanization (Freire, 1970) for both the student and educator. As such, humanizing pedagogy is described by Freire (1970) as an approach that expresses the consciousness of the students rather than the teacher manipulating students (Salazar, 2013, p.127). This approach to teaching is also exemplified by engaging in a quest for the “mutual humanization” (Freire, 1970, p. 56) of teachers with their students that invites the disruption and end of the banking model of education, which strives toward the goal of developing conscientização (Freire, 1970; Salazar, 2013, p.127).

Salazar (2013, p.128) identified five tenets based on Freire’s works that are fundamental to humanizing pedagogical practices. The first of these tenets is the development of the full person is essential for humanization, and that denying the humanization of another is to deny your own (Salazar, 2013, p. 128). This idea resonates with the poem, *In Lak’ech* (See Appendix A) and reinforces the connection between self-love extending that love to reach others for the benefit of all. The next tenet explained that the journey of humanization is both an individual and collective effort and a movement toward critical consciousness (Salazar, 2013, p. 128). This too links to the essence of the Mayan precept embedded in *In Lak’ech*, and the Mayan definition of the human being, which they called “*huinik’li*” or “vibrant being” (Valdez and Martinez Paredes, n.d.) In this way, “we are all part of the same universal vibration”, as highlighted by Salazar’s (2013) second tenet (Valdez and Martinez Paredes, n.d.) Similarly, Salazar’s (2013, p.128) third tenet identifies praxis as the means of transforming systematic inequities for both the self and others which facilitates the liberation of all (Salazar, 2013, p.128). Lastly, the fifth

tenet (Salazar, 2013, p.128) states that it is the responsibility of the educator to use pedagogical principles and practices that promote a fully human world.

The selection of principles and practices of humanizing pedagogy collected and synthesized by Salazar (2013) which this paper will focus on relate to culturally relevant, responsive, and sustaining pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2001, Paris 2012), ethnic studies and critical race pedagogy (de los Ríos, 2013; de los Ríos, et al., 2015), radical self-love practices (hooks, 2006; Taylor, 2018) as well as the promotion of civic engagement through praxis (Freire, 1970) within curricula.

Self-Knowledge: Culturally Responsive Pedagogies and Ethnic Studies

Culturally relevant (Ladson-Billings, 1995) or responsive (Gay, 2001), and sustaining pedagogies (Paris, 2012) are foundational to humanizing students and teachers and are the most critical of all humanizing pedagogies and curriculum as they form the basis for liberatory praxis to develop (Freire, 1970). Culturally responsive pedagogies (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2001, Paris 2012), acknowledge the reality of the learner (Salazar, 2013) and the student's community cultural wealth (Yosso, 2005). In fact, culturally responsive pedagogy as whole values and extends students' sociocultural resources by linking to prior knowledge (Salazar, 2013; Yosso, 2005).

One way to incorporate the lives of students to create meaningful curricula (Salazar, 2013) is to include learning about one's own history, or what this paper calls self-knowledge, often through the lens of Ethnic Studies (de los Ríos, 2013). The importance of this aspect of humanizing pedagogy is that it intervenes to disrupt colonial race-neutral curriculum and serves as a counternarrative and counterhistory to the hegemonic *whitestream* (Grande, 2000) history

perpetuated by traditional pedagogy and curriculum (De los Ríos, 2013). Furthermore, Ethnic Studies recovers and restores lost counterhistories, epistemology, and cultures of those who have been denied full participation in the education system (Butler, 2001, Hu-Dehart 1993, Yang 2000; de los Ríos 2013). The opportunity to compare and contrast traditional history with counter-tellings provide space to develop critical thinking skills and eventually equip an active critical consciousness.

