

PREFACE

A furious hand waving a hand-painted sign of protest outside of the U.S. Department of Education office building on L'Enfant Plaza in Washington, DC wants attention, and wants it now. The person behind the sign devises many strategies to get it: first, she stands in the center of the sidewalk. This ensures that any passers-by must physically confront her bodily presence. Second, she makes the lettering on her sign as bold as possible, hoping that the message written on it is consequently read by the public often and is legible from the lengthiest distance she can achieve using paint and cardboard. Finally, the protestor has dedicated the next two weeks to her effort—she will appear every day in the same spot, for as many hours as she can endure, hoping to garner enough attention to make a difference on behalf of her chosen cause. She is lobbying for the institution of state education law in Tennessee that would put limits and restrictions on the use of Restraint and Seclusion disciplinary methods in special-education classrooms.

There are, however, a number of other elements, both observable and unobservable, which will impact the success of her attempt. The following are the barest of initial considerations: first, whether or not her sign is seen by passers-by might depend on the weather in Washington, DC. In the spring and summer, weather can be hot; additionally, in the winter, high winds can make it very undesirable to stand or travel out-of-doors, which means that invariably fewer people will view her sign than would have in fair weather. Second, a multiplicity of similar calls for public attention on the city streets in the Washington metropolitan area can be said to saturate the visual attention of many area dwellers. Some individuals may have grown weary of demands for time and energy from protestors like the furious advocate or, indeed, stop noting the wording of their signage at all.

Finally, the furious advocate is wearing particular clothes and possesses a certain perceived gender; these effects complicate the manner in which her message is understood and will not, of course, always work to the advocate's benefit. It may be feasible for a person knowledgeable about the area and strategies of public protest to assess the probability of success or failure for the advocate in garnering attention from a group of, for example, 15 people. However, it seems daunting to attempt to analyze the "power" available to her in her project and the "power structures" and "power relationships" that may or may not impact her attempts, because the variables involved impact passers-by differently and can easily act in combination (or not at all).

The person behind the sign, the furious advocate, wants to gather strength in numbers in support of her opinion in order to convince political leaders of an idea. She may hope that her voice, presenting a slogan and aching for recognition, is perceived to be representative of a force. The force perceived would be that of a group, a mass willing to coalesce around an opinion that it would behoove leaders to mark because they may be voted out of office by that mass if changes are not fulfilled. Furthermore, the protestor is acting out of a core belief of political efficacy—that she has the "power", as a citizen in her democracy, to question institutions like the EPA and point out policy alternatives.

Personal efficacy in a given sphere of life, whether that sphere is public and political, or private and otherwise, is often thought of as "power." Power is thought to be *displayed, evident, corrupt, authoritarian, paternal*; power is thought to be *gained, lost, bought, stolen, abused*; power, in other words, is often considered a commodity. Power, on this view, can be owned by an individual or group, acting as a tool honed to achieve particular ends. But, what about powerful machines, ideas, or weather? What about violence, influence, ownership, or intellect?

In what way can the furiously-waved sign on L'Enfant Plaza compare to the furiously-waved brief, given to a congressperson by a lobbyist in her personal office? Why is the concentrated activity of one individual less influential than another? Clearly, socio-political location is a form of power in some ways external to individual effort; that is, the lobbyist and the advocate may apply the same percentage of time to the “influence game,” without yielding the same result. This part of the power narrative is familiar and, perhaps, tiresome. Persons are regularly considered to be “located” in asymmetrical power relationships throughout society. Some people are said to possess greater social capital than others; some may appear to have or lack the ability to persuade others and thus influence human activity and achieve desired results.

What I have said in the paragraph immediately above is a view of power based on *agents*. That is, I am assessing notions of power by considering the role agents play in power relationships and how much “power,” certain agents are thought to possess. Social scientists tend to pick up on this philosophical idea about power by assessing and attempting to quantify the amount of influence a person has upon others. The definition of power on this view looks like this: *power is a quantifiable measure of the ability of person A to influence the activity of person B*. Power, then, is thought to be owned and exercised through the positive activity of an agent, so any power analysis based on measurements of influence is grounded in quantifiable behavior. As noted by Steven Lukes, whose contentions concerning power I aim to investigate in this critique, “the pluralists see their focus on behaviour in the making of decisions over key or important issues as involving actual, observable conflict.”¹ When he uses the word pluralists, Lukes is generally indicating thinkers like Robert Dahl and Nelson Polsby, major theorists on power of the 20th century.

¹ Steven Lukes. *Power, Second Edition: A Radical View*. (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 18.

Some who are critical of the pluralist point of view protest that power is considered an “essentially contested” concept and, thus, not fully defined by the backbone of this simple construct ($A > B$, $A < B$). Yet, these thinkers steadfastly maintain that fruitful social-scientific inquiry about power knows *bounds*.² For example, theorist Terence Ball makes the following statement about power: “If an action is to count as an exercise of power, it must be calculated to cause some other person(s) to do something that they would not otherwise do, and meant to result in some advantage to someone, without necessarily resulting in any disadvantage or harm to anyone.”³ The implication for political science, then, is that outside of those bounds, power may be at work, but its effects are difficult to empirically test and thus are not appropriate for analysis.

Working within a general system of shared ethics in which persons can consistently be held responsible for negative effects that are within their power to change, this might seem somewhat problematic. That is, “power” might generally be considered a concept that is only important in political science insofar as it is a method of determining influence quotients. Thus, responsibility can be assigned for undesirable conditions with which human beings have been burdened.⁴ If this is the case, then why *should* social scientists be interested in conducting a power analysis that considers issues extant outside of the influence of either persons or institutions? It would seem that such a shift would suggest that specific individuals or institutions become less responsible for negative conditions that burden people on an unequal basis. Overall, then, something might be lost—a community feeling of concerned responsibility

² Ball, Terence. “Power.” In *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*, (eds. Robert E. Goodin and Philip Pettit. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers) 1993, 549.

³ *Ibid.* 550.

⁴ *Ibid.* 549.

when something goes wrong, or when a person or group of persons is disaffected by power's effects.

THE CASE

In an answer to the above question, the following practical critique aligns itself with scholarship contending power analyses can extend to a larger territory than that of agent-based analysis in order to include a new richness. This larger territory would have increasing freedom from the limitations inscribed in analyses of hierarchical power relationships that concern measurable, positive agent behavior only. In no way do I wish to challenge the idea that assigning moral culpability for negative circumstances in communities and nations is *centrally* important to analyses of power. I do, however, consider human agents to be a part of a webbed community of social roles that are impacted by external power conditions best characterized as “relationships” or “effects.” This means that the influence of individuals and the influence of power's effects should not *alone* be calculated in terms of blocks of human activity and behavior.

There is a two-pronged result for the type of power analysis I am proposing here. First, inactivity on the part of individuals is just as important and potentially empirically valid as activity, because specific motivations and influences affect individuals to both fail to act and act. Second, contextual issues related to the network of relationships as a whole, outside of the purview of individual actors, have an effect that should be considered (and, if possible, measured). Although no person or institution is *individually* responsible when such effects are negative, it is still possible to review and amend such situations as a *community* in order to improve or change negative conditions that harm people. In this way, consideration of power as potentially “agent-less” does not allow an escape from ethical culpability, but rather informs it

and makes it possible to consider solutions that require the effort of entire communities. This has the additional benefit of reminding those involved that no single individual can or should be held responsible for making change for entire communities; this is fruitless and cannot ethically be required of individuals, even those in roles of authority or perceived spheres of influence.

This viewpoint is informed by the work of 20th-century French philosopher and sociologist Michel Foucault, lauded lecturer at the Collège de France in the 1970s. For Foucault, the appropriate tool or method by which discoveries concerning the phenomenon of power can be obtained is the "genealogy," an attempt to discuss, in a non-linear way, the manifestation of power as method.⁵ For Foucault, the appropriate question, to begin, is: by what method does power perpetuate itself? This is radically different from the traditional questions of power within the sphere of political science and, importantly, is disconnected from questions of *agency* or *behavior*. Instead, it focuses on the method by which power applies itself and draws together a picture, in this way, of power's effects. I will touch briefly upon the Foucauldian impact on discourses of power in a section below.

The foremost part of the analysis of power presented here is a critique of Steven Lukes' offered theory in his landmark books *Power*, written in 1986, and *Power: A Radical View*, a second edition, with commentary, published in 2004. Lukes suggests that "power is real and effective in a remarkable variety of ways, some of them indirect and some hidden, and that, indeed, it is at its most effective when least accessible to observation, to actors and observers alike, thereby presenting empirically minded social scientists with a neat paradox."⁶ For Lukes, however, this paradox is not unassailable, and he asserts that the general criticism of the pluralists' behavioral focus in power analysis must be developed into its own line of inquiry. He

⁵ *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France 1975-76* (New York: Picador, 2007), 23-34.

⁶ *Power: a Radical View*, 64.

calls this an inquiry into “power’s third dimension,” or “third face”— inquiry concerned with potential and latent conflicts and phenomena. His summary of "power's third dimension" can be found in chart form in his *Power: A Radical View*.⁷ The chart is reproduced in the appendix of this document.

Lukes characterizes the first dimension of power as focused solely on behavioral analysis, a viewpoint defended by thinkers such as Robert Dahl and Nelson Polsby, as I touched upon above. The second traditional dimension, according to Lukes, attempts to critique the first but is yet focused on decision-making and non decision-making, thus failing to make a significant departure from the behavioral model. In the excerpt below, I have italicized those portions which he has used to differentiate the third dimension of power from the first and second traditional dimensions.

Focus on a) decision-making and control *over political agenda (not necessarily through decisions)*, b) issues and potential issues, c) observable (overt or covert), and *latent* conflict, d) subjective and *real interests*.⁸

Having called the necessity of analyzing inaction a “paradox” for political scientists, Lukes goes on to state what I have made it my business to investigate:

In suggesting this, I do not mean to imply that they should therefore give up. On the contrary, they have three lines of action: 1) to search for observable mechanisms of what I call power's third dimension, 2) to find ways of falsifying it, and 3) to identify relations, characteristics and phenomena of power for which the first and second dimensions cannot account."⁹

Accordingly, Lukes cites as an example of a successful work using this type of analysis:

Matthew Crenson's *The Un-Politics of Air Pollution: A Study of Non-Decisionmaking in the Cities*, published in 1971.¹⁰ In it, Crenson contrasts political activity in the city of Gary, Indiana,

⁷ *Ibid.* 29.

