INDIANA UNIVERSITY – INDIANAPOLIS SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

The Education-Industrial Complex: A Consideration of Power, Educational Institution and the Political Disengagement of Urban Secondary Students – Version III

Qualifying Exam Response for Doctoral Candidacy of Troy Crayton in Urban Education Studies

Troy Crayton

10/24/2014

The K-12 system of education is a complex organization that has historically denied students of low socio-economic status the opportunity for political engagement through the exercise of power (Apple, 1993; Ben-Porath, 2013; Boggs, 2000; Crayton, 2014; Ethiraj & Levinthal, 2009; Fazzaro, 2006; Gordon, 1980; Horowitz, 1969; Karabel, 1977; Lukes, 2005; Shipps, 2008; Wedel, 2009). This statement is in response to a series of questions presented by members of my Academic Advisory Committee, respectively, as a Qualifying Exam for doctoral candidacy in Urban Education Studies. This article is a response to the series of questions that will address the concern of the opening statement including: Professor Peter Seybold's Questions of Power in the K-12 Education System; Professor Brendan Maxcy's request on the state of political youth engagement in Urban Secondary Schools; and Professor Jim Scheurich's request for focus on PAR (Participatory Action Research) and YPAR (Youth Participatory Action Research) in the education system as they relate to the political engagement of Urban Secondary Students.

Introduction

The K-12 system of education is a complex organization that has historically denied students of low socio-economic status the opportunity for political engagement through the exercise of power (Apple, 1993; Ben-Porath, 2013; Boggs, 2000; Crayton, 2014 ; Ethiraj & Levinthal, 2009; Fazzaro, 2006; Gordon, 1980; Horowitz, 1969; Karabel, 1977; Lukes, 2005; Shipps, 2008; Wedel, 2009). This statement is in response to a series of questions presented by members of my Academic Advisory Committee, respectively, as a Qualifying Exam for doctoral candidacy in Urban Education Studies. The addressed concern has developed from graduate studies in sociology and education in addition to experience as a teacher of students in grades 7 through post-secondary levels. The three series of questions that will form the frame for the balance of this response are:

I. Seybold Questions of Power in the K-12 Education System (Page 8)

- A. What are Complex Organizations?
- B. What is power and how is power exercised in the K-12 education system?
- C. Who has power in the K-12 education system and what form does this power take?
- D. How has the exercise of power in education systems been transformed over time?

II. Maxcy Request on Political Youth Engagement in Urban Secondary Schools (Page 25)

- A. Drawing from the relevant literature, discuss the substantive issue of youth political engagement. Incorporate studies of and related to youth political engagement as appropriate.
- B. Drawing on the relevant educational policy and related literature, present a conceptual framework that would guide your inquiry into youth political engagement. Discuss and justify your choices among the alternatives.

III. Scheurich Request for Focus on PAR (Participatory Action Research) and YPAR (Youth Participatory Action Research) in Education System and the Political Engagement of Urban Secondary Students (Page 55)

- A. Describe what the historical development of PAR from its beginning to the present has been and discuss what its current key characteristics are.
- B. Describe the emergence of YPAR from PAR and discuss YPAR's current key characteristics.
- C. Briefly discuss at least three "high quality," defined by possessing most of the key characteristics just discussed, research examples of YPAR.
- D. Conclude with a discussion of how all of this might apply to your dissertation research.

Obradović and Masten (2007) state that "SES (socioeconomic status) is positively correlated with measures of activity involvement and citizenship (but) researchers need to shed more light on how factors such as poverty, unemployment, marginalization, and discrimination influence development of civic engagement" (p. 17). In fact, Baum (2003) preceded Obradović and Masten (2007) in suggesting that SES must be looked at more critically in considering involvement of students. Weinstein, Deci, and Ryan (2010) link the meaning of student involvement as a correlate to family engagement with the student on topics that are intrinsically motivating for them given their lived experiences. Baum (2003) cites that

[T]he most accurate predictor of a student's achievement in school is not income or social status, but the extent to which the student's family is *able to*: 1) Create a

home environment that encourages learning; 2) Express high (but not unrealistic) expectations for their children's achievement and future careers; and 3) Become involved in their children's education at school and in community" (p. 36, italics added).

Each of Baum's (2003) cited characteristics for family engagement are problematic and is representative of the systemic challenge of power in that if parents and teachers understand key terms such as achievement or learning differently, for example. Whose 'power' is being promoted in Baum's first quoted sentence above? Is there a standard curriculum that is being followed that does not allow for engagement of student's intrinsically motivating interests? Why does the student's home environment, generally speaking, need to conform to that which is being presented by the teacher and school?

These questions represent other contexts by which family engagement are problematic of the current American public education system. The practices that produce these contexts paint a picture that devalues and negates the given family and students' lived experiences as a basis for engagement and the learning process (J Dewey, 1938, 1991; K. W. Fischer & Rose, 2001; K. W. Fischer & Rose, 1998). And given such practices, the matter of what I'll call *achievement opportunity deficit* (AOD), which represents placement of responsibility on the education system and its mechanisms, rather than the phrase *achievement gap* that represents placement of blame on students and their families, as a process toward productive remedy (Trent, Artiles, & Englert, 1998; Valencia, 2010). For example, Ballard (2014) suggests that a curriculum must entail a process that initiates by answering the question from the perspective of the student: How does the meaning of this subject – being presented - address my needs, respectively, so that I may feel empowered to "(organize) voluntary activity focused on problem solving and helping others" (p.

181)? As this response will reveal, this is a critical dilemma given the genesis of curricula, the content and manner imposed on teachers for implementing are stifled by powers outside the classroom.

Second, the next cited characteristic for family engagement suggests that parents, for example, should “(e)xpress high (but not unrealistic) expectations for their children’s achievement and future careers” (Baum, 2003, p. 36). Such suggestions could be tricky in that the student’s lived experiences as a basis for engaging those characteristics indicative of potential political engagement, or potential future career interests for that matter, may be lost if relevance to lived experiences and thus a feelings of competence are more difficult to be realized by the student (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Kalyuga, 2011; J. Reeve, Deci, E, 1996). Said another way, if information is represented by the teacher that fails to be relevant for the student, then the likelihood that engagement will occur, by which the student will not be motivated to realize her competence, for ‘learning’ the presented information. So, even if a teacher, or parent, has high expectations of a student, if how the information is presented is not relevant nor allows the student to feel able to engage, then one can expect as highly as one wishes, but if the presented information does not engage the student intrinsically then opportunity is minimalized and thus AOD is maintained.

Another more concrete example considers the practice of teaching students to ‘learn’ answers to standardized tests. In other words, do curricula for learning content of standardized tests allow for instruction that is initiated based on students’ lived experiences, firstly, and is the relevance of that relationship allowed to be engaged intrinsically? It is submitted that the answer is “no” in that teachers are restricted by administrators directives. And likewise, administrators are restricted by state and federal monitoring requirements that are not made compatible to engaging students intrinsically. Does the curriculum or school standard allow for acknowledging such

potential ‘nontraditional’ ways of understanding that are known by the student from their lived experience but not communicated in the form in which the ‘correct answer’ states? What power exist that control administrators and teachers in this manner?

And lastly, what does it mean to “become involved in their children’s education at school and in community”? This response’s scope does not aim to address the conception of othering and deficit processes, although very relevant in another context, but use of the term “their” could be critically analyzed even though Baum (2003) appears to be ‘pro-student’. There are definitely lenses of unconscious bias that could be engaged to interrogate uses of such terms in contexts such as these (Malle, 2005; Vedantam, 2010), and worthy of future consideration. That said, what does “involved” mean? Is this involvement also limited by some form of power?

Epstein (1995) suggests that there is need that education stakeholders and the general public alike understand that when presented with certain terms such as ‘involvement’ and ‘partnership’ that depending on a person’s lived experience each of these terms could mean something significantly different from one person to the next. This understanding could be different among teachers and administrators, i.e. “professional” and “professional,” just as they could be understood differently between a teacher and a parent, i.e. “professional” and “non-professional.” In either case, a failure to understand terms equally illustrates a power structure that maintains a process of difficulty for collaborating against certain power structures. Perhaps needless to add that some meaningful partnership among professionals and non-professionals, in any combination, to effectively coalesce in partnership toward determining remedies for student engagement become that much more difficult to establish and or maintain against certain power structures. Indeed, in this same spirit, the term partnership was used and an understanding of this term is needed before proceeding.

There are three types of partnership (Epstein, 1995) usually understood in varying degrees from one person to the next. Two types of partnership are understood commonly among administrators, teachers, parents, community members, and students (stakeholders) as *involvement*. The term involvement, when used, generally means that the parent or community member, i.e. the non-professional, has an ancillary function to enhance the plans of the teacher or administrator, i.e. the professionals. The third type of partnership is a true partnership that, in the words of Baum (2003), includes “actively involving parents and community members in school practices and decision-making, [which] largely stakes out new ground” (p. 33). Toward remedies to engagement of stakeholders in the education engagement process, the latter is preferred. However, as this response will also reveal, the reality of the education system exhibit the former two as other examples of some form of power outside the classroom that maintains AOD.

How terms are understood and used are important as bases for collaborative efforts and thus are primary in a project of engagement among parties a school environment (K. Chang, 2014; Cravey, 2013; Mather & Hanley, 1999). How terms are understood and used given the parties involved become forms of power that beg the question to know more if one is to analyze the engagement of a stakeholder in an education system (Apple, 1993; Ben-Porath, 2013; Boggs, 2000; Lukes, 2005; Morriss, 2002; Perrow, 1986; Picciano & Spring, 2013). Context and systems that encompass and maintain such power will be the main foci for the balance of this response.

As stated earlier, the K-12 system of education is a complex organization that has historically denied students of low socio-economic status, which in turn has maintained an AOD that includes all forms of ‘learning’ in the classroom environment including political engagement

through the exercise of power. The thesis for the balance of this response will address the relationship of engagement among stakeholders in an urban public K-12 school system. Each of the three series of questions, also spelled out earlier, will represent a section of this response as a lens through which this thesis will be analyzed. The analysis will initiate with a consideration of power in the K-12 education system given the relationship of engagement among stakeholders. This section, Seybold, will consist of two subsections. The first subsection titled *The Exercise of Power in the K-12 Education System* will address four overarching inquiries: 1) What are Complex Organizations; 2) What is power and how is power exercised in the K-12 education system; 3) Who has power in the K-12 education system and what form does this power take; and 4) How has the exercise of power in education systems been transformed over time? The concluding subsection titled *The Pouvoir and Puissance of Education* will address: 1) Holders of Power: The Form it Takes and the Nature of its Manifestation from Relationships and Experience; 2) Exercise of Legal Authority and the Employment of a Bureaucratic Administrative Staff; and 3) The Exercise of Control as Power by a Bureaucratic Administrative Staff on the Basis of Knowledge as Power. To conclude this section, Lukes' (2005) third dimension of power will be introduced to account for certain shortcomings that the binary consideration of power presents.

The next section, Maxcy, drawing from the conclusions of the previous section, will analyze the thesis by discussing relevant literature on education policy and political youth engagement in urban secondary schools. This section of analysis will consist of two subsections. First, drawing from the relevant literature, there will be a discussion of the substantive issues of youth political engagement and the effects of power today. This discussion will incorporate studies of youth political engagement in light of institutional causal influences. And the second subsection will

discuss and justify my choices for alternatives given these causal influences from drawing on the relevant educational policy and related literature, then present Urban Regime Theory as a conceptual framework that would guide my inquiry into youth political engagement.

Lastly, the Scheurich section, will consider the conclusions from the preceding sections as a developing lens for potential remedies in future research using PAR (Participatory Action Research) and YPAR (Youth Participatory Action Research). First, there will be a discussion of what PAR is. Next, there will be a historical development of PAR from its beginning to the present. There will then be a description of the emergence of YPAR from PAR and a discussion of YPAR's current key characteristics. Also, there will be a brief discussion of at least three "high quality" (defined by possessing most of the key characteristics you have just discussed) research examples of YPAR. The response will conclude with a discussion of how all of this might apply to the conclusions of the former two sections of this response.

I. Seybold

The Exercise of Power in the K-12 Education System

Perrow (1986) advises that "Nearly all large, *complex organization* in the United States , for example, are best classified as bureaucracies" (p. 3, italics added), particularly, according to Perrow (1986), today's bureaucracies are *rational-legal bureaucracies*. Inspired by Weber (1947), Perrow (1986) explains that "A rational-legal bureaucracy is based on rational principles (rational in terms of management's interests, not necessarily worker's), is backed by legal sanctions, and exists in legal framework" (p. 3). In other words, Perrow's implication is that bureaucracies are hierarchical in nature with the interests of 'management' [i.e. professional] being *superior* to that of the 'worker' [i.e. non-professional] (Bowers, 2010; Kahne, Crow, &

Lee, 2013; Searle, 1995; Weber, 1947). As the reader knows, many authors (Apple, 1993; Ben-Porath, 2013; Boggs, 2000; Coplan, Hughes, Bosacki, & Rose-Krasnor, 2011; Lukes, 2005; Shipp, 2008) have linked hierarchy to power. The conception of power and its relationship to hierarchy will be investigated later in this section, but for now let us consider the ideal of bureaucracy.

Weber (1947) speaks to bureaucracy, a tool of power, in stating that

The purest type of *exercise of legal authority* is that which employs a bureaucratic administrative staff [whereas] (b)ureaucratic administration means fundamentally the *exercise of control on the basis of knowledge*. This is the feature of it which makes it specifically rational. This consists on the one hand in technical knowledge which, by itself, is sufficient to ensure it a position of extraordinary power. But in addition to this, bureaucratic organizations, or *the holders of power who make use of them*, have the tendency to increase their power still further by the knowledge growing out of experience in the service. For they acquire through the conduct of office a special knowledge of facts and have available a store of documentary material peculiar to themselves. (Weber, 1947; 339; italics added)

Weber (1947) is telling us that there are four manifestations of power that should guide analysis of a bureaucracy as a complex organization. The four manifestations of power being: 1) the exercise of legal authority and the employment of a bureaucratic administrative staff; 2) the bureaucratic administrative staff exhibits the exercise of control on the basis of knowledge; 3) the exercise of control on the basis of knowledge is an exhibition of power; and 4) the holders of power who make use of them, have the tendency to increase their power still further by the knowledge growing out of experience in the service. Seybold (2014) and Picciano and Spring

(2013), for example, have advised that the K-12 education system is a complex organization and therefore, when analyzed, exhibit illustrations of these manifestations. So, how does the K-12 education system, specifically, exhibit these manifestations? An answer to this question will begin with a determination for what power will mean for this thesis given the literature.

What is power? In no way is this author anything other than monolingual, but, Morriss (2002) provides an important distinction for understanding power given the French language. For the French, there are two terms that are used conceptually to convey forms of power, *pouvoir* and *puissance* (Aron, 1964; Morriss, 2002). Morriss (2002), citing Aron (1964), states that “One has the *puissance* to do something, and one exercises the *pouvoir* to do it [So] (t)his distinction would therefore be roughly that between potential and act” (p. xvi-xvii). Lukes (2005), however, suggests that “we need to broaden and deepen the scope of analysis” (p. 109). For Lukes (2005), “power is an imposition or constraint, working against those subject to it [including] the power to decide what is decided” (pp. 111-112). It would seem that Lukes is speaking more toward *puissance* in that he does not seem to be speaking of some physical act. However, the nature of *pouvoir* seems evident in that this power for which he speaks causes one to act regardless of whether there is some physical impetus. Along this ideal, Smith and Hodkinson (2005) advise that “Power is the ability of individuals or groups to realize their will even if others are opposed” (p. 916). Said another way, for example, when a teacher acts because an administrator instructs them to follow a teacher Historically, the K-12 education system, as a bureaucratic complex organization, has transformed in America as to how folks within the system have those with more power, of said system, deciding what the folks decide. Maxcy (2011) speaks to this bureaucratic phenomenon with the ideal of policy logics. As he states

performance accountability begins with the notion of policy logics. Within the normative notion of policy as an authoritative allocation of value, policies implicitly carry logics that provide both justification for action and criteria for evaluation. Actors draw on policy logics, at their different theoretical and empirical stages, as general ideologies to evaluate decisions, procedures and practices. (p. 254)

In other words, those within a bureaucratic system make decisions based upon the best interest of the system and those who ‘outrank’ her, or become no longer a part of said system. For example, a teacher follows the instruction of her principal, if not she may very well be out of a job. And heaven forbid others are dependent on her holding that job as teacher.

This response’s scope does not include an analysis of free will and a person’s ability to choose. However, a brief treatment of this ideal is needed as this response develops. Lukes (2005) advises that “the ‘dictates of one’s judgment’ need not just involve rationality (for) ‘judgment’ can be taken in an Aristotelian way to mean *phronesis*, or practical wisdom involving the application of principles to particular circumstances” (p. 116). But there is power that withholds or obstructs information to make practically wise judgments (Lukes, 2005; Picciano & Springs, 2013), and this claim will be presented later in this response. To that end, it is important to this response to make clear that such power exists, and has so throughout the history of bureaucracy in America, given American capitalist origins (Beard, 2004; Picciano & Spring, 2013). A brief history will be provided with more analysis on the state of the K-12 system today.

Tyack (1974) provides a historical evolution of the American education system by the years 1890-1940 and 1940 to 1973. In roughly 1890, rural schools and education, the dominant system

to that point, were deemed haphazard and inadequate per the Reformers of the day when compared to the ‘professional educator’. In the words of Tyack (1974), “(w)hat was basically wrong with rural education was that rural folk wanted to run their schools and didn’t know what was good for them in the complex new society” (p. 21). From 1890-1940, there were definitive movements to centralize school systems, an introduction of “the corporate model” (Tyack, 1974, p. 147) for schooling, and a continued urbanization of the education system.

From a perspective of bureaucracy and power such changes are significant because the changes in political structures and political behaviors changed the ability to maintain and or exercise power within, and without, the education system of the day. Politics, paraphrasing the words of (Smith & Hodkinson, 2005), politics is the ability to allocate scarce resources. Said another way, “In each case [in areas across America], the proponents of reform were member of highly educated political elites who believed that structural reforms were necessary to create efficient, rational, and ‘non-political’ school bureaucracies” (p. 148). As far as the corporate model,

[The new professors of education administration from schools such as Teacher’s College, Columbia and the University of Chicago] tried to develop “scientific” ways of measuring inputs and outputs in in school systems as a tool of management, and to elaborate ways in which the school might rationalize its structure and curriculum to fit new industrial and social conditions. (Tyack, 1974, p. 136)

In the spirit of this adopted corporate model of education, the power of the Reformers and the ‘rationality’ of bureaucracy, the label of ‘urban’ came to be identified with economic status and the intent of the emerging “corporate-bureaucratic model” (Tyack, 1974, p. 6) to prepare citizens for various lives of labor, with creative development of the thinking processes as a primary

motivation for ‘learning’ taking a seat at the back of the proverbial education system bus (K. Fischer, Schwartz, & Connell, 2004; K. W. Fischer & Rose, 2001; K. W. Fischer & Rose, 1998), if at all. Tyack (1974) advises that

Educators developed school system whose specialized structures partly reflected the differentiation of economic roles in the larger social order. As employers and occupational associations placed ever greater reliance on educational credentials jobs, schooling acquired a new importance as the gateway to favored positions.

(p. 6)

This system of meritocracy as a part of the rational, efficient way of schooling championed since at least the 1940’s. An epistemological position that has failed to employ curricula with genesis in students’ lived experiences because of an ideological genesis controlled by economic and political elites (Tyack, 1974). The years of 1940-1973 illustrate the power of forces outside stakeholders by making education the mechanism for keeping America an economic power with a series of presented crises by making the term a “common (word) in the school lexicon during the years from 1940-1970” (Tyack, 1974, pp. 269-270). In the 1940’s and 50’s, for example, the crises were presented as controversies as to how to address the migration of different types of folks into the cities (Tyack, 1974). A series of selection processes based on the long-standing system of meritocracy was an example of a longstanding controversy of the time. Toward the end of the 1960’s, “Many people questioned whether equality of input in schooling was enough to promote equality of opportunity” (Tyack, 1974, p. 270). As Tyack (1974) states, “Critics of the establishment claimed that the professionals had neither the expertise nor the empathy to design schooling appropriate for all groups” (p. 270). The table was being set for the reform activities of today guided by ideology, profit, and technology (Picciano & Spring, 2013) as borne

out by the power of legal authority and bureaucratic policies that continue to lack the basic components of learning “for all groups.” The *pouvoir* and *puissance* lay in the hands of the prevailing ideology at the time of consideration. On one hand ideology, technology and profit are the *puissance* sold as key to solving the popular crisis of the day. On the other hand, legal authority and bureaucratic administrative staffs are the hammers or the *pouvoir* to enforce the *puissance*. How are these “powers” exercised? Within the next section, the content will address the dynamics of power in the K-12 education system of today. The dynamics that will be addressed will be the: Holders of Power, the Form it Takes, and the Nature of its Manifestation from Relationships and Experience; Exercise of Legal Authority and the Employment of a Bureaucratic Administrative Staff; and The Exercise of Control as Power by a Bureaucratic Administrative Staff on the Basis of Knowledge as Power.

