**HOW THE HEGEMONIC STRUCTURE OF SCHOOL DISCIPLINE
SUPPLIES THE SCHOOL-TO-PRISON PIPELINE**
Natalie Castro Lopez
The University of Texas at Arlington

Abstract

Racial minorities are overrepresented among students in schools who receive disciplinary infractions. Research has not been able to confirm that the discipline is based solely on differences in behavior. Popular disciplinary tactics such as zero-tolerance, suspension/expulsion, differential treatment, and differential processing push students out of educational environments. Students pushed out of school do not learn how to appropriately address their questionable behavior and tend to engage in escalated levels of criminal activity not deemed appropriate by society. This paper explores the possibility that the hegemonic structure of education contributes to the racial disproportion evidenced in the school discipline statistics. This paper explains the school-to-prison pipeline and the concept of hegemony separately. Then, the article explores the components of the concept of hegemony such as dominance, resistance, and manipulation in educational contexts. The idea that subjugated groups typically resist dominant ideology is evidenced in the racial disproportion found in school discipline systems. The negative repercussions of the theoretical underpinnings of hegemony in education impact students of color, historically marginalized communities, and society in general. Accomplishing equity in education by addressing any discriminatory areas within the control of the school is worthwhile in order to disrupt the school-to-prison pipeline and its negative effects on society.

INTRODUCTION

Just as racial minorities are overrepresented in America's prison population, children of color are grossly overrepresented among students receiving office referrals (Rocque, 2010), suspensions (Osher, Bear, Sprague, & Doyle, 2010), expulsions (Skiba, Horner, Chung, Rausch, May, & Tobin, 2011), and other forms of discipline in schools. The similarity of the disproportionate demographics evidenced in both institutions is not merely a coincidence and the term "school-to-prison pipeline" (STPP) has been assigned to the phenomenon (Fenning & Rose, 2007). The abuse and misuse of certain discipline strategies such as zero-tolerance, suspension, and expulsion appear to foster the growth of the pipeline, particularly for Black males (Skiba, Michael, Nardo, & Petrson, 2002). Although removal from school by way of suspension and expulsion has been argued to be ineffective by studies performed by Fenning and Rose (2007), Hoffman (2014), Martinez (2009), and Rocque (2010) based on the amount of recidivism that follows the disciplinary action, educational discipline systems still utilize the punishment. Evidence shows that suspension actually functions as a predictor of future suspensions (Skiba, Arredondo, & Williams, 2014), which can lead to dropout. Students that drop out are eight times as likely as high school graduates to become incarcerated (Christle, Jolivette, & Nelson, 2010). Because removal does not accomplish the desired impact of behavioral correction, exclusionary tactics do not appear to be a valuable form of discipline (Martinez, 2009; Meiners, 2011; Rocque, 2010; Skiba et al., 2011). Moreover, the punitive disciplinary practices seem to be funneling the STPP (Fenning & Rose, 2007; Hoffman, 2014; Martinez, 2009).

The racial composition of students disciplined in schools and prison populations are both largely comprised of people who are of low socioeconomic status and of color (Payne, Rocco, Miller, & Salmon, 2014). In education, the lack of conformity to rules does not fully account for the overrepresentation of low socioeconomic and minority students receiving referrals, suspensions, and expulsions (Raible & Irizarry, 2010). In other words, differential student behavior is not the sole factor contributing to the racial disproportion in school discipline systems (Sullivan, Klingbeil, & Norman, 2013). Differential treatment by authority figures and differential processing within the discipline management systems also contribute to the overrepresentation of minorities receiving discipline in schools (Gregory, Skiba, & Noguera, 2010). The idea that the disproportion may be linked to unfair treatment and processing enabled by the structure of the educational institution can be viewed as a disconcerting possibility. Knowledge about the existence of the issue and the motivation to create just schools serve as the first steps in fixing the problem.

PURPOSE

Research shows that ineffective exclusionary discipline practices (Martinez, 2009), differential treatment (Skiba et al., 2002) and differential processing (Rocque, 2010) push students out of educational environments. Unfortunately, many students that are pushed out may not learn how to appropriately correct their behavior and may not be exposed to nurturing, structured environments that encourage positive change (Noguera, 2003). These students are at risk for more serious, long-term issues because of the lack of appropriate interventions at the preliminary stages (Martinez, 2009; Raible & Irizarry, 2010). Black male students, in particular, are the largest subset of the population by percentage being pushed out of schools (Allen & White-Smith, 2014; Caton, 2012; Fenning & Rose, 2007; Gregory et al., 2010) and into the

STPP. The existence of hegemonic structures in education are contributing to the oppression of the Black male population by utilizing disproportionate discipline practices that funnel the STPP and confounds the existing phenomenon (Dancy, 2014). In order to attempt to disrupt the detrimental pipeline, educators need to be informed about their potential contribution to the pressing issue.

