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ABSTRACT

The role ideology plays in human activity has undergone a resurgence of interest (Jost, 2006; Rudolph, & Evans, 2005; Van Hiel, Mervielde, & De Fruyt, 2004) after lying dormant for many years. Following the destructiveness of World War II, the Frankfurt School and a group identified as End of Ideology emerged analyzing the role of ideology. The Frankfurt School (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950) approached ideology by analyzing the possibility of an authoritarian personality. The End of Ideology group concluded that ideology had discontinued its importance in the post War West (Bell, 1960; Lipset, 1960). Both of these views fall short because stronger connection needs to be made between individual and community in understanding ideology’s power and implications. Ideology is a dynamic instrument that is used to guide behavior and achieve individual and community goals. Through the use of anxiety and fear, ideology easily becomes a tool utilized for authoritarian goals by groups seeking to either expand or maintain power.

The theoretical framework created for the examination of the relationship between ideology and authoritarianism combines the Pragmatic Instrumentalism of John Dewey (1938) who wrote extensively on the necessity for examining a ‘real’ (existential) problem; the work of Erik Erikson (1968) who analyzed ideology as the other side of the
center of his theory – identity within a social, cultural, historical perspective; and Uri Bronfenbrenner (1977) who provides an ecological model that emphasizes the interconnectedness of environments. By integrating these three theorists and using the case studies of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (RHYA), the possibility will be explored that ideology permits policies to develop which fail to address the true problem, leading to a concentration on observable symptoms.

The potential to move away from the authoritarian use of ideology is investigated through Erikson’s ideas on generativity. With generativity, Erikson began to move beyond traditional psychology and into broader paradigms. Generativity is expressed through social institutions and in social contexts by adults through intergenerational transfer (de St. Aubin, McAdams, & Kim, 2004). Humans are not isolates, but rather social beings in which relatedness to the world is of primary importance.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

There is a renewed interest in the concept of ideology and its implications for human activity coinciding with increased political polarization in the United States (Jost, 2006; Rudolph, & Evans, 2005; Van Hiel, Mervielde, & De Fruyt, 2004). Some of the current discussion of ideological influences intersects with schools of thought that emerged in the mid 20th century in response to the rise of extreme political positions that moved beyond simple nationalism (e.g. fascism, communism). Following World War II, and the role extreme political perspectives played in its generation and aftermath, two different approaches emerged that attempted to explain the role of ideology as an influence on human decision-making and activity. One approach is most often identified with the Frankfurt school, specifically as written in *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswick, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950). Adorno and his colleagues explored the existence of a personality type created by a manipulative and hierarchical parent-child relationship. This relationship translates into a political philosophy which strongly rejects that which is identified as threatening to both the individual and society (Adorno et al., 1950). The second approach, taken by the end of ideology proponents, argued ideology had lost its relevance in the post World War II developed world due to changes in the political economy and emergence of social democracy (Bell, 1960; Lipset, 1960). Converse (1964) advanced a separate argument, readily absorbed into the end of
ideology movement, that ideology did not exist in the mass population due to the lack of an internal belief system construction capable of guiding behavior – basically attempting to strangle the concept in its crib.¹

The rise of fascism in Germany combined with the destructiveness of World War II created an atmosphere within intellectual and academic circles leading to an interest in authoritarianism. Initially the idea that authoritarianism influenced (non-pathological) extreme behavior found outlets across a spectrum of analysis, including famously the work of Hannah Arendt (1964).² Once WW II ended, the research turned into a search for the possible existence of a fascist ‘personality’. The Frankfurt school led this research culminating in the publication of The Authoritarian Personality (Adorno et al., 1950) – containing a series of studies that integrated the increasingly sophisticated use of quantitative and qualitative research designs within the social sciences into their study.

The goal of Adorno et al (1950) was to discover whether there existed a certain group of individuals who were particularly vulnerable to fascist propaganda – whether an individual such as Adolf Eichman was both normal and susceptible. Using Freudian analysis as their base, they created an f-scale to measure individual vulnerability to communities promoting authoritarian governmental structures. They discovered that the high scorer (individuals most vulnerable/susceptible) grew up in households that gave out love “inconsistently and sparingly” (p. 455). As adults these individuals actively sought

¹ One of the interesting aspects of ideology that soon after it was identified as a guiding force in human behavior researchers tried to make arguments that it was no longer relevant – suggesting that the concept only had value as a historical – but not an immediate psychological – phenomenon.
² In Eichman in Jerusalem Arendt suggested that Eichman - and Nazi’s in general – were normally functioning human beings who engaged in horrific acts because that is what their authoritarian milieu demanded of them. Many of these individuals could just have easily been passive functionaries in a society that demanded something different of them.
out an authority that would guide them on the ego level. These high scoring individuals were termed pseudo-conservatives and indicated authoritarian personalities. Adorno et al believed that these types of cold, distant families were inevitable, so the problem had to be approached at the community/societal level. Marxism offered a way out of this cycle by taking authority away from the individual and putting it back in the hands of the masses within a nonalienating environment.

It did not take long for a response to *The Authoritarian Personality* to emerge. At first the response was positive but it quickly became embroiled in the politics of the cold war (Roiser & Willig, 2002). In 1954 Christie and Jahoda edited *Studies in the Scope and Method of “The Authoritarian Personality”* in which several authors comment on the research. Shils responded with the essay “Authoritarianism: ‘Right’ and ‘Left’”, asserting the existence of not only a right authoritarianism but also a left authoritarianism. Shils proposed that the right/left continuum used by Adorno et al. (1950) missed the similarities between fascism and bolshevism and that the left pole of the continuum is just as authoritarian as the right. This is related to the idea that left/right is not a continuum at all but circular in nature.

The argument made here is that the end of ideology movement throws the “baby out with the bathwater” – that ideology does exist as a guiding force in human behavior in spite of global transitions, but a much stronger connection needs to be made between individual and community in understanding its power and implications. For instance, Adorno et al was correct that there is such a thing as ideology, and that ideology gets its power from individual fears, but also the end of ideologists were right that the use of these fears to achieve goals cannot be restricted to any part of the political spectrum.
Ideology is a dynamic instrument that is used to guide behavior and achieve individual and community goals. Because ideology is primarily an instrument it needs to be understood in terms of its social goals and consequences, rather than individual susceptibilities (although susceptibility to authoritarianism as an instrument does play an important role). In making the argument for an instrumental authoritarianism, ideas of John Dewey and his ideas on Instrumental Pragmatism are referred to.

*Ideology and The Frankfurt School*

After WW I, Classic Marxism had a few questions to answer: nationalism had increased not decreased during the war, despite the existence of the correct historical conditions the proletariat did not revolt, and the one country that experienced a revolution was not industrialized. It was obvious that the worker’s revolution failed to happen as a result of historical events. The Frankfurt school and critical theory emerged in the 1920s to answer why. Critical theory differed from Classic Marxism through the dialectical analysis of both social and economic processes within society combined with Freudian psychology. Horkheimer, Marcuse and Fromm (among others) were all associated with the early history of the Frankfurt school, with Adorno joining later (Held, 1980). One possibility Fromm and later Adorno in *The Authoritarian Personality* explored was the potential development of an authoritarian personality.

In the *Authoritarian Personality* (1950) Adorno et al. concluded that late industrial society created the economic and social conditions that made the authoritarian personality possible. Classic Marxism was correct that capitalism exploits and separates man from his full potential. Marx did not understand the role of the social process in creating conditions that sustained capitalism. For Adorno and the other critical theorists,
the family became the transmitter of culture within capitalist society. An important ingredient to this was their interpretation and use of Freud to explain family conditions. The authoritarian personality emerges from the Oedipal conflict between the child and the father in which little and/or inconsistent love combined with harsh discipline is exhibited.

The Frankfurt school advanced the idea that authoritarian ideology was a Freudian expression of the need for (certain) personality types to find a controlling, patriarchal influence outside the self. Many criticisms of Adorno et al. miss their major points about personality development in authoritarian contexts (Shils, 1954; Martin, 2001), particularly the insights they offer in their Freudian/ Marxist synthesis concerning the role fear plays in the interaction between the individual and ideology. *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno et al., 1950) asserts that the authoritarian personality is fearful of the reemergence (and possible domination in action) of his/her id. In this personality type the ego is not strong enough to control id in the manner that the superego demands. The superego becomes frightened and the ego becomes frightened because the emergence of id tendencies at this point is seen as dangerous. The harsh discipline used and inconsistent love provided by the parents (particularly the father) impedes the development of a strong ego demanded by the superego. The child then becomes the adult who learns only fear of punishment combined with a subconscious desire to live according to pleasure. A charismatic leader/object becomes a replacement father for the individual and the group, with all the power and magical authority of the lost father figure (Freud, 1949). Authoritarian ideology becomes a tool to control the impulses of the id, and in turn a tool of the group to control and/or harness the impulses of the individual.
Once an authoritarian personality is created, the individual is vulnerable to authoritarian processes. Ideology can be adopted as an instrument for use by the individual to control the id. The ideology itself is based on recognition of this primal process. Societies like Nazi Germany use authoritarian ideology (including symbols and charismatic leadership) as a tool to access the authoritarian personality.

Since the family is the transmitter and reflects the conditions that are present in late capitalism itself, the only way to truly overcome authoritarianism is with a radical change in the social and economic conditions within society. Adorno (1968) speculated that reification may never be overcome by the revolutionary working class in late capitalism. Ideology then is viewed as a product of one’s early childhood that cannot change. Due to the reliance on traditional Freudianism, the individual almost becomes a prisoner to this overlay of belief system – the seeds of which were completely created by the time she was five.

Erich Fromm and the split within the Frankfurt school

When Adorno joined the Frankfurt school in 1938, Fromm left due to both personal and theoretical disagreements with Adorno and Horkheimer (Wilde, 2004). This split within critical theory became increasingly public in the 1950s, when Marcuse engaged Fromm in an open debate in Dissent (1955; 1956b) accusing Fromm of revisionist Freudianism. The Frankfurt school vocally expressed its disdain for Fromm by accusing him of not only creating a revisionist theory of Freud and Marx, but actually adopting bourgeois attitudes (Wilde, 2004). Adorno has attracted most of the attention for the concept of the authoritarian personality, but it was actually Fromm (1984) who
originally researched the possible existence of an authoritarian ‘attitude’ in Weimar Germany in the late 1920s.

Fromm came to the conclusion that there existed an inconsistency between Freud and Marxism making the theories paradoxical. Marxism is based on the concept that as the worker becomes increasingly alienated she becomes radicalized, eventually overthrowing the existing economic structure. Freud was a critic of civilization, not of capitalist society (Fromm, 1956b). The Oedipal complex is a result of civilization, not capitalism. Following from this, it is logical to believe that if the authoritarian personality is the result of Oedipal complex, it will occur in any condition civilization presents. This is precisely what Fromm found in his studies on the German worker in the late 1920s. There were workers crossing class boundaries by indicating authoritarian attitudes (Fromm, 1984).

In a major movement toward a new understanding of Freud, Erich Fromm rejected drive theory in 1936 (Wilde, 2004) – moving towards a conflict between conscious and unconscious strivings that does not preclude the individual from experiencing love and happiness (Fromm, 1955). He rejected Freud’s idea that man will never be fully happy because civilization will always frustrate his attempt at satisfying his sexual desires (Fromm, 1956b). Fromm agreed that an authoritarian conscience or attitude existed, but despite its existence human history was a progression towards greater freedom. The danger exists in that authoritarianism, whether it is religious or secular, in the form of nationalism or racism, is full of easy
answers. Ultimately the dialectic process in human history unveils the quest for freedom (Wilde, 2004). For Fromm, this is why Nazism would eventually crumble. It could not fulfill this undeniable need for freedom (Fromm, 1941).

In this view authoritarian ideology can unleash incredible destructive forces but ultimately will consume itself. The individual is enticed toward authoritarianism because of a fear of the unknown-the id being unleashed. On the societal level, groups use authoritarianism as a tool to control populations exploiting this fear on the individual level and moving it to a mass level. For Fromm, eventually the essential human desire for freedom would triumph.

Adorno’s commitment to a strict, traditional interpretation of Freud led him to view all attempts at reinterpreting Freud as revisionist. Fromm is accused of giving “an oversimplified account of the interaction of the mutually alienated institutions id and ego” (Adorno, 1968, p. 79). A second important influence on Adorno’s theoretical framework was Lenin. Leninism advocates an elitism in its advocacy of a party that must lead the workers until the correct conditions arise in which the workers are no longer susceptible to false consciousness. Fromm’s advocacy of social democracy contradicted Leninist elitism, which combined with the rejection of Freud’s drive theory, made him a dangerous revisionist. Adorno became so concerned that in March 1936 he wrote a letter to Horkheimer stating that Fromm needed to “read more Lenin” (as cited in McLaughlin, 1999, p. 6). Adorno asserted the existence of a structure within the individual that determined beliefs and actions.
The conclusion of WW II saw the world split into bipolar spheres of influence between the U.S. and the U.S.S.R. as the cold war intensified. While the Frankfurt school was exploring the origins of the authoritarian personality, a completely different movement was emerging in Europe and the United States that became known as the end of ideology movement. This movement completely rejected the premise on which *The Authoritarian Personality* was based. In the political climate of the cold war an assault on the (partially Marxist influenced) work of Adorno and his colleagues ensued (Roiser & Willig, 2002).

The Congress for Cultural Freedom was covertly created as an anti-communist organization in 1950 by the American CIA to attract the most renowned scholars to conferences and its publications. During a series of Congress for Cultural Freedom conferences in the 1950s, the end of ideology movement crystallized (Scott-Smith, 2002). The attendees to these conferences included Shils, Bell and Lipset all of whom became intimately associated with the end of ideology movement. Both Lipset and Bell published seminal books in 1960 discussing why they believed ideology had become irrelevant in a post World War II global environment. In *Political Man* (1960) Lipset asserted that there was very little difference in liberal democracies between the left and right due to the emergence of universal suffrage, post WW II affluence and the acceptance of wealth redistribution. These changes represented a repudiation of the type of social/political dialectic suggested by Marx -the working class had no reason to be revolutionary.
Bell wrote *The End of Ideology* in 1960 and like Lipset believed that the passion required to maintain ideology had disappeared. The ideological age had ended due to “the acceptance of a Welfare State; the desirability of decentralized power; a system of mixed economy and of political pluralism” (1960, p. 373). Bell added to this argument the idea that in democratic politics a search for consensus and bargaining was important and that this was achieved through representative government. Again, a rejection of the Marxist-Leninist USSR was implicit in the argument, as well as rejection of the idea that capitalism inspired an object oriented culture that provided a context for mass psychologies which used individual authoritarian personalities to establish control and promote action within social groups. The motivation is still to attain and maintain objects, but ignoring the Freudian implications of *The Authoritarian Personality*, this did not result in violent (or fear of violent) competition for objects of libidinal desires, but the development of rational institutions that helped to create consensus among members of the group.

Converse (1964) approached the end of ideology argument from a different perspective. His research focused on whether an ideological framework in the mass public might even exist. Working out of the influential Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan (Weisberg, 1999), Converse argued that different degrees of consistency and sophistication occurred in the use of ideology but that only about 10-12 percent of the mass public actually retained an ideological framework (Moskowitz & Jenkins, 2004). Converse focused his research on measuring stability of partisanship on the individual level, thus connecting the individual, party identification and ideology (Converse, 2006, Weisberg, 1999). Ideologies are present but only in a small percentage
of population. For the vast majority of the mass public, there is no internal construction of ideology capable of guiding behavior (Converse, 1964). Because ideology is theoretically a part of personality, and because personality is constant (from a Freudian perspective there is little change in personality after the individual enters the latency stage), this called in to question whether ideology was an attribute of most individual personalities.

Shils criticism focused on his belief that there was both a right and left authoritarian personality, but in so doing he completely ignored the Freudian basis of The Authoritarian Personality. In Shils’s reply (1954) to The Authoritarian Personality his emphasis on the left/right continuum missed the central point of the original work—that right wing authoritarianism is a result of the individual’s fear of the emergence of the id and that this fear cannot be separated from experiences with the parents during early childhood. The use of Freud’s theory of the Oedipal complex by Adorno et al. (1950) creates the inability of a true authoritarian personality to emerge in anyone other than an extreme rightist/conservative. A person acting from a perspective based on fear is going to be far more concerned with maintenance rather than exploration. The issue is not whether the individual considers herself right/left, but rather what is embodied in the individual’s psychological belief system. As Erich Fromm and Hilde Weiss discovered in The Working Class in Weimar Germany (1984) the self-identification as a leftist can be significantly different from the actual, ideological belief system.

Bell and Lipset commit a different error. Apart from disregarding the fact that not everyone was sharing in either the post WWII affluence or universal suffrage in the United States, they confuse the psychological with the political. Simply because the
existence of forces (i.e. economic and consensus) external to the individual appear to be pointing in one direction does not eliminate the psychological basis of fear over loss of control (individually and socially). The potential for the psychological to emerge as a result of seeds planted during the Oedipal conflict still exists—it just needs a trigger to be activated (with the possibility that the same demagogue and/or object who triggers the fear will serve as the father figure who will control the id’s needs of the self and others).

The major weakness with Converse is the detachment of the actions of the individual with the directed thinking processes of the individual. Taking Converse to its logical end, the individual is simply reacting to events without any rational explanation. Ultimately Converse posits the individual as an irrational or at the very least arational, actor without emotional baggage. This is an incomplete picture based on what is known about human behavior (Glassman, 2000). The suggestion here is that humans work towards goals that are meaningful to them and have a purpose. The activity is always rational to the individual even if it appears irrational to the onlooker. To separate the two is to separate thought from action, and suggest that individuals are not much more than social/cultural sieves.

The end of ideology movement focused on the question ‘under what conditions does ideology discontinue its existence?’—as if ideology was the sole creation of the social macro-system, and individual personalities played little or no role. In essence they were trying to make the same argument about capitalism that Adorno and his colleagues were attempting to make about Marxism— that it created an emotional utopia. But while the members of the Frankfurt school made a careful, if flawed argument about how individual psychosis was alleviated through the Marxist dialectic, the end of ideology
group simply declared their utopia and were done with it. The perspective that there was no longer any such thing as ideology was a function of the cold war of the 1950s and reflected in the explicit rejection of Marxism of its progenitors (Scott-Smith, 2002). Ideology lost all importance for human decision making because conditions in post WWII Europe and the United States made it irrelevant. The idea that ideology was very much an individual based compensation, and that if ideology disappeared it would have to be replaced by some other Oedipal related mechanism, was completely lost on these theorists.

As recently as 2001, Lipset suggested that the European left is rejecting Marx-Leftist politics, creating the “Third Way” so frequently referred to by Tony Blair — yet another attempt to suggest individual needs related to the authoritarian personality have been ameliorated without explanation. Public opinion polls measure attitudes and beliefs at the moment — it is a snapshot approach. Ideology, at least as conceived by Adorno et al. is based on a developmental progression where personality interacts with critical environmental factors across a broad spectrum of systems over the life of the individual. Because ideology is based on personality type it may be too complex to capture through initial survey methods without follow-up. Erich Fromm and Hilde Weiss encountered this issue when they used the questionnaire method in their original study of German worker attitudes. Their questionnaire consisted of 271 questions a number they felt was necessary to measure the subtleties of attitudes, but reduced their response rate to only 33%. Even with 271 questions Weiss and Fromm decided that the attitudinal research

---

3 The Third Way is an alternative between neo-liberal economics and socialism achieved through the adoption of both market-based and interventionist economic elements. This is the descendent to the End of Ideology.
required the maximization of open ended questions (1984). As Bonss (1984) points out in his introduction to \textit{The Working Class in Weimar Germany}, “arguments were developed which remind one of today’s criticism of attitudinal research” (p. 25). If individuals overcome ideology it needs to be understood at the individual level – and it demands a rational explanation that speaks to the relationship between material and emotional needs.

\textit{Recapturing ideology}

The end of ideology movement was precipitous and somewhat cavalier in their declarations that ideology is no longer relevant. John T Jost’s article “The End of the End of Ideology” (2006) explores the role played by the end of ideology movement in the 1950s to political psychology. His main thesis is that the end of ideology movement was the child of sociologists and political scientists and not psychologists, damaging political psychology that lasted many decades. Jost lists four claims by the end of ideologists which he proceeds to dissect: political ideology became undistinguishable between liberals and conservatives; the political attitudes of ordinary citizens were incapable of sustaining coherency or stability; there was no behavioral significance in the constructs of liberal and conservative; and the psychological differences between liberal and conservative orientations were negligible. He introduces a different approach from the 1950s embodied in the product of Adorno et al., \textit{The Authoritarian Personality} (1950) as an alternative based in psychology.

