

UCLA

K-12 Racial Disparities in School Discipline

Title

Discipline and Participation: The Long-Term Effects of Suspension and School Security on the Political and Civic Engagement of Youth

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2x35t1tf>

Authors

Kupchik, Aaron
Catlaw, Thomas J

Publication Date

2013-04-06

Discipline and Participation: The Long-Term Effects of Suspension and School Security on the Political and Civic Engagement of Youth¹

Aaron Kupchik
University of Delaware

Thomas J. Catlaw
Arizona State University

Abstract

In this study we use the National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health) dataset to evaluate the long-term influence of school discipline and security on political and civic participation. We find that young adults with a history of suspension in school are less likely than others to vote and volunteer in civic activities after high school, suggesting that suspension negatively impacts the overall likelihood that youth will engage in future political and civic activities. Though Black and Hispanic students suffer negative long-term effects of school suspension far more frequently than others, the results suggest that the intensity of the effect of suspension is consistent across racial/ethnic groups. Overall, these findings are consistent with prior theory and research highlighting the long-term negative implications of punitive disciplinary policies and the salient role schools play in preparing youth to participate in a democratic polity as adults. We conclude that suspension, in particular, is anti-democratic insofar as it substitutes the exclusion and physical removal of students for dialogue and collaborative problem-solving. The research lends empirical grounds for recommending the concrete reform of school governance and the implementation of more constructive models of discipline.

Introduction

The sweeping changes in the regime of school discipline and security in the United States that have occurred over the past two decades have resulted in many negative consequences, as discussed throughout this volume. Schools of all kinds and in all parts of the country have increasingly adopted harsher, more punitive disciplinary policies, such as zero tolerance and mandatory arrest. They have augmented their use of police, metal detectors, and closed-circuit surveillance (see Casella, 2001; Cornell, 2006; Hirschfield, 2009; Simon, 2007). Scholars (e.g., Effrat & Schimmel, 2003; Fine et al., 2004; Kupchik, 2010; Nolan, 2011) have suggested that among these other negative effects, harsh school discipline and rigid security practices may socialize students into docility and obedience, whereby they accept authority of adults

¹ This research uses data from Add Health, a program project designed by J. Richard Udry, Peter S. Bearman, and Kathleen Mullan Harris, and funded by a grant P01-HD31921 from the Eunice Kennedy Shriver National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, with cooperative funding from 17 other agencies. Special acknowledgment is due to Ronald R. Rindfuss and Barbara Entwisle for assistance in the original design. Persons interested in obtaining Data Files from Add Health should contact Add Health, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Carolina Population Center, 123 W. Franklin Street, Chapel Hill, NC 27516-2524 (addhealth@unc.edu). No direct support was received from grant P01-HD31921 for this analysis.

rather than participate actively in political and civic exchange, though to date these suggestions have not been tested empirically.

During roughly the same period during which we have observed the increasing harshness of school punishment and rigid security, there has been a widely heralded call to renew and reenergize American civic and political life. This is reflected in the substantial theoretical and empirical literatures on civic and political engagement, deliberative democracy, and social capital, among others (e.g. Buss, Redburn, & Guo, 2006; Creighton, 2005; Fuhrman & Lazerson, 2005; Fung & Olin Wright, 2003; Lin, 2002; Schachter & Yang, 2012; Skocpol, 2003; Skocpol & Fiorina, 1999; Sirianni & Friedland, 2001). It is, moreover, reflected concretely in the now established expectation (though the reality often falls short) that governments at all levels involve the public in matters large and small. Indeed the active exchange of information between citizens and government is central for governmental decision-making and policy formulation (Bevir, 2006; Catlaw & Sandberg, Forthcoming; Fung, 2006; Hale, 2011). These trends have refocused academic and practical attention on the ways in which citizens are politically socialized and how they develop the capacity to effectively participate in civic and political life (Campbell, 2006; Rawlings, 2012; Verba, Schlozman, & Brady, 1995). Schools figure prominently in these efforts.

These trends are at cross-purposes: Schools cannot be training grounds for a vibrant democratic polity if they suppress the development of students' political and civic capacities. Furthermore, there may be grave consequences not only for the lives of individual students but also for the efficacy of the nation's democratic institutions writ large if schools are playing this negative socializing role. Surprisingly, however, prior research has generally investigated neither the long-term effect of political socialization of schools nor has it tested longitudinally the consequences for students of the contemporary school discipline and security regime.

This study uses the National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (Add Health) dataset to evaluate the long-term influence of school discipline on political and civic participation. Our research goal is to examine whether school discipline discourages youth from civic and political participation in their young adult years, so that we can better understand the ramifications of contemporary school discipline and security. Our methodological strategy follows directly from a recent publication in the *American Sociological Review*, by McFarland and Thomas (2006), which used Add Health data to estimate how youth voluntary associations influence adult political participation. Though we share McFarland and Thomas' overall analytical strategy, their analysis neglects to consider an issue of growing importance: school discipline. We hypothesize that increasingly harsh security and discipline practices socialize students into docility and obedience, whereby they accept authority of adults rather than participate actively in political exchanges. We empirically examine this hypothesis by studying (1) the long-term effects of the new school discipline regime and, in particular, (2) the relationship between school security and punishment, and students' future levels of democratic participation.

We find that the use of *suspension* has a modestly suppressive effect on the likelihood that individual youth will vote and volunteer in civic activities after high school. These findings are

consistent with the theoretical and normative literatures that point to the potentially long-term negative implications of punitive disciplinary policies (Fine et al., 2004; Kupchik, 2010) and also the salient role schools play in preparing youth to participate in a democratic polity as adults (Barber, 1998, pp. 161-233; Dobozy, 2007; Ehman, 1980; Fuhrman & Lazerson, 2005). In accounting for the unique effects of suspension in particular, we draw from empirical work that demonstrates how suspension is experienced as alienating by youth and then argue that suspension inherently is anti-democratic insofar as it relies on the exclusion and physical removal of students rather than dialogue and collaborative problem-solving. Our results strongly suggest that, for the good of individual students and democratic institutions nationwide, schools seek alternatives to school suspension.

Literature Review

Schooling and Political Socialization

A wealth of research exists that examines the factors that contribute to the likelihood that a young person will become active in political and civic life later in life (Verba et al., 1995)². For our purposes we focus on two broad categories of factors—the family and the school.

