sampling and enumeration. That costs more money. No one anticipated that three years ago, especially the administration, because they didn't think the Court was going to rule against them. So although the census has been going on for 200 years, this battle is a very real current one, over a constitutional interpretation. And that was only given in January or February. So the budget had already been determined, and the Census Bureau needs more money than it had originally anticipated because it was only going to do the Clinton way, and the Court said you can't do it just the Clinton way. They could have conceded and done enumeration, but they didn't.

Now, is that an "emergency?" It is a current need imposed by outside forces—the Supreme Court—on the current budgetary process, which cannot be accounted for under the current budget process. I mean, that kind of meets the definition of an emergency. Although it's dealing with something that's been done all along, it simply wasn't accounted for. I think that makes sense. Now, take a look at most of these disaster bills, which you know... Here's a hurricane, well fine, let's do a little bit of disaster aid for this. But you take a look at what's added to it. The emergency aid is the engine, but then boxcar after boxcar of other expenditures are added to it. It gets pretty far out, pretty fast, as to whether these "boxcars" are emergencies or not. It's the engine that's pulling it.

That, I think, is the greatest misuse of emergency funding: where you take a real emergency and then wrap it with all this other stuff that is desirable, but is truly not an emergency, and would have a difficult time funding itself in the regular budget process because there you play priorities and these are always such low priorities they never make it. Now, when you look at the total amount of money that's involved in this, it truly is not that significant. It's getting bigger, and so you have to watch it. Any of this fiscal stuff over time is a quantity determination. There has to be some decent system to get accommodation and compromise. That's always been the American way.

To a certain extent, that's what this emergency funding is doing. It's putting a little grease in the system so you can go forward. Is it the best way to grease it? Of course not. You've got to go to the joint, and put it in right where the joint is supposed to be greased. Now, can you slap it all around it and pack it? Sure, but that's a waste. Almost always when you try to deal with these, you end up with a lot of waste, which is an inefficient way of doing things. But politics sometimes, to someone's view of what's going on, is a big waste. But if you compare the amount of money that gets all these committee people on board - you know, $5 million, $10 million, $50 million, $100 million—and then they pass a $400 *billion* package that otherwise wouldn't have passed, if they didn't get these hokey little things that got them to say yes, then you've got to weigh the percentages. I mean, that's just the way Congress has always worked.

Interview conducted by Ann Strohm and Matthew Taylor.

Bill Thomas, Republican of Bakersfield, California, represents over 585,000 people in California's Twenty-first Congressional District. He serves on the House Ways and Means Committee and is chairman of the Subcommittee on Health. In 1998, Thomas was appointed administrative chairman of the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare. He is also a member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Trade, where he works for California's trade interests. Thomas is the chairman of the Committee on House Administration. Throughout his career, Thomas has been recognized for his legislative efforts to eliminate the federal deficit. The congressman graduated from Santa Ana Community College and obtained both his bachelors and masters degrees from San Francisco State University.

The Effect of Private Education on Political Participation, Social Capital and Tolerance: An Examination of the Latino National Political Survey

Jay P. Greene, Joseph Giammo and Nicole Mellow
University of Texas at Austin

Considerable research exists to demonstrate that the amount of education that people receive is strongly related to the political attitudes and behaviors they display. People with more years of formal education tend to be more politically active, possess higher levels of social capital and demonstrate greater levels of tolerance. Little empirical research exists, however, on whether different *types* of education, such as public or private schooling, have significantly different effects on these civic outcomes. In this article we examine the effect of public and private education on these civic values among a nationally representative sample of Latinos, as measured in the Latino National Political Survey (LNPS). Given that the dissemination of basic, desirable civic values is thought to be particularly important for immigrant populations, focusing on Latinos, of whom a disproportionate number are immigrants, is particularly relevant. After controlling for a variety of factors, the findings of our analyses are that private education contributes to higher levels of political participation, social capital and tolerance than does public education.

Introduction

Considerable research exists to demonstrate that the amount of education that people receive is strongly related to the political attitudes and behaviors they display. People with more years of formal education tend to be more politically active, possess higher levels of social capital and demonstrate greater levels of tolerance (Nie 1996; Verba 1995; Putnam 1995). Little empirical research exists, however, on whether different *types* of education, such as public or private schooling, have significantly different effects on these outcomes. To be sure, the US system of public education was developed with the belief that government-operated public schools are essential for the development of future generations of citizens possessing certain basic, desirable civic values. But the need for government operation of schools has been largely a matter of faith and has not been subjected to much systematic, empirical analysis.

In this article we examine the effect of public and private education on civic values among a nationally representative sample of Latinos, as measured in the Latino National Political Survey (LNPS).[1] Given that the dissemination of basic, desirable civic values is thought to be particularly important for immigrant populations, focusing on Latinos, of

Author's note: *The authors wish to thank Rudy de la Garza and the Public Policy Clinic of the Government Department at the University of Texas at Austin for their assistance in conducting this research. Additional research assistance was provided by Jongho Lee.*

whom a disproportionate number are immigrants, is particularly relevant. After controlling for a variety of factors, the findings of our analyses are that private education contributes to higher levels of political participation, social capital and tolerance than does public education.

