

6

Politics of Education

LANCE D. FUSARELLI
North Carolina State University

What is the politics of education and what do we mean when we discuss it? This chapter of the *Handbook* provides readers with a panoramic overview of research on the politics of education, beginning with exploration into the multiple levels and arenas within which conflict over educational politics takes place. Interestingly, the lay public rarely pays attention to school politics, as evidenced by the very low rates (often as low as 10%) of voter participation in school board and local school bond elections. According to Boyd (1987), "Ignorance about school politics has become almost as American as apple pie" (p. 89), which is ironic given that education is the single largest expenditure of every state government and one of the most extensive and expensive enterprises in which government engages—whether it be the federal, state, county, municipal government, or the local school board. Few people realize the extent or scope of K-12 education in the U.S.A., nor just how many adults earn a livelihood from the system (not just teachers—principals, central office, counselors, secretaries, janitors, bus drivers, and other support staff) as well as all the industries, such as transportation and agriculture, that support it. For example, the New York City public school system employs approximately 79,000 teachers in over 1,400 schools with an annual budget of nearly \$17 billion dollars—far larger than most Fortune 500 companies.

Any system that consumes so many resources inevitably produces political behavior. After all, local school, municipal, county, and state budgets only stretch so far. And, much like a pizza, how the budget pie gets sliced inevitably involves political wrangling, negotiations, and tradeoffs. Fundamentally, education is all about politics, since it involves decisions regarding, "Who gets what, when, and how?" (Lasswell, 1936) and reflects or represents the authoritative allocation of values in society (Easton, 1965). As such, we find it useful to think of educational politics as a game, albeit a high-stakes game with grave consequences for children and the future of our society (Scribner,

Reyes, & Fusarelli, 1995). We begin by setting the context of the game by examining the origins of research in the politics of education.

Origins of the Politics of Education

Systematic study of the politics of education began in earnest with the *Brown* decision in 1954 and the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965 (Scribner & Englert, 1977). Until this period, politics was largely relegated to the fringe of scholarly inquiry in education, with most researchers focusing on organizational efficiency and effectiveness. In 1959, Thomas Eliot issued a call for more detailed and systematic analysis of education by political scientists—a call which was left largely unanswered by political scientists themselves. However, education scholars, many of whom had some training in political science and sociology, heard Eliot's call and rushed to study his ideas for research: (1) structural analysis of district organization, including comparative analysis across districts; (2) behavioral analysis of key players (school boards, superintendents, principals, teachers, and staff); (3) bond referenda (including comparative analysis of); (4) state politics of education; (5) federal politics of education; (6) international/comparative education; (7) the role of the judiciary in education (both state and federal); and (8) the school curriculum and societal values.

A review of research of the politics of education reveals that Eliot's identified areas for research have been studied extensively, so much so that the subfield has become part of the required training for school administrators. Research on educational politics exploded in the 1970s, with Wirt alone editing 30 books in the field (Kirst, 2006). Much of this work was comparative in nature—school districts and state-level politics (Kirst, 2006), while scholarship from 1980 to the present focuses much more on individual schools, and school districts.

Although research in the politics of education is multidisciplinary, drawing from political science, public administration, sociology, and organizational studies, it "is more appropriately thought of as a subfield of education, rather than of political science" or public administration because most scholars working in the area were trained in schools of education (Edlefson, 2006, p. 772). With a few notable exceptions (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Howell & Peterson, 2006; Peterson & Hassel, 1998), few political scientists study education—although judging by the increasing number of education policy papers at the annual meeting of the Association of Public Policy and Management, scholars are devoting more attention to this area.¹ However, as Cibulka (1995) observes, "much of what is considered enlightenment in the study of educational policy has little or nothing to do with politics" (p. 120). Although Division L of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) is devoted to Educational Policy and Politics, many politics of education scholars have always sought a distinct identity apart from educational policy scholars; hence, the Politics of Education Association operates as a special interest group (SIG) within AERA, even though most of its members also belong to Division L.

Furthermore, unlike scholars in political science and, to a somewhat lesser extent, in public administration, education scholars studying the politics of education overwhelmingly utilize qualitative, as opposed to quantitative, methodologies in their research. One need only compare articles in the last two decades published in the *American Political Science Review* to those of the Politics of Education Association *Yearbooks* to see the vast differences in approaches (particularly quantitative vs. qualitative) to the study of politics. Wong (1995) observed that as political science embraced rational choice and econometric approaches and methods to studying politics in the 1980s, scholars of educational politics largely rejected the approach and chose instead to focus on more qualitative methods. A review of PEA *Yearbooks* from 1991 to 2008, including two special issues of the *Peabody Journal of Education* (2005 and 2007) devoted to the politics of education, finds that less than 9% of the total articles published (19 of 223) utilized quantitative methodologies in their studies of educational politics, whereas most research in the politics of education from 1960 to the mid-1980s was overwhelmingly quantitative in approach and method. As the politics of education as a field of inquiry has become dominated by the qualitative paradigm, it becomes more difficult for researchers working in the area to develop and test middle-level or macro-level theories of educational politics, which may constrain efforts to build more complete, comprehensive theories and models of educational politics.