First, research indicates the importance of parents: If parents are civically engaged, children are more likely to be as well (Campbell, 2006, chap. 6; Verba et al., 1995); however children from homes of a higher socioeconomic (SES) status are more likely to become civically active than children from lower SES homes. Second, it has long been assumed that schooling³ also plays a critical role in the “second” socialization of young people into society (Durkheim, 1903/1961) and, more particularly, that school socialization is an important dimension of producing *democratic* citizens (Dewey, 1909/1959, 1916; Hartmann, 1946; Hyman, 1959). Early research on this topic focused on the transmission of civic and political knowledge, or the “manifest curriculum,” to students and was pessimistic about the ability of schools to alter students’ political attitudes or to encourage participation (Ehman 1980, p. 103), though lower SES groups proved to be exceptions (K. Jennings & Jennings, 1968; M. K. Jennings & Niemi, 1974). This general pessimism has been compounded by research which indicates that political knowledge and participation in civil and political life may be in decline in the United States (Putnam, 2000; Skocpol, 2003) and that this decline, in turn, reinforces entrenched patterns of inequality and uneven political participation across social and racial groups (Kahne & Middaugh, 2008; McFarland & Thomas 2006; Verba et al. 1995). However other research has tempered these findings somewhat (Niemi & Junn, 1998; Youniss & Levine, 2009).

Second, contemporary scholarship continues to emphasize the importance of civic and political education (or cognitive outcomes) as well as the work that schools do in preparing (or not preparing) youth for active, engaged participation in a democratic polity (e.g. Apple & Beane, 1999; Gutmann, 1987) and in reproducing the values, habits, and practices of the world beyond

² This review draws substantively from Campbell Rawlings and Catlaw (2011).

³ We define “schooling” as “institutionalized interactions of youth in the formal education system prior to university years,” which includes both classroom-level and school-level attributes (Ehman 1980, p. 100).

the classroom (Bourdieu, 1986). However researchers have broadened their scope beyond civic and political *knowledge* to advance Dewey's (1909/1959) concern for the *method* of education; that is, democratic knowledge should be delivered democratically (see Dobozy, 2007).

Researchers argue that specific "democratic" capacities and skills should be taught in schools which, in turn, will assist youth in becoming politically engaged later in life and will help to reinvigorate and deepen democracy more generally. In a helpful review, Apple and Beane (1999) identify seven of these capacities, including an appreciation for an open flow of ideas, "faith in the individual and collective capacity of people" to solve problems, critical reflection, "concern for the welfare of others and the 'common good'," and a "concern for the dignity and rights of individuals and minorities" (p. 7). The cornerstone of cultivating these capacities is *participation*—that is, engagement of students in school-related planning, decision making, problem solving, and other activities that affect them at both the classroom- and school- levels (p. 10). Exemplary democratic schools tend to view students as active, rights-bearing individuals rather than "objects to be acted upon" (Dobozy, 2007). Other education research tends to support this view: Student engagement with such "democratic practices," such as school place decision making, encourages the cultivation of positive school climate which, in turn, enables higher levels of educational achievement and related outcomes (Anderson, 1982, pp. 400-401; see also Effrat & Schimmel, 2003).

For the most part, empirical studies of the effects of democratic capacity building and political socialization have been case studies of individual schools or classrooms (e.g. Angell, 1998; Apple & Beane, 1999) and/or investigations of the effects of various democratic practices on students while students were in school (e.g. Feldman, Pasek, Romer, & Jamieson, 2007). However empirical examination of the *long-term* effects of democratic schooling on *political and civic participation* after graduation from high school has been rare (see Pasek, Feldman, Romer, & Jamieson 2008; Zaff, Moore, Papillo, & Williams, 2003). This was the conclusion also reached by Ehman (1980) in his review of the literature on schooling and political socialization some thirty years ago, and it is largely still true today.

A significant exception is McFarland and Thomas (2006), who examined the ways in which extracurricular activities affected political involvement later in life (e.g. voting, involvement in presidential campaigns, volunteering in community or civic organization). They found compelling evidence that "involvement in politically salient youth voluntary associations has significant, positive returns on adult political participation seven to twelve years later" (p. 412). Interestingly, classes in government and civics did not have such effects, a finding in line both with prior scholarship and with contemporary concern for the "hidden curriculum" (e.g. Giroux & Purpel, 1983), or the non-conscious learning children do in the school above and beyond the explicit transmission of knowledge (see also Ehman, 1980, pp. 111-112).

In summary, research on the effects of schooling on the political socialization of youth has focused on classroom-level attributes, such as the characteristics of the teacher and instructional materials, or school-level attributes, such as student participation in school governance and extracurricular activities and school climate and organization (e.g. school size,

religiosity, demographic composition of schools/classrooms) (Ehman, 1980). Though prior research considers the effects of school governance and climate and allied concerns, such as authority relations, researchers generally have not examined the long-term effects of schooling on political behavior and, to the best of our knowledge, none have studied explicitly the consequences of school security and punishment practices on civic and political participation.

School Discipline

The contemporary lack of attention to the long-term effects of school security and punishment is surprising, given that since the early 1990s there have been sweeping changes in school discipline policies and practices. Schools across the U.S. have tightened their security practices and increased the punishments they give to students (see Cornell, 2006; Dinkes, Kemp, & Baum, 2009; Kupchik & Monahan, 2006). It is now common to find armed police officers, drug-sniffing dogs, surveillance cameras, and zero-tolerance policies in all types of schools and all areas of the U.S. Existing research documents several problems with these new school discipline and security practices, including: the increasing marginalization of poor students and youth of color (e.g., Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Peterson, 2000; Noguera, 2003), unnecessary denial of future educational opportunities due to suspension and expulsion (e.g., Skiba et al., 2006), and increases in the numbers of students who are formally prosecuted in the juvenile and criminal justice systems (known as the “school-to-prison pipeline”) (e.g., Na & Gottfredson, 2011; Kim, Losen, & Hewitt 2010; Wald & Losen, 2003). This body of research consistently finds large discrepancies in punishment rates between white youth and youth of color, where African American and Hispanic American students are far more likely than whites to be punished, even when controlling for self-reported rates of misbehavior (Skiba et al., 2006).

In *Homeroom Security*, Kupchik (2010) describes how the primary mission of school discipline is to assert the school’s authority: to enforce the rules for the sake of the rules themselves, not for the betterment of students. That is, the harsh punishments and tight security we now see in schools create conditions whereby students are disempowered and treated as objects to be acted upon—exactly the opposite of what scholars propose for a democratic education (Lyons & Drew, 2006). Students are socialized to believe that they are powerless in the face of a rigid discipline system, and that they are potential criminals rather than citizens who deserve respect (see Fine et al., 2004; Nolan, 2011). In sum, they are taught that their only option is to submit to the school’s authority with neither complaint nor ability to shape their environment.

Based on the prior research on how schools can influence future democratic participation, we fear that the contemporary school discipline regime is preparing students for apathetic political and civic futures; the lessons of compliance and obedience translate to a lack of participation once they become young adults. Moreover, since school discipline is disproportionately applied to youth of color, we are concerned that the effects of school discipline may be particularly harmful to youth of color and their future civic and political engagement. As Fine et al. (2004) find, based on focus group and survey data:

. . . poor and working-class youth and youth of color in California’s most disadvantaged schools are being educated away from these “obligations of

citizenship” and toward civic alienation. They are learning that their needs are irrelevant to policy makers and government leaders. (p. 2212)

Recent research by Godsay, Kawashima-Ginsberg, Kiesa, and Levine (2012) on working-class “non-college youth” reinforces this conclusion. Drawing on data collected from 20 focus groups with non-college youth (ages 18-29) in four cities, their study found that these former students’ recollections of schools’ efforts to develop political and civic capacities were “overwhelmingly and sometimes scathingly critical” (p. 34). Former students described their schools as largely distrusting, disempowering environments (pp. 38-39).