Luna, Evans, and Bret (2013) studied a two-semester long community based high school program about indigenous Mesoamerican traditions and heritage which included a mixed-methods study of 225 high school student participants. The majority of the student participants identified as Latinx and attended the urban emergent (Milner, 2012) school district of Clark County, found in Las Vegas, Nevada (Luna, et al, 2013). The program, *Anahuac School and Community Engagement Program (Anahuac)* was implemented by two Latinx instructors from the University of Nevada Cooperative Extension and it was delivered as a dropout prevention strategy (Luna, et al, 2013). The program met once a week for two hours over the course of ten weeks as well as for a field trip to the university for a college tour (Luna et al, 2013). The motivation and purpose behind the program was to increase academic achievement and academic aspirations and foster a sense of ethnic identity and connection to ethnic history and ancestral culture by way of LatCrit, Critical Race Theory, and community cultural wealth theoretical frameworks (Luna et al, 2013; Yosso, 2005). Specifically, the relevant program curricula themes connecting to the idea of self-knowledge included ethnic identity, history of Mesoamerican groups and the contributions of these peoples to history, as well group work on a collective poem, “I am from.”

Luna et al.'s (2013) evaluation compared pre- and post-survey results captured the changes of student's perceptions of academic aspirations, commitment to their school, reduced favorable views of dropping out of high school, and increased knowledge of the college application process, as well as self-efficacy and positive ethnic identity. In conversation with the qualitative interviews, overall, *Anahuac* was found to increase participant sense of ethnic background and their membership within their ethnic group, as well as a sense of belonging and attachment to their ethnic group. Exposure to one's ethnic history and ancestral history and contributions is humanizing – increased attachment to one's own identity and sense of belonging means that more knowledge creates an awareness of one's history and thus their self.

Latinx students are deprived of learning about themselves in American schooling (Valenzuela, 1999; Luna et al., 2013; Sánchez, 2010) and this denial of culture and self-knowledge increases the likelihood of Latinx youth to portray and enact stereotypes that are dehumanizing to themselves, for example, low academic achievement, which encourages this group of youth to drop-out. (Guyll et al. 2010; Luna et al. 2013). Moreover, discrimination toward Latinx students is correlated with low grades and high absenteeism in early high school (Benner and Graham 2011; Luna et al., 2013)

Luna et al. (2013) suggest that their findings support the need for educators to include culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2001, Paris 2012) and ancestral cultural knowledge to engage minority students, such as Latinx students. They offer up the idea of incorporating these ideas into regular curriculum rather than simply in elective programming (Godina 1996; Godina and McCoy 2000; Luna et al., 2013). Additionally, the *Anahuac* program supported participant cultural awareness and increased their academic aspirations. Luna et al. (2013) find that an implication of their study is the importance of pairing culturally relevant

curricula with college access and success programming in order to engage marginalized students in their education

De los Ríos' (2013) critical teacher inquiry investigation over the course of nine months in the Pomona Unified School District in the urban emergent (Milner, 2012) community east of Los Angeles, California found that the education setting calls for *sitos y lengua*, or decolonizing spaces and discourses that allow for ethnic identity exploration. An Anzaldúan (1999) Chicana/o Border Pedagogy model was used to teach Chicana/o Latina/o Studies and college preparatory course to 35 juniors and seniors that was based in, “maiz-based indigenous concepts that promote truth seeking, interconnectedness, respect for others, critical consciousness and love” (Rodriguez, 2012). De los Ríos' (2013) curricula and teaching style fostered positive identity development as her students had more pride in their identification with and connection to their specific countries and ethnicities rather than umbrella terms such as “Hispanic” or “Latino” (p. 64). Ramirez (2008) found a similar trend in her study of the self-identification of 8 high school students participating in a Chicano and Latin American Studies course. These results are demonstrative of the power of humanizing pedagogy and curricula that have developed a sense of pride, belonging, and attachment for the students to their ethnic identity group through self-knowledge.

Critical Race Pedagogy

As described by de los Ríos et al. (2015, p. 84-86) Critical Race Pedagogy is based on Friere's (1970) work and is an education process that engages historically underserved groups to name and react to oppressive (Freire, 1970) structures. A goal of Critical Race Pedagogy is to cultivate strong literacy skills (and critical thinking skills) within learners so that they may use

this knowledge to develop conscientização and pursue praxis via civic engagement in their community (Darder, 2002, Freire 1970; de los Ríos et al., 2015). In addition, a hopeful outcome of critical race pedagogy is to work with dehumanized groups that have historically been disregarded, ignored, silenced, excluded, to promote their education and participation in collective democratic action and attainment of humanity (Bartolomé, 1994; McLaren 1994; de los Ríos et al., 2015). This pedagogy emphasizes the potential of each individual to be a revolutionary change agent (Duncan-Andrade and Morrell 2008).