How Public and Private Schools Might Affect Civic Values

The development of a universal system of government-operated public schools in the latter part of the nineteenth century was spurred by concerns about the civic values of new generations of citizens. In the face of waves of Catholic immigrants, first from Ireland and later from Italy, many worried that these new citizens might not possess the civic values necessary for the successful functioning of our democratic system. As early as the 1830s, Horace Mann addressed these concerns by articulating the idea of the common school, in which students of varying backgrounds would be educated together in government-operated schools that would promote the basic civic virtues of political involvement, public spiritedness and tolerance. The Congregationalist journal *New Englander* praised Horace Mann's idea of the common schools with words that may bruise modern sensibilities but accurately reflect the thinking during the birth of the public school: "These schools draw in the children of alien parentage with others, and assimilate them to the native born. ... So they grow up with the state, of the state and for the state" (Glenn 1988, 83). The public purpose of instilling desired civic values was assumed to require government operation of schools.

Political commentators in more recent times continue to believe that government-operated public schools are essential for achieving the public purpose of promoting certain civic values. Benjamin Barber, for example, writes, "Public Schools are not merely schools for the public, but schools of publicness: institutions where we learn what it means to be a public and start down the road to common national and civic identity. As forges of our citizenship, they are the bedrock of our democracy" (1997, 1). Barber does not repeat the statist rhetoric of the *New Englander*, but his views do represent the strong and enduring belief in the importance of public schools for developing future generations of citizens with necessary civic values.

While little empirical evidence has been produced to either verify or refute the belief in the civic benefits of government-operated public schools, a number of theoretical arguments have been advanced on this question. Theorists have suggested that public schools are essential for the promotion of civic values because of the experience, content and procedures of these schools. One benefit of the *experience* provided by a public school, according to these observers, is that it mixes students of different backgrounds. This experience of integration leads to mutual understanding and tolerance. As Secretary of Education Richard Riley recently argued, "The 'common school'—the concept upon which our public school system was built—teaches children important lessons about both the commonality and diversity of American culture. These lessons are conveyed not only through what is taught in the classroom, but by the very experience of attending school with a diverse mix of students" (1997, 1).

The *content* of public schooling is also thought to be important in promoting desired political values. Public schools are thought to be more likely than private schools to incorporate lessons about the virtues of political participation, public spiritedness and tolerance in their curricula. Horace Mann's words of almost two centuries ago capture a sentiment still common today: "(T)he tendency of the private school system is to...—each sect according to its own creed—maintain

separate schools, in which children are taught, from their tenderest years to wield the sword of polemics with fatal dexterity.... Of such disastrous consequences, there is but one remedy and preventative. It is the elevation of the common schools" (1837, 33). According to Mann and later supporters of this view, private schools teach the values of particular, narrow groups, while public schools teach the values of our whole society, the values of democracy.

The *process* by which public schools are governed is also thought to be an important advantage for promoting desired political values. Because public schools are governed democratically, they teach by example the values necessary for the successful operation of democratic systems. This view is best articulated by Amy Gutmann, who argues that the only way to ensure "our collective interests in the moral education of future citizens" (1987, 69) is to determine what those interests are through democratic processes. Private schools are not required to make decisions in a democratic fashion; the fear is that autocratic processes of governance may convey autocratic political values.

But there are also some reasons to expect that private schools should be at least as proficient as public schools in promoting desired political values. Some argue that many private schools more closely resemble the ideal of the common school than do public schools. The public school to which students are assigned is primarily determined by where students live. By attaching schooling to housing, public schools tend to replicate and reinforce racial and class segregation in housing patterns. Private school student composition is primarily a function of voluntary association for some common purpose. That common purpose may transcend racial and other differences, leading to higher levels of integration in private schools. Greene (1998a; 1998b) and Coleman (1982a) have advanced this sort of argument along with evidence to support their claim, although Taebur and James (1982) have provided some evidence to the contrary. If the experience of mixing with students of different backgrounds tends to lead to mutual understanding and tolerance, and if this mixing is more likely to occur in private schools, then private schools may be better at promoting these desired values.

The content of values taught at private and public schools has been the subject of dispute, as well. Bryk (1993) and Greeley (1982) have suggested that Catholic schools, which constitute the majority of all private schools, devote considerable attention to teaching desired civic values. They observe that central to Catholic school pedagogy is a goal "to foster an appreciation for their [students'] social connectedness and individual responsibility to advance social justice; and to stimulate those critical dispositions of mind and heart essential to the sustenance of a convivial democratic society" (Bryk 1993, 10). At the same time a number of commentators have critiqued public schools for failing to teach adequately the necessary civic values (Final Report of the National Commission on Civic Renewal, 1998). Whether the content of the education provided by private or public schools effectively conveys desired political values is an empirical question, the answer to which cannot easily be assumed.