Despite the importance of these questions for educational policy, the existing research has failed to consider how school discipline and security may be shaping future democratic participation and civic life in the United States.

We empirically test our hypotheses by studying the long-term effects of the new school discipline regime in two ways. The first is at the individual-level, as it considers students’ individual experiences with school discipline. Here we examine whether a history of suspension—the most common form of school punishment—relates to students’ future civic roles. Given prior research showing that school discipline can shape future educational outcomes (Skiba et al., 2006), our analyses consider other, longer-term outcomes: We hypothesize that students who have been suspended are less likely to vote and volunteer than others in future years, and that this effect is most pronounced for youth of color. Our second test instead is a school-level test that looks at school climate, hypothesizing that individuals who attend schools with rigid security mechanisms, such as police officers, metal detectors, surveillance cameras, and harsh punishment policies, are less likely to vote and volunteer than others in the future.

Methods

Using data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Adolescent Health (known as “Add Health”), we evaluate the long-term influence of school discipline and security on civic participation. The Add Health data include interviews of youth, school administrators and parents during the 1994-1995 school year, when a nationally representative sample of adolescents were in grades 7-12; the study follows up with them multiple times, through a fourth wave of interviews, completed in 2007-2008. We describe these data in greater detail in the Appendix.

To assess political and civic participation as adults, we look at voting and volunteering behaviors at two different time periods, using data from both wave 3 (collected in 2001-2002) and wave 4. The wave 3 data are collected when some of the respondents are just old enough to vote, as they are aged 18-26 at that time, thus these data allow us to view early adult behaviors. The wave 4 data offer a different view, as the respondents are aged 24-32 and no longer going through the final stages of transition to adulthood.

There are two wave 4 variables that relate to our research question. Each comes from an ordinal-scaled question. One asks “How often do you usually vote in local or statewide elections”, and is coded from 1=never to 4=always. The second asks “In the past 12 months, about how many hours did you spend on volunteer or community service work?”, and is coded 1= 0 hours to 6 = 160 hours or more.

We selected wave 3 variables that mirror the available wave 4 variables, thus we have three dependent variables from the wave 3 data. Each of them is dichotomous, where a value of 1 indicates a response of “yes” (“no” responses = 0) to each of the following questions: “Are you registered to vote?”, “Did you vote in the most recent presidential election?”, and “During the last 12 months did you perform any unpaid volunteer or community service work?”.

To test our hypotheses at both the individual-level and school-level, we include variables for school security and discipline measured at each level of aggregation. Our individual-level variable is dichotomous, indicating whether each respondent had ever been suspended from school (by wave 1).

We include several school-level variables that indicate schools’ security policies and punishment responses to different misbehaviors. The following dichotomous variables are derived from the wave 1 school administrator surveys (variable names are in parentheses):

- Whether students in any grade may not leave school grounds (closed campus)
- Whether students in any grade must obey a dress code (dress code)
- Whether a student who is caught on a first offense of cheating is suspended or expelled (cheating punishment)
- Whether a student who is caught on a first offense of fighting is suspended or expelled (fighting punishment)
- Whether a student who is caught on a first offense of “verbally abusing a teacher” is suspended or expelled (verbal punishment)
- Whether a student who is caught on a first offense of smoking is suspended or expelled (smoking punishment)

We also include several from the wave 2 school administrator survey:

- Whether there is a security officer or police officer on duty during school hours (officer)
- Whether students walk through metal detectors as they enter the building (metal detectors)
- Whether the school has surveillance cameras (surveillance)
- Whether students are prohibited from wearing “certain colors,” or whether “bandanas or other gang paraphernalia” are prohibited (anti-gang rules)

Because our research questions revolve around racial disparities in the effects of punishment, we include both main effects and interaction terms for race/ethnicity. The main effects are a series of dichotomous variables indicating a respondent’s self-identified racial/ethnic group, with categories for Hispanic, Black, American Indian, Asian, and Other (white youth are

excluded as a contrast category). We include two interaction terms in each model as well: Black respondent * ever suspended, and Hispanic respondent * ever suspended. These variables test whether the effects of suspension on future civic participation differ for Black and Hispanic youth compared to other youth; we use only these two racial/ethnic categories because they include the youth who have been found in prior research to suffer most from disproportionate school discipline.

As described in the Appendix, we also include several control variables that factor out the influence of several factors that may shape civic participation. These include variables regarding underlying propensity to participate in civic life, as well as the respondents' community characteristics, family characteristics, deviant behavior and school experiences.

To analyze the data we compute a series of multi-level models, as is appropriate and commonly done when analyzing data at multiple units of analysis (here: data on students and on schools; see Rabe-Hesketh and Skrondal, 2008; Raudenbusch and Bryk, 2002). Specifically, we compute random intercept logistic models to predict wave 3 outcomes and random intercept ordinal models to predict the wave 4 outcomes. Wave 3 outcomes are reported in Table 1, and wave 4 outcomes in Table 2. For each outcome we compute models with and without interaction terms; the interaction terms indicate whether the impact of school suspension significantly differs for Black or Hispanic youth relative to others. All results listed in Tables 1 and 2 refer to the log odds of each outcome; negative results suggest that an independent variable is associated with lower likelihood of voting, volunteering, etc., while positive results suggest greater likelihood of each outcome.

Results

Beginning with the wave 3 outcomes, shown in Table 1, we see that being suspended in school decreases the log odds of respondents having voted or having volunteered while a young adult. These results are modest, as they do not remain once we add interaction terms for suspension * Black, or suspension * Hispanic; some reduction in strength of effect is to be expected, due to the inevitable multicollinearity that comes along with interaction terms. With regard to the school-level measures of security and discipline, we see that schools' punitive responses to cheating reduces the likelihood of having voted, but that punitive responses to smoking increases the likelihood of volunteering. No other measure of school discipline or security shapes future civic participation based on these wave 3 outcome measures.

TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The results for race and ethnicity suggest that Black young adults have higher log odds of voting and being registered to vote. However, as shown by the interaction terms, the effect of suspension does not significantly vary for Black respondents or Hispanic respondents, relative to its effect on others.