Radical Self-Love

One of Salazar's (2013) guiding principles of humanizing pedagogy is that it involves, "trusting and caring relationships [that] advance the pursuit of humanization" (p.138). This concept of trust and care connects to the idea of love, the ethic of love (hooks, 2006; Laura, 2013), and what this paper calls self-love, which Sonya Renee Taylor expands upon by adding the adjective, "radical" (Taylor, 2018). She explains, "a radical self-love world is a world free from the systems of oppression that make it difficult and sometimes deadly to live in our bodies" (Taylor, 2018, p.4). Furthermore, Taylor considers self-love from an intersectional (Crenshaw, 1991) perspective, and views it as an opportunity to create a more equitable society, and that the necessity for this drastic change is emphasized by the use of "radical" (Taylor, 2018, p.4-6).

bell hooks (2006) and Laura (2013) both highlight the importance of the ethic of love and Freire's envisioning of love as an expression of humanity, and that the source of teaching is an act of love (Laura, 2013). hooks (2006) wrote in "Love as the Practice of Freedom," a chapter of *Outlaw Culture: Resisting Representations*, that without love our efforts to liberate ourselves and our world community from oppression and exploitation are doomed (p. 243). hooks continues on

to explain that if we as a society are committed only to the improvement of factors that affect us as individuals, we are not only maintaining the status quo but nurturing it (p. 244). Moreover, hooks (2006) writes that until we are open to the idea of the interlocking, intersectional (Crenshaw, 1991) ways in which systems of oppression and domination are maintained, we will each continue to perpetuate anti-love (p.246). In addition, hooks (2006) cites M. Scott Peck's definition of love, "the will to extend one's self for the purpose of nurturing one's own or another's spiritual growth" (p. 246-247). These interpretations of love as captured by hooks and Laura demonstrate Salazar's (2013) tenets, principles and practices of humanizing pedagogy, as it emphasizes the role of praxis and interconnectedness and how a love for one's self is inherently connected to the love of humanity and society, within the same spirit as Valdez's *In Lak'ech* (Appendix A).

Civic Engagement and Praxis

A pillar of De los Ríos' (2013) Chicana/o-Latina/o Studies course was "fostering community commitment," a pedagogical choice made to support self-determination and pride in one's self to create a sense of social responsibility for your community, inspired by Delgado Bernal (2001) and Arrieta and Méndez Benavidez (2007). This concept, which is a combination of both praxis and civic engagement, was captured best by a student who explained in his interview, how the course shaped his thinking and attachment to his community:

"This learning environment makes you feel like you have an obligation to help better your *gente*, like we all have to do something, you know? We have the responsibility to graduate from high school and also college, and then come back to help others in our community." (De los Ríos, 2013, p.69)

Another student added that, “I’m an activist, we are students and it is our duty to be revolutionary and especially at a time when Ethnic Studies is under attack in Arizona” (De los Ríos, 2013, p. 69). This statement alone attests to the power and strength humanization through liberatory praxis, as it is self-love and love for one’s identity and an attachment to that group that drives the application of the student’s conscientização to create positive change for her community.

Critical Thinking and Conscientização

Another of Salazar’s (2013) principles of humanizing pedagogy required, “challenging inequity in the educational system [to] promote transformation” (p. 138) which blends critical thinking skills with conscientização to move toward praxis (Freire, 1970). Ramirez (2008) relies on a definition of conscientização, that pulls from Freire, (1970) as well as bell hooks (1994) that aligns with Salazar’s (2013) interpretation of the concept as being, imperative for both students and educators (p. 138). Ramirez (2008) describes critical consciousness as one’s awareness of systems of oppression and the ability to think critically about the circumstances and engage in a process (both student and teacher-facilitator) of learning and reflective action that moves toward praxis (Freire, 1970) (Freire, 1973; Freire & Shor, 1987; hooks, 1994 as cited by Rodriguez, 2008). The process of continually developing critical consciousness is transformative and liberatory as it essential to humanizing historically and contemporarily marginalized and dehumanized populations, such as Latinx students. The awareness and ability to consider one’s circumstances and react accordingly cannot be understated. Luna et al.’s (2013) *Anahuac* qualitative interviews found that the students paid greater attention to media portrayals of Latinx people as a result of participating in the program. More importantly, the students’ awareness