Jost is correct that there is such a thing as ideology and that it has a psychological (rather than strictly sociological) basis. There are three critical arguments to make, all interconnected. The first difficulty is that he objectifies ideology as a grand strategy
implemented at the individual level, rather than as an instrument used for a specific purpose in activity. In doing so he forces ideology into a category separate from human experience and its continuum with nature (Dewey, 1929), setting it up as an “object” that guides human behavior. The second issue follows on the first, is that he seems to commit an ancillary to the “naturalistic fallacy” (Kohlberg, 1981) - that because somebody acts in a manner that can be categorized ideological, there is actually is such a thing as ideology separate from that event and/or political experience, and that we ought to understand the meaning of ideology in order to understand future human activities as outside observers. This leads to the third difficulty, which is seeing this objective ideology as a unidirectional, causal mechanism for activity. It is assumed that individuals act according to ideology rather than immediate ideological positions are the residue of purposeful activity.

An alternate approach focuses on ideology as a process integrated in to social activity, rather than as an object outside the human/nature continuum that determines activity. Ideology does play a role in guiding activity but it is not continuous or absolute, and the trajectory and ends-in-view of activity plays just as important a role in the development of ideology. The works of Erich Fromm, Erik Erikson, and John Dewey are replied upon in making this argument.

*Fromm to Erikson to Dewey*

Erich Fromm (1947, 1984) wrote extensively on the authoritarian conscience. Fromm’s departure from classic Freudianism impacted his conclusions on authoritarian personalities. For Fromm, Freud understood and explained character as “mechanistic-naturalistic thinking” (Fromm, 1947, p. 54). The problem Fromm has with Freud’s thesis
is that it offers an incomplete picture of character. Freud’s explanation is based on
instinct, but in so doing he creates a dualism in activity, separating the body from the
mind. The body must react with the mind. Man is a social being who is not isolated and
his relatedness to the world is of primary importance (Fromm, 1947). Fromm is
exploring the concept that the relationship between the individual and her environment
was functional, an idea further clarified by Erik Erikson.

Erikson (1993, 1968) was a major figure in merging Freud’s theory of personality
development with adaptation to social needs and goals – both expanding conceptions of
the phallic stage/Oedipal conflict to include dynamic social environmental interactions
and suggesting that Freud was thinking along these same lines near the end of his life
(Erikson 1968). Erikson makes three important additions to Freud’s theory that are
important for an instrumental conception of ideology,

1. Erikson believed society had a significant affect on the actions and structure
   of the family – especially in child rearing – and therefore on personality. There is no
   separation between society and individual in personality. It is part of a continuum. But
   Erikson saw society as Pragmatic, and not irrational, in its early incarnations.

2. While Erikson believed that Freud was correct when suggesting personality
   was formed early in life, he also believed that personality had a dynamic component and
   was open to different developmental trajectories based on social circumstance (1993).
   Individuals face a number of crises, or forks in the road, over the course of their lifetimes
   (1968). There is a Pragmatic aspect to these crises because individuals must achieve
   certain both proximal and distal developmental goals. No crisis is more important than
   the identity crisis faced by adolescents. It is especially during adolescence that the
individual struggles for meaning in attempting to adapt to physical and social environments (Weigart and Gecaus 2005).

3. Erikson proposed the idea of generativity - a behavioral trajectory that stands as a counter-point to authoritarianism. In many ways generativity, with its positive focus on collective activity and communion (and the idea that personality can be rational in service of goal directed activity) is more progressive as opposed to authoritarianism’s more conservative orientation.

An Eriksonian perspective suggests that personality intermingles with social and cultural history as well as present circumstance in determining whether individual choices are generative or ideological – there are circumstances when individuals see exploration leading to change as more adaptive, and circumstances when individuals see maintenance as more adaptive. Personality plays a major role in determining action, but always in the context of social history and circumstance. The effect of outside influences on personality is indirect (in that all influence is mediated through family structure). But personality only offers a general skeleton for activity. It is circumstance that puts flesh on the skeleton. Personalities are adaptive and run along a range - some personalities are more susceptible to fear of the id and the primal actions of the social group, while some personalities are more susceptible to opportunities for change (as a result of family and social histories, Baumrind, 1966) – but in most cases individual choices are always based within the social situation. It is possible for individuals/groups to create atmospheres that foster fear (to promote ideology) or exploration (to foster generativity). Ideology and

---

4 Erikson was of course not the only one to do this – Fromm suggested a culture of caring (1956a) and Lewin suggested a democratic perspective. Erikson’s idea on generativity may have more resonance for discussions about ideology because it is an off-shoot of Freud’s original theory.
generativity are used as tools by individuals/groups to guide activity and achieve specific goals.

It is best then to view ideology from a functional perspective rather than a structural perspective – as a dynamic tool rather than a static personality type. Ideology is integrated into human experience and cannot be separated from it (Eldridge, 1998). Far from being irrational (as Adorno might have claimed) ideology is a rational tool used by both the group/individual fostering goals. Once ideology is “put out there” it is adopted by individuals as an adaptive measure. The person/group promoting ideology by “packaging” belief systems and selling them as a salve for fear of change (leading to loss of control of the id and the primal instincts of the crowd) is able to achieve political and social goals that might otherwise be difficult if not impossible to achieve. The individual adopts ideology in order to protect the self against real or imagined danger.\(^{5}\) It is important to recognize that ideology is conservative but it is not right wing. Any political perspective can use fear of the crowd to promote a political agenda and achieve goals they might not otherwise be able to achieve, including the primal power of the group harnessed to guide individual and social activities.

The observation that people act (vote) in ideological ways that seem to be against their interests, and that those from the lower socio-economic strata tend to be more Conservative with an upper case “C” (as opposed to conservative with a lower case “c”)\(^ {6}\) is an example of ideology as functional psychology. Individuals prioritize goals – these

\(^{5}\) Sometimes the dangers can be very real. For instance the ideology of the Baath party in Iraq or the communist party in Croatia did protect against and control primal instincts that were devastating once unleashed.

\(^{6}\) The difference between big “C” Conservative (or Liberal) and small “c” conservative (or liberal) is an important distinction. The former are ideologically based instruments, while the second are experimental perspectives on immediate problems.
priorities are situation dependent - and they act to meet their highest priority ends-in-view. In other words primary activity is rational first and ideological second – it is rational goals that enable an ideological belief system to take hold (so that they see the belief system as a tool in meeting their ends-in-view). Authoritative elements of society (who have some control of information) work to intermingle locally prioritized goals with the prioritized issues of a larger group so that individuals believe they are acting in their own best interests by agreeing with an array of secondary issues. The relationship between primary goals and secondary issues is based on quality of available information. For example, the primary goal of individuals may be protecting what they already have, including material worth and way of life. The rational goal of politicians, media figures, and business groups might be to increase wealth and power. These organizing social groups fold conservative goals into Conservative (ideological) ideals so that they become a single instrument.

Lower socio-economic groups may feel much greater immediate threats to what they possess (both on a material and spiritual level), so become more likely to take a more conservative approach to experience. The more a Conservative movement is able to fold a conservative approach to experience in to a larger Conservative ideology as a tool to obtain what they want, the more likely members of socio-economic strata act to promote a Conservative ideology. Instrumental Pragmatism (Dewey, 1938) would argue that control and flow of information augments the ability to intermingle the local goals and the ideological issues in to a single meaning/truth. This is the reason that ideological

7 These goals can’t be separate from quality of experience in the life of the actor. For example, if an individual builds life and relationships around a religious/church culture then the priority becomes maintenance of this culture. A prioritized goal is attempting to deflect or defeat any perceived encroachment on this culture.
movements (including the Conservative movement) have worked so hard to develop univocal information sources and to denounce outside information outlets as having no interest in their priorities.  

*Ideology as a political strategy: the dangers of reification*

Reifying ideology in to an object of control can be dangerous. It offers those who promote ideology, folding conservative or liberal into Conservative or Liberal, a free “pass.” As an example we take the shift over the last three plus decades to a more Conservative ideology in the United States. Not coincidentally this shift coincides with the development of the political tactic known as the “Southern Strategy” (Black & Black, 1992; Lamis, 1990). The Southern Strategy was created in 1968 and first used by the Nixon campaign partly as an answer to the segregationist platform of George Wallace. The idea for it emerged out of the events of the civil rights and anti-war student movements of the 1960s, which were upsetting the conservative voters within the Democratic Party. Beginning with the creation of the New Deal coalition, southern Democrats had been a significant source of power and stability for the Democratic Party. The Southern Strategy was designed to alter this balance of power by using first the issue of race and secondly the issue of law and order. The Conservative (ideological) ideals through the combination of civil rights and the anti-war movement directly appealed to the fear of chaos and change. The Southern Strategy was effective in using Conservative ideology to attract conservative southern voters to support the Nixon presidency. In fact

---

8This would suggest that Conservatives do not have poor information because they are ideological, but that they are ideological because they have been convinced to not trust information of sources that do not prioritize conservative goals. An issue such as the “War on Christmas” may be laughable, but it is tied to perceived attacks on people’s way of life and therefore effective in helping to control information.
it was the beginning of the change in party identification in the south from the Democratic to Republican Party that has been so frequently noted in the popular press.

The Southern Strategy played on the fears people had of losing their way of life to “others” who, if not held in check, would come and take it from them. The prioritized goal of many (especially rural) poor, white Southerners became maintaining their way of life. The goal of the “Southern Strategy” was to both stoke fears of debilitating change and fold them in to a larger Conservative ideology. The Southern Strategy became about promoting goals of harsh “Law and Order”, not coddling “others” by giving them the opportunity to take what they did not deserve\(^9\), and strict maintenance of ‘traditional values’ (Black & Black, 1992; Kinder & Sanders, 1996; Petrocik, 1987). We make the argument that these were not the immediate goals of the individuals who actually developed the ‘Southern Strategy’ as much as a method for obtaining control of the political and social agenda. Those who developed the ideology intermingled fear of change with Conservative ideology that included a more expensive military (tied to Law and Order), lower taxes (tied to not coddling “others” with welfare programs), and an assault on ‘secular humanism’ (tied to the need to maintain traditional values).\(^10\)

A different example, but one within more recent memory, is the government and public reaction to the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001. The Bush administration did not begin its term with an intense focus on security. The first major piece of legislation prior to 9/11 was No Child Left Behind, a bipartisan effort initiated by a Republican President whose presidential campaign had successfully used education to its

\(^9\) Reagan’s famous comment about the ‘Welfare Queen’ made during his 1976 presidential campaign.

\(^10\) We could make a similar argument for more “Left” ideologies as instruments, such as in Stalinist Soviet Union.
advantage, a domestic policy subject that traditionally had benefited Democrats. When 9/11 occurred, it fundamentally altered the administration and the public toward a focus on security due to a sense of fear. A presidency that had begun with a domestic emphasis became preoccupied with foreign policy and security issues.

As the American public has historically done during crisis, they looked to the executive for guidance. The Bush administration reacted to this collective fear by consolidating executive power and neither Congress nor the public questioned this response. There were a series of actions taken by the U.S. government whose purpose was the maintenance and protection of American society. While most certainly the Islamic fundamentalists who steered the planes into the World Trade Center entertained the goal of inflicting pain on the United States, the reaction by the U.S. government can be described as authoritarian.

As with the Southern Strategy, there was a sense of a threat to a way of life that fueled mass fear. The American public became receptive to authoritarian measures for the purpose of maintenance. The reaction by the public allowing for greater authoritarianism was tightly bound to events and goals. This sense of fear which was triggered by 9/11, an extreme act of violence, was shared by many across the right/left spectrum. As events unfolded, the response became increasingly authoritarian and less open to debate. The language used to promote the authoritarian agenda clearly distinguished between citizens who supported the War on Terror and those who at best did not understand what was at stake. The political movement within the United States turned to goals that were aggressively and explicitly designed to protect a way of life against all outsiders. In doing this, our policymakers labeled those who did not agree
with this outlook as traitors, including many in Europe. Human behavior is functional and at the point individuals began to perceive that there were negative consequences to the increasingly authoritarian government action, the sense of fear became less proximal and other concerns became dominant.

**Ideology as an Instrument**

Ideology as a concept has experienced an interesting journey since World War II. Immediately after the war, the search for a fascist-leaning personality dominated as scholars searched to explain the rise of Nazi Germany. *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno et al., 1950) became the most recognizable work in this search using Freud as its base. Personality became a blueprint shaped early in life making it structural. On the opposite end of the journey, the end of ideology movement proposed that ideology exerted little or no influence on human behavior thus disconnecting it from the psychological process that creates the belief system. Both approaches are incomplete, but in an odd way complement one another. The end of ideology movement was correct that ideology does not exist strictly as a structural mechanism and Adorno was right that ideology is a psychological construct.

To fully understand ideology as an instrument of the individual and society, Fromm is a starting point. Fromm agreed that authoritarian personalities existed, but not in a vacuum. Interactions between social and economic forces combined with personality are continually at play, creating fluidity. One of the most frequently cited criticisms of Fromm is his optimistic outlook for humanity, the culture of caring. His is a forward-looking, functional theory. But it is Erik Erickson who clearly articulates a theory using personality as a base that changes as the individual experiences life crises simultaneously...
within social and cultural history. The development of the id, ego and superego is the basis for the creation of the ideological tendencies, but Erikson was correct that they alter during the lifespan. The individual will choose maintenance (conservative outcomes) or exploration and adaptation (generativity) depending on personality in combination with the social and cultural conditions. The Pragmatic Instrumentalism of John Dewey adds to Erickson the concept of ideology as a dynamic tool used to meet ends-in-view. However, if ideology can be a tool, then it is not confined to the individual. Groups (generally powerful and dominant) use ideology as tools to achieve their own ends - fear can be introduced to maintain or increase their power base. As stated previously, ideology is basically a conservative dynamic, but it is not right-wing. Any group who has the capacity in terms of organization, access, and power is capable of exploiting the ideological tendencies of the individual and transforming them into an ideological tool. The case studies chosen in this work to explore authoritarian or generative public policy outcomes are No Child Left Behind and The Runaway and Homeless Youth Act.

Ideology is neither continuous nor absolute. Child-rearing style not only influences the creation of the individual’s personality, but in addition transmits cultural norms to the individual. As the person matures and engages in more experiences, his/her needs and goals are not static. Ideology is used to help achieve these adapting goals. It is not possible to disconnect the activity with the ends-in-view because humans work towards goals.
References


CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

As public policy develops, among the forces that shape its outcome are two opposing influences: authoritarianism and generativity. Policy characterized by authoritarianism results in rigidity, constricting policy prescriptions often through the use of ideology as a tool to promote goals. Policy influenced by generativity emphasizes optimizing community through human agency with a focus on future generations. Generative policy requires inclusion and fluidity allowing for policy to be more sensitive to not only multiple generations, but also the diversity reflected in human societies. This fluidity and openness suggests that generativity is likely to be found within democratic environments.

Human development currently often exhibits a struggle between authoritarian and generative forces that can be illustrated using the image of a playground teeter totter with the two ends going up and down. The problem is that due to its nature and tools at its disposal, authoritarian forces figure out how to control the game, frequently to the detriment of democratic forces and the development of the individual and/or group to which one belongs. Although many policies reflect the duality of authoritarianism and generativity, it is important to distinguish and understand the differences that they represent and the outcomes generated in terms of the impact on the development on human communities.
A profound understanding of these influences requires a theoretical framework that crosses the disciplinary boundaries of psychology, political science and public policy, simultaneous to using a methodology that allows for a rigorous, scientific process. The methodology adopted for this research is interdisciplinary, multifaceted and has previously been successfully used by Erikson (1968), Bronfenbrenner (1977), and Dewey (1916). The beginning of this framework will explore the connection between authoritarianism and ideology, specifically within democratic systems. This connection involves exploiting the fears and anxieties of the superego (Freud, 1961) providing the opportunity for authoritarianism to use ideology to calm fears and anxieties. The work of Erik Erikson (1968) provides excellent methodological case study examples analyzing ideology as the other side of the center of his theory – identity within a social, cultural, historical perspective. John Dewey supplies the methodology with an emphasis on using the scientific method when examining a ‘real’ (existential) problem that allows the researcher to focus on causes and not the symptoms (see figure 2.1). The critical research question that emerges is whether broad (federal) public policy solutions are designed pragmatically and generatively to solve ongoing social problems or are they developed to primarily meet the ideological demands of particular (authoritarian) groups? It will be argued using this methodology and examining the case studies of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (RHYA), that ideology permits policies to develop which fail to address the true problem, and instead leads to a concentration on observable symptoms. In other words, the policy resolution involves surface problems, failing to address the problem at its roots. Bringing the proposed paradigm together is the work of Uri Bronfenbrenner (1975) providing an ecological
Figure 1.1: Problem Identification in Public Policy
Authoritarian/Generative Outcomes
model that emphasizes the interconnectedness of environments. Methodologically Bronfenbrenner focuses on the discovery of the problem combined with strategies for insight that do not include a prior assumption.

Whether a system is generative and democratic and open or authoritarian and restricted has significant implications on the types of policies that are created and what they look like. Authoritarianism focuses on controlling behavior or events with little interest in the views and dispositions of outside groups. Democratic forces are identified with meaningful choice allowing for individuals and groups to pursue activities that are important to them (Dewey, 1938), the antithesis to authoritarianism. The fields of political science and psychology have struggled with these two concepts. Within psychology there is an ongoing discussion (Altemeyer, 1986; Jost, 2006; Zimbardo, 2007) concerning the origination of authoritarianism. Are there individuals who have personalities with authoritarian tendencies or is it more related to the environment in which the individual finds her/himself. Political science (Hermann, 1986; Lasswell, 1930; Feldman, 2003) also has a high level of interest in democracy and authoritarianism through an approach traditionally focusing on institutions, governments and political elite values– concluding that changing the system, leadership and/or government creates conditions for authoritarianism or democracy. What both psychology and political science are missing is the interconnectedness between environmental conditions, the activities of the citizen and the belief systems present within the environment. The importance of this point is evident in the developmental outcomes for the individuals and groups involved. A policy created using a belief system that is rejected by the group targeted by the policy ultimately will likely fail. For example, if a new policy is pursued
for the homeless youth population advocating abstinence resulting in the discontinuation of the distribution of condoms, it will not succeed in the goal of stopping the high-risk sexual activity of this group. The environmental realities of homeless youth are such that abstinence can be promoted, but the youth themselves will not embrace it (Kelly, & Caputo, 2007).

The argument presented here is that generative societies require the openness and inclusion that democracy embodies creating better developmental outcomes for both society and individuals. Authoritarianism is not concerned with the broad definition of positive developmental outcomes for human communities, but rather positive outcomes for specific, targeted groups. One way to ensure that policy is inclusionary and not exclusionary is through the democratic process.

Democracy is non-authoritarian and works best with compromise, cooperation and negotiation. A democratic process for meaningful participation based on mutual aid is necessary to ensure that everyone who has the desire can be engaged in the decision-making process (Navarro, 2007; Glassman, 2000). Robert Dahl (2006), who has written extensively on democratic theory, asserts that there are six critical elements to an “ideal democracy” (p. 9-10).

1. Effective participation
2. Equality in voting
3. Ability to gain an enlightened understanding
4. Final control of the agenda with the polity
5. Inclusion
6. System of fundamental rights

Authoritarian methods can become dominant through the distortion and control of these critical elements often accomplished by utilizing ideology. Another common
authoritarian method is ignoring the interests of diverse, less powerful groups by overlaying their interests during the decision making process, particularly at the point of policy creation. These two authoritarian strategies often occur simultaneously: the interests of the more dominant group are supported using ideology through the distortion and control of information sources obstructing the ability for an “enlightened understanding” of the situation.

The capability to identify these twin strategies of authoritarianism in a democratic system is pivotal to those who believe that democracy creates better outcomes for human development than authoritarianism and thus important to protect. This task is difficult and requires methodology that moves beyond sterile facts that appear isolated and linear. What is essential is an ability to identify what is ideology, when and why it is used within the framework of a ‘real-life’ problem which has many interconnections within it. The emphasis on an actual problem leads to a focus on public policy. Public policy in a democracy has the potential to solve problems through the process of inclusion and high quality information that aids in understanding the nature of the problem.

Authoritarianism is inherently non-inclusive and within a democratic system must find a means to control the policy agenda. This dissertation argues that ideology is effective at achieving control due to its particular qualities. Equally important is moving beyond the identification and analysis of authoritarianism to offering a workable, alternative approach that aids individuals and groups in developing their full potential.

The problems and dangers inherent in ideology have been identified (Lasswell, 1930; Freud, 1961; Dewey, 1916; & Erikson, 1968) widely across academic fields. Psychology is particularly key to the discussion of ideology since it is uniquely
equipped to link the individual to her culture which Erik Erikson explored in his life span theory. For Erikson, the central task for the individual was in identity creation during adolescence and he viewed ideology as a “necessity for the growing ego” (Erikson, 1968, p. 153). Erikson used the term moratorium for the period in identity formation when an adolescent or young adult ‘tries’ out ideologies. The problems emerge when in later life these ideologies do not transform into mature identities. Ideology encourages the acceptance of outside rationales in place of ones beliefs and actions through the reliance on authoritarian authority figures. Erikson connected these ideas on ideology onto both the individual and societal level as evidenced in his case study of Germany and Hitler.