The results for the control variables mirror results from prior research. In sum, we find that respondents whose parents are more educated, whose parents participate in civic activities, who attain high grades in school, who desire to go to college, who have high neighborhood bonds, who participate in honor society, performing arts, and other school clubs, who attend religious services frequently, and who are older have higher log odds of at least two of the measured civic participation outcomes.⁵

Table 2 lists the results for the regressions of wave 4 outcomes. Again, being suspended has a long-term effect on voting, though not on volunteering. Here we see a strong effect, or one that is sufficiently robust that it remains even after introducing the interaction terms. We also find some unexpected results for the school-level indicators of security and discipline. Rather than having a suppressive effect, as expected, the presence of metal detectors and surveillance cameras is associated with greater log odds of voting frequently. The presence of anti-gang rules is negatively related to the log odds of voting frequently.

TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

Regarding race and ethnicity, Black and Hispanic respondents are less likely to volunteer frequently than whites, and Black respondents are more likely to vote frequently than whites. We find that the interaction between Hispanic and being suspended is positive for voting frequency, meaning that Hispanic respondents who were suspended as youth are more likely than others to vote frequently, which contradicts our hypotheses.

Results for our control variables are similar to our results in wave 3, with several expected relationships observed. Respondents are more likely to vote and volunteer frequently if they speak English as their primary language, have parents with high levels of education and who participate in civic activities, attain high grades, want to go to college, discuss a wide range of topics with their parents, are members of honor society, performing arts clubs, or other clubs, and attend religious services frequently.

Taken together, the results from our analyses at both waves indicate a consistent pattern that confirms one of our hypotheses, but not others. We find that youth who are suspended at school have lower odds of future civic and political participation, while controlling for several alternative explanations. The results thus suggest that first-hand experiences with school discipline—being suspended—have a suppressive effect on future civic and political participation. We observe these results in both waves, suggesting that the effect lasts beyond the young adult years and can shape long-term behaviors well into adulthood. At the same time, we do not find the expected relationships for school-level security and discipline; here there are few significant results, and some that run contrary to our expectations. We also find no evidence that the effect of suspension varies significantly by race or ethnicity.

⁵ Given the need to be brief despite our long list of control variables, we refrain from a full discussion of the results for these variables. All results are listed in Tables 2 and 3.

Discussion

By finding that a history of suspension is related to decreased odds of future civic participation, our research extends previous findings in a new direction. The education research literature is fairly clear that suspension is an ineffective, counter-productive policy—at least in terms of enhancing school safety, discouraging future disciplinary actions, and improving important educational and related outcomes. Not only does it fail to advance its stated ambitions, but suspension is associated with a range of negative outcomes, such as higher rates of dropping out and diminished academic achievement (Skiba et al., 2006). It also fails to reduce the likelihood of future disciplinary action (Iselin, 2010; Way, 2011). Yet to our knowledge, no prior research has considered how suspension shapes students' future civic participation. Thus, we add to the literature by uncovering an additional negative consequence of school suspension, observed at multiple points in time: both during young adult years and several years later.

Following prior research, we speculate that the observed negative effect of suspension is because suspension short-circuits dialogue and student involvement; it removes a student from the school rather than responding constructively and therapeutically to problematic behavior. Research on suspension finds that it is administered in ways that alienate students from the school and from the school's authority structure, leading them to view school staff as unfair, arbitrary, and uncaring (Kupchik 2010; Lyons & Drew 2006). We interpret the results of our analysis to suggest that this practice teaches students a lesson about authority and their powerlessness relative to governing bodies. To the extent that students learn this lesson and apply it to their future roles as citizens, they may be less likely to vote and volunteer because they see little opportunity to actively shape governance or community life. School punishment, thus, may socialize students into cynicism, disengagement, and apathy.

Higher rates of suspension also are associated with more hostile, antagonistic relationships among students, staff, and administrators, while lower suspension rates are associated both with caring, positive student-staff relationships and with teachers who report having supportive relationships with administrators (Iselin, 2010). Individual students who are suspended may be less likely than others to develop positive relationships with students, teachers and administrators, which can shape their future orientation toward civic life. Those whose school experiences predispose them to reduce contact and connectedness with others will understandably participate less in civic life. Our results in this paper may be due to such effects.

Our results are unsurprising, since prior research finds that: a) civic participation is taught through democratic, inclusive educational climates that encourage participation and b) suspension tends to *reduce* student participation and contribute to *undemocratic, noninclusive* school climates. Though unsurprising, these results are important, for this is the first empirical effort of which we are aware to test the long-term effects of school suspension on civic participation. Indeed, our results discouragingly suggest that schools' recent shift toward vigorous enforcement of harsh discipline may be detrimental to the nation's long-term civic and political health.

Contrary to our expectations, our study provides little evidence regarding school-level effects of security and discipline on future civic participation. That is, attending a school with police or security officers, metal detectors, harsh punishment policies, and other criminal justice-oriented practices has little to no effect on the likelihood of voting and volunteering in the future.

On the one hand, it may be the case that students are relatively unfazed by school discipline and security efforts. Recent research finds that many students appreciate having rigid security and tough punishment policies (Kupchik, 2010); this appreciation may mean that these policies have little long-term effect on the behaviors of most students, and that their individual experiences with school discipline are what matters instead. On the other hand, the lack of results may be due to limitations in our measures of school security. The variables to which we are limited are somewhat vague, which may hide actual long-term suppressive effects of security on civic participation. For example, despite drastic differences between security guards (who are employed by and report to schools, have no arrest power, and usually do not carry weapons) and police officers stationed in schools, the two are measured together by a single question in the Add Health interviews. Future research should use more specific and careful measurements of school security to better test whether school-level discipline and security shape long-term civic participation.

We also find it surprising that the effects of school suspension are not experienced more acutely among Black and Hispanic respondents, as indicated by non-significance of our interaction terms. It is important to keep in mind that despite this result, Black and Hispanic youth do still suffer the negative consequences of school suspension at disproportionately high rates. We find school suspension to have an overall negative effect on civic participation, even while controlling for race/ethnicity; since Black and Hispanic youth are far more likely than white youth to be suspended, they bear the brunt of this overall negative effect far more often than do white students. In other words, the effects of school suspension are felt by all youth at somewhat equal intensity, though Black and Hispanic youth are far more often exposed to this effect.

Despite the importance of our findings, there are a number of limitations to our analyses that should be addressed by future research. Above we refer to the vague measurements of school-level discipline and security. Another data limitation is that we are predicting a very narrow range of political and civic participation variables: voting, registering to vote, and volunteering. Future analyses that consider other types of civic and political participation, such as participating in social and professional networks, being engaged in political life (e.g., going to political demonstrations, donating money to political causes, etc.), and building social networks with fellow members of one's community more broadly, would greatly enhance our understanding of the long-term ramifications of school discipline and security. A final data limitation is that our measures of school discipline and security come from wave 1 and wave 2 data, collected 1994-1996. This is fairly early in the chronology of the buildup of school discipline and security. While we have sufficient variation in students' experiences to model their effects, we are mindful of the fact that results may be somewhat different if measures

were collected in 2012, when harsh punishments, rigid rules, and criminal justice oriented security measures are more commonplace across the U.S. These limitations, though, are fairly minor; though they may reduce the clarity of our results, the fact that we have such findings using a large, nationally representative, longitudinal database leaves us confident in our results and conclusions.