It is also not clear that the processes by which many private schools are governed are demonstrably less democratic than public schools; at least they may be no less helpful at modeling democratic values by example. Many public schools have formal institutions of democratic control but lack a true democratic process. As one journalist noted after yet another low-turnout school board election, "Urban school boards are a false democracy, in which candidates who gain 600 votes out of 10,000 potential voters claim a man-

date" (Casey 1998). The dizzying bureaucratic complexity and red tape of some public schools further undermine the positive civic instruction they might provide. Private schools, on the other hand, may not have the formal mechanisms of democratic control (although some do), but they may actually do a better job of eliciting parental and community participation. Mark Schneider and colleagues (1997) found that parental involvement in schools increases when parents choose the school, as is more common with private schools.

There are plausible theoretical arguments to suggest that either public or private schools should be associated with promoting higher levels of political participation, social capital and tolerance. What has been absent from most of these discussions is systematic evidence on whether one type of schooling tends to promote civic values better than another. The analysis of data from the LNPS presented here is intended to shed more empirical light on these issues.

Evidence from the Latino National Political Survey

The LNPS conducted face-to-face interviews with a national representative sample of Latinos in 1989. The survey was an especially important project for several reasons. First, it overcame obstacles, such as lingual, social and economic barriers, that had prevented other surveys from collecting accurate information on Latino political attitudes. The LNPS had the advantage of going door-to-door with trained, Spanish-speaking staff to record subjects' responses. Second, the large and focused sample of Latinos in the LNPS allowed for more nuanced analyses of differences among sub-groups within the Latino community. Political attitudes and behaviors are not monolithic among Latinos. The LNPS was able to identify differences by countries of origin and social class that surveys with a small sample of Latinos would have difficulty detecting. And third, the LNPS collected a wealth of data on a population that is often overlooked but growing in its political importance. Understanding the factors that influence the political attitudes and behavior of Latinos gives us a picture of this large and fast-growing, ethnic minority and immigrant group.

Thorough analyses of many of the results from this survey have already been published (De la Garza 1992; Garcia 1996; Arvizu 1996; Hero 1996; Wrinkle 1996; Diaz 1996; Hill 1996; DeSipio 1996; Jones-Correa 1996; Montoya 1996). While information on the type of school—public, private or foreign—that respondents attended in each grade was collected, the relationship between type of education and civic outcomes in the LNPS has not been analyzed until now. The extent to which Latinos, like the waves of Irish and Italian immigrants before them, are socialized by different kinds of schooling is an important question that the LNPS can effectively address.

Variables Used in the Analyses

In Table 1, the name, mean, standard deviation, lowest value, highest value and the number of observations for all of the variables used in the analyses are presented. Below is a brief description of what those variables measure.

The first dependent variable is political participation. The LNPS asked subjects whether they had engaged in various political activities, including whether they had signed a petition, worn a campaign button, attended a political rally, volunteered for a political organization, contributed money to a political organization, registered to vote, or voted in the most recent presidential election. In total there were seven activities to which subjects could answer that they had or had not engaged. To combine these activities into a scale we simply calculated the sum, with a range from zero to seven. In one analysis we focused solely on whether subjects reported voting in the most recent presidential election because this is the most important and most common form of political participation (Campbell 1960; Verba 1995).

The second dependent variable is social capital. The LNPS collected information on this by asking whether subjects were members of five different types of voluntary organizations: charitable, Hispanic, social, sports and work organizations. To construct a scale of social capital for one analysis, we calculated the number of different types of organizations to which people belonged, with a range from zero to five. In a separate analysis, we developed a variable that took the value of one if the respondent was a member of any civic organization and a value of zero otherwise. Membership in civic organizations, as a proxy for social capital, is thought by some to be an important factor in establishing the social networks and trust that allow democratic systems to operate efficiently (Putnam 1995).

The LNPS collected information on the third dependent variable, tolerance, by asking a series of questions that previous scholars have developed to measure this concept (Stouffer 1955; Sullivan 1979). Subjects were asked to identify their least liked group from a list that was provided to them. They were then asked the extent to which they would agree to letting that least liked group hold public office, teach in schools, or hold a rally in their town. The answers on each item ranged from strongly agree, with a numerical value of five, to strongly disagree, with a numerical value of one. A person was considered more tolerant if he or she was more agreeable to letting a least liked group hold office, teach, or hold a rally. For one analysis we combined the responses to these three items simply by calculating the sum, producing a tolerance scale that ranged from three to 15, with higher numbers representing greater levels of tolerance. In another analysis we dichotomized the responses so that a one was recorded if subjects ever agreed or strongly agreed to let their least liked group engage in any of the three activities, and a zero otherwise.[2] As with the political participation and social capital scales, the results were not sensitive to the particular formulation of the indices.

The independent variables collected in the LNPS permit a relatively precise estimate of the effects of private education on civic values and behaviors. For each grade between first and twelfth grade, subjects were asked to report whether they had been in a US public, private or foreign school. From these questions we were able to calculate the total number of years that the subject had attended private school and the total number of years the subject attended school outside of the United States.[3] The number of years in US public schools was omitted as the default category against which the effects of private and foreign schooling are measured.