*Erikson: Psycho-historical Methodology and Research*

Erikson anchors his methodology on three major processes (Erikson, 1968 p. 49)

1. the process of the organization of experience by ego synthesis
2. the process of the social organization of ego organisms in
3. geographic-historical units.

Erikson stresses that these three coexist and are relative to one another. When one alters, then the other two must also undergo change within this organic system. The methodology used to determine these changes and alterations is the case study. For Erikson, the case study was a superior method in understanding the inter-relatedness of these three processes. Erikson analyzed the case studies of both individuals and groups for evidence gathering. He then allowed the evidence to lead him based on his eight life span stages. The evidence indicated how the various crises were being resolved or avoided, again either on an individual level as he did with his study of Gandhi or group level as he succeeded with his studies on the Sioux and Yurok tribes.
The method that Erikson employed has become better known as psychohistory (Pietikainen & Ihanus, 2003). Although his emphasis on the individual is not methodologically relevant for this study, the basic precepts used are similar. Erikson focused his research on the meanings of historical events as opposed to quantitative, theory driven research which was removed from experience (Pietikainen & Ihanus, 2003). The critical methodological ingredient is the experience, not the sanitized and cleaned up quantitative data. Experience focused research is messy but can lead to important insights into behavior that quantitative data misses. Historical processes are understood by analyzing the psychoanalytic viewpoints held within them. “The Legend of Hitler’s Childhood” (Erikson, 1993) clearly illustrates how the social, history and culture of a country becomes interwoven when analyzing events. In this psychohistory, the use of dichotomies and ideologies within a historic period in Germany clearly becomes interconnected. Erikson argues that Hitler utilized dichotomies, particularly in the realm of racial issues. Racial dichotomies allowed Hitler the use of racial imagery ‘either you are one of us or not” with the conclusion that “this antithesis is clearly one of ape man and superman” (1993, p. 343). This racial dichotomy was only one manifestation of the ideology that became Nazism. For Erikson, Nazism was transposed on an entire nation as the “imagery of ideological adolescence” (p.344). Ideology became the outcome of the identity crisis on a societal level. This dissertation will use the case studies of NCLB and RHYA as possible policy examples which reflect ideology that currently exists within social, historical and cultural fabric of the United States.

Erikson wrote extensively on the role of ideology. His methodology was firmly grounded in historical accounts and case histories for the purpose of gaining insights
into the interconnections of group identity and historical events. Pietikainen & Ihanus (2003) refer to this as “empathy based interpretations” using empathic methodology that was achieved through “disciplined subjectivity” (Erikson, 1964).

Disciplined subjectivity includes both self-awareness within a specific context as well as one’s emotional response. Erikson warned against the researcher’s attempt at emotional disengagement together with the goal of emotional objectivity because it obstructed the ability to observe and participate. This is an important point since Erikson asserted that researchers are inherently part of the historical process they are studying. The researcher becomes involved in the process of human existence (Pietikainen & Ihanus, 2003). There is a sense of generativity to this process as the researcher begins to identify activities and policies that expand or contract human potential (Pietikainen & Ihanus, 2003).

John Dewey: Scientific Rigor and Process

John Dewey also recognized the importance of experiential research, but with a much different focus than Erikson. Dewey did not believe that research was truly relevant unless it could be identified with what he referred to as an ‘existential problem’ (1938). The existential problem is one that is real and must be identified as such by the researcher. This is accomplished by finding evidence that the problem is a true reflection of an actual event or issue in the lives of a person or group. Effective methodology cannot separate the existential problem from the inquiry. The type of problem or question should drive what methodology is chosen. What the researcher must avoid is the temptation to analyze symptoms and not the actual causes. Dewey was concerned with creating a methodology of social inquiry that embodied scientific rigor by using the
scientific method. He specified three conditions of the scientific method of social inquiry (Dewey, 1938, p. 499)

1. grow out of actual social tensions, needs, “troubles”.
2. have their subject-matter determined by the conditions that are material means of bringing about a unified situation.
3. be related to some hypothesis, which is a plan and policy for existential resolution of the conflicting social situation.

These conditions require observation to satisfy their existence. Dewey (1938) warned against what he referred to as “atomistic empiricism and rational a priorism” (p. 154) as dangerous because they can lead to misidentifying the existential problem.

Dewey is suggesting that searching for universals is a road that ultimately leads to nowhere because each problem is different and requires its own question. The method by which to analyze each problem is based on observation and data collection that allows the researcher to rigorously look at the problem through ideas and organization. The problem definition must be clear and concise for this methodology to be effective. The observable facts of the problem must satisfy the conditions (Dewey, 1938). The challenge to this methodology is to take these individual events that are not really separate events but rather a part of continuous development and connect them with a more extensive history. Dewey strongly believed (1938) that it was a fallacy for social science to attempt to separate itself from the social environment. The ability to access high quality information in the data collection and observation stage cannot be overstated. Dewey understood the dangers present in how groups use symbols to warp evidence. Symbols are powerful and are most effective when they trigger intense emotions (Stone, 2002). They obstruct the scientific method by not only distorting
evidence, but also by focusing the data collection on the symptoms of the problem and not the problem itself.

Dewey focused on existential problems by using case studies and was not involved in the type of historical, empathic methodology used by Erikson. The case study for Dewey embodied the current existential problem and then used the active process of scientific method to discover possible solutions to the problem. By combining the Eriksonian methodology of the historical/empathic use of history with a Deweyian emphasis on the existential problem, a deeper understanding of current issues can be attained. The issue of homelessness in the United States embodies a cultural and social history although the problem itself is current and extremely real. NCLB has a well-documented history deeply embedded in U.S. social and culture (some of which include progressive education) that as a policy focuses on symptoms and not the roots of education problems.

The case study is critical in understanding the causal interdependencies present in problems. It cannot be noted too frequently that isolated propositions do not exist in this methodological framework. There are a myriad of interconnecting threads within one existential problem; if the researcher only focuses on one thread, the true nature of the problem cannot be uncovered. Additionally a problem with narrowed methods leads to a lack of understanding of the causes to the problem. When using historical case studies to examine a current problem, greater understanding is connected to the variety of strands of information that are analyzed. These strands can include potential sources such as government records, information from the media, academic research, and personal
Interviews. The over-reliance on one thread leads to a third, and for Dewey a major source of concern, and that is the problem of dualism.

Dualism appears in the scientific method when the researcher analyzes the existential problem as something external to the activity and goal thereby objectifying it. Dewey (1916) identified three dangers of dualism to be avoided by the researcher: a) continuity v dualism, b) activity and passivity in knowing, and c) intellect and emotions. Continuity v dualism splits knowledge that is the result of everyday activity from that which is empirical and ‘higher’. By using a method based on collecting data from a case study, the researcher avoids the dualism that emerges from empirical knowledge. For example, it is a statistical fact that homeless youth are less likely to graduate from high school and are more likely to be involved in substance use, but this tells the researcher very little about the environmental realities of this at-risk population let alone how to help them. Before leaving the home, these youth are exposed to high levels of violence with caregivers who are frequently substance abusers themselves leading to intolerable living conditions eventually resulting in the youth leaving the household. Once on the street, homeless youth face a lack of stable housing, insufficient income, and physical and mental health problems. Unhealthy environments saturated in physical and sexual violence are perpetually present (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997). The existential problems for this population cannot be reduced to one or two environmental conditions; they are complex and interconnected going back to before becoming homeless. The second type of dualism is that of activity and passivity in knowing. The problem with passivity in knowing is the lack of any existential meaning. Taking up the above example of homeless youth, activity of knowing would involve contacting and listening to the
homeless youth themselves. Not relying on ‘expert knowledge’ or statistical information that is passive. Knowledge needs to be connected to experiences for a true understanding of the problem to be realized. Lastly, a dualism emerges between the intellect and emotions. The scientist is expected to objectively pursue research while avoiding that which is subjective. For the researcher involved with homeless youth, this implies that understanding the subjective is necessary for good research. This last point is a frequent criticism of case studies - that they allow the biases of the researcher into the study. The external and internal validity of the scientific method can be maintained while using the case study method through triangulation of information sources (Yin, 1994; Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 1991). Documentation, archival records, direct observation, and physical artifacts have previously shown to produce high validity (Yin, 1994).

The presence of dualism circumvents inquiry, but can be avoided by choosing methods that examine the problem together with the actual activity that is involved with the problem. The use of case studies allows for observing the problem and collecting data which avoids dualism. Even when using case studies the researcher must be especially vigilant in recognizing symbols and other distortions of data. Distorting information is often the basis by which ideologies transmit belief systems. The exploitation of anxiety and fear through the use of symbols is a favorite tactic of groups using ideology for their own goals, as will be explored in the two cases studied analyzed in this dissertation. The manipulation of information can take various forms: symbols, numbers, phrases, and omissions (Stone, 2002). Accessing information from numerous high quality sources limits the effectiveness of manipulation since it exposes the individual to diverse perspectives. It is a reasonable assertion that manipulating
information is critical to sustaining ideological dualism. By emphasizing the requirement of high quality information from a variety of sources, Dewey is giving the researcher using case studies a means to identify and avoid this particular trap of dualism.

(Uri Bronfenbrenner and the Ecological System)

The dynamism and fluidity between and within the environment and the individual is difficult to fully portray without the perspective of the entire system. Uri Bronfenbrenner (1975; 1977; 1978) successfully captured the complexity of these multi-level interactions with his ecological system model. Bronfenbrenner created a theoretical framework connecting various levels of environments in which an individual interacts moving from the proximal to the distal. The microsystem is the most proximal to the individual and includes the most immediate environments (home, neighborhood, and school, among others) in which the individual (sex, age, health, temperament, etc.) functions and is bidirectional between the individual and the setting. The mesosystem consisting of interactions between any two microsystems in which the individual inhabits. Moving out from the mesosystem is the exosystem incorporating both formal and informal social systems. The exosystem does not itself contain the individual, but events within it affect the individual. Legislation is a product of a formal social system impacting the mesosystem of the individual. The macrosystem moves outward from the exosystem thus making it the most distal from the individual’s inhabited environment. The macrosystem is composed of the beliefs and ideologies of the society, including those held by subcultures. The legislation of the exosystem reflects beliefs present in the macrosystem.
Although often overlooked in policy discourse, ultimately the beliefs present in the macrosystem need to be carefully analyzed because they explicitly influence the type of laws produced in the exosystem; setting up conditions in the meso- and micro-systems in which the individual resides. The exosystem reflects the beliefs and ideologies of the macrosystem through statutes and norms. This relationship between the exosystem and macrosystem is a major cause of tensions between stakeholders attempting to impact policy creation. Beliefs within the macrosystem change over time by shifting, opening or closing opportunities for groups to influence the passage of legislation.

Bronfenbrenner left a substantial body of work describing the appropriate methodology for the researcher to use during an investigation of the ecological environment. As with Dewey, he focused on the ever-changing landscape of the ecological system, which he named experimental ecology. Within experimental ecology, ecological validity is vital for scientific research. Ecological validity involves using observation to determine the extent to which the environment being studied has the properties that are expected or assumed to have by the investigator (Bronfenbrenner & Hamilton, 1978). Bronfenbrenner (1977) stressed that the question asked by the researcher determines the methods used within the research setting and that the research design is dictated by existing theoretical considerations. In the process of achieving ecological validity, observable patterns need to be discernable through the evidence gathered. Due to the domain connections within the ecological system, data itself is insufficient to discover the causal connections between domains (Bronfenbrenner, 1975). For Bronfenbrenner there is great fluidity found both within and between the
environments existing together with confounding variables. The researcher needs to move beyond the statistics to allow greater depth of understanding, and a research design using case studies is a well-established method (Erikson, 1968; Yin, 1994; & Stake, 1995).

Studying the ecological experiment is the other important part to Bronfenbrenner’s research design. There is a requirement of two or more domains or structural components for a rigorous scientific research design. An emphasis is placed on discovering the interconnections of the ecological system, not testing a hypothesis. The principal main effects within the ecological experiment are the interactions within the domains. For example, in public policy an acceptable research focus is on discovering the internal relations between a belief system present in the macrosystem and its relationship to the policy product of the exosystem. This can be further extended by looking at the impact the policy has on the job or housing situation of the parent and how it interacts with the mesosystem and microsystem of the child. The focus is on the social contexts of the individual by moving from the distal to the more proximal effects on the individual. It is important to note that by focusing on the exosystem and macrosystem, the level of analysis is not on the individual, but rather on groups and even more broadly society. Interestingly, Bronfenbrenner (1977) noted that if a researcher restricts herself to the status quo, the research itself is also limited.

The Problem: Authoritarianism and Ideology

Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford (1950) seminal work The Authoritarian Personality was one of the first to look at possible links between psychoanalytic theory and authoritarian personalities. Since its publication, there have
been many critiques written on its theoretical validity (Jahoda, 1954; Martin, 2001; Jost, 2006). For Adorno et al., (1950) the authoritarian personality is created by the age of 5 or 6 since it is based on a strict interpretation of psychoanalytic theory. This severe adherence to Freud’s personality development limited the effective analysis of the possibility of an interaction between the id, ego and superego and fear and anxiety.

Anxiety and fear were frequent concerns of Freud (1949, 1961, and 1968) and became particularly prevalent in his later work. In psychoanalytic theory (Freud, 1968), the id represents instinctual impulses that are continuously present within the subconscious of the individual. The role of the ego is to mediate between the ‘real world’ and the impulses of the id. But it also must answer to the superego which represents norms of behavior of the external world. The superego has no concern for the tensions between itself and the impulses of the id, which makes the balancing role by the ego critical. Guilt occurs from fear of the superego due to the inability of the ego to control the id to the superego’s demands. In this sense, guilt is a variety of anxiety which is turned into a fear of the super ego (Freud, 1949). The actual or perceived existence of anxiety and then fear triggers a response in the individual allowing for the adoption of beliefs that placate the superego and calm the ego. Authoritarian groups take advantage of issues involving anxiety and fear on the individual level and move them to a mass level. Fear and anxiety transform into emotions experienced by a large number of individuals within the society, creating conditions for authoritarianism to calm the fear by offering rigid belief systems that calm this mass fear. At this point, it is irrelevant if there are ‘authoritarian personalities’ since the situation is (whether real or manufactured) being exploited by the authoritarian group on a mass level. As others who have studied
the “Banality of Evil” (Arendt, 1977) have observed (Arendt, 1977; Zimbardo, 2007) there is evidence that anyone is susceptible to following authoritarianism.

Authoritarianism uses many tools and methods, but one of the most insidious and longest lasting might be ideology. Ideology has been given many definitions tracing back to its modern roots in Destutt de Tracy’s *Elements of Ideology* (McDonald, 1997) and other French philosophers in the Napoleonic era. From this French tradition emerged the modern political division of ideology between left and right, radical to reactionary (Baradat, 2006). For de Tracy events not personally experienced by the individual are given meaning through ideas, or ideology, which is neither positive nor negative, but instead a neutral phenomena (de Tracy, 1817). Researchers in the tradition of Adorno or Altemeyer have adopted a left/right continuum through the search for authoritarian personality types that can be found in the right and/or left of the political spectrum. But the concept of ideology as formulated by de Tracey reflected individual perspectives, not the dualistic types of organizing systems of modern ‘ideology’.

The definition of ideology adopted for this research has a greater focus on ideology that has been reified. Three inter-related parts can be identified in reified ideology\(^{11}\) that distinguishes it from other definitions (McDonald, 1997). The first is the existence of ideology as a basic ‘non-scientific’ world view that is shared by groups of individuals. This leads to the second point; groups use this ideology to further their own interests, frequently by deceptive means. The third part is that ideology as a group belief system becomes politicized. This occurs with any belief system whether it is non-

\(^{11}\) Unless otherwise specified, from this point when ideology is referred to, it is in the sense of being reified.
or political-they become intertwined. Book burning occurs when a philosophy which embodies certain beliefs becomes reified into an ideology promoting the elimination of all printed materials that counters the statements of the ideology. Another way to look at it is ideology as a philosophy which has been reified (Ollman, 1976)

Reified ideology constricts how an issue is viewed and analyzed. Ideology does not allow for a complete understanding of the subject matter because the ideology is too narrow, focuses too specifically on appearances or for some other reason is badly or incompletely organized (Ollman, 1993). Ideology in this sense does not falsify information, but rather encourages the misinterpretation of the information to be the reverse of what it actually is. A reflection of the real situation is present, but ideology allows for a manipulation of the interpretation of the situation (Marx, 1947). Ideas and realities are reduced to dichotomies – they are either one or the other. Because ideology reduces all things to dichotomies, there is no basis for negotiation or cooperation. What the groups advocating the ideology assert is correct, must be correct. Ideology offers an all-encompassing belief system that answers every question without requiring the individual to look more deeply into the situation. Authoritarian groups link issues to ideology for the promotion of their agenda. This is accomplished by convincing other groups within the society that this agenda pursued by the authoritarian group is in the best interests of everyone, even if objectively it does not. This becomes a potent tool when mixed with individual and group fear and anxiety. Fear is calmed by the offering the use of ideology which answers all questions. The ideology becomes the authority figure for the superego, soothing the worried ego.
Human development and public policy within the ecological system

Public policy is composed of five major ideas which are identifiable in the ecological system (Theodoulou, 1995). The first involves determining the difference between what government intends to do and what really results from the policy. The second idea is that many levels and stakeholders both formal and informal are involved in public policy. Thirdly, public policy does not just include the expected legislation, rules, and regulations, but is more all-encompassing in nature. The fourth idea is that it is intentional and embodies both long-term and short-term goals. Lastly, policy is ongoing and ever-evolving. Within the ecological system, public policy occurs within the exosystem, but is deeply influenced by the belief framework of the macrosystem. The many stakeholders that are involved at all levels with both formal and informal output within the exosystem target various stated and unstated goals. Through ideology and authoritarianism groups influence public policy creating disconnections between the policy and the realities of the actual situation of the groups for which the policy was created. When this happens, the result is a confluence between ideology, authoritarianism and the macrosystem.

Ideology is particularly effective because of its link to fear and anxiety. Fear and anxiety are unsettling to individuals creating a susceptibility to belief systems which calms the ego and are easily accepted by the superego. The power of issues that can access the emotions of fear and anxiety is difficult to overstate, as anyone who has experienced an incident such as extended unemployment on the individual level, or on a societal level, 9/11 can attest. If a group is able to adopt an issue(s) that can use fear and/or anxiety in its appeal, then ideology becomes the perfect solution to calming that
fear and/or anxiety. At this point, ideology becomes absorbed into the macrosystem as part of the belief system of the society. The ideology is adopted by the superego as an overlay belief system and is authoritarian reflecting the sharp right/wrong delineation of the ideology. Once the ideology is accepted within the macrosystem it can then influence public policy in the exosystem. For public policy, this is extremely unhealthy because the ideology masks the true problem. The assumptions embodied in the ideology do not accurately reflect the true realities of the problem. Additionally, contrary to the models of both Bronfenbrenner and Dewey, the solutions are a prior and thus dualistic. When using ideology, there is no use for alternative information sources, avoiding dualism, ecological validity or using the ecological experiment. The answers are already present within the ideology.

If the policy is a product of an authoritarian system, the ideology is generally a stated part of the macrosystem. For example, in Nazi Germany or Stalinist USSR, the ideology was critical to the functioning of the state. The problems occur if the system is democratic. To be a democratic macrosystem, there is a requirement for the inclusion of many stakeholders within the decision making process and these stakeholders need access to different information sources so that the problem can be accurately identified and effective solutions created. Instead, authoritarian use of ideology results in the increase or maintenance of power by the authoritarian groups and the marginalization of groups who dissent. There is no place for exploring new types of policies in an authoritarian environment and in fact as a result of control/coercion dynamic, exploration is actively discouraged. The final consequence is policy stagnation. Authoritarianism is frequently identified with conservative political environments due to conservative goals
of upholding the status quo or even regressing to a reactionary state (Baradat, 2006). Although this approach may have an appeal based on a classic Burke-based conservatism, it is ultimately insufficient. Authoritarianism is found across the political spectrum. Authoritarianism rests on the ability to coerce individuals and groups to follow rules, which is distinct from upholding the status quo. For this reason it is found on the left and right within the political spectrum.