The purpose of this conceptual paper is to expose the power structures enforced by the hegemonic design of schools that reinforce the STPP. This paper will first supply an overview of the STPP and the concept of hegemony. Second, the paper explores the inevitable resistance to hegemony that occurs in educational institutions. Third, the paper explicates how the aforementioned resistance results in disproportion in school discipline funneling the STPP. Fourth, the paper discusses the negative repercussions and implications of the disproportion on education, the Black community, and society. Finally, the paper concludes with recommendations for further research that may be useful in contributing to the exposure of the pipeline, therefore encouraging its demise.

School-to-Prison Pipeline Overview

In order to obtain a firm understanding of the relationship between the hegemonic structure of education and the STPP, an explanation of the pipeline is necessary. The concept of the current STPP is based on a widespread pattern in educational systems of removing students from schools through disciplinary measures, which encourages their entrances into the criminal justice system (Dancy, 2014; Meiners, 2011; Skiba et al., 2014). Regardless of intention, push out is frequently a result of harsh, punitive discipline leading to suspension and expulsion (Tuzzolo & Hewitt, 2007). Students that cannot follow school rules receive punishments that often result in their removal from the institution because of a lack of change in their behavior over time (Christle et al., 2010; Noguera, 2003; Skiba & Peterson, 2000). The removal appears to be for the sake of the other students and their need to focus and learn free of distractions (Noguera, 2003). Although the reasoning undergirding this approach to classroom management may seem appropriate, the application is one of the first steps in the pattern established by the STPP (Christle et al., 2010; Fenning & Rose, 2007; Wilson, 2014).

The disproportionate treatment towards Black males, in particular, in discipline systems in education remains a large contributor to the racial trend present in the pipeline (Allen & White-Smith, 2014; Gregory et al., 2010; Sullivan et al., 2013). The racial issue frequently arises because of the differential treatment and processing the Black male population endures (Skiba et al., 2002). Researchers have explored the racial disproportion from multiple angles in order to determine if differential behavior is the sole factor. Rocque (2010) asserted that discipline is disproportionately utilized beyond basic behavior differences. In other words, the disproportion of Black males cannot be solely attributed to behavioral differences, but can be explained by a difference in the discipline they receive. Rocque examined this idea by analyzing the relationship between office referral write-ups and a variety of explanatory variables. By controlling for school factors, behavior, and individual characteristics, his study showed that Black students are 1.58 times more likely to receive office referrals than their White peers. Rocque highlighted a systemic problem of disproportion in discipline targeted towards a specific racial group.

Sullivan, Klingbeil, and Norman (2013) conducted a similar study of behavior by examining the relationship between the individual, classroom, and school characteristics for student likelihood of suspension through multinomial regression analysis. The researchers found

that Black students are suspended at 3-4 times the rate of their White counterparts for the same behavior, indicating that disproportionality in punishment exists based on race, gender, and socioeconomic status. This study inspected hierarchical aspects of the disproportion within the educational institution.

Nicholson-Crotty, Birchmeier, and Valentine (2009) investigated suspicions about the amount of Black overrepresentation in juvenile justice systems and school discipline. Their study explored the level at which school disciplinary decisions impact the rates of disproportionate minority contact with juvenile courts. The researchers utilized a sample of schools in Missouri and found that racial disproportion in out-of-school suspensions is associated with similar levels of disproportion in juvenile court referrals. This analysis showed a link between school-level violations and further justice system problems for Black youth. The authors were careful to control for differences in delinquent behavior, poverty, urbanization, and other perceived related factors, and therefore, pinpointed an association based on race.

Not only are the differences revealed by these studies overwhelmingly discriminatory, research shows that expulsion (Skiba et al. 2011), suspension (Lee, Cornell, Gregory, & Fan, 2011; Osher et al. 2010), and classification as "special education" (Meiners, 2011) are strong predictors of inevitable future incarceration. In fact, high school dropout statistics are often used to determine how much space is needed for future prison facilities (Giroux, 2009). In addition, members of the Black population are six times more likely to become incarcerated than White counterparts (Wilson, 2014). Nearly one in four young Black male dropouts become incarcerated compared to one in 14 dropouts from other racial groups (Dillon, 2009). Seemingly, many current discipline systems in education that funnel the students out of school are contributing to the carceral nature of American society (Meiners, 2011; Skiba et al., 2014; Wilson, 2014). The disproportion in discipline leading particular groups down a bleak path towards a solemnly disappointing future may stem from the hegemonic structure of educational institutions (Dancy, 2014). In order to establish the link between the STPP and the power structures in schools, an overview of the concept of hegemony is necessary.

Hegemony Overview

Antonio Gramsci perfected the concept of hegemony in critiquing the existing Marxist notion of a "superstructure" society (Bates, 1975; Woolcock 1985). A superstructure is the culture, institutions, power formations, and rituals established by the base of human society, which are influenced by forces of economic production. Gramsci responded to the Marxist concept with his creation of the "historical bloc," a recognition that the base of society and the superstructure work together in a symbiotic fashion (Bates, 1975; Buckel & Fischer, 2009; Woolcock 1985). Two main components comprise the "historical bloc" structure. First, "civil society" is the private aspect of the structure composed of churches, educational institutions, clubs, and media (Bates, 1975). These are the cultural, intellectual pieces. Second, "political society" is the public aspect composed of the government, military, police, and judicial system (Woolcock, 1985). These are affected by economic influences. While acknowledging the separate components, Gramsci also highlighted their reciprocal relationship, which comprises the overall structure of society.

Although Gramsci made a distinction between the two aspects of the "superstructure," he clarified that they are not mutually exclusive elements (Litowitz, 2000). In order for hegemonic ideals to thrive, the dominant social group must utilize both components (Woolcock, 1985). If

private power is denied, then public force must be exercised to insure that supremacy is preserved and vice versa (Litowitz, 2000). For example, when lower class citizens resist "civil", educational means of the dominant ideology, the state exercises "political", police forms of incarceration and abuse to reaffirm power over the resistors. By exploiting the relationship between the two societies, the domineering social classes maintain control (Woolcock, 1985). The accepted principles of the dominant group become widespread because they disseminate through both aspects (Buckel & Fischer-Lescano, 2009).

Hegemony in Education

Once the dominant group's beliefs are engrained in both private and public aspects of society, they begin to be viewed as common sense (Krancberg, 1986). This process does not occur with flippancy, but with manipulation and strategy (Litowitz, 2000). Members of society live and teach the dominant principles without explicit cognition. Because multiple institutions proliferate hegemonic principles, members of society do not generally question the issues (Litowitz, 2000). The lower classes accept their social role and consent to the rules enforced by everyday institutions (Bates, 1975; Giroux, 1981; Krancberg, 1986; Woolcock 1985). Hegemony is, therefore, achieved through establishment of an organic link between civil and political societies (Woolcock, 1985).

In order for the integral connection between the components of the societies to occur, utilizing the structure of a public organization becomes necessary for the relationship to appear natural (Litowitz, 2000). Although schools are components of the "civil society", educational establishments become the key institution to solidify the link between the two components and proliferate the dispersal of the perspectives of the dominant ideology (Bates, 1975). Teachers are considered the agents within the link between the two aristocracies (Giroux, 1981). Whether teachers are cognizant of their role in the hegemonic superstructure or not, they are responsible for distributing and encouraging the agenda of the dominant ideology through the school curriculum, classroom instruction, and discipline management (Giroux, 1988). Through education, the elite can produce and promote ideologies that justify their position by making their beliefs seem general (McDonald & Coleman, 1999).

Once the general hegemonic ideology reaches the younger generations, it becomes present in their habits, experiences, and beliefs. The ideology becomes so deeply ingrained that the individual loses the ability to separate dominant hegemonic tenets from his/her own beliefs (Buckel & Fischer-Lescano, 2009). Hegemony permeates all aspects of a society, starting with children, and it reproduces itself continuously in the societal structure (Bates, 1975). Education serves as one of the primary institutions utilized in accomplishing the compliance of the next generation with the status quo principles of the dominant class (Bates, 1975; Buckel & Fischer-Lescano, 2009; Giroux, 1981; Krancberg, 1986).

Agents in Hegemonic Structure of Education

The hierarchical structure of education creates a platform for resistance to dominant ideologies to originate at every level. The classroom is a primary location where disciplinary issues occur because of student altercations with teachers, with whom they have the most interaction (Payne et al., 2014; Raible & Irizarry, 2010). Some of the miscommunication between students and teachers can be attributed to the concept of cultural mismatch (Ladson-

Billings, 1999; Skiba et al., 2011). Teachers are predominantly White, suburban, middle class women, but the student populations display more diversity (Raible & Irizarry, 2010). Dissonance in racial and ethnic composition between students and teachers is not a problem in and of itself, however diversity has the potential to create issues if the associated cultures are misunderstood (Rocque, 2010). Cultural mismatch may lead to possible tension in the classroom, creating an avenue for disciplinary actions to ensue.

Culture mismatch does not have to equate to a cultural clash, resulting in misbehavior and discipline. Education regarding differences in culture, race, and ethnicity has the power to halt some of the unnecessary angst resulting from diversity (Ladson-Billings, 1999). Teacher preparation programs, however, do not necessarily address culture and prepare pre-service teachers for the differences in views, beliefs, or priorities of their students (Raible & Irizarry, 2010). Instead of educating on diversity, a popular strategy recommended for teachers is colorblindness (Allen & White-Smith, 2014). Colorblind techniques entail not recognizing the different races of students, so as to create a universal view towards all. The misunderstandings created by eschewing cultural diversity are prospective predictors of negative behavior in the classroom, resulting in disproportion in discipline (Allen & White-Smith, 2014; Dancy, 2014; Ladson-Billings, 1999; Raible & Irizarry, 2010; Rocque, 2010; Skiba et al., 2002; Skiba et al., 2011).

The classroom may be the area where disciplinary issues originate, but the assignment of punishment for bad behavior occurs at the next level of the educational system. Administrators maintain power when it comes to reprimanding students who are breaking rules, misbehaving, or acting out. Many discipline management systems give administrators room for subjectivity (Skiba et al., 2002). This approach assumes that the administrator can determine the best means of discipline for each student based on the situation and the student's unique circumstances. The problem with this strategy is that without objectivity, personal bias is bound to emerge (Caton, 2012). As agents in the hegemonic structure, administrators are merely reflections of the hegemonized norms and, in turn, manifest social expectations through their role as intellectuals (Giroux, 1981). Administrators, however, inadvertently reinforce the ideologies of dominant powers because of the hegemonic structure of the discipline system in education, contributing to the disproportion in discipline (Rocque, 2010).

Hegemonic Design of Schools

In addition to teachers and administrators, the level of school discipline and the institutional policies contribute to racial disproportion in discipline by way of the hegemonic design (Christle et al., 2010). Inner city schools have harsher punishments for minimal issues because those institutions have larger minority populations in attendance (Noguera, 2003). Metal detectors, surveillance, and considerable police presence creates an environment that projects the belief that schools are not safe (Meiners, 2011) and that students are not trustworthy (Price, 2009). The school atmosphere in urban areas inadvertently exacerbates the previously established mistrust of authority that some minority students may already harness (Allen & White-Smith, 2014). Schools in areas that have a large minority presence utilize hegemonic practices of policing and suppressing populations that have a history of nonconformity with dominant beliefs (Dancy, 2014). The school discipline policies that call for punishment with flippancy and the patrolling police force that reprimands with ease reify the hegemonic tactics of

stifling potential resistance (Allen & White-Smith, 2014; Caton, 2012; Christle et al., 2010; Meiners, 2011; Noguera, 2003).

The most general level of hegemony in education comes from the influence of the government, which provides partial funding and approval for operations (Martinez, 2009). In order to reach the masses in content and curriculum, testing standards take priority over restorative forms of discipline that may properly address issues with a disturbed student (Raible & Irizarry, 2010). Because of requirements to meet national standards, the "bad apple theory" to remove bad students that may poison the whole classroom takes precedence over interventions, mentoring, or proactive approaches to discipline (Noguera, 2003). When "bad" children are removed because they are viewed as a distraction, they lose instructional time, academic reinforcement, and participation in a structured environment (Fenning & Rose, 2007). The likelihood of failing a course increases as seat time decreases (Gregory et al., 2010). The consequences of prioritizing federal standards seem to negatively impact troubled students.

The structure of education and the actors within the institutions seem to contribute to the imbalance in discipline of students based on race and socioeconomic class (Allen & White-Smith, 2014; Caton, 2012; Christle et al., 2010; Dancy, 2011; Rocque, 2010). Whether the behaviors of those in control are intentional or inadvertent, the discipline structure and policy designs appear to coercively push students out of environments they need to eradicate their negative behavior into settings that are detrimental to their lives and future (Dancy, 2014; Noguera, 2003). The resistance displayed towards the institutions and those in authority positions also play a part in the prolonged existence of the STPP.

Resistance to Hegemony

Hegemony is an effective means of spreading the dominant ideology because it is layered throughout all societal institutions (Bates, 1975; Buckel & Fischer, 2009; Woolcock 1985). When the masses resist the adoption of the dominant ideology through manipulation, then the elite group resorts to the utilization of force as exerted by the programs of the state, which reduces resistance (Buckel & Fischer-Lescano, 2009). When defiance does arise, it is usually ineffective because the efforts are unorganized, individual, and scattered (Litowitz, 2000). Resistance produces similar results as compliance in that the dominant culture remains suppressive and in control.