In sum, the results of our analyses make a substantial contribution to the literatures on school discipline and on civic participation, despite the fact that our hypotheses for racial/ethnic interaction and school-level effects are not supported. In the first empirical test of the long-term effects of suspension on civic participation, we find that being suspended is associated with reduced odds of voting both in young adult years and beyond, and on volunteering while a young adult. Our findings support the proposition that school suspension is undemocratic and part of a hidden curriculum that socializes students into a disinclination to participate in civic life.

The policy implications of our research are straightforward: suspension is harmful to the development of political and civic capacities of youth, and schools ought to pursue alternative strategies for responding to unwanted student behavior. Undoing much of the buildup of school discipline, which has led to increased suspension rates, would benefit individual students, communities, and the nation's democratic practices in general and over the long-term. In this connection, our findings support the view that sees schools as important training grounds for political and civic participation. Moreover, schools need to attend not only to the civic and political content of their curriculum (e.g. extra-curricular activities, civic and political information), but be conscious of the ways in which less obvious, non-curricular institutional practices shape students' propensity to become politically and civically engaged outside of school.

Appendix: Methods

The Add Health study is compiled by the University of North Carolina Population Center and funded by a number of agencies (including NSF, NIMH, the CDC, and NIH). It is a longitudinal, nationally representative sample of adolescents who were in grades 7-12 in the 1994-1995 school year. It includes a cluster sample of 80 high schools selected from a sampling frame of 26,666, and their feeder schools. Within these schools, 90,118 students completed in-school questionnaires, and an administrator from each school completed an administrator questionnaire. Of these students, 20,745 were randomly selected to complete in-home interviews at multiple times (the fourth wave of data is now complete), as were their parents. The UNC Population Center provides sampling weights that adjust for unequal probability of selection, thus offering a nationally representative view of adolescents' experiences.

We use all cases of adolescents who have complete data from in-school wave 1 questionnaires, wave 1 and wave 2 school administrator interviews, in-home wave 1 questionnaires, in-home wave 1 parental questionnaires, in-home wave 3 questionnaires, and in-home wave 4 questionnaires. The wave 1 data were collected in 1994-1995, wave 2 data in 1996, wave 3 in 2001-2002, and wave 4 data in 2007-2008.

Control Variables

One of the most significant challenges to our analyses is the need to factor out the underlying propensity of students to participate in civic life, regardless of school discipline and security. To reduce the potential influence of such confounding factors, we include many independent variables that control for factors found by prior research to shape civic participation. These include the respondent's age at wave 1 interview, the respondent's sex, whether the respondent's primary language is not English, parental education level (coded for the highest level either parent reached, with 1= less than high school and 5= graduate education), respondent's grades (measured as the mean, scored where 1=A and 4=F, of English, history/social studies, math, and science), whether the respondent does not live with his/her mother, whether the respondent does not live with his/her father, and whether the respondent expresses an interest in going to college. The models include type of area (variables for suburban and rural, with a contrast of urban), the school's average attendance (measured ordinally, from 1=95% or more to 5=75-79%), the school's average class size, and whether it is a public school. We include a measure of how often a respondent attends religious services in the last 12 months, ranging from 1=never to 4=once a week or more. We also include a measure of the respondents' parents' civic participation, measured as the sum of the following activities his/her parents report: parent/teacher organization, military veterans' organization, labor union, sports/bowling team, and civic or other social organization.

We compute indices intended to control for characteristics and perceptions of respondents that may shape their community involvement; each index was formed after exploratory factor analysis, and each has moderate to high reliability (Cronbach's alpha values are reported below). One measures the extent to which each respondent sees his/her school as a community; this has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.7618, and is the mean (from 1=strongly agree to 5 = strongly disagree) of responses about whether the respondent feels close to people at the school, feels like a part of the school, is happy to be at his/her school, and feels safe at his/her school. We also include respondents' answers to whether they feel that teachers at the school "treat students fairly," recoded so that 1=strongly disagree and 5 = strongly agree.

Another variable measures autonomy from respondents' parents, using the sum of the number of the following the respondents report being able to decide on: a weekend curfew, who to "hang around with," what to wear, how much TV to watch, which TV programs to watch, when to go to bed on week nights, and what to eat (Cronbach's alpha = 0.9431). Following McFarland and Thomas (2006), we include a variable measuring the range of discussions respondents have with their parents, measured as the sum of the following topics respondents report discussing with either his/her mother or father (each measured separately): someone he/she is dating or a party attended, personal problems, and school work or grades. Another index measures low self-esteem by taking the mean response to several statements about respondents' feelings toward themselves where 1=strongly agree and 5=strongly disagree: "you have a lot of good qualities," "you are physically fit," "you have a lot to be proud of," "you like yourself just the way you are," "you feel like you are doing everything just about right," "you feel socially accepted," and "you feel loved and wanted" (Cronbach's alpha=0.8474).

Further, we created an index that sums the number of statements indicating neighborhood bonds to which respondents agreed (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.6017$): knowing most people in the neighborhood, stopping to talk on the street with a neighbor, that people in the neighborhood look out for each other, using a recreation center in the neighborhood, feeling safe there, being happy living there, and being unhappy if he/she had to leave the neighborhood.⁶

We also use several variables to control for respondent drug use and delinquency. These include the natural logarithm of the number of times the respondent reports that he/she has used each of the following variables (with a different variable for each substance): marijuana, cocaine, inhalants, and other drugs. We created a delinquency index, computed as the mean ordinal responses (along a scale of 0=never to 3=5 or more times) indicating the frequency each respondent committed each of fourteen different offenses and misbehaviors over the past 12 months (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.8314$): graffiti, damage to property, lying to parents, theft from a store, fighting, injuring someone badly, car theft, theft (over \$50), burglary, threat with a weapon, selling drugs, petty theft (less than \$50), group fight, and creating a public disturbance.

Finally, following the primary results of McFarland and Thomas (2006), we include a series of dichotomous variables indicating respondents' membership in varying student activities: honors society, student council, future farmers of America, performing arts, news or yearbook, academic clubs, sports teams, and other clubs. We present descriptive statistics for all variables in Table 3.

TABLE 3 HERE

Analytical Strategy

Because we analyze data from students nested within schools, using variables at both the school-level and student-level, multi-level modeling (also known as hierarchical linear modeling) strategies are more appropriate than ordinal least squares (OLS) methods (Raudenbush & Bryk, 2002). Among other reasons, OLS results are less desirable because they do not account for similarity of students clustered within each school. Thus, we use multi-level models to predict civic participation at wave 3 and wave 4 in Stata SE 11.1.