Regardless of left/right leanings, authoritarian use of ideology within a democracy distorts the exosystem. This distortion results due to the violation of the rules of the game. Within a democratic exosystem, not only is the combination of the inclusion of many stakeholders together with strong information sources important, but the existence of fair and meaningful negotiation is critical. Democracy requires access. Ideology also blocks the ability to understand and define the problem in a meaningful way due to the constriction imposed by the prior assumptions that exist within ideology. This echoes Dewey’s concerns with the dangers implicit in focusing on symptoms instead of the problems themselves and avoiding dualism. Authoritarian groups purposely focus on symptoms simultaneous to using ideology to distort the actual causes, offering simplistic solutions that fail to address the actual problem.

The challenge within a democracy is to eliminate the possibility of the use of ideology. Ideology within the macrosystem could be suffocated out if all groups were allowed a voice in the exosystem. An existential problem could be identified, information sought out and causes identified within an open system. Using fear to support ideology relies on irrational decision-making and authoritarianism. The existence of these tendencies is antithetical to a democratic macrosystem.
Democracy, Polyarchies and Authoritarianism

In a fluid democracy authoritarian methods would encounter many obstacles and difficulties in the pursuit of legitimacy. Authoritarianism relies on the ability to control agendas and events – something nearly impossible if participation is open and equal with information readily available to the polity including final control over the agenda. The existential problem that has emerged within modern democracy is that of democratic polyarchy (Dahl, 1971, 1998). The concept of democratic polyarchy is that democracy in modern nation-states is actually limited due to a number of economic, political and social realities (Dahl, 2006, pp. 50-51):

1. Distribution of political resources, skills, and incentives
2. Primary limits on time
3. Size of political systems
4. Prevalence of market economies
5. Inevitability of severe crisis

What emerges is a democratic system with non-democratic parts. The result is competition between groups embodying unequal levels of power and access. Several studies concerned with interest group politics have clearly illustrated the problems inherent with distribution (Bavetta & Padovano, 2000; Potters, & Sloof, 1996; Bartels, 2008). Limitations on time are present, but if an issue is highly salient to an individual or group the probability of time commitment should increase unless it is concluded that access will be blocked, either in reality or perceptually. This is partially related to the size of the system - the more peripheral the unit of government, the more difficult the access. The prevalence of market economies is critical for the growth of polyarchy. As

---

12 Dahl did include a sixth: International systems that are important, but not necessarily democratic. For the purposes of this framework, it was omitted.
Friedman (1962) argued, free enterprise encourages democracy due to the decentralization of the economy. However, another outcome is unequal economic resources leading to political inequality between individuals and groups. Lastly is the issue of crisis. Crisis can be real or imagined but either can result in restrictions of fundamental rights and an increase in authoritarianism because it triggers fear and anxiety not only on an individual, but also a group and societal level. Ideology is useful in a crisis situation since it offers solutions to the group that at least on the surface eliminates fear and anxiety. During a crisis, ideology is used for authoritarian purposes for the exclusion of specific groups while limiting access to information that might challenge the solutions prescribed through the ideology.

At the point authoritarian groups mix fear and ideology within a polyarchal democracy, the ideology allows the group to either amass more influence and/or maintain the level of influence. An excellent example of amassing power occurred in the U.S. during McCarthyism. The crisis presented was the infiltration of pro-Soviet communists within American society and government. Fear expressed itself in what became known as ‘red-baiting’. There were few who challenged the information presented by McCarthy (partly out of fear that they would become targets) until he overstepped and challenged the U.S. army. This fear within the U.S. of the USSR and communism expressed itself in a variety of policies including those in education. When Sputnik was launched the expression to this fear led to the increased involvement of the federal government into education policy (Cross, 2004) through programs targeting increasing the number of science and technology teachers. What is now known is that the superiority of the USSR was a mirage and furthermore that the launching of Sputnik was not a surprise to the
Eisenhower administration. The maintenance of power is often connected to the status quo. When threatened by a change in the status quo, ideology can serve as an overlay belief system to decrease the fear created by the threat of change. The maintenance-driven ideology divides groups between us v ‘the others’, with ‘the others’ frequently dehumanized and framed as a threat to the well-being of society. This marriage of ideology and maintenance is often found in racially-based issues.

Since polyarchal democracies assimilate inequalities, when authoritarian groups exploit these inequalities it is possible for the democratic system to become more authoritarian than democratic. As this occurs, participation and fundamental rights become constricted as the authoritarian groups gain more power through coercion and control. The belief systems adopted within the macrosystem become instrumental in the level of democracy or authoritarianism within the system. If there is a severe crisis triggering high levels of fear within society, then the belief system adopted might be in the form of an ideology. A critical component to the outcome is the availability of high quality information that can negate the presented ideology. A different outcome leading to increased democracy is based on an open and community-building belief system, such as the one presented by generativity theory.

*Changing the macrosystem: generativity theory*

A generative society is concerned with the well-being of future generations. With the combination of political, economic, religious, and cultural forces present in generativity, Erikson ventured the farthest from psychology in the formation of his theory on generativity (de St. Aubin et al., 2004). The generative adult is a healthy adult having achieved integration as a human through concern and interest for others, especially future
generations. If accomplished successfully it allows the middle aged and older adult to experience being part of the generational cycle (Hoare, 2002). By cultivating the next generation through teaching, modeling, and mentoring, both the older and younger generations grow as part of the human community. Generativity is based within the individual who succeeds in moving beyond narcissism and is involved in activities that nurture others beyond the self. Adults who achieve this are highly agentic by having a healthy sense of self and promoting the self. But generative adults also are able to merge this agency into the community and moving beyond the self. Therefore generativity involves both agency and community (McAdams & Logan, 2004). Erikson (1993; 1968) wrote extensively on the importance of the development of a healthy, integrated individual to be supported by the cultural context surrounding her. Generative societies create and maintain supportive belief systems, institutions and cultural artifacts (de St. Aubin et al., 2002).

Societies that fail to support generative adults begin to stagnate paralleling the adult who fails to be generative and becomes stagnate. Stagnation implies a society focused on short-term gains that aid current generations but may hurt future generations. Erikson (1968) was particularly concerned with affluent adults who conspicuously consume and then discard with little thought of the impact of this on future generations. For Erikson this is an example of adult preoccupation and absorption for their own short term well-being at the expense of the long term interests of the community. A critical component of generativity is the belief in the ability of the human specie to continue through human agency and community. Human communities are composed of multiple generations who are involved in differing points of the life cycle. The mature generations
are responsible for the well-being of the younger generations in these intergenerational communities (Peterson, 2004). A generative society extends this well-being to include unborn generations with its emphasis on the continuation of a healthy community. For this to be accomplished, the macrosystemic belief systems must support laws and institutions within the exosystem that make this possible for all citizens within the society.

Identifying generativity can be accomplished utilizing various research techniques. Generativity scales like the self-report Loyola Generativity Scale (McAdams & de St. Aubin, 1992) and the Generative Realization scale (Peterson & Klohnen, 1995) have been developed to measure levels of generativity in individuals. The question of generativity on a societal level (or lack thereof) is methodologically different since the unit being researched occurs in the exosystem and macrosystem. Researchers working in generativity have utilized demographic information as Gerald Moran (1998) did in his study comparing and contrasting Colonial Virginia with Colonial New England. Other researchers such as Bill Peterson (2004) in his study on the Meiji Restoration or Erikson himself rely on in-depth case studies. The advantage of the case study is its allowance for the building of preliminary theory development (Stake, 1978) which is important since generativity theory is still in its infancy. The ability to analyze public policy holistically and organically is critical when analyzing it in conjunction with a concept like generativity that involves all levels of the ecological system. Specifically the researcher should be critically analyzing what population(s) benefits from the policy, what long term and short term goals does the policy involve, and does the policy encourage the full development of potential for the targeted group taking into account the
realities of their environment? For a case study to effectively address these issues, information must be accessible that is free from political rhetoric (or at least can be readily identified) and reflect the opinions and interests of the stakeholders involved in the policy.

When identifying a policy that is not generative, the researcher must be aware of the alternative – stagnation or “rejectivity”. The adult who becomes stagnant is self-indulgent and narcissistic. Erikson (Friedman, 1999) believed that this self-absorption easily translate into a suspicion of those who are different; what he termed pseudospeciation. The adult who stagnates does not translate the well-being of the human community into her interests, but rather narrows the focus to only a small group or a select number of other like-minded individuals. In other words, the emphasis is not on future generations as it pertains to humans as specie, but rather on a certain groups within the specie. This is what Erikson meant by the term pseudospeciation. Pseudospeciation is built on exclusion and marginalization of groups that are different or identified as such. Once pseudospeciation begins separating human groups, ideology easily can then be used as a tool. Pseudospeciation relies on adolescent ideology instead of healthy identity creation. The use of ideology by authoritarian interests can easily become intertwined with pseudospeciation.

Public policy that reflects generativity can help individuals progress through the life span with conditions that allow for healthy development. For this to succeed, the policies must allow all groups opportunities for development from infancy through older adulthood to navigate as an individual through society (Erikson, 1968). Growth and development is systematically related to all previous and future development. Generative
societies include belief systems that encourage the combination of agency and community that complement one another. This can be accomplished through a democratic process of public policy that avoids the problems of authoritarianism and ideology.
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CHAPTER THREE

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND

Part B-Public Charter Schools
“Subpart 1-Charter School programs”
Sec. 5201.Purpose
“It is the purpose of this subpart to increase national understanding of the charter schools model by-
1) providing financial assistance for the planning, program design, and initial implementation of charter schools
2) evaluating the effects of such schools, including the effects on students, student academic achievement, staff, and parents;
3) expanding the number of high-quality charter schools available to students across the Nation; and
4) encouraging the States to provide support to charter schools for facilities financing in an amount more nearly commensurate to the amount the States have typically provided for traditional public school”
(Public Law 107-110, 1788)

With these words charter schools officially became part of U.S. education policy. Public Law 107-110 is better known as No Child Left Behind (NCLB) an ambitious piece of legislation that is almost 600 pages long. NCLB was created to solve the ‘crises of education’ identified in A Nation At Risk (1983). This crisis consists of children who are not learning how to read, write and solve math problems and thus are unable to compete with the rest of the world. NCLB specifically targets children who attend failing schools, often in poor rural and urban areas. The stated purpose of the law was to ensure high quality educational opportunities and outcomes for all populations. On the surface this goal is not controversial. Within a democratic framework, this goal appears to align with that of equality and education. NCLB approaches the solution to this identified crisis
through parental choice and a movement towards privatizing education. This chosen solution embodies certain assumptions as to how democratic education is defined.

The movement towards parental choice and privatization existed within the policy stream for several decades. Indeed many advocates of privatization trace their roots to Milton Friedman’s education chapter in his seminal work *Capitalism and Freedom* (1962) in which Friedman proposed a voucher system for education in America. This idea on privatizing education laid dormant until the early 1980’s when *A Nation at Risk* (1983) was published. The question arises, what changed allowing for new participants in the policy stream (Kingdon, 1984).

Kingdon (1984) discusses how a softening up process is critical for new policy windows to open within policy streams. While this is undoubtedly true, it does not completely answer the question. What must change for these windows to open are changes in the dominant values that exist in the macrosystem (Bronfenbrenner, 1977). Once the values alter within the macrosystem, laws within exosystem can undergo profound change. In the 1980s a value system of competitive individualism gradually became dominant, growing stronger in the 1990s that for education culminated in the advocacy of charter schools and vouchers.

Labaree (1997) offers a clear distinction of education goals found within the United States. He describes three major goals that coexist in American education history: democratic equality, social efficiency, and social mobility. The democratic equality advocates have traditionally focused on effective citizenship and relative equality as a way to prepare future citizens, while the social efficiency group accepts inequality in its desire to train a proper workforce. Social mobility has evolved into something quite
different by looking at education as a private good which prepares the individual for workplace competition. These goals have balanced each other out until the recent prominence of social mobility. This was evident in the battle over education at the beginning of the Twentieth Century when the now familiar comprehensive education system became dominant in the United States (Tanner & Tanner, 2007). While the belief of social stratification was combined with skill acquisition, the goals of a democratic education for all was much in evidence.

Labaree further divides these three educational goals into two types: a public good, the traditional view, and a private good, a view that has increased in popularity in recent years. Historically democratic equality and social efficiency viewed education as a public good, though through very different political eyes. More recently some of the issues important to social efficiency such as accountability have become intertwined with social mobility advocates leading to an acceptance of viewing education as both a private and public good.

The belief systems supporting each of these three goals are all competing within the current macrosystem. Social equality embodies an emphasis on preparing citizens to be participants within the American democratic system and more recently equal treatment (Labaree, 1997) within the education system. This goal has a long history within the macrosystem as reflected in the mandates of the Northwest Ordinance of 1785 setting aside land for public schools (Hirschland & Steinmo, 2003) to school desegregation in the mid-twentieth century. However, as Hirschland and Steinmo point out, this social equality goal coexisted with social efficiency. The constitution explicitly was written to encourage and support the growth of free enterprise and became intertwined with creating
commercially astute individuals (Hirschland & Steinmo, 2003). When viewed through a historic lens, the social efficiency goal reflected a capitalist belief system in which students existed in a social and economic hierarchy and education should accept the role of occupational trainer. Social efficiency is an example of Burkian conservatism in the sense that the social structure has evolved over a period of time and reflects the reality of inequalities between groups and individuals that cannot be easily altered. There is an uneasy relationship between social equality and social efficiency. In capitalism not everyone is equal and it is competition that separates individuals out (Pharo, 2005); in a democratic political system all individuals should have equal voice and access (Dahl, 1971).

*Competing Visions of Education*

Social mobility attempts to resolve this tension. Social mobility does not accept this existing social and economic hierarchy asserting that what children need is to be given the tools necessary to improve their position once they leave school. The objective of social mobility is opportunity for a high quality education, but since the environment is competitive some level of stratification will exist. The implicit argument is that social mobility is inherently democratic, but not in the sense advocated by the social equality group. Milton Friedman preceded the social mobility movement with his early connection of capitalism with education in his book *Capitalism and Freedom* (1962). Friedman was an early advocate of individualism and competition arguing that government involvement in any activity has the danger of reducing freedoms. Government must have limited scope and its power dispersed to guarantee political freedom. This is overtly connecting the philosophical-economic construct of capitalism...
with the philosophical-political construct of democracy. Friedman’s argument continues to assert that “The kind of economic organization that provides economic freedom directly, namely competitive capitalism, also promotes political freedom because it separates economic power from political power and in this way enables the one to offset the other.” (p.9).

Friedman agrees that government does have some responsibility to fund education for two reasons: a) there are substantial “neighborhood effects”\(^\text{13}\) and b) there exists a necessary paternalistic concern for children and other “irresponsible individuals”. Therefore government can require a minimum level of schooling, but only through the use of vouchers that can be used at any institution of the parent’s choice. The institutions can be run either as for profit or non profit centers and there should be minimum standards set that the institutions meet. For Friedman, the public school system inherently blocks individual freedom through indoctrination. Those who create the curriculum have no accountability and set policy through non-democratic methods. At the end of the education chapter he expresses the differing outcomes between a public school system and one that is market based: “And it would do so by impeding competition, destroying incentive, and dealing with symptoms, as would result from the outright redistribution of income, but by strengthening competition, making incentive effective, and eliminating the causes of inequality” (p. 107). In an editorial he wrote for the *Wall Street Journal* (June 9, 2005) he restated his ideas emphasizing that yes, government could legislate compulsory schooling and finance schooling based on the

\(^{13}\) Neighborhood effects in this context occur when the action of one individual imposes significant costs on other individuals and that individual cannot be charged for the action (Friedman, 1962).
neighborhood effect, but once government became the administrator, education became less democratic. These are the exact arguments expressed today by school choice advocates.

An alternative vision of democracy based on the polity evolved in the U.S. and is closely identified with John Dewey. Democracy for Dewey (1916) involved more than either a form of government or an economic system; it was a way of life which included allowing each individual an opportunity for enrichment. Taking this concept further, Dewey, Boyd, & Smith (1939) wrote that any system based on liberty which professed an interest in developing the individual had to provide for the basic needs of the citizens. For Dewey (1916), education in a democracy acted as a social process consisting of shared experiences and activities. In this view, neither private property nor individualism through competition is emphasized, but rather a widening of personal capacities through shared activities. The isolation of individuals and groups from each other creates a corrosive rigidity that results in stagnation and selfishness within groups that distances individuals from one another thus blocking the ability of society to progress. There is a requirement of not only involvement but also the honest exchanging of ideas between individuals and groups that enrich the lives of others (Hewitt, 2006). Community life is more important in the development of the individual than the selfish pursuits found in the market-place (Dewey, 1916, p. 344-345).

Since democracy stands in principle for free interchange, for social continuity, it must develop a theory of knowledge which sees in knowledge the method by which one experience is made available in giving direction and meaning to another. Connection of knowledge in the schools with activities or occupations carried on in a medium of associate life.
This vision has very different outcomes when discussing education than the market-based paradigm. Education becomes the vehicle in which the student learns how to engage in community life and pursue shared interests with others for ends in view. Since communities create shared goals or ends in view, the goals constantly change and are reinterpreted. The school provides an institutional setting for this continuous reinterpretation, thus preparing the student to become an engaged participant within the democratic system (Dewey, et al.1939). Dewey (1916) is not present to enter into the discussion of ensuring democracy and the liberties of the student through choice, but was a strong proponent of public education. He was also concerned with avoiding what he termed dualism – the separation of the activity from the goal, opening the gate to non-democratic education for authoritarian goals.

Social equality and social mobility embody different interpretations of what democratic education means, with equality focusing on educating a democratic citizen and mobility stressing the connection between capitalism, decentralization and democracy. Since these two coexist together with the social efficiency group, how did social mobility gain in popularity at the expense of social equality? Advocates of consumer choice in education found the policy window opened with the publishing of A Nation at Risk (1983). As Kingdon (1984) points out when the problem, policy proposal and political environment is receptive, the policy has a much greater likelihood of reaching the political agenda.

Shifting the Macrosystem: A Nation at Risk

Ted Bell was the first Secretary of Education under Ronald Reagan, who came to office under an administration whose goal was the elimination of the Department of
Education, a creation of the Carter administration. Bell was viewed with suspicion by the conservative establishment who helped elect Reagan as President. He accepted the job after obtaining the agreement with Reagan that other alternatives would be looked at other than abolishing the department altogether (Cross, 2004). One of Bell’s first major actions as Secretary of Education was the creation of the National Commission on Excellence in Education (NCEE) on August 26, 1981 (NCEE, 1983). Cross (2004) mentions that Milt Goldberg who was named to head the staff of the commission believed that Bell used the commission as a way to keep education as a cabinet level department. The expanded role of the federal government at the expense of state and local control that was solidified in NCLB was made possible by *A Nation at Risk* (1983) which made education a national issue (Cross, 2004).

The eighteen member NCEE consisted of education researchers and practitioners, business leaders, state officials and Annette Y. Kirk who later became an advisor to the Mackinac Center for Public Policy. The NCEE created a book that was filled with language meant to shock and cause national anxiety regarding the state of education as in peril and placing the U.S. at risk of becoming a third rate power unable to compete in an increasingly globalized economy. There was a distinct theme of social mobility and social efficiency that was also present (NCEE, p. 8)

All, regardless of race or class or economic status, are entitled to a fair chance and to the tools for developing their individual powers of mind and spirit to the utmost. This promise means that all children by virtue of their own efforts, competently guided, can hope to attain the mature and informed judgment needed to secure gainful employment, and to manage their own lives, thereby serving not only their own interests but also the progress of society itself.
When reading this paragraph two things are obvious: the first is that there is no mention of education as process for individual and community growth as a polity and the second is the emphasis on employment and individual interest. There is a list of risk indicators and findings regarding expectations. The expectations included the “level of knowledge, abilities an skills school and college graduates should posses, but also the time, hard work, behavior, self discipline and motivation that are essential for high student achievement” (NCEE, p.19). There is a list of recommendations, many of which were based on testing, accountability and standards, again foreshadowing NCLB. Cross (2004) notes that when *A Nation at Risk* was released, Reagan issued a statement filled with references to school prayer, private schools and tuition tax credits (together with the abolishment of the Department of Education) none of which actually were mentioned. With the exception of abolishing the Department of Education, the policies included in Reagan’s speech foreshadowed the parental choice movement in the 1990s. This was particularly true in the school voucher policy discussions (Education at a Crossroads, 1997).

From this point, not only did the federal government become increasingly involved in education policy, but interests supporting school choice became more important within the exosystem as the macrosystem shifted its emphasis on greater individualism and competition. Bill Bennett embodied this shift perhaps better than anyone. During his tenure as Secretary of Education, he became highly visible and energetically pursued his political agenda. One major goal he pursued was in the area of data and statistics. He expanded the role of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, specifically through the National Assessment of Educational Progress.
(NAEP) which developed data and statistics allowing for the first time state by state comparisons and performance measures for accountability (Cross, 2004). Today the NAEP is responsible for publishing the ‘Nation’s Report Card” which helps to tie accountability into school choice.