The Pouvoir and Puissance of Education

Borrowing from the Dwight D. Eisenhower’s phrase the Military-Industrial Complex¹ introduced as a warning to the nation on January 17, 1961, Picciano and Spring (2013) introduce the reader to what they call the Education-Industrial Complex to refer to the current state of the education system.

(W)e must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. (quoting Eisenhower, Picciano & Spring, 2013, p. 1)

By the 21st century, “democratic control slipped away as the federal legislation No Child Left Behind opened an era of national curriculum standards and mandated standardized testing”

(Picciano & Spring, 2013, p. 4). Like Eisenhower’s warning about the Military-Industrial Complex, the Education-Industrial Complex (EIC) is developing schooling products not for the sake of student learning “but for the sake of their own development” (Picciano & Spring, 2013, p. 1) with government mandates and policy as its rational-legal authority. As stated earlier, rational-legal authority is a bureaucratic characteristic. In this case, rational-legal authority, exemplifies puissance by providing an environment potential for profit through the development of these schooling products. Fail safes provided in the guise of accountability are based on ill-informed criteria, such as standardized tests and curricula that do not support the basic learning process mentioned earlier, that support certain groups and not others. The power of the EIC also includes the interactivity of its components (see Figure 1), however.

Figure 1: The Components of the Education-Industrial Complex

The cyclical form of the EIC is a network of bureaucracies with a process that consists of four interactive components; ideology, profit-making, technology, and education policy (Picciano & Spring, 2013), each acting as a transforming *pouvoir* and *puissance* for the other respective components in the process of the EIC. This transformation occurs depending on given circumstances, situation presented, and the interaction of bureaucratic staff (Lukes, 2005) given their respective interests and goals (Picciano & Spring, 2013). First we shall consider an example of the form of the EIC as a network of alliances, bureaucratic staffs (Picciano & Spring, 2013), with an exemplification for how these interactions may be controlled by single individuals, called Flexian, who use their experience, knowledge, and relationships gained as actors over time within this network to exercise *pouvoir* action (Picciano & Spring, 2013; Wedel, 2009). And to conclude this section, there will be a consideration of a Third Dimension of Power as an example for envisioning the dynamic interactional process among the EIC that maintain the *pouvoir* and *puissance* of the network (Lukes, 2005; Picciano & Spring, 2013).

The EIC consists of a network of bureaucracies with *pouvoir* and *puissance* interacting very dynamically. The structure of this network will be visited again shortly. The dynamic of power revolves around the control of four components: technology, profit-making, ideology, and education policy. The ideology of the dynamic has evolved with the timeline of the public education system history. The “crisis” presented for the time is guided by the ideology of control for that given time period, as outlined previously. Today’s ideology is one that is both political and economic in nature, whereas the economic ideology is generally a *pouvoir* or enacts a “business model in a network of relationships which decreases voters’ control” (Picciano & Spring, 2013, p. 3). The political ideologies that support the economics of the matter are more the *puissance* or potential ability to enact legislation, for example, to uphold and support the

economics of today's crisis. The ideological epistemologies are either "free-market economists" (Picciano & Spring, 2013, p. 4) or "those advocating a limited free-market approach to schools favor choice of public schools and charter schools that would teach a standardized state curriculum and tests" (Picciano & Spring, 2013, p. 4).

The use of technology is not new to the field of public education. Since the 1960's technology has been evolving on its use to increase the effectiveness of administrative duties and as a tool to more effectively teach students in the K-12 arena. The 1990's introduced the era of performance accountability that made more powerful the efforts of standardization despite proven track record for success (Maxcy, 2011). An example of private response to such policies is provided by Picciano & Spring (2013) in reporting that, "several million students take online courses" (p. 6), but this phenomenon has also increasingly influenced the higher-education arena whereas today "over 6 million students or 30% of the total higher education student population [are] taking a fully online course in any given year" (p. 4). As far as the profit-making is concerned, Picciano & Spring (2013) advise that

The third component of the education-industrial complex is made up of entities that profit by providing goods and services to schools and colleges. Textbook publishers, testing and tutoring services, education management companies, and for-profit colleges are significant players in the education-industrial complex. (p. 7)

As Figure 1 above illustrates, these three components interact to produce education policy. Each component consists of bureaucracies that interact among each other to achieve a rational course of action to execute. The types of industries that predominantly effect education policy are major companies (e.g. Carlyle Group and IBM), think tanks (e.g. American Enterprise Group

and Heritage Foundation), and media conglomerates (e.g. Washington Post Company, News International, and New York Times Company) (Picciano & Spring, 2013). These industries interact dynamically through their respective bureaucratic systems as illustrated by Figure 2.

Figure 2: Networks and Alliances of the American Education-Industrial Complex

As provided by Picciano & Spring (2013), there are nine bureaucratic systems by which the dynamic interaction among these industries that maintain the EIC: 1) the United States Department of Education (USDOE); 2) state education agencies; 3) school districts; 4) school board members; 5) the mass media; 6) policy makers; 7) networks of relationships (e.g. personal contacts, regular meetings, social gatherings, associations in formal organizations); 8) Flexians/Shadow Elite; and 9) the World Economic Forum. Citing study findings of (Watts, 2003) and (Barabasi, 2002), Picciano and Spring (2013) reveal an overarching power that can aggregate in the hands of a Flexian as puissance but can then also become pouvoir that is worthy of closer consideration. As they state

(N)etworks enable individual behavior to aggregate into collective behavior.

Something special happens when individual entities such as nodes, components, and people, are able to interact to form larger wholes such as networks, systems, and communities. Furthermore, the “interaction effect” or collective behavior result in a far more productive environment than individuals acting by themselves; one individual working with another individual does not simply comprise two individuals but a third more powerful collaborating entity which can extend the benefits beyond two. (p. 9)

Wedel (2009) in her work *The Shadow Elite* introduce us to Flexian, “The mover and shaker who serves at one and the same time as business consultant, think-tanker, TV pundit, and government adviser glides in and around organizations that enlist his services” (Wedel, 2009, p. 1). An example is Karen Cator, Director of the Office of Technology, U.S. Department of Education (Picciano & Spring, 2013). Cator has prior experience as an executive with Apple, a board member of education for-profit organization the Software & Information Industry Association. A Flexian, then, can in-fact hold a form of ultimate power as both forms, *puissance* and *pouvoir*, at once and thus may exhibit collective behavior based on her individual behavior in the form of node, component, and of course as a person. The power of the interaction effect, said another way, is potentially in the hands of a given individual among the network of the EIC. In fact, “The networks they form between governments, business, and private foundations are a realistic portrait of current educational governance” (Picciano & Spring, 2013, p. 17). But to make such assertions assumes that each other individual as a part of this bureaucratic network may at some point, inevitably, act in a manner that is not in her best interest, right? In other words, a person may realize that the action that her organization proposes as action is not in-line

with her experience or knowledge base. Nonetheless, she must act as directed by her organization or no longer be a part of it. Lukes (2005) sheds some light on this binary formulation of power as a form in addition to the aforementioned *pouvoir* and *puissance*; a third dimension of power, domination of judgment as a result of one's preference in situations of choice being influenced by some stimulus in the environment. It is at this point where a closer consideration must be paid when using the term influence too loosely as a conflated understanding with power, and thus where the binary idea of power becomes problematic.

Lukes' (2005) expression of a third dimension of power describes the "securing of compliance to domination" (pp. 109-110) by an entity of power from a subordinate as is experienced in a person's environment. This third dimension of power brings into question the various terms used interchangeably for power. The third dimension of power makes one aware that there are in-fact different natures for this term in a dynamic world. There are distinctions of power that describe an interaction among entities depending on the position in a hierarchy that these entities hold when interacting and the extent to which the *pouvoir* or *puissance* affects the judgment of the subordinate in said interaction. The effects on judgment of subordinates' remains challenged as a discussion of power currently and will be fleshed out shortly. Additionally, this understanding of power will further be offered as a power *to mislead* in the next section. But for now, the reader is asked to consider the distinctions in other forms of power given Lukes' (2005) third dimension of power.

Lukes (2005) reminds us of an important distinction of power; and among them show a distinction between the terms *power* and *influence* depending on how the reference to either affects the *judgment* of a subordinate in a given interaction. Influence does not affect decision-making to the extent that judgment against the interest of the subordinate is executed. Inspired

by Nagel (1975), Lukes (2005) explains that “[influence] explores ways of defining, measuring and inferring the causal influence of preferences upon outcomes” (p. 163). In other words, the *pouvoir* or *puissance* of the interaction does not “cause” the subordinate to make a decision that weighs enough on her so that her interest is harmed (Feinberg, 1984). For example, Maxcy (2011), as inspired by Lukes (2005), advises that “power derives from an ability to suppress potential conflict by shaping the wants from which interests form” (p. 255). “Is it not,” Lukes (2005, p. 28) states

the most supreme and most insidious form of power to prevent people, to whatever degree, from having grievances by shaping their perceptions, cognition and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in an existing order of things either because they can see or imagine no alternative to it, or because they see it as natural and unchangeable, or because they value it divinely ordained and beneficial? (p. 28).

This illustration of causal influence reveals itself as an effect, to some degree, “(as) *coercion*²; (as) *authority*³; (as) *autonomy*⁴; (as) *manipulation*⁵; [or as] the concept of *interests*⁶” (Lukes, 2005, p. 163, italics added). These ideals of domination as characteristics of the nature of the third dimension of power exemplify, additionally that, “power is an imposition or constraint, working against the interests of those subject to it” (Lukes, 2005, p. 112). Moreover, “(d)omination occurs where the power of some affects the interests of others by restricting their capabilities for truly human functioning” (Lukes, 2005, p. 118).

Indeed this ideal extends to a position that advises that these impositions or constraints extend to effecting judgments of individuals in their decision-making, including making decisions in their best interest in favor of option in favor of the ideological hegemony of society (Lukes, 2005;

Scott, 1990), as presented earlier. Of the aforementioned causal influences that potentially affect subordinate judgment, each will be considered a form of domination for the purposes of this response, except for subordinate coercion and interests, in the following section. In other words, the scope of this response is not an analysis of individual rights as a relation to coercion and interests. Said another way, this response is not an analysis of individual rights, although highly important. These causal influences would therefore be indicative of what Lukes (2005) attributes to *false consciousness*.

False consciousness is an adopted set of causal influences by which individuals make judgments potentially against their respective interests. Scarince (2014) submits that the phrase false consciousness is used “to describe a particular state of mind that prevents a person from recognizing the injustice of their current situation [as a result of capitalist societies]” (p.1). Scarince (2014) presents this statement in the context of Marxist doctrine of capitalism but it clearly coincides with the picture that Lukes (2005) presents. Arguably, the ideal of false consciousness is at least related to Lukes’ (2005) discussion of false consensus as a product of individuals’ not voicing grievance when collective position is contrary to her individual wants, needs, values or interests. For “(t)o assume that the absence of grievance equals genuine consensus is simply to rule out the possibility of false or manipulated consensus by definitional fiat” (p. 28). Lukes (2005) explains that

(t)he idea of a dominant or hegemonic ideology which, while not entirely excluding the interests of subordinate groups, ‘operates to conceal or misrepresent aspects of social relations that, if apprehended directly, would be damaging to the interests of dominant elites’” (p. 126).

Now, Scott (1990) breaks down the conception of false consciousness as a mechanism for maintaining the interests of elite ideology with thick and thin theories (Scott, 1990). Lukes (2005) argues that

(t)he thick version claims that a dominant ideology works its magic by persuading subordinate groups *to believe actively* in the values that explain and justify their own subordination...The thin theory of false consciousness, on the other hand, maintains only that the dominant ideology achieves compliance by convincing subordinate groups that the social order in which they live is natural and *inevitable*. The thick theory claims consent; the thin theory settles for resignation.
(p. 126, italics added)

Scott (1990) breaks down the distinction of thin theory of false consciousness as having either of two plausible reasons why a person would be involuntarily subordinate. He precisely refers to these plausible reasons as “A Paper-Thin Theory of Hegemony” (Scott, 1990, p. 82), in fact. The first suggests that it is plausible for a person to become involuntarily subordinate if “the expectation is that one will eventually come to exercise a domination that one endures today is a strong incentive serving to legitimate patterns of domination” (p. 82). In other words, as long as a person believes that one could possibly become a person with whatever level of power that one would aspire to be satisfied, then one is willing to play by the dominant rules of the game as a dominated subordinate. The other reason for Scott suggests that one involuntarily subordinates “providing that [said] subordinates are more or less completely atomized and kept under close observation” (p. 83). This statement and the context from which it was drawn strikes as relevant today in that it brings to mind accountability, the mechanisms, and procedures for monitoring

and controlling activities of subordinate stakeholders throughout the EIC network; especially at the district level (local education agency) and within.

The discussion brings pause at this point, however. Given such a portrayal of false consciousness and its effects on the violence to individual student's values, interests, and such, the representation of Lukes (2005) does not fully speak to the injustices of domination.

Weinstein (2011) and Artiles (2011) speak to findings whereas students' identities are effected by exposure to such societal processes. Crossman (2014) comes to mind and troubles the labeling of false consciousness, in that, a more accurate identification would actually be dual consciousness. Borrowed from W.E.B. DuBois, Crossman (2014) advises that "Dual consciousness exists when people hold one set of beliefs based on the mainstream culture and a contradictory set of beliefs based on their actual experience" (p. 1).

Hay (1997), however, exemplifies a criticism for both a third dimension of power (Lukes, 2005), particularly a conception of false consciousness and the distinctions of thick and thin theories that support this conception (Scott, 1990). Hay's (1997) critique speaks to the "condescending" tone of these theories as she states

(t)he problem with such a formulation is the deeply condescending conception of the social subject as an ideological dupe that it conjures up. Not only is this wretched individual incapable of perceiving her/his true interests, pacified as s/he is by the hallucinogenic effects of bourgeois indoctrination. (p. 149)

Morriss (2002) provides a response to the heart of this very well stated point by Hays (1997). Specifically, he advises that turning the consideration away from the question of whether a puissance consideration implies that a person is "incapable of perceiving his/her true interests"

the argument should have the context of whether or not the environment allows for everyone's growth equivalently, thus considering the potential capacity of all. As he states

If the potentiality argument is to work, then, what is involved is not [that] potentiality as a mere prediction about the future (that is, as a possibility or probability) but potentiality as a currently existing power. In so far as it is a currently existing power – “the power possessed by an entity to undergo changes which are changes to itself, that is, to undergo growth, or better still, *development*.” (p. xix)

Morriss' (2002) cite is especially poignant when considering the quality of education that each student is, or is not, provided. A consideration for where on this spectrum that “education” lay will be developed as the term *engagement* is clarified. Taken a little further, use of the term *provided* is purposeful in that it refers to the provision of education that contributes to the development of the student. Lukes' (2005) counter is at least equally worthy of further consideration in that he points out the “power to mislead [by mechanisms such as] censorship and disinformation” (p. 149), for example. A power to mislead extends to utilization of curricula and standards that fail to provide opportunities to extend knowledge and capabilities to enhance natural creative tendencies and engagement for all students (Ben-Porath, 2013; Hill & den Dulk, 2013). So, the question that remains is what does a “power to mislead” look like? And given evidence of a power to mislead, by element(s) of the EIC, does it characterize causal influence in some form? In other words, given the existence of power, is a “power to mislead” (Lukes, 2005) in evidence given the current literature in the area of education policy and political youth engagement in urban secondary schools? Is this “power to mislead” prevalent in the youth

political engagement literature, as a landscape? And given this landscape, how are these powers realized dynamically as youth political engagement for urban secondary youth?

These questions will be addressed in the Maxcy section in the context of education policy and political youth engagement in urban secondary schools. According to a recent study by Jonasson (2012), this ‘power-to-mislead’ takes form as divergent perceptions of engagement among students and teachers and is manifest in student behaviors. She states what this author presents as the substantive issue of youth political engagement, the heart-of-the-matter if you will, in stating that

In extant research, the concept of student engagement refers to individual behavioural patterns and traits. Recent research indicates that *engagement not only should be related to individual but also should be anchored in the social context*. Results show that teachers and students held diverging perceptions of student engagement that rested on educational goals related to perceived future work settings. This *misrecognition* of the students’ perception of engagement had direct negative consequences for student performance and school attachment. (p. 723, italics added)

The key to the substantive issue is unpacked through an analysis of the term *misrecognition*. Misrecognition, in the context of Jonasson’s (2012) statement, implies a pedagogical disconnect between students and teachers. In the context of this response, the “disconnect” from the individual, or student side, is in students’ perception of politics and their generally perceived ability to ‘make a difference’ through it (Ballard, 2014; Crayton, 2014; Curtis, 2012; Youniss et al., 2002). For the teacher, the “disconnect” occurs through not successfully engaging students’ lived experience and accessing their intrinsic motivations to understand, again given the focus of

this response, the political system (Curtis, 2012; Kahne et al., 2013; Schwartz, 2009). There are policies of logic that impose power of pedagogical practices for teachers (Maxcy, 2011).

Drawing back a little, this misrecognition is a form of the greater power-to-mislead in the spirit of a kind of null curriculum (Flinders, 2013; H. M. Kliebard, 2004; Pinar, 2012) because of the curricular limitations placed on teachers by education policy through the social context. Again as stated by Jonasson (2012), “engagement not only should be related to individual but also should be anchored in the social context.”

Maxcy, therefore, will consist of two subsections. The two subsections will respond to Maxcy’s inquiries, first, from a macro-level or from a perspective of the social context and lastly from an omni-level, or a perspective based from student contexts, presented as an integrating component with the requirements of the greater social-context in which school’s currently operate (Lawson & Lawson, 2013). The macro-level subsection will consist of two sections, moreover. First, drawing from relevant literature, there will be further discussion of *the substantive issue of youth political engagement* and the effects of certain causal influences. This discussion will begin with a determination for what Lukes (1995) means by “power to mislead,” as an exacerbation of misrecognition, for example, and what the literature says as it relates to the incorporation of secondary urban school studies of, and in relation to, youth political engagement as appropriate. The next subsection will discuss and justify the author’s choices of alternatives to adverse findings in-light of evidence of domination through the causal influences of powers to mislead.

Drawing from the relevant educational policy and related literature, there will be a presentation of Urban Regime Theory as a proposed conceptual frame toward further inquiry into youth political engagement for the social influences outside the student as youth political actor. The Maxcy section will conclude with a response toward an omni-level conceptual framework that

discusses and includes a micro-level consideration of the substantive issue, or inside the student as youth political actor. The omni-level subsection will present a conceptual framework toward addressing the dynamic process of youth political engagement for each student.

II. Maxcy

Toward Determining a Macro-level Conceptual Framework: The Social Context of the Substantive Issue of Engagement

Education Policy and Political Youth Engagement in Urban Secondary Schools

The substantive issue of youth political engagement is the system of public education and its' contribution to the *academic opportunity deficit* (AOD) of urban secondary students, as introduced earlier. Picciano & Spring (2013) advise that in reference to school governance and organization "Today, American schools operate on a business model in a network of relationships which decrease voters' control" (p. 3). As such, this response will focus on challenges to youth political engagement of students in American schools, specifically urban secondary students. However, it is submitted that the challenges, such as the aforementioned, that face youth political engagement in the classroom is a symptom of greater learning challenges that sustain the AOD (Ainley, Hidi, & Berndorff, 2002; K. Fischer, Rose, & Rose, 2006; K. Fischer et al., 2004; Roth & Lee, 2007).

The American public education system contributes to the AOD in at least three main ways: 1) by failing to adequately involve families and parents in the activities of the schools as contributing partners (Hill & den Dulk, 2013); 2) by failing to engage students' intrinsic motivations and lived experiences in the learning process (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Kalyuga, 2011; J. Reeve, Deci, E, 1996; Weinstein et al., 2011); and 3) the "professionals" belief that they "know best" as far as what to do for the education of students over the "non-professional," for example, students,

community members, parent or family members (Apple, 1993, 2013; Picciano & Spring, 2013; Tyack, 1974).

The American K-12 public education system is a complex organization that is dominated by, what Picciano and Spring (2013) call, the Education Industrial Complex (EIC). The existence of an EIC-type entities was foreseen and written by folks like Habermas (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005), in term of what he defined as the *public sphere*. Inspired by Baynes (1995), Kemmis and McTaggart (2005), explain a *public sphere* as

“strong publics” of parliamentary and legal subsystems and the “weak publics” of the “public sphere ranging from private associations to the mass media located in ‘civil society’ [which] assume responsibility for identifying and interpreting social problems” [while also taking on the task of being] an opinion-forming public sphere as that of laying siege to the formally organized political system by encircling it with reasons without, however, attempting to overthrow or replace it. (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005, p. 301)

The EIC includes each of these components as mentioned by Kemmis and McTaggart. Figure 2 is reintroduced as Figure 3 below to illustrate how the EIC consists of elements of Habermas’ public sphere.