Because the wave 3 dependent variables are dichotomous, we use random intercept logistic regression models to predict whether respondents are registered to vote, voted in the previous election, or volunteered recently, as measured in wave 3. The wave 4 variables are measured differently, along ordinal scales. To accommodate this level of measurement we used random intercept ordinal logistic models, using Stata's `gllamm` command with an `ologit` link. Each model estimates a random intercept for each sampled school.

⁶ In earlier analyses we included a variable for whether the respondent's parent reports that the respondent has ever been diagnosed with a learning disability or is in special education classes. This variable caused a problem with multicollinearity with our variable for suspension, which relates directly to our hypotheses. As a result we remove it from the current analyses, though the connection between learning disabilities, suspension, and civic participation remains important to consider in future work.

Draft: Not for circulation or citation without express consent of the author

References

- Apple, M. W., & Beane, J. A. (1999). *Democratic schools: Lessons from the chalk face*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.
- Anderson, C. S. (1982). The search for school climate: A review of the research. *Review of Educational Research*, 52, 368-420.
- Barber, B. R. (1998). *A passion for democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bevir, M. (2006). Democratic governance: Systems and radical perspectives. *Public Administration Review*, 66, 426-436.
- Bourdieu, P. (1986). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education* (pp. 241-258). New York: Greenwood Press.
- Buss, T. F., Redburn, F. S., & Guo, K. (Eds.). (2006). *Modernizing democracy: Innovations in citizen participation*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Campbell, D. E. (2006). *Why we vote: How schools and communities shape our civic life*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Casella, R. (2001). *"Being down": Challenging violence in urban schools*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Catlaw, T. J., & Sandberg, B. (Forthcoming). "Dangerous government:" Info-liberalism, active citizenship, and the Open Government Directive. *Administration & Society*.
- Cornell, D.G. (2006). *School violence: Fear versus facts*. New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Creighton, J. L. (2005). *The public participation handbook: Making better decisions through citizen involvement*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: MacMillan.
- Dewey, J. (1959). *Moral principles in education*. New York: Philosophical Library. (Original work published 1909)
- Dinkes, R., Kemp, J., and Baum, K. (2009). *Indicators of School Crime and Safety: 2009* (NCES 2010-012/NCJ 228478). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, and Bureau of Justice Statistics, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Dobozy, E. (2007). Effective learning of civic skills: Democratic schools succeed in nurturing capacities of students. *Education Studies*, 33, 115-128.

- Durkheim, E. (1961). *Moral education: A study in the theory and application of the sociology of education* (H. Schnurer & E. K. Wilson, Trans.). Glencoe, IL: The Free Press. (Original work published 1903)
- Effrat, A., & Schimmel, D. (2003). Walking the democratic talk: Introduction to a special issue on collaborative rule-making as preparation for democratic citizenship. *American Secondary Education, 31*, 3-15.
- Ehman, L. H. (1980). The American school in the political socialization process. *Review of Educational Research, 50*, 99-119.
- Feldman, L., Pasek, J., Romer, D., & Jamieson, K. H. (2007). Identifying best practices in civic education: Lessons from the Student Voices program. *American Journal of Education, 114*, 75-100.
- Fine, M., Burns, A., Payne, Y.A., & Torre, M.E. (2004) Civics lessons: The color and class of betrayal. *Teachers College Record, 106*, 2193-2223.
- Fuhrman, S., & Lazerson, M. (Eds.). (2005). *The public schools (Institutions of American democracy)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review, 66*(Special Issue), 66-75.
- Fung, A., & Olin Wright, E. (2003). *Deepening democracy: Institutional innovations in empowered participatory governance* London: Verso.
- Godsay, S., Kawashima-Ginsberg, K., Kiesa, A., & Levine, P. (2012). *"That's not democracy": How out-of-school youth engage in civic life and what stands in their way*. Medford, MA: CIRCLE/Kettering Foundation.
- Giroux, H. A., & Purpel, D. E. (Eds.). (1983). *The hidden curriculum and moral education*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corp.
- Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hale, K. (2011). *How information matters: Networks and public policy innovation*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Hartmann, G. W. (1946). Interrelations of education and democracy. *Review of Education Research, 16*, 81-93.
- Hirschfield, P. (2008). Preparing for prison: The criminalization of school discipline in the USA. *Theoretical Criminology 12*, 79–101.

- Hyman, H. H. (1959). *Political socialization: A study in the psychology of political behavior*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Jennings, K., & Jennings, M. K. (1968). Political socialization and the high school civics curriculum. *American Political Science Review*, 62, 862-867.
- Kahne, J., & Middaugh, E. (2008). Democracy for some: The civic opportunity gap in high school. CIRCLE Working Paper 59. Medford, MA: CIRCLE.
- Kim, C.Y., Losen, D.J., & Hewitt, D.T. (2010). *The school-to-prison pipeline: Structuring legal reform*. New York: NYU Press.
- Kupchik, A. (2010). *Homeroom security: School discipline in an age of fear*. New York: New York University Press.
- Kupchik, A., & Monahan, T. (2006). The new American school: Preparation for post-industrial discipline. *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 27, 617-632.
- Lin, N. (Ed.). (2002). *Social capital*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, W., & Drew, J. (2006). *Punishing schools: Fear and citizenship in American public education*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- McFarland, D. A., & Thomas, R. J. (2006). Bowling young: How youth voluntary associations influence adult political participation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 71, 401-425.
- Na, C., & Gottfredson D.C. (2011) Police officers in schools: Effects on school crime and the processing of offending behaviors. *Justice Quarterly*, (DOI:10.1080/07418825.2011.615754).
- Jennings, M. K., & Niemi, R. (1974). *The political character of adolescence*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Niemi, R., & Junn, J. (1998). *Civic education: What makes students learn*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Noguera, P. (2003). *City schools and the American dream: Reclaiming the promise of public education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Nolan, K. (2011) *Police in the hallways: Discipline in an urban high school*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Pasek, J., Feldman, L., Romer, D., & Jamieson, K. H. (2008). Schools as incubators of democratic participation: Building long-term efficacy with civic education. *Applied Development Science*, 12, 26-37.

- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Rabe-Hesketh, Sophia, and Anders Skrondal (2008). *Multilevel and Longitudinal Modeling Using Stata, 2nd ed.* College Station, TX: Stata Press
- Raudenbush, S.W., & Bryk, A.S. (2002). *Hierarchical linear models: Applications and data analysis methods* (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Rawlings, K. C. (2012). Attending Tocqueville's school: Examining the intrapersonal, political, and civic effects of nonprofit board participation. *Administrative Theory & Praxis, 34*, 320-356.
- Rawlings, K. C., & Catlaw, T. J. (2011). "Democracy as a way of life": Rethinking the place and practices of public administration. In C. S. King (Ed.), *Government is us 2.0* (Second ed., pp. 31-58). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Schachter, H. L., & Yang, K. (Eds.). (2012). *The state of citizen participation in America* Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Simon, J. (2007). *Governing through Crime: How the war on crime transformed American democracy and created a culture of fear*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sirianni, C., & Friedland, L. (2001). *Civic innovation in America: Community empowerment, public policy, and the movement for civic renewal*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C. & Peterson, R. (2000). *The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment*. Indiana Education Policy Center, Research Report SRS1.
- Skiba, R. J., Reynolds, C. R., Graham, S., Sheras, P., Conoley, J. C., & Garcia-Vazquez, E. (2006). *Are zero tolerance policies effective in the schools? An evidentiary review and recommendations* (Report by the American Psychological Association Zero Tolerance Task Force). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. Retrieved December 24, 2008, from <http://www.apa.org/releases/ZTTFReportBODRevisions5-15.pdf>
- Skocpol, T. (2003). *Diminished democracy: From membership to management in American civic life*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Skocpol, T., & Fiorina, M. P. (Eds.). (1999). *Civic engagement in American democracy*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.
- Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., & Brady, H. (1995). *Voice and equality: Civic voluntarism in American politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Wald, J., & Losen, D. J. (Eds.). (2003). *Deconstructing the school-to-prison pipeline: New directions for youth development*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Way, S.M. (2011). School discipline and disruptive classroom behavior: The moderating effects of student perceptions. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 52, 346-375.

Youniss, J., & Levine, P. (Eds.). (2009). *Engaging young people in civic life*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Zaff, J. F., Moore, K. A., Papillo, A. R., & Williams, S. (2003). Implications of extra-curricular activity participation during adolescence on positive outcomes. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 18, 599-630.

Draft: Not for circulation or citation without express consent of the author

Table 1. Random-Intercept Logistic Regression of Wave 3 Civic Participation on School Discipline and Security Indicators and Control Variables (n=9006), Log Odds Reported

	Voted		Reg. to Vote		Volunteer	
		Full Model		Full Model		Full Model
Ever suspended	-0.129*	-0.050	-0.091	-0.058	-0.190*	-0.204
Verbal punishment	-0.100	-0.098	-0.098	-0.096	-0.089	-0.088
Cheating punishment	-0.415*	-0.415*	-0.226	-0.226	-0.287	-0.287
Fighting punishment	0.026	0.025	0.082	0.082	0.094	0.093
Smoking punishment	0.071	0.066	0.020	0.014	0.171*	0.170*
Dress code	-0.060	-0.060	-0.168	-0.169	-0.128	-0.128
Closed campus	0.244	0.243	0.032	0.034	0.221	0.224
Officer	-0.029	-0.031	-0.071	-0.073	0.052	0.052
Metal detectors	0.119	0.122	0.099	0.103	-0.130	-0.128
Surveillance	0.094	0.094	0.099	0.099	-0.118	-0.119
Anti-gang rules	0.011	0.007	0.026	0.023	-0.080	-0.081
Black*suspended		-0.200		-0.218		-0.059
Hispanic*suspended		-0.053		0.184		0.229
Age	0.135***	0.134***	0.089***	0.089***	-0.028	-0.028
Sex	0.058	0.060	0.089	0.091	0.024	0.025
Foreign language	-0.528***	-0.525***	-0.561***	-0.556***	0.056	0.058
Hispanic	0.117	0.123	0.067	0.009	-0.045	-0.094
Black	0.280***	0.339***	0.191**	0.274**	0.005	0.027
American Indian	0.210	0.204	0.278	0.280	0.247	0.251
Asian American	-0.529***	-0.528***	-0.314**	-0.315**	0.011	0.010
Other race/ethnicity	-0.297*	-0.301*	-0.396**	-0.402**	-0.267	-0.267
Does not live w/ mother	-0.132	-0.136	-0.102	-0.107	-0.046	-0.047
Does not live w/ father	-0.046	-0.047	-0.061	-0.064	-0.009	-0.010
Parent educ. level	0.143***	0.143***	0.093***	0.092***	0.181***	0.181***
Grades	-0.197***	-0.199***	-0.136***	-0.137***	-0.426***	-0.425***
School community	0.024	0.023	-0.004	-0.005	0.011	0.011
Teacher fairness	0.018	0.017	-0.024	-0.024	-0.026	-0.026
Marijuana use (ln)	0.032	0.031	0.042	0.041	-0.058	-0.058
Cocaine use (ln)	-0.041	-0.045	0.006	-0.003	-0.419	-0.422
Inhalant use (ln)	0.029	0.028	0.022	0.021	0.024	0.023
Other drug use (ln)	-0.051	-0.055	-0.004	-0.007	0.002	-0.001
Delinquency scale	-0.104	-0.101	0.007	0.007	-0.018	-0.017
Wants college	0.094***	0.096***	0.089***	0.091***	0.066	0.067
Autonomy from parents	-0.006	-0.006	-0.006	-0.006	-0.010	-0.011
Discussions w/ parents	0.034*	0.034*	0.019	0.019	0.027	0.027
Low self-esteem	-0.043	-0.042	-0.062	-0.062	-0.146**	-0.147**
Neighborhood bonds	0.055**	0.056**	0.048**	0.048**	0.035	0.035

Parents' civic part.	0.089**	0.089***	0.114***	0.113***	0.111***	0.111***
Honor society	0.198*	0.197*	0.302***	0.302***	0.196*	0.196*
Student council	0.013	0.012	0.131	0.127	0.092	0.090
Future farmers	0.014	0.016	-0.136	-0.133	-0.079	-0.080
Perform arts	0.179**	0.181***	0.151**	0.153**	0.322***	0.322***
News/yearbook	-0.003	-0.002	-0.036	-0.038	0.074	0.073
Academic clubs	0.072	0.073	0.046	0.047	-0.114	-0.112
Sports teams	-0.031	-0.030	-0.011	-0.011	0.187**	0.187**
Other clubs	0.161**	0.164**	0.124	0.124	0.236***	0.235***
Religious service attend.	0.109***	0.109***	0.094***	0.093***	0.086***	0.086***
Public school	-0.298**	-0.297**	-0.107	-0.102	-0.104	-0.103
Suburban	0.102	0.105	0.105	0.106	-0.066	-0.065
Rural	0.167	0.170	0.300*	0.304*	-0.002	0.000
Avg. attendance	-0.072	-0.069	-0.058	-0.054	0.094	-0.092
Avg. class size	0.016*	0.016*	0.005	0.005	-0.002	-0.002
Constant	-3.945***	-3.964***	-1.878***	-1.903***	-0.761	-0.768
Random Intercept (sd)	-1.579***	-1.581***	-1.444***	-1.449***	-1.912***	-1.922***
Log-likelihood	-5514.8805	-5513.6549	-5812.4536	-5809.1474	-4544.019	-4543.1079

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Draft: Not for circulation or citation without express consent of the author