Beginning with *A Nation at Risk* (1983), business began to take an increasingly active role in education policy. The Business Roundtable became a visible advocate of increasing the human capital level output in schools. In the late 1980s and early 1990s they published several documents (1989, 1991, 1992) laying out their vision for education, the most thorough of which was *The Business Roundtable Participation Guide: A Primer for Business on Education*, 1991. In this 1991 participation guide, many ideas on curriculum, assessment, early childhood education and other concepts are discussed at length. A section on school choice also made an appearance, in both the main body and as an appendix. It is pointed out that choice can be defined many different ways but ultimately they “can increase student and family options and subject schools to the discipline of the marketplace…Choice, when coupled with enabling legislation and other necessary changes, can help sustain a sound school system” (pp. 103-104). The assumption is that educational outcomes will be better if choice exists and education is turned into a privatized good. All of this based on being a ‘nation at risk’ with even those in highest tier of schooling being beaten internationally. When reading these documents, there is a palpable feeling of fear and anxiety present.

*School Choice in the 1990s*

Beginning in the early 1990s other school choice advocates (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Allen, 2001; DeWeese, 1994) became active in the policy stream and thus the softening
up process. As with the Business Roundtable, they believe that the private sector will and can do a better job at providing quality education than the public school system. There is a strong belief that the traditional institutions of public education actually smother academic performance with their bureaucratic inefficiencies and dysfunctions. Chubb and Moe (1990) assert that schools in the private sector have an advantage over public schools for two reasons: a) they are not directly controlled through democratic politics, and b) they are indirectly controlled by society through the marketplace. As with Friedman (1962), they identify the ability of the government to coerce as evidence of non-democratic behavior that can be avoided by the atomistic nature of the privatization. Education benefits from the transactional nature of the market place because the owners of the school have a motivation to please the parent-turned-consumer. Schools who fail to satisfy the parent will go out of business leaving the better performing schools to serve the parental community. To remain in business, the school must find its specialized market, advertise itself using branding, and then provide the required educational services to retain the parents as customers.

A different set of groups that supports privatization are those in the faith-based community who believe that the secular school system has abandoned them. In a privatized education system, these parents can choose a school that fits their belief system and place their children in an environment that share those beliefs. DeWeese (1994, as cited in Lubienski, 2003) is attempting to encourage faith-based education through privatization by expanding the definition of a state-run school. The Wisconsin voucher system was upheld by the state Supreme Court with the U.S. Supreme Court declining to hear the case in 1998 (“Supreme Court: Wisconsin tuition vouchers can continue”, 1998).
Four years later, the US Supreme Court upheld Cleveland’s voucher system created in the 1996-1997 school year in spite of their overwhelming use in parochial schools (Walsh, 2002). This issue of choice, vouchers and public funding reemerges in the Senate and House NCLB debates.

The debate on school choice in the early years focused on the failure of the schools to educate the students. The failures identified had many sides: teacher quality, low curricular standards, entrenched bureaucracy and lack of parental involvement. What groups identified these perceived failures? And are the forces behind the school choice movement reflective of democratic education or instead a different set of concerns? To answer this, a careful analysis of the legislative history leading up to NCLB combined with awareness to the dangers of dualism is required.


The “softening up” began to show signs of effectiveness within the exosystem in 1994 when the experimental Charter School Grant Program appeared in the reauthorization of ESEA. This program was only available to states that allowed for the creation of charter schools, but it had limited national impact with 780 charters in existence at the beginning of the 1997-1998 school year (Riddle, Stedman, & Aleman, 1998). This is not to say that this growth was insignificant; in fiscal year 1995, the appropriation was 6 billion which grew to almost 60 billion by 1997 when the ESEA was again up for reauthorization. During this period the support for charters was broad based and included a wide range of groups from teachers (although not necessarily teacher organizations) to the previously discussed Business Roundtable (Riddle et al, 1998). In this same period, both Wisconsin and Cleveland were experimenting with voucher
programs, a more contentious alternative education setting. The issue of vouchers keeps emerging throughout this period leading up to NCLB, having parallel histories although differing outcomes (School Choice, 1997; No Child Left Behind, 2001).

On October 22, 1998 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 was amended to “improve and expand charter schools” (PL 105-278, 1998). This amending of ESEA became known as the Charter School Expansion Act of 1997 and is the direct predecessor to Title V in NCLB. As with NCLB, PL 105-278 began its legislative history in the House Committee on Education and the Workforce (formerly the Committee on Education and Labor) before consideration in the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources (formerly the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare) (105 Bill Tracking Report, H.R. 2616,1997). The committee names for both the House and Senate reflect the macrosystem shift of viewing education almost exclusively as a builder of human capital. The emphasis is on linking the workforce and education.

The Charter School Expansion Act of 1997 began in the House of Representatives with hearings in January, 1997 and moved over to the Senate for hearings in March, 1998 (105 Bill Tracking Report, H.R. 2616,1997). The reports and hearing are conspicuous for what was missing – any meaningful discussion on possible negative outcomes in charter schools. Speakers such as Cornelia M. Blanchette who as the Associate Director of Education and Employment Issues for Health and Human Services (Issues affecting access, 1997) and Congressman Roemer (Roemer, 1997) both spoke favorably concerning charter schools. School voucher programs were also considered in both the House and the Senate. The voucher advocates emphasized the ability of the poor to choose between public, private and parochial school (School choice, 1997). In 1997,
Peter Flanigan (Education at a Crossroads, 1997) testified that the “I have a dream” program he sponsored failed where parochial schools succeeded. Carol Moseley-Braun (Sen. Moseley-Braun, 1997) was one of the few who spoke out against the voucher system. Her main argument against them was what she viewed as the inability based on what the voucher was worth in truly finding a quality school. NEA President Bob Chase (Issues Affecting Access, 1997) testified concerning charter schools indicating that he thought they should be only allowed if connected within the public school framework.

In spite of the efforts to get a voucher system passed by Ron Paul, Newt Gingrich, and J.C. Watts it was not added to the Charter School Expansion Act. The pro-voucher advocates called for a restoration of parental control through their Family Education Freedom Act. The emphasis being placed on giving the parent control over education was connected to decisions over child-rearing (School choice, 1997). These arguments are consistent with the vision of democracy that accompanies privatization arguments in general. There was a lack of support in using public funds for private schools for a variety of reasons including a concern of economic and social segregation and misuse of funds (School choice, 1997). The issue of vouchers reappeared in the debates leading up to the passage of NCLB.

In the Senate, the debate was primarily supportive of the charter school movement. And as in the House was bipartisan. There was an emphasis placed on the idea that charters were not an attempt to “privatize the public school system” (Senator Jeffords, 1998). Indeed the exact opposite argument was made, that charter would strengthen the public school system (Senator Jeffords, 1998). Cornelia M. Blanchette testified in favor of charters as the representative of the administration and various others
such as the State Superintendent of Public Instruction from Phoenix, Arizona together with the CEO from ATOP Academy (Public school charters, 1998). The Senate did invite Eric Rofes from UCLA to testify on the impact charter schools were having on public school districts. In his Charter Impact Finding, Rofes (Public school charters, 1998) describes thirteen specific ways charters impacted the public school system, both positive and negative. He also supplied seven policy recommendations based on his empirical findings. Several of these recommendations strongly suggested greater attention be paid to how charters would impact public school systems and on the relationships and education about charters as they relate to superintendents and school boards. In the rush to proceed with charter schools, these recommendations which may have helped to avoid some of the current mistrust between public and charter schools were not adopted.

The message that permeates much of the debate on charter schools together with that of vouchers is the parent as the consumer. As the momentum increased during the 1990s toward the social mobility goal, the connection of the market place to education became overt. The movement of the Charter School Expansion Act paralleled the policy activity with the policy stream. Changes in the macrosystem were directly and observably altering the exosystem. The shift completing this movement was still to come with the election of George W. Bush and the first major piece of legislation produced between his administration and Congress, No Child Left Behind.

Public Law 107-110: No Child Left Behind

NCLB was introduced into the House of Representatives on March 22, 2001, passed in the House on May 23, 2001, considered and passed in the Senate on June 14,
2001 and signed by President Bush on January 8, 2002. It is described in the bill as “A bill to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice so that no child is left behind (P.L. 107-110 p. 1444). The populations targeted by NCLB are children attending failing schools, often in poor rural and urban areas. School choice was one of its cornerstones, made possible through a system of accountability that included teachers, schools and school districts. The School Charter Expansion Act is considered part of the legislative history of NCLB together with hearings and testimony in the intervening years of 1999 and 2000. These were not idle years for the advocacy of federal involvement in the encouragement of charter schools. Best illustrating this point was the prepared statement of Edward B. Rust Jr., Chairman and CEO of State Farm Insurance Companies for the House Education and Workforce Committee on July 1, 1999. Rust was also the chair of the Education Task Force for the Business Roundtable. His statement clearly reflects that business concluded that it needed to play an active policy role to better develop human capital. He emphasized the relationship between democracy and free enterprise that is a theme in school choice. Going back to 1989 and the Business Roundtable, he documented the increased interest business took in setting education policy. This included the creation of Achieve, Inc.; an organization created by 50 CEO’s and state governors to serve as a resource to states for policy based on accountability (Business community views, 1999).

The public discussion on charter schools continued throughout 2000, with several congressional reviews of elementary and secondary charter school programs. The testimony consisted of individuals involved in charter schools, again voices from those who may have been negatively impacted by charter schools were absent (Successes and
challenges, 2000). The ability for charter schools to innovate partly due to the lack of a bureaucracy and its flexible structure were discussed. But so was lack of funds for buildings together with hostility from school boards, districts and professional organizations (Successes and challenges, 2000). In September, 2000 five witnesses testified including Michael H. Feinberg CEO of KIPP Foundation. Feinberg explained to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce that KIPP was designed as a “no shortcuts” to education model emphasizing discipline and commitment on the part of everyone, including students who attend school 6 days a week and teachers who are on-call “24 hours and day, 7 days a week” (Success of charter schools, 2000).

March 22, 2001 H.R. 1 was introduced by John Boehner. The previously discussed themes of the parent as the consumer, accountability, and tying choice with democracy are all prominent in the testimony and debate in the House. School choice is intimately associated as an escape for children attending schools that are failing or are unsafe (Vote yes on H.R. 1, 2001). Another common theme is the idea that money alone cannot improve the public schools – competition is the only solution. There were differences expressed between the Democrats and Republicans, particularly on funds for school infrastructure renovations and support staff such as counselors and limitations on class size that did not make it to debate on the floor of the House (Providing for consideration, 2001). The addition of vouchers to the House version of the bill was rejected on the committee level, although it would reappear through Rep. Paul’s introduction of the Family Education Freedom Act which would again be rejected. One of the major reasons for the defeat of vouchers, was the proposed amount of $1500 was viewed as insufficient to support the argument that it would give economically
disadvantaged parents the same type of choices that wealthy and middle class parents
already have (No Child Left Behind, 2001). Choice advocates again asserted that money
alone will not solve the problem of failing schools.

During floor debate in the Senate, the topic of providing sufficient funding for
schools in the poorest areas arose. From this discussion, two divergent thoughts
emerged: a) one based on the belief that marketplace competition would propel poorly
financed public school districts and/or schools to either improve or suffer the
consequences of students leaving for charter schools and b) the opinion that charters
would disrupt the environment of the child and damage the public school by taking funds
away. (Child Left Behind, 2001). It was at this juncture that vouchers were reintroduced
into the discussion. The Senate discussion of school vouchers was spirited and at times
testy. Those who advocated for charters linked not only the concepts of competition and
democracy, but also faith based education. One concern that emerged was how to bring
true choice to rural areas that lack the population to sustain multiple schools. This too
became intertwined with faith-based education since parochial schools already exist in
some rural areas, thus providing an opportunity for choice (Elementary and Secondary
Education Act, 2001). As in the House, the Senate rejected the voucher issue. Senator
Kennedy was especially instrumental in guiding NCLB through, and together with
Senators Wellstone, Dorgan, Stevens and Clinton strenuously argued against vouchers.

NCLB continued through the process, returning to the House and Senate for the
Conference Reports. In the House, the themes of identifying the problem as an
unresponsive bureaucracy and returning authority to parents through choice are revisited
that there was a genuine belief that school choice would redress the problems of education by offering parents a marketplace in which to shop. These themes of democracy, free-market, and education appear in the Senate Conference Report (2001) with an added accent on equalizing funding (Senator Bayh, 2001). As in the House, the connection of reversing the academic crisis in the U.S. with greater parental involvement and choice is prevalent.

Identifying the Existential Problem

Strong, clear patterns emerge in the legislative history of NCLB. A shared belief that the American education system is in a crisis, much like that described in A Nation At Risk (1983). This crisis required greater accountability on the part of all participants, especially the teachers, schools, and school districts. And if these participants repeatedly failed, parents should have the opportunity that already existed for the middle class and wealthy: removing your child and choosing a different school. The underlying assumption being that the marketplace would create high quality schools regardless of parental economic status. During the debates and reports (107 Bill Tracking Report H.R. 1, 2001) it was asserted more than once that more money toward education was not the solution since it went to large education bureaucracies that were unable to address the problems of education. The problems manifested itself through poor teachers, schools, and school districts. This is a critical point because if the correct problem is not identified then the policy will most likely fail.

Berliner and Biddle in their seminal book The Manufactured Crisis (1995) empirically analyzed the arguments stipulating that there is a crisis in U.S. education. The argument forwarded by Berliner and Biddle is that the true problem is poverty. In
refuting the arguments expressed by those who believe education is in a crisis, they
gather evidence that after breaking test scores such as the SAT down into income
brackets, U.S. students from higher SES are very competitive with their international
peers. Indeed, they do not believe that there has been any achievement decline for
students from higher SES backgrounds. In the argument they assert that the most
important finding from Moe and Chubb (1991) was that the SES of the student’s and
family together with the SES of the other families attending the school, led to higher
levels of academic achievement. They expand their argument by analyzing the
relationship between business and education. The suggestion they make is that business
is using its power to advocate for its needs at the expense of other educational goals.
This of course is what Labaree (1997) refers to in his discussion of the social mobility
goals. The interest in increasing the worth of human capital becomes the overwhelming
and most important goal (Moe & Chubb, 1991, Hoxby, 2003).

There are few studies that have attempted cross-national studies of international
education systems beyond test comparison (Rojewski, 2004; Centre for Educational
Research and Innovation, 1994). In *International Perspectives on Workforce Education
and Development* (Rojewski, 2004), education was divided internationally by region and
the study focused on what each country needed to implement to create an advantage
based on the social, cultural and economic strengths of each country. A significant
number of suggestions centered on creating workers who were flexible, creative and with
cross-cultural understandings. The Centre for Educational Research and Innovation
(1994) took a different approach in their study by looking specifically at school choice.
They found in countries that rely heavily on choice, the middle class are more frequent
users and that parents choose schools with relatively few students from lower economic backgrounds. Not surprisingly, they also discovered that the decisions are not just parental, but that the child’s wishes are included in the decision-making process, particularly as they become older. This point is infrequently if ever brought up in policy discussion on choice in the U.S. Lastly, the study points out that frustration occurs when parents and children discover that the most attractive schools are full and that they must then turn to less desirable options (Centre for Educational Research and Innovation, 1994). In the U.S. where income disparities are greater than in other liberal democracies (Witztom, 1997), these findings are not encouraging.

The populations which NCLB targets most directly with all of its various reforms are disadvantaged students. Simply by visiting school district websites it becomes apparent that schools in wealthier and middle class areas have achieved many or all of the targets the standardized tests measure for purposes of accountability as shown in the grade card reports of the states. The schools in lower income areas often are still struggling and are not meeting the stated targets created in NCLB (P.L. 107-110, 2002). Poverty is the factor impacting school performance above all other. There are many environmental influences that create conditions that are not positive for education: crime, insufficient health care, insufficient housing, substance abuse and the list could continue. The fact that the U.S. has a greater income gap than similar economies and political systems says something about the macrosystem. There is greater emphasis placed on individual responsibility instead of collective responsibility influencing the laws created in the exosystem. On the distal level, poverty is the true problem in education (Carnoy, Jacobsen, Mishel, & Rothstein, 2005; Berliner, 2006). Within NCLB, this is implicitly
accepted as evidenced by the linkage of choice with underperforming schools which are found in areas of poverty without identifying poverty as the main cause of poor performance. Thus on the proximal level, one of the ways NCLB suggests reversing the poor education outcomes is through an alternative charter school system. The microsystem and mesosystem is altered by NCLB with the creation of charter schools with the anticipation that they will improve outcomes.

But have they? Charter schools have existed for more than fifteen years and there have been a number of studies conducted to determine their effectiveness. The evidence has been mixed (Berends, Watral, Teasley & Nicotera, 2008; Betts, Rice, Zau, Tang, & Koedel, 2006; Hoxby, 2003) based on test-based evidence. What has become clear is that in many states there is a shortage of high quality charter schools and charter schools are not clearly superior to their public school peers (Buckley & Schneider, 2006). There is a lack of strong empirical evidence that human capital levels are increasing through the use of charter schools.

*Are Charter Schools an Ideological Solution?*

The problem identified within the exosystem was an education system in severe crisis which was failing and falling further behind the rest of world. *A Nation At Risk* (1983) articulated this in the strongest of language, even proposing that the U.S. was doomed to third world status if the education system was not improved. The NCEE succeeded in dichotomizing education through the lens of failure, thereby denying any form of achievement. This narrative of decline and failure (Stone, 2002) became seared into the consciousness of the American public. At this point business became increasingly active in influencing education policy and there emerged an emphasis on the
social mobility goal at the expense of social equality and to a lesser extent, social efficiency. The identified problem became the object of policy and the idea of school choice became increasingly discussed – through vouchers and charter schools culminating in the passage of NCLB. This paper argues that the real problem, poverty, failed to be addressed. Increasingly it appears that NCLB will not attain the stated goal of equalizing education by the year 2014 regardless of economic status (Wiley, Mathis, & Garcia, 2005). The question is why not?

John Dewey’s (1938) writings on social inquiry aids in answering this ‘why not’ question. One necessary condition identified by Dewey is whether the crisis is the result of a real social tension. This is fulfilled, but not correctly identified by the policy. The crisis is an outgrowth of the high levels of poverty in the U.S., a result of the competitive, free market system. This was not the identified problem in NCLB. The incorrect identification of the problem led to an inability to observe and collect data allowing the policy-maker to create a plan that reflected the existential problem. Instead, a plan was created that placed the blame on the schools, teachers and school districts for poor performance. This avoided blaming the effect poverty exerts on the microsystem and mesosystem of the child. Ideology became the tool giving an easy solution to an extraordinarily complex problem.

The ‘why not’ is answered by looking at the role of ideology in the policy-making process. The use of ideology results in dualism that blocks the ability to identify the problem because the ideology drives the solution, not the evidence. Beginning with A Nation At Risk in 1983, the discussion concerning education was colored with words that alarmed and induced fear and anxiety leading to faulting the education community for the
crisis in education. Once the business community through the Business Roundtable and other organizations became involved, the emphasis on developing human capital became paramount and was tied to social mobility. During the 1980s there occurred a resurgence of interest in competitive individualism and free enterprise within the macrosystem. This trend continued into the 1990s and appeared to be confirmed with the fall of the USSR.

Socialism became viewed as a complete economic and social failure strengthening the evidence that individuals benefit when they compete against one another in a free marketplace. There was an elimination of competing belief systems within public discourse and this was reflected in the school choice discussions. The assumption that competition would work was taken as a given. The economic system of free enterprise and competitive individualism became politicized. The school voucher issue illustrates this point. They were ultimately rejected by Congress on the basis that not enough monies would be available in the form of a voucher to truly open up choices and also that they might violate separation of church and state – they were not rejected because of a disagreement with privatization as a concept.

The softening process within the policy stream for competitive, individualized education goals gained momentum with the publication of Moe and Chubb’s *Politics, Markets, and American Schools* in 1990. The exosystem responded in 1994 with an experimental program for school charters and then later with the School Charter Expansion Act of 1997. The policy prescription for school charters was led by the assumption that by definition they would improve education, specifically for those attending underperforming schools which meant neighborhoods of poverty. Although poverty was identified as the likely condition in which charter schools would be used, the
role of poverty was avoided in policy discussions. This was true during congressional debate on NCLB; the focus of the problem was on the shortcomings of education. The bad teachers, ineffective bureaucracy, uncaring schools and school districts were at fault for the poor education outcomes in the children, not the economic system that the education system reflected.