Figure 3: The EIC as Public Sphere

The *strong publics* of the EIC public sphere, represented by government agencies consist of the parliamentary and legal systems at the center of the network. The *weak publics* of the EIC public sphere would consist in the remaining entities exhibited, the private associations consisting of the think tanks; education technology providers; foundations and venture philanthropists; for-profit education providers; and the various media companies. As Kemmis and McTaggart (2005) advise, this network identifies social problems and interpret them based on their accumulated knowledges. This is a decades old challenge as found by many authors (Apple, 1993; Baker, Corbett, & Gowda, 2013; Berger, 1966; Broudy, 1981; J. Dewey, 1897) As stated previously, the *knowledges*, or beliefs, values and cultures that are lived experiences of those most affected, students, teachers, parents, community members, are foundational for the intrinsically motivated leaning process at optimal levels (K. Fischer et al., 2006; K. Fischer et al., 2004; K. W. Fischer & Rose, 2001) and thus contributing to sustaining this AOD.

Now, to further define what is meant by the EIC, Picciano and Spring (2013) cite the Merriam-Webster Dictionary and its definition of the military-industrial complex “as an informal alliance of the military and related government departments with defense industries that is held to influence government policy” (p. 2). Similarly, the EIC is a loosely coupled group of “networks and alliances [formed] to promote the use of technology and related services in American K-12 education” (Picciano & Spring, 2013, p. 2).

As a complex organization, and large bureaucratically linked system of networks and alliances (Figure 3, previously), the EIC consists of organizations and individuals with powers, interests, beliefs, and values that must be considered for any attempt to analyze classroom level execution of the learning process. It is hoped that this response will not only address the questions presented, but also will plant seeds toward illuminating strategies for balancing the power for the conception and implementation of the learning process toward eliminating the AOD. So, what are the challenges to realizing that which is hoped for? Maxcy (2011), reminds us that state departments of education, for example, desired to centralize control of classroom level instruction since circa the 1990s “states turned to a PA (performance accountability) systems to catalyze improvement in student academic outcomes [which produced policies that] increased the institutional capacity of states to direct local-level reform” (p. 256). Tyack (1974) and others (Airola, 2013; Febey & Louis, 2008) have long since provided support for such activities. Other members of the EIC network, federal agencies, reinforced these actions in 2002 with the No Child Left Behind Act or the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Maxcy, 2011) this illustrating the power of the EIC and its network.

The dynamics of power (Lukes, 2005; Maxcy, 2011; Morriss, 2002; Wedel, 2009), the organizations and individuals among the EIC, are significant. Of the powers potentially

exhibited by the EIC are powers-to-mislead through political authority, autonomy, and manipulation, for example. But how does this power to mislead, in relation to the development of youth political engagement for urban public secondary education system, occur? If this power to mislead is manifest in this manner, in what form of causal influence? Moreover, what is the form of this or these causal influence(s) given the exercise and execution of ideology, profit-making, technology as the structural characteristics of the EIC that effect the political engagement of public urban secondary students.

To begin, the forced assimilation to knowledges, or as Valenzuela (2013) uses the phrase subtractive schooling, is contrary to the learning process, as presented earlier is characteristic of a power-to-mislead. The literature for youth political engagement is fairly extensive for the area of urban secondary students (Ballard, 2014; Checkoway, 2013; Cohen & Chaffee, 2013; Fox et al., 2010; Kahne et al., 2013; Shiller, 2013). But the literature is not as definitive in positing a common understanding and basis from which to consider youth political engagement under influence of specific powers-to-mislead as a challenge or barrier. However, the relevant literature on youth political engagement in public schools, especially for students of color, speaks to an education policy that has foregone allowance of an effective integration of what it is to be a citizen and citizenship (Checkoway, 2013; Curtis, 2012; Sherrod, Flanagan, & Youniss, 2012). An argument for conscious or unconscious intent of said education policy and powers-to-mislead that include restriction to citizenship and free exercise of rights is not within the scope of this response, but, well worth further consideration given the historical record of American public education (Alexander, 2012; Crayton, 2013; Tyack, 1974).

Sherrod, Flanagan, and Youniss (2012) raise the question of “what constitutes citizenship” in asking “Can investment in groups other than the nation state represent a form of citizenship” (p.

265)? In other words, whereas a “citizen” is a person as a part of a nation-state, or group, “citizenship” refers to the behaviors of that person, or lack thereof, perhaps, with loyalty to a culture or group within a nation-state. What constitutes either? Would not a challenge or barrier to the development of either, for the person/student, be indicative of the existence of some power or influence? And moreover, would either not correlate to a students’ motivational level of political engagement?

Sherrod, Flanagan, and Youniss (2012) point to expressions of a person’s loyalty⁷ as a key lynchpin for determining such a distinction, as well as development of a potential relationship between how a power to mislead may be enacted as a barrier to youth political engagement. This is hypothesized, at this point, based on the ideal that loyalty, for a person, consists of “an association to which a person has become *intrinsically* committed as a matter of his or her *identity*” (<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/loyalty/>; also see Endnote “7”; italics added). The significance of the terms *intrinsically* and *identity* will be fleshed out throughout this section.

On one hand, for example, as a *citizen*, does one’s loyalty, say as an immigrant to America from the Ukraine, transfer to America wholly or does said loyalty remain to some extent with the Ukraine and the family, cultures and groups with which one has departed? It is problematic to believe that loyalty to one’s family, for example, would cease because one gains citizenship of another country. So, the intrinsic motivations that link a person to that family should be engaged and integrated as part of the process for becoming a citizen of America. For this is where the immigrant’s personal experiences lie and the current set of values and beliefs were formulated. On the other hand, *citizenship* is realized through the development and exercise of certain behaviors. Sherrod, Flanagan, and Youniss (2002) sum up review of other scholars (e.g. Conover & Searing, 2000; Flanagan & Faison, 2001) in stating that

Whereas a commitment to the rule of law is necessary for democratic governance, a society that is “ruled by the people” also depends on citizens who make informed judgments, who at times object to policies and even (as in many movements for social justice) disobey unjust laws. Good behavior may be one aspect of citizenship, but so is activism or taking action to improve the nation-state, which is frequently not considered good behavior. The exercise of good judgment, as a component of citizenship, involves assessing when behavior is needed to maintain the status quo and when it is necessary to take action to change it. (p. 265)

Therefore, before considering this literature for further discussion upon addressing how power affects education policy in relation to youth political engagement of urban secondary school students, this is a good time for there to be a dedicated focus toward understanding the two phrases: *power to mislead* and *youth political engagement*. The balance of this section will begin with a discussion toward describing the substantive issue of youth political engagement which is the lack of youth political engagement through development in public schools. What constitutes youth political engagement and evidence for the importance of engagement by youth? Next, there will be a discussion toward determining a “policy of logics” (Maxcy, 2011) and how it translates to a power to mislead? Then, the discussion will continue toward considering the existing literature showing potential relationships, as a form of puissance, between powers to mislead through causal influences of political authority over those within the classroom; manipulation by the same; and autonomy of members of the EIC, as barriers to youth political engagement. The contextual goal for the discussion to this point will seek to envision characteristics or a glimpse at the nature of this potential relationship. And to conclude this

section, Urban Regime Theory will be used as a conceptual frame through which to present a structure by which further consideration toward addressing this potential relationship given the existence of the EIC and the power-to-mislead. So, what of political engagement for youth in urban secondary schools?

Youth Political Engagement in Urban Secondary Students

What is political engagement for urban public secondary students? The approach for developing this answer will be a determination of meaning, given relevant literature, for each key term of the phrase. Smith and Hodkinson (2005) define *political* in the following excerpt as

the process for allocating scarce resources. Any desired resource that is not totally abundant – be it money, social prestige, recognition, research grants, or whatever – must be divided up through a political process with some people getting more and others getting less of whatever is desired. (p. 916)

The scarce resource in the case of this response is an education, an *advanced knowledge* (Tyack, 1974), that provides and enhances student engagement in the political process. The matter of abundance is arguable in as much as education with mechanisms for learning for all students is questionable because intrinsically motivating curriculum has been co-opted as illustrated by the causal influences of false consciousness and a power to mislead by agency of the EIC (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Fazzaro, 2006; Goldspink, 2007), for example. As we were advised earlier that intrinsic motivation for students is a lynchpin for loyalty and provides a desire for engagement and persevering through group activities that relevantly benefit the student. But what is engagement, in the context of this response?

The Glossary for Education Reform includes the definition of student engagement “predicated on the belief that learning improves when students are inquisitive, interested, or inspired, and that learning tends to suffer when students are bored, dispassionate, disaffected, or otherwise ‘disengaged’” (<http://edglossary.org/student-engagement/>). Thus, as supported by Deci and Ryan (2000) and others (Kalyuga, 2011; Reeve, 1996), intrinsic motivation would be an acceptable approach to engage students, especially to challenge the power-to-mislead and other obstructions to the learning process. Deci and Ryan (2000) have found and recorded that intrinsic motivation consists of the satisfaction of three areas for a person: feelings of competence; relevance to an issue; and feeling of autonomy toward addressing that which is relevant. Engagement, therefore, as a product of intrinsic motivation, would satisfy the students’ feelings of competence, associating that which is presented as the subject or issue to be learned as relevant to the students’ lived experience, while allowing the student to engage through the experience of feeling autonomous in the endeavor (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Weinstein, Deci, & Ryan, 2011). Weinstein, Deci, and Ryan (2011), moreover, illuminate the importance of identity⁸, as well, as a processional product of motivation and engagement.

Cohen and Chaffee (2013) provide a meaning of political engagement per their findings as various exhibited attitudes and activities. Although Cohen and Chaffee (2013) found through their study that attitudes and activities are social in nature and were primary to their findings. Now, identity, as the lead into Cohen and Chaffee’s (2013) use of attitudes, is contextualized by the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (2014) and represented more relevantly as “personhood⁹” (<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/akan-person/>) and not “identity” (<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/identity/>) as referred to throughout the literature (Greenwood, 2008; Rosales, 2011; Shiller, 2013; Weinstein et al., 2011), which is significant. Personhood

speaks of the nature of an individual person in relation to her community; and it is this way in which an *interacting person*¹⁰ is nurtured, or not, that develops her toward engagement. Said another way, personhood is more relevantly understood, for this response, as activities of a person that exhibit “standards for which individual persons aim that have an important role in how people think of themselves and their place in society”

(<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/akan-person/#PerSocSta>). More plainly said, for example, how a person sees herself portrayed in media affects her sense of personhood. As such, media can arguably be considered as a barrier to the political engagement of students given how one is portrayed even unconsciously (Vedantam, 2010). The media, as the reader may recall, is one of the weak publics of the EIC public sphere. And as such, in such a manner, the media is indicative of a puissance (power)-to-mislead.

Now, Cohen and Chaffee (2013) used five objective categories in their study to define political engagement for adolescents: academics and demographics, as covariates; political knowledge; political attitudes, and political behavior; each of which is potentially representative of an objectively measurable variable. It is troubling to note that the study by Cohen and Chaffee (2013), although enlightening on many qualitative measures in this study relies upon the norm in methodology, quantitative bases for substantiation, and so that each used variable of the study falls short of linking characteristics of personhood, which is social in nature and perhaps better shown through qualitative type processes (Artiles & McClafferty, 1998; Ballard, 2014; Gibbs, 2007; Hesse-Biber, 2004; Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005; Weaver-Hightower, 2014; Weis & Fine, 2004, 2012). For example, Cohen and Chaffee (2013), with the citation of Torney-Purta and Amadeo (2003), reflect the results of their study in stating that

increased civic content knowledge, current events knowledge, general self-efficacy and skill-specific self-efficacy are each independently associated with increased self-reported likelihood of future voting [for example]. These findings build upon and are congruent with other studies (that) have found civic knowledge and self-efficacy to be strong predictors of intended future voting among adolescents. (Cohen & Chaffee, 2013, p. 51)

Cohen and Chaffee (2013) have very positively moved toward more effective indicators of personhood using objective means, however, the measured variables still fall short of considering the bridge between their measured variables and the students' "standards for which [they as] individual persons aim that have an important role in how [they as] people think of themselves and their place in society" (<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/akan-person/#PerSocSta>). And as such, certain objective methodologies are another potential candidate as a barrier to the development of youth political engagement. Toward addressing barriers to intrinsic motivation and personhood (hereinafter used in-place of identity), questions of methodology, or equally significant processes – such as participatory action research (PAR) or youth action research (YPAR) - will be presented and developed in the Scheurich section.

Certain objective methodologies, when not carried out to some level of subjective understanding at the level of 'personhood', as measurable criteria appear to represent the maintenance of the power structure and hegemony of the EIC by provision of tending to inadequate and non-relevant knowledges to the intrinsic motivations and learning of students. Scott (1990) speaks to the importance of tending to subjective variables as a distinction from objective variables in pointing out that when "we take them to be only objective facts, objectively apprehended, we miss much of the social logic (of the person's personhood from lived experiences) by which open

declarations of the hidden transcript operate” (p. 220). In short, Scott (1990) uses the phrase *hidden transcript* to acknowledge that dominated groups “(create), out of its ordeal, a ‘hidden transcript’ that represents a critique of power spoken behind the back of the dominant. The powerful, for their part, also develop a hidden transcript representing the practices and claims of their rule that cannot be openly avowed” (p. xii), thus disclosing yet another potential barrier for youth political engagement.

Immediately I remind the reader of the concept of *policy of logics* presented earlier (Maxcy, 2011). As we may recall, “[educational stakeholders other than students] draw on policy logics, at their different theoretical and empirical stages, as general ideologies to evaluate decisions, procedures and practices” (Maxcy, 2011, p. 254), and therefore become a barrier for the development of the student because said ‘logics’ may not, and often do not, correlate with the “logics” of her experiences. Consequently, knowledges gleaned and acted upon from such policies-of-logic exemplify the same pedigree as the inadequate and non-relevant knowledges mentioned earlier.

Another troubling aspect for using objective variables to measure social facts is that these are *indicators-after-the-fact* that does not reveal leading-indicators of intrinsic motivation, which would speak to the causal influences of values, beliefs, needs, and wants as a bridge to engage students. This neglect of addressing the bridge could also be a barrier to the education process within schools engaging students intrinsically, including political involvement, and thus the potential remedies for their respective situation. Many respected culturally inclusive scholars have provided evidence for countering this barrier in the classroom (Artiles & McClafferty, 1998; Bank, 1993; Deci & Ryan, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 2009), but they are clearly not prevalent

enough across the public school spectrum to continually counteract the policy logics of the perduring greater urban educational system, the EIC, its' power and influence.

Considering these challenges differently, Ballard (2014) found that political engagement “is often used as a broad term referring to a set of constructs including political skills, knowledge, attitudes, behaviors, and goals” (p. 440). However, as Ballard (2014) reminds us, interest and motivation for political engagement, or, as she recognizes, political involvement, means something different for adolescents than it does for adults (Sherrod, Flanagan, and Youniss, 2002; Weinstein, Deci, & Ryan, 2011). This distinction by Ballard reveals that methodology for research is very important if one aspires to analyze power relationships such as those among the EIC and engagement of secondary students. The Scheurich section will develop this ideal further, but for now it is purported that preparation, interpretation, and implementation of a research study in collaboration with ‘those being studied’ should be imperative toward becoming a normative process for research (Artiles, Kozleski, Dorn, & Christensen, 2006; Bowers, 2010; Denzin, 2007; Fox & Fine, 2013; Fox et al., 2010; Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005).

Power to Mislead

Now, given the presentation of the potential barriers to youth political engagements by the education system, to what extent, if at all, do powers-to-mislead contribute? But first, more needs to be fleshed out about the nature of this specific type of power. The potential barriers will be addressed in the Scheurich section also. For now, a co-existing substantive issue of youth political engagement is how false consciousness and the power to mislead effects students’ development as informed, and thus engaged ‘persons’ and citizens. Sherrod, Flanagan, and Youniss (2002) focus reader’s more on the importance of a substantive issue, mentioned previously, being the development of political engagement interests for youth. As they suggest,

More developmental work is needed in fleshing out how, between the ages of 10 and 25, young people's concepts of citizenship expand from a focus on obedience and support of the status quo to a more critical appraisal of a citizen as one who would be irresponsible if she or he blindly obeyed. (pp. 265-266)

So how does this power to mislead challenge the development of secondary public school students in the area of political engagement? Maxcy (2011) represents the significance of the effects of this issue in citing Lukes (2005) statement that

Prevent(s) people, to whatever degree, from having [or providing the opportunity to develop the skill to voice] grievances by shaping their perceptions, cognition and preferences in such a way that they accept their role in the existing order of things, either because they can see or imagine no alternative to it...? (p. 255)

Drawing from earlier in this response, “development” or “growth” of students’ unrealized potential when faced with puissance as an opportunity for students through the classroom experience; whereas *classroom experience* will mean development or growth of students through instructional interaction between student and teacher based on students’ lived experience and instructors’ expertise to enhance said development or growth in such relevant skills as creative interpretation via proven cognitive learning processes (S. Chang, Jia, Takeuchi, & Cai, 2014; K. Fischer et al., 2006; K. Fischer et al., 2004; K. W. Fischer & Rose, 2001; K. W. Fischer & Rose, 1998; Vygotsky, 2004). Vygotsky (2004), for example, find significant relationship among curriculum that consist of the interplay of behavioral patterns from lived experiences and early impressions expressed by students and what he refers to as “organic” and reproductive activities toward creative thought.

Generally, the power to mislead is the significant issue because of these illustrated effects (pouvoir) and affects (puissance) upon the classroom experience. Lukes (2005) tells us that the power to mislead takes many forms, and is most effective through the network of the EIC, [through] straightforward censorship and disinformation (e.g. in the form of engaging students' personhood, or through the use of inappropriate objective measurable variables, as presented earlier) to the various institutionalized and personal ways there are of infantilizing judgment, and the promotion and sustenance of all kinds of failures of rationality and illusory thinking, among them the 'naturalization' of what could be otherwise and the misrecognition of the sources of desire and belief. (p. 149)

This form of the power to mislead is particularly insidious because it could be used unconsciously by bureaucrats – within and without the EIC - who are unaware of the detrimental effects of championing certain 'data-driven findings' that are founded on variables that fall short of considering personhood levels of research. In other words, Lukes (2005) is advising that a first form of the power to mislead by the EIC is by the networks, organizations, and institutionalized values (e.g. standards), interests and beliefs thereof that are enacted to make other judgments infantile or, ill-informed as a prescription for educating students. PA is an example of a tool that reinforces policies of organizations and bureaucracies that are the EIC (Scott, 1990). Such dynamics engage censorship and disinformation in that any judgment other than a judgment to use a curriculum by an agent of the EIC– for example, a curriculum that effectively engages student lived experiences toward 'learning' that which the teacher may attempt to present in the development of students (as defined earlier) – is deemed inappropriate if

‘learning type’ or ‘learning level’ is not achieved in the form of or in the timeframe dictated by enacted policy.

But such “logics of action” (Maxcy, 2011) maintain legitimacy despite the fact that “state and federal actors enacted [these] powerful performance accountability (PA) systems despite limited information on the efficacy of such systems” (Maxcy, 2011, p. 255). Shipps (2008) adds that “Like corporate regimes in general, Newark’s produced some efficiency gains by streamlining the administration *but little in the way of improved student performance*” (p. 96, italics added).

And another form of this power to mislead engages and espouses a “rationality and illusory thinking” to also reinforce the values, beliefs, and interests of the EIC. As far as illusory thinking, it may be represented as a form of disinformation also. The response to Hay (1997) representation that such a claim is condescending to persons applies here also in that said person’s potential is hindered by in-fact hiding an opportunity for development and growth. Now rationality, on the other hand, represents a different lens by which power to mislead is represented in literature (e.g. Lukes, 2005; Picciano & Spring, 2013; Shipps, 2008). Maxcy (2011), for example, speaks of the potentially malleable nature of rational processes for logics of action as political processes when stating that “the governing logics of action among possible alternatives is neither the outcome of *explicit* rational process nor an *overt* political contest, but rather an unreflective acceptance, endorsement of orthodoxy” (p. 254, italics added). The terms explicit and overt in this context clearly paint a picture for a lack of transparency and thus the potential for the execution of a power-to-mislead.

False Consciousness: Authority, Autonomy, and Manipulation

The power to mislead, moreover, is rooted in *false consciousness* (Lukes, 2005). False consciousness is based on causal influence/s that affects the judgment of a subordinate through authority, lack of autonomy, and/or manipulation. Christiano (2013) distinguishes between *theoretical* and *political* authority. Theoretical authority “[does] not normally impose duties on others” and therefore will not be considered a form that affects judgment given use of the term normally and thus not definitive to use given the scope of this response. Political authority, on the other hand “are normally thought to give people reasons for action” (Christiano, 2013, p. 1). To be fair, use of the term ‘reasons’ in this context indicate that political authority is potentially a causal influence only to the extent that there are a certain number of, or degree to which, reasons that compel a person to act contrary to her interest. Political authority is relevant as a distinction in that it is dependent on certain lived experiences, beliefs, values, and interests. The stance in maintaining authority in the form of political authority as compared to coercion as a causal influence in this response is that political authority is not being considered to the extent that an individual’s rights are not in question and, thus, beyond the scope of this response. An example of a reason for a person to comply with a directive from one’s supervisor given the situation that a person has to use the restroom, but there is an urgent call from a client that said supervisor instructs person to take immediately; so, the person uses the restroom on one’s self and takes the call. The person has satisfied the interest of the supervisor and organization but forewent their interest and suffered a level of indignity to do so.