Past Developments and Recent Trends in Research

Reflecting the diverse interests of researchers, scholarship in the politics of education covers all aspects, issues, and hot topics in the field. A recent *Handbook* devoted to the politics of education contains 21 diverse chapters and is organized around three themes: structure, behavior, and beliefs (Cooper, Cibulka, & Fusarelli, 2008). The nine chapters that address the political structure of education at the federal (national), state, and local level present a fairly traditional organizational schema similar to that used in earlier classic textbooks in the field (Scribner & Layton, 1995; Wirt & Kirst, 2005). Topics covered include the politics of federal and state-level policymaking, the judiciary, political culture, school boards, superintendents, and the micropolitics of education at the school level. These areas have consistently been researched and examined by politics of education scholars for several years, although differences exist in the depth of research in these areas. For example, the micropolitics of schools (primarily principals and teachers) and school districts (primarily superintendents and school boards) have been studied extensively for decades (see, for example, Blasé & Anderson, 1995; Lutz & Iannaccone, 1978; Malen, 1995; Malen & Vincent Cochran, 2008). However, much less research has been conducted on the politics of education at the state level—which is odd given that education is primarily a responsibility of state government (exceptions include Campbell & Mazzone, 1976; Fusarelli, 2002, 2003; Malen & Muncey, 2000; Mazzone, 1989, 1993; McClendon & Cohen-Vogel, 2008; Wong & Shen, 2002).

Another area of research that has fallen out of favor analyzes the effect of political culture on educational politics and policy. In the 1970s and 1980s, studies of political culture in education were relatively common, perhaps reflecting interest among scholars in quantitative, state-level political analyses. In a research review, James (1991) observes that "varying political cultures are significant in structuring attention to educational issues at the state level" (p. 195). Marshall, Mitchell, and Wirt (1989) use differences in state political culture to explain variance in policy outcomes. Testing Elazar's cultural framework, the researchers found that the framework explained some of the variation among states, but its explanatory power was limited by a series of national and international forces sweeping through the states, which produced similar state policy responses (see also Wirt, Mitchell, & Marshall, 1988).

Sacken and Medina (1990) used the political culture taxonomy developed by Marshall, Mitchell, and Wirt as a framework to analyze bilingual education legislation in Arizona. The researchers found that Arizona's traditionalistic political culture served as a

significant constraint in the formulation and passage of bilingual education legislation, producing legislation far less expansive and comprehensive than originally conceived. In another state-level study, Benham and Heck (1994) conducted an historical study of the relationship between state political culture and policymaking in Hawaii over a period of 150 years and found that the unique characteristics of Hawaii's political culture, which Elazar characterized as traditionalistic, reflect limited citizen involvement with an overriding concern for the value of efficiency. Their findings provide support for Elazar's cultural framework.

Generally, studies of policy restraint situated within the traditionalistic political culture tend to be supportive of Elazar's framework, since that political culture is unambiguous in its embrace of limited government intervention and intolerance of expansive public policies. Applying Elazar's political culture framework to the micropolitical (local) level, Foster (1983) attributed variation in the beliefs of school board members in Nebraska and Louisiana to differences in each state's political culture. In another study, Pustka (1996) analyzed the effect of political culture on school district policymaking in Texas and found that political culture influences policy decisions concerning students' placement in special education, vocational programs, and district spending. While results of studies testing the operational efficacy of political culture at the micropolitical level are mixed, few dispute the assertion that more general cultural values permeate the politics of education at the state level. However, in the past decade, researchers have generally been much more interested and concerned with studying organizational culture at the school or district level, rather than political culture at the state or national level.

A series of related studies attempt to situate political culture within the nexus of religion and educational policymaking at the county and school district levels, exploring such questions as: "How well do reform initiatives such as outcomes-based education, site-based management, and the movement toward integrated social services in schools mesh with the dominant political culture of the district, region, or state? As religion relates to the larger political culture, to what extent may differences among districts ... be attributable to the effect of religion on the political culture?" (Scribner & Fusarelli, 1996; pp. 289-90; Scribner & Marten, 1994). Interestingly, with a few notable exceptions, politics of education scholars tend to ignore the influence of religion in shaping educational politics, particularly at the local level (Boyd, Lugg, & Zahorchak, 1996; Lugg, 1996; McCarthy, 1996; Myers & Cibulka, 2008).