Authoritarianism, Ideology and Democratic Education

Authoritarian groups find that ideology is an effective tool when trying to change policy. Ideology allows the authoritarian group to maintain or increase their power through the use of fear and anxiety offering up solutions that do not advance the interests of the human community, but rather their own narrow ones. Critical to authoritarianism is the ability to control events. No Child Left Behind prescribed the solution of charter schools thus advancing the social mobility as a superior goal through parental choice. A democratic process of looking for the true problem was not pursued. The marketplace was extended into education thus turning education into a private good. Historically education had been considered a public good which society contributed money into because it benefited the community to have good schools and ultimately well-educated citizens (Tanner & Tanner, 2007). The good of privatizing education was presented as an

a priori giving little flexibility for other solutions to the problem of bad schools in poor communities. The ends were taken to be already given, with no true evaluation of the social condition. It was an isolated proposition which aided the authoritarian goal of spreading free enterprise to all facets of society, including education.

Once school choice became popularized, unequal funding ensured that the inequalities in schooling would persist. Since funding is based on local property tax for
school districts, the wealthier the district the more of an advantage. It is disingenuous to contend that money does not make a difference. When a child attends a school that is well-funded with sufficient supplies and the most recent technology - that child perceives that society cares; the child who attends schools that routinely suffer shortages, infrastructure that is falling apart and a lack of technology - that child perceives that society has forgotten about her.

The emphasis of privatization is on competition and individualism. One way of interpreting school choice and parental involvement is that it increases parental responsibility. This corresponds with the emphasis on the individual and removes the responsibility of society. One almost expects the next step to be if the child is at an underperforming charter school to be told it is the fault of the parent for choosing a bad school. In fact, this is one of the major problems with a market system for social systems – it depends on perfect information and perfect information is not realistic for any population (Stone, 2002). Again, this avoids the true, existential problem of poverty on the distal level and on the proximal level, unequal school funding. This issue will never be addressed unless the macrosystem shifts to place greater emphasis on shared responsibility within the community to ensure positive outcomes for all.
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CHAPTER FOUR

THE RUNAWAY AND HOMELESS YOUTH ACT

Public policy has failed to address the realities and challenges within the homeless youth population. For many years between the end of the depression through the 1950s the homeless were mainly sporadically employed, middle age white men. Housing was available to these individuals in the form of cheap hotels and rooming houses; resorting to sleeping on the streets was not the norm (Kiesler, 1991). As this population declined, another began to replace it in ever greater numbers. A recent demographic profile of the homeless consists of: families with children (41%) of which 63% are single parents and the average age of the child is 6; single men (41%); single women (13%), and unaccompanied minors (5%) (U.S. Conference of Mayors, 2003). Being homeless is a traumatic event whether it involves an adult or a youth, leading to a sense that others will not help and that you are unable to care for yourself (Goodman, Saxe, & Harvey, 1991). It becomes a problem involving many issues including economics, crime, public policy choices and psychological well-being. While all homeless populations are marginalized, unaccompanied minors have shown to be particularly difficult for successful policy to reach (Legislative History, 1974; Annual Report, 1983; PL 108-98, 2004). Youth homelessness questions assumptions concerning how American youth are taken care of and protected - both by society and families.
U.S. federal policy first attempt at legislation developed specifically for unaccompanied youths was the Runaway Youth Act passed in 1974 as Title III of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDPA). The population of unaccompanied minors was identified solely as runaways and defined within policy targeting delinquency. Hagan and McCarthy (1997) in their study of homeless youth suggest that North American researchers have traditionally approached the problem as an extreme outcome to adolescent rebellion. The premature leaving of the home is connected to the desire to be independent of parental authority and not the result of exposure to severe and sometimes dangerous living conditions within the family. This attitude reflects a middle class assumption that a) there is a functional environment in which to return; and b) to remedy the runaway ‘problem’, predictability and security need to be reasserted. Unfortunately this set of assumptions is not appropriate for all (if not most) homeless youth. Hagan and McCarthy (1997) argue that circumstances within the family set up situations in which the youth see no other option than to leave the home. Then once on the street, societal expectations, pressures and conditions impacts quality of life and ability to escape street life. Youth who become homeless do not always leave under their own volition; they are sometimes ‘thrown away’. Either way, youth homelessness cannot be reduced to a simple explanation of adolescent rebellion. Although the Runaway Youth Act has undergone significant transformations as it proceeded through its many reauthorizations, it has never fully emerged from the assumptions found it the 1974 version. This inability to recognize all populations within unaccompanied youth has impeded reaching and therefore serving all homeless youth.
A secondary issue confronted by homeless youth is the attitude mainstream society holds towards them. These youth exhibit physical and behavioral characteristics that make mainstream society avoid and/or ignore them. Staller (2005) reports that their vulnerability includes skin ailments, lice, poor dental care, lack of hygiene, tuberculosis together with mental health problems. Of the various homeless youth, those existing on the street often have the most acute problems but also are the least acceptable to society. This results in further marginalizing the street population leading to a deepening distrust and avoidance for all involved. These youth become harassed by authorities as they are connected to delinquent behaviors which are frequently the result of the realities within their microsystem (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997). Part of the process of marginalizing homeless youth is maintaining a linkage to crime, as evidenced in the history of federal policy.

The U.S. census does not count homeless youth, and unless these youth are in shelters or within the child welfare/foster care system they are difficult to access. This explains the great variation in population estimates including those used by the U.S. government. H.R. 3409 (2007) estimates that between 1.6 and 2.8 million young people experience some level of homelessness each year and 1 out of every 7 children will runaway before they turn 18 from their guardian (either a family or institution). The available information on these youth is scarce, increasing the difficulty in creating good policy. It is a reasonable to ask if we cannot even count the population, how can the phenomena be understood. This leads to the corollary of what the current policy based on – if there is a lack of knowledge concerning the most immediate environments of unaccompanied youth, what are the laws produced in the exosystem relying on for
empirical evidence? Is the knowledge extracted from the realities within the microsystems and mesosystems of the youth or assumptions made within the macrosystem? If the answer is the latter, the exosystem will fail to address the actual problem of delivering basic services to these youth.

**Homeless Youth in the United States**

Beginning with the 1974 Runaway Youth Act, there have been allusions to the lack of information regarding this population. There was even a mandate in the 2004 Runaway and Homeless Youth (RHYA) reauthorization (P.L. 108-96) that a report on the homeless youth population be made to congress within 2 years of the passage of the bill. The most is known concerning youth who have sought out help, which is a small number of the homeless (Smollar, 1999). Although there is a difference between adult and youth homelessness (Toro & Warren, 1999), the structural and individual explanations are similar. Economic forces and lack of affordable housing are frequently cited as structural causes (Toro & Warren, 1999; Chamberlain & MacKenzie, 2004). Family problems, economic problems and residential instability have been cited by the National Coalition for the Homeless (NCH, 1999) as reasons for youth homelessness. The inability becomes more critical once the youth leaves home. A complication to finding shelter is the minor status of these youth. Even if housing is available, they encounter difficulties in signing a contract since they are under eighteen.

In their study, Martijn and Sharpe (2006) discovered individual explanations which followed five different pathways toward youth homelessness: drug and alcohol trauma absent of psychological problems, trauma and psychological problems without the incidence of substance abuse, drug and alcohol combined with family problems, family
problems, and trauma induced by sexual abuse. In this study, only 33% of the participants reported no history of either (or both) physical, sexual abuse. Other studies have discovered similar results (Whitbeck & Hoyt, 1999; Molnar, Shade, Kral, Booth, & Watters, 1998; Unger, Kipke, Simon, Montgomery & Johnson, 1997). The individual explanations place an emphasis on individual agency and human activity which transform into blaming the youth and/or the family of the youth (Chamberlain & MacKenzie, 2004). The impact of exosystemic societal pressures on the microsystem of the family are often ignored while the sole focus turns to the family. The result is that the family is blamed for the phenomena of homeless youth, while the role of instability due to societal pressures remains ignored.

Since societal expectations are not met, these youth experience shame on a daily basis. Kaufman (1992) has written extensively on the damaging role of shame within the individual from the perspective of a psychologist. Shame that originates in the family is Kaufman’s major focus, but shame can also be the result of not meeting society’s expectations (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997). Family abuse certainly encourages feelings of shame, but the dominant culture can also create them through stigmatization. Hagan & McCarthy (1997) argue that the shame administered by abusive and neglectful parenting is augmented by society’s use of criminal sanctions ensuing in more criminal behavior. The youth become angry and defensive, not regretful and guilty. An interaction between shame and a lack of basic needs may also be present. The constant search for safe sleeping arrangements, lack of hygiene, medical care and food all compound the dominant culture’s avoidance of these youth. They are seen by police as trouble makers, they are dirty and often involved in substance abuse. These individuals have low self
esteem and have learned not to place confidence in those who represent the dominant culture. Due to macrosystemic influences, the exosystem has created difficulties in the microsystems of these youths.

Although there is a dearth of information regarding youth homelessness, congressional legislation has attempted to categorize different types of unaccompanied youth. The original 1974 Runaway Youth Act did not attempt to formally define a runaway, rather there was an implicit suggestion that these youth left home without parental permission and needed to be returned to that family. (P.L. 93-415, 1974). As the RYA transformed into the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (RHYA) and underwent a succession of reauthorizations, definitions become important. By 2004 the definition for a homeless youth included different meanings based a) on the type of shelter or center, b) had no relative as an alternative and c) no other alternative living arrangement. Also included in this reauthorization were definitions for street youth which included a) “runaway youth or indefinitely or intermittently homeless” (P.L. 108-96, p. 20) and b) who spends time on the street and is at-risk for sexual exploitation, sexual abuse, prostitution or drug abuse (P.L., 108-96). These definitions emerged as awareness of the diversity within the homeless youth population evolved, even as the policies themselves failed to fully embrace the diversity of the population.

A different approach to the problem of recognizing the multiplicity of the homeless youth is defining based on experiential components. Using this method, four types can be identified: throwaways, system kids, street kids and shelter kids. Throwaways have been deserted, forced, or told to leave by their families frequently due to extended conflict (Son, 2002; Athey, J.G. Rabinowitz, S., & Hanson K.,1995). System
kids have come into contact with various societal institution or agencies including psychiatric facilities, juvenile justice, and residential facilities (Athey et al., 1995; Slesnick, 2001). Shelter kids are different in that they may revolve between the home of friends, relatives, shelters, and foster families and may never actually live on the streets (Slesnick, 2004). Shelter kids may be the closest to what is often thought when the word runaway is used. The last type is street kids, which are the most invisible. These youth have lived on the streets for an extended period of time and seem to have chosen the streets over life with their families or guardians. They sleep where they can including outdoors, in abandoned buildings and on the streets (Son, 2002; Smollar, 1999; Slesnick, 2004).

Definitions and typologies for unaccompanied youth are critical in the formation of meaningful policy. Where these youth come from, where they go, and what experiences induce them to leave their families or guardians impacts what the programs should look like created to aid them. Currently there exists a myriad of agencies on the federal state and local level involved with homeless youth. Federal policies under RHYA are administered through the Department of Health and Human Services, which distributes monies through grants (DHHS, 2008). On the state level, programs exist similar to those found on the federal level, but there is frequently an emphasis on the role of the juvenile court together with issues involving the independence and minor status of the youth (American Bar Association (ABA), 1994). Local government focuses on immediate neighborhood issues and as with the state level, delinquency concerns (ABA, 1994). What will not be effective is legislation that ignores the diversity of experiences both before and after leaving the home by these youth. Policy should not be constructed
with assumptions as to what the lives of these youth look like. Ideally policy needs to be constructed that discontinues the criminalization of homeless youth allowing them to become members of the full community.


The Social Security Act of 1935 emphasized getting aid to children who were impacted by economic uncertainty. The legislation specifically gave the Children’s Bureau responsibility over public-welfare services (together with state welfare agencies) dividing children into four basic types: “homeless, neglected, dependent and those in danger of becoming delinquent” (Social Security, 1935, p.10). The depression was felt by so many within society that it allowed for a broadening scope of public policy. The Social Security Act specified aiding children whose extended family was experiencing economic insecurity. It was also a product of the socio-cultural period in which it was written. Aid to children was focused on single parent homes that had no paternal support due to divorce, widowhood or desertion. The assumption that the woman would go out into the workforce and support her family was absent. Delinquency, which becomes the focus of later legislation, is mentioned and the need for child-care services is identified but it is not the focus of the law (Social Security Bill, 1935). Due to the depth and breadth of economic instability common in the Great Depression on many levels of American society, homelessness was not considered an uncommon event. The social stigma applied to it later was not yet significant within the macrosystem and not expressed in the Social Security Act (1935). Interestingly, this focus on “security for children” (Social Security Bill, 1935, p. 16) remained a part of the social security mission, most recently through the John H. Chafee Foster Care Independence Program (A
Social Security was the basis for public welfare for minors extending into the 1950s. There were some changes; in 1950 welfare funds could be used to return a runaway under the age of 16 and then in 1958 that was extended to age 18 (Fernandes, 2007). During the years after WWII until the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offences Control Act of 1961, a fundamental transformation occurred in how at-risk youth were viewed. One of the first signs that times were changing occurred in the 1950 Social Security Act which eliminated references to the Children’s Bureau and the Chief of Children’s Bureau and assigned “Administrator” as the referent (Social Security, 1950). Although a bureaucratic formality that applied to all programs within Social Security, it does indicate an approach moving away from aiding children to one more bureaucratic and distant. Another detail that appeared in the 1950 reauthorization was the singling out runaway youth. As will become evident, being a runaway became connected to delinquency.

It was in 1955 that concrete evidence emerges for this connection when the Senate Judiciary Committee investigated juvenile delinquency. This investigation which did not directly result in any legislation but instead identified the influences leading to an increase in delinquency as: education, public school conditions, motion pictures, obscene and pornographic literature, comic books, television and juvenile employment (Juvenile Delinquency, 1955-1956). This list is illuminating because of its reflection of changes within American culture. Beginning in the late 1940s the U.S. saw a huge increase of
children being born, the generation that became known as the baby boomers, and the adult population was increasingly becoming concerned with what they viewed as juvenile delinquency. This delinquency was especially worrisome because it affected middle-class youths who according to their parents were adopting the values of the lower classes. These new attitudes of the middle class youth were seen as anti-social and sometimes outright illegal (Loss, 1999). Delinquency had spread to the suburbs. All of which was reflected in the mass medium identified by the Senate Judiciary Committee through the emergence of rock-n-roll, movies like *The Wild One* and *Rebel Without a Cause*, the dress of the youth and the way they spoke. It was a demographic shift and it concerned the adults. Public policy began to reflect this anxiety and fear of youth culture by focusing more on delinquency.

This culminated in the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961. This act centered its attention on the increasing delinquency which had been occurring in the past twelve years, paralleling the development of the baby boomers. It is difficult to exaggerate the demographic impact of the maturing of the baby boomer generation had on all aspects of U.S. society. By 1964, those who were younger than 17 outnumbered any other age group in the country (Loss, 1999). The increased concern over juvenile delinquency occurred tangentially with the new youth culture reflected in the emergence of rock and roll. Rock n’ roll (synonymous for sexual intercourse in blues music), with its roots in ‘race music’ was closely identified with delinquency by mainstream society (Loss, 1999). This connection between delinquency, law and order, and race emerges again in the conservative countermovement of the late 1960s. Those youth identified as most likely to be delinquent were unemployed youths who had
dropped out of school giving them nothing to do and too much time on their hands. However, youth delinquency was also connected to poverty, foreshadowing the creation of the anti-poverty programs of the 1960s. Youths from deprived family situations were mentioned, but what was meant by deprived was not clearly defined. Unlike the Social Security Act of 1935 there is no mention of youth homelessness (JDYOA, 1961). Perhaps due to American post-war affluence society did not recognize that anyone other than single men could be or were homeless. This same lack of recognition of homelessness surfaced again in the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968. Delinquency is viewed not only as a current national problem but one destined to become ominous in the next decade (JDPDA, 1967). As in 1961, there is no mention of homeless youth. This absence of recognition would not change until the 1974 Runaway and Homeless Youth Act was passed and then under certain assumptions as to what constituted homelessness.

The focus of these federal acts was delinquency, not homeless youth. Running parallel to these youth delinquency bills was the Social Security Act which retained portions of its focus on security for children. Thus the two separate trajectories of delinquency and security for children occur, neither of which is involved with the issue of homeless youth. It is worth noting that the tensions between generations are present in the delinquency legislation. This is illustrated in the following statement (JDPCA, 1968, p. 2):

Much evidence now indicates that problems of delinquency are associated in a complex fashion with the formation of a separate and distinct “youth culture.” Everyone recognizes that the differences between youth and the adult world can harden into antagonisms, and even explode into overt conflict.
A connection to these antagonisms and explosions and runaways is not difficult to follow. The Runaway Youth Act became a part of a much larger juvenile delinquency bill because runaways were identified as real or potential offenders. The emphasis in the 1968 Delinquency Prevention Act is controlling crime through prevention and rehabilitation of the potential and active delinquents as defined in the legislation. This is the connection to the next era of legislation that does involve including the concept and reality of homeless youth.


The summary for the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974 read “To provide a comprehensive, coordinated approach to the problems of juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes” (Legislative History, 1974). The newly identified problem of runaways was formally linked with delinquency. The RYA was inserted into the JJDPA as Title III and came from the House version of the bill (Legislative History, 1974). But the linkage of runaways to delinquency from the beginning contained inconsistencies. The House Education and Labor Committee Report (Legislative History, 1974), states that runaways should not be linked with delinquency and that runaways were more likely to be the victims of crime than the perpetrators of crime. Conversely Sen. Hruska (Legislative History, 1974) stated in the Conference Report that he did not support including RYA into the JJDPA because runaways were already provided for in other sections of the JJDPA as well as in the Omnibus Crime Control and Sage Street Act.

RYA was envisioned as a small program within the larger JJDPA (Committee Report, 1974) in part due to the lack of substantive and empirical knowledge concerning
the runaway population. The Runaway population was identified as an increasing problem, with one Senator estimating that as many as one million youth ran away from home each year (Sen. Bayh in Legislative History, 1974). The underlying assumption was that the youth ran away due to problems with the family (Legislative History, 1974). Within the Congressional findings some recognition existed that the nature of the problem was not well defined or understood and more information was needed. As will be illustrated later, this is a common theme in each successive reauthorization. The Act emphasized the need for temporary shelter and counseling services, but with the recognition that not much was truly understood. There was also an explicit statement that the police and juvenile justice authorities were already over-whelmed and could not be expected to be involved with the runaway population (P.L. 93-415, 1974). If the belief was that these youth were victims, this sentence appears contradictory by suggesting a link to delinquency. This contradiction appears in the manner committee testimony was bound together. RYA testimony on runaway youth programs was bound with testimony on juvenile delinquency prevention (Hearing, 1974).

In general, the goal of RYA was to locate, detain and return runaways what was presumed to be primarily middle class homes. Even though this was designed to be a small grant program, a list of requirements for the runaway homes funded through federal grants was created. The first major stipulation was that these houses provided “temporary care outside the law enforcement structure” (P.L. 93-415, 1974, p. 21). These Houses were to be located in convenient areas for the runaway population and not exceed 20 youth at one time. A development plan needed to address creating contacts between the child and the parents or relatives for their safe return. Another development
plan was required for “assuring proper relations with law enforcement personnel and the return of runaways from correctional institutions” (P.L. 93-415, 1974, p. 22). Relating to the belief that the family was the origin of running away, aftercare for the youth and family once reconciled was specified.

In the 1977 Juvenile Justice Amendments, the term “otherwise homeless youth” was introduced into the RYA by Senator Bayh. Senator Bayh pointed out that these homeless youth were not the same population as the runaway’s targets in the original 1974 bill. Homeless youth left home due to extreme abuse or neglect and saw leaving as a rational alternative to remaining in the home; this new category also included those who were thrown away by their families (Sen. Bayh in Legislative History, 1974). However, there was no significant change in the type of programs themselves. The runaway homes were viewed as temporary living arrangements until some type of reconciliation with the family could be attained. The assumption that the runaway population emerged from the middle class is clearly stated in the legislative history in the following statement: “although the runaway problem is usually seen as particularly prevalent among the white middle class, other groups are also affected” (Legislative History, 1977, p. 22). In the 1977 Amendment is the declaration that the runaway houses should fulfill the function of rerouting these youth from the juvenile justice system. The Social Security Act is referred to as inappropriate for dealing with the runaway population since the SSA deals primarily with youth who imminently will be or are part of the welfare system. This leaves out the middle class population targeted by the RYA (Legislative History, 1977).

The major additions that the 1977 Amendments made to RYA was in the discussion and inclusion of homeless youth and an increase in funding for the runaway
houses. The problem was although ‘otherwise homeless’ youth were recognized, the programs themselves did not change to reflect the addition of this new population. The increased funding went toward runaway homes in the Basic Center Program – from 130 to an estimated 300 (Legislative History, 1977). The assumptions that the runaways were from the middle class remained the basis for the programs.