To increase our confidence that the effect of private education is actually caused by the experience of attending a private school, we were able to control for a variety of background characteristics that may be associated with the likelihood of attending private school and with the dependent variables being studied. For example, we were able to control for the highest level of education obtained by either of each subject's parents. Families with higher levels of education may have a greater likelihood of sending their children to private school. Higher levels of parental education may also be associated with greater political participation, social capital and tolerance. The parental education variable has a range of zero to 17 years with a mean of 6.1 years, where 12 and above represents completing high school and pursuing higher education.

We also have information on the national ancestry of the subjects. Respondents whose families originated in Cuba have different educational and political experiences from those that originated in Puerto Rico, Mexico or elsewhere. In our analysis, Cuban-Americans were the default category against which those of Puerto Rican and Mexican ancestry are compared.[4] We also controlled for the subject's gender, age and the number of years each had resided in the United States. Gender is an important control variable because educational opportunities and political behaviors are not necessarily the same across the sexes. Age is important because it captures generational effects as well as the amount of time passed since leaving secondary school. The number of years in the United States is important, because it measures the amount of time that subjects may have been exposed to informal political socialization simply by residing in this country.

The last two control variables that we used, the subject's income and highest level of education, are slightly more problematic because they may partially be the result of the type of education received. Some previous research suggests that attendance at private school tends to produce higher levels of academic achievement, which in turn causes greater financial success (Greene 1998c; Hoxby 1998; Neal 1997; Chubb and Moe 1990; Coleman 1982b). These findings, however, have been the subject of dispute (Levin 1998; Cookson 1996; Smith and Meier 1995). If the research findings that private education contributes to greater academic and financial success are correct, then controlling for the subject's highest level of education and current income may partially control for the effect of private education and depress results. All of the other control variables more clearly precede in time or are independent of the type of school that subjects attended. The difficulty with these latter two control variables is that they follow in time and may partially be the product of private school attendance.

Three options exist for handling this problem. One option, and the one we have chosen, is to control for highest level of education and current income despite the possibility that those measures are partially the product of attendance at private schools. If it is true that private education tends to lead to students going further in their education and to higher salaries, then controlling for these factors while trying to estimate the independent effect of private schooling on civic behavior will cause us to underestimate a positive effect or overestimate a negative effect. In other words, the likely bias of the model specification that includes controls for the highest level of education and current income is against finding positive effects of private education on political participation, social capital and tolerance.

The second option is to develop a two-stage model: The first stage would predict the highest level of education or current income; the second stage would then use those values to predict political participation, social capital and tolerance (Heckman 1978). A two-stage model can minimize possible bias by isolating the variance in the dependent variable that can be attributed to highest level of education or current income independent of the variance that can be attributed to private school experience. To do this correctly, however, requires an exogenous instrument, something that helps predict highest level of education or current income that is unrelated to political participation, social capital and tolerance. Unfortunately, we can think of nothing that meets the criteria for an exogenous instrument. Moreover, the literature has not accepted any suggested instruments as truly exogenous (Chubb and Moe 1990, 114). To use an instrument that is not exogenous could introduce greater bias than the potential bias we are trying to correct. We therefore chose not to pursue this strategy for managing the possible relationship between private education and the subject's highest education and current income.

The third option is to decide not to control for highest level of education and current income. The problem that this strategy produces is that it would fail to adjust fully for the background differences of those who go to public or private school. Considerable research exists to suggest that highest levels of education and current income are strongly related to political participation, social capital and tolerance. In addition, we have good reason to believe that one's current income and highest level of education are strongly related to one's family income and the social values held during childhood. Those factors, in turn, may be strongly related to the likelihood that one attended private school. Ideally, we would have measures of family income and the value the household placed on education for subjects when they were children instead of measures obtained after and perhaps altered by their attendance at public or private school. But the bias to our estimate of the effect of private education produced by failing to control for the level of education and current income is likely greater than the bias of controlling for measures that may be partially the product of private schooling.

Many models of political participation, social capital and tolerance include additional controls for items such as political ideology and party affiliation. We chose not to control for these and other variables because they are likely to be outcomes of one's schooling, just as tolerance, political participation and social capital may be outcomes of one's schooling. In addition, these factors are not likely to be strongly related to whether individuals attended public or private school as children. Excluding some variables that are commonly found in models of political behavior is therefore not a problem. Omitted variable bias is only a problem when the omitted independent variable is related to the dependent variable and to the independent variable that is the focus of the analyses. We did not control for some items that may predict participation, social capital and tolerance but that are not strongly related to attendance at private school because measures of those items were not available or because we feared that those variables were more the product of attendance at private school than the cause of attendance at private school. Nevertheless, we believe that our models control for the most important factors that are related to participation, social capital and tolerance that are also related to whether subjects attended private school, giving us an estimate of the independent effect of private education in which we can be reasonably confident.