As research on political culture has become passé and been critiqued rigorously for its conceptual and methodological limitations, changes in the local political

context of education, particularly at the municipal level, have assumed a more prominent place on the scholarly agenda. One significant difference from earlier scholarship is the inclusion of research on the politics of mayoral control—a relatively new phenomenon, coupled with the application of regime theory (borrowed from political science) to explain the politics of urban education (and where mayoral control is most likely to be found) (Kirst, 2002; Kirst & Bulkley, 2003; Shipp, 2008). Researchers assert that this movement, which replaces democratically elected school boards with mayoral appointees, has significant implications for educational governance and democracy. In many ways, the arguments made for efficiency, effectiveness, and equity harken back to previous periods of centralization and decentralization in the politics of education (Tyack, 1974; Tyack & Cuban, 1995). Viewed holistically, the politics of education, specifically, "the *structure* (federal-state-local), the *roles* (superintendent, mayors, and school boards), and *functions* (judicial, executive, and legislative) all combine to create a dynamic political environment for understanding educational development and change" in education (Cibulka, Fusarelli, & Cooper, 2008, p. 2).

Interest groups and institutions are featured prominently in recent scholarship, utilizing classic (pluralist) and contemporary (advocacy coalitions) models drawn from political science, together with institutional models borrowed from political science and sociology (institutional theory). Here researchers tend to focus their attention on specific interest groups or issues, such as the Religious Right, school choice, and teachers unions (although teachers' unions now receive far less attention from researchers than in the late 1960s and 1970s, when strikes and militant activism were more common) (Cooper & Sureau, 2008; Opfer, 2005; Opfer, Young, & Fusarelli, 2008; Scott, Lubieniski, & DeBray-Pelot, 2008). A number of scholars, particularly those studying educational reform and school choice, document the powerful role played by advocacy coalitions in the educational policy arena (Fusarelli, 2003). In his analysis of changes in state educational policymaking over 20 years in Minnesota, Mazzoni (1993) found that advocacy coalitions were a driving force behind the educational reform movement. Mazzoni argues that Minnesota's state school policy subsystem can be characterized as an advocacy coalition of innovative reformers, which contributed significantly to Minnesota's adoption of the nation's first charter school law in 1991. According to Mazzoni, Minnesota's advocacy coalitions "have repeatedly squared off during the past decade over issues of school reform, with their struggle appearing to have been spawned by a fundamental cleavage over core beliefs, by stable structural features of the institutional setting, and by the impact of multiple changes in a turbulent external environment" (p. 377). Mawhinney's (1993)

...of the prominent role of advocacy coalitions in educational politics in Ontario supports the research of Mazzoni and others who believe that the politics of education is being transformed from a loose collection of interest groups into a more unified, national network of advocacy coalitions (Opfer, Young, & Fusarelli, 2008).

In many ways, despite new nomenclature (such as the "new institutionalism" and "advocacy coalitions" instead of "interest groups"), the focus of this research is not appreciably different from earlier periods, although the specific focus, such as the Religious Right, the involvement of big business or conservative think tanks, and the emergence of issues such as accountability, No Child Left Behind, and school choice, is different than in previous decades. In their review of multiple-state case studies in education, Burlingame and Geske (1979) assert "the politics of education at the state level is still a politics of interest groups" (p. 71). This remains largely true today. In his 40-year perspective of research on the politics of education, Kirst (2006) notes that scholars have been attentive to the usurpation of local control by "federal and state governments, courts, foundations, and nationwide business organizations" (p. 4, see also Fusarelli & Cooper, 2009).

The shifting involvement and power of education actors, specifically state and federal officials, has brought renewed interest among scholars toward analyzing state and federal education policy and politics. In some ways, perhaps reflecting the shifting pendulum of interest among researchers, recent attention to state and federal politics of education harkens back to research in the late 1960s and 1970s, when federal and state politics of education occupied a pre-eminent place in scholarship. A number of researchers observe that state education policymaking has become more complex. Throughout much of U.S. history, education policy was shaped by a small handful of key education professionals whose expertise was generally unquestioned (Tyack, 1974). Conflict was largely limited to disagreements between school board associations, school administrators, and teachers' unions. State lawmakers, overworked and understaffed, did little except appropriate funding for schools. No longer. States have become powerful actors and willing (some would say too willing) participants in education reform, particularly legislatures and governors (Fusarelli, 2002; 2005; Fusarelli & Cooper, 2009). Murphy (1990) observes that there "has been a dramatic increase in the capacity of state governments to engage in educational issues" (p. 21). State legislatures and their staffs have become more professionalized and judicial interventions and gubernatorial initiatives have increased, enabling state governments to "use the means at their disposal to influence schooling at the local level" to a degree unprecedented in U.S. history (Firestone, 1990, p. 146; Kirst & Somers, 1981).