The Runaway Youth Act became the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act (RHYA) in the 1980 reauthorization and evaluations of program centers proceeded. The 1983 Annual Report analyzed both the status of the centers’ being funded and the demographics of the youth themselves. Even though there was an implicit policy recognition that the populations of unaccompanied youth were not the same, the goals for the centers failed to reflect this diversity. Four goals are stipulated for the centers as specified by RHYA (p. 3):

- To alleviate the problem of runaway and homeless youth
- To reunite youth with their families and to encourage the resolution of intra-family problems through counseling and other services
- To strengthen family relationships and to encourage stable living conditions for youth
- To help youth decide upon a future course of action

Several questions arise from these goals. The report defines distinctive types of unaccompanied youth beyond the more general runaway and homeless typologies including push-out youth who have been encouraged to leave home and youth away by mutual agreement which includes youth who leave with the knowledge and agreement of the parent or legal guardian. What happens to these youth if there can be no reconciliation or if the reconciliation leads to greater dysfunction fails to be addressed. The report does mention that about 8% of youth who received services ended back on the
streets. In addition, the family may be experiencing unstable living conditions due to systemic conditions such as lack of income or lack of affordable housing. But the assumption of stability is built into RHYA because it is referring to the stability of the family system (micro- and meso-systemic) and denying any responsibility for instability on society (exo- and macro-systemic).

Information regarding the population of unaccompanied youth revealed useful demographics. Statistics were gathered including children beginning at 12 and below (as young as 10) and extending to 18 and above. Not surprisingly, the older youth were more likely to be homeless and to have dropped out of school. The list of major reasons cited by the clients for leaving home does not appear adequate based on the research into what triggers youth to leave home (Slesnick, Bartle-Haring, Dashora, Kang, & Aukward, 2008; Hagan & McCarthy, 1997). The prevalence of violence and abuse is not reflected in the reasons for seeking services focused on problems such as no communication with parents, parents who were too strict and poor self-image (Annual Report, 1983). When asked what their most immediate needs were, the clients responded with “immediate shelter, crisis counseling, and referral for other specific services” (Annual Report, 1983, p.15).

The next major reauthorization occurred in 1988 with the addition of what became known as the Transitional Living Programs (TLP). The problem of where to place the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Amendments continued and the solution was to insert it in the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988 within Title VII, Death Penalty and Other Criminal and Law Enforcement Matters (P.L. 100-690, 1988). The basic framework of the already existing Basic Center Programs of providing temporary
shelter until the youth could be reunited with their families or guardians remained. However, the needs of older youth who would not or could not return home were the target of the Transitional Living Programs (TLP). Senator Simon conducted hearings on the problem of homeless youth for the Committee on the Judiciary in Chicago. During this hearing, his subcommittee heard testimony from individuals who ran and worked with homeless youth, officials from government entities responsible for programs with homeless youth and the homeless youth themselves. The stated focus of the hearings was helping these homeless youth acquire living skills for independent living (Sen. Simon in Problem of Homeless Youth, 1989).

The inability to reunite these youth with the families or guardians was accepted in these hearings together with their existence outside of the established social service network (Problem of Homeless Youth, 1989). One theme that emerged in much of the testimony was the existence of high levels of abuse and violence within the lives of these youth. Another theme was that there were many more homeless youth than services that reached out to them. The effects that poverty has on communities and society’s inability to resolve it were also a topics brought up in the hearings (Problem of Homeless Youth, 1989). The outcome of these hearings was the creation of the Transitional Living Program (TLP). TLP’s were created for youth between the ages of 16 and 21 to help them transition to independent living. It was constructed as a residential program not to exceed 540 days which offered the youth programs that helped them develop interpersonal skill building, job counseling and education help together with physical and mental care (Rep. Miller, 1988). When the TLP was first designed in the first year it was appropriated $5 million, on the condition that the total appropriations for the BCP (with a
minimum of $75,000 per state) exceeded $26.9 million (P.L. 100-690, 1988). This discrepancy between the two programs slowly narrowed (U.S. Budget, 1995).

The next major event in the legislative history of RHYA occurred in 1994 with the creation of the Street Outreach Program (SOP). In 1994 Congress passed the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 of which Title IV was Violence Against Women of which the SOP was a part. The street outreach program was specifically created for runaway, homeless and street youth who were at risk for sexual abuse and exploitation (P.L. 103-322, 1994). This is the first time the term “street youth” is used within RHYA. A street youth was defined as “a juvenile who spends a significant amount of time on the street or in other areas of exposure to encounters that may lead to sexual abuse” (P.L. 103-322, 1994, p. 1922). Therefore these street outreach centers were focusing solely on the sexual exploitation of homeless youth. These centers were created as an alternative to street youth who were not involved in sexual abuse or exploitation. From the beginning, the Street Outreach Program was smaller than either the BCP’s or TLP’s.

It should be noted, that this amendment to RHYA was an extremely small part of a much larger and controversial piece of legislation. P.L. 103-322 was introduced in October, 1993 and signed by President Clinton on September, 1994. In its journey it was altered considerably and filibustered in the Senate. The contentious issues involved gun control, drugs, the death penalty and spending on social programs (Bill Tracking, 1994). The Street Outreach Program was pushed through by Senator Biden who was instrumental in preparing and advocating for Title IV (Sen. Biden, 1994)
Up to this point, the RHYA program funding for BCP and TLP had been dominated by small categorical programs that were “piecemeal, unnecessary and duplicative” (Rep. Goodling, 1997, p.1). To solve this issue, in the 1999 the funding streams were consolidated under the Missing, Exploited and Runaway Children Protection Act. Both the TLP and BCP retained their own funding formulas. The debate in congress highlighted that many of those served under the RHYA had become homeless at the result of being pushed our or with parental/guardian agreement that they leave (Rep. Goodling,.1997). The Director of Public Policy at the National Network for Youth pointed out that runaway and homeless youth are running from their homes, but not running to anything (Miriam A. Rollin, 1999).

The Runaway, Homeless and Missing Children Protection Act was signed into law on October, 2003. The legislative journey through various crime bills finally ended with RHYA attaining independent statutory status as P.L. 108-118. Many of the issues previously cited emerged again combined with new concerns (P. L. 108-118). The Basic Centers were created as temporary shelter and that had been interpreted to mean a maximum of 15 days. During testimony, this was pointed to as an insufficient amount of time and it was suggested that it be extended to six months (Mai Fernandez, 2003). A suggestion that failed to be included in the final version of the bill. Others praised the Basic Centers and their mission to reunite families (Rep. Hoekstra, 2003).

There were some changes made to the Transitional Living Program. For those youth not yet 18 at the end of the 540 day shelter eligibility period, the stay was extended to their 18th birthday. Also, Maternity Group Homes were added for pregnant and parenting homeless youth. In addition to the regular TLP, the maternity group homes
included education on childcare, child development, family budgeting and health and nutrition. The issue of education was referenced back to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. As was true with all reauthorizations, it was stated that a report on strategies to end youth homeless be submitted to congress within two years of passing the program (Sen. Leahy, 2003). The Street Outreach Program continued to target youth who were at risk or engaged in sexual exploitation or abuse. It also still received a small portion of the grant money compared to the larger BCP and TLP.

The underlying theme that emerges from the testimony and debate is that the runaway and homeless youth are from families who throw them away or are in some other manner at fault. These youth often have no adults to turn to because everyone has failed them (Capital Hill Hearing Testimony, 2003). However, even with the recognition that perhaps not all can return to their homes, the programs, especially the Basic Program and Street Outreach do not significantly change. There is little discussion on the role society plays in rejecting these youth in their immediate environments such as school or how society avoids and ignores them.

There are two RHYA reauthorizations currently under consideration in Congress. The short title for H.R. 3409 is A Place to Call Home Act and folds several issues previously either not addressed by RHYA or addressed in a brief manner (H.R. 3409, 2007). A short list of some of the additional issues being combined with RHYA indicates a change in the scope and some of the assumptions of the program: the John H. Chaffee Foster Care Independence Program which is from the Social Security Act, funds for transitional housing is being made available to street youth (but remains targeted to victims of sexual exploitation), education availability on the elementary, secondary and
post-secondary levels, provides Section Eight rental assistance for homeless youth, stipulates the creation of a national homeless youth awareness campaign, and several additions include health care and workforce development. There is also a section addressing congressional intent to allow minors to sign contracts with an encouragement to states to pass statutes allowing this to be done. The issue of missing and exploited children has been removed and a section on unaccompanied immigrant youth has been added (H. R. 3409, 2007). There remains a section on juvenile status offenders and substance abuse in families. This is a major piece of legislation that is over 200 pages long. It is currently in committee.

An amendment to RHYA is also under congressional consideration – H.R. 5524, Reconnecting Homeless Youth Act of 2008. This legislation was introduced on March 4, 2008 and is also in committee. This amendment is confined to issues directly relating to RHYA. It makes some changes regarding age requirements (i.e. not more than to less than), requires periodic updates to congressional leadership on the number of runaways between 13 and 25 years of age, allows longer TLP stays if state law allows it, and it makes some alterations in the grant programs. It also specifically defines a runaway youth as “an individual who is less than 18 years of age and who absents himself or herself from home or place of legal residence without the permission of parents or legal guardians” (H.R. 5524, 2008, p. 10). The amendment is limited to revising specific sections of PL 108-09 and does not attempt to broaden the existing law in the same manner as H.R. 3409.
Identifying the Problem

There is a long history of legislation meant to address the issue of homeless youth. Recognition began with connecting homeless youth to delinquency but even as this was occurring there was an alternative view present which entertained the idea of significant differences within the population. The dominant strand became the one originating with the delinquency linkage.

From the beginning legislation was connected to crime and anti-drug bills. This association can be traced to the 1950s when mainstream, middle class America became concerned with the rise of juvenile delinquency. In the 1960s this concern became apparent in the 1961 and 1968 crime bills that targeted juvenile delinquency. By the early 1970s it became clear that there were youth living as unaccompanied minors (Appathurai, C., 1991), leading to the passage of the Runaway Youth Act in 1974. The underlying assumptions present in RYA is that these youth were from middle class backgrounds and that the most desirable course of action was reuniting them with their families, thus the Basic Center Program was born. The possibility that there were youth who were not runaways from middle class homes but rather homeless unaccompanied minors coming from unstable environments was not contemplated in the legislation. The need to avoid overburdening either the justice authorities or the police was categorically stated in RYA (P.L. 93-415, 1974), evidence of the intimacy in which runaways were connected to delinquency.

The alternate view attempted to delink homeless youth to delinquency and broaden the understanding of homelessness. There are moments in the legislative history when an attempt was made to discover the real problems of the homeless population.
Beginning in 1974, there were those who recognized that these youth had been abandoned by society, had no where to go and should not be linked with juvenile delinquency (Legislative History, 1974). A further expansion occurred in 1977 when a differentiation between homeless youth and runaways was placed in the legislation (Legislative History, 1977). Finally there were the hearings led by Sen. Simon which led to the formation of the Transitional Living Centers. These hearings included individuals from a variety of perspectives, including the homeless youth themselves. Even information regarding the under sixteen population has also been available to policy makers. The 1983 Annual Report broke the homeless population into age groups beginning with those younger that thirteen. The idea that homeless youth are all from middle class families (albeit with dysfunctions) that shared the values of mainstream America denies what is known from research – that homeless youth are a diverse population (Athey et al., 1995; Son, 2002; Slesnick, 2004).

Policy failed to successfully disentangle from the initial criminalization of the homeless population. The TLP was created to help those sixteen and older obtain independent living skills with the implicit understanding that these youth could not return home. What has happened in implementing the law is that those youth who can conform to the program’s guidelines are admitted while the more dysfunctional street youth are left outside it. By definition those younger than sixteen do not fit the program which leaves the younger group to either the BCP or SOP. The BCP with its 15 day maximum (a time limit that is written into H.R. 3409) does not address youth from highly distressed backgrounds. Fifteen days is insufficient in dealing with a myriad of problems including inadequate housing for the family, abusive situations, substance abuse by parents,
unemployment and so forth. For many of these youth it is not a situation of returning them to a stable microsystem. The Street Outreach Program is also limited in its scope by connecting it to the specific issue of sexual abuse and exploitation. The SOP has the potential to reach out to the youth who refuse and avoid the BCP because they do not want to be reunited with their family, but by associating it with a single issue it limits its reach into this diverse population. The origins of the SOP reflect the policy ambivalence present throughout the history of the RHYA; it was created under the Violence Against Women section of a major crime bill viewing these youth as victims but not moving beyond this characterization. A separate issue is that the same organizations often house both the BCP and TLP, leading to less diversity in providers. Perhaps the needs of the homeless youth would be better provided for if there was greater diversity of providers.

**Authoritarianism, Homeless Youth, and the Macrosystem**

As the RYA transformed into the RHYA and the TLP and SOP were added, assumptions existed that failed to completely address the problems and realities of the population. When RYA was created, it was with the a priori presumption that most runaways were from middle class families that desired reunification with their children. The possibility that this was incorrect was not seriously entertained by the policymakers. Mainstream, middle class beliefs present in the macrosystem pushed out any alternate policy prescriptions in the exosystem. Those homeless youth who could not or would not be reunited with their families or guardians were left out.

Evidence for authoritarianism is present in the RHYA through the lack of programs for certain homeless youth populations. While the TLP was meant to help homeless youth with life skills, it was limited to youth 16 and older. And the street
outreach targeted youth who were at risk for sexual abuse or exploitation. What if the unaccompanied youth was younger than 16 and not sexually exploited? There currently is no program which covers the needs of these youth. There is an entire population of street youth who avoid the BCP because they do not want to be reunited with their families and are unable to use the TLP because of their age. These street youth are so far outside the norm of society that it becomes easy to ignore their existence. These youth frequently are the most marginalized of all populations and the least acceptable to mainstream society. They (and perhaps their families or guardians) have not prospered in the individualistic, competitive environment of U.S. Their microsystem is defined by a lack of housing, victimization by adult homeless, distrust of social institutions, bad relations with the police and inadequate nutrition (Hagan, J. & McCarthy, B., 1997). In short, these street youth are viewed through a lens of anxiety and fear. The authorities and institutions within the exosystem reduce this fear by ignoring them or criminalizing them.

In the beginning the dominant view of homeless youth was through the ideological lens of delinquency. The concept that many levels of failure shaped these youth within their microsystems was not entertained. Since these youth failed to fit into mainstream society, they became connected to delinquent behaviors and moved to the fringe of society. In maintaining a middle class connection in RHYA, the population was understood and to a certain degree considered “known”. Other groups of homeless youth could be ignored and kept on the outside where they continued to be perceived as dangerous to society. As a result of the ideologically motivated BCP that forced all homeless youth into a middle class paradigm, it failed to address the needs of other
populations. Although there have been attempts at recognizing other needs they have failed to emerge completely from the original set of beliefs.

For public policy to meet the needs of the homeless youth population, a recognition of the diversity within the population must be met. Whether the youth is a throwaway, system kid, shelter kid, or street youth a program should be available that creates the most positive microsystem. These youth often have become so removed from society that they avoid contact out of a distrust of possible consequences. RHYA was a product of authoritarian a prior assumptions regarding the behavior of youth and the type of microsystem that the youth came from. The policy itself has not been successful at alleviating the incidence of homeless youth even though it has been in existence since 1974. The reason for this inability is connected to the underlying assumptions that have been present since its creation – deviancy from middle class homes. The reality of the problem is that these youth are from many different economic backgrounds, including those from situations of poverty and youth from the foster care system. The legislation will continue to fail until it accounts for the realities in the environment of the homeless youth. In a pragmatic sense the problem fails to be solved because the dominant groups in the policy stream do not wish to solve the problem.
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CHAPTER FIVE

AUTHORITARIANISM OR GENERATIVITY

If we want to make the world safe for democracy, we must first make democracy safe for the healthy child.

A basic function of public policy is the ability to correctly identify a problem that is experienced within a population and offer solutions that optimally eliminate or at the least minimize the problem. In the process of achieving this, public policy as a product of the exosystem links the inhabited environments of individuals with the broader belief systems of the macrosystem. For the public policy process to correctly identify and answer the real or existential problem, the macrosystem must be open and inclusive. Problems arise when policy discourse and activity become dominated by authoritarian goals. Policy then becomes driven by the goals of the more dominant, authoritarian group leading to stagnation and little true progress.

The existential problem resides in the micro and mesosystem for the individuals experiencing it. This suggests that to help the population, the policy should reflect the realities of these most immediate environments. Once the existential problem is identified a democratic, comprehensive information-gathering process is critical in its resolution. A high quality information process invites complete inquiry by inhibiting assumptions and dominance from various groups within the exosystem and more distal macrosystem. But public policy incorrectly identifies the existential problem in the
presence of authoritarianism. Authoritarianism blocks effective public policy by overlaying authoritarian goals over those of the population experiencing the problem. Reified ideology is one of the most effective tools in the promotion of authoritarian goals because it succeeds in separating the activity of the affected group with the policy prescription. When ideology becomes reified, the belief system within the macrosystem becomes a politicized ‘world view’ reducing realities into dichotomies (Ollman, 1976). Reified ideology is used as a means for authoritarian goals to control the public policy process in the exosystem. The result is maintenance of authoritarian goals simultaneous to failing to resolve the existential problem.

The issue of the dominance of authoritarian goals is especially troubling in policy issues affecting minors. Because the populations represented in NCLB and RHYA are composed of minors who by definition rely on adults within the polity to advocate their interests, authoritarianism can be especially pernicious. In the “ideal democracy” as envisioned by Robert Dahl (2006), the activity of full, complete political participation is not a possibility for minors. As Dahl (1993; 2006) discusses at length, the result of combining democracy with an economic system based on free enterprise is the emergence of polyarchy. Some participants within the polyarchy have more power and ‘voice’ than others. The groups with greater resources can reach a point where they are maintaining their power or conclude that it is necessary to increase their power. Minors rely on the adult population to articulate their true interests within the exosystem. This reliance creates a situation of vulnerability and increases the opportunities for distortions in policy.
On the surface, NCLB and RHYA appear to reflect different policy trajectories, but upon closer analysis they both reflect the influence of authoritarianism. NCLB encourages viewing the student as the embodiment of human capital and education as an economic commodity. The school choice movement gained momentum with few questioning its effectiveness. The education agenda was shifted from those in education over to economic and business interests. Looking at the whole student as a product of her ecological system was nonexistent. If there is an absence of awareness in NCLB of the student and her environment – in RHYA for homeless youth there is an absence of recognition. RHYA has been unable to emerge from the original linkage of homeless youth to juvenile delinquency and family/social class assumptions. In both of these broad federal policies the overlay of adult, authoritarian goals unsuccessfully addressed the problems of the youth. The process of creating and maintaining healthy communities was absent in the legislative histories of both policies.

Generativity and the Ecological System

The movement from healthy individual to healthy community development greatly interested Erikson as attested to the increase in writing on generativity. With generativity, Erikson began to move beyond traditional psychology and into broader paradigms. Generativity is expressed through social institutions and in social contexts by adults through intergenerational transfer (de St. Aubin, McAdams, & Kim, 2004). Intergenerational transfer creates, maintains and revitalizes cultural beliefs and traditions that focus on long-term consequences. Humans are not isolates, but rather social beings in which relatedness to the world is of primary importance. Generative adults seek to foster human potential in future generations (de St. Aubin, et al., 2004). However,
Intergenerational transfer is bidirectional—dependence on adults by children coexists with dependence of the older generation on the younger (Friedman, 1999). Generativity manifests itself in both the adult within micro- and mesosystems simultaneous to societal-based manifestations in the exo- and macrosystem. Maladaptions and potential pathologies are possible both on the individual and societal level.

The microsystem and mesosystem is where transfers occur between different generations of individuals; the parent and child, teacher and student, older worker to younger worker, and so forth. In a generative system, the transference results in cogwheeling (Rapaport, 1959) in which the caretaker passes on knowledge that is appropriate to the developing person given their characteristics and psychosocial needs. This is occurring within the context of the more distal exosystem and macrosystem. The exosystem and macrosystem create the social, cultural, political and economic environments for the knowledge transferred on the individual level. As the individual proceeds through epigenetic development, older members of society are responsible for making sure that development and growth occur that ensures the ability to successfully function (Rapaport, 1959).

Stagnation, or what Erikson referred to as rejectivity in his later writings results when the intergenerational transfer fails to look out for future generations. For example, Erikson clearly stated that generativity did not include extending one’s own children all the leverage you can; in fact this would exemplify adult stagnation on the microsystemic level. However, since the exosystem and macrosystem determine societal generativity, stagnation is not confined to micro and mesosystem levels. When the exosystem and macrosystem are dominated by the interests of the few, stagnation that is authoritarian in
character and actions is the result (Peterson, 2004). A significant impediment to the encouragement of generativity in society is poverty. Poverty is a condition of the immediate environments to the individual which reduces concerns to immediate survival; it is a product of the exosystem and macrosystem due to political and/or economic policy decisions.