⁸ *ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*, 64

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 44-45

which had extensive air pollution as a result of the local industry, US Steel, with political activity in the nearby city of East Chicago, where levels of air pollution were commensurate and population demographics were similar. He found that the power of the industry in Gary, Indiana, was such that the expected response of members of the community—i.e., eventual public outrage about air pollution and its visible effects on health and bodily safety—was suppressed and retarded by a number of years as compared to East Chicago.

No observable behavior against political outcry could be recorded in the city, but Crenson's work nevertheless uncovered a system of "power," that could explain the reluctance of community members to express a grievance or, even, a lack of the expected grievance itself. To do so, he employed a "reputational" study of power influence: Crenson used surveys to assess the perceptions of influence that community members actually held and reported, adjusting for a variety of different issues while making certain to leave open the option of respondents reporting no agent of influence on a given topic.¹¹ In my own analysis, described below, I will employ similar strategies of assessing and compiling self-reported information on the part of community members.

In an attempt to choose an analogous situation to further test Lukes's contentions, I am also comparing two comparable communities, one of which has articulated a grievance and the other of which, despite actively critiquing institutionalized power, has not articulated the same grievance. For my case study, I have chosen to investigate the status of children who are classified, under state and federal statute as well as through the medical community, as "special needs," within the educational system. To insure the anonymity of the participants, I am using pseudonyms rather than actual names of the communities as well as the individuals from my

¹¹ Crenson, Matthew. *The Un-Politics of Air Pollution: A Study of Non-Decision Making in the Cities*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971), 108-110.

research. The organ of special-needs educational administration in affluent YTO County, Maryland, is the special-needs curriculum, used in every special-education facility and in mainstream educational facilities that service special-needs students. While the special-needs curriculum used in a given county in Maryland is both informed and restricted by the requirements of statewide curriculum, each county develops its own curriculum to implement. YTO County includes Sunrise Elementary, which, like other primary schools in the county, provides “Learning Centers” with special-needs resource teachers who fulfill special-education needs of students at the facility. Students, from the age of 3 to the age of 21, are enrolled in various special-needs and mainstream facilities throughout the county based on their legal classification under the guidelines of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA). Each facility employs unique methods and schedules that are assigned to students based on age and need.

No observable political conflict or behavioral phenomenon on the topic of “Restraint and Seclusion” (disciplinary methods) has arisen in this community of special-needs students or their parents, although grievances and objections on other topics in special-needs education have been raised. “Restraint and Seclusion” is the common catch-all category for the types of discipline that are commonly used in public education classrooms in order to intervene upon students with a wide variety of special needs who exhibit behavior that endangers or distracts themselves or other members of the classroom community. The nebulous meaning of “Seclusion and Restraint” is a problematic source of controversy. Often, there are basic bounds restricting teachers or support staff from disciplining children in ways that are too severe or might be considered borderline abusive. There are federal standards for Restraint and Seclusion, which amend Title V of the Public Health Service Act (42 USC 290aa et seq.) by adding Section 591 and 595. The law

can be accessed at the Thomas website of legislative activity, which is maintained by the Library of Congress.¹² Less often, however, are teachers given specific guidance concerning the appropriate application of either seclusion or restraint methods. When the IEP is developed (discussed below, in fn 30), these issues should be cemented for each individual child; that is, specific Restraint and Seclusion procedures should be included as a part of the IEP document.

I will discuss the public grievance against Restraint and Seclusion, which has arisen in the state of Tennessee. It is here that I will test the potential of making a Lukes-inspired analysis of the third dimension, or face, of power, and attempt to answer the question of why school systems, in similar socio-political contexts and operating under identical federal laws, inspire a specific grievance—outcry against seclusion and restraint in disciplinary methods in special education—in the state of Tennessee, but not in another—Maryland, as represented by YTO County.

It should be noted that since YTO County's special education curriculum is a result of contemporary laws—as I already alluded to above—it is less likely that each separate education facility in the County has potential power to *act* in order to effect change and avoid the existence of *latent* conflict. The force of the legislative mandate underscores my contention that individual agents are subject to external limits and controls. In early 2008, I visited educational facilities in YTO County and recorded the observations of teachers and administrators to trace the method of the forces that shape schedules and routines of special-needs students. I did so in the hopes of conducting a Foucauldian-type investigation of those schedules and routines in question in order to bring to light a narrative of power relationships in the classroom that might normally be disregarded in the social sciences, and thus deserve attention as potentially significant impacts into the daily lives of these students. I do this within the framework of Lukes's posited third

¹² Thomas: Legislative Information from the Library of Congress. <http://thomas.loc.gov>, accessed 18 February 2008.

dimension in order to determine whether it is possible to analyze both 1) inactivity and 2) agent-less sources of power. In those two ways, I wish to introduce support for the overall grievance-analysis, described above, that I conduct as analogous to the Crenson example.

RECENT DISCOURSE ON POWER

Critics of the simplicity of the A and B influence-relationship argue that it relies too heavily on measurable and positive behavior. That is, for an entity A to influence entity B under the traditional scheme, entity A must be said to exert power in order to cause B to act in a specific (and measurable) manner. If B does not act, then A is not considered to have exerted any power. The concept might be summarized as “power as capacity,” that is, power exists when a person has the ability to perform certain actions (such as, influence entity B to...). This type of assumption, however, seems unduly muddy and, on my view, conflates several key concepts in the typology of “influence,” – strength and capacity are not interchangeable with power. Supporting this statement is the work of Hannah Arendt, who, writing in 1970, is critical of the widespread discursive habit of conflating the terms “power”, “strength”, “force”, “authority” and “violence.”¹³ She decries the tendency in the media to talk about power in the way that “accompanied the rise of the sovereign European nation-state.”¹⁴ In contrast, she argues that power exists in the collaboration of the community; “Power,” says Arendt, “always stands in need of numbers.”¹⁵ Separating herself from the traditional core theorists, she makes the following argument:

Power corresponds to the human ability not just to act but to act in concert. Power is never the property of an individual; it belongs to a group and remains in existence only so long as the group keeps together. When we say of somebody that he is in power we

¹³ *On Violence*, 43.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 38.

¹⁵ *Ibid.* 42.

actually refer to his being empowered by a certain number of people to act in their name.¹⁶

Furthermore, she states, “It is only after one ceases to reduce public affairs to the business of dominion that the original data in the realm of human affairs will appear, or, rather, reappear, in their authentic diversity.”¹⁷ This sentiment is echoed in the work of Michel Foucault, who I will explore below, in that Arendt means to free the discourse of power from a narrow conception tied to that of agent influence or “dominion.” Foucault, similarly, wishes to pry open the discourse of power in order to include the concept in its most minute manifestation; he focuses on power as sets of procedures.¹⁸

Arendt makes her statements about power within the framework of the following concern: “Power needs no justification, being inherent in the very existence of political communities; what it does need is legitimacy.”¹⁹ This statement is related to the statement I made above concerning the need to assess power relationships in terms of culpability; power analyses are important because they constitute an examination of constraints and their origins.

Clarissa Rile Hayward, a political scientist, conducted a long-term observation in two classrooms in order to test, as I wish to do, the contentions of Steven Lukes and other theorists concerning the concept of power. Her aim is to debunk the limited conclusions of traditional social science concerning asymmetrical power relationships with a critical ethnographic study of the contemporary public elementary school. She shows, through observational inquiry at two schools over the period of a year, that explanations of classroom behavior based on dominant and dominated personalities and existence in various socio-economic roles do not provide a full

¹⁶*Ibid.* 44.

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 43-44.

¹⁸ Power, states Foucault, is “not a substance, fluid, or something that derives from a particular source.” Instead, he states, “it is a set of procedures.” Michel Foucault, *Security, Territory, Population*. (Trans. Graham Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 2.

¹⁹ *On Violence*, 52.

account of power's effects. Rather, for Hayward, any complete understanding of power's presence in the classroom must be informed by a consideration of environment –this includes the physical or spatial setup of the classroom as well as the physicality of the surrounding neighborhood and methods of transportation to and from school. These elements are presented by Hayward as interconnected with a child's experience in an elementary classroom, many elements of which do not appear to be produced by individual people or even institutions made up of individuals acting in concert.²⁰

Hayward focuses on three elements in her observations in the classroom, which are the following: classroom management, school knowledge, and production of the responsible student. By classroom management, she means the general politics of space and furniture arrangement, and the way that the teacher allows students to circulate within the room (or, perhaps, the way students choose to circulate in response to the room's arrangement itself). By school knowledge, she means the pedagogic form of the classroom in relation to the curriculum being presented. And finally, by the production of the responsible student, she means the system of affirmations and negotiated behavior that are involved in the discipline and nurturing of students in the classroom.²¹

Hayward made the following statement about the role of the teacher in the classroom. It is in reference to the teacher who leads the comparatively socio-economically “advantaged,” she chose to observe: “My central claim...is that to begin an exploration...by defining Segal as a powerful teacher who chooses to use an empowering pedagogy is to overlook much of the work

²⁰ Clarissa Rile Hayward. *De-Facing Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

²¹ *Ibid.* 117

power performs at Fair View.”²² In reference to the other classroom, Hayward makes a second seminal claim about the forces of power in public schools:

Power’s mechanisms shape social action at North end, what is more, by constraining and enabling the forms of action that are possible for all actors here. They affect the fields of action, not only of students, who seem relatively “powerless,” but also of teachers, administrators, and other actors who, by the prevailing view, “have” and “use” power.²³

The concept Hayward touches upon here, of power as a network, leads directly into the important work done by Michel Foucault. Indeed, Foucault consistently affirms that power exists as a network, and that individuals fulfilling social and political roles are variously situated in relation to access to power. Yet, these individuals have limited freedom of movement within that network based on elements effectively beyond their individual control.

FOUCAULDIAN INFLUENCE

Michel Foucault developed a large corpus of literature from the standpoint of both history and sociology. One aspect, or goal, of his work was to elucidate the true origins of some prevalent binaries: these include sane and insane, normal and abnormal, criminal and non-criminal. According to Hubert Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, Foucault significantly shifted discourses on power through his approach:

One important difference between Nietzsche and Foucault is that whereas Nietzsche often seems to ground morality and social institutions in the tactics of individual actors, Foucault totally depsychologizes this approach and sees all psychological motivation not as the source but as the result of strategies without strategists.²⁴

That is, on Foucault’s view, power is not something that can be owned, transferred or utilized by individuals as agents. While individuals do exist in complex networks, fulfilling roles such as

²² *Ibid.*

²³ *Ibid.* 3.

²⁴ Hubert L. Dreyfus and Paul Rabinow, *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982), 109.

teacher, student, parent or administrator, the power hierarchies are not designed or controlled by individuals based on their placement within them. For instance, the teacher at the “head” of a classroom is not necessarily in control of the power hierarchy by virtue of his or her placement above the students in the authority structure.

For Foucault, the concept of power is dependent upon context: both time and place, along with the vector of its application (the person impacted by its effects). In connection with his investigation of established binaries, listed above, he asserts that a general type of “discipline” arose with the concern of power—in its ever self-perpetuating mode—to classify individuals as correct or, perhaps, lacking. That is, power has, as a project, the aim of classifying individuals as normal or abnormal in order to create a more organized society.²⁵ Entire discursive and non-discursive systems arose around this general project, including institutions like the hospital or prison. This general method is clearly at work in the process of “mainstreaming” students into general education programs, or placing students into special-education programs as a result of perceived differences and fit with pre-conceived categorical types.

The purpose of the systems Foucault describes is to correct divergent individual behavior: by sorting out widely-variable deviations, identifying them as dangerous, unhealthy, abnormal, or even symptomatic, individuals could be separated from other members of the population and thus ensure the health of the population as a whole. Thus the behavior or modes of existence that posed a threat to power’s effective functioning was curtailed, excised and eliminated. Further, the domains in which this enactment is occurring—in this case, the human body or the human mind—gives power the opportunity to exercise itself.²⁶ That is, as long as a structure defining a “healthy” population or a “healthy” community is maintained, there is opportunity for power to

²⁵ Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. (Trans. Alan Sheridan, New York: Vintage Books, 1995), 26.

²⁶ *Ibid.* 25

work at paring individuals away from that construct or correcting deviant behavior in order to allow them to participate in the community. Power, for Foucault, is self-perpetuating as well as primarily agent-less.

Thus Foucault, for the purposes of this study, is questioning how much information can be gleaned from a power analysis of a community that assumes control for individuals in roles of authority. He states: “Look not to the stable possession of a truth, or of power itself.” Instead, “conceive” of each element of power as a strategy, or a “network of relations, constantly in tension, in activity.”²⁷ His theory introduces a sense of chaos into the hierarchical structure of power as it is commonly conceived (i.e., A has power and B does not): “The forces operating in history are not controlled by destiny or regulative mechanisms, but respond to haphazard conflicts.”²⁸ There is a connection here to what Hayward investigates when she considers the available means of transportation to schools based on geographic location; what effect is enacted upon a student when the only means to arrive at school in the morning is the public bus? Is there a negative, positive, or even quantifiable effect?

THE RADICAL VIEW

While Lukes does seem concerned at the prevalence of and reliance upon analyses of power that are dependent on agents, he is less inclined to radicalize, as Foucault did, the concept of power into an essentially agent-less phenomenon. He does, however, consider carefully Foucauldian claims that power can exist outside the bounds of agent behavior, and also that the disaffected members of a population might be somehow constrained by elements that are

²⁷*Ibid.* 26

²⁸ Michel Foucault, “Nietzsche, Genealogy, History” in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. (Donald F. Bouchard, ed. and trans. with Sherry Simon, trans. New York: Cornell University Press, 1977), 154.

typically overlooked. These might include, for purposes of this study, the space that is used for learning (the dimensions of the actual classroom, the placement of furniture, the spatial relationship between the student/s and the teacher/s). According to Lukes: “We should search behind appearances for the hidden, least visible forms of power...that means that the power of the powerful is to be viewed as ranging across issues and contexts, as extending to some unintended consequences and as capable of being effective even without active intervention.”²⁹ It is thus that Lukes finds his connection with Foucault, although Lukes betrays a belief in the “real interests” of an individual; objective interests that exist outside the dictates of that individual’s will. Foucault does not endorse this view in his own work.

On a theoretical level, does Lukes prove that there *is* a ‘third’ dimension to power? Steven Lukes describes his theory of a third dimension of power without attempting to definitely “prove” that the dimension exists. If Lukes’s theory of a third dimension could be reduced to its most rudimentary form, it might be described thus: that individuals somehow acquiesce to dominance by other individuals or institutions in such a way as to lose sight of their natural self-interest. Such an argument might consist, it seems, of simply providing a single instance in which an individual or entity, manipulated by a second, more powerful individual or entity, has become confused about his or her basic interests and willingly replaced some values with externally-*imposed* values provided by the second individual.

Insofar as an infinite number of relationships and contexts can be imagined in the social sphere, it is not difficult for Lukes to *suggest* that such instances are occurring. It is even less difficult to suggest, as Lukes does, that one can retroactively examine reasons why some grievances or policy issues remained latent for a time period, and provide an overall explanation why this was so (Crenson’s analysis). Thus, he relies on the probability that most social

²⁹ *Power: A Radical View*, 86.

scientists, without, perhaps, attempting to analyze the falsifiability of the third dimension, would agree that such instances exist. Indeed, he names many who do so, the majority of whom might fall under the umbrella of Foucault's typology of analysis.

Instead of focusing on a falsifiable proof of the existence of power's third dimension, he attempts to provide an argument meant to prove that there exist reliable methods to explore and analyze instances of it. He wants to show that it's possible to make such analyses meaningful to discussions about power without stepping into ad-hoc conjecture concerning objective interests. However, within his argument he leaves the behaviorist realm completely and, as a consequence, must make the argument that theorists *can* somehow deduce real interests that apply across broad spectrums to individuals, regardless of the sort of recognition the individuals in question afford such interests. He does not provide a method for this deduction. It is in this vein that he introduces Michael Crenson's work, referenced above; however, there is a complication in doing so. Crenson's work relies upon a grievance which did arise in Gary at a later time, and he applies his analysis retroactively. As I stated, this type of analysis seems relatively easy to create; beyond Crenson's reputational study, in which he relies upon surveys taken of the opinions of community members, there is little that can be refuted in Crenson's argument. Furthermore, since the grievance in Gary did eventually emerge, Crenson can state, almost without qualification, that community members held this latent grievance previous to its emergence.

Because of the structure of his argument, in order to promote his three-dimensional theory of power, Lukes must subscribe to the possibility, or potential deduction, of an objective-type value system by which to ascribe "real" interests to individuals and by which to judge societies that fail, by action or inaction, to bring such interests forth into the political arena. Lukes endeavors to present the identification of those interests as minimally assuming, citing the

possibility of examining possible counterfactual situations which might contribute to quality of life issues such as health and employment. It is clear, however, that such a presentation is misleading, as the stance Lukes takes requires more assumptions than interest in these quality of life issues.

Lukes contends that any theory of power is tied inextricably to value judgments and that every theory of power has been “essentially contested.”³⁰ For Lukes, this provides an argument for his own third-dimension: how can social scientists ignore a phenomenon connected with power because of its basis in objective values and its controversial nature, when any basic theory of power has the same characteristics? He argues that the relative difficulty of conducting research should not exclude imperatively relevant realms from coming under methodological scrutiny. Says Lukes ironically of his own assertions and the consequent research problems which arise: “one could resolve the problem by just defining power narrowly and calling what is excluded something else.”³¹ It is obvious that Lukes does not wish to do so, and though he argues dedicatedly for the exploration of the ways agents become voluntary subjects of dominance, he does not himself explain how to do so without a full and static list of situations agents should desire for themselves. Lukes cannot escape implication in a new arena of “ideological criticism.” Arguments within the one and two-dimensional theories of powers, classified by Lukes himself, lack this essential necessity, and therefore, although they are controversial, do not require the conjecture required of Lukes in the third dimension.

According to Lukes, the one-dimensional view of power is based solely on overt conflict and the accomplishment of favorable outcomes through action, the exertion of which is the exertion of power. This type of analysis is carried out by thinkers like Robert Dahl and N. W.

³⁰ D. C. Hoy, “Power, Repression, Progress: Foucault, Lukes, and the Frankfurt School,” in Hoy, David ed., *Foucault: A Critical Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986), 124.

³¹ Lukes, *Power: A Radical View*, 111

Polsby, who build an understanding of power and those who hold power without questioning the political agenda itself. Such a question would explore why certain conflicts occur or why certain decisions are made while others aren't. It is this question that is taken up by proponents of the two-dimensional view; such research would attempt to draw out potential issues, covert conflict (as long as it remains observable), "non-decision-making," and possible grievances.

Lukes criticizes both the one and two-dimensional views of power as behaviorist in nature—in other words, they focus too much on overt actions. He does, however, concede that the two-dimensional view criticizes the behaviorist structure by making an attempt to explore non-decision-making. Both essentially lack a layered criticism of agenda-setting and latent conflicts that Lukes insists are included in a full exploration of power structures and their effects.³² Lukes looks to dominance when seeking a more fully-realized concept of power because "to speak of power as domination is to suggest the imposition of some significant constraint upon an agent or agents' desires, purposes or interests, which it frustrates, prevents from fulfillment or even from being formulated."³³ This is his description of latent conflicts, unrecognized by even the agents themselves.

Consequently, Lukes is claiming that an utmost exercise of power would require that the dominated are misled; the dominated actually consent in some way to being acted upon. Thusly, Lukes defines the third dimension of power as "securing the consent to domination of willing subjects..."³⁴ In order to appropriately analyze the decision-making, non-decision-making, and agenda-setting explored in the one and two-dimensional views of power, Lukes believes that the analysis of this third dimension is intrinsically necessary. He states: "Power as domination... invokes the idea of constraint upon interests, and to speak of the third dimension of such power

³²*Ibid.*, 29

³³ *Ibid.*, 113

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 109

is to speak of interests imputed to and unrecognized by the actors.”³⁵ The dominated, then, can be expected to be largely unaware of this phenomenon. If a culture is widely inculcated in this way, a simple determination of the political conflicts that surface and the winners and losers in such conflicts cannot be expected to identify true beneficiaries or the roots and mechanisms of power relations within that culture.

To be more specific, Lukes contends that the definitions of power and the type of research included in the one and two-dimensional views he describes relate directly to and naturally include the third-dimension he wishes to introduce. In brief sum, he states that the one-dimensional view analyzes decisions, the two-dimensional view analyzes decisions about decisions, or political agenda-setting, and the three-dimensional view opens up the possibility of questioning what decisions weren’t made when political agendas were set.

Involved in this line of questioning is the idea of voluntary consent and the diffusion, or even preclusion, of conflict: “I continue to think that it makes best sense to see some ways of averting both conflict and grievance through the securing of consent as a further dimension of power.”³⁶ Just as sociologists like Martha Nussbaum have endeavored to emphasize that the lack of options for any agent cannot indicate endorsement for that agent of his or her subsequent choice, Lukes states that a surplus of options cannot do so, either.³⁷ Simply that, he states, there exist apparent choices for a given agent, does not preclude the existence of constraints upon that agent’s decision-making. Again, it seems obvious that it is difficult to disagree with this statement. Yet, methodological agreement and expansion of power theory requires the practice of something more controversial: identifying the ways in which agents have acquiesced.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 146

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 111

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 146

Lukes argues that he can avoid blatant normativity in research in the realization that it is a mistaken enterprise to determine the interests of persons based upon social roles; this frames the deduction of real interests within the dictates of social prescription and misplaces them gravely.³⁸ Within such a limited sphere Lukes calls upon the example of pollution control in Gary, Illinois. With such an example, he is able to demonstrate the latent interests of agents—specifically, the desire to not be poisoned by pollution. This desire, he said, did not surface because of the non-recognition of such an interest by the agents in question, those who were employed and lived in the town dominated by US Steel (Lukes references Crenson’s work). Even within this context, however, Lukes would surely be compelled to concede that a second force is at play: the desire to be employed. It does not follow that the agents were unaware of their own interest to avoid pollution. Further, such an example is a small slice of social research concerning power; life and health as interests are largely agreed upon, but stand alone in the scheme of public and private desires.

As aforementioned, some critics have called Lukes’ addition to the power schema more revolutionary than his own literature would suggest, stating that the addition amounts to “ideology criticism.” States David Hoy, “The distinguishing feature of the radical view of power is that it insists on a distinction between subjective and real interests, as well as a related difference between observable (whether overt or covert) and latent conflicts of interests.”³⁹ Instead of building upon or extrapolating the realm touched by the first and second-dimensions, as Lukes would argue he is doing, Hoy is pointing out the movement into an analysis of real interests as the all-important earmark that makes the third dimension what it is. Without subjecting cultures and the system of power effects among persons to an outer set of objective

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 122

³⁹ “Power, Repression, Progress,” 125

interests that the researcher *believes* are or should be held by dominated individuals, it is impossible to conclude that the individuals are acquiescing to a situation that lies outside of those interests. It is this fact that makes the third dimension, although generally considered extant, methodologically unsound. The type of subjection that Lukes would like to discover is replicated in his scientific methodology; it cannot be proved that Steven Lukes, or any other social scientist, is objectively more or less qualified to make statements concerning the interests of other agents.

Keith Dowding makes a nuanced attempt to defend and illustrate Lukes' third dimension, stating that it differs from that of Foucault because Lukes believes that freedom and autonomy from power is possible.⁴⁰ Yet, it is Dowding who insists that Foucault's trap—the idea that dominance and domination is achieved and experienced by all members of society and is therefore nearly meaningless from a methodological standpoint—must be avoided somehow when taking up Lukes' three-dimensional view. For, Dowding insists, otherwise the trap implicates the researcher in concluding that autonomy is impossible and influences are rife at once and everywhere against the individual.⁴¹ Lukes himself, in that vein, quotes Spinoza: "From the ancient arts of rhetoric to the contemporary skills of publicists and propagandists, it is undeniable that, as Spinoza remarked, a 'man's judgment can be influenced in many ways, some of them hardly credible.'"⁴² This consideration is why Dowding wants to introduce the idea of a strict "intentional stance" in order to separate significant influence from the normal, every-day affecting that occurs in every person's life as a result of normal experiences and involvement with others.

⁴⁰ Keith Dowding. "Three-Dimensional Power: A Discussion of Steven Lukes' *Power: A Radical View*", *Political Studies Review* vol. 4, no. 2 (2006), 136.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, ¶13

⁴² Lukes, 116

If one only assigns responsibility and the idea of “dominance” to an agent when that agent intentionally affects another agent, one can avoid meaninglessness in the analysis of dominance in power relations.⁴³ Additionally, one can thus use Lukes’ three-dimensional view to make an account of reasons that dominated persons might acquiesce to dominance. Without this so-called intentional stance, an attempt to uncover deliberate attempts at manipulation and assign responsibility, Lukes’ third dimension relegates itself to the umbrella of ideological criticism, the rejection of which is described above.

Unfortunately, Lukes himself would call such a method limiting and misleading: “to focus on ‘manipulation’ by defining the concept of power as deliberate intervention is unduly to narrow its scope. Power can be at work, inducing compliance by influencing desire and beliefs, without being ‘intelligent and intentional.’”⁴⁴ It is made clear, then, that the argument made by Lukes himself precludes the possibility of employing the intentional stance and cannot stand on its own without entering the dangerous and normative territory of ideological and cultural criticism, which is necessarily opposed to consistent and meaningful social science research.

GRIEVANCE ARTICULATION

Case A – Grievance Articulation in YTO County, Maryland

In order to consider Lukes’ claims concerning political inactivity as an important jumping-off point for evaluating power relationships in communities, I began by considering problems that have arisen in many public school systems concerning the needs of special education students. Parents and student advocates in many school systems have considered school policies of Restraint and Seclusion to be not only undesirable but overtly abusive for

⁴³ Dowding, ¶12

⁴⁴ Lukes, 136

children. investigating those problems which were articulated by parents and advocated in YTO County.

Parents of the students in YTO County, where Sunrise Elementary, a public school, is located in Maryland, have devised an on-line community system in which they can interact with one another and publicly air issues that arise in the school system, from the specific needs of their children to the quality of curriculum. The website YTOConcern⁴⁵ is for use by the parents and concerned advocates for students in the community and links to a Yahoo™ on-line group of the same name, which the homepage of the website claims to be “associated” with, but not identical to. As of March of 2008, there were 1,561 members in the Yahoo™ group. The principal of Sunrise Elementary, where I had the opportunity to observe three classrooms, named this on-line community first when asked about parental concern and involvement related to special education in the county. The mission of the organization is published as follows on the site:

YTOConcern is a grassroots organization that advocates for the improvement in the quality of life for individuals with disabilities and their families in YTO County, Maryland. Its membership includes parents, advocates, lawyers, teachers and many others. While its focus is primarily special education, YTOConcern advocates for and addresses other issues that impact the lives of individuals with disabilities.

Links are provided to numerous other websites related to curriculum and resources are provided in the form of school board contact information and other relevant contact information.

On the organization website, seven items of concern, labeled “Major County Issues,” are listed for easy reference at the top of the homepage. These include the following: Secondary Learning Centers, IEPs, Bullying, County Operating Budget ‘09, CIP and the Hidden Special Ed Changes, and, finally, Compliance Updates. The first topic, Secondary Learning Centers, is related to the 2007 decision in the county to eliminate “Learning Center” classrooms from public

⁴⁵ <http://www.ytoconcern.org>, accessed 18 February 2008.

secondary education.⁴⁶ Primary school Learning Center classrooms, on the other hand, remain open in the public school system. In response, community organizers proposed four County Council Public Hearings, occurring in spring of 2008, at which parents were encouraged to voice their opinion concerning the FY08 budget and the consequent decision to close the Secondary Learning Centers.

The second “major” topic listed, IEPs, or Individual Education Plans, has survey content that is delineated as standing-in for a more formal survey process, which community members hope to complete in the future.⁴⁷ Once they’ve clicked on that topic, parents have the opportunity to fill out a brief form that requests information about the quality of the collaborative process of Individualized Education Program writing in the school system. The IEP process is part of IDEA (2004) and the school system’s specific IEP process involves its interpretation of the regulatory requirements made by that law. According to this portion of the website, the community members who are dedicated to compiling this type of information are doing so in response to the

⁴⁶ Learning Centers are the classroom meeting-places for students who receive special education services and the teachers who provide the services and support. Students spend varying amounts of time in Learning Center classrooms based on their needs. Their needs have been articulated by teams as per the Individualized Education Programs, which are required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004. This articulation is described in the footnote immediately following. Learning Centers, then, are staffed by special educators and supporters who administer services to students on an individual basis. Some Learning Centers have permanent classes of special education students, which coalesce around shared needs. Some Learning Centers lack this cohesion, but still provide support to students on a case-by-case basis; for instance, a math class might be designed for a small number of students and held in the Learning Center classroom.

⁴⁷ Individualized Education Programs are a component of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004. This law makes it a requirement that every child in public schooling who receives special education or related services must develop a document that is designed for them, addressing the specific services that the school will provide in support of them. According to a guide published by the US Department of Education, this plan is the cornerstone of public education for a child with special needs: “The IEP creates an opportunity for teachers, parents, school administrators, related services personnel, and students (when appropriate) to work together to improve educational results for children with disabilities. The IEP is the cornerstone of a quality education for each child with a disability.” An IEP typically includes the following elements: how the school plans to help the child “advance toward the annual goals; be involved in and progress in the general curriculum; participate in extracurricular and nonacademic activities; and be educated with and participate with other children with disabilities and nondisabled children.” The IEP must be updated by the IEP team (the individuals listed in the above quote) at least once a year in order to fulfill the requirements of IDEA. This information is gathered from the Department of Education website at the following address: <http://www.ed.gov/parents/needs/speced/iepguide/index.html#closer>, accessed 18 February 2008.

FY08 budget: “In an effort to assist families facing challenges due to ... budget changes, we are collecting and consolidating any issues that may arise during current IEP Meetings. We are already receiving reports about inconsistencies and misinformation.”⁴⁸ Thus, the major topic considered problematic in connection with the IEP meetings is *neither* Restraint and Seclusion *nor* disciplinary methods, despite the fact that individual policies concerned with these topics are required by law to be included in the IEP after discussion by the IEP team. Rather, the parents in this community hope to draw forward issues of *budget change and cuts* at IEP meetings.

The website provides, under the tab dedicated to “Bullying,” instructions on how to report incidences of bullying as well as a list of references. Furthermore, the website provides parent advocates with budget testimonials from parents as well as members of the board of education under the tab “County Operating Budget ’09.” The section entitled “CIP and the Hidden Special Ed Changes,” the group considers the Capitol Improvement Plan and its proposed effects on the special education community, which includes moving certain programs held at separate facilities in YTO County into facilities dominated by mainstream education. The final major topic brought forward for comment and attention, “Compliance Updates,” is a compilation of current documents explicating topics in special education, which are produced by YTO County. Seven of the 40 documents included are dedicated to issues surrounded the IEP process, but none are listed as specifically referencing Restraint and Seclusion issues.

It is worthy of note, however, that there is a lengthy Restraint and Seclusion clause in the Maryland Annotated Code that addresses limits and boundaries on Restraint and Seclusion as it is implemented in public schools.⁴⁹ While the clause does not provide specific guidance to

⁴⁸ <http://www.ytoconcern.org>, accessed 28 February 2008.

⁴⁹ Annotated Code of Maryland, Education Article, Subtitle 11, Student Behavior Intervention, §7-1101. Code of Maryland Regulations Title 13A, Subtitle 08, Chapter 04 Student Behavior Interventions.

teachers, it does give some limits to the use of Restraint and Seclusion. The Code contains the following item:

School personnel shall only use exclusion, restraint, or seclusion:

- (1) After less restrictive or alternative approaches have been considered and attempted or deemed inappropriate;
- (2) In a humane, safe, and effective manner;
- (3) Without intent to harm or create undue discomfort; and
- (4) Consistent with known medical or psychological limitations and the student's behavioral intervention plan.⁵⁰

This section of Code further delineates the IEP process as the appropriate vector for negotiating the use of Restraint and Seclusion for specific children. While this Code seems, at first glance, thorough, it relies upon the institution of the individual school to responsibly carry out this type of discipline and determine the meaning of the above four points. Furthermore, the clause makes the following statement: “Each public agency and nonpublic school shall develop policies and procedures to address ... A continuum of positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports for use by school personnel prior to exclusion, restraint or seclusion.” These policies and procedures, then, are largely unregulated by the Code, although they are mentioned.

If the law were clearer, it would be possible that grievances against Restraint and Seclusion fail to arise in YTO County because the concept is addressed and fully treated by force of law, to the extent that individuals in the community did not feel distress surrounding the issue. It seems, however, that the Code does not fully treat or delineate standards of behavior for teachers and administrators in using Restraint and Seclusion, leaving instances in which it might be appropriate to be determined by the authority figure present and the emergent nature of the behavior to be dealt with. Thus, it is not immediately obvious why parents and student advocates in YTO County do not appear to dedicate time or energy to considering this topic.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*

Case B- Grievance Articulation in the State of Tennessee

While IEP concerns center around budget issues in YTO County, in Tennessee elements of the IEP process are the center of controversy concerning Restraint and Seclusion tactics employed in schools. According to the Tennessee Disability Coalition News Blog, in an entry published on 14 November 2007 states,

Today, nothing in Tennessee's laws or education rules regulates the use of restraints and seclusion in school settings. As a result, it is possible that a student might be physically restrained or isolated for a long period of time without the family being notified. There are also no limits on the frequency or length of episodes of restraint/seclusion, or training requirements for school staff who use these practices.⁵¹

In response, the Tennessee Disability Coalition contributed to efforts to pass a bill in Tennessee "to establish guidelines and reporting requirements for restraint and seclusion." According to the website: "This bill was introduced in the TN legislature during the 2007 session, HB1186/SB1662. The bill did not pass, but a legislative study group has been set up to review these practices in TN schools."⁵² A related institution, the Disability Coalition on Education, has begun work in response to this failure in collecting stories and narratives from effected families "whose children or youth with disabilities have experienced restraint and/or isolation at school."⁵³ Thus far, no law treating Restraint and Seclusion has passed in Tennessee and community members in Tennessee continue to publish articles, blog entries, and organize others in order to change this state of affairs.

In Sarasota County, Tennessee, the public school system has a total of 14,441 students and 1,843 of those students are classified as special education students.⁵⁴ As early as spring of 2005, the question of the appropriate use of Restraint and Seclusion in the county was being

⁵¹ "Tennessee Disability Coalition News Blog: Advocacy." <http://tndisability.org/news/category/advocacy/>, accessed 18 February 2008.

⁵² *Ibid.*

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ Sarasota County at a Glance, http://www.sarasota.org/ataglance%202007_2008.pdf, accessed 21 March 2008.

raised in public forums. According to a document prepared by the office of the County Commissioner, “on April 8-9, 2005 in Somersetville, professional and parent activists representing the ethnic communities of the city came out to support, share, fellowship, advocate, and empower one another at ‘A Community of Color Think Tank & Training on Special Education.’ The purpose of the gathering was to make it known that children with ‘special needs’ are entitled to access full services in treatment, education and potential for a full life as adults.”⁵⁵ Reproduced in the Commissioner’s document was a list of recommendations and advice for parents and student advocates who are involved in the IEP process, reminding those involved that special-needs children have definable rights and must be given an IEP document. According to the executive secretary to the Commissioner, the Commissioner was actively working to pass legislation that dealt in issues of Restraint and Seclusion.⁵⁶ As I mentioned above, there is yet no law in Tennessee regarding the use of Restraint and Seclusion in public schools.

It is obvious that parents and student advocates were vocal about problems in special education in school districts in both Maryland and Tennessee, and became involved in community organizations and events in order to serve the interests of the students. There doesn’t appear to be an element influential enough to cause these activists in both states to fail to articulate grievances in general. However, it is not clear why the particular grievance against practices of Restraint and Seclusion arose in the state of Tennessee, but not in Maryland. According to Steven Lukes, as we have seen, it is a mistake to discredit “latent conflict” as insignificant.⁵⁷ So, Lukes would posit that the differences between articulations in both states is significant; i.e., that the grievance should have arisen in Maryland but it did not, and

⁵⁵ Commissioner’s Weekly Wrap-Up, <http://www.tn.gov/youth/dcsnews/wwu/2005/04-22-2005.pdf>, accessed 21 March 2008, 2.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁵⁷ Lukes, 29.

investigations should occur as to why this grievance did not arise. However, he gives no clear indication of how to carry out this type of investigation. In the Crenson case, the grievance had eventually arisen in both communities (both Gary and East Chicago). However, in my case, the grievance has yet to arise (if it ever will) in the Maryland school district I focused on. Lukes does not provide a blueprint, then, for considering latent grievance other than in a retroactive consideration.

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION

Sunrise Elementary School, YTO County

In order to further satisfy my inquiry into the effects of spatial arrangements and scheduling in the classroom, I observed three classrooms at Sunrise Elementary School in YTO County. I investigated the political context of this county by checking for specific grievances, as recorded in the section above. I also wished to observe the classrooms in order to further investigate any possible reasons why grievances against Restraint and Seclusion policies were not expressed in YTO County.

The classrooms I visited each had a unique setting of both furniture and space, as dictated by the walls and structure of the classroom and the furniture available (including items such as desks, computers, televisions, large rugs and carpets). The teachers in each of the three classrooms described, through word or activity under observation, a different type of authority. I endeavor to show how each type of authority is impacted by the space available to the teacher and the ways in which it was possible for those spaces to be manipulated by the teacher. I will also strive to show the general response of the students in each classroom to the spaces in which they learned in addition to their responses to teacher direction and authority. Additionally, I spent

time talking to both the principal of the elementary school and the assistant principal, both of whom spoke to me candidly of the disciplinary situation at the school as well as the relationship among the parents, student advocates and the administration of Sunrise Elementary.

I also include, within this section, a description of an educational panel held for graduate students; on this panel one of the teachers I had the opportunity to observe served as a panelist, and articulated directly some of issues connected with discipline in previously prepared statements. The class schedules for all three classrooms, prepared by the individual teachers, are included in an appendix to this document. I also append several photocopied pages of my field notes, which I have here transcribed. I have obscured any reference to proper names in order to protect the identities of the individuals involved. As I did not collect quantifiable raw data, I did not include any data tables or survey information.

Class A

Ms. Williams conducts a kindergarten Learning Center classroom, one of four special-education centers for various age groups and achievement levels at Sunrise Elementary School in Maryland. About 50 students are a part of the Learning Center program at Sunrise Elementary in the 2007-2008 school year. This means that 50 students have “hours” of special-education assistance built in to their IEP, and will be circulated in and out of the four Learning Center classrooms at different times throughout the school day in order to fulfill those hours. The number of students in the Learning Center program changes as a result of revisited IEPs, which must be updated at least once per year. In the 2006-2007 school year, as reported by *Special Education at A Glance*, the number of students enrolled at Sunrise with special needs was 64.⁵⁸

⁵⁸ *Special Education At A Glance 2006-2007*. Various Materials from YTO County.
<<http://www.ytoschoolsmd.org/departments/regulatoryaccountability/SpEdGlance/>> accessed 18 February 2008, 25.

According to the dictates of IDEA, each special-education student must be provided with a Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) at the public school, which means that to the furthest extent possible, students who need access to special-education services should be educated with mainstream students.⁵⁹ In YTO County, this establishes a quota on special-education assistance; the goal for the public school system is that 80 per cent of students with IEPs be educated with mainstream students 80 per cent of the time.⁶⁰

After my visit to Ms. Williams' classroom, I observed her speaking on a panel for graduate students in special education, during which she stated that most of her students, who are aged anywhere from 6-years to 10-years-old, operate on the cognitive level of a 4-year-old. I describe this panel in more detail in a section below. Her classroom is generally managed by four adults, including Ms. Williams herself. All four adults are women; Ms. Williams is the youngest of the four. Those present include a para-educator, an aide for the students who is not required to have a degree in education, and two one-on-one "itinerant" aides, who have a primary responsibility to a single student as dictated by their Individualized Education Program. The number of adults in any special-education classroom or mainstream classroom at Sunrise is dictated by the needs of the students; itinerant aides will follow the students to whom they are assigned throughout the day, and from classroom to classroom as each child's schedule requires. Para-educators are not guaranteed elements of the Learning Center classrooms, but each of these is typically assigned at least one of these special-needs aides.

⁵⁹*Ibid.* According to the *Special Education at a Glance* document prepared by YTO County, the concept of LRE is defined as follows: The Individuals with Disabilities in Education Act (IDEA) provides that to the maximum extent appropriate, children with disabilities are to be educated with children who are not disabled and that special classes, separate schooling or other removal of children with disabilities from the regular educational environment occurs only if the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily. YTODE requires that 80% of students with Individual Education Plans be in the general education environment 80% of the school week" (215).

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

When I entered Classroom A at 11:45 am on a Thursday in early spring, Ms. Williams was interacting with her students at the head of a half-circle of 12. Each student faced Ms. Williams and stood in order to play a game involving a ball. Ms. Williams was talking when I entered the room, and continued a constant conversation with the class as a whole, intermittently addressing a specific student as she tossed the plastic, striped ball toward them gently. The children responded to the sound of the commands that Ms. Williams gave, often repeating the phrase she uttered or repeating some of the noises she made in the same, or a similar, cadence. The instructions given by Ms. Williams were not carried out by the students as often as they were simply repeated vocally by the students. A student, upon catching the ball, was expected to call out the colorful shape taped to the stripe they noticed first. Ms. Williams prompted each step in the game. Each child was standing at the beginning of the game, but was instructed to “Throw to me [Ms. Williams],” “Sit down,” and wait for the other students to perform their own recognition of a shape. When all the students were seated, Ms. Williams reiterated the purpose of the game, saying “We’ve had a nice warm-up reviewing our shapes.”

Ms. Williams, like the other teachers at Sunrise, has a considerable amount of leeway in the physical set-up of the elements of her classroom—including desks, chairs, and electronic media. Limited space does not make it feasible for a teacher to request a classroom swap or a specific classroom at the beginning of the year. In fact, 4 classrooms at Sunrise are “portables”—trailers connected by wooden decks to the main building facility at the elementary school. The assistant principal at Sunrise, Mr. Farris, did assure me that each teacher would be accommodated in a facilities request – such as a corral desk for a quiet time-out—as often as possible. Budget limits, however, restrict teachers from ordering new sets of furniture. Mr. Farris said, further, that each teacher does take the initiative to decorate the classroom and will set up

the furniture according to his or her wishes, rearranging often throughout the year in order to accommodate the needs of students and adults in the classroom. While at times this might be as simple as moving children among desks in a new seating arrangement, teachers often chose to rearrange furniture and spaces more radically as new needs or considerations arise among students.

Ms. Williams has chosen to set up her own classroom with a mixture of group spaces. To the far right as one faces the room from the doorway, two bean bags and a carpet are set up near the right-hand wall of windows. Next to the beanbags is a rocking chair. Each of the pieces of furniture in the room is labeled with a colorful sticker announcing its name: for instance, “rocking chair,” “television,” and “window.” At the “front” of the classroom—the section one faces when entering, directly in front of a wall-to-wall blackboard, a colorful carpet has been placed on the floor. When I observed the classroom, it was here that Ms. Williams sat, on her knees, directing the students to participate in a review of shapes.

During my visit to her classroom, Ms. Williams used the various spaces to direct the students’ movements during the game that reviewed shapes. None of the students were conducted from space to space physically, but verbal commands, repeated, would direct the students to a new part of the classroom in order to complete an activity. For instance, after each student recognized and identified for Ms. Williams a shape that was their “favorite” of those being studied, they were told to “go to the desks” in order to draw their favorite shape with a marker. Later, these drawings were to be compiled and pasted onto a large piece of paper, in order to represent the preferences of the students in a “graph,” thus serving the purpose of helping the students understand the mathematical concept of a graph as well as recognition of

shapes. I later learned that the county curriculum unit math goals included graphs and Ms. Williams was preparing the students for testing in the area.

The driving goal for each of the Learning Center classrooms at Sunrise Elementary is the contention that the students who have special needs—i.e., those students who have been assigned an IEP by the school system in response to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), updated in 2004—are “diploma-bound” students. That means, for the teachers and administrators at Sunrise Elementary, that the students must be taught the core elements of mainstream curriculum in such a way that they, at one point, might re-join or join for the first time a general education classroom. Each student’s IEP undergoes annual review, a collaborative process that requires the input of both teachers and parents. IEPs are written, according to county guidelines, by teachers. IEPs also undergo a reevaluation process every 3 years, and teachers are expected to make placement recommendations for students. These recommendations determine whether or not the student retain hours in special-education classrooms in their schedule. Parents, however, can request a review of a student’s IEP at any time—just as a teacher can.

According to the principal, Dr. Skinner, Sunrise Elementary provides a copy of student IEPs to parents or guardians at all times. Parents, as aforementioned, are always a part of review meetings for IEP development. Dr. Skinner noted further that the “litigious” nature of the geographical area feeding into Sunrise Elementary made it common for parents to bring in third party consultants, often lawyers, in order to be certain that the process and product was fully beneficial to their child. When asked why the IEP process, a legal requirement resulting from the 2004 IDEA, varied so widely among school districts and states, Skinner noted that public education itself—“the big picture”—was subject to a high level of variability. In fact, she stated that “some states do not even have curriculum,” although the No Child Left Behind Act (2001)

makes it more necessary for states to develop benchmarks in compliance with federal education standards. Skinner, however, asserted that “parent involvement” is “written in” to the IDEA, and that compliance with federal regulations demands the type of interaction displayed at Sunrise Elementary in IEP development. If parents, said Skinner, “can get what they want,” from the process, through the medium of the meetings and the advocacy of third-party consultants, grievances against special needs practices at Sunrise Elementary and against county curriculum itself tend not to arise.

Class B

I observed Ms. Vandergriff’s classroom at 2 pm, during their “handwriting” period.⁶¹ Upon entering the classroom of Ms. Vandergriff, I immediately noticed that the desks were set up in rows rather than grouped into a “u” shape, like those of Ms. Williams’ classroom. There were nine student desks, set up in three rows of three. While Ms. Williams had not physically responded to my presence in the back of her classroom, her attention absorbed in leading a game, both Ms. Vandergriff and another adult female in the room looked at me as I entered her space. Ms. Vandergriff’s physical classroom contrasted sharply with that of Ms. Williams, as the space was noticeable smaller. Ms. Vandergriff also directs a Learning Center classroom at Sunrise Elementary, and her classroom has eight students. She called her classroom “self-contained” and explained that, in contrast to some of the other Learning Center classrooms, her students stayed with her throughout most of the day—with the exception of instruction in Social Studies and Science, when the students were mainstreamed into general education classrooms. Ms. Vandergriff explained her decision to arrange the desks in rows within the classroom based on the inclusion of her students in these Social Studies and Science classroom. Since, she stated,

⁶¹ Appendix III, Classroom Schedules.

the “aim is to mainstream kids,” the desks should be situated in the way they would be in a mainstream classroom, mimicking their setup so that the students would be familiar with it. She mentioned that one of her students, who subsequently walked up to me and stood nearby for several minutes while I was speaking with Ms. Vandergriff, was going to be placed in a different school very soon as a result of a recent IEP reevaluation.

A second major contrast between the Ms. Vandergriff’s classroom and that of Ms. William’s, in addition to the size of the space, was the fact that students may be out of the visual range of a teacher of authority figure depending upon where a student was standing in the classroom. This was due to a large set of storage cabinets near the back of the room, which stood to the right of the doorway and created a kind of passageway between the wall facing the cabinets and the cabinets themselves. Beneath the storage closets, which reached nearly to the ceiling (there were a few inches of clearance between the top of the closets and the ceiling), there were cubicle spaces for coats and personal items belonging to the students. As a result, students standing in this area cannot be seen by an instructor who is in the larger space of the classroom itself, which is used for all instruction that does not involve leaving the classroom for another space or storing a student’s belongings. In contrast, with the exception of a closet and a bathroom in Ms. William’s classroom, there was no space in which a student could stand and be hidden from view.

I observed that Ms. Vandergriff’s students were aware of her inability to always monitor their behavior visually, as well as the inability of her aides to do so. During the hour time period that I observed her classroom that afternoon, the majority of the students (6 of the 8) were moving about the classroom almost continually, circling around the hidden space. In Ms.

Williams' classroom, the students did not move throughout the room unless they were instructed to do so by either Ms. Williams herself or a member of the support staff who was present.

Ms. Vandergriff, like Ms. Williams, also led a game in her classroom. Her game was connected to the state-wide curriculum goal in math of teaching number sentences. One at a time, each student was expected to read out a number sentence for the rest of the class, all of whom were circled around a large piece of paper which displayed it. Each of the students sat on the floor, along with Ms. Vandergriff, who coached the students in their reading. While reading his number sentence, Davis, one of Ms. Vandergriff's students, began reacting to his inability to articulate one of the phrases. He hit the student closest to him, and the aide who was assigned to him on a one-on-one basis attempted to intervene by taking Davis by the hand. In response, Davis hit the aide, as well. Every member of the class stopped to watch this scene play out, and Ms. Vandergriff registered no reaction until after the aide had been hit. At that point, she said: "show me nice hands, and sit on them if you can't handle it." When Davis failed to respond to her instruction, she told him to physically move away from the group. When faced with alienation from the circle, Davis immediately quieted and chose to stay within it.

Like Ms. Williams, Ms. Vandergriff held the attention of the group through near-constant conversation. When none of the students responded verbally, she would solicit response from the support staff instead, refusing to cease her commentary. In Ms. Vandergriff's classroom, I recognized what Dr. Skinner had referred to as "prompt hierarchies," in their earlier stages. According to Dr. Skinner, the teachers have been trained to move slowly from stronger to weaker prompts for appropriate behavior. For example, at the beginning of the year, an aide might guide a student through the classroom to a new location by the hand. For the teachers at Sunrise, a goal would be to move from this physical prompt to a simple visual or verbal cue; this

would mean that a student would have developed a higher level of responsiveness to the teacher's authority. While Ms. Williams had relied on verbal prompts only to gain responses from students, Ms. Vandergriff touched students often and kept them within arms' reach.

Class C

Ms. Robinson, another special education teacher at Sunrise Elementary, has charge of a somewhat unorthodox classroom. Students enter and leave her Learning Center classroom sporadically because of the IEP arrangement for special education assistance. I noted that the schedule seemed somewhat haphazard, and required some students to interrupt the learning of others. Laughingly, Ms. Robinson explained to me that the students "know their schedule better than the teachers do" and are "really good about it." Because there was a fire drill for the entire school at 2 pm on the afternoon I visited Ms. Robinson's classroom, her math lesson was cut short and occurred much later in the day than usual. I observed a fifteen-minute math lesson which, like Ms. Williams' math lesson, centered on graphs and their meaning. Unlike Ms. Williams, Ms. Robinson mentioned out loud the necessity of learning the graphs in order to fulfill unit curriculum goals during the lesson itself. Like the other teachers, Ms. Robinson relied on the tool of music and chanted directions to capture and hold the attention of her class. In fact, half of the math lesson relied on the students' performance of a song repeating the numbers 1 through 100, during which one student at a time was allowed to "lead" the group with a plastic microphone.

Ms. Robinson's classroom situation at Sunrise Elementary is unique among the Learning Centers. Because she joined Sunrise Elementary staff late in the school year, Ms. Robinson was placed in a "communications" room where intra-school media is generally produced; through a

large window on the far wall of the classroom, one can see into an adjacent room where large batches of television and sound equipment are kept and used by general education students and a communications director. Her classroom is not small, but in it are the belongings of other teachers, which she expressed frustration about; Ms. Robinson attempted to ask another teacher to remove her materials, but had to personally endeavor throughout the fall season in order to clear her room of them. Because of this, Ms. Robinson felt she could not decorate or arrange her room the way she wanted.

Furthermore, the classroom lacks windows to the outside. The other two classrooms I visited at Sunrise Elementary had multiple large-pane windows facing grassy areas of the grounds. Ms. Robinson told me, that she wished there were windows, but admitted that the high level of distraction for her students that would have been introduced with the presence of a window would have made her job more difficult. Ms. Robinson has only five students in her Learning Center during the majority of her school day. When she first began working at Sunrise Elementary, she was assigned only three. She stated in conversation with me, when asked about her classroom furniture, that she originally grouped the student desks into two clusters. Ms. Robinson found, however, that in order to retain student attention, she needed the students to face her throughout the school day and, thus, decided to rearrange the student desks. This became especially important after her classroom was expanded to include five regular students. While I observed the classroom in a single afternoon, the size of the class expanded to 10 students and was subsequently reduced to one student, based on the dictates of individual student schedules. During the hour that I spent observing the classroom that afternoon, 4 students left the classroom on their own, and 3 students arrived in the classroom on their own.

Ms. Robinson asserted to me verbally, and also displayed while I observed, a certain laxity toward student movement in the classroom. She allowed students to stand and move about as long as their movements were not too distracting. Her policy was augmented by the fact that students were individually taking leave of and entering the classroom throughout the day. Unlike Ms. Williams and Ms. Vandergriff, Ms. Robinson affected a casual tone with her students that lacked the constant, sing-song characteristics of the conversation affected by the other two teachers, with the exception of the time the students spent on their math lesson. Her approach to discipline and rule-based approaches to classroom management were similarly casual; she seemed to rely much more readily on the students' ability to self-manage and monitor their own behavior. According to Ms. Robinson, each student is "very aware of the rules," and knows to "let Ms. Robinson know" when anything has gone wrong with their own behavior or the behavior of another student.

Peachtree School Panel

I attended a panel discussion held at a private special-education school in the Washington metropolitan area, which hosts a graduate student program that allows students to intern in special-education classrooms as part of their certification. The panel discussion was meant to offer these students a comparison between private education, which the graduate students learned by apprenticeship at the Peachtree School, and public special education. The panel featured three speakers, one of which was Ms. Williams from Class A at Sunrise Elementary. Ms. Williams shared her experiences at Sunrise Elementary with the graduate students and was asked a barrage of questions about her daily schedule and the heavy responsibility of coordinating lesson plans to comply with county curriculum and Maryland's Voluntary State Curriculum (VSP).

There, Ms. Williams made a series of claims that described her disciplinary reaction to perceived student misbehaviors in the classroom as largely based on reliance on her own resources. Although she had found occasion, she said, to send students to the principal's office, she acknowledged that the intervention of administrators was too one-dimensional to address the needs of the students in her classroom as she perceives them. She said, of her overall procedure, I "take a lot at my own discretion." Laughing a little bit, Ms. Williams said further, "yelling from the principal," won't stop negative behavior, but tends to "intimidate" her students. Instead, she stated that she uses the repetition of four simple rules to either condemn or exhort behavior among her students, even if the type of behavior she wishes to indicate does not fit exactly with the rules she sets.

The simplicity of the rules, she stated, is key—because the students respond to the familiarity of the concepts she uses instead of a more complex system of recognition of unique negative and positive behaviors. When she verbally invokes a rule, she claimed that she uses small, illustrated cards (she had brought them to share with the audience) to visually reinforce the concepts, which she asserted addressed the variable needs of the students. The rules were 1) "stay seated" 2) "hands to self" 3) "quietly raise your hand" and 4) "keep a quiet mouth." Ms. Williams stated that she attempted to use administrative support only rarely. This account accords with the statements of Mr. Farris, who had asserted that most of the behavioral conflicts that arise in classrooms at Sunrise Elementary are dealt with on the level of the classroom. In addition the verbal, rule-based tactics above, Ms. Williams addressed what I observed in Ms. Vandergriff's classroom: that students will respond to the physical feeling of isolation. Ms. Williams stated that regularly, as a disciplinary measure, she will tell the student that they have to be physically separated from the rest of the classroom. Often students will respond to the

suggestion alone, and Ms. Williams rarely needs to resort to actually physically separating the student who is engaging in disruptive or distracting behavior.

Alone among her colleagues at Sunrise Elementary, Ms. Williams verbally addressed the topic of restraints without provocation during her presentation. She first asserted that she had never observed a restraint occur, and went on to say that members of a special team—those staff (both administrative and teaching staff) at Sunrise who had been specifically authorized—would enter the classroom upon request in order to perform a restraint on a student who had misbehaved. Ms. Williams, according to her testimony at the Peachtree Panel, would never perform a restraint on a student on her own.

ANALYSIS and CONCLUSIONS

In order to reflect on the observations I made in the classrooms at Sunrise Elementary, I would like to re-incorporate those spatial elements and scheduling elements that are suggested in the work of Michel Foucault and applied in Clarissa Hayward's discussion in her own book (insofar as she found that elements of transportation to and from school, such as when children are confined to arriving by city bus, tend to affect children's attitudes toward authority). In the case of Ms. William's kindergarten Learning Center, it is clear that Ms. Williams is very aware of the organization of space within her classroom. In order to implement her authority as a teacher, she uses various "centers" throughout the room to direct children's movements. In this way, she alleviates her own burden to direct the children on a one-on-one basis in order to elicit a response. It is evident that she has gradually made the students accustomed to certain verbal signals and to the organization of the elements in the room.

Whereas the teachers from Classes B and C made statements indicating that they had made changes to the furniture in their classrooms since the beginning of the year, Ms. Williams did not; the students appeared used to the set-up and responded to commands such as “go to the desks” by first acknowledging the verbal command and then correctly moving toward the indicated area. So, I argue that Ms. Williams exercised her authority over the classroom in a manner that was augmented by her surroundings, which she was able to manipulate in order to fulfill her needs. While Ms. Williams’s authority is surely compromised in other, similar areas that she cannot equally control (such as a sudden fire alarm, or the existence of an observing student from American University) it is clear that in the case of physical space Ms. Williams is not significantly hampered in her exercise of authority over students.

In the case of Ms. Vandergriff, on the other hand, it seems evident that Ms. Vandergriff’s authority over the movement of students in her class was hampered by the pre-existing condition of the architectural make-up of the classroom. As I explained in the preceding section, Ms. Vandergriff could not consistently see her students because of a large set of storage cabinets which created a passageway in the back of the classroom. During the time I spent observing the classroom, the majority of the students were continually moving throughout the room and circulated throughout the passageway created by the tall storage cabinets. Ms. Vandergriff and the aides did not follow the students into the area. While I do not have a basis for asserting that this situation is somehow worse for the students’ learning environment than the spatial organization in Ms. Williams’s classroom, I will assert that Ms. Vandergriff’s authority over the movement of her students was hampered by the presence of the large storage cabinets. I observed that the students were aware that Ms. Vandergriff would not be able to see them if they were in

this space, and subsequently chose to not participate in group activities (such as lining up or doing a math assignment), instead choosing to both stand and move in the hidden area.

Finally, Ms. Robinson was uniquely unable to control either the content of her classroom (other teachers had left their own belongings behind in the space) or the furniture available to her. Because she had become a staff member at the school in the middle of the fall season, she had the least desirable classroom at the school (it was attached to the media production center). The space had no windows and was cluttered. Her response to these facts was largely optimistic, although I observed that her teaching style was radically more casual than that of either Ms. Vandergriff or Ms. Williams. While, again, I have no reason to assert that the learning experience for students in Ms. Robinson's class was in some way inferior to that of students in either of the other classes I observed, Ms. Robinson's method of authority and control was directly affected by her surroundings. Her students moved throughout the classroom as they pleased, and as a result of the extreme mixture of student schedules (as explicated in the preceding section) students even entered the classroom and left the classroom without supervision and according to their own timetable as they perceived it (students, said Ms. Robinson, "know their schedule better than the teachers do"). Ms. Robinson played a number of games with the students in the afternoon that I observed her, and the students responded to her, often running up to her at the front of the room to say or do something in front of the class or in order to gain her attention. While, again, I am not positing that this teaching style is in some way negative, I will posit that it is a result of Ms. Robinson's surroundings and that the differences among the teaching styles of Ms. Robinson, Ms. Vandergriff, and Ms. Williams in general are directly affected by their material and spatial surroundings. These effects occur in a way that both informs, and, in some, instances, challenges their authority.

To complete my critique of Steven Lukes' "third dimension" of power, I would like to suggest that my case study shows that considerations of the "third dimension" are useful as a tool to remind those who conduct power analyses that there are "hidden" elements in power relationships or constraints that might often be overlooked. That is, the fact that the grievance against Restraint and Seclusion, as it is practiced in public schools upon students who have special needs, has *not* arisen in YTO County is odd. It is odd because in similar counties in the state of Tennessee, this grievance *has* arisen. At first glance, as I mentioned above, it seems that the presence of coded law in Maryland that places limitations on the use of Restraint and Seclusion is the key element that is missing in Tennessee. If Tennessee had a similar law, perhaps no grievance would have arisen there; however, I excerpted the portion of Maryland code which deals with the topic above and it is evident that the law does not sufficiently guide teachers in individual cases. The Individualized Education Program, which is developed by teams of teachers, parents, and student advocates, is the driving force that determines the use of Restraint and Seclusion in Maryland. While grievances have arisen in connection with the IEP, they have largely been in response to budget changes and other possible issues (such as bullying). Meanwhile, members of the public in Tennessee advocate for a law to be passed that would define and regulate the use of Restraint and Seclusion, making this a central grievance for any parent or student advocate connected with major Tennessee school systems, particularly in the Nashville area. This grievance has existed for over a decade.

If the hidden elements that are affecting grievance articulation in these two studies are left unearthed, they might pose a detriment to considerations of power or, even, predictions concerning the efficacy of public policy. For purposes of this study, an insufficient understanding of influential elements in the political community can have a negative effect on

educational and disciplinary policy inside the classroom. Inarticulation of grievances among members of a populace or political inactivity does not, of course, preclude the existence of either a grievance or political concern. Furthermore, it certainly does not preclude the existence of hidden power effects that constrain grievance articulation or political activity from occurring. This is the mistake that Lukes and Crenson set out to correct: the assumption of political scientists dealing with democratic systems that concerns, if they exist, will be raised. On this note, I think that Steven Lukes' commentary is well-taken. Grievances in public schools concerning disciplinary methods in classrooms for children with special needs do not necessarily arise according to the negativity of conditions, but rather to perceptions of negativity or, perhaps, to a lack of communication between the school system and parents as well as parent advocates.

However, analyses based on Steven Lukes' conception of the "third dimension" of power are reliant upon an objective list of real interests that, effectively, members of a community *should* be concerned about. While at certain levels, such as health concerns (like the concerns raised by dangerous levels of air pollution in Crenson's study) this is unproblematic, it creates a knotty set of ethical questions in other areas. For instance, in the realm of the classroom, appropriate or effective teaching methods are not the object of consensus and often evolve over time. Some instances of Seclusion and Restraint seem physically dangerous and should, of course, be avoided in order to provide basic care to individuals with special needs. It is not, however, always clear what type of intervention is appropriate or necessary in order to subdue a student who is endangering either himself or others through his behavior. Do general tactics of Restraint and Seclusion truly violate a real interest held by a student with special needs? How can we know, and how would a researcher endeavor to prove this?

It is also important to note that the type of analysis carried out by Crenson and lauded by Steven Lukes only seems to work in retrospect. There are some issues that arise when one, as I did, attempts to unearth hidden, influential elements otherwise: with respect to the case that I examined, grievance articulation concerning Restraint and Seclusion policy, I have no reliable method to use to prove that the grievance won't arise tomorrow in YTO County, the way it has in the state of Tennessee. There may be something valuable in pointing out the fact that the grievance has not yet arisen, and wondering why that may be so. However, I found the prospect of identifying influential elements and persuading others of their influence in suppressing the latent grievance to be singularly daunting. Indeed, I could not imagine an effective way of carrying out my analysis without waiting for the grievance to arise and identifying the accompanying change that may have loosed it from its barriers. Overall, while both Foucauldian-type observations of power networks and considerations of possible latent grievances can be generally informative, they are difficult to falsify and thus have limited utility.

Appendix I.

Excerpted from Steven Lukes, *Power, Second Edition: A Radical View* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004), 29.

One-Dimensional View of Power

Focus on (a) behavior
(b) decision-making
(c) (key) issues
(d) observable (overt) conflict
(e) (subjective) interests, seen as policy preferences revealed by political Participation

Two-Dimensional View of Power

(Qualified) critique of behavioural focus

Focus on (a) decision-making and nondecision-making
(b) issues and potential issues
(c) observable (overt or covert) conflict
(d) (subjective) interests, seen as policy preferences or grievances

Three-Dimensional View of Power

Critique of behavioural focus

Focus on (a) decision-making and control over political agenda (not necessarily through decisions)
(b) issues and potential issues
(c) observable (overt or covert), and latent conflict
(d) subjective and real interests

Appendix II.

The following pseudonyms were used in this document. Any resemblance to names of authentic persons or institutions is purely incidental:

Davis

Dr. Skinner

Mr. Farris

Ms. Robinson

Ms. Williams

Ms. Vandergriff

Peachtree School

Sarasota County

Somersetville

Sunrise Elementary

YTO Concern

YTO County

<http://www.ytoconcern.org>

Appendix III.

Classroom Schedules, Classes A, B, and C, Sunrise Elementary












Class A

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
9:15-9:45	Circle Time	Circle Time	Circle Time	Circle Time	Circle
9:45-10:15	Media Center (10-10:30)	Reading	Reading	Reading <i>11-11:20 Sustained</i>	Re
10:15-11:00	Literacy Centers	Literacy Centers	Speech. (10:15-10:45)	Literacy Centers	Lit Ce
11:00-12:00	Writing	Math	Writing	Writing Meeting	W
12:00-12:50	Math	PT Group (12:10-12:40)	P.E. (12:20-12:50)	Math Rec-Tutors	Comp (12:1
12:50-1:50	Lunch/Recess	Lunch/Recess	Lunch/Recess	Lunch/Recess	Lunc
1:50-2:30	Science/SS	Art Speech Plug-in (1:50-2:30)	Science/SS	Science/SS	Scie
2:30-3:00	Choice Centers	Choice Centers	Choice Centers	Music (2:35-3:05)	5 th B1
3:00-3:20	Pack-Up/ Dismissal	Pack-Up/ Dismissal	Pack-Up/ Dismissal	Pack-Up/ Dismissal	Pa Di

*Speech groups Monday 10:30-12:00

***OT Tuesday am 9:30-11:00 Friday am 9:30-10:30

**PT Tuesday pm after art /Thursday am 30 min before lunch

	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday
8:05-9:25	Morning work Handwriting	Morning Work Handwriting	Morning Work Handwriting	Morning Work Handwriting	Morning Work Handwriting
9:25-10:05	Music for Cade 	Reading and Writing	9:30-10:15 Lesson with Mrs. Grossman	Reading and Writing	9:30- calendar/schedule
10:40-10am	Calendar and review schedule 		10:15-11:30 Reading/Writing Snack/break Cade PE w/LCK 	11 am Snack/break	10:30-Science 
10-11am As needed <i>Handwriting</i> <i>Student</i>	Math/Writing				
11am	Snack/break	Snack/break	11:25-12:05 Art Cade		Snack/break
11:20-12:50 Mrs. G 2-12:30 M, M, R	Reading /writing	12:20-12:50 Ms. Whalen every other week	11:30-12:00 MediaCenter 	11:30 math	12:00-12:50 reading/writing
12:50-1:50	Lunch/recess	Lunch/recess	Lunch/recess	Lunch/recess	Lunch/recess
1:50-2:15	Story	1:50-2:35 Math	2pm- 	Handwriting	Story
2:15-2:45	Computer lab 	2:35-3:15 Art 	2:30 PP 		Works in progress
2:15-3:20	Handwriting		2:30 Social Studies	music  2:35-3:10	Freedom Friday 
3:00-3:45	Mathematical	Mathematical	Mathematical	Mathematical	Mathematical

Class B

Class C

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2008 8:31 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Visit

2nd & 3rd

Thursday Schedule:

9-9:30 beginning of the day nonsense

9:30-11:50 reading initiative

11:50-12:20 media center with helene's class - Helene Gracoff - 2nd grade

12:20-12:50 free read/journal writing or a reading game

12:50-1:50 recess and then lunch

1:50-2:35 math

2:35-3:10ish music

Pack up

That is my schedule...though I think Felice pulls some of my kids in the morning for 30 min so. In fact she does from 9:20 until 9:50 but it is more like 9:35 until 10:05 usually.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, March 10, 2008 8:27 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Visit

My friend is coming Thursday. I will stop by today and pick up a schedule (if that's ok with you) to help her p

Thanks,,

Appendix IV.

Photocopied sample of field notes taken at Sunrise Elementary

students clap - response 3 MINS later

Mic woman again, please be
one you know all you trash away

"S" you know I see you

"Raise your hand if you are not done"

↓ Dr. Charet disciplines students who
throw food by asking them to clean
up

"no, I'm not taking
them to the office, they
have a job here."

— Students line up by class

↓ run to line up

line up by themselves, find each
other

student w/ Asperger's
attempts to run out door full speed,
stops himself, joins line

unusual to self-report
food fight

PROMPT HIERARCHIES

stronger to the weaker prompts

↓ waiting, relies on visual cues,

everyone else goes to the carpet

Bibliography

- Arendt, Hannah. *On Violence*. Orlando: Harvest Book, 1970.
- Ball, Terence. "Power." In *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*, eds. Robert E. Goodin and Philip Pettit. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1993: 548-557.
- Butler, Judith. "Bodies and Power, Revisited." *Radical Philosophy: A Journal of Socialist and Feminist Philosophy*. 114: 13-19, 2002.
- Commissioner's Weekly Wrap-Up, <http://www.tn.gov/youth/dcsnews/wwu/2005/04-22-2005.pdf>, accessed 21 March 2008: 1-8.
- Crenson, Matthew. *The Un-Politics of Air Pollution: A Study of Non-Decision Making in the Cities*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1971.
- Detel, Wolfgang. "Foucault and Classical Antiquity: Power, Ethics and Knowledge." Trans. David Wigg-Wolf. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- DiPalma, Carolyn. "Power at Work: Navigating Hierarchies, Teamwork and Webs." *Journal of Medical Humanities*. 25(4): 291-308, 2004.
- Dreyfus, Hubert, L. and Paul Rabinow. *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982.
- Dowding, Keith. "Three-Dimensional Power: A Discussion of Steven Lukes' *Power: A Radical View*", *Political Studies Review* vol. 4, no. 2 (2006), pp. 136-145.
- Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. Alan Sheridan. New York: Vintage Books, 1995.
- Foucault, Michel. "Nietzsche, Genealogy, History" in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*. Donald F. Bouchard, ed. and trans. with Sherry Simon, trans. New York: Cornell University Press, 1977.

- Foucault, Michel. *Security, Territory, Population*. Trans. Graham Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Foucault, Michel. *Society Must Be Defended: Lectures at the Collège de France 1975-76*. New York: Picador, 2007.
- Hayward, Clarissa Rile. *De-Facing Power*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Hoy, D.C., 'Power, Repression, Progress: Foucault, Lukes, and the Frankfurt School', in Hoy, David ed., *Foucault: A Critical Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1986).
- Lukes, Steven. *Power*. New York: New York University Press, 1986.
- Lukes, Steven. *Power, Second Edition: A Radical View*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, The (IDEA). Full text. <http://www.idea.ed.gov>, accessed 18 February 2008.
- "Sarasota County at a Glance." http://www.sarasota.org/ata glance%202007_2008.pdf, accessed 21 March 2008.
- "Special Education At A Glance 2006-2007." Various Materials from YTO County. <http://www.ytoschoolsmd.org/departments/regulatoryaccountability/SpEdGlance/>, accessed 18 February 2008.
- "Tennessee Disability Coalition News Blog: Advocacy." <http://tndisability.org/news/category/advocacy/>, accessed 18 February 2008.
- Thomson, Dennis F. *Restoring Responsibility: Ethics in Government, Business and Healthcare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- U.S. Department of Education, *A Guide to the Individualized Education Program*. <<http://www.ed.gov/parents/needs/speced/iepguide/index.html#writing>>, accessed 18 February 2008.

Williams, Garrath. "‘Infrastructures of Responsibility’: The Moral Tasks of Institutions." *Journal of Applied Philosophy*. 23(2): 207-221, 2006.

Wolf, Kirk. "Foucault's Ethics of Power." *Auslegung: A Journal of Philosophy*. 25(1): 1-36, 2001.