At the federal level, a number of interesting studies have been released that carefully examine the expanded role of the federal government in education politics and policy, spurred in part by the No Child Left Behind Act. Cross' (2004) historical analysis of the federal politics of education traces the development of national education policy from the Truman and Eisenhower administrations through the George W. Bush administration, while DeBray (2006) focuses on federal education policy from the 1990s to the present, with particular attention to the Clinton administration, Congress, and the G. W. Bush administration. These studies have helped refocus attention back toward the vital role played by the federal government in shaping educational politics and policy, a role that far exceeds its actual fiscal contributions to local education.

Another trend in research has been to focus on challenges to public education, principally charter schools, vouchers, tuition tax credits, and privatization (Boyd, 2007; Bulkley & Fusarelli, 2007). In recent decades, public schools have found it increasingly more difficult to retain broad-based public support (Boyd, 1987). As the U.S.A. becomes more diverse, multicultural, multilingual, and, at the same time, more unequal, the character, values, and legitimacy of society and of its public school system are called into question. The public is increasingly quality conscious, unwilling to accept mediocre school performance and bureaucratic inefficiency, and frustrated with the often glacial pace of education reform (Hess, 1998). Under attack from various groups and organizations, not all of which are conservative, public education in the U.S.A. faces a "crisis of legitimacy" (Cibulka, 1997, p. 317). Accordingly, scholars are devoting more close attention to the seeming dissolution or separation of the public and private spheres in education as reformers seek to draw upon lessons learned in the private sector and apply them more forcefully and systematically to the public sector (Fusarelli & Johnson, 2004; Miron, 2008). This trend, which affects hiring, staffing, training, licensure, organization, financing, and school operations, among others, has significant and potentially far-reaching implications for how public schools are organized and operated in this new political environment.

Reflecting this new politics of education, specifically the blurring of the line between the public and the private spheres, a significant difference in recent research on the politics of education has been a gradual shift toward issues of equity and excellence for *all* students. Issues such as equity, fiscal adequacy, feminism, social justice, coordinated social services, and resegregation are being examined more closely than ever before, although many politics of education scholars remain uncomfortable with the more activist rhetoric used in some of this research. Researchers

studying these issues raise “fundamental questions about rights and responsibilities, about governance, dominance, control, and inclusion, and about efforts to create an equitable and excellent educational system within a federalist system in which politics is embedded at all levels and layers. ... [including] the often unquestioned patterns of power, authority, and control” (Cibulka, Fusarelli, & Cooper, 2008, p. 12).

Ongoing Tensions and Debates

Some scholars assert that, “Much has changed in the forty-six years since Thomas Eliot’s (1959) call for a formal field of study of educational politics—and too little” (Aleman & Maxcy, 2006, p. 1). Recent scholarship has addressed issues of “social justice, critical race theory, sodomy, teen pregnancy,” and queer theory, issues largely ignored by traditional politics of education researchers (Kirst, 2006, p. 5). Interpretive approaches to the study of educational politics have not been widely used, despite their popularity in other areas of education, particularly curriculum studies. Feminist research and cultural studies in the politics of education remain marginalized (Marshall & Anderson, 1995; Marshall & André-Bechely, 2008). Critical race theory is seldom used (Aleman & Maxcy, 2006; Lopez, 2003) and queer theory even less so (Lugg, 2003; 2006). In a web-based survey designed to assess how content and topics in teaching the politics of education has changed since Layton and Scribner’s (1989) UCEA monograph, *Teaching Educational Politics and Policy*, Garn and Fusarelli (2006) found relatively little coverage of issues of “power, justice, equity, critical theory, [and] feminism” as compared to issues of political behavior, institutions, policy issues, and the policy process (p. 7). They note many similarities with the Layton and Scribner monograph and conclude that “the basic topical areas: values, federal, local, and state governance, interest groups, agenda setting, policy formation, [and] institutions” had not changed much (p. 8).

An analysis of the Politics of Education *Yearbooks* from 1987 to 2008, including two special issues of the *Peabody Journal of Education* (2005 & 2007), reveals the diverse interests of scholars studying the politics of education: choice, school reform (twice), curriculum and testing (twice), urban education, race and gender, integrated school social services, new institutionalism, school–community relations, accountability, politics of research, teacher education, interest groups, elections, higher education, teacher and administrator preparation, social justice, privatization, media, and No Child Left Behind. With a few notable exceptions, these are fairly traditional topics studied in a fairly traditional manner and reflect the academic training of scholars, particularly senior scholars, in the field—most of whom are white males. An analysis of the last

seven years of scholarship (2002–2008) in the politics of education (PEA *Yearbooks* and the *Peabody Journal of Education*) reveals that while the gender make-up of published scholars is approaching 50% (43%), the ethnic composition is overwhelmingly Caucasian and also, again overwhelmingly, U.S.-centered in focus.