We analyzed the data using both ordinary least-squares (OLS) and logit models. The OLS models have the advantage of examining the full range in the dependent variables and therefore providing the most precise estimates. The logit models dichotomize the dependent variables, which results in the loss of some information. The logit models, however, have the advantage of permitting the generation of expected percentages of subjects who vote, join civic organizations or tolerate the activities of their least liked group. These expected percentages are easier to interpret than the effects on participation, social capital and tolerance scales produced by the OLS models. In the sections below we report the OLS results followed by the logit results for each dependent variable.

Political Participation Results

Private education had a positive effect on political participation relative to public or foreign education (Table 2). For each year that respondents attended a private school

they reported a .05 increase in their political participation on a scale from zero to seven. Attending private schools for all 12 years of primary and secondary education increased political participation by .60. This increase is both statistically and substantively significant. Of the seven political activities that subjects in the LNPS could report, those who attended 12 years of private education, on average and controlling for all other factors, engaged in more than one-half additional activity over those who attended 12 years of public education.

Because the most common and important type of political activity is voting, we conducted a logit analysis looking at the effect of private education on the probability of voting in the most recent presidential election (Table 2). For this analysis we excluded all respondents who could not vote because they were not citizens.[5] The results are similar to the participation scale with all seven political activities. Latinos who attended private school are significantly more likely to have reported voting in the most recent presidential election. By setting the value of all other variables to their means and using the formula for a logit model, we were able to generate the expected probability of having voted for those who attended 12 years of private school and those who never attended private school. Based on this model, we would expect 70.3 percent of Latino US citizens who had attended 12 years of private school to have voted in the most recent presidential election. The percentage with no private education that we would expect to have voted is 55.7 percent. Both of these voting rates seem high, which can probably be explained by significant over-reporting of voting among Latinos (Shaw and de la Garza 1998).[6] But the difference in voting rates is a striking 14.6 percent. Private education seems to have a large beneficial effect on voting and other types of political participation.

The effects of the other independent variables in our OLS model of the seven political activities are what we would generally expect. Respondents who received more of their education in foreign schools were less likely to participate than those who received their education in US public schools. The magnitude of the negative effect of foreign education was about the same as the positive effect of private education. The gender of the respondent had no significant effect on political participation. Latinos of Mexican and, to a much greater extent, Puerto Rican origins were significantly more likely to participate than were the omitted comparison group of Latinos of Cuban origin. Apparently the level of political activity among Mexican-Americans and Puerto Rican-Americans is high relative to Cuban-Americans after adjusting for their generally lower levels of wealth and education.

Respondent's income and highest level of education were strongly related to the amount of political participation, but the education of their parents did not have a significant effect on participation. The positive effect of income on participation was comparable to that of private education. Income was scaled from one, representing annual incomes under $5,000, to 15, representing incomes over $75,000. The highest level of education completed had a positive effect on participation that is more than twice as large as income or private education. Respondent's age and the number of years in the US were also significantly and positively related to political participation.

In the logit model, which excluded non-US citizens, only private education, current income, highest level of education, and years in the US had significant effects on the probability of voting in the most recent presidential election. Several variables that were significant in the OLS model were not also significant in the logit model, such as years in foreign schools, national origin and age. Those factors appear to be more strongly related to whether subjects are citizens than they are directly related to whether subjects would participate politically if they were citizens. Regardless of whether we examine only citizens or all Latinos, or whether we examine a variety of political activities or only voting, going to private school contributes to higher levels of participation.

Social Capital Results

Private education had a similar positive effect on participation in civic organizations. Subjects in the LNPS were asked whether they were members of five different types of nonpolitical groups: charitable, Hispanic, social, sports and work organizations. Membership in these civic organizations is an important indicator of social capital, which Putnam describes as the "trust, norms, and networks that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions" (1993, 167). Social capital, like other types of capital, can eventually be "spent" to achieve political goals. Latinos who join these nonpolitical organizations may ultimately be more easily mobilized to engage in political activities such as voting, campaigning and perhaps running for office.

Attending a private school has a moderate, positive effect on joining civic groups (Table 3). In an OLS analysis of the five-point social capital scale, each year of private education increases social capital by .01. Going to private school for 12 years would increase social capital by .13.[7] The magnitude of the effect of private education on social capital is more clearly shown by examining the results of the logit model of whether respondents were members of any civic organization (Table 3). Setting the value of all other independent variables to their means, we can calculate the likelihood that Latinos who had 12 years of private education would join at least one civic organization compared to those who had no private education. Using the same logit formula that was used to calculate the effect of private education on voting, we would expect that 29.8 percent of respondents who had 12 years of private education would be a member of a civic organization versus 22 percent for those who had no private education. The type of school that respondents attended—controlling for their highest level of education, parent's education, income, national origin, sex, age and length of residency in the US—could increase the odds of joining a civic group by a third.

The effects of other independent variables are mostly what we would expect. More years spent in a foreign school had a negative effect on being a member of civic groups, which is about twice as large as the positive effect of attending a private school. Female respondents, as well as those of Mexican and Puerto Rican descent, were more likely to be in civic organizations than men or those of Cuban descent, respectively. Current income and the highest level of education had large positive effects on social capital, but parent's education was not a significant factor. Older respondents were also significantly more likely to join civic groups, but those who resided longer in the US were not.