Autonomy

Now, Lukes (2005) explains that “Autonomy has to be understood as embedded in social relationships [and is] about self-determination—living a life that reflects [a person’s] values and wants and needs” (<http://magazine-archives.wustl.edu/spring06/selfdetermination.htm>). So, said

another way, if a person's judgment is affected such that her values, wants and needs are compromised, then *pouvoir* is in evidence and some form of domination, as *puissance*, has been presented. An interpretation of Maxcy (2011) suggests an insidiousness that speaks to a denial of opportunity in that a person's wants produce a person's interests. Autonomy as a *power* to mislead, "derives from an ability to suppress potential conflict by shaping the wants from which interests form" (Maxcy, 2011, p. 255), and therefore should cause pause in one's thinking when presented with "commonsense claims in shaping priorities" (p. 255). The infamous question "what knowledge is of most worth" (Broudy, 1981) comes to mind.

This is where the potency of a power-to-mislead causing action through false consciousness; when considering autonomy and teachers' ability to be pedagogically free and the students' ability to enhance learning through personal lived experiences. Considering the limited autonomy of teachers and the power of the EIC, Bennett and Hansel (2008) remind the reader of theorists' arguments that "Schools are structured (to) conform to societal rules and beliefs, thereby engendering legitimacy with the community and helping to ensure their own survival" (p. 220). But legitimacy as presented to the community may not be that which is most effective for the learning processes of their students. Bennett and Hansel (2008) sum this point up well in stating that

It may be that schooling as it is currently configured has survived because it is in the interest of powerful social or political groups who have similar ways of thinking and similar interests to defend. Schools and school districts, they claimed, are accepted by society as *legitimate* not on the basis of accountability or the outcomes of schools but rather on their conformity to societal expectations. (p. 220).

The power-to-mislead here is exemplified by unproven national policies and curricula that tie the hands of school-level facilitators of learning (Baum, 2003; Darling-Hammond, 2000; Goldspink, 2007). As cited by Bennett and Hansel (2008), “schools have traditionally had strong regulative and normative environments with relatively weaker technical environments, leaving *teaching and learning* largely uninspected” (p. 221). The weak technical environments is an entrée into how this power-to-mislead effects students’ learning by adversely allowing autonomy for the student as well.

Deci and Ryan (2000) speak of autonomy in terms of intrinsic motivation in the context of self-determination theory. “According to [Self Determination Theory], a critical issue in the effects of goal pursuit and attainment concerns the degree to which people are able to satisfy their basic psychological needs as they pursue and attain their valued outcomes” (Deci & Ryan, 2000, p. 227). Clearly, if such needs are obstructed then some form of domination is probable, as *pouvoir* and as *puissance*. In the event that judgment is affected to the extent that a person does not realize “their valued outcomes” because of the obstruction of their respective wants, needs, and/or interest then the person has been dominated. An example, once again, would be a classroom experience by which the optimal level for learning (K. Fischer et al., 2004) is obstructed by mandated curriculum that denies the opportunity to engage lived experiences and other classroom environmental constraints.

Manipulation

An overall conception of manipulation through the EIC, although more covert in nature, it has been argued for decades that a person’s judgment will be affected if there is reason to believe that a valued outcome seems unattainable given subordinates’ lived experiences (Lukes, 2005; Morriss, 2002; Scott, 1990). Scott’s (1990) plausible reasons for a paper-thin theory of false

consciousness (as hegemony) as presented earlier in Seybold comes to mind as an example given the feeling of hopelessness conveyed by the last sentence. Another form of manipulation becomes evident given the parent choice push by the EIC. Maske and Durden (2003) cite Riker (1986) by suggesting

that much of the contemporary work in public choice has focused on the momentary exchange process as applied to politics, with the role of institutions subordinate or missing altogether: but exchanges [of manipulation] take place in a much larger institutional context, and they have implications beyond the moment. For example, politicians and political parties are not just concerned with the voting (exchange) process for a current election cycle, but with the *maintenance of power and influence over time*. Riker proposes that, if the institutional context for political choices (over time) is not considered, then the sub-field of public choice is not needed at all or at best becomes greatly reduced in importance. (pp. 203-204, italics added)

The implication for Riker (1986) for the act of manipulation, therefore, is institutional in nature, or are “composed of cultural-cognitive, normative, and regulative elements that, together with associated activities and resources, provide stability and meaning for social life” (Bennett and Hansel, 2008, p. 217). In other words, an individual’s judgment, as a “subfield of public choice,” must be made having knowledge of the institutional manipulation that persists is realized over time, not in the moment. Is this condition made clear to parents when considering the choice project for their children? Given Riker’s conception of manipulation, puissance has the potential to transform to pouvoir in political contexts. In other words, an agent of an institution when acting on behalf of allocating a scarce resource (Smith & Hodkinson, 2005) for

said institution produces the potential to affect the judgment of others, say a subordinate, to the extent that the subordinate's values, wants, or needs are compromised, then an act of domination has been realized.

American institutional values have historically been the driver for education while trumping the personal interests and motivations of respective students' lived experiences and cultures (Ainley, Hidi, & Berndorff, 2002; Airola, 2013; Fallace & Fantozzi, 2013; Tyack, 1974). Hodgson (2006) advises that "we may define institutions as systems of established and prevalent social rules that structure social interactions [whereby] language, money, law, systems of weights and measures, table manners, and firms (and other organizations) are thus all institutions" (p. 2). As an institution, therefore, the complex organization that is the EIC, and/or its agents, possess causal influences that have been exemplified as *pouvoir* that effect and *puissance* to affect the interests, wants, values, needs, and beliefs of non-EIC agents and organizations.

Urban Regime Theory and Youth Political Engagement

Education policy, as supported by the ideology, profit-making, and technology, coincides with interests of the EIC that are at odds with interests of teachers and students for youth political engagement, at the secondary school level. The conceptual framework that has been chosen to guide further inquiry into political youth engagement is Shipps' (2008) *urban regime theory*.

Why urban regime theory over other conceptual frameworks? There are at least three reasons to which the literature points to as elements that a conceptual framework and approach should address. First, it must be understood that there are no quick-fixes to this complicated matter. Ravitch (2010) summarizes that "The fundamentals of good education are to be found in the classroom, the home, the community, and the culture, but reformers of our time continue to look

for shortcuts and quick answers” (p. 225). Regime theory allows for the analysis of and addressing of each these components. As Cibulka, Fusarelli, and Cooper (2008) suggest that

Without the knowledge of the political landscape, political behaviors, culture, and the prevailing beliefs of political actors, researchers and leaders will have difficulty understanding the complexities of education governance and the best means for improving the governance. (p. 1)

McClendon and Cohen-Vogel (2008) present the Punctuated Equilibrium (PE) Theory which “provides both a conceptual foundation upon which to test propositions about how reform initiatives move dynamically among governmental institutions over time and an analytical framework with which to track changes in the agenda status of policy initiatives” (p. 43). This approach shows promise except for its concentration on state level structures. There are three key reasons why urban regime theory has been chosen as an approach over PE. The EIC is multi-organizational in structure and although state level agencies are included they only form a part of the organizational structure. Next, PE’s approach is initiated given times of crisis, rather than being proactive in nature. And the PE approach, as presented, is focused on higher-education whereas the focus of this response is on secondary schools.

Secondly, as Shipps (2008) has written, “regime theory assumes institutions shape and are shaped by political, economic, and cultural contexts, but it also attends closely to the role of human agency in constructing institutional options and sustaining them over time” (p. 89).

Given the theme of this response, improved political engagement of urban secondary youth through American public education, urban regime theory (regime theory) recognizes that “Institutions help explain stability [which is a primary requirement of bureaucracy of the EIC], but human agency is required for regime change” (Shipps, 2008, p. 89). I depart briefly to paint

a picture of a theory that was very close to be selected for this response as a framework of further inquiry. McLendon and Cohen-Vogel (2008) call “one of political science’s most familiar and well cited contemporary policy theories [known as] Kingdon’s Multiple Streams Model” (p. 30).

The Multiple Streams Model (MSM) is a theory produced as a way to further analyze the decision-making processes of Congress, loosely based on the organizational management of higher education institutions (McLendon & Cohen-Vogel, 2008). Generally, MSM consists of any combination of three processes, or as Kingdon calls them “streams,” that attribute to how policymakers come to establish an agenda to pursue legislatively. The first stream is called the *problem stream*, or that “which policymakers have chosen to interpret as problems” (McLendon & Cohen-Vogel, 2008, p. 32). A second stream would be the *policy stream* which, according to McLendon and Cohen-Vogel, (2008) “consists of the various ideas or solutions ‘developed’ by [selected] specialists in myriad policy communities” (p. 32). The term selected implies the influence, if not power, of a policymaker to select the findings of a study, from say a think-tank or institution of higher education, which may or may not be adequate to address the problem as understood – or misunderstood, as the case may be. And the third stream according to McLendon and Cohen-Vogel (2008) would be the *political stream* which is a process that “consists of developments involving the national mood, interest group politics, and administrative or legislative turnover” (p. 32). Although the MSM does speak of the influence of what Kingdon calls “policy entrepreneurs,” individuals who are described in very similar terms of influence and action as the Flexian, as espoused in this response, the MSM does not seem to analyze at a level of potential influence of those who would best represent the needs of the *student based interest in learning* (discussed later). Nor does the student based interest in learning speak quite to an analysis for how ideas outside think-tanks or institutes of higher

education may form and flex *pouvoir*, over policymakers. Somehow the *problem stream* needs to be understood to be lack of intrinsic motivation and civics engagement within the school environment, along with another stream of influence that purports the same.

Now, the last statement by Shipps (2008) provides an entry point for contemplating regime change through analysis of the relationships institution of public education, as controlled by the EIC (Picciano & Spring, 2013; Wedel, 2010) and individuals within the EIC, on one hand, and teachers, administrators, community members, and students as relevant individuals to the process given the literature of positive relationships for youth political engagement (Checkoway, 2013; Curtis, 2012; Hattam, Brennan, Zipin, & Comber, 2009; Kahne et al., 2013; Shiller, 2013) outside the EIC. Going forward, the group of stakeholders mentioned as “relevant individuals to the process given the literature of positive relationships for youth political engagement (those outside the EIC” will be referred to collectively as the *student-based-interest-in-learning* (SBIL) group.

Lastly, an approach toward addressing the substantive issue that challenges youth political engagement is the now century’s old strategy and process of decentralizing control of schools away from the communities, i.e. beyond school-level (including parents, families, and community members within school’s neighborhood), to state and federal controls (Darling-Hammond, 2000; Goldspink, 2007; H. Kliebard, 2013; H. M. Kliebard, 2004; Ravitch, 2010; Tyack, 1974). Now although no specifically named theories for decentralizing the control of schools by classroom-level interest holders (teachers and students), there are a number of examples whereby centralization has been diminished by delegitimizing each of the centralizing governmental agencies, respectively (Febey & Louis, 2008). Regime theory speaks to a collaborative “partnership” in educational policy construction and implementation among, for

example, SBIL and EIC as opposed to the “involvement” process whereby those of the EIC barely tolerated input from those of the SBIL (Epstein, 1995; Picciano & Spring, 2013; Shipps, 2008).

As we may recall, Epstein (1995) explains that there are three types of *partnership* usually understood in varying degrees from one person to the next. Two types of partnership are understood commonly among administrators, teachers, parents, community members, and students (stakeholders) as *involvement*. The term *involvement*, when used, generally means that the parent or community member, i.e. the non-professional, has an ancillary function to enhance the plans of the teacher or administrator, i.e. the professionals. The third type of partnership is a partnership that is in-line with a proposed reconciliatory approach between the EIC and SBIL, in the words of Baum (2003), includes “actively involving parents and community members in school practices and decision-making, [which] largely stakes out new ground” (p. 33).

Toward closer examination of the institutional dynamics of challenges to youth political engagement, and using the three reasons for choosing urban regime theory as just presented, the analysis will examine institutional structures of the EIC and SBIL separately, first, through the lenses of political, economic, and cultural contexts of each. This subsection will be a process for establishing an approach for reconciliation. And to conclude the Maxcy section, there will be a summary of each analysis toward a proposed reconciliatory education policy that addresses the challenge of the power-to-mislead as a basis for further reconciliatory activities and the elimination of the AOD.

Establishing an Approach for Reconciliation

Any approach toward resolving the issues produced by the interests of the EIC must be a reconciliatory process that redistributes the structure and power of the EIC as a shared structure and source of power for stakeholders within and without the EIC. On one hand, for the EIC, the structure of power, *pouvoir* and *puissance*, for the EIC, consists of s a political context that promotes an ideology that is reinforced by the promotion of technology that permeates the cultural context of the EIC's activities. Additionally, the *pouvoir* by which the EIC operates is one of a power-to-mislead which must be addressed as a part of the overall cultural context. And profit-making as an economic context, in addition to ever increasing school district budget cuts, that should serve as the focus-point and basis from which to develop a strategy that reconciles with "the EIC side" of the developing approach to address the AOD (Picciano & Spring, 2013; Shipps, 2008). A continued discussion of the power-to-mislead will initiate the balance of this subsection in relation to the interests of the EIC will be developed first. Then, a similar process for considering the SBIL will be developed, immediately thereafter, to conclude this section.

As Shipps (2008) advises, "Unlike the power needed to resist change, the power to create it must be collaboratively (and patiently) developed" (p. 92). In other words, using regime theory as the framework, the approach to address the substantive issue would be an effort to develop a mutually beneficial ideology for both the SBIL and EIC to form and an adjusted education policy agenda toward elimination of the AOD. Individuals functioning within the newly proposed network of organizations, as flexian, would be a core function along with district level leadership that is able to adapt and work with bureaucrats among the network of the EIC while not compromising the implementation and maintenance fidelity of SBIL.

Diffusing the Power to Mislead through Urban Regime Theory: Opportunity Expansion

As represented by Lukes (2005) and Scott (1990), the power to mislead, as false consciousness, is the use of manipulation, autonomy, and political authority to realize power through *pouvoir* or *puissance* by the EIC. As we may recall, Lukes (2005) explains the state of false consciousness “operates to conceal or misrepresent aspects of social relations that, if apprehended directly, would be damaging to the interests of the dominant elites” (p. 126). Shipps (2008), in-fact, offers the following statement as a position from which to consider why coalitions, like an SBIL, are influenced by a power-to-mislead. The power-to-mislead is a form of power that emphasizes and regulates for the maintenance of the status-quo while being reinforced by members of the EIC. Shipps (2008) refers to regimes of this type as a *maintenance regime* (p. 90). Clearly, a collaborative effort that has complementing interests could act to diffuse the causal influences of the EIC upon the efforts of SBIL. However, Shipps (2008) presents a problem that faces a movement to dismantle and replace a maintenance regime. As Shipps (2008) states

The inverse relationship between a regime agenda’s ambition and the difficulty of sustaining its coalition is not a new insight. But regime theory provides the conceptual underpinnings for explaining why many persistent urban problems, including poorly performing school systems, *repeatedly elicit the same solutions*, even when those solutions have demonstrably failed: The governing regime is constrained by its own composition to support a narrow set of responses. (p. 94, italics added)

In other words, toward revealing ways to overcome maintenance regimes, the development of processes that are sustainable and are continually fluid, creative in that coalition members sustain cohesiveness, and are effective in influencing policymakers in agenda setting, would be

foundational in advocating for a pro-SBIL education policy. Regime theory, additionally, as a frame for education governance,

views systemic power (as) an impersonal power that is structured into economic, political, or socially advantaged roles – but views it as a *resource* to be used in regime formation, rather than as a decisive factor. Instead, regime theory adopts another conception of power: it is “about the production rather than the distribution of benefits” (p. 91, italics added).

Said another way, the systemic power exhibited by the power-to-mislead, for example, considers power as a potentially positive force that can act as a reciprocal tool to benefit both the EIC and SBIL. An exemplification for breaking the status quo of coalitions following a maintenance regime, urban regime theory provides a lens that potentially may enlighten both the EIC and SBIL toward enhancing student opportunities through “a political process of building and maintaining a stable cross-sector coalition, assembling public and private resources, developing the means by which they will be aligned, and matching those means to ‘an agenda that addresses a distinct set of problems’” (Shipps, 2008, p. 91). Picciano and Spring (2013) would warn, however, that prior to attempting a collectively collaborated ideology and agenda, beneficial to both the EIC and SBIL advocates, certain factors of the current EIC agenda would have to be dealt with. First, each component of the EIC would have to be philosophically reconciled with a philosophy that is conducive to SBIL. Such a philosophy would call for a reconciliation of ideals among the sides that answer the question, “Is [the mission of the education system] one based on capitalist principles of competition and profit-making or is it one based on the need to nurture students and their minds” (Picciano & Spring, 2013, p. 13)?

Next, bearing in-mind that an SBIL coalition would be built from “weakly organized and poorly resourced groups that must be supported by government, typically through regulation, so that they can mobilize the masses,” (Shipps, 2008, p. 94) there would need to be a plan-of-action for governmental regulations that support rather than dominate the interests of the SBIL, specifically those that directly affect the operation and learning processes at the school building level. The Multiple Stream framework comes-to-mind in those cases would need to be made to influence at least two of the three streams, those streams being problem, policy, and or politics, of influence for policymakers (McLendon & Cohen-Vogel, 2008). Now, let us consider each of the EIC components toward establishing a basis for reconciliation.

The ideology of the EIC, as provided by Picciano and Spring (2013), is constructed around three main principles: 1) to “privatize schooling with regulation turned over to the ‘invisible hand of the marketplace’” (p. 4); and 2) to “favor choice of public schools and charter schools that would teach a standardized state curriculum and tests” (p. 4); and 3) to “limit choice and privatization by asserting that schools should serve public goals and reflect public control” (p. 4). Shipps (2013) presents that the ability to reconcile these ideological principles depends on the current state of “governmental and economic contexts” (p. 97), for each side, of the area are in-play and to what degree. For SBIL advocates there are four contextual variables: 1) “the condition of the [areas] democracy” (p. 97); 2) “the level of intergovernmental support” (p. 97); 3) “the city’s market position for private investors; and 4) “is the city’s share of the national product increasing or decreasing” (p. 97)? The degree to which each of these factors is in-play, will dictate the level of conflict that will need to be addressed toward reconciling each sides’ ideological position.

The second component, technology, is significant in the agenda of the EIC. Information and communication technology (ICT), as an adopted ideological tool, is advocated for

implementation of more effective administrative tasks in K-12 and an increase of online courses. As Shipps (2008) defines, “The third [or profit making] component of the education-industrial complex is made up of entities that profit by providing goods and services to schools and colleges” (p. 7). To conclude, the driving principle for reconciling these components, however, must be based in diffusing each of the effects of powers-to-mislead at the classroom level.

First, addressing the *pouvoir* and *puissance* of authority, dignity must be a product of judgments that are beneficial for the interests of students and those stakeholders who produce students’ environment for an optimal-level for learning. To this point, however, regime theory has not spoken to the student-side of engagement for a proposed conceptual framework. Lawson and Lawson (2013), for example, suggest that engagement is a process-oriented dynamic involve “elements [that] reflect a complex set of interactions and transaction between people and their social environment” (p. 441). In-fact, if the suggested conceptual framework were left solely with Urban Regime Theory, Hay’s (1997) challenge to Lukes (2005), earlier, in being condescending to the intellect of students would have fertile ground to regain traction. Stone (2006) in his work Power, Reform, and Urban Regime Analysis reminds us of Morriss’ (2002) distinction earlier in stating that

Although “power over” (*pouvoir*) and “power to” (*puissance*) are conceptually distinct, in political reality they are intertwined. As forms of “power to,” urban regimes are not neutral mechanisms, but are forms of empowerment. Still, they may come less out of a contest of wills around fixed preferences and more out of how preferences are shaped by relationships. (p. 23)

In keeping with this response’s goal of determining a conceptual framework for the enhanced political engagement of students, there must be a relationship built between the EIC, as a macro-

level of student engagement, and the SBIL, as a representation for the micro-level of student engagement. This position will be elaborated upon shortly.