moved forward into a critical discussion of the origins of the stereotypes they saw reflected back at them on television and in film, exemplifying the power of developing conscientização (Freire, 1970). Moreover, de los Ríos' (2013) critical teacher inquiry and use of *sitos y lengua* allowed students to explore their social and political identities, cultivating their critical consciousnesses.

Conclusion

Latinx students that have participated in Chicano/Latin American Studies or Chicano/Latino Studies classes and afterschool programs have been found to have greater civic engagement, interest in social justice issues, critical consciousness, positive identity and ethnic perception and pride, as well as higher academic aspirations, greater academic motivation, and academic achievement (Caraballo, 2017; de los Ríos, 2015; de los Ríos, López, & Morrell, 2015; Luna, Evans & Davis 2015; Ramirez, 2008). These results highlight an important outcome of humanizing pedagogy: knowing yourself, your history, and loving yourself as a Latinx student is needed in the U.S.

Ideally every student in the U.S. would receive a high-quality education that teaches multiple epistemologies, cultures, and languages that create a well-rounded holistic cultural knowledge and a program like Luna et al.'s (2015) *Anahuac* would not be necessary. This is not the case however, and there is a dire need to humanize Latinx students in our school system. In fact, all educators and students should be humanized through liberatory praxis, especially educators and students of color and other groups who have been marginalized and othered by American society, policy, and the education system itself. Ethnic studies classes and programs described in this paper are needed in today's education climate as a means to support students in a grassroots approach before tackling greater systematic issues such as racism, colorism, and

classism. In reality, it is not possible in all school districts to have ethnic studies programming, however the pedagogy can be utilized and interspersed throughout curriculum in all content areas.

The humanizing pedagogies, curriculum, and liberatory praxis synthesized in this paper seek to specifically address the needs and dehumanization of Latinx students. In the future, research might consider applying the frameworks outlined and synthesized in this paper to support humanization of other ethnic groups and students. However, this model will not replicate the same results without adaptations that are culturally relevant, responsive, and sustaining to the target group (Ladson-Billings, 1995; Gay, 2001, Paris 2012).

References

- Anzaldúa, G. (1999). *Borderlands la frontera: The new Mestiza* (Second ed.). San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books.
- Apple, M. (1982). *Education and power*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Apple, M. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum*. New York: Routledge.
- Barajas, H. L., & Ronnkvist, A. (2007). Racialized space: Framing latino and latina experience in public schools. *Teachers College Record*, 109(6), 1517-1538.
- Bartolomé, L. I. (1994). Beyond the methods fetish: Toward a humanizing pedagogy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 64(2), 173–194.
- Benner, A. D., and S. Graham. 2011. “Latino Adolescents’ Experiences of Discrimination Across the First Two Years of High School: Correlates and Influences on Educational Outcomes.” *Child Development* 82 (2): 508–519.
- Bernstein, B. (1975). *Class, codes, and control*. London: Routledge.
- Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America*. London: Routledge.
- Butler, J. E. (2001). *Color-line to borderlands: The matrix of American ethnic studies*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Caraballo, L. (2017). Students' critical meta-awareness in a figured world of achievement: Toward a culturally sustaining stance in curriculum, pedagogy, and research. *Urban Education*, 52(5), 585-609.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299.
- Darder, A. (2002). *Reinventing Paulo Freire: A pedagogy of love*. Boulder: Westview Press.