Hegemony imposes the influences of the powerful elite on multiple groups within the lower social class strata (Krancberg, 1986). Black cultures, in particular, have to counter the Anglo-hegemony that is prevalent in the United States (Gordon, 1993). Questions about dominant, Eurocentric ideologies continually arise in educational institutions because issues of race are ignored in academic and literary circles (Caton, 2012; Rocque, 2010). The contribution of Black work to educational and literary institutions poses a threat to the current hegemonic ideals because it is antithetical to interests of the social hierarchy and is therefore marginalized (Gordon, 1993). Marginalization of an existing alternate belief system is a common tool in hegemonic societies.

Suppression of Black culture occurs in educational institutions, in particular, in order to reaffirm the existing dominant principles (Allen & White-Smith, 2014; Dancy, 2014; Merelman, 1993). The subordination of members of the Black community has led to the creation of a subculture in schools that combines subjection and resistance to White dominance (Merelman, 1993). Dominant groups view the values, beliefs, and behaviors of the Black subgroup within the

lower social class category with an "otherness" that is believed to be deviant and defiant (Allen & White-Smith, 2014; Dancy 2014; Rocque 2010). Although White hegemonic principles are typically universal and widespread in schools, Black students do not necessarily respond to and adopt those ideas (Rocque & Paternoster, 2011). Since teachers act as organic intellectuals in the hegemonic structure, they have the responsibility of spreading the dominant agenda by incorporating the themes in their classroom (Bates, 1975, Buckel & Fischer, 2009; Woolcock 1985). That agenda does not resonate with all students, especially Black students who may not willfully accept the beliefs of White dominance (Rocque & Paternoster, 2011). The rejection of the ideals, fueled by the anger regarding the oppressive marginalization, sets the stage for resistance.

Students of color encounter and resist hegemonic practices in schools typically in two ways: disengagement and defiance (Miron & Lauria, 1998). If a student senses feelings of racial hostility by educators, he/she tends to shut down, disengage, and refuses to perform academically (Rocque & Paternoster, 2011). Some students may even experience feelings of internalized oppression, which lowers self-esteem in an individual caused by the acceptance of an external, negative opinion towards the individual (McDonald & Coleman, 1999). Just as students conform when they feel comfortable in a nurturing environment, they resist institutions when they do not feel acceptance (Miron & Lauria, 1998). Educators and principals may then respond to the resistance by using harsh, disciplinary measures (Rocque & Paternoster, 2011). Rocque and Paternoster (2011) clarify how resistance to hegemony results in a disproportion of discipline towards racial groups:

> Both because minority students are less likely to buy into a predominantly White school culture with its emphasis on academic achievement and at least the appearance of docility (due to their own cultural values that emphasize detachment and aloofness) and because teachers are likely to believe that minority youth do not buy into White school culture (because of stereotypes), teachers in schools are more likely to resort to formal punishment against minority children than against their White counterparts. (pp. 636 - 637)

In other words, because students of color recognize the deficit perspective with which some educators view them and acknowledge their decreased likelihood of success in White hegemonic institutions, they accept their subservient role and adopt lackadaisical attitudes towards the required curriculum. Although they have to be present at school due to national expectations, they do not have to willingly behave (Merelman, 1993). Discipline in schools exists for valid reasons, however, and is not solely the effect of student resistance to hegemony. Although a multitude of problems create the need for school discipline (Knoff, 1984), those reasons can be researched at a later time. Resistance to the hegemonic structures of schools partially contributes to the disproportion of discipline on Black students (Allen & White-Smith, 2014; Dancy, 2014; Merelman, 1993; Rocque & Paternoster, 2011), which further funnels the population into the STPP.

Resistance and school discipline

Educational efforts focused on protecting the youth of America develops quickly after major national events, such as "9-11" and Columbine (Irby, 2013). The federal influence on

discipline through policies like the Guns Free School Act of 1994 aims to make a statement about zero tolerance towards school violence, which requires more punitive reaction to issues involving weapons (Hoffman, 2014; Irby, 2013; Martinez, 2009). The castigatory practice of the policy transforms over time, encouraging the implementation of harsh disciplinary measures for a multitude of other infractions including fighting, defiance, and alcohol/drug possession (Hoffman, 2014). The original retributive nature of discipline targeted at serious issues involving weapons changes shape by encompassing other factors, and thereby, loses efficacy.

The deepening of school discipline policies seems to overshadow the importance of educating children for the sake of protecting them (Irby, 2013; Raible & Irizarry, 2010). Once removed from school, a student is missing out on the educational opportunities and exposure to a nurturing environment that could potentially model examples of structure and appropriate behavioral interactions (Fenning & Rose, 2007). The loss of academic instruction and exposure to the contents of the curriculum set the student back and create a larger academic challenge when the student eventually does return to the classroom (Sullivan et al., 2013). The feeling of isolation paired with an inadequate academic perspective due to loss of instruction time may contribute to further discipline problems for the removed students, which results in more removal (Noguera, 2003). Students of color and those of low socioeconomic status tend to be the largest group in the removal category, and tragically, decreased seat time for these students only furthers existing achievement discrepancies (Skiba et al., 2014). Deepening of discipline in the form of removal seems to create a paradox with original educational intentions.

Because various conduct problems can lead to suspension, the disciplinary tactic has lost its influence as an effective punishment. Studies have shown that removal from school does not correct behavior (Skiba et al., 2014). Nicholson-Crotty, Birchmeier, & Valentine (2009) explain how removal usually exacerbates disciplinary issues through a concept entitled the "labeling theory." The theory posits that once a student begins to display inappropriate behavior, he/she becomes aware of the negative perceptions that peers and teachers develop about his/her behavior. The perceptions of those around the troubled student towards the disciplinary issues isolate the troubled student further, which predicates a decline in their behavior (Fenning & Rose, 2007). The "labeling theory" enables a self-fulfilling prophecy to develop since the student responds to external, negative perceptions (Nicholson-Crotty, Birchmeier, & Valentine, 2009; Noguera, 2003). The "labeling theory" and exclusionary forms of discipline, both indirectly and directly, contribute to the growing population in the STPP (Fenning & Rose, 2007).

Suspension and removal do not seem to curtail behavior (Martinez, 2009), have negative effects on students (Sullivan et al., 2013), and typically result in recidivism (Skiba et al., 2014). Not only is suspension a predictor of future suspensions, but also, Black students have 4 times increased likelihood for receiving suspensions (Sullivan et al., 2013). Sixty-one percent of students in the juvenile justice system start with suspension/expulsion from their academic institutions and dropouts are eight times more likely to be incarcerated than high school graduates (Skiba et al., 2014). The deepening of harsh discipline policies and the resulting recidivism results in a push out of the Black male population, in particular (Gregory et al., 2010; Skiba et al., 2002; Sullivan et al., 2013). Since schools continue to utilize ineffective forms of discipline that are detrimental to certain subgroups of the student body, the STPP and the racial disproportion within the pipeline continues to grow (Allen & White-Smith, 2014; Hoffman, 2014; Meiners, 2011; Noguera, 2003; Skiba et al., 2014; Sullivan et al., 2013; Wilson, 2014).

Repercussions and Implications

The detrimental aspects of hegemony, which contribute to the STPP (Dancy, 2014), exist throughout the educational system (Bates, 1975; Buckel & Fischer-Lescano, 2009; Giroux, 1981; Krancberg, 1986). The dominant ideology permeates the curriculum deemed appropriate by educational officials (Skiba & Peterson, 2003), the permitted school policies reinforced by classroom teachers (Raible & Irizarry, 2010), and the discipline management carried out by administrators (Allen & White-Smith, 2014). The resistance to the hegemonic principles that erupts occasionally appears to be handled differentially based on race and socioeconomic status (Dancy, 2014). The disproportion that results from the differential treatment and processing creates negative repercussions for multiple groups in society.

To begin with, the hegemonic structure that encourages punitive disciplinary practices has negative backlash for children because of the funnel it creates into the STPP (Buckel & Fischer-Lescano, 2009; Dancy, 2014). Without an education, students are less likely to obtain jobs that provide a financial safety net for their future families (Noguera, 2003). Without success in academic environments, students are more likely to continue to engage in behavior that is punished at a larger level in society, resulting in jail time (Rocque & Paternoster, 2011). The future for students projected to enter the STPP is bleak. Fair and equitable education for all students is the goal of our nation's schools and the STPP directly contradicts that mission (Allen & White-Smith, 2014; Noguera, 2003; Raible & Irizarry, 2010; Skiba et al., 2014).

In addition, the results of punitive practices that feed the pipeline are ineffective in the classroom (Martinez, 2009). When students misbehave, teachers understandably react by removing the distraction from the classroom so balance can be restored and delivery of instruction to the majority of compliant students can proceed (Payne et al., 2014). Because the teacher sees value in educating the masses, he/she will remove the disruptive student who does not see value in the educational lessons from the classroom for disciplinary punishment (Skiba & Peterson, 2003). The teacher has inadvertently placed priority on the dominant ideology of acceptable curricular material over the education of the challenging student (Raible & Irizarry, 2010). Since students of color tend to have issues with acceptance of the hegemonic ideology, they are flagged as problem students and are punished for not adhering to societally accepted norms of student behavior (Caton, 2012). However, many teacher experiences with removal indicate that once the problem student is removed, there is another student ready to take on the role as the disciplinary problem and creates new distractions (Noguera, 2003). If forms of punishment are not working and have negative results for the student body, revision of the disciplinary approach seems necessary to assist the teacher in becoming an effective instructional leader.

Lastly, the pipeline is detrimental to our society (Dancy, 2014; Irby, 2013; Meiners, 2011; Noguera, 2003; Skiba et al., 2014; Wilson, 2014). The United States constitutes 5% of the world's population, but the nation is accountable for a startling 25% of the world's prison population (Meiners, 2011; Wilson, 2014). The underlying issue regarding the prison percentage exists in the evidence that shows that of the 2 million children that have at least one incarcerated parent, those children are more than 5 times as likely to end up in prison themselves (Wilson, 2014). This relationship displays evidence that the home environment of children with an incarcerated parent has future implications for their own well-being. How can someone make a positive contribution to society from a jail cell? Educational institutions need to focus on

preventing any factors that the school can alleviate, control, or prevent that encourage dropout and future criminal involvement for students.

CONCLUSION

Hegemonic disciplinary practices in our educational institutions are marginalizing and oppressing the young Black male population by funneling them into the STPP (Dancy; Fenning & Rose, 2007; Hoffman, 2014; Rocque, 2010). Without education, these young men are at a severe disadvantage in building a bright future and making a positive contribution to society (Noguera, 2003; Rocque & Paternoster, 2011; Wilson, 2014). Informing educators of the existence of the pipeline, the racial disproportion within the path, ineffective disciplinary approaches, their inadvertent contribution to the disproportion, and possibilities for change can potentially pave the way to equity in discipline and education. Further research can focus on examining appropriate interventions for troubled youth, restorative forms of discipline that have the potential to disrupt the existing STPP, and successful measures that educate practitioners in teacher and administrator preparation programs about equitable disciplinary practices.

REFERENCES

Allen, Q., & White-Smith, K. A. (2014). "Just as bad as prisons": The challenge of dismantling the school-to-prison pipeline through teacher and community education. *Equity and Excellence in Education , 47* (4), 445-460.

Bates, T. R. (1975). Gramsci and the theory of hegemony. *Journal of the History of Ideas* , 351-366.

Buckel, S., & Fischer-Lescano, A. (2009). Gramsci reconsidered; hegemony in global law. *Leiden Journal of International Law , 22* (3), 437-454.

Caton, M. T. (2012). Black male perspectives on their educational experiences in high school. *Urban Education , 47* (6), 1055-1085.

Christle, C. A., Jolivette, K., & Nelson, C. M. (2010). Breaking the school to prison pipeline: Identifying school risk and protective factors for youth delinquency. *Exceptionality: A Special Education Journal , 13* (2), 69-88.

Dancy, T. E. (2014). (Un)Doing hegemony in education: Disrupting school-to-prison pipelines for Black Males. *Equity and Excellence in Education , 47* (4), 476-493.

Dillon, S. (2009, Oct 8). *Study finds high rate of imprisonment among dropouts.* Retrieved May 10, 2015, from The New York Times: http://www.nytimes.com/2009/10/09/education/09dropout.html?_r=1&

Fenning, P., & Rose, J. (2007). Overrepresentation of african american students in exclusionary discipline the role of school policy. *Urban Education* , 536-559.

Giroux, H. A. (1981). Hegemony, resistance, and the paradox of educational reform. *Interchange*, 3-26.

Giroux, H. A. (2009). *Youth in a suspect society: Democracy or disposability?* New York, New York: Palgrave McMillan.

Gordon, B. M. (1993). African American cultural knowledge and liberatory education: Dilemmas, problems, and potentials in a postmodern American society.*Urban Education,* 448-470.

Gregory, A., Skiba, R., & Noguera, P. A. (2010). The achievement gap and the discipline gap: Two sides of the same coin? *American Educational Research Association , 39* (1), 59-68.

Hoffman, S. (2014). Zero Benefit: Estimating the Effect of Zero Tolerance Discipline Policies on Racial Disparities in School Discipline. *Educational Policy* , 69-95.

Irby, D. J. (2013). Net-deepening of school discipline. *Urban Review* , 197-219.

Knoff, H. M. (1984). Conceptualizing discipline: a school psychologist's perspective. *NASSP Bulletin* , 80-85.

Krancberg, S. (1986). Common sense and philosophy in Gramsci's "prison notebooks". *Studies in Soviet Thought* , 163-181.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1999). Preparing teachers for diverse student populations: A critical race theory perspective. *Review of Research in Education , 24* (1), 211-247.

Litowitz, D. (2000). Gramsci, hegemony, and the law. *Brigham Young University Law Review* , 515-551.

Martinez, S. (2009). A system gone berserk: How are zero-tolerance policies really affecting school? *Preventing School Failure , 53* (3), 153-159.

McDonald, P., & Coleman, M. (1999). Deconstructing hierarchies of oppression and adopting a 'multiple model' approach to anti-oppressive practice. *Social Work Education* , 19-33.

Meiners, E. (2011). Ending the school-to-prison pipeline/Building abolition futures. *Urban Review , 43* (1), 547-566.

Merelman, R. M. (1993). Black history and cultural empowerment: A case study. *American Journal of Education* , 331-358.

Miron, L. F., & Lauria, M. (1998). Student voice as agency: Resistance and accomodation in inner-city schools. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* , 189-213.

Nicholson-Crotty, S., Birchmeier, Z., & Valentine, D. (2009). Exploring the Impact of School Discipline on Racial Disproportion in the Juvenile Justice System. *Social Science Quarterly* , 1003-1018.

Noguera, P. A. (2003). Schools, prisons, and social implications of punishment: Rethinking disciplinary practices . *Theory Into Practice , 42* (4), 341-350.

Osher, D., Bear, G. G., Sprague, J. R., & Doyle, W. (2010). How can we improve school discipline? *Educational Researcher , 39* (1), 48-58.

Payne, D. M., Rocco, T. S., Miller, L. D., & Salmon, A. K. (2014). How teachers use power in the classroom to avoid or support exclusionary school disciplinary practices. *Urban Education* , 297-328.

Raible, J., & Irizarry, J. G. (2010). Redirecting the teacher's gaze: Teacher education, youth surveilance and the school-to-prison pipeline. *Teaching and Teacher Education , 26* (1), 1196-1203.

Rocque, M. (2010). Office discipline and student behavior: Does race matter? *American Journal of Education , 116* (4), 557-581.

Rocque, M., & Paternoster, R. (2011). Understanding the antecedents of the "school-to-jail" link: the relationship between race and school discipline. *Journal of Criminal Law and Crimonology* , 633-665.

Saltman, K. J. (1969). *The politics of education.* Colorado: Paradigm Publishers.

Skiba, R. J., Arredondo, M. I., & Williams, N. T. (2014). More than a metaphor: The contribution of exclusionary discipline to a school-to-prison pipeline. *Equity and Excellence in Education , 47* (4), 546-564.

Skiba, R. J., Horner, R. H., Chung, C.-G., Rausch, M. K., May, S. L., & Tobin, T. (2011). Race is not neutral: A national investigation of African American and Latino disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Review , 40* (1), 85-107.

Skiba, R. J., Michael, R. S., Nardo, A. C., & Petrson, R. L. (2002). The color of discipline: Sources of racial and gender disproportionality in school punishment. *Urban Review , 34* (4), 317-342.

Skiba, R., & Peterson, R. L. (2000). School discipline at a crossroads: From zero tolerance to early response. *Exceptional Children , 66* (3), 335-347.

Skiba, R., & Peterson, R. (2003). Teaching the social curriculum: school discipline. *Preventing School Failure* , 66-72.

Sullivan, A. L., Klingbeil, D. A., & Norman, E. R. (2013). Beyond behavior: Multilevel analysis of the influence of sociodemographics and school characteristics on students' risk of suspension. *School Psychology Review , 42* (1), 99-114.

Tuzzolo, E., & Hewitt, D. T. (2007). The re-emergence of the school-to-prison pipeline in New Orleans. *The High School Journal , 90* (2), 59-68.

Wilson, H. (2014). Turning off the school-to-prison pipeline. *Reclaiming Children and Youth , 23* (1), 49-53.

Woolcock, J. A. (1985). Politics, ideology, and hegemony in Gramsci's theory. *Social and Economic Studies* , 199-210.

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHY

Natalie Castro Lopez is a secondary mathematics teacher at Trinity High School in Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District. She received her B.A from the University of Texas at Austin and her M. Ed from the University of Texas at Arlington. Natalie has been a classroom teacher for ten years and received HEB's Different by Design Award for excellence in teaching AP Statistics each year for the past four years. Natalie is currently pursuing her doctoral degree from the University of Texas at Arlington and her research interests include educational approaches that equitably address disparities affecting historically marginalized populations.

PREFERRED CITATION

Lopez, N.C. (2015). How the hegemonic structure of school discipline supplies the school to-prison pipeline. *Journal of Ethical Educational Leadership, 2*(5), 1-14. **Retrieved from: http://www.cojeel.org.**

JEEL

www.cojeel.org

The views expressed in this publication are not necessarily those of *JEEL's* Editorial staff.

JEEL is a free, open-access online journal.

Copyright ©2015 (*ISSN 2377-4975*)