Perhaps not surprisingly, most research in the politics of education focuses on politics in the U.S.A. International or comparative education scholarship has received only intermittent attention. Fowler (1995) notes that many scholars contest the very idea of an international politics of education, given difficulties with the perceived non-comparability of educational systems (see also Ginsberg, et al., 1990), although Fowler contends that (1) “advanced industrial democracies resemble each other in several ways” and (2) that national educational systems are subject to many cross-national influences (p. 90). Occasionally, PEA *Yearbooks* include a chapter on international education politics in K-12 education (DeYoung & Nadirbekyzy, 1997; Woods, 2002) or more rarely still higher education (Neave, 2003), but only one *Yearbook* to date has devoted significant attention to international perspectives on the politics of education (Macpherson, 1998).

The diversity of interests and research among politics of education scholars led Kirst (2006) to express concern that the lack of overarching theory in the field has led to it becoming fractured and that the future may be “whatever individual professors happen to find interesting at a particular time. ... [with] conceptual frameworks [cycling] around every conceivable possibility from rational choice to social justice to critical race theory” (p. 4). The history of scholarship in the politics of education supports Kirst’s claim, as do several earlier overviews of the field (Cibulka, 1995; Iannaccone, 1975; Scribner & Englert, 1977; Scribner, Reyes, & Fusarelli, 1995). Boyd (1987) characterizes research in the politics of education as schizophrenic and at times contradictory, such as researchers asserting that local control is largely a myth, yet research on policy implementation emphasizes the crucial role of local educators, street-level bureaucrats, in implementing or resisting reform. Cibulka (1995) observed the pluralistic nature of scholarship in the politics of education and expressed concern about the atheoretical nature of much research in the field. He went on to state that, “The disparate and idiosyncratic character of much politics of education research defies easy classification, much less building on confirmable generalizations” (p. 109). This reflects a trend away from macro-level explanations of political behavior and educational politics and toward more micro-level (or even atheoretical) case studies of school politics. Kirst (2006) is concerned about this trend and calls for a return to large-scale projects and interdisciplinary longitudinal, comparative

studies, while Aleman and Maxcy (2006) express concern that such a re-centering of the field will marginalize and exclude scholars who do not conduct research in such narrow areas. This tension between traditional (positivist and postpositivist) and interpretive approaches and between macro- and micro-level analyses of educational politics is ongoing and endemic to research in the politics of education, although it may ultimately make the politics of education more interesting and diverse, if less theoretically coherent.

Scheurich and McKenzie (2006) believe that as younger scholars interested in (and trained in) critical theory, feminism, postmodernism, critical race theory, queer theory, and social justice assume more prominent leadership roles in the Politics of Education Association, the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA), and the American Educational Research Association (AERA), these heretofore marginalized approaches may lead to a re-centering of the field. However, the experience of the editors of a recent *Handbook* of research on the politics of education, a handbook designed to be an authoritative source of scholarship and research in the field, suggests that this re-centering of research in the politics of education will be slow, uneven, incomplete, and may fail to re-center the field, although it clearly has made it more pluralistic and diverse. Despite an open call for manuscripts to the *Handbook*, and despite personal pleas to scholars working in the areas of critical race theory, feminism, cultural studies, and queer theory, only 2 of the 21 chapters are devoted to race and gender issues. In fact, the editors were disconcerted and frustrated to receive so many manuscripts focused exclusively on such topics as school choice, as opposed to more broad areas of research in the politics of education (Cooper, Cibulka, & Fusarelli, 2008). To cite another example, calls for greater attention to race and gender issues were made in *Politics of Education Association Yearbooks* in 1992 and 1995 (Marshall, 1993; Marshall & Anderson, 1995), yet Marshall and André-Bechely (2008) argue that feminist and critical, cultural approaches to studying educational politics remain largely ignored by most politics of education scholars.

This leads to the inescapable conclusion that research in the politics of education will continue to be idiosyncratic and driven not by an overarching theory, paradigm, or approach, but by whatever scholars seem interested in at the moment. Although we disagree with the assertion that the field "has advanced through [the] dynamic interplay among paradigms" (Scribner, Aleman, & Maxcy, 2003, p. 33), because the theoretical and methodological paradigms used by politics of education researchers do not intersect or engage with each other but rather speak past or ignore each other (especially the researchers themselves), we

agree that the theoretical pluralism that characterizes research in the politics of education is a strength of the field. Plenty of room and numerous outlets exist for scholars studying educational politics to disseminate their work in peer-reviewed journals and books. There is plenty of room at the trough for all the hogs to eat their fill. However, from the standpoint of legitimacy within the fields of political science, public administration, and even educational policy, it would be beneficial if greater attempts were made to study educational politics systematically and integrate research into a more coherent, theoretical system using both contemporary and classical approaches.

Conclusion

We began this chapter by recommending the heuristic device of game theory in studying and understanding educational politics. The game heuristic is useful insofar as educational politics are contentious, ideological, dynamic, full of action, and involve multiple players in competition over scarce resources.² As a game, the politics of education is "highly contested, continuously in motion. ... [and] emanates from persisting conflicts over unresolvable issues" (Scribner, Reyes, & Fusarelli, 1995, pp. 201, 203)—unresolvable because they "rest on underlying tensions among competing values. ... [particularly the values of] choice, efficiency, equity, and quality (excellence)" (Stout, Tallerico, & Scribner, 1995, p. 5).