Table 2. Random-Intercept Ordinal Logistic Regression of Wave 4 Civic Participation on School Discipline and Security Indicators and Control Variables, Log Odds Reported

	Voting Frequency		Volunteer Frequency	
		Full Model		Full Model
Ever suspended	-0.141*	-0.226**	0.041	-0.049
Verbal punishment	-0.108	-0.106	-0.179*	-0.179*
Cheating punishment	0.138	0.138	0.152	0.150
Fighting punishment	0.068	0.069	-0.055	-0.054
Smoking punishment	0.131	0.132	-0.002	0.002
Dress code	-0.115	-0.119	0.057	0.054
Closed campus	0.184	0.194	-0.117	-0.112
Officer	-0.164	-0.163	0.168	0.170
Metal detectors	0.336**	0.336**	-0.002	-0.003
Surveillance	0.272*	0.269*	0.105	0.105
Anti-gang rules	-0.270*	-0.267*	-0.049	-0.044
Black*suspended		0.061		0.141
Hispanic*suspended		0.392*		0.300
Age	0.088***	0.088***	0.018	0.018
Sex	0.151**	0.151**	0.090	0.089
Foreign language	-0.334***	-0.332***	-0.291*	-0.292*
Hispanic	0.010	-0.085	-0.322**	-0.387***
Black	0.487***	0.481***	-0.188*	-0.220*
American Indian	0.174	0.184	0.000	0.008
Asian American	-0.695***	-0.698***	-0.177	-0.178
Other race/ethnicity	-0.190	-0.190	0.136	0.139
Does not live w/ mother	-0.063	-0.067	0.125	0.126
Does not live w/ father	0.001	-0.002	-0.030	-0.030
Parent educ. level	0.170***	0.169***	0.097***	0.097***
Grades	-0.152***	-0.150***	-0.285***	-0.284***
School community	0.025	0.025	-0.046	-0.045
Teacher fairness	-0.014	-0.014	-0.011	-0.010
Marijuana use (ln)	0.006	0.007	-0.006	-0.005
Cocaine use (ln)	-0.006	-0.016	-0.171	-0.171
Inhalant use (ln)	-0.013	-0.013	0.007	0.008
Other drug use (ln)	0.073	0.074	0.052	0.053
Delinquency scale	-0.045	-0.050	0.037	0.036
Wants college	0.165***	0.164***	0.068*	0.067*
Autonomy from parents	0.016	0.016	0.005	0.005
Discussions w/ parents	0.033*	0.034*	0.076***	0.077***
Low self-esteem	-0.082	-0.083	-0.029	-0.030
Neighborhood bonds	0.027	0.027	0.040*	0.040*

Parents' civic part.	0.100***	0.098***	0.102***	0.100***
Honor society	0.163*	0.162*	0.264**	0.264**
Student council	-0.005	-0.007	0.237**	0.236**
Future farmers	0.095	0.093	0.073	0.069
Perform arts	0.175***	0.174***	0.190***	0.189***
News/yearbook	0.107	0.107	-0.028	-0.029
Academic clubs	0.040	0.041	0.060	0.060
Sports teams	0.015	0.015	0.075	0.074
Other clubs	0.146*	0.143*	0.296***	0.293***
Religious service attend.	0.118***	0.118***	0.130***	0.130***
Public school	-0.251*	-0.251*	-0.034	-0.035
Suburban	0.007	0.005	-0.034	-0.036
Rural	0.130	0.130	-0.126	-0.128
Avg. attendance	0.010	0.012	-0.070	-0.070
Avg. class size	0.012	0.011	-0.003	-0.003
Random intercept (sd)	0.262***	0.261***	0.212***	0.211***
Intercept1	2.038***	2.022***	1.258**	1.244**
Intercept2	3.260***	3.246***	2.683***	2.670***
Intercept3	4.119***	4.105***	3.289***	3.276***
Intercept4			3.947***	3.934***
Intercept5			4.617***	4.605***
N	7361	7361	7357	7357
Log-likelihood	-9549.355	-9546.033	-7673.555	-7672.128

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Draft: Not for circulation or citation without express consent of the author

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Variables in Multivariate Models

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Dev.	%	Min	Max
voted	9622			35.25	0	1
votereg	9622			57.59	0	1
volunteer	9622			23.62	0	1
voteoften	7820	2.37	1.17		1	4
hrsvolunteer	7816	1.66	1.13		1	6
Ever suspended	9612			25.31	0	1
Verbal punishment	9622			39.72	0	1
Cheating punishment	9622			2.94	0	1
Fighting punishment	9622			71.94	0	1
Smoking punishment	9622			45.17	0	1
Dress code	9622			11.32	0	1
Closed campus	9622			9.56	0	1
Officer	9622			44.61	0	1
Metal detectors	9622			22.71	0	1
Surveillance	9622			8.97	0	1
Anti-gang rules	9622			91.52	0	1
Age	9617	14.83	1.57		11	20
Sex (Female)	9622			51.96	0	1
Foreign language	9622			11.26	0	1
Hispanic	9622			16.25	0	1
Black	9622			22.19	0	1
American Indian	9622			2.48	0	1
Asian American	9622			6.80	0	1
Other race/ethnicity	9622			4.65	0	1
Does not live w/ mother	9622			4.28	0	1
Does not live w/ father	9622			28.00	0	1
Parent educ. level	9622	2.82	1.35		0	5
Grades	9430	2.20	0.76		1	4
School community	9522	2.23	0.78		1	5
Teacher fairness	9520	3.50	1.06		1	5
Marijuana use (ln)	9377	0.53	1.17		0	6.86
Cocaine use (ln)	9529	0.03	0.28		0	6.55
Inhalant use (ln)	9527	0.09	0.42		0	6.40
Other drug use (ln)	9500	0.13	0.60		0	6.69
Delinquency scale	9583	0.29	0.36		0	3
Wants college	9591	4.49	0.98		1	5
Autonomy from parents	9622	4.99	1.62		0	7
Discussions w/ parents	9622	2.13	1.52		0	6
Low self-esteem	9604	1.92	0.59		1	5
Neighborhood bonds	9622	5.46	1.44		0	7

Parents' civic part.	9622	0.68	0.90	0	5
Honor society	9622		9.45	0	1
Student council	9622		8.06	0	1
Future farmers	9622		2.11	0	1
Perform arts	9622		26.76	0	1
News/yearbook	9622		10.58	0	1
Academic clubs	9622		20.12	0	1
Sports teams	9622		58.69	0	1
Other clubs	9622		17.16	0	1
Religious service attend.	9461	2.69	1.39	0	4
Public school	9622		83.78	0	1
Suburban	9622		50.67	0	1
Rural	9622		19.73	0	1
Avg. attendance	9622	1.98	0.89	1	5
Avg. class size	9622	26.57	5.82	10	38

Draft: Not for circulation or citation without express consent of the author