While the positive effect of private education on social capital was not as large as income or the highest level of education, the effect of private school remained significant and substantively important even after all of these other factors were controlled. The type of school one attends, public or private, continues to affect political participation and social capital even after holding constant the amount of education one receives.

Tolerance Results

Attending a private school was associated with higher levels of political tolerance, although the effect was modest (Table 4).

For each year that subjects attended a private school, they reported a .03 increase in tolerance on a scale ranged from three to 15, with a mean of 6.66 and a standard variance of 1.84. Students who attended 12 years of private school had .39 higher scores on the tolerance scale than students who attended 12 years of public school. The positive effect of private education on tolerance is statistically significant at $p < .05$.

The number of years in which subjects attended a foreign school had a negative but statistically insignificant effect on tolerance. Since the comparison group that was omitted from the analyses is years spent in public education, this means that there is no statistically significant difference between the effect of going to a US public school or a foreign school on people's reported tolerance. Male respondents were significantly more tolerant than female respondents, but the difference was a moderate .17. Subjects of Mexican or Puerto Rican heritage were significantly more tolerant than the omitted category of Cuban-American subjects. Latinos of Mexican origin had tolerance scores that were .43 higher and Latinos of Puerto Rican origin had tolerance scores that were .62 higher than Latinos of Cuban origin.

Current annual income was positively related to higher levels of tolerance, but the size of that effect was also not very large. Subjects in the highest income group had tolerance scores that are .35 higher than those that were in the lowest income group. There is no significant relationship between the respondent's highest level of education and reported tolerance. There is also no significant relationship between reported tolerance and the highest level of education achieved by either of each subject's parents. The age of the respondent and the number of years that person had been in the US also did not have significant effects on reported tolerance.

The OLS model of the tolerance scale captures relatively little of the variance in the dependent variable, with an adjusted R-squared of only .02. Personal and random factors may account for much of the differences in how Latinos respond to these tolerance items. Yet among the systematic factors that can help explain tolerance in the LNPS, exposure to private education is significantly and positively related to tolerance. The size of the effect of private education is about as large as the effect of income and is larger than the effect of any of the other independent variables besides the dichotomous variables for national origin.[8] Interestingly, the extent to which one attended private school had a larger and more significant effect on tolerance than the amount of education that one received, as measured by highest level of education. This suggests that whether someone goes to public or private school may be of greater importance to tolerance than the independent effect of additional years of education.

To convey the magnitude of the effect of private education, we dichotomized the dependent variable to separate those respondents who would agree or strongly agree to letting their least liked group do any of the activities mentioned (hold a rally, run for public office or teach in school) from those respondents who would not. Controlling for the same factors as the previous analysis, we developed a logit model of this dichotomized measure of tolerance (Table 4). From this logit model we can generate the percentage of those who receive 12 years of private education who would ever tolerate their least liked group compared to the same percentage for those who never went to private school. Using the same logit formula as was used for political participation and social capital, the predicted percentages for 12 years of private school and for no private school are computed, while all of the other independent variables are set

to their mean values. The results show that, adjusting for all other factors, 49.7 percent of those who had 12 years of private school would tolerate their least liked group compared to 39.1 percent of those who never went to private school. This difference in predicted percentages more easily captures the size of the benefit of private education on tolerance than the effect on a 15-point scale. The positive effect of private education on tolerance is both statistically and substantively significant.

Conclusion

While the LNPS provides evidence that private education is related to higher levels of political participation, social capital and tolerance, it does not provide evidence that would allow us to identify exactly why private schools better promote these civic outcomes. Earlier we considered three possible explanations for the better promotion of civic values by private schools. We considered the suggestion that private schools more closely approximate the ideal of the common school, teaching students important civic values by better mixing students of different backgrounds than public schools based on segregated housing patterns. We considered the possibility that private schools have chosen to stress civic education more than public schools. And we considered the claim that private schools teach desired civic values by better promoting participation and involvement among students' parents.

What else may account for the surprising findings from the LNPS that private schools are more successful at doing what public schools were created to do? It is always possible that some important control variables have been omitted from our model which would reveal that private schools are not really better at conveying civic values, but that does not seem to be a likely explanation in this case. First, the model in this study contains the most important factors that are likely to be related to political participation, social capital and tolerance, as well as attending a private school, such as income, highest level of education, and parents' education. Any other controls that could be added to the models are unlikely to have effects on the results as large as the controls that were included, reducing the chance that they could dramatically alter the estimated effect of private education. The chances are even lower that the effect of private education could be reversed from positive and statistically significant to negative and significant. Given the prior belief that public schools are essential for promoting desired civic values, even if the finding were that there were no significant differences between the effect of public and private education, this would be significantly different from what has been previously assumed to be the truth.

Second, a common suspicion is that families that select private school are less civic-oriented and less tolerant. Even the word we use for private, religious schools—"parochial," which means narrow —suggests that our expectation is that people drawn to private schools have a narrow orientation that may be antithetical to the broad public goals of participation and tolerance. The fear that there is a selection bias of more civic-oriented families into private school that we are failing to control fully for is at odds with this presumption that families that seek private education are not particularly publicly minded.