Toward Determining an Omni-level Conceptual Framework: Integrating the Individual-Student Context of the Substantive Issue of Engagement

As presented earlier, students suffer from an academic opportunity deficit (AOD), in part, due to a lack of political engagement. False consciousness and misrepresentation, as a form of a power-to-mislead by macro-level sources, are realized and maintained through these tools at the micro, or student, level. The realization of the existence of these tools, for example, is evidenced through curricular practices that mute youth political engagement (Ballard, 2014; Fox et al., 2010; Jenkins & Carpentier, 2013; Kahne et al., 2013). How? The “how” will be determined by discussing the tenants of social-ecological theory as a micro-level representation that reveals the effects of the societally influenced false consciousness and misrepresentation for students.

Lawson and Lawson (2013) provide eight areas of consideration toward accomplishing this goal. Three of these areas are methodological in-nature and will be discussed to conclude this response. The five areas that will be discussed immediately are: 1) through a discussion of a distinction between motivation and engagement (J. D. Finn & Zimmer, 2012; Martin, 2012; Reschly & Christenson, 2012); 2) through a discussion of three external challenges to student engagement (Green et al., 2012; J. Reeve, 2012; Skinner, Furrer, Marchand, & Kindermann, 2008; Tseng & Seidman, 2007); 3) through a deeper discussion that considers why a micro-level distinction for engagement is needed (Reschly & Christenson, 2012); 4) through an introduction and discussion for the validity for further inquiry through social ecological frameworks (U Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1994; Urie Bronfenbrenner & Ceci, 1994; Ungar, 2011); and, to conclude the Maxcy section, through a discussion of relevant elements of engagement as a process

(Galster, 2012; Holme & Rangel, 2012; Tate, 2012; Wells et al., 2012); but first, a brief introduction to the micro-level of this discussion.

Inspired by Finn (1989) and others (Mahoney, Cairns, & Farmer, 2003; J. Mahoney, 2000), Lawson and Lawson (2013) reiterate this important consideration in stating that

work on how the social environment influences engagement and disengagement processes, nascent research in adolescent development shifts the influence of the social environment from the background to the foreground. Here, studies that employ frameworks known as *developmental contextualism* (Lerner & et.al, 2005) and *holistic interactionism* (Mahoney et al., 2003; J. L. Mahoney, 2000) frame student engagement as a complex interplay between students' activity involvement, competencies, dispositions, and expectancies and their surrounding social environment. These theories also implicate a dynamic and synergistic process, and they can be interpreted as recommending a transactional conceptualization of engagement. (p. 442, italics added)

Historically, however, has not been transactional but one-sided from societal dictates as a driver for education by neglecting to incorporate, not to mention establishing the learning and engagement process through the personal interests and motivations of students' lived experiences and cultures (Ainley, Hidi, & Berndorff, 2002; Airola, 2013; Fallace & Fantozzi, 2013; Lawson & Lawson, 2012; Tyack, 1974). This omni-level approaches the question of civic engagement of secondary students from a sustentative position. In other words, the review of the relevant literature will discuss political engagement, as an example of the greater learning engagement issues of the education system, toward balancing out the transactional one-sidedness that have

supplanted student values, interests, and motivations in the classroom through policy logics (Maxcy, 2011).

First, Cohen and Chaffee (2013) found that an integral part of student interest and motivation in the area of political engagement is formed through developed attitudes via skill-specific activities that are relevant to the respective student. Lerner (2002) speaks to conceptual frameworks that engage the learning process through forms of contextual development of concepts. Lerner (2002), for example, advises that meaning through conceptual frames “are developed and interpreted within the context of a given philosophical perspective [and as such] we need to understand the different philosophical assumptions on which the study of development can be based” (p. 48). Moreover, Lawson and Lawson (2013) take this advisory a step further in suggesting that students’ philosophical perspectives are influenced “factors that are external to the student” (p. 452). Such observations reinforce a need to discuss engagement from both a macro and micro-level to student perspectives.

And the second component is to consider and discuss relevant civics coursework may be developed, in-lieu of the societal misrepresentations painted throughout this response to this point. In other words, to discuss ways in which “education programs can intervene” (Cohen & Chaffee, 2013, p.43) that both engages students’ interests, motivations, and lived experiences, primarily, and satisfies institutional interests that effect the operation of schools and teachers’ ability to be most effective for students (Curtis, 2012; Febey & Lewis, 2013).

Motivation and Engagement

The literature on youth engagement is far from agreement when it comes to defining this phrase (J. D. Finn & Zimmer, 2012; Green et al., 2012; Lawson & Lawson, 2013; Martin, 2012; J.

Reeve, 2012; Reschly & Christenson, 2012; Skinner et al., 2008). A breathe level review of this literature reveals a conflation of the terms motivation and engagement in understanding and researching youth engagement (Lawson & Lawson, 2013). For example, Lawson and Lawson (2013) advise that “engagement is theoretically distinct from students’ motivations (and) although student motivation may reflect the direction of students’ energy toward [civics] in the classroom, engagement is thought to represent the affective, cognitive, and behavioral activation of that energy and direction” (p. 435). Clearly, an understanding of this distinction should be fleshed out before pursuing further discussion and analysis of any level of student engagement. A brief representation for each of the types of engagement will be presented before proceeding.

Affective Engagement

Lawson and Lawson (2013) found that “Researchers use the term *affective/emotional* engagement to describe students’ social, emotional and psychological attachments to school (from an) institutional view (from) students’ feelings of relatedness to school overall” (pp. 435-436). An example of affective engagement is provided by Cohen and Chaffee (2013) by finding that civic engagement through the exhibition of various attitudes and activities exercised by students, that mirror Lawson and Lawson’s (2013) categories of engagement. Somewhat similarly, Ballard (2014) found that civic engagement “is often used as a broad term referring to a set of constructs such as civic skills, knowledge, attitudes, behaviors, and goals” (p. 440).

For adolescents, on the other hand, there are four motivations, “material gratifications, social gratifications, civic gratifications, and desire to influence collective policy” (p. 443). For Ballard (2014), though, there are “at least two theories of motivation worth mentioning as they give rise to more recent and more specific theories of motivation in the domains of civic and political development” (p. 442), the theories of Lewin (1944/1951) and Deci and Ryan (2000).

According to Ballard (2014), “Lewin understands motives as goal-directed forces related to one’s values” (p. 443) as one approach and “a second approach to understanding motivations in other psychological domains draws on the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivations” (p. 443). Gratifications through intrinsic motivation speak to an individual’s satisfaction of innate needs and desires as opposed to extrinsic motivations and amotivations that motivate either superficially or not at all (Ryan, 1993; Deci & Ryan, 2000).

Cognitive Engagement

Lawson and Lawson (2013) recorded that “studies of students’ “in the moment” cognitive engagement (i.e., cognitive engagement states) typically describe the ways in which students think deeply about ideas and concepts [such as political or engagement]” (p. 436). However, in terms of intrinsic motivation, Deci and Ryan (2000) speak to the significance of student gratification and the attachment process to environmental stimuli; again ringing reminiscence of environmental stimuli including external factors mentioned a short time ago. For them, relatedness or relevance to external stimuli is a principle component for intrinsic motivation as a vehicle toward satisfaction of a desire or need as a sense of gratification.

The relatedness and relevance for students would be how these external stimuli misrepresent optimal ways in which knowledge is acquired for learning, i.e. through adverse curricula and pedagogies, and for addressing challenges that students experience everyday outside the classroom and schoolhouse. If external sources, paraphrasing Newman and Wehlage (1993), do not “highly (engage) and intrinsically (motivate) students (to) take a particularly disciplined approach toward learning that extends beyond a desire to simply understand class content” (p. 436), which contextually includes not being made aware of political matters as a specific tie to this response. In further discussing relevance or relatedness, Deci and Ryan (2000) explain that

Relatedness refers to the desire to feel connected to others—to love and care, and to be loved and cared for (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Bowlby, 1958; Harlow, 1958; Ryan, 1993). Like us, Baumeister and Leary argued that relatedness is a fundamental need, and the idea of relatedness as a need is central to, although not widely discussed in the field of attachment. (p. 231)

Sherrod, Flanagan, and Youniss (2002), as presented by Ballard (2014), also illustrate how the literature considers civic engagement of youth in terms of outcomes as dictated by societal needs in stating that outcomes are indicative of “The What, Why, When, Where, and Who of Citizenship Development” (Sherrod, Flanagan, & Youniss, 2002, p. 264), rather than merely the interests and motivations of youth. In addition to being an example of external factors in action, this exemplifies a nurturing of false consciousness of students. How? As they state by identifying that “personal satisfaction, collective efficacy, and contributing to shared national values” (p. 443) are used as an extrinsic motivation for civic engagement, but is also a form of amotivation for students. For Deci and Ryan (2000), extrinsic motivation is amotivational because even “fully internalized extrinsic motivation does not typically become intrinsic motivation. [Fully internalized extrinsic motivation] remains extrinsic motivation because, even though fully volitional, it is instrumental rather than being what Csikszentmihalyi (1975) referred to as autotelic” (p. 237), “(of an activity or creative work) having a purpose in and not apart from itself” (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/autotelic>). Said another way, fully internalized extrinsic motivation does not satisfy the intrinsic motivational characteristic of relatedness as discussed earlier. An example of an external motivation would be the education is the key to success in life. The external motivation for accomplishing this conception is to do well on things like standardized tests, for example (Ben-Porath, 2013; Bowers, 2011; Fazzaro,

2006). In-fact education policy mandate standardized tests and various monitoring criteria for schools and districts not inclusive of adequate time and credit for utilizing intrinsically motivating curricula and pedagogy (Artiles, 2011; Darling-Hammond, 2000; K. Fischer et al., 2006; K. Fischer et al., 2004; K. W. Fischer & Rose, 2001; K. W. Fischer & Rose, 1998; Helfenbein, 2012; Ravitch, 2010; Thorne, 2011). Such practices are indicative of false consciousness for students and parents, while being a misrepresentation of optimal learning as well (J. Dewey, 1897; Greenwood, 2008; Nishida & Fine, 2014; Searle, 1995; Shiller, 2013; Weinstein et al., 2011).

Ballard (2014) speaks of the link between the ideal of relatedness in relation to student needs and attitudes based from the context within which the student is and has been exposed to outside stimuli and their effect on student civic involvement. There are five contexts, according to Ballard (2014), that effect students' attitude toward feeling as if an opportunity to satisfy needs. The five contexts are "cultural practices, family values and culture, peer group values and activities, neighborhood composition, and school climate" (p. 441), which are each, in their respective ways, societally influenced in nature but different in influence for each student and how each, individually and collectively, motivate as a "dynamic interaction between values, goals, and experiences" (p. 443) of the student intrinsically. Hill and den Dulk (2013) have found that levels of volunteerism, for example, in adolescents is related to intrinsic motivation, but they most definitively found that schooling type, Public, Protestant, Catholic, Private, or Homeschool, was the most conclusive context for civic involvement, through volunteerism, beyond secondary school. But, what does this say as far as behavioral engagement for secondary students given societally influenced contexts, the type of school attended, and the level of intrinsic motivation?

Behavioral Engagement

Lawson and Lawson (2013) explain behavioral engagement “prosocial conduct indicators, such as the amount of time students spend on homework or the extent to which students comply to school rules” (pp. 436-437). Ballard (2014) has found that civic engagement for adolescents, as an example of behavioral engagement, is not limited to activities such as volunteerism. “We have seen,” Obradović and Masten (2007) states, “that SES (socioeconomic status) is positively correlated with measures of activity involvement and citizenship, but not with volunteering” (p. 17). Andolina, Jenkins, Keeter, and Zukin (2006), as provided by Ballard (2014), suggest that the definition must answer the question of how does this meaning gratify the students’ needs, respectively, for a sense of “organized voluntary activity focused on problem solving and helping others” (p. 181)? Moreover, the socioeconomic status of the urban secondary student, in addition to the school type as contexts, must be a distinguishing factor to answer this question (Andolina, Jenkins, Keeter, & Zukin, 2006; Sherrod, Flanagan & Youniss, 2002).

External Challenges that Affect Youth Engagement

There are three overarching challenges that affect youth engagement in the literature (Lawson & Lawson, 2013). Two of the challenges are temporal in nature in that each respectively purports that motivation, engagement, and outcomes of said engagement differ as challenges based on the order of occurrence as a process. Ballard (2014) advises that “Civic development is situated in social contexts and local institutions” (p. 445). Rubin (2007), as conveyed by Ballard (2014), “found that young people develop their civic identities as reactions to their everyday experiences” (p. 445). Everyday experiences, as influenced by their respective exposure to “civic institutions and individuals” (Ballard, 2014, p. 445), are negative to an extent for a large

number of students. Levinson (2010), for example, found that the context of school is “a particularly important context for civic development” (cited in Ballard, 2014, p. 445).

Weinstein, Deci, and Ryan (2011) warn that to the extent that an outside stimulus is causing a students’ feeling of being forced to integrate that which is being presented proportionally, the student will resist acceptance as an intrinsically generated ideal to act upon. In other words, the degree to which an adolescent accepts an ideal presented by either of the five contexts offered by Ballard (2014) earlier depends upon the extent to which the student is able to wrestle with it autonomously and come to accept in accordance with the beliefs and values already accepted by the student. Moreover, the extent that a student finds a proposed ideal unjust, and feels that she or he can do something about it, effects the degree to which the student develops a social attitude toward engaging, attempting to find, and act upon, a remedy (Ballard, 2014; Hill & den Dulk, 2013; Obradović & Masten, 2007). As Matsuba, Hart, & Atkins (2007) and others (e.g., Cemalcilar, 2009; Penner, 2003, as cited in Ballard, 2014) found, the degree to which a student reconciles “Social attitudes such as a feeling that one belongs to their community, endorsing social responsibility, empathy for others, and feeling civic obligation” (p. 441) as principles to be wrestled with are rectified, outside ideals will be problematic. And to the extent to which each student reconciles these principles, motivation to act is reciprocated toward civic involvement, for example (Ballard, 2014).

Checkoway (2011) and others (e.g., Au, Bigelow, & Karp, 2007; Oakes & Rogers, 2006) found that the ideals that are not reconciled with could be challenged in secondary schools by teachers, but “there are institutional obstacles to their ideals” (Checkoway, 2011, p. 391). Such findings fly directly in the face of school climate being a principle context within which civic engagement is nurtured (Ballard, 2014). Barber and Battistoni (1999) and many others (e.g., Colby,

Beaumont, Erhlich & Corngold, 2010; Ehrlich, 2000; Jacoby & Ehrlich, 1996; Jacoby, 2009) found additionally that secondary schools that serve predominantly minority students (do not) “emphasize constructions of democracy” (Checkoway, 2011, p.391), thus disallowing an opportunity for secondary minority students for gaining competence in the area of civics, thus decreasing the opportunity to engage (Obradović & Matsen, 2007; Weinstein, Deci & Ryan, 2011).

Obradović and Matsen (2007) emphasize, “belonging to a social group provides youth with opportunities to further exercise [civic] skills” (p. 4), the lack of which has long been a barrier to students of color, specifically students of low socio-economic status (Youniss & et.al, 2002). Youniss and others (2002), for example, advise that “It is known that adolescents group together for purposes of distinguishing their own from other crowds [so that] disparate groups could become increasingly polarized or find bonds of common ground and a shared frame of reference” (p. 134). From Tyack (1974) enlightening the reader to the phenomenon of “advanced knowledge” being used to keep the elite in power to Valencia (2010) speaking of the ideal of deficit thinking and the societal norm of “othering” have such barriers been exemplified. These barriers and processes have perdured through American public education history and permeated the institutions within it. These barriers and processes, moreover, have produced environmental contexts from which beliefs and values have negatively influenced students by providing a lack of opportunities to engage students of color.

Ben-Porath (2013) and many other authors (e.g., Checkoway, 2013; Cohen & Chaffee, 2013; Curtis, 2012; Jenkins & Carpenter, 2013; McGovern 2013; Tyack, 1974) have found and recorded a historically and sociologically negative influence by institutions and individuals on the environmental contexts of students of color and specifically those students of families and

communities who are economically challenged (Naughton, 2013). David Tyack (1974) actually speaks of a withholding of advanced knowledge from persons of color historically. For Tyack (1974), there have always been groups that have conspired “to keep black children ignorant, to keep them from the advanced knowledge that they needed for their liberation” (p. 113). Such advanced knowledge is exemplified in students as citizens being active in the political processes and the resources for which those in power allocates, or not (Apple, 1993; Boggs, 2000; Crayton, 2013; Crayton, 2013a; Horowitz, 1969; Jenkins & Carpentier, 2013; Shipps, 2008). Hill and den Dulk (2013) remind us the effects of such negatively influenced contexts when stating that “It is important to note that feeling concern for the welfare of others is not a sufficient explanation of intrinsic motivation. One might have this concern yet fill entirely ill-equipped to act on it” (p. 183) or exist in a state of civic illiteracy. Disallowing students of color, specifically those who are economically challenged, denies them the opportunity to feel competent because of being ill-equipped through public education, in matters such as the integration of civics, thus continuing this denial of civic literacy.

The Constructs of Institutional Contexts and the Maintenance of Inequality

Richard Valencia (2010) illustrates the inequality of deficit thinking that permeates the consciousness and unconsciousness of institutions and the produced contexts among individuals in society. Kimberley Clark (2012) speaks to the irresponsible nature of not teaching and engaging students in civics in a manner that allows the ability for students of color and of economic challenge to wrestle with societal stimuli that conflict with lived experiences. As Clark (2012) presents:

How to teach young people about the grave ecological and social crises of our times without crushing their sense of possibility? The author has come to believe that the nature of these crises, together with a widespread weakening of civic and democratic culture, makes it irresponsible to teach young people about “the world as it is” without simultaneously giving them opportunities to develop capacities for collective agency (p. 354).

Consciousness of discriminate inequality, especially in-light of knowledge of states of being for low socio economic students of color, as a correlation to socio-economic status, is important. This correlation is important because it affects how education is understood and how education is conveyed. Additionally, this correlation is important because it reveals how students’ roles as citizens are developed with knowledge and hope to change one’s circumstances. And to not address this inequality one would be aiding in not fulfilling the historic purpose of public education (Buckley, 2010; Clarke, 2012; Cohen & Chaffee, 2013; Foote, 2005; Kapitzke & Hay, 2011; Lee, Robinson, & Sebastian, 2012). Cohen and Chaffee (2013) set the stage for becoming and remaining conscious of inequalities in education by finding and conveying that “White students and students from high socioeconomic status backgrounds are more likely to receive civics education that builds their civic knowledge and skills than non-White students and students from low socioeconomic status backgrounds” (p. 44). This inequality in preparation for citizenship is exacerbated by the findings that civics is consistently being cut back or removed from all public school curricula (Curtis, 2012; Fallace & Fantozzi, 2013).

Alexander (2012) speaks to another contemporary context of denial of civic literacy through maintained inequalities in finding that the highest concentrations for such illiteracy is among urban school districts with the higher proportion of populations of students of color and low socio-economic populations (see, also, Ben-Porath, 2013; Checkoway, 2013; Cohen & Chaffee,

2013; Curtis, 2012; Jenkins & Carpenter, 2013; McGovern 2013). In the school environment and climate, wrestling with the historical, negative and positive, conscious and unconscious, the impact of conflicting influences that students are presented with in school breeds the development of competence by allowing students to more readily engage lived experiences. However, the overall environment would have to set the stage to promote this development in an autonomous manner (Weinstein, Deci & Ryan, 2011; Pinar, 2012). Ballard (2014) advises that the probability to engage issues civically beyond secondary school is enhanced as student interests and motivations are reconciled with the students' lived experiences.

From Student Interests and Motivations to Civic Attitudes and Civic Knowledge

It is well established in the literature (see, for example, Deci & Ryan, 2000; Dewey, 1990; Dewey, 1991; Erickson-Nepstad, 1997; Paavola, Lipponen & Hakkarainen, 2004) that student's lived and living experiences establish values and beliefs that link significantly to the learning process. Thus, affecting student beliefs and values reveals a potential route toward eradicating the denial of advanced knowledge, civic involvement, or civic literacy by adjusting the learning process to incorporate lived and living experiences. Weinstein, Deci, and Ryan (2011), moreover, emphasize the importance of recognizing that cultural differences are important to integrating values, beliefs and interests. As they state, "there is considerable variability in the values and goals held in different cultures, suggesting that some of the avenues to basic need satisfaction may differ widely from culture to culture" (p. 246).

To address the limitations and reductions of civic knowledge and engagement by urban secondary students, it is anticipated that the product of this study will be utilized by public schools to develop and utilize relevant material to promote and evoke student interests in the

learning endeavor focused on increasing civic literacy and engagement (Checkoway, 2013; Obradović and Masten, 2007; Shiller, 2013). Toward achieving these goals, analysis of student interviews will be collaborative in that student interpretation will act as the meaning making mechanism of the researchers' interaction with the students. Thus, the questions that the study seeks to address are:

- 1) In the perspectives of a group of urban high school students, how should we define civic literacy? Are there elements of civic knowledge essential to democratic participation? If so, what are those elements?
- 2) In the perspectives of a group of urban high school students, what aspects of civic knowledge are most predictive of civic engagement?
- 3) In the perspectives of a group of urban high school students, has the growth of social media fostered or inhibited civic literacy?
- 4) In the perspectives of a group of urban high school students, why have previous efforts to improve civics education failed?

Overall, these questions aim toward addressing that which Fazzaro (2006) reminds us, “at base (public education) is about the role of education in the allocation of values through politics” (p.12), but whose politics remains the question.

III. Scheurich

Collectively, this response is the development toward a dissertation thesis if granted doctoral candidacy. This section will consider the use of PAR (participatory action research) and YPAR (youth participatory action research) as processes, not methods (Fine, 2008), toward the development of an SBIL based educational environment while addressing the challenges presented in the Seybold and Maxcy sections, respectively. The structure of this section, Scheurich, will consist of three subsections toward the development of a supporting process to support the author's dissertation thesis with the aforementioned challenges serving as the foundation.

First, there will be a description of the historical development of PAR from its beginning to the present including its key current characteristics. Next, there will be a transition in describing the emergence of YPAR from PAR and a discussion of YPAR's current key characteristics. Throughout this section, there will be brief discussions of at least three "high quality" research examples of YPAR as expressed in the relevant literature that supports speaking to the challenges to youth political engagement in urban secondary public schools. And to conclude, there will be a discussion of this section collectively as a potential application to my dissertation research, practically, using characteristics of YPAR to address the challenges to youth political engagement as presented throughout this response.

A Historical Development and Key Characteristics of PAR

Fine (2008), through *An Epilogue, of Sorts*, has provided content and context from which to structure a basis for initiating a representation for the historical development of participative action research (PAR), and its evolved version, youth participative action research (YPAR). The content and context presented establishes key characteristics for each as tools toward achieving a reconciliation of the education policy challenges to urban secondary youth and political

engagement as presented in the Seybold and Maxcy sections of this response. Historically, other “methods” for conducting studies have served to maintain a research structure conducive to the EIC, the interests of the EIC, and an environment within which the power-to-mislead has been incubated (Denzin, 2007; Hesse-Biber, 2004; Weaver-Hightower, 2014). PAR, on the other hand, was borne and evolved as a “radical epistemological challenge to the traditions of social science” (Fine, 2008, p. 214) is not a method but rather a process, and mechanism, to “(breakdown) hegemonic beliefs into their basic elements and then creating novel conceptions to express new situations [whereby] the interests of the dominant class are articulated with the needs, desires, interests of subordinated groups” (Fine, 2008, p. 216). Before a more detailed discussion of PAR and YPAR, I ask the reader to consider a brief historical presentation of the context through which these processes evolved.

The earliest form of PAR, as Chambers (1994) conveys, was realized as Activist Participatory Research in late 1960’s Latin America by the education giant Paulo Freire. Freire’s foundational work in indigenous studies, including *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, brought into focus a consideration of the exploited in societies while also providing direction toward taking action against such societal ills (Chambers, 1994). As the reader may recall, Freire (2003) speaks of the importance of dialogue to gain better understandings among folks as a mechanism for challenging inequalities. As Freire (2003) exemplifies in stating that “the dialogue cannot be reduced to the act of one person’s ‘depositing’ ideas in another, nor can it become a simple exchange of ideas to be ‘consumed’ by the discussants” (p. 89). Said another way, the process of dialogue inspires an environment and spaces by which folks of different societal positionalities can communicate openly while gaining mutual understandings toward a more equal and mutually beneficial societal environment for each. Most importantly, works such as Freire’s brought to

light the importance of indigenous peoples doing their own investigation and analysis (Chambers, 1994).

Since the work of Freire (2008), research has experienced an evolution of “methods” on becoming ever more conscious of inequalities among folks in societies and coming to realize that the discourse sought by Freire was one-sided as has been presented in this response through the Seybold and Maxcy sections. Toward addressing these inequalities, the next iteration of research came to be known as Participatory Research (Chambers, 1994). Participatory Research emerged in the mid 1970’s and has a strong relationship to Participatory Action Research of today (Chambers, 1994), which will be discussed shortly.

Participatory Research (PR), according to Chambers (1994), is similar to Activist Participatory Research in that it not only focuses on the poor of society but it also includes the analysis of the condition and levels of powerlessness of the poor as well (Chambers, 1994). Cornwall and Jewkes (1995) note a epistemological departure from conventional research methodology with the accelerating use of PR. As they state

In conventional research and extension, inappropriate recommendations have frequently followed from a failure to take account of local priorities, processes and perspectives. In contrast, in participatory research the emphasis is on a "bottom-up" approach with a focus on locally defined priorities and local perspectives. (p. 1667)

This epistemological departure evolved yet again as researchers learned that more needed to be done with that which was conveyed through defining local priorities and perspectives. Rahman (1985) exemplified what had become an evolution of PR based on the need to advocate for that

which was being revealed. This evolving form would soon come to be known as Participatory Action Research (PAR) by the early 1990's (Chambers, 1994). Kemmis and McTaggart (2005) actually introduce us to what a next evolution of PAR called critical participatory action research (CPAR), developed in the late 1990s. CPAR speaks more specifically to the research process, its conduction, and analysis of the data as a cycle that “(involves) a spiral of self-reflective cycles of the following: planning a change; acting and observing the process and consequences of the change; reflecting on these processes and consequences; replanning; acting and observing again; [and] reflecting again, and so on” (p. 276). However, Scheurich only asks for response through the era of PAR. And so, what is the historical development of PAR?

As Weis and Fine (2004) have written, “Much work over the past 20 years focuses on the ways in which social inequalities along racial, social class, and gendered lines are sustained through schools” (p. 121). PAR, as a process, is distinct from Activist Participatory Research and PR in that PAR analyzes inequalities in society due to the manipulations of knowledge by the powerful (Chambers, 1994) while utilizing various methods “to interrogate the conditions of oppression and surface leverage points for resistance and change [while being] designed to unveil the ideological and material architecture of injustice” (Fine, 2008, pp. 213-216). Rahman (1985), as cited by Fine (2008), provides a further understanding of the epistemology that becomes PAR in stating that

The distinctive viewpoint of PAR [recognizes that the] domination of masses by elites is rooted not only in the polarization of *control over the means of material production* but also over *the means of knowledge production*, including...*the social power to determine what is valid or useful knowledge*. (p. 119, italics added)

The content was italicized to introduce the three bases from which further inquiry into the power-to-mislead and false consciousness as an integration of the key characteristics of YPAR later in this response. Meanwhile, Fine (2008) presents a conceptual lens through which PAR provides insight as a research process. As she states, PAR analyzes “with a critical gaze on *institutions* where (in) justices reign and human spirits are mangled, in the name of schooling” (p. 214, italics added). As the reader may recall, this response has presented institutional power structures that have illuminated injustices in the form of domination over urban secondary students, for example, through manifestations of false consciousness and barriers to the engagement of intrinsic interests and motivations – mangling their human spirits.

Fine (2008) makes clear that PAR’s critical gaze does “care about traditional features of social inquiry, in particular objectivity and bias, validity, and generalizability” (p. 221). These areas will be discussed as key characteristics of PAR. Additionally, Fine (2008) advises that, for PAR, “there is not just one legitimate way to conceptualize [strong] objectivity” (p. 221) because there is not a monopoly on whose knowledge is of most worth. Strong objectivity for Fine (2008) is exemplified as an

(exercise by which) researchers work diligently and self-consciously through their own positionalities, values, and predispositions, gathering as much evidence as possible, from many distinct vantage points, all in an effort to not be guided, unwittingly and exclusively, by predispositions. (p. 222)

Said another way, toward achieving a strong objectivity as a process, Fine (2008) advises that one should analyze evidence not from an interpretation of the ‘researcher’, but from multiple sources and perspectives. A second key characteristic of PAR is what Fine (2008) calls *expert validity*. She advises that “PAR stands on the epistemological grounds that persons who have

historically been marginalized or silenced carry substantial knowledge about the architecture of injustice” (Fine, 2008, p. 223) and as such bring value to diffusing the powers wielded by the EIC as a bestowing of criteria for whom is deemed to be expert in the process of teaching and learning. As Fine explains

Classic social science is measured, in part, by the extent to which “experts” consider the design and construct to be valid. [But] I want to tie this commitment to *plural and subjugated expertise* to the traditional standard of expert validity because participatory action research projects are designed expressly around a set of processes to *honor and develop these varied bases of knowledge* in youth and in adults, explicitly troubling hegemonic and hierarchical assumptions about who is expert. (p. 223, italics added)

Said another way, for Fine (2008), a second key characteristic of PAR is a valuing of knowledge from all sides, as opposed to a notion of *expert validity*, of the proverbial societal tracks through collaborative dialogue (Freire, 2004). The collaborative nature of a new agenda spoken of in Maxcy section warns that once the “*what*,” as product of the varied bases of knowledge, is agreed upon by the advocates of SBIL and bureaucrats of the EIC, the real challenge begins with coming to consensus in determining the agenda items to address the *how*. The challenge here would be *how* the two groups would reconcile the varied interests that will invariably present themselves.

A third key characteristic of PAR would be the execution of *construct validity* (Fine, 2008). Cook and Campbell (1979), as cited by Fine (2008), define “construct validity as the means to assess the extent to which theoretical notions are indeed meaningful and valid to determine how cause relates to effect” (p. 225). An example of a product of such analysis was stated earlier in

this response by declaring that the perspective of considering the challenges to youth political engagement as an exercise in maintaining an *academic opportunity deficit* (AOD) through education policy rather than as an “achievement gap” (Fine, 2008). A final key characteristic for PAR would be *generalizability*.

Generalizability is an ideal that reveals causal influences that systemic injustices exhibit through demographic and geographic contexts. Fine (2008) breaks down understanding generalizability in terms of PAR, and YPAR in-fact, in two forms: *theoretical* and *provocative*. She explains by stating that

Theoretical generalizability refers to the extent to which theoretical notions or dynamics move from one context (e.g. political, economic, and cultural) to another. To what extent can we glean lessons about social oppression and forms of resistance from across the five cases described in this volume?

Provocative generalizability offers a measure of the extent to which a piece of research provokes readers or audiences, across contexts, to generalize to “worlds not yet,” in the language of Maxine Greene; to rethink and reimagine current arrangements. To what extent have these cases instilled in audiences a sense of urgency, pressing the question, what must we do? (p. 227)

This characteristic brings the author to think about the anticipated challenge to reconciling the *how* for collaborative process between the EIC and SBIL advocates. As far as provocative generalizability, to what extent does the discourse provoke each side to act to change education policy by opening each respective mind to consider and desire a “world not yet” as a product of the agreed upon novel education policy. As far as the theoretical generalizability of this novel policy, to what extent does this novel policy satisfy each side’s collective mind as far as their

political, economic, and cultural positionality? To complicate the matter, many authors (Ballard, 2014; Cohen & Chaffee, 2013; Kahne et al., 2013; Stoudt, Fox, & Fine, 2012) have found an important distinction in considering political engagement between youth and adults which brings us to an emergence of youth political action research (YPAR).

The Emergence of YPAR and Key Characteristics

As stated previously, “PAR [recognizes that the] domination of masses by elites is rooted not only in the polarization of *control over the means of material production* but also over *the means of knowledge production*, including...*the social power to determine what is valid or useful knowledge* (Rahman, 1985, p. 119, italics added). These three italicized conceptions will serve as the bases from which further inquiry will build toward addressing the author’s dissertation thesis. The balance of this subsection will engage the key characteristics of YPAR, as will be discussed, toward addressing each of these roots of domination as realized through the EIC. Specifically, the discussion will engage the following questions as a basis for further inquiry and thesis for dissertation, which are:

- 1) How does the EIC polarize and enact control over the means of material production in the urban secondary school environment?
- 2) How does the EIC exercise control over the means of knowledge production? And,
- 3) How does the EIC control the social power to determine what is valid or useful knowledge?

Aside from addressing these questions specifically from the perspective of youth, the key characteristics for YPAR are almost identical to the key characteristics of PAR. The key characteristic that differs is *construct rebuilding* rather than *construct validity* (Fine, 2008). In YPAR, the difference is based from an epistemological context in that *construct rebuilding* takes

advocacy a step forward as part of the research process. Construct rebuilding, speaks most directly to a reform of classroom environment that enacts problematizing, relearning, and understanding of words and language that are loosely used in media and generally that negatively affect the optimal learning experience of students. In other words, construct rebuilding is a key characteristic that is revealed through YPAR that works as an agent to disrupt the nourishment of false consciousness and powers-to-mislead.

As the reader may recall from the Maxcy section, toward closer examination of the EIC and the institutional powers that challenge youth political engagement, YPAR has been selected as a process for further inquiry. Given the focus of the response being urban public secondary youth, Urban Regime Theory was selected as a conceptual framework to analyze the general political, economic, and cultural contexts of the EIC (Education Industrial Complex) and advocates for SBIL (student-based interest for learning). This framework for analysis was presented to discuss and problematize the difference between the two, given these contexts, toward a reconciliation of education policy.

A Discussion toward a Potential Application of YPAR as the Process of Dissertation Research

This response has spoken to defining the EIC and its powers as barriers to the effective development of urban public secondary students as politically engaged youth. This subsection will act as summary, conclusion and a vehicle for addressing the presented barriers throughout. The barriers to be addressed are extensive and are as follows in the form of needs. It is theorized that YPAR may be used as a process to address the barriers to youth political engagement toward:

- 1) Coming to a common understanding and basis from which to consider youth political engagement;

- 2) Coming to understand a direct and habitual link among the ideals of a citizen, citizenship, and a student's personhood as a distinction from the common use and understanding of identity;
- 3) Conversely coming to understand and appreciate that this link illuminates the potential power gleaned by the student, or teacher as agent for the personhood of students;
- 4) Understanding that a tool for the power to mislead is to divert attention from students' engagement in political affairs as a potential tool of power for students by denying the exercise and realization of students' intrinsic motivations;
- 5) Understanding that there is a direct link among students' intrinsic motivations, identities, and personhood. And that the foci of evaluating processes should frame evaluative assessments;
- 6) Understanding that there is a disconnect between "policies of logics" and students' "logics from lived experiences";
- 7) Evaluating the contents presented by media as barriers to the positive development of students' personhood;
- 8) Seeking methods of evaluation that illuminate unconscious biases that we all have;
- 9) Using processes that are predominately qualitative in nature as an evaluative tools;
- 10) Revealing the hidden transcripts among stakeholders in the education system, especially those of bureaucrats of the EIC, students, and teachers; and

11) Identifying teachers using positive counter pedagogies to barriers and the powers against them.

There is evidence through use of YPAR that are indicative of “high quality” processes that have engaged these barriers to youth political engagement in urban secondary schools. “High quality” processes include the incorporation of most of the key characteristics of YPAR in the analysis of schooling environments. As a quick reminder, the key characteristics of research in using the YPAR process are: strong objectivity; expert validity; construct rebuilding; theoretical generalizability; and provocative generalizability. There are several YPAR/PAR influenced research projects that exemplify support for their use to execute further inquiry into challenges presented in this response. Kemmis and McTaggart (2005) provide the first two examples in their work. Each will be presented and evidence for support of the key characteristics of YPAR/PAR will be exhibited by key quotes from each respective study.

The Yirrkala Ganma Education Project

The series of quotes exemplifying key characteristics of PAR/YPAR are as follows:

- An exhibition of problematizing *expert validity* and implementing *construct validity* and *rebuilding* is exemplified by the statement, “Yolngu children have difficulties in learning areas of Balanda [white man’s) knowledge. This is not because Yolngu cannot think, it is because the curriculum in the schools is not relevant for Yolngu children, and often these curriculum documents are developed by Balanda who are ethnocentric in their values.” (pp. 303-304)
- An exhibition of problematizing *construct validity* and *expert validity* in stating that “Often the things that they learn favour [the interests of] the rich and

powerful, because when they leave school [and go to work] the control of the workforce is in the hands of the middle class and the upper class.” (p. 304)

- An exhibition of executing *strong objectivity* and *provocative generalizability* in conveying that “Throughout the process, the teachers were guided by their own collaborative research into their problems and practices. They gathered stories from the old people. They gathered information about how school worked and did not work for them. They made changes and watched what happened. They thought carefully about the consequences of the changes they made, and then they made still further changes on the basis of the evidence they had gathered.” (p. 304)

The Córdoba Educational Congress

The series of quotes exemplifying key characteristics of PAR/YPAR are as follows:

- An exhibition of problematizing *construct validity* and implementing *theoretical generalizability* and *provocative generalizability* in conveying that “The Córdoba congress operated outside the functional frameworks of education and state systems and aimed to change the ways in which education and schooling were understood and practiced indirectly rather than directly.” (p. 314)
- An exhibition of problematizing *construct validity* while implementing *construct rebuilding* and *provocative generalizability* by stating that “The Córdoba congress brought together some 8,000 teachers, students, education officials, and invited experts in various fields (to) contribute to and reproduce inequitable social relations in those countries and how transformed educational practices and

institutions might contribute to transforming those inequitable social conditions.”
(p. 306)

Six Summers of YPAR: Learning, Action, and Change in Urban Education

And in the last example, Morrell (2008) conducted a research project using YPAR “in the context of a summer seminar in critical research offered from 1999 – 2004 to high school senior in the Greater Los Angeles area” (p. 156). Key characteristics of YPAR were exhibited as exemplified in the following statements:

- An exhibition of problematizing *expert validity* and exercising *construct rebuilding* and *theoretical generalizability* in conveying that “Participants become researchers about their daily lives in hopes of developing realistic solutions for dealing with the problems that they believe need to be addressed.” (p. 158)
- An exhibition of problematizing *expert validity* and exercising *provocative generalizability* in conveying that “youth are the people involved in this research process. Involving youth is significant for several reasons. First, youth, and especially youth from low-income communities, are seldom engaged as potential knowledge producers.” (p. 158)
- An exhibition of *strong objectivity*, problematizing *construct validity*, and *theoretical generalizability* in sharing that “we must equip young people with the investigative tools that allow them to collect, analyze, and distribute information about these issues from their unique perspectives as insiders.” (p. 158)

In closing and summary, the American K-12 public education system is a complex organization that is influenced by, what Picciano and Spring (2013) call, the Education Industrial Complex (EIC). As a complex organization, the EIC is a large bureaucratic network of organizations and

individuals with powers, interests, beliefs, and values that must be considered for any attempt to analyze classroom level execution of the learning process. It is anticipated that my dissertation thesis will be toward developing a driving principle for reconciling conflicting interests among SBIL advocates and EIC bureaucrats. The contexts of which will aim to diffuse each of the effects of powers-to-mislead at the classroom level as a mutual education philosophy and mission for the proposed collective group whereby political engagement will be included and enhanced for every student.

Ballard (2014), drawing from the findings of Verba, Schlozman, and Brady (1995), advises that adult motivation for political involvement is “compelled by the gratification of contributing to society” (p. 443). For adolescents, on the other hand, there are four motivations, “material gratifications, social gratifications, political gratifications, and desire to influence collective policy” (p. 443). For Ballard (2014), though, there are “at least two theories of motivation worth mentioning as they give rise to more recent and more specific theories of motivation in the domains of politics and political development” (p. 442), the theories of Lewin (1944/1951) and Deci and Ryan (2000). According to Ballard (2014), “Lewin understands motives as goal-directed forces related to one’s values” (p. 443) as one approach and “a second approach to understanding motivations in other psychological domains draws on the distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic motivations” (p. 443). Gratifications through intrinsic motivation speak to an individual’s satisfaction of innate needs and desires as opposed to extrinsic motivations and amotivations that motivate either superficially or not at all (Ryan, 1993; Deci & Ryan, 2000).

In terms of intrinsic motivation, Deci and Ryan (2000) speak to the significance of student gratification and the attachment process to environmental stimuli. For them, relatedness or

relevance to outside stimuli is a principle component for intrinsic motivation as a vehicle toward satisfaction of a desire or need as a sense of gratification. As Deci and Ryan (2000) state

Relatedness refers to the desire to feel connected to others—to love and care, and to be loved and cared for (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Bowlby, 1958; Harlow, 1958; Ryan, 1993). Like us, Baumeister and Leary argued that relatedness is a fundamental need, and the idea of relatedness as a need is central to, although not widely discussed in the field of attachment. (p. 231)

As a transition into considering public urban secondary students specifically, Ballard (2014) illustrates how the literature considers political engagement of youth in terms of outcomes, as dictated by societal needs in stating those outcomes, rather than the interests and motivations of youth. As they state by identifying that “personal satisfaction, collective efficacy, and contributing to shared national values” (p. 443) are used as an extrinsic motivation for political engagement, but is also a form of amotivation for students. For Deci and Ryan (2000), extrinsic motivation is not optimal because even “fully internalized extrinsic motivation does not typically become intrinsic motivation. [Fully internalized extrinsic motivation] remains extrinsic motivation because, even though fully volitional, it is instrumental rather than being what Csikszentmihalyi (1975) referred to as autotelic” (p. 237), “(of an activity or creative work) having a purpose in and not apart from itself” (<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/autotelic>). Said another way, fully internalized extrinsic motivation does not satisfy the intrinsic motivational characteristic of relatedness as discussed earlier.

Ballard (2014) speaks of the link between the ideal of relatedness in speaking of student needs and attitudes based from the context within which the student is and has been exposed to outside

stimuli and their effect on student political involvement. There are five contexts, according to Ballard (2014), that effect students' attitude toward feeling as if an opportunity to satisfy needs. The five contexts are "cultural practices, family values and culture, peer group values and activities, neighborhood composition, and school climate" (p. 441), which are each, in their respective ways, societally influenced in nature but different in influence for each student and how each, individually and collectively, motivate as a "dynamic interaction between values, goals, and experiences" (Ballard, 2014, p. 443) of the student intrinsically. Hill and den Dulk (2013) have found that levels of volunteerism, for example, in and through adolescents is related to intrinsic motivation but most definitively found that schooling type, Public, Protestant, Catholic, Private, or Homeschool, was the most conclusive context for political involvement, through volunteerism, beyond secondary school. But, what does this say as far as what defines political engagement for secondary students given societally influenced contexts, the type of school attended, and the level of intrinsic motivation? Ballard (2014) has found, however that political engagement for adolescents is not limited to the level of volunteerism. "We have seen," Obradović and Masten (2007) states, "that SES (socioeconomic status) is positively correlated with measures of activity involvement and citizenship, but not with volunteering" (p. 17). Zukin, Keeter, Andolina and Jenkins (2006), as provided by Ballard (2014), suggest that the definition must answer the question, how does this meaning gratify the students' needs, respectively, for a sense of "organized voluntary activity focused on problem solving and helping others" (p. 181)? Moreover, the socioeconomic status of the urban secondary student, in addition to the school type as contexts, must be a distinguishing factor to answer this question.

Ballard (2014) advises that "Political development is situated in social contexts and local institutions" (p. 445). Rubin (2007), as conveyed by Ballard (2014), "found that young people

develop their political identities as reactions to their everyday experiences” (p. 445). Everyday experiences that are influenced by their respective exposure to “political institutions and individuals” (Ballard, 2014, p. 445), that are negative to an extent for a large number of students. Levinson (2010), for example, found that the context of school is “a particularly important context for political development” (Ballard, 2014, p. 445). Weinstein, Deci, and Ryan (2011) warn that to the extent that an outside stimuli is causing a students’ feeling of being forced to integrate that which the entity, institutional or individual conception, is proposing, proportionally the student will resist acceptance as an intrinsically powered ideal to act upon (Weinstein, Deci & Ryan, 2011). In other words, the degree to which an adolescent accepts an ideal presented by either of the five contexts presented by Ballard (2014) earlier depends upon the extent to which the student is able to wrestle with it autonomously and come to accept in accordance with beliefs and values already accepted by the student. Moreover, to the extent that the propose ideal is unjust for the student and the student feels that she or he can do something about it effects the degree to which the student develops a social attitude toward engaging and attempting to find, and act upon, a remedy (Ballard, 2014; Hill & den Dulk, 2013; Obradović & Masten, 2007). As Matsuba, Hart, & Atkins (2007) and others (Cemalcilar, 2009; Penner, 2003), through Ballard (2014), found that the degree to which a student reconciles, “Social attitudes such as a feeling that one belongs to their community, endorsing social responsibility, empathy for others, and feeling political obligation” (p. 441) are principles that students must wrestle with and the extent to which each principle is reconciled determines the degree to which the student is motivated to act upon that which has not been reconciled ideally.

Checkoway (2011) and others (Au, Bigelow, and Karp, 2007; Oakes & Rogers, 2006) found that the ideals that are not reconciled with could be challenged in secondary schools by teachers but

“there are institutional obstacles to their ideals” (Checkoway, 2011, p. 391). Such findings fly directly in the face of school climate being a principle context within which political engagement is nurtured (Ballard, 2014). Barber and Battistoni (1999) and many others (Colby, Beaumont, Erlich & Corngold, 2010; Ehrlich, 2000; Jacoby & Ehrlich, 1996; Jacoby, 2009) found additionally that secondary schools that serve predominantly minority students don’t “emphasize constructions of democracy” (Checkoway, 2011, p.391) thus disallowing an opportunity for secondary minority students and equal opportunity to majority students for gaining competence in the area of politics and thus decreasing the opportunity to engage (Obradović & Matsen, 2007; Weinstein, Deci & Ryan, 2011). As Obradović and Matsen (2007) emphasize, “belonging to a social group provides youth with opportunities to further exercise [political] skills” (p. 4), which has long since been a barrier to students of color, specifically students of low socio-economic status (Youniss & et.al, 2002). Perduring and permeating influence to institutions and individuals that have in-turn produced contexts from which beliefs and values have been influenced students while unequally providing opportunities to engage students of color, specifically.

Ben-Porath (2013) and many other authors (Checkoway, 2013; Cohen & Chaffee, 2013; Curtis, 2012; Jenkins & Carpenter, 2013; McGovern 2013; Tyack, 1974) have found and recorded a historical and sociological negative influence by institutions and individuals to the environmental contexts of students of color, and specifically those students of families and communities who are economically challenged (Naughton, 2013). David Tyack (1974) actually speaks of a withholding of advanced knowledge from persons of color historically. The essence of what Tyack (1974) speaks of as that which advanced knowledge consists equates, and the skills and opportunities spoken of thus far are characteristic of this advanced knowledge. For Tyack

(1974), there have always been conspiring groups “to keep black children ignorant, to keep them from the advanced knowledge that they needed for their liberation” (p.113). Such advanced knowledge is exemplified in students as citizens being active in the political processes and the resources for which those in power allocates, or not (Apple, 1993; Boggs, 2000; T Crayton, 2013; T Crayton, 2013a; Horowitz, 1969; Jenkins & Carpentier, 2013; Shipps, 2008). Hill and den Dulk (2013) remind us the effects of such negatively influencing contexts when stating that “It is important to note that feeling concern for the welfare of others is not a sufficient explanation of intrinsic motivation. One might have this concern yet fill entirely ill-equipped to act on it” (p. 183), or in a state of political illiteracy. Disallowing a student of color, specifically one who is economically challenged, denies the opportunity to come to feel competent, ill-equipped, in matters such as the integration of politics, thus continuing this denial of political literacy.

Richard Valencia (2010) illustrates the inequality of deficit thinking that permeates the consciousness and unconsciousness of institutions and the produced contexts among individuals in society. Kimberley Clark (2012) speaks to the irresponsible nature of not teaching and engaging students in politics in a manner that allows the ability for students of color and of economic challenge to wrestle with societal stimuli that conflict with lived experiences. As Clark (2012) presents:

How to teach young people about the grave ecological and social crises of our times without crushing their sense of possibility? The author has come to believe that the nature of these crises, together with a widespread weakening of political and democratic culture, makes it irresponsible to teach young people about “the

world as it is'' without simultaneously giving them opportunities to develop capacities for collective agency (p. 354).

Consciousness of discriminate inequality, especially in-light of knowledge of states of being for low socio economic students of color, as a correlation to socio-economic status, is important. This correlation is important because it affects how education is understood, how education is conveyed, and students' roles as citizens are developed with knowledge and hope to change one's circumstances without moving to counter said inequalities is cruel and lacking the fulfillment of the historic purpose of public education (Buckley, 2010; Clarke, 2012; Cohen & Chaffee, 2013; Foote, 2005; Kapitzke & Hay, 2011; Lee, Robinson, & Sebastian, 2012). Cohen and Chaffee (2013) set the stage for becoming and remaining conscious of inequalities in education by finding and conveying that "White students and students from high socioeconomic status backgrounds are more likely to receive political education that builds their political knowledge and skills than non-White students and students from low socioeconomic status backgrounds" (p. 44). This inequality in preparation for citizenship is exacerbated by the findings that political is consistently being cut back or removed from public school curricula (Curtis, 2012; Fallace & Fantozzi, 2013).

Alexander (2012) speaks to another contemporary context of denial of political literacy through maintained inequalities in finding that the highest concentrations for such illiteracy is among urban school districts with the higher proportion of populations of students of color and low socio-economic populations (Ben-Porath, 2013; Checkoway, 2013; Cohen & Chaffee, 2013; Curtis, 2012; Jenkins & Carpenter, 2013; McGovern 2013). In the school environment and climate, wrestling with the historical, negative and positive, conscious and unconscious, the contextual influences that students are presented in school needs breeds competence by being

allowed to be reconciled with students' lived experiences in an autonomous manner (Weinstein, Deci & Ryan, 2011; Pinar, 2012). Ballard (2014) advises that the probability to engage issues politically beyond secondary school is enhanced as student interests and motivations are reconciled with the students' lived experiences (Weinstein, Deci & Ryan, 2011).

From Student Interests and Motivations to Political Attitudes and Political Knowledge

It is well established in the literature that student's lived and living experiences, establish values and beliefs that link significantly to the learning process (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Dewey, 1990; Dewey, 1991; Erickson-Nepstad, 1997; Paavola, Lipponen & Hakkarainen, 2004); thus revealing a potential route toward eradicating the denial of advanced knowledge or political literacy. Weinstein, Deci, and Ryan (2011) emphasize the importance of recognizing that cultural differences are important to integrating values, beliefs and interests. Weinstein, Deci and Ryan (2011) found and reported that "there is considerable variability in the values and goals held in different cultures, suggesting that some of the avenues to basic need satisfaction may differ widely from culture to culture" (p. 246).

Cooper, Cibulka, and Fusarelli (2008) and many others (Coplan & et.al, 2011; Fazzaro, 2006; Gordon, 1980; Horowitz, 1969; Lukes, 2005; Morriss, 2002; Wedel, 2009) have troubled the overall question as to whether public education systems for urban secondary students can intervene given what the literature is suggesting for increased political literacy, as there are significant sociological challenges and institutional interests to consider. For example, merely establishing and utilizing relevant material to evoke and utilize student interests in the learning endeavor toward political literacy becomes a challenge because of institutional interests outside the school and a lack of consideration of the interests and experiences of the student (Crayton,

2013). As Fazzaro (2006) reminds us, public education “at base...is about the role of education in the allocation of values through politics” (p.12), but whose politics remains the question.

References

- Ainley, M., Hidi, S., & Berndorff, D. (2002). Interest, learning, and the psychological processes that mediate their relationship. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94(3), 545-561. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.94.3.545
- Airola, D. (2013). *Navigating Educational Change in an Increasingly Complex and Interconnected State and Federal Policy Environment*. Paper presented at the 2013 University Council for Educational Administration Annual Conference, Indianapolis. www.uark.edu
- Alexander, M. (2012). *The new Jim Crow: Mass incarceration in the age of colorblindness* (Revised ed.). New York: The New Press.
- Apple, M. (1993). The Politics of Official Knowledge: Does a National Curriculum Make Sense? *Teachers College Record*, 95(2), 20.
- Apple, M. (2013). *Can education change society?* New York and London: Routledge.
- Aron, R. (1964). Macht, Power, Puissance: Prose Democratique ou Poesie Demonique? *European Journal of Sociology*, 5, 27-51.
- Artiles, A. J. (2011). Toward an Interdisciplinary Understanding of Educational Equity and Difference: The Case of the Racialization of Ability. *Educational Researcher*, 40(9), 431-445.
- Artiles, A. J., & McClafferty, K. (1998). Learning to Teach Culturally Diverse Learners: Charting Change in Preservice Teachers' Thinking about Effective Teaching. *The Elementary School Journal*, 98(3), 189-220.
- Baker, R. S. J. d., Corbett, A. T., & Gowda, S. M. (2013). Generalizing automated detection of the robustness of student learning in an intelligent tutor for genetics. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 105(4), 946-956. doi: 10.1037/a0033216
- Ballard, P. J. (2014). What Motivates Youth Civic Involvement? *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 29(4), 439-463. doi: 10.1177/0743558413520224
- Bank, J. (1993). Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice. *Review of Research in Education*, 19, 3-49.
- Barabasi, A. (2002). *Linked: The new science of networks*. Cambridge, MA: Perseus.
- Baum, H. (2003). *Community action for school reform* Albany: SUNY Press.
- Baynes, K. (1995). Democarcy and the rechtsstaat: Habermas's faktizitat und geltung In S. White (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion in Habermas* (pp. 201-232). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Beard, C. A. (2004). *An economic interpretation of the constitution of the United States*. Mineola, N.Y.: Dover Publications, Inc.
- Ben-Porath, S. (2013). Deferring virtue: The new management of students and the civic role of schools. *Theory and Research in Education*, 11(2), 111-128. doi: 10.1177/1477878513485172
- Bennett, J., & Hansel, J. (2008). Institutional agility: Using the new institutionalism to guide school reform. In B. Cooper, J. Cibulka & L. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 217-231). New York and London: Routledge.
- Berger, P., Luckmann, T (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.
- Boggs, C. (2000). *The end of politics: Corporate power and the decline of the public sphere*. New York and London: The Guilford Press.

- Bowers, A. J. (2010). Toward Addressing the Issues of Site Selection in District Effectiveness Research: A Two-Level Hierarchical Linear Growth Model. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 46(3), 395-425. doi: 10.1177/0013161X10375271
- Bowers, A. J. (2011). What's in a grade? The multidimensional nature of what teacher-assigned grades assess in high school. *Educational Research & Evaluation*, 17(3), 141-159. doi: 10.1080/13803611.2011.597112
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological Models of Human Development. In M. Gauvain & M. Cole (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education* (Vol. 3, pp. 1643-1647). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., & Ceci, S. J. (1994). Nature-nuture reconceptualized in developmental perspective: A bioecological model. *Psychological Review*, 101(4), 568-586. doi: 10.1037/0033-295X.101.4.568
- Broudy, H. S. (1981). What Knowledge is of Most Worth? *Educational Leadership*, 574-578.
- Chambers, R. (1994). The Origins and Practice of Participatory Rural Appraisal. *World Development*, 4(7), 953-969.
- Chang, K. (2014, March 2, 2014). [Call for Papers: ITS2014 Workshop on Utilizing EEG Input in Intelligent Tutoring Systems
-].
- Chang, S., Jia, L., Takeuchi, R., & Cai, Y. (2014). Do high-commitment work systems affect creativity? A multilevel combinational approach to employee creativity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 99(4), 665-680. doi: 10.1037/a0035679
- Checkoway, B. (2013). Education For Democracy by Young People in Community-Based Organizations. *Youth & Society*, 45(3), 389-403. doi: 10.1177/0044118x11419535
- Christiano, T. (Ed.) (2013) *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Cibulka, J., Fusarelli, L., & Cooper, B. (2008). Introduction: Researching toward a new politics of education. In B. Cooper, J. Cibulka & L. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 1-15). New York and London: Routledge.
- Cohen, A. K., & Chaffee, B. W. (2013). The relationship between adolescents' civic knowledge, civic attitude, and civic behavior and their self-reported future likelihood of voting. *Education, Citizenship and Social Justice*, 8(1), 43-57. doi: 10.1177/1746197912456339
- Cook, T., & Campbell, D. (1979). The 1954 social science statement and school desegregation. *American Psychologist*, 39(8), 819-832.
- Coplan, R. J., Hughes, K., Bosacki, S., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (2011). Is silence golden? Elementary school teachers' strategies and beliefs regarding hypothetical shy/quiet and exuberant/talkative children. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 103(4), 939-951. doi: 10.1037/a0024551
- Cornwall, A., & Jewkes, R. (1995). What Is Participatory Research? *Social Science and Medicine*, 41(12), 1667-1676.
- Cravey, I. (2013). It's Different Here! The Early College: A New Secondary School Culture. *Community College Journal of Research & Practice*, 37(9), 691-703. doi: 10.1080/10668926.2013.774895
- Crayton, T. (2013, September 10, 2013). *Education and the New American Caste System: An Analysis of the New Jim Crow*. Indianapolis.

- Crayton, T. (2014, September). *Toward the Development of an Equitable and Relevant Policy Studies and Civics Coursework for Secondary Urban Students*. Venture Fund Papers, (3). Indianapolis.
- Crayton, T. (2014). The Taking of Freedom of Thought by State and Federal Policies: A Response to the 2013 UCEA Presidential Address and Airola Plenary Session. *UCEA Review*, 55(1), 14-19.
- Crossman, A. (2014). Dual consciousness. 2014, from http://sociology.about.com/od/D_Index/g/Dual-Consciousness.htm
- Curtis, K. F. (2012). Creating a Culture of Possibility: A Case for Engaged Pedagogy. *Humanity & Society*, 36(4), 354-373. doi: 10.1177/0160597612455744
- Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). New Standards and Old Inequalities: School Reform and the Education of African American Students. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69(4), 263-287. doi: 10.2307/2696245
- Davison, J. (2010, August 10, 2010). Interest Principle. *Intergenerational Justice*. from <http://ijdb.auzigog.com/concept/interest-principle>
- Deci, E., & Ryan, R. (2000). The “What” and “Why” of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227 - 268.
- Denzin, N., Giardina, M. (2007). *Ethical futures in qualitative research* N. Denzin, Giardina, M. (Ed.) *Decolonizing the politics of knowledge* (pp. 279).
- Dewey, J. (1897). My Pedagogic Creed. *School Journal*, 54, 77-80.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Touchstone.
- Dewey, J. (1991). *How we think*. Amherst, N.Y.: Prometheus Books.
- Epstein, J. (1995). School, family, and community partnerships: Caring for the children we share. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(), 701-712.
- Ethiraj, S. K., & Levinthal, D. (2009). Hoping for A to Z While Rewarding Only A: Complex Organizations and Multiple Goals. *Organization Science*, 20(1), 4-21. doi: 10.2307/25614637
- Fazzaro, C. (2006). Freedom of speech, American public education, and standardized tests: A critical enquiry. *Journal of Thought*, 41(4), 27.
- Febey, K., & Louis, K. (2008). Political cultures in education at the state and local level: Views from three states. In B. Cooper, J. Cibulka & L. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of educational politics and policy* (pp. 52-72). New York and London: Routledge.
- Feinberg, J. (1984). *Harm to others: The moral limits of the criminal law*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fine, M. (2008). En epilogue, of sorts. In J. Cammarota & M. Fine (Eds.), *Revolutionizing education: Youth participatory action research in motion* (pp. 213-234). New York: Routledge.
- Finn, j. (1989). Withdrawing from school. *Review of Educational Research*, 59, 117-142. doi: 10.3102/00346543059002117
- Finn, J. D., & Zimmer, K. (2012). Student engagement: What is it? Why does it matter? In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 97-132). New York, NY: Springer.
- Fischer, K., Rose, L., & Rose, S. (2006). Growth cycles of mind and brain: Analyzing developmental pathways of learning disorders. In K. Fischer, J. Bernstein & M. Immordino-Yang (Eds.), *Mind, brain, and education in reading disorders*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Fischer, K., Schwartz, M., & Connell, M. (2004). *Cognitive Development and Learning: Analyzing the Building of Skills in Classrooms and Neural Systems*. Paper presented at the Conference on Building Usable Knowledge in Mind, Brain, & Education, Cambridge, MA.
- Fischer, K. W., & Rose, L. T. (2001). Webs of Skill: How Students Learn. *Educational Leadership*, 59(3), 6.
- Fischer, K. W., & Rose, S. P. (1998). Growth cycles of brain and mind. *Educational Leadership*, 56(3), 56-60.
- Flinders, D., Thornton, S (Ed.). (2013). *The curriculum studies reader*. New York and London Routledge.
- Fox, M., Mediratta, K., Ruglis, J., Stoudt, B., Shah, S., & Fine, M. (2010). Critical Youth Engagement: Participatory Action Research and Organizing *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth* (pp. 621-649): John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Freire, P. (2003). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (30th Anniversary Edition ed.). New York: Continuum.
- Galster, G. C. (2012). Urban opportunity structure and racial/ethnic polarization. In W. F. Tate (Ed.), *Research on schools, neighborhoods, and communities: Toward civic responsibility* (pp. 47–66). Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Gibbs, G. (2007). *Analysing qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks and London: Sage.
- Goldspink, C. (2007). Rethinking Educational Reform: A Loosely Coupled and Complex Systems Perspective. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 35(1), 27-50. doi: 10.1177/1741143207068219
- Gordon, C. (Ed.). (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews & other writings 1972 - 1977*. New York: Pantheon Press.
- Green, J., Liem, G., Martin, A. J., Colmar, S., Marsh, H., & McInerney, D. (2012). Academic motivation, self-concept, engagement, and performance in high school: Key processes from a longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35, 1111–1122. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.02.016
- Greenwood, R. M. (2008). INTERSECTIONAL POLITICAL CONSCIOUSNESS: APPRECIATION FOR INTRAGROUP DIFFERENCES AND SOLIDARITY IN DIVERSE GROUPS. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 32(1), 36-47. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2007.00405.x
- Hattam, R., Brennan, M., Zipin, L., & Comber, B. (2009). Researching for social justice: contextual, conceptual and methodological challenges. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 30(3), 303-316. doi: 10.1080/01596300903037010
- Hay, C. (1997). Divided by a Common Language: Political Theory and the Concept of Power *Politics*, 19(1), 47-50.
- Helfenbein, R., Houser, J., Smith, J. (2012). School Reform and the Mind Trust Proposal: Another Look at the Evidence (CUME, Trans.). Indianapolis: Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis
- Hesse-Biber, S., Leavy, P (Ed.). (2004). *Approaches to qualitative research: A reader on theory and practice*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hill, J. P., & den Dulk, K. R. (2013). Religion, Volunteering, and Educational Setting: The Effect of Youth Schooling Type on Civic Engagement. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 52(1), 179-197. doi: 10.1111/jssr.12011
- Hodgson, G. (2006). What are institutions? *Journal of Economic Issues*, 40(1), 1-25.

- Holme, J. J., & Rangel, V. S. (2012). Putting school reform in its place: Social geography, organizational social capital, and school performance *American Educational Research Journal*, 49, 257–283. doi: 10.3102/0002831211423316
- Horowitz, I. (Ed.). (1969). *Power, politics, & people: The collected essays of C. Wright Mills* London, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jenkins, H., & Carpentier, N. (2013). Theorizing participatory intensities: A conversation about participation and politics. *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies*, 19(3), 265-286. doi: 10.1177/1354856513482090
- Jonasson, C. (2012). Teachers and students' divergent perceptions of student engagement: recognition of school or workplace goals. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 33(5), 723-741. doi: 10.2307/23256180
- Kahne, J., Crow, D., & Lee, N.-J. (2013). Different Pedagogy, Different Politics: High School Learning Opportunities and Youth Political Engagement. *Political Psychology*, 34(3), 419-441. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00936.x
- Kalyuga, S. (2011). Cognitive Load Theory: How Many Types of Load Does It Really Need? *Educational Psychology Review*, 23(1), 1-19. doi: 10.1007/s10648-010-9150-7
- Karabel, J., Halsey, A (Ed.). (1977). *Power and ideology in education*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2005). Participative action research: Communicative action and the public sphere. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE book of qualitative research* (Third ed., pp. 559-604). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.
- Kliebard, H. (2013). The Rise of Scientific Curriculum-Making and its Aftermath. In D. Flinders, Thornton, S (Ed.), *The Curriculum Studies Reader* (Fourth ed., pp. 69-78). New York and London: Routledge.
- Kliebard, H. M. (2004). *The struggle of the American curriculum, 1893-1958* (3rd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (2009). *The dream-keepers: Successful teachers of African-American children* (Second ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Boss.
- Lawson, M. A., & Lawson, H. A. (2013). New Conceptual Frameworks for Student Engagement Research, Policy, and Practice. *Review of Educational Research*, 83(3), 432-479. doi: 10.3102/0034654313480891
- Lukes, S. (2005). *Power: A radical view* (Second ed.). Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mahoney, Cairns, R., & Farmer, T. (2003). Promoting interpersonal competence and educational success through extracurricular activity participation *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, 409-418. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.95.2.409
- Mahoney, J. (2000). School extracurricular activity participation as a moderator in the development of antisocial patterns *Child Development*, 71, 502-516. doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00160
- Mahoney, J. L. (2000). School Extracurricular Activity Participation as a Moderator in the Development of Antisocial Patterns. *Child Development*, 71(2), 502-516. doi: 10.2307/1132005
- Malle, B. (2005). The theory of mind: Conceptual foundations of human social cognition. In R. Hassin, J. Uleman & J. Bargh (Eds.), *The new unconscious* (pp. 225-255). Oxford New York: Oxford University Press.

- Martin, A. J. (2012). Part II commentary: Motivation and engagement: Conceptual, operational, and empirical clarity. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 303-313). New York, NY: Springer.
- Maske, K., & Durden, G. (2003). The Contributions and Impact of Professor William H. Riker. *Public Choice*, 117, 191-220.
- Mather, D., & Hanley, B. (1999). Cohort Grouping and Preservice Teacher Education: Effects on Pedagogical Development. *Canadian Journal of Education / Revue canadienne de l'éducation*, 24(3), 235-250.
- Maxcy, B. D. (2011). The Politics of Priorities in Turbulent Times: Policy Logics, Faces of Power, and Reform Possibilities. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 86(3), 252-271. doi: 10.1080/0161956X.2011.578974
- McLendon, M., Cohen-Vogel, L. (2008). Understanding education policy change in the American states: Lessons from political science. In B. Cooper, Cibulka, J., Fusarelli, L. (Ed.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 30-51). New York and London: Routledge.
- Morrell, E. (2008). Six summers of YPAR: Learning, action, and change in urban education. In J. Cammarota & M. Fine (Eds.), *Revolutionizing Education* (pp. 155-184). New York and London: Routledge.
- Morriss, P. (2002). *Power: A philosophical analysis*. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Nagel, J. (1975). *The descriptive analysis of power*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Newman, F. M., & Wehlage, G. G. (1993). Five standards of authentic instruction. *Educational Leadership*, 50(7), 8-12.
- Nishida, A., & Fine, M. (2014). Creating Classrooms of and for Activism at the Intersections of Class, Race, Ethnicity, Gender, and Disability. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 16(1), 8-11. doi: 10.1080/15210960.2013.867237
- Perrow, C. (1986). *Complex organizations: A critical essay* (Third ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Picciano, A., & Spring, J. (2013). *The great American education-industrial complex: Ideology, technology, and profit*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Pinar, W. (2012). *What is curriculum theory?* (Second ed.). New York and London: Routledge.
- Rahman, A. (1985). The theory and practice of participatory action research. In O. Fals-Borda (Ed.), *The challenge of social change*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ravitch, D. (2010). *The death and life of the great American school system: How testing and choice are undermining education*. New York: Perseus Books.
- Reeve, J. (2012). A self-determination theory perspective on student engagement. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 149-172). New York, NY: Springer.
- Reeve, J., Deci, E. (1996). Elements of the Competitive Situation that Affect Intrinsic Motivation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(1), 24.
- Reschly, A. L., & Christenson, S. L. (2012). Jingle, jangle, and conceptual haziness: Evolution and future directions of the engagement construct. In S. L. Christenson, A. L. Reschly & C. Wylie (Eds.), *Handbook of research on student engagement* (pp. 3-20). New York, NY: Springer.
- Riker, W. (1986). *The art of political manipulation*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Rosales, S. (2011). Fighting the Peace at Home: Mexican American Veterans and the 1944 GI Bill of Rights. *Pacific Historical Review*, 80(4), 597-627. doi: 10.1525/phr.2011.80.4.597
- Roth, W.-M., & Lee, Y.-J. (2007). "Vygotsky's Neglected Legacy": Cultural-Historical Activity Theory. *Review of Educational Research*, 77(2), 186-232.
- Scarince, C. (2014). False Consciousness in Sociology: Definition, Examples & Quiz. Retrieved October 14, 2014, from <http://education-portal.com/academy/lesson/false-consciousness-in-sociology-definition-examples-quiz.html#lesson>
- Schwartz, M. (2009). Cognitive Development and Learning: Analyzing the Building of Skills in Classrooms. *Mind, Brain, and Education*, 3(4), 198-208. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-228X.2009.01070.x
- Scott, J. (1990). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden Transcripts* New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Searle, J. (1995). *The construction of social reality*. New York: The Free Press.
- Seybold, P. (2014). [Questions for Qualifying Examination of Troy Crayton].
- Shiller, J. T. (2013). Preparing for Democracy: How Community-Based Organizations Build Civic Engagement Among Urban Youth. *Urban Education*, 48(1), 69-91. doi: 10.1177/0042085912436761
- Shipp, D. (2008). Urban Regime Theory and the Reform of Public Schools: Governance, Power, and Leadership. In B. Cooper, Cibulka, J., Fusarelli, L. (Ed.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 89-108). New York and London: Routledge.
- Skinner, E. A., Furrer, C., Marchand, G., & Kindermann, T. (2008). Engagement and disaffection in the classroom: Part of a larger motivational dynamic. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 100, 765-781. doi: 10.1037/a0012840
- Smith, J., & Hodkinson, P. (2005). Relativism, criteria, and politics. In N. Denzin (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 915-932). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Stone, C. N. (2006). Power, Reform, and Urban Regime Analysis. *City & Community*, 5(1), 23-38. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-6040.2006.00151.x
- Stoudt, B. G., Fox, M., & Fine, M. (2012). Contesting Privilege with Critical Participatory Action Research. *Journal of Social Issues*, 68(1), 178-193. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01743.x
- Tate, W. F. (2012). *Research on schools, neighborhoods, and communities: Toward civic responsibility*. New York, NY: Roman & Littlefield & American Educational Research Association.
- Thorne, C. (2011). The Impact of Educational Reforms on the Work of the School Principal in the United Arab Emirates. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*, 39(2), 172-185. doi: 10.1177/1741143210390058
- Trent, S. C., Artiles, A. J., & Englert, C. S. (1998). From Deficit Thinking to Social Constructivism: A Review of Theory, Research, and Practice in Special Education. *Review of Research in Education*, 23(ArticleType: research-article / Full publication date: 1998 / Copyright © 1998 American Educational Research Association), 277-307.
- Tseng, V., & Seidman, E. (2007). A systems framework for understanding social settings. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 39, 217-228. doi: 10.1007/s10464-007-9101-8
- Tyack, D. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Ungar, M. (2011). *The social ecology of resilience: A handbook for theory and practice*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Valencia, R. (2010). *Dismantling contemporary deficit thinking: Educational thought and practice*. New York: Routledge.
- Valenzuela, A. (2013). Subtractive Schooling, Caring Relations, and Social Capital in the Schooling of U.S.-Mexican Youth. In D. Flinders, Thornton, S (Ed.), *The curriculum studies reader* (Fourth ed., pp. 289-300). New York and London: Routledge.
- Vedantam, S. (2010). *The hidden brain: How our unconscious minds elect presidents, control markets, wage wars, and save our lives*. New York: Spiegel & Grau.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (2004). Imagination and Creativity in Childhood. *Journal of Russian & East European Psychology*, 42(1), 7-97.
- Watts, D. (2003). *Six degrees: The science of a connected age*. New York: Norton.
- Weaver-Hightower, M. B. (2014). A Mixed Methods Approach for Identifying Influence on Public Policy. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, 8(2), 115-138. doi: 10.1177/1558689813490996
- Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization* (A. Henderson & T. Parsons Eds.). New York: The Free Press and the Falcon's Bring Press.
- Wedel, J. (2009). *Shadow elite: How the world's new power brokers undermine democracy, government, and the free market*. New York: Basic Books.
- Weinstein, N., Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2011). Motivational Determinants of Integrating Positive and Negative Past Identities. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 100(3), 527-544. doi: 10.1037/a0022150
- Weis, L., & Fine, M. (2004). *Working method: Research and social justice*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Weis, L., & Fine, M. (2012). Critical Bifocality and Circuits of Privilege: Expanding Critical Ethnographic Theory and Design. *Harvard Educational Review*, 82(2), 173-201.
- Wells, A. S., Ready, D. D., Duran, J., Grzesikowski, C., Hill, K., Roda, A., & White, T. (2012). Still separate, still unequal, but not always so “suburban.” The changing nature of suburban school districts in the New York metropolitan area. In W. F. Tate (Ed.), *Research on schools, neighborhoods, and communities: Toward civic responsibility* (pp. 125–149). Lanham, MD Rowman & Littlefield.
- Youniss, J., Bales, S., Christmas-Best, V., Diversi, M., McLaughlin, M., & Silbereisen, R. (2002). Youth Civic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century. *Journal of Research on Adolescence* (Wiley-Blackwell), 12(1), 121.

Notes

¹ “The Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines the military-industrial complex as ‘an informal alliance of the military and related government departments with defense industries that is held to influence government policy’” (Picciano & Spring, 2013, p. 2).

² With reference to Alain Wertheimer (Lukes, 2005, p. 163), the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy advises that “The concept of coercion has two different faces, corresponding to the two parties involved in its most ordinary cases. On one face, it picks out a technique agents (coercers) can use to get other agents to do or not do something. On the other face, it picks out a kind of reason for why agents (coercees) sometimes do or refrain from doing something. *Coercion is typically thought to carry with it several important implications, including that it diminishes the targeted agent's freedom and responsibility, and that it is a (pro tanto) wrong and/or violation of right*” (<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/coercion/>; July 15, 2014, italics added).

³ With reference to Joseph Raz (Lukes, 2005, p. 163), the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy advises that “It discusses the consent theory of authority according to which authority is legitimate only if the subjects have consented to it. It discusses the theory advanced by John Rawls that authority is legitimate if and only if it acts in accord with principles the subjects agree to.... It is important here to note the distinction between theoretical and practical authority. A theoretical authority in some area of intellectual inquiry is one that is an expert in that area. Theoretical authorities operate primarily by giving advice to the layman, which advice the layman is free to take or not. The judgments of theoretical authorities give people reasons for belief while the judgments of *political authorities are normally thought to give people reasons*

for action. Theoretical authorities do not normally impose duties on others, although they might give advice on what a person's duty is”

(<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/authority/#LegPolAutSomConDis>; Section 1.1; July 15, 2014, italics added).

⁴ Referencing Marilyn Friedman (2006), as suggested by Lukes (2005), “Friedman’s understanding of *autonomy centers on people living their own lives in accord with their own ideals, rather than living according to someone else’s values*. She spent much of her time in the 1990s and early 2000s responding to feminists who criticized the concept, showing how her self-determinist approach was congenial to feminist ideals. At the same time, other feminist thinkers began suggesting that autonomy could be reconstructed to take account of its social context, another theme that Friedman says “seemed exactly right.”

“Autonomy has to be understood as embedded in social relationships,” Friedman says. “It’s about self-determination—living a life that reflects your values and wants and needs. The sources of self-determination include socially available options and socialization that enables us to be self-reflective about what matters most to us. If that means being in a committed relationship, or having children, it is still autonomy” (<http://magazine-archives.wustl.edu/spring06/selfdetermination.htm>; July 15, 2014, italics added).

⁵ Lukes (2005) suggests the writings of Riker (e.g. 1986) in considering an understanding of manipulation. As reviewed by Maske and Durden (2003), “It is important to note that Riker was among those who argued that public choice theory might become too narrow, and that it should employ a broader approach, one which fuses the better elements of economics and traditional political theory. His thoughts in that regard are presented in “The Place of Political Science in

Public Choice,” published in 1988 in *Public Choice*, which is a must read for anyone studying the interplay between economics and politics (whether one agrees with the author or not). In this paper, Riker suggests that much of the contemporary work in public choice has focused on the momentary exchange process as applied to politics, with the role of institutions subordinate or missing altogether: but *exchanges take place in a much larger institutional context, and they have implications beyond the moment*. For example, politicians and political parties are not just concerned with the voting (exchange) process for a current election cycle, but with the maintenance of power and influence over time. *Riker proposes that, if the institutional context for political choices (over time) is not considered, then the sub-field of public choice is not needed at all or at best becomes greatly reduced in importance*” (pp. 203-204, italics added).

⁶ Lukes (2005) suggests Joel Feinberg as reference to understanding the concept of interests. Davidson (2010) writes “Joel Feinberg formulated a highly influential ‘interest principle,’ which he and others have used to analyze a wide range of ethical issues, including many with intergenerational dimensions.

According to Feinberg, ‘The sorts of beings who can have rights are those who have (or can have) interests’.

‘A person has an interest in Y when he has a stake in Y, that is, when he stands to gain or lose depending on the condition or outcome of Y’.

‘A person is harmed when someone invades (blocks or thwarts) one of his interests.’

‘*Without awareness, expectation, belief, desire, aim and purpose, a being can have no interests; without interests, he cannot be benefited....Without the capacity to be a beneficiary, he can have*

no rights”” (p. 1, italics added). To the extent that this response is not speaking to rights of subordinates and therefore is beyond its scope, this causal influence will not be considered as an affect to subordinates’ judgment.

⁷ *Loyalty* is usually seen as a virtue, albeit a problematic one. It is constituted centrally by perseverance in *an association to which a person has become intrinsically committed as a matter of his or her identity*. Its paradigmatic expression is found in friendship, to which loyalty is integral, but many other relationships and associations seek to encourage it as an aspect of affiliation or membership: families expect it, *organizations often demand it*, and countries do what they can to foster it. May one also have loyalty to principles or other abstractions? Two key issues in the discussion of loyalty concern its status as a virtue and, if that status is granted, the limits to which loyalty ought to be subject (First published Tue Aug 21, 2007; substantive revision Thu Jul 11, 2013; italics and bold added for emphasis; <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/loyalty/>).

⁸ Much of the debate about identity in recent decades has been about personal identity, and specifically about personal identity over time, but identity generally, and the identity of things of other kinds, have also attracted attention. Various interrelated problems have been at the centre of discussion, but it is fair to say that recent work has focused particularly on the following areas: the notion of a criterion of identity; the correct analysis of identity over time, and, in particular, the disagreement between advocates of perdurance and advocates of endurance as analyses of identity over time; the notion of identity across possible worlds and the question of its relevance to the correct analysis of de re modal discourse; the notion of contingent identity; the question of whether the identity relation is, or is similar to, the composition relation; and the notion of vague identity. A radical position, advocated by Peter Geach, is that these debates, as usually

conducted, are void for lack of a subject matter: the notion of absolute identity they presuppose has no application; there is only relative identity. Another increasingly popular view is the one advocated by Lewis: although the debates make sense they cannot genuinely be debates about identity, since there are no philosophical problems about identity. Identity is an utterly unproblematic notion. What there are, are genuine problems which can be stated using the language of identity. But since these can be restated without the language of identity they are not problems about identity. (For example, it is a puzzle, an aspect of the so-called “problem of personal identity”, whether the same person can have different bodies at different times. But this is just the puzzle whether a person can have different bodies at different times. So since it can be stated without the language of personal “identity”, it is not a problem about identity, but about personhood.) This article provides an overview of the topics indicated above, some assessment of the debates and suggestions for further reading (First published Wed Dec 15, 2004; substantive revision Fri Apr 25, 2014; <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/identity/>).

⁹ The culture of the Akan people of West Africa dates from before the 13th century. Like other long-established cultures the world over, the Akan have developed a rich conceptual system complete with metaphysical, moral, and epistemological aspects. Of particular interest is the Akan conception of persons, a conception that informs a variety of social institutions, practices, and judgments about personal identity, moral responsibility, and the proper relationship both among individuals and between individuals and community.

This overview presents the Akan conception of persons as seen by two major contemporary Akan philosophers, Kwasi Wiredu and Kwame Gyekye. These scholars present two very different accounts of the concept, particularly with respect to the relationship between social

recognition and innate characteristics to personhood. Examining the Akan conception of personhood from these two different perspectives highlights both the richness of the conception as well as the myriad ways in which the resulting conception contrasts with Western conceptions. Among those contrasts are four on which we focus below: (1) the continuous nature of personhood, (2) the means by which individuals achieve full personhood, and the implications of this conception of personhood for (3) the relationship between individuals and the community and (4) the Akan understanding of responsibility and freedom.

The debate between Wiredu and Gyekye provides insights regarding not just the substance of the conception of personhood, but also the way empirical evidence can be used to inform philosophical analysis. In this particular case, the Akan view of personhood has, like many other metaphysical and moral conceptions, far-reaching effects on social practices and institutions. Using facts about these practices and institutions to reconstruct a conception of personhood underscores another important general theme in African philosophy: the practical implications of philosophical principles on everyday life. For the Akan, judgments about personhood are not matter of merely academic interest, but play an important role in shaping and supporting their highly communal social structure. To the extent that the Akan notion accommodates a common humanity as an innate source of value, it supports moral equality. At the same time, its emphasis on the social bases of personhood helps firmly to embed trust, cooperation, and responsibility to the community in cultural practices. The Akan philosophy of persons thus represents an attempt to resolve questions of identity, freedom, and morality in favor of a communalistic way of life that has evolved as a rational adaptation to the exigencies of survival under harsh conditions (<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/akan-person/>).

¹⁰ Like Wiredu, Gyekye recognizes that there are standards for which individual persons aim that have an important role in how people think of themselves and their place in society. Unlike Wiredu, however, Gyekye denies that facts about a person's ambitions or goals add or subtract from that individual's status as a person,

The individual may fail in his strivings and, in the Akan community, for example, may consequently be judged as a “useless person” (onipa hun), an opprobrium term. But it must be noted that what the individual would be striving for in all these exertions is some social status not personhood. The striving are in fact part of the individual's self-expression, an exercise of a capacity he has as a person. Even if at the end of the day he failed to attain the expected status, his personhood would not for that reason diminish, even though he may lose social respect in the eyes of the community. So that it is social status not personhood at which individuals could fail (Wiredu & Gyekye 1992, 111 note 20).

Instead, then, of treating persons as a kind of individual that admits of degrees, Gyekye employs criteria of personhood that are quite independent of individual aims and actions. He maintains that, while persons may differ with respect to how they are treated in a community, this difference is a matter of the social status accorded each, not facts about their status as persons (<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/akan-person/#PerSocSta>).