The outcome of this conflict or this game is determined by the powerful and produces winners and losers—the idea of win-win outcomes for everyone involved is theoretically possible but seldom reality. As Cibulka, Fusarelli, and Cooper (2008) conclude, "School reform policies often produce differential (and sometimes deleterious) effects on students, teachers, administrators, and the communities in which they are located. Analyzing and understanding these effects is crucial toward developing better theories of educational politics and to producing better policies that promote equity and excellence for all in the educational system" (p. 15). The theoretical approaches, constructs, and methods used by scholars studying educational politics as they work to address these issues will remain as diverse as the topics such scholars study. We hope that this theoretical and methodological pluralism leads to a stronger, better, more interesting, and more useful politics of education.

Notes

1. Some may argue that the increased involvement of political scientists such as Paul Peterson at Harvard and John Witte at the University of Wisconsin, together with a new generation of political scientists and economists interested in education such as

Dominic Brewer at the University of Southern California and Jay Greene and Patrick Wolf at the University of Arkansas, among others, who utilize quantitative, experimental designs in their research will bring rigor and relevance to research in the politics of education. However, these scholars and others of their ilk focus almost exclusively on educational policy evaluation (which is outcomes-based), rather than educational politics (which is process-oriented). Since these scholars operate almost exclusively beyond the realm of educational politics, and rarely cite research within the field, we see little overlap in the fields of inquiry.

2. This heuristic is drawn from Frantzich and Percy (1994).

References

- Aleman, E., & Maxcy, B. D. (2006). A forty-two year perspective on the politics of education and the future of PEA. *Politics of Education Association Bulletin*, 31(1), 1, 7-9.
- Benham, M. K. P., & Heck, R. H. (1994). Political culture and policy in a state-controlled educational system: The case of educational politics in Hawaii. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 30(4), 419-50.
- Blasé, J., & Anderson, G. L. (1995). *The micropolitics of educational leadership: From control to empowerment*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Boyd, W. L. (1987). Public education's last hurrah? Schizophrenia, amnesia, and ignorance in school politics. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 9(2), 85-100.
- . (2007). The politics of privatization in American education. *Educational Policy*, 21(1), 7-14.
- Boyd, W. L., Lugg, C. A., & Zahorchak, G. L. (1996). Social traditionalists, religious conservatives, and the politics of outcome-based education. *Education and Urban Society*, 28(3), 347-65.
- Bulkley, K. E., & Fusarelli, L. D. (2007). Introduction: The politics of privatization. *Educational Policy*, 21(1), 5-6.
- Burlingame, M., & Geske, T. G. (1979). State politics and education: An examination of selected multiple-state case studies. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 15(2), 50-75.
- Campbell, R. F., & Mazzone, T. L. (1976). *State policy making for the public schools*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Cibulka, J. G. (1995). Policy analysis and the study of the politics of education. In J. D. Scribner & D. H. Layton (Eds.), *The study of educational politics* (pp. 105-25). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- . (1997). Two eras of urban schooling: The decline of the old order and the emergence of new organizational forms. *Education and Urban Society*, 29(3), 317-41.
- Cibulka, J. G., Fusarelli, L. D., & Cooper, B. S. (2008). Introduction: Researching toward a new politics of education. In B. S. Cooper, J. G. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 1-15). New York: Routledge.
- Cooper, B. S., Cibulka, J. G., & Fusarelli, L. (Eds.). (2008). *Handbook of education politics and policy*. New York: Routledge.
- Cooper, B. S., & Sureau, J. (2008). The collective politics of teacher unionism. In B. S. Cooper, J. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 263-280). New York: Routledge.
- Cross, C. T. (2004). *Political education: National policy comes of age*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- DeBray, E. H. (2006). *Politics, ideology, & education: Federal policy during the Clinton and Bush Administrations*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- DeYoung, A. J., & Nadirbekyzy, B. (1997). Redefining schooling and community in post-Soviet Kazakhstan. In M. McClure & J. C. Lindle (Eds.), *Expertise versus responsiveness in children's worlds: Politics in school, home and community relationships* (pp. 71-78). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Easton, D. (1965). *A framework for political analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Edlefson, C. (2006). Politics of education. In F. W. English (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of educational leadership and administration*, vol. 2 (pp. 772-76). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Eliot, T. H. (1959). Toward an understanding of public school politics. *American Political Science Review*, 53(4), 1032-51.
- Firestone, W. A. (1990). Continuity and incrementalism after all: State responses to the excellence movement. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases* (pp. 143-166). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Foster, L. S. (1983). Political culture: A determinant of public regardiness among school board members. *Urban Education*, 18(1), 29-39.
- Fowler, F. C. (1995). The international arena: The global village. In J. D. Scribner & D. H. Layton (Eds.), *The study of educational politics* (pp. 89-102). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Frantzich, S. E., & Percy, S. E. (1994). *American government: The political game*. Madison, WI: Brown and Benchmark.
- Fusarelli, B. C., & Cooper, B. S. (2009). *The rising state: How state power is transforming our nation's schools*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Fusarelli, L. D. (2002). The political economy of gubernatorial elections: Implications for education policy. *Educational Policy*, 16(1), 139-60.
- . (2003). *The political dynamics of school choice: Negotiating contested terrain*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- . (2005). Gubernatorial reactions to No Child Left Behind: Politics, pressure, and education reform. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 80(2), 120-36.
- Fusarelli, L. D., & Johnson, B. (2004). Educational governance and the new public management. *Public Administration and Management*, 9(2), 118-27.
- Garn, G., & Fusarelli, L. D. (2006). Teaching educational politics: Advances in the field since 1989. *Politics of Education Association Bulletin*, 30(3), 6-8.
- Ginsberg, M. B., Cooper, S., Raghu, R., & Zagarro, H. (1990). National and world-system explanations of educational reform. *Comparative Education Review*, 34, 474-99.
- Hess, F. M. (1998). *Spinning wheels: The politics of urban school reform*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Howell, W. G., & Peterson, P. E. (2006). *The education gap: Vouchers and urban schools* (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Iannaccone, L. (1975). *Politics in education*. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education.
- James, T. (1991). State authority and the politics of educational change. *Review of Research in Education*, 17, 169-224.
- Kirst, M. W. (2002). *Mayoral influence, new regimes, and public school governance*. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.
- . (2006). A forty-year perspective on the politics of education and its association, PEA. *Politics of Education Association Bulletin*, 31(1), 1, 4-6.