- DiAngelo, R. & Sensoy, O. (2014). Leaning in: A student's guide to engaging constructively with social justice content. *Radical Pedagogy*, 11(1)
- de los Ríos, C.,V. (2013). A curriculum of the borderlands: High school Chicana/o-Latina/o studies as sitios y lengua. *The Urban Review*, 45(1), 58-73.
- de los Ríos, C.,V., López, J., & Morrell, E. (2015). Toward a critical pedagogy of race: Ethnic studies and literacies of power in high school classrooms. *Race and Social Problems*, 7(1), 84-96.
- Educators for Fair Consideration. (2014). An overview of undocumented students [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from http://www.e4fc.org/images/E4FC_Fact_Sheet.pdf
- Fergus, E. (2017). "Because I'm light skin... they think I'm italian": Mexican students' experiences of racialization in predominantly white schools. *Urban Education*, 52(4), 460-490.
- Flores, A. (2017, September 18). How the U.S. Hispanic population is changing. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/09/18/how-the-u-s-hispanic-population-is-changing/>
- Fordham, S. (1988). Racelessness as a factor in black students' school success: Pragmatic strategy or pyrrhic victory? *Harvard Educational Review*, 58(1), 54.
- Fránquiz, M., & Salazar, M. (2004). The transformative potential of humanizing pedagogy: Addressing the diverse needs of Chicano/Mexicano students. *High School Journal*, 87(4), 36–53.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York, NY: Continuum.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Seabury Press.

Freire, P. & Shor, I. (1987). *A pedagogy for liberation: Dialogues on transforming education*.

Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.

Gay, G. (2001). Preparing for culturally responsive teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*,

53(2), 106-116.

González, J. (2011). *Harvest of empire: A history of Latinos in America*. New York: Penguin

Books.

Gonzalez, G. (1997). Culture, language, and the Americanization of Mexican children. In A.

Darder, R.D. Torres, & H. Gutierrez (Eds.), *Latinos and Education*, pp. 158-173. New

York: Routledge.

Gonzales, R. G. (2009). *Young lives on hold: The college dreams of undocumented students*.

(.). College Board Advocacy & Policy Center. 45 Columbus Avenue, New York, NY

10023.

Grande, S. (2000). American Indian geographies of identity and power: At the crossroads

of indigena and mestizaje. *Harvard Educational Review*, 70, 467–499.

Godina, H. 1996. “The Canonical Debate-Implementing Multicultural Literature and

Perspectives.” *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 39 (7): 544–549.

Godina, H., and R. McCoy. 2000. “Emic and Etic Perspectives on Chicana and Chicano

Multicultural Literature.” *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy* 44 (2): 172–179.

Guyll, M., S. Madon, L. Prieto, and K. C. Scherr. 2010. “The Potential Roles of Self-Fulfilling

Prophecies, Stigma Consciousness, and Stereotype Threat in Linking Latino/a Ethnicity

and Educational Outcomes.” *Journal of Social Issues* 66 (1): 113–130.

Hamann, E. T., & Reeves, J. (2012). ICE raids, children, media, and making sense of latino

newcomers in flyover country. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 43(1), 24-40.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. New York: Routledge.

hooks, b. (2006). *Outlaw culture: Resisting representations*. New York: Routledge.

Howard, T. (2010). *Why race and culture matter in schools: Closing the achievement gap in American Schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Hu-Dehart, E. (1993). The history, development, and future of ethnic studies. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75(1), 50–54.

Krogstad, J. M. (2016, September 08). Key facts about how the U.S. Hispanic population is changing. Retrieved from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/09/08/key-facts-about-how-the-u-s-hispanic-population-is-changing/>

Kteily, N., & Bruneau, E. (2017). Backlash: The politics and real-world consequences of minority group dehumanization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(1), 87-104.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1995). Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 465–49.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2006). It's Not the Culture of Poverty, It's the Poverty of Culture: The Problem with Teacher Education. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, 37: 104–109.

Lopez, N. 2000. "The Missing Link: Latinos and Educational Opportunity Programs." *Equity & Excellence in Education* 33 (3): 53–58.

Luna, N., Evans, W. P., & Davis, B. (2015). Indigenous mexican culture, identity and academic aspirations: Results from a community-based curriculum project for Latina/Latino students. *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, 18(3), 341-362.

- McLaren, P. (1994). *Life in schools: An introduction to critical pedagogy and the foundations of education*. New York: Longman.
- Milner, H. R. (2012). But What is Urban Education? *Urban Education*, 47(3), 556-561.
- Montejano, D. (1987). *Mexicans and Anglos in the Making of Texas, 1836-1986*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Palos, A. L. (Director). (2011). *Precious Knowledge* [Motion picture on DVD]. United States: Dos Vatos Productions.
- Paris, D. (2012). Culturally sustaining pedagogy: A needed change in stance, terminology, and practice. *Educational Researcher*, 41(3), 93-97.
- Pinar, W. (2004). *What is curriculum theory?*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Pulido, I. (2009). "Music fit for us minorities": Latinas/os' use of hip hop as pedagogy and interpretive framework to negotiate and challenge racism. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 42(1), 67-85.
- Ramirez, S. S. (2008). *Developing ethnic identity through chicano /Latino studies: A case study of high school students in central valley, california* (Order No. 3345154). Available from Education Database; ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: Social Sciences. (304839911).
- Reyes, Reynaldo, I., II. (2016). In a world of disposable students: The humanizing elements of border pedagogy in teacher education. *The High School Journal*, 99(4), 337-350.
- Rodriguez, R. C. (2012). Tucson's maiz-based curriculum: MAS-TUSD profundo. *Nakum Journal*, 2(1), 72-98.

- Saldaña, L. P. (2013). Teachers' memories of schooling: The sociocultural injuries and the mis-education of Mexican teachers in the barrio. *Journal of the Association of Mexican American Educators*, 7(1), 58-72.
- Salazar, M. d. C. (2013). *A humanizing pedagogy: Reinventing the principles and practice of education as a journey toward liberation* SAGE Publications. 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks, CA 91320.
- Sánchez, P. (2010). "In between Oprah and Cristina": Urban Latina youth producing a countertext with participatory action research. *Social Justice: A Journal of Crime, Conflict, and World Order*, 36(4), 54-68.
- Santiago, E. (1994). *When I Was Puerto Rican*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Thangasamy, A., & Horan, D. (2016). Lowering the cost barrier to higher education for undocumented students: A promising university-level intervention. *Journal of Latinos and Education*, 15(2), 113-120.
- Torres R.S. (2012) *Border Challenges and Ethnic Struggles for Social Justice in Arizona: Hispanic Communities Under Siege*. In: Lusk M., Staudt K., Moya E. (eds) *Social Justice in the U.S.-Mexico Border Region*. Springer, Dordrecht
- Trivette, M. J., & English, D. J. (2017). Finding freedom: Facilitating postsecondary pathways for undocumented students. *Educational Policy*, 31(6), 858-894.
- Tyack, D. B. (1974). *The one best system*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Urrieta, L. (2009). *Working from within: Chicana and Chicano activist educators in whitestream schools*. Tucson: University of Arizona Press.
- Valdez, L., & Martinez Paredes, D. (n.d.). In lak'ech: you are my other me. Retrieved from <http://vue.annenberginstitute.org/perspectives/lak'ech-you-are-my-other>

Valencia, R. (2002). *Chicano school failure and success: Past, present, and future* (2nd ed.).

New York: Routledge/Falmer.

Valenzuela, A. 1999. *Subtractive Schooling: U.S.–Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring*.

Albany: State University of New York Press.

Warikoo, N., & Carter, P. (2009). Cultural explanations for racial and ethnic stratification in academic achievement: A call for a new and improved theory. *Review of Educational Research*, 79, 366–394.

Yang, P. Q. (2000). *Ethnic studies: Issues and approaches*. Albany: SUNY Press.

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69-91.

Appendix A

Tú eres mi otro yo.

You are my other me.

Si te hago daño a ti,

If I do harm to you,

Me hago daño a mi mismo.

I do harm to myself.

Si te amo y respeto,

If I love and respect you,

Me amo y respeto yo.

I love and respect myself.

(Valdez and Martinez Paredes, n.d.)