In a society dominated by stagnation, ideology is important in maintaining “outside/inside” groups (Hoare, 2002). The “in” group uses fear and anxiety to keep the “outside” group from joining the community, instead being kept meaningless, but also wrong in some manner (Erikson, 1966). What develops is an insularity of the “in” group supported through ideology—what Erikson called pseudospeciation. In other words, generativity may greatly benefit one group but at the expense of others. This is not true generativity and in the long term will not benefit either group. For example, segregation on the surface benefited the white population, but at the cost of losing the skills and talents of the black population - thereby hurting both communities. Objective vigilance is necessary within the exosystem and macrosystem to avoid policies that create “in” and “out” groups. Public policy needs to analyze problems pragmatically, focusing on the actual problems as they manifest themselves on all levels of the ecological system.

Erikson concluded that during adolescence, the period of identity formation, ideology was necessary for the growing ego as it synthesized past and present (Erikson, 1968). Ideology provides alternatives for the youth involved in identity formation. While Erikson believed that ideology was unavoidable in identity formation, it also came with significant risks due to its potentially dualist nature of “totalism and exclusiveness” (p. 170) that the superego easily adopts. This is exactly what groups with
authoritarian goals exploit through the use anxiety and fear triggering a susceptibility to ideological prescriptions. Ideology as it becomes part of the macrosystem turns into the instrument used to impact public policy outcomes in the exosystem. As the individual moves beyond identity formation, ideology transforms into an impediment for healthy development.

Within the ecological system the individual and community continuously interact, placing pressures on all levels of interaction. This phenomenon of the individual acting and being acted upon by the social environment was explored by both Adorno and Fromm. Adorno’s (1950) focus on the relationship between the authoritarian personality and its exploitation by society through ideology begins an inquiry into aspects of the relationship of the individual to the macrosystem, but it was Erich Fromm who influenced Erikson the most, particularly in his writings on identity (Friedman, 1999; Burston, 2007). In the German Worker (1984), Fromm discovered workers who were susceptible to obeying powerful authority while on the surface following the expected “left wing” answers to questions. For example, they would give answers that were anti-authoritarian when asked about the ideal form of government, but then would reply with authoritarian attitudes when asked about corporal punishment. Fromm interpreted this as a loss of individual identity to mass conformity (Friedman, 1999). The result is an authoritarian character who believes that activity is related to a superior power which cannot be changed (Fromm, 1947). The individual allows the external authority to become part of the conscious instead of looking outside to objectivity. But this relationship is bidirectional in the sense that the external authority reinforces the internalized authority simultaneous to the individual seeking out the external authority.
The bidirectional links weaken if the external authoritarianism ceases to exist (Fromm, 1947). The authoritarianism can be embedded in either the immediate environments to the individual or on a more distal, societal level.

Erich Fromm’s exploration of the relationship between authoritarianism, society and the individual was a precursor to Erikson’s own thoughts on identity creation and generativity, although Erikson never recognized the influence of Fromm on his work (Friedman, 1999; Burston, 2007). For Erikson, the young adult can become trapped in authoritarian rigidity if the intergenerational transfer does not proceed along healthy trajectories (Burston, 2007), opening up the possibility of emerging maladaptations or pathologies. Just as the individual becomes susceptible to maladaptations and pathologies, so is the macrosystem which is dominated by authoritarianism and ideology.

*Authoritarianism, Ideology and Public Policy*

Ignoring diversity within the population is inherent in the pursuance of authoritarian goals; the goal of authoritarianism is to eliminate diversity. A disconnection arises between the policy and the reality of the actual situation with ideology adopted to protect and/or further authoritarian goals. Anxiety and fear are integrated into ideology giving authoritarian groups a tool in which to convince the public that there is a ‘way out’ of the ‘problem’. This is why the existence of Adorno’s authoritarian personality becomes irrelevant. Through the use of fear and anxiety the authoritarian group connects their policies of maintenance with the perceived welfare of the general public thus promoting an authoritarian agenda.

Fear and anxiety over the U.S. education system were present in the publishing of *A Nation at Risk (1983)*. The statement “We have, in effect, been committing an act of
unthinking, unilateral educational disarmament” (NCEE, 1983, p. 5) creates imagery linking education failure to appeasement and ultimate defeat. The blame for the failure was placed on the public school system and the education profession. School choice became the chosen solution opening the policy stream window for advocates equating education with increasing human capital through a for-profit education system. The identified problem was objectified in the poor quality of the teachers, schools and school districts that as public entities stifled competition and creativity.

Was this really the problem? As Berliner and Biddle (1995) illustrate, the empirical evidence for education decline is inextricably connected to the SES of the student. The greater the poverty level, either urban or rural, that the child inhabits the greater chance of dropping out, having poor grades and scoring poorly on test scores. Even Chubb and Moe (1991) discovered a connection between student SES, the SES of the neighborhood, and school performance. NCLB permits charter school choice in failing schools – which are overwhelmingly found in areas of poverty. The ecological reality of poverty for these children is ignored through the assumption that school choice will resolve the problem of poor education. The status quo is maintained in NCLB through the guise of charter schools.

The dualistic, a priori nature found in the school choice movement is apparent in its legislative history. Beginning with the first experimental Charter School Grant Program in 1994 and ending with the charter school program in NCLB, the debate focused on how to create the charter school system and the only significant debate questioning the privatization of education occurring in the topic of vouchers. In the early 1990s free enterprise was in ascendance after the collapse of the Soviet Union. It
appeared that the free enterprise system had emerged triumphant over alternative economic systems (Fukuyama, 1993) and were tied more closely with democratic government. These events fundamentally shifted the U.S. macrosystem toward free markets and less government intervention. Alternative visions emphasizing the individual, community and democracy were closed.

The role of anxiety and fear in the formation of RHYA was present but in a different form. Instead of focusing on maintaining (i.e. stopping the slide of education quality), policy ignored certain populations of homeless youth who were too far outside of the mainstream. Those youth who were from homes in which they could return had programs designed to help and reunite them with their families through the BCP, older youth who had hope of reintegrating into society had the TLP, but youth who could not return home or were too disturbed to function in a TLP are largely nonexistent in the legislative history of the RHYA. The exception to this is in the link to delinquency and the criminalization of their behavior. As Hagan and McCarthy (1997) discovered, much of the violence which exists in the microsystems of these youth is a product of the marginalization that they experience in greater society.

Street youth have been placed into the shadows of society by this refusal to recognize their existence. As cities gentrify their downtown areas, the result is less diversity and greater exclusivity (Jacobs, 1961). The lack of affordable housing increases as the microsystems of the poor experience greater instability. As the gentrification continues, those who are displaced experience increasing marginalized and segregation (Wilson, 1996). Jacobs wrote extensively about the lack of diversity leading to urban decay. For Jacob’s diversity is important since it ensures constant activity on the street.
In the morning it will be those going to work, during the day businesses and their customers and at night restaurants and bars that keep the streets busy and safe. Diversity encourages a sense of community and there are ‘public eyes’ on the streets at almost any hour of the day. By creating ‘dark spaces’ for homeless youth there is a lack of public eyes resulting in reinforcing the invisibility of the population.

The successful identification of the real problems that homeless youth face such as safe shelter, better hygiene and medical care were blocked by the adoption of programs dominated by authoritarianism. Those policymakers who were concerned with improving the microsystem of street youth were unable to create programs that succeeded in reaching all populations. The original barrier to effective policy was the linkage to delinquency that can be traced back to the 1950s (Delinquency, 1955-1956). Even as attempts were made to move away from this view of homeless youth toward one in which they were victims (Legislative History, 1974), the history of RHYA is one of inclusion within crime bills. The second barrier emerged with the overlaying of the assumption that runaways were from middle class homes. This assumption has left street youth who are unable to return to home without a program other than the small street outreach program that is limited in scope due to the linkage to sexual exploitation. If the youth do not fit the program, they are left living on the streets. Because the dominant policy stream is authoritarian, the identification of the problems of the diverse homeless youth population is unsuccessful leading to policy failure.

RHYA has dichotomized and marginalized the homeless youth population with predetermined assumptions. Although attempts were made to identify the true problem of these youth, they were never able to emerge dominant within the legislative process.
The fact that in the many revisions RHYA has undergone there has continued to be discussion on how little is known concerning homeless youth illuminates the marginalization and a priori assumptions. To collect empirical data regarding homeless youth, the researcher needs to find them and talk to them resulting in acknowledging their existence. Keeping unaccompanied youth in the shadows and not recognizing them encourages perceptions of anxiety and fear. The lack of information sustains the authoritarian goals within RHYA – the availability of accurate information on unaccompanied youth would illustrate the same diverse population that researchers have uncovered (Son, 2002; Athey et al., 1995; Smollar, 1999; Slesnick, 2004). The lack of information is critical in sustaining the use of fear and anxiety in maintaining the invisibility of some populations of homeless youth.

*Social Inquiry and the Failures of NCLB and RHYA*

Authoritarian tactics impede the ability to uncover the real problem and connecting the problem with actual activity to ameliorate or eliminate it. Inherent in authoritarian goals is a rejection of divergent realities. Authoritarian goals are based on the belief that there are antecedent events which result in cause and effect. But within an ecological system, cause and effect are bidirectional simultaneous to being both proximal and distal to the individual. This point is critical to understanding the existential problem. When attempting to identify the cause and effect of an event, causation is not a linear relationship (Dewey, 1938) and evaluation of success must be based on the fluid relationships within the ecological environment. Authoritarianism asserts a dualistic framework in which there are preconceived ideas on what is right and what will work. At the point of evaluation, results are based on not what is empirically occurring within the
environment, but rather on the a priori truths (Dewey, 1938). The obstacle in public policy creation lies in the disassociation between the subject of the policy and the resolution as a result of authoritarian goals distorting the process. As illustrated in the case studies of NCLB and RHYA, often the tool used to accomplish the distortion is ideology, specifically the use of fear and anxiety. One method of avoiding these distortions is to begin the policy process with rigorous, open inquiry. John Dewey (1916) suggests a paradigm that connects the observation of the problem with the pattern of inquiry (p. 150):

1. Perplexity, confusion, doubt, due to the fact that one is implicated in an incomplete situation whose full character is not yet determined.
2. A conjectural anticipation-a tentative interpretation of the given elements, attributing them a tendency to effect certain consequences.
3. A careful survey (examination, inspection, exploration, analysis) of all attainable consideration which will define and clarify the problem in hand.
4. A consequent elaboration of the tentative hypothesis to make it more precise and more consistent, because squaring with a wider range of facts
5. Taking one stand upon the project hypothesis as a plan of action which is applied to the existing stage of affairs: doing something overtly to being about the anticipated result, and thereby testing the hypothesis.

This sequence to social inquiry is designed to allow an exchange of knowledge between the researcher and those experiencing the problem. To avoid authoritarianism, the researcher as expert must be avoided so that policy does not reflect the interests of the few (Dewey, 1991). The challenge to federal policy is moving away from policies designed to protect against national anxiety and fear and towards policies designed to meet the real needs of the community. As Dewey (1991) succinctly phrased it “…on a local level, we have inherited local town-meeting practices and ideas. But we live and act and have our being in a continental national state” (p.113).
Ultimately this necessitates the weakening of the existing political polyarchy.

Dahl (1993) implied the relationship between authoritarianism and democratic polyarchy when he wrote:

Over time the victims of free markets are likely to influence the government, or some government (local, state, federal) to adopt policies intended to protect them. Some proponents of free markets might conclude that the fault lies not in the policies themselves, but in the democratic process that allow the unenlightened to prevail over the enlightened (p. 81).

The political process requires open and accurate information, decisions residing in the polity and inclusion of all adults in the process. In a polyarchy this process cannot proceed due to unequal power. Those left out of the process drop out of the community, thus leading to a loss in the effectiveness of the community. For policies involved with minors, the adult advocates must be rigorous in checking that they not only understand the problem experienced by the youth but also that the understanding is within a developmental and ecological context. If awareness breaks down, the adult (consciously or not) may begin identifying problems and solutions which do not reflect the realities of the youth. The consequence will be authoritarian policies.

Advocates of school choice assert that opening education to the market place creates community. The community created is one based on private need in which there are by definition winners and losers. Capitalism emphasizes short-term gain and fails to address the generation of effective community values (Lipset, 1993). Public education historically has emphasized the social process of creating citizens through shared experiences and activities. The introduction of choice into education policy was achieved by triggering anxiety and fear through connecting failing education status with a loss of
economic power. The issues of poverty and unequal funding were avoided and contradictory empirical evidence was ignored.

The policies in RHYA failed to be inclusive even as attempts were made to identify the diverse population of homeless youth. Unaccompanied youth were identified as runaways from middle class homes or older youth who were able to reintegrate into mainstream society. All other populations of homeless youth went unidentified and left outside of the community. Fear and anxiety regarding these ‘other’ populations connected them to delinquency. In 1974 when RYA was first introduced mainstream, white society had been witnessing urban turmoil in the form of riots leading to significant fear and anxiety of urban disorder that was effectively used in the ‘counter-revolution’ (Loss, 1999, Krugman, 2008). The emphasis on law and order, traditional values and individual responsibility (not coddling others) objectified the anxiety and fear. For homeless youth this confluence led to policy which failed to fully address their needs.

Stagnation, Authoritarianism and Generative Pathology

At the point authoritarian goals become dominant in public policy, generative policy is no longer possible. Democratic polyarchies are predisposed toward authoritarianism due to power structures that invites inequality. In the two case studies analyzed, authoritarian goals were supported by using ideology as an instrument based on the use of anxiety and fear. A pragmatic approach designed to identify and solve the existential problem was absent in both cases though objectified within the exosystem quite differently.

NCLB is the culmination of a movement towards emphasizing human capital above other goals in education. The shift in the policy stream began with the publishing
of *A Nation at Risk* (1983) by announcing the abject state of education in U.S. schools. The education crisis was framed within a context of fear and anxiety for the economic future of American workers. As discussions on the state of education continued, what emerged was a focus on poor rural and urban children who attended poorly performing schools. A critical component to creating better outcomes for these children was school choice. The push to privatize education and remove it from the domain of educators commenced through the efforts of the business community. The lack of any meaningful dissent to the solution within the exosystem becomes apparent through an analysis of the legislative history. There was an a priori assumption that the solution of school choice would succeed, thus fitting the problem into the solution. Business utilized its massive resources to dominate policy in a manner that is expected within a polyarchy.

By recognizing that the problem occurred within distressed economic areas, there was implicit recognition that poverty was a problem. But the poor do not fit into the free enterprise American paradigm and are generally blamed for being poor (i.e. the welfare queen). The exosystem does not know what to do with the poor because of the belief system held within the macrosystem. For education policy this mutates into blaming the microsystem for the problem: the family for poverty and the classroom for poor education. The social conditions that are encouraged by the exosystem that create new and maintain existing poverty fail to be held accountable.

It is significant that Erikson cited teachers (1950; 1968) as a generative link. Educators pass on cultural knowledge to students in the form of cognitive and social learning. But if the micro and mesosystem which the child inhabits does not easily integrate with the expectations of the dominant culture, difficulties emerge due to
inconsistencies in the child’s environment and the expectations of the status quo. Poverty interrupts the ability to look beyond one’s own survival making intergenerational transfer difficult if not impossible. Free enterprise as embodied in capitalism has difficulty with long term outcomes because of the emphasis on short term gain. The interests of a few become dominant which eventually will have negative consequences for democratic education.

Since education was identified as a vehicle for generativity, the introduction of ideology is profound. Although ideology is essential to the identity formation of the adolescent, as the adolescent transitions into young adulthood the continued use of ideology becomes an impediment to emotional growth. For Erikson when the individual becomes ‘stuck’ in one crisis and is unable to move onto the next stage, maladaptions and pathologies result. In a sense, the inability of society to confront poverty and instead revert to ideological and authoritarian prescriptions reflects a societal maladaptation that is transposed onto the impoverished individual. Adopting school choice as a solution to bad schools in economically distressed areas is a symptom of an immature society that is maladapted in dealing with poverty.

The case study of homeless youth has particular implications for the connection of intergenerational transfer, ideology, and identity formation. RHYA as a policy has largely defined homeless and runaway youth as from middle class backgrounds, and those youth who are not, as delinquents. There is a dearth of policy initiatives that move beyond the delinquent link for homeless youth from distressed backgrounds that make reuniting with their families unlikely. On the surface, intergenerational transfer on the family level has failed to occur. However, the effects of poverty on the
micro- and mesosystem of the youth twists this interpretation. Intergenerational transfer occurs between the parent and the youth, but it is impacted by poverty. The inability of society to pragmatically resolve poverty leads to discrepancies between the cultural and social realities of the exosystem and macrosystem and what is happening in the life of the youth. In terms of survival the knowledge passed on to the youth by the family might be rational, but inconsistent with societal expectations.

Homeless youth are generally in their adolescence, the developmental point when identity formation occurs. The intergenerational transfer that is expected to help create healthy formation that aligns with societal expectations becomes distorted due to conditions within their immediate environments. The youth encounter difficulties between the identity they are forming and societal ideals on many levels including education (Hagan & McCarthy, 1997). The classroom, a primary transmitter of societal norms and expectations, becomes a place that is viewed as hostile by the youth. The youth drops out as they become increasingly disconnected to the education experience.

It is easier for the exosystem to delegate homeless youth who do not fit into the middle class paradigm to shadows where they can be ignored-the ultimate ‘outside group’. It is only at the point they are viewed as delinquents that they emerge from these shadows and then society views them with fear and anxiety because they are so ‘different’. The family is blamed for the existence of homeless youth, while the macrosystem and exosystem ignore the societal condition of poverty that takes these youth out of the community and criminalizes them.
Is it possible for federal public policy to solve social problems using generative and pragmatic solutions or are they prone to use by authoritarian groups who employ anxiety and fear as a tool to meet their ideological demands? The answer to this can be found in the linkages within the ecological system beginning with the most distal - the macrosystem, to the most proximal - the microsystem. For federal policy to correctly identify the existential problem and proceed onto resolving them, the evidence needs to be carefully and objectively analyzed given the true realities and conditions of the population experiencing the social problem. The solutions to the problem cease to be ideologically driven.

Anxiety and fear are potent emotions that can lead individuals towards looking for a priori solutions that help reduce them. These solutions benefit the authoritarian groups who propose them at the expense of knowledge and evidence that would aid in resolving the real problem. Authoritarian groups use anxiety and fear to fulfill their ideological demands encouraging the policy to reflect a dualism that promotes universal principals and truths (Dewey, 1938). This phenomenon was present in both case studies.

In NCLB the assumption is that introducing competition and parental choice would improve a crumbling public school system. These assumptions circumvented the real problem of poor education quality in economically distressed populations due to effects of poverty and unequal funding. In addition, the impact of choice on democratic education failed to be discussed in terms of democratic communities. NCLB as a federal policy promoted a single authoritarian vision of education simultaneous to marginalizing other community and democratic goals.
The history of RHYA is in a sense more tortured than NCLB. Even as RYA was being formulated, there were those in the policy stream attempting to separate homeless youth with delinquency – ultimately an unsuccessful endeavor. A larger impediment to solving the social problem of homeless youth was the assumption that the population consisted of runaways from middle class homes. This has diminished the outreach to homeless youth who are from diverse backgrounds and experiences. Those most in need have been left out of the RHYA programs. These populations that have been marginalized are viewed with anxiety and fear by the general public, a view encouraged by the linkage to delinquency. They are the “outside” group living in a microsystem ignored by the policy created within the exosystem.

This dissertation has suggested that due to authoritarianism displayed in the exosystem, social pathologies emerge. These social pathologies are a product of a distortion in intergenerational transfer resulting in a lack of generativity. In education the intergenerational transfer is fundamental to the transmission of knowledge. This transmission has been twisted by reducing education to a matter of human capital and narrowing its community through a reliance on free market mechanisms. For homeless youth, the social pathology creates an intergenerational transfer within the family that is not healthy while the intergenerational transfer on the exo and macrosystem has broken down. Generativity accompanied by a diminishing in the power of ideology, is possible in both instances with a movement away from the authoritarian conscious that manifests itself in feelings of fear (Fromm, 1947).

Frequently when policy is created with the exosystem, the policy makers rely on objective information that is ‘scientific’ and a priori. This does not result in social
inquiry that resolves a problem, instead the objectivity results in detachment bereft of respect (Fromm, 1947). Social inquiry based on the understanding of the true problem that moves away from ideology by encouraging accessible, high quality information will move federal policy towards generativity. Healthy and viable linkages between ecological levels require a macrosystem that is open and democratic. Fear and anxiety as ideological tools are unable to flourish in a generative society.
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