- ... & Bulkley, K. (2003). Mayoral takeover: The different directions taken in different cities. In J. Cibulka & W. Boyd (Eds.), *A race against time: The crisis in urban schooling* (pp. 63-81). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- ... M. W. & Somers, S. A. (1981). California educational interest groups: Collective action as a logical response to Proposition 13. *Education and Urban Society*, 13(2), 235-56.
- ... H. (1936). *Politics: Who gets what, when, how*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- ... D., & Scribner, J. D. (Eds.). (1989). *Teaching educational politics and policy*. University Council for Educational Administration, Arizona State University.
- Lopez, G. R. (2003). The (racially neutral) politics of education: A critical race theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1), 68-94.
- Lugg, C. A. (1996). *For God and country: Conservatism and American school policy*. New York: Peter Lang.
- ... (2003). Sissies, faggots, lezzies, and dykes: Gender, sexual orientation, and a new politics of education? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1), 95-134.
- ... (2006). Thinking about sodomy: Public schools, legal panopticons, and queers. *Educational Policy*, 20(1), 35-58.
- Lutz, F. W., & Iannaccone, L. (1978). *Public participation in local school districts: The dissatisfaction theory of American democracy*. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath.
- McCarthy, M. M. (1996). People of faith as political activists in public schools. *Education and Urban Society*, 28(3), 308-26.
- McClendon, M. K., & Cohen-Vogel, L. (2008). Understanding education policy change in the American states: Lessons from political science. In B. S. Cooper, J. G. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 30-51). New York: Routledge.
- Macpherson, R. J. S. (Ed.). (1998). *The politics of accountability: Educative and international perspectives*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Malen, B. (1995). The micropolitics of education: Mapping the multiple dimensions of power relations in school politics. In J. D. Scribner & D. H. Layton (Eds.), *The study of educational politics* (pp. 147-67). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Malen, B., & Muncey, D. (2000). Creating "a new set of givens"? The impact of state activism on school autonomy. In N. D. Theobald & B. Malen (Eds.), *Balancing local control and state responsibility for education* (pp. 199-244). Larchmont, NY: Eye on Education.
- Malen, B., & Vincent Cochran, M. (2008). Beyond pluralistic patterns of power: Research on the micro-politics of schools. In B. S. Cooper, J. G. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 148-78). New York: Routledge.
- Marshall, C. (1993). *The new politics of race and gender*. New York: Routledge.
- Marshall, C., & Anderson, G. L. (1995). Rethinking the public and private spheres: Feminist and cultural studies perspectives on the politics of education. In J. D. Scribner & D. H. Layton (Eds.), *The study of educational politics* (pp. 169-82). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Marshall, C., & André-Béchely, L. (2008). Feminism and educational politics: No longer for women only. In B. S. Cooper, J. G. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 283-310). New York: Routledge.
- Marshall, C., Mitchell, D., & Wirt, F. (1989). *Culture and education policy in the American states*. New York: Falmer.
- Mawhinney, H. B. (1993). An advocacy coalition approach to change in Canadian education. In P. A. Sabatier & H. C. Jenkins-Smith (Eds.), *Policy change and learning: An advocacy coalition approach* (pp. 59-82). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Mazzoni, T. L. (1989). Governors as policy leaders for education: A Minnesota comparison. *Educational Policy*, 3(1), 79-90.
- ... (1993). The changing politics of state education policy making: A 20-year Minnesota perspective. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(4), 357-79.
- Miron, G. J. (2008). The shifting notion of "publicness" in public education. In B. S. Cooper, J. G. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 338-49). New York: Routledge.
- Murphy, J. (1990). The educational reform movement of the 1980s: A comprehensive analysis. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The educational reform movement of the 1980s: Perspectives and cases* (pp. 3-55). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Myers, N., & Cibulka, J. G. (2008). Religious faith and policy in public education: A political and historical analysis of the Christian Right in American schooling. In B. S. Cooper, J. G. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 232-45). New York: Routledge.
- Neave, G. (2003). The Bologna Declaration: Some of the historic dilemmas posed by the reconstruction of the community in Europe's systems of higher education. *Educational Policy*, 17(1), 141-64.
- Opfer, V. D. (2005). Personalization of interest groups and the resulting policy nonsense: The Cobb County School Board's evolution debate. In G. J. Petersen & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *The politics of leadership: Superintendents and school boards in changing times* (pp. 73-93). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.
- Opfer, V. D., Young, T. V., & Fusarelli, L. D. (2008). Politics of interest: Interest groups and advocacy coalitions in American education. In B. S. Cooper, J. G. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 195-216). New York: Routledge.
- Peterson, P. E., & Hassel, B. C. (Eds.). (1998). *Learning from school choice*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- Pustka, B. L. (1996). Relationship of political culture orientation to policy decisions made at the school district level. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.
- Sackén, D. M., & Medina, M., Jr. (1990). Investigating the context of state-level policy formation: A case study of Arizona's bilingual education legislation. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12(4), 389-402.
- Scheurich, J. J., & McKenzie, K. B. (2006). The continuing struggle for social justice. *Educational Policy*, 20(1), 8-12.
- Scott, J., Lubienski, C., & DeBray-Pelot, E. (2008). The ideological and political landscape of school choice interest groups in the post-Zelman era. In B. S. Cooper, J. G. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 246-62). New York: Routledge.
- Scribner, J. D., Aleman, E., & Maxcy, B. (2003). Emergence of the politics of education field: Making sense of the messy center. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1), 10-40.
- Scribner, J. D., & Englert, R. M. (1977). The politics of education: An introduction. In J. D. Scribner (Ed.), *The politics of education* (pp. 1-29). Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.
- Scribner, J. D., & Fusarelli, L. D. (1996). Rethinking the nexus between religion and political culture: Implications

- for educational policy. *Education and Urban Society*, 28 (3), 279-92.
- Scribner, J. D., & Layton, D. H. (Ed.). (1995). *The study of educational politics*. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Scribner, J. D., & Marten, A. (1994). *Measuring the political culture of school districts: The Texas case*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New Orleans, LA.
- Scribner, J. D., Reyes, P., & Fusarelli, L. D. (1995). Educational politics and policy: And the game goes on. In J. D. Scribner & D. H. Layton (Eds.), *The study of educational politics* (pp. 201-12). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Shipp, D. (2008). Urban regime theory and the reform of public schools: Governance, power, and leadership. In B. S. Cooper, J. G. Cibulka, & L. D. Fusarelli (Eds.), *Handbook of education politics and policy* (pp. 89-108). New York: Routledge.
- Stout, R. T., Tallerico, M., & Scribner, K. P. (1995). Values: The "What?" of the politics of education. In J. D. Scribner & D. H. Layton (Eds.), *The study of educational politics* (pp. 5-20). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Tyack, D. B. (1974). *The one best system: A history of American urban education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tyack, D., & Cuban, L. (1995). *Tinkering toward utopia: A century of public school reform*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wirt, F. M., & Kirst, M. W. (2005). *The political dynamics of American education (3rd ed.)*. Richmond, CA: McCutchan.
- Wirt, F., Mitchell, D., & Marshall, C. (1988). Culture and education policy: Analyzing values in state policy systems. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 10(4), 271-84.
- Wong, K. K. (1995). The politics of education: From political science to multi-disciplinary inquiry. In J. D. Scribner & D. H. Layton (Eds.), *The study of educational politics* (pp. 21-35). Washington, DC: Falmer Press.
- Wong, K. K., & Shen, F. X. (2002). Politics of state-led reform in education: Market competition and electoral dynamics. *Educational Policy*, 16(1), 161-92.
- Woods, P. A. (2002). Space for idealism? Politics and education in the United Kingdom. *Educational Policy*, 16(1), 118-38.