Third, the dangers of omitted variable bias are limited in the LNPS by the fact that it focuses on one ethnic group. While Latinos are far from homogenous in their backgrounds and political outcomes, the amount of variation within this sample on most dimensions is less than the variation would be in a multiethnic sample. Looking only at Latinos limits the amount of variation in the characteristics of the sample, which automatically controls for

many factors in that they are close to being constants. For example, the religious affiliation of the respondents in the LNPS lacked much variation since the vast majority are Catholic.[9] Other background characteristics that might produce omitted variable bias if not controlled for in a multiethnic sample are more likely to be controlled automatically by the relative lack of variation in the backgrounds of a Latino-only sample.

While focusing on Latinos may strengthen internal validity by limiting the possibility of omitted variable bias, it does raise concerns about external validity. Latinos who attend private school overwhelmingly attend Catholic schools. It is possible that the positive effects of private education observed here are only generalizable to Catholic private schools. Perhaps secular or religious schools of other denominations have very different effects on political participation, social capital and tolerance than do Catholic schools. The only way to address this concern definitively is to collect and analyze data on the effects of other types of private education. But until that work can be done, the results of the LNPS are the most systematic and comprehensive information we have on the influence of different types of school on political outcomes.

Even if the conclusions of this study are limited only to the effects of Catholic education among Latinos, the results are still important. The large proportion of immigrants in the Latino community allows us to address whether the current wave of immigrants, like the Italians, Irish and others before them, needs to be educated in government-operated public schools to acquire the civic values that society may wish them to have. The answer appears to be that government-operated schools are not particularly beneficial, let alone necessary, to achieve this goal. The results from the LNPS suggest that private schools, most of which are Catholic, actually do a better job of promoting participation and tolerance. Additional studies are necessary to verify this conclusion. At the very least, the long-held assumption that government-operated schools are an essential part of making good citizens needs to be reconsidered.

Notes

[1]The Latino National Political Survey is available from the Interuniversity Consortium for Political and Social Research for any reader who would like to replicate any of the findings reported in this study.

[2]There are other, more complicated ways of combining the responses from the three tolerance items. We chose not to present those formulations of a tolerance scale because they make no difference in the substantive results in this case and because they are more difficult to interpret.

[3]Of the sample, 18.5 percent attended private school for at least one year. Analyses conducted with a dichotomous variable for private school attendance do not alter the substantive findings of the paper. Since a dichotomous measure throws away some information, those results are not presented here.

[4]There were a very small number of subjects whose families did not originate from Cuba, Mexico or Puerto Rico. These subjects are also in the default category in the reported analyses, but their numbers are too few to make a substantive difference in the findings. Excluding those cases does not change the results.

[5]We included non-citizens in the OLS analysis of the seven political activities because most of those activities do not legally require that participants be citizens. Excluding non-citizens from the OLS analysis does not substantively alter the estimated effect of private education.

[6]There is no reason to believe that the over-reporting of voting occurs more frequently among those who attended private schools. If, however, the over-reporting is not evenly distributed across public and private school subjects, then this result may be in question. Nevertheless, even if the effect that is being measured here is that those who attend private school feel the greater desire to report that they voted, the desire for the social approval for having voted may itself be an important civic virtue.

[7]The effect of 12 years of private education appears to be more than 12 times the effect of one year due to rounding.

[8]This claim is also supported by reviewing the standardized coefficients.

[9]Because religious affiliation was close to being a constant, we excluded it from our analyses. We similarly did not try to separate the effects of different kinds of private schools, because the vast majority attended Catholic schools.

References

Arvizu, John R. and F. Chris Garcia. 1996. Latino Voting Participation: Explaining and Differentiating Latino Voting Turnout. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18 (May):104-128.

Barber, Benjamin R. 1997. Education for Democracy. *The Good Society* 7(Spring):1-7.

Bryk, Anthony S., with Valerie E. Lee and Peter B. Holland. 1993. *Catholic Schools and the Common Good*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Campbell, Angus, with Philip Converse, Warren E. Miller and Donald E. Stokes. 1960. *The American Voter*. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Casey, Rick. She Has Good Ideas, For Lawyer Wannabe. *San Antonio Express News*. September 13,1998.

Chubb, John E. and Terry Moe. 1990. *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Coleman, James, with Thomas Hoffer and Sally Kilgore. 1982a. Achievement and Segregation in Secondary Schools: A Further Look at Public and Private School Differences. *Sociology of Education* 55(April/July):162-183.

Coleman, James with Thomas Hoffer and Sally Kilgore. 1982b. *High School Achievement*. New York: Basic Books.

Cookson, Peter W. 1996. There is No Escape Clause in the Social Contract: The Case Against School Vouchers. *Choosing Schools: Vouchers and American Education*. Washington, DC: American University Press.

De la Garza, Rodolfo O., with Louis DeSipio, F. Chris Garcia, John Garcia and Angelo Falcon. 1992. *Latino Voices*. Boulder: Westview Press.

DeSipio, Louis. 1996. Making Citizens or Good Citizens? Naturalization as a Predictor of Organizational and Electoral Behavior Among Latino Immigrants. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18(May):194-213.

Diaz, William A. 1996. Latino Participation in America: Associational and Political Roles. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 18(May):154-174.

Final Report of the National Commission on Civic Renewal. 1998. http://www.puaf.umd.edu/civicrenewal/finalreport/table_of_contentsfinal _report.htm.

Garcia, F. Chris, with Angelo Falcon and Rodolfo de la Garza. 1996. Ethnicity and Politics: Evidence from the Latino National Political Survey. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18(May):91-103.

Glenn, Charles Leslie. 1988. *The Myth of the Common School*. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press.

Greeley, Andrew M. 1982. *Catholic High Schools and Minority Students*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books.

Greene, Jay P. 1998a. Civic Values in Public and Private Schools. In Paul E. Peterson and Bryan C. Hassel (eds). *Learning from School Choice*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Greene, Jay P. and Nicole Mellow. 1998b. Integration Where It Counts: A Study of

Racial Integration in Public and Private School Lunchrooms. Paper presented at the American Political Science Association meeting in Boston.

Greene, Jay P., with Paul E. Peterson and Jiangtao Du. 1998c. School Choice in Milwaukee: A Randomized Experiment. In Paul E. Peterson and Bryan C. Hassel (eds). *Learning from School Choice*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Gutmann, Amy. 1987. *Democratic Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Heckmann, James. 1978. Dummy Endogenous Variables in a Simultaneous Equation System. *Econometrica*. 46(May):931-959.

Hero, Rodney E. and Anne G. Campbell. 1996. Understanding Latino Political Participation: Exploring the Evidence from the Latino National Political Survey. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18(May):129-141.

Hill, Kevin A. and Dario Moreno. 1996. Second Generation Cubans. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 18(May):175-193.

Hoxby, Caroline M. 1998. Analyzing School Choice Reforms that Use America's Traditional Forms of Parental Choice. In Paul E. Peterson and Bryan C. Hassel (eds). *Learning from School Choice*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Jones-Correa, Michael and David L. Leal. 1996. Becoming 'Hispanic': Secondary Panethnic Identification Among Latin American-Origin Populations in the United States. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*. 18(May):214-254.

Levin, Henry. 1998. Educational Vouchers: Effectiveness, Choice, and Costs. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 17 (Summer):373-392.

Mann, Horace. 1837. First Annual Report. In Lawrence A. Cremin, ed. *The Republic and the School*. New York: Bureau of Publications Teachers' College, Columbia University.

Montoya, Lisa J. 1996. Latino Gender Differences in Public Opinion. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18(May):255-276.

Neal, Derek. 1997. The Effects of Catholic Secondary School Education on Educational Achievement. *Journal of Labor Economics* 15:98-124.

Nie, Norman H., with Jane Junn and Kenneth Stehlik-Barry. 1996. *Education and Democratic Citizenship in America*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Putnam, Robert D. 1995. Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America. *Political Science and Politics* 128(December):664-683.

Riley, Richard W. 1997. What Really Matters in American Education. U.S. Department of Education. Published on the Web at http://ed.gov/Speeches/09-1997/index.html (September 23).

Schneider, Mark, with Paul Teske, Melissa Marschall, Michael Mintron and Christopher Roch. 1997. Institutional Arrangements and the Creation of Social Capital: The Effects of Public School Choice. *American Political Science Review* 91:82-93.

Shaw, Daron, with Rodolfo O. de la Garza and Jongho Lee. Examining Latino Turnout in 1996: A Three State, Validated Survey Approach. Paper presented at the 1998 American Political Science Association Conference.

Smith, Kevin B. and Kenneth J. Meier. 1995. *The Case Against School Choice: Politics, Markets, and Fools*. Armonk, New York: M. F. Sharp.

Stouffer, Samuel. 1955. *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties*. New York: Doubleday.

Sullivan, John L., with James Peirson and George F. Marcus. "An Alternative Conceptualization of Political Tolerance: Illusory Increases 1950s – 1970s." *American Political Science Review* 73:781-794.

Taebur, Karl E. and David R. James. 1982. "Racial Segregation Among Public and Private Schools." *Sociology of Education* 55(April/July):13-43.

Wrinkle, Robert D., with Joseph Stewart, Jr., J. L. Polinard, Kenneth J. Meier and John R. Arvizu. 1996. Ethnicity and Nonelectoral Political Participation. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences* 18(May):142-153.

Verba, Sidney, with Kay Lehman Schlozman and Henry E. Brady. 1995. *Voice and Equality: Civic Voluntarism in American Politics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Jay P. Greene is Assistant Professor of Government at the University of Texas at Austin. He is also a Research Associate of the Harvard Program on Education Policy and Governance. Joseph Giammo and Nicole Mellow are graduate students in the Department of Government at the University of Texas at Austin.