

ART ENTREPRENEURSHIP AFTERSCHOOL:
PROVIDING MARGINALIZED YOUTH TOOLKITS FOR SUCCESS

BY

SARA CAROLYN MACKUS

THESIS

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts in Art Education
in the Graduate College of the
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2011

Urbana, Illinois

Adviser:

Professor Elizabeth Delacruz

ABSTRACT

The following paper argues for arts-based afterschool programming that focuses on the creation of highly crafted objects and entrepreneurial behaviors. The researcher's interests in this topic stem from a life-changing experience as an art director at a non-profit leadership camp. From this experience, questions and hypotheses have risen about the value of art lessons in contemporary society, and the researcher has assembled a compilation of studies and theories to further inform these questions. Research in the fields of art education, entrepreneurial education, afterschool programming, self-efficacy, and cultural capital provide grounding and applications for the lessons learned at the leadership camp.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 — INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2 — MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE WITH OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH DEVELOPMENT	2
2.1 Responsibilities and Class Structures	4
2.2 Struggles within the Afternoon Classes	5
2.3 A Breakthrough Lesson	7
2.4 Changing the Curriculum	8
2.5 Concerns of Values	10
2.6 Returning with Experience	11
2.7 Questions and Suppositions	12
CHAPTER 3 — THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAMMING	14
3.1 A Brief History of the Evolution of Afterschool Programming	16
3.2 Research on Afterschool Programming	19
CHAPTER 4 — CULTURAL CAPITAL FOR MAINSTREAM SUCCESS	21
4.1 Evolving from "Culture of Poverty Theory" to Cultural Toolkits	21
4.2 Non-Dominant Cultural Capital	23
CHAPTER 5 — SELF-EFFICACY	25
5.1 Separating Self-Efficacy from Similar Constructs	26
5.2 Self-Efficacy as a Cultural Tool	27
5.3 Self-Efficacy Beliefs About What?	28
CHAPTER 6 — ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN EDUCATION AND YOUTH CULTURE	31
6.1 Entrepreneurial Education Within Art Education	35
6.2 Examples of Entrepreneurial Out-of-School Art Programs	37
6.3 Artists for Humanity	38
6.4 Little Black Pearl	39

6.5 YouthARTS	41
CHAPTER 7 — APPLICABLE LESSONS AND CONNECTIONS TO MY OWN EXPERIENCES	43
7.1 Participant Control	43
7.2 Mentor Collaboration and Professional Ways of Working.....	45
7.3 Real-World Value	45
CHAPTER 8 — CONCLUSION.....	47
REFERENCES	48

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The following paper argues for arts-based afterschool programming that focuses on the development of entrepreneurial behaviors and beliefs. My interests in this topic stem from a life-changing experience as an art director at a non-profit leadership camp. At this camp, I worked teaching art to a population of high-poverty youth that had been specifically selected for their leadership qualities. I worked with young people ranging between the ages of 9 and 18, and found myself struggling to justify my art lessons as these bright participants questioned the purpose of these projects. From this experience, certain questions have lingered with me about the value of art lessons in contemporary society, particularly for urban youth with disadvantaged backgrounds. To answer these questions, I have looked at the structures and goals of other out-of-school programs that use the arts as a means of empowerment and youth professional development. This paper documents the connections I have drawn between my own experiences and my research in the fields of art education, entrepreneurial education, afterschool programming, self-efficacy, and cultural capital.

CHAPTER 2

MY PERSONAL EXPERIENCE WITH OUT-OF-SCHOOL YOUTH DEVELOPMENT

A couple winters ago I was an undergraduate student entering my student teaching semester, already planning on attending graduate school the following fall semester. I had a small dilemma at the time, in that I was looking for a job to fill in the summer between my graduation and graduate school. It was important to me that this summer job give me some relevant teaching experience and I searched the Internet for possible seasonal teaching positions. A friend recommended that I teach art at a summer camp, which I was not particularly interested in, having been to summer camps myself as a child, and remembering the silly crafts activities offered. Despite my initial reservation, I browsed various web databases, finding the repetitive phrase, "arts and crafts teacher," something I refused to apply to. As I pretentiously perused the listings, I came across a listing that spoke to me.

The camp that caught my eye also requested an "arts and crafts" teacher, but the situation was different from my previous encounters with camp art. The overall camp mission was not to provide suburban middle class children with a special summer vacation experience, like a majority of the camps I had surveyed. Instead, this was a non-profit organization working with underprivileged youth to provide leadership training. All the participants were required to qualify for free or reduced lunch, meaning they were all living in homes with incomes below the poverty line.

The mission captivated me. The program recruited children at the age of 7 and enrolled them in a free 10-year leadership program with the incentive that if they met the yearly school and behavior requirements they could go to camp each summer. The participants were

intentionally chosen to be 45% from the north side of Milwaukee, 45% from the south side, and 10% from small rural towns. This meant that the demographics of the camp were roughly 45% African American, 45% Latino/Latina, and 10% white, deliberately mixing youth from different backgrounds that otherwise may never have met.

The final, and possibly most significant, aspect of the mission to me was the core beliefs taught to the children. The organization worked hard to instill a series of worldviews that would inform positive life decisions, interactions, and self-evaluation. Children were taught to perceive themselves and others as equal, valuable, and members of a greater community and were entrusted to take ownership of their mistakes and personal reactions to adversity. All lessons, discussions, and games aimed to teach or reference these beliefs in some fashion.

I was completely enthralled. I instantly felt a connection with this organization and its mission. I applied to other camps, but somewhat half-heartedly. I had already made my decision that this was what I wanted. Where this connection came from, I have yet to find an explanation. I have always been exceptionally determined and goal oriented, and this was a detour from what I had planned for my future. My life trajectory, until that point, had been to attend graduate school, work at a rich suburban high school, teach at a community college while teaching high school, get my PHD and eventually become a well-published professor at a competitive university. Working with mostly elementary and middle school students at a summer camp did not have the same competitive edge as working at a fine arts camp for high school students, but the appeal of the mission was enough to stray me away from the logical path to achieving my goals.

2.1 Responsibilities and Class Structures

Working at the camp was like working in a utopia. I was in charge of all my programming, with a relatively large budget considering I was working for a non-profit. There were approximately four hundred students coming for the summer and I had a budget of one thousand dollars. I was in charge of all art activities, special weekend events, and I oversaw the curriculum of classes in performance arts, including spoken word, dance, and drama.

My main responsibility was running morning and afternoon art classes. The morning classes were the easiest. Students signed up to take the classes they desired, and classes met for three days each, one hour per day. Because there was a sign up, all the students wanted to be there, and the majority had artistic tendencies. Additionally, each class had three hours total to complete their projects, which allotted plenty of time for participants to explore a variety of multiple-step, complex projects. These classes worked with wire, fabrics, clay, paper arts, book-making, printing, and mosaics. Products were refined, the participants were engaged, and objectives were generally achieved. The most well received projects employed a different artistic process each of the three days. An example of this was book making. Day one was making homemade paper. Day two was binding the dry paper into book forms. Day three was creating stamps and printing the stamps onto the covers of the books. Even in situations where there was a different activity each day, one hour was too long for a single activity. It was important that each hour remained a series of events with different quick activities to break up the time. In situations where an activity grew too long, students often gave up after a certain point, regardless of the level of completion, and restlessly waited for class to be over. Luckily, this was a rare occurrence in morning classes.

The afternoon classes were a different story completely. In the afternoon, all participants between the ages of 9 and 14 were signed up by their counselors to take one hour of art. They came grouped by gender and age, so that a group of 9 year old boys would come for an hour, and then a group of 12-year-old girls, etcetera.

2.2 Struggles within the Afternoon Classes

There were three main struggles with the afternoon classes: the short time limit, low participant interest in the arts, and the class location. These three circumstances worked together to make afternoon art classes an entirely different atmosphere than the highly engaged morning classes.

The problem with having art for a single hour is that it made the participants aware of the project's limitations. The participants were well aware that a single hour is not enough time to do anything well. The projects were often small in scale, limited in the amount of materials, and lacked a finished quality. My examples and explanations were visually and conceptually underwhelming to the participants. I found myself explaining the project, and having at least one participant ask: "And then what?" to which I could only respond, "Well actually, that's all we have time for". The consequences of these shorter projects were a large percentage of the participants quitting early because the process and the end product were not exciting enough to entice motivation.

Even with adjustments to projects to improve engagement, I faced a second struggle: a high percentage of students wanted absolutely nothing to do with art. These students were significantly greater in number than I would have ever expected, and they were also very stubborn. At some point in life, these students learned and internalized one or more of these three

ideas: they lacked artistic skills and were incapable of making anything of value, art was for girls and freaks only, or art was like school and school was boring. These ideas were most prolific amongst boys, and the ideas became more dominant with increased age.

One group who was nearly exempt from the ideas, was the nine to eleven year old girls. Regardless of the project and materials, nine to eleven year old girls found all art fun, cool, and rewarding. The classes with this group usually went smoothly with everyone enjoying the activity.

This was not the case for other groups. With the nine to eleven year old boys, it was common for the boys to sit and complain that they wanted to be playing sports or be in the pool. Many times they would not participate at all in the activity, or they would speed through the process with little attachment to what they were doing, in hopes of finishing early and leaving.

Middle school aged girls were usually a toss-up. Sometimes there would be a group that was entirely into art and remained engaged the entire time. Sometimes the class was only fifty percent engaged. Occasionally the group had a high level of peer pressure provoking them to reject any participation. Often the deciding factor for these girls was the level of difficulty of the project, and the perceived value of the final product. If a project was perceived to require artistic talent, such as any form of drawing, girls quickly shut down and refused to try. If the final product had little utility to the girls when finished, the project was deemed stupid and usually no one would try it. Projects that were most successful with this age group were basic weaving, sewing pillows, and projects that allowed some form of tracing. Quickly the projects for this age group became traditional gendered crafts, something that I was not proud of.

The toughest group by far was the middle school boys. Most of the time their counselors avoided signing them up for art because of the serious lack of interest and participation. These boys were too cool for whatever project or materials that were out, and seemingly too masculine to be caught making anything.

The final struggle I faced in my afternoon classes, and to a lesser extent in my morning classes, was the physical location of my class. I had my own closet and covered porch with picnic tables designated for art only. It was a great set-up, except for one major problem: on three sides I was surrounded by athletics. On the left, twenty feet away, was the pool, constantly filled with screaming and giggling children enjoying cool water on warm days. Directly in front of the porch was the soccer field, usually occupied with groups playing soccer, ultimate Frisbee, or a water war (soccer and ultimate Frisbee were the second and third most popular sports). The most popular, of course, was basketball, and the basketball courts were on the right of my porch, approximately thirty feet away. Always at the art porch, where students have to sit at picnic tables and "work", they could hear laughing, screaming, and splashing from all three sides.

2.3 A Breakthrough Lesson

It wasn't until the my third week that I discovered a solution to the lack of interest from boys in my afternoon classes. I was with a group of eleven-year-old boys, attempting to teach them how to draw human eyes, and only vaguely holding their attention. One of the eleven-year old boys was terribly upset and making a scene, because all he wanted to do was play basketball. Before this group, I had just taught a class to thirteen-year old boys who had also been very vocal about their disinterest in art and desire to play basketball. This was something I heard just about every day.

I had been trying to teach my planned lesson for ten minutes when the one boy came up to me and begged me to cancel art so he could play basketball. Being on my porch was agonizing to him. It was apparent to me that the other boys were feeling similarly. I decided at that moment, to cancel the project we were working on, and I told the boys, our new project was to devise a way for them to play basketball anywhere they wanted. Suddenly I had all of their eyes looking at me filled with puzzlement. I told them, we were going to make miniature basketball games that they could shoot baskets with. There was a cheer. Quickly I got out a new set of materials: foam sheets, markers, wire, cardboard, and plastic spoons. I explained that we would make two basketball courts with plastic spoons and springs as the ball launcher. I began delegating roles for building baskets and drawing out the courts. For the first time, every hand was raised asking if they could be the one to draw. The participants worked quickly and worked the entire class time, because they wanted the final product to be perfect. At the end of class they had built a working two-player basket race game, where the first person to launch a ball into the hoop wins. They were so excited with the finished project, that instead of asking their counselors when they were going to play basketball, or when they were going to the pool, they asked when they could get their project and play it. As the group walked away from the art porch, the boy who had previously begged me to leave art ran back and gave me a long hug, and I remember feeling extremely touched as he looked up at me and said "thank you".

2.4 Changing the Curriculum

That night I reflected on the success of the class. What had been a snap decision, a moment of desperation, held potential for future classes. During the class I had felt this was a project that was below both my potential as a teacher, and their potential as artists. It was crafty,

unpolished, and the final product had few options for originality. In fact, the product looked exactly as I had imagined it when I handed the materials to the children; it was my artwork, and not theirs. Still, this was the highest level of engagement I had seen up to this point. I made some mental adjustments and prepared a plan for my next class.

The next day I had a group of fourteen-year old boys. They arrived, somewhat surprised by the intense amount of materials I had laid out, but otherwise looking nonchalant and disinterested. Once they were settled, I told them they were participating in a boys-only challenge. They looked perplexed. The challenge, I told them, was to build a mechanical game that made use of a spoon and a spring. This created a series of confused looks, but had captivated all of their attention. I pulled out the basketball courts from the previous day and I told them that eleven-year old boys had made them. They were generally impressed. Then I told them, I expected much more innovation from them. At this point I started holding up materials. I had spools that could be used for pulley-systems, magnet strips, potential levers, and foam for building various colorful obstacles or goals. I pulled out a concealed package of x-acto knives and told them they had a privilege no other age group had. And then, I told them they had only fifty minutes and they had better start building.

For not knowing what to expect, the results were fantastic. The boys had come up with extremely creative uses of spoons and springs that were different than the original models. Some games were held up on springs, some used the spoon and spring in a similar fashion as a pinball plunger, other games used the spoons as flaps to be operated by players. The design of the games were creative as well. Half of the games, as anticipated, were sports-related. The other half,

however, were surprisingly unique. The games took place in camp locations, memories from home, and popular culture references.

The most successful aspect of the project however, was the fact that as there were five minutes left in class, the boys looked at their counselors and requested to sign up for art again so they could continue to add to their machines. They had become invested and were motivated not only to participate, not only to complete the project, but to additionally tweak and improve their work to perfection. They had found value in what they were making and they believed in their ability to further increase that value.

I continued this project for the remainder of the summer with similar results. Due to the problem-solving nature of the project, the participants needed me to provide large amounts of individual aid as they found solutions to the mechanical and three-dimensional aspects of their projects. Peers were called on to help find solutions and as helping hands for difficult assemblages. Overall, the activity was an intense teambuilding exercise that developed a sense of respect and trust within the group. My reputation with the middle school boys went from one of anonymity to one of near reverence. There was a mutual understanding of each other as creators, and the act of creating was no longer associated with negatively perceived connotations of femininity. I saw a dramatic increase of boys in my morning classes, as well as in the afternoon.

2.5 Concerns of Values

As proud as I am of this breakthrough, there are a few problems I have yet to work through. The first problem is my own questioning of the artistic value of creating these machines. I might categorize them as kinetic sculptures, but they are also products modeled after highly commercialized toys. The low craftsmanship of the assembly may even remove them

from being craft objects. I do not know what title to classify these objects as, and what, if any, traditional artistic values they promote. These objects are dramatically different than the drawings and paintings I had imagined the students creating.

My second concern is more troubling to me. As engaged as the students were with the final projects, the processes and ideas followed very strict gender stereotypes. The girls worked with textiles and repetitive processes that encouraged talking and sharing stories. The boys' projects were mechanical, highly individualistic, and asserted an air of superiority over arts associated with femininity. In morning activities I was able to encourage some boys to take up textiles and some girls to work with kinetics in wire sculptures, but I was not able to make these situations work in the single gender afternoon classes. Reinforcing gender stereotypes is not something I want to make a habit of, and further developing strategies of breaking down these barriers will be a focus of mine.

2.6 Returning with Experience

Since my first summer of working with this organization, I have returned and worked a second. Having built a reputation with the youth the previous summer, art classes went significantly smoother, and students were considerably more excited for class. I continued to promote projects that involved thinking on their feet, and created a new challenge: The cabin-gift challenge. Within the hour, the group needed to democratically decide what one person or cabin they were going to make a gift for, and execute it. These gifts were often murals on paper, board games with invented rules, and cloth pillows or bandannas. The students were allowed to choose any process or medium, and I facilitated quick hints for using these processes. The gift challenge,

like the spoon-spring challenge, promoted the creation of products with value, and the value of these products was re-enforced by the gratitude of the receiving parties.

In some ways, the gift challenge remedied my issues with the projects of the previous summer. Because they were created for others, greater care was often taken in the craftsmanship of the product; the creators became increasingly aware of the importance of planning and care. This improved the aesthetic qualities of the projects, making it easier for me to call them artistic works.

Addressing the gender-role problems from the previous summer, I often required the groups to create gifts for opposite genders, and very different ages. This caused participants to re-organize their priorities concerning what materials and processes might be best. Instead of catering their artistic visions to the masculine or feminine pressures of their peers, the groups became more concerned with choosing materials and processes that would best suit the recipients. The most dramatic result of this requirement was the number of older male participants that independently chose textile arts in the afternoons. Receiving hand-sewn pillows with embroidered names or personal messages was a well-known favorite gift amongst all participant ages, and the older boys were able to overcome masculine pressures to create such gifts for the younger campers. In some instances I witnessed the boys becoming competitive with each other over their quality of stitching, an occurrence I could not have dreamed of the previous year.

2.7 Questions and Suppositions

I have discovered from these experiences a new interest in the field of art education. Before teaching at this organization, I planned to mentor self-identified student artists in the

mechanical and conceptual skills necessary to continue on to a career in the arts. This future no longer holds the same level of significance to me. My new interest lies within those who do not view themselves as artists. What value does art hold for these individuals aside from internalized humiliation? Where will they use the skills they learn from art, and what purpose do these skills serve in contemporary society? I believe certain forms of craft-based arts can hold great amounts of value to all youth, regardless of artistic inclinations. The ability to make something of worth is a powerful tool, and reflects upon the individual's own levels of self worth.

These questions, although applicable to art education as a whole, are population-specific within my own research. After my experiences with the mission of this camp, my research now focuses mainly on out-of-school programming for urban, underprivileged youth. I am looking at the role art education plays in similar non-profit organizations, and what additional lessons may be learned from connecting my personal experiences with the experiences of more established community organizers. I believe providing enriching out-of-school programs to disadvantaged youth is an issue of social justice, as well as a societal need.

CHAPTER 3

THE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAMMING

In the past few decades it has become more and more apparent that the American dream is a luxury only afforded to the privileged. For many, pulling oneself up by the bootstraps has become a systematic impossibility. Decades of racism embedded in neighborhood zoning policies, police attention, allocation of money, and hiring processes have left U.S. cities with large pockets of racially-segregated poor (Downs, 1978; Venkatesh, 2002; Carter, 2003; Cohen, 2010; Wilson, 1996). In such neighborhoods, the idea of attending college may seem distant to youths, if considered at all (Swidler, 1986; Venkatesh, 2002). Instead, there are much more attainable ways of achieving power and status: violence, drugs, gangs, or all three (Patillo-McCoy, 2000; Venkatesh, 2002). These ventures can occur as a statement of rebellion, as submission to peer pressure, or as an act of necessity when other options are not available. Over the last 20 years, a great deal of attention has been placed on the power of afterschool programs to deter youth from becoming involved in these unfavorable activities (Kugler, 2001, Patten & Robertson, 2001). The FBI's National Incident Based Reporting System shows that the majority of violent youth crimes occur during the period of 3 PM and 6PM (as cited in Patten & Robertson, 2001). Programs have developed in cities throughout the U.S. in an attempt to keep youth off the streets during these dangerous and usually unsupervised times.

However, there is much more that is owed to these youth. Many of these programs acknowledge that there is a significantly greater need from them than just acting as a crime-detering babysitter (Adejumo; 2002). Schools in areas of high poverty often lack adequate funding, are overcrowded, and have a high teacher turnover rate. Youth in these areas do not receive the same education, resources, or consistency as their counterparts in wealthier areas

(Aud et al., 2010). The focus on raising standardized test scores has stripped schools of the few arts they had left, as well as depleted classroom activities that might lead to divergent thinking (Fusarelli, 2004; Neill, 2003). It is not a surprise that these areas have high dropout rates and low levels of college attendance (Aud, et al., 2010).

Afterschool programs attempt to supplement what is lacking in these schools. They recognize the need for arts, athletics, tutoring, and basic life skills. These activities, although not necessarily academic, are crucial to the overall cultural and motivational education of youth. The missions of these programs are to provide youth the opportunity to learn skill sets necessary to overcome the obstacles in their lives and be able to pursue college or career-oriented jobs. Many of the institutions providing afterschool programs are able to achieve these kinds of objectives (Lauer et al., 2006; Beckett et al, 2009; Carryl, Lord, & Mahoney, 2005; Posner & Vandell, 1994). The question no longer is whether to provide afterschool programming or whether it works, but what kind of programming should be available, what kind of programming works best, and how civic leaders and policy makers in communities might design programs for twenty-first century youth.

Afterschool programming in neighborhoods and communities of need must provide the missing school and life experiences often taken for granted in wealthier areas. These programs should act as a bridge between school and outside life, providing youth with experiences that enrich or legitimize school lessons, while incorporating student-oriented and hands-on experiences often absent from the school day. Additionally, afterschool programming needs to supplement street-savvy lessons that are not always learned in school, sometimes even unlearned in school, such as divergent thinking, cultural capital toolkits, and self-efficacy.

These desired experiences and outcomes are important motivators for students to stay in school, on track, and away from dangerous activities that are detrimental to their futures.

Art afterschool programming holds unique opportunities for the development of these goals in the twenty-first century. The ephemeral, technological, and entrepreneurially-driven culture of today provides a great incentive for both youth and educators to embrace contemporary artistic practices. Artists today are exploring the digital realm and pushing to discover new meanings and uses as it rapidly changes the way contemporary lives are lived. Learning to repurpose digital media for new tasks is a contemporary life skill, demonstrated last year when Mark Zuckerberg received the title of Time Person of the Year in 2010 for re-organizing the Internet into a social experience on Facebook (Grossman, 2010). The naturally hands-on problem solving resulting from art challenges creates the ideal set of circumstances for developing self-efficacy as well as situational toolkits to guide youth to success. There are several afterschool art programs that currently employ these strategies, and these programs will be discussed later in this paper.

3.1 A Brief History of the Evolution of Afterschool Programming

Understanding the growing social responsibilities tied to afterschool programs is grounded in an understanding of the changing roles of these programs, and what these roles have become today. Patterns of afterschool care, as can be easily deduced, have always been closely tied with patterns in schooling. It first became an issue in the early twentieth century, as child labor laws and compulsory education laws began to change the societal roles of American children (Halpern, 2002). As less children were allowed to pursue paid labor, more children became available to attend school. Attendance of school created segregated times in the day for

children: time in school, and time outside of school (Halpern, 2002). Time in school was structured and rigid. Time outside of school became domain of the child, unstructured and social. The lack of regular adult supervision after school resulted in widespread systems of apprehensive parents and community members. These periods in the day were perceived as breeding grounds for youth mischief and disorder. Communities were so concerned that they founded small clubs, called boys' clubs, for young people to spend time in after school (Halpern, 2002). In the early 1900s, these boys' clubs began to spring up in storefronts and churches all over the country as alternative spaces for play (Halpern, 2002). Programs provided a great variety of enriching activities and were staffed by well-educated professionals in various occupational areas. These programs were places for learning, discoveries, positive child-adult interactions, and supervised play.

Towards the middle of the century; however, this structure began to change as programming funding began to dwindle and the quality of staff diminished. Shrinking resources, as well as greater cultural changes in the acceptable roles of women, altered the missions of these programs from youth enrichment to childcare. More and more women were working, leaving a greater strain on the programs to keep up with their increasing enrollment. At the same time, the workday was growing more standardized, leaving employed professionals little free time to spend working with children at local boys' clubs. As the quality of staff members declined and the number of children increased, the programming became less inspired (Halpern, 2002).

The role of these programs shifted again in the 1980s and 1990s as growing concerns about drugs, sex, and gangs renewed the interest in afterschool programs as a way to prevent risky behaviors in youth (Kugler, 2001). Before this new crisis, most afterschool programming

focused on middle class children, and providing convenient childcare. These new precarious decades developed an increasing awareness of the more serious stakes for children growing up in areas of high poverty. Once again afterschool programs were evaluating their content, and deciding what lessons would best serve the community.

A renewed sense of social responsibility for these children has generated a large growth in the number of programs, the amount of government funding, and the amount of research surrounding afterschool programs (Kugler, 2001). The social ills often cited as the reason for this increased interest are related to the alarming differences in academic achievement between students in high-poverty schools and low-poverty schools.

Recent national data continues to support findings of substantial differences between children in high and low poverty schools. On the 2010 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading assessment, eighth-graders at high-poverty schools scored thirty-four points lower than eighth-graders at low-poverty schools and thirty-eight points lower on the mathematics assessment (Aud et al., 2010). In 2008, the rate of students immediately enrolling in a four-year college from high-poverty schools was half as many as from low-poverty public schools (Aud et al., 2010).

These achievement gaps correlate with college attendance, future occupational income, and likelihood of incarceration. Overall, the future quality of these children's lives is heavily connected to their academic success. Academic success is correlated to quality of schooling, and quality of schooling is a national responsibility. The cycles of poverty created by poor public schooling and services are an issue of social justice, and this issue is the central rationale for development of quality supplementary programming afterschool in these areas.

3.2 Research on Afterschool Programming

Research on the effects of afterschool programming in the last twenty years has been promising. Students enrolled in afterschool programming have shown greater academic growth throughout the school year than students not enrolled in afterschool programming (Lauer et al., 2006; Beckett et al., 2009; Carryl et al., 2005; Posner & Vandell, 1994). The effects of afterschool programming on children from areas of high poverty have been shown to be even greater than the effects on children from areas of low poverty (Cosden et al., 2001; Kane, 2004; Welsh, Russell, Williams, Reisner, & White, 2002).

Questions that arise from these assertions relate to the questions of causation of academic success. The factors that lead to parents enrolling their children in afterschool programming could be determining academic success, rather than the program itself. Controlling for factors of caregiver employment, family poverty status, race/ethnicity, grade, and gender, Joseph L. Mahoney, Heather Lord, and Erica Carryl (2005) conducted a longitudinal study evaluating afterschool program (ASP) participation and the development of academic performance and teacher-rated motivational attributes over a school year. The study compared the academic growth of students in ASP care to the academic growth of students in the three other most common arrangements: parent care, combined parent/self-sibling care, and combined other-adult/self-sibling care. Academic performance and motivational attributes were significantly higher at the end of the school year for children in ASP care compared with those in the 3 alternative patterns of care. Reading achievement and expectancy of success showed some of the greatest differences between children in ASP care and children in alternative forms of care (Carryl et al., 2005).

Looking at the research from the last 25 years, afterschool programming does make a difference on the academic performance of students, as shown in the Meta-analysis conducted by Lauer et al.(2006). Their survey of 35 qualifying studies of out-of-school time programs effects on student achievement in reading and math showed small, but statistically significant positive effects of out-of-school programs on reading, mathematics, and student achievement (Lauer et al., 2006).

Where the research lacks is in what kinds of afterschool programs best serve their populations. Studies have shown that providing a safe and structured environment, opportunities to develop skills and interests, and supportive relationships with adults are key elements in afterschool programs (Quinn & Kahne, 2001). It becomes vague, however, when it comes down to what skills and interests are most important for creating engagement and academic development. There is not enough data to show that one formula for afterschool programming works any better than another, which is likely the case (Beckett et al., 2009). More research is necessary to fine-tune our understanding as to what specific programs can provide to at-risk youth.

CHAPTER 4

CULTURAL CAPITAL FOR MAINSTREAM SUCCESS

Tackling high dropout rates and low college attendance in low-income, minority, and marginalized communities has resulted in a long evolution of social theories explaining why poverty in America is passed on through generations. Consensus has moved from earlier, controversial, ideas of a "culture of poverty" to more accepted ideas about cultural capital and toolkits. Being unaware of essential cultural toolkits can be a crucial missing connection as to why intelligent youth may continue to fall short within public schools. These mistakes are more easily controlled in afterschool programs, and a thorough understanding of both dominant and non-dominant cultural capital may help educators fill in the opportunity gaps between urban, marginalized youth and the suburban middle class. Many of these important cultural tools needed to navigate through school and pursue college and careers can be learned from entrepreneurially-based art programs. Such programs give students the self-efficacy and the commercial know-how to market themselves and target professional opportunities.

4.1 Evolving from "Culture of Poverty Theory" to Cultural Toolkits

In the U.S. during the 1960s, to the dismay of many sociologists, "the poor" were identified as a national problem. Of course, the poor had always been there, but prior to 1960, the poor were assumed to be a very small percentage of the population, and assumed to be mostly African American or temporarily poor. The discovery that the poor still made up between fifteen and twenty-five percent of the U.S. population, were mostly white, and were families that had been poor a very long time was unanticipated and shocking to sociologists (Roach & Gursslin, 1965). In a culture based upon the ideal of hard work and pulling oneself

up by the bootstraps, the discovery of the perpetually poor was inconvenient, to say the least. Theories explaining these impoverished populations began to emerge, some of which took to blaming the poor for their own misfortunes.

A prominent theory first coined by Oscar Lewis in 1959 was the "Culture of Poverty", a controversial model that still lingers in policies and attitudes today (Cohen, 2010). This theory proposed that the poor shared a collective subculture supported by attitudes, values, and actions which both differs greatly from core culture and reinforces poverty (Roach & Gursslin, 1967). Assumptions from this model imply that the poor do not value marriage, hard work, or success. Criticisms of this theory have been numerous, including assertions that systematic structures have kept the poor immobile (Downs, 1978; Venkatesh, 2002; Wilson, 1996), cultures of poor enclaves vary dramatically from one to the next (Roach & Gursslin, 1967), and that the poor share the same values as core culture, but do not receive the same opportunities to act on them (Swiddler, 1986).

These criticisms have given rise to a new dominant theory that is cognizant of the "Culture of Poverty" attitudes, but differs in its placement of blame. Ideas of "Cultural Capital" as a continually lacking resource in the lives of the poor have become popular in literature on urban youth and poor communities. The term "Cultural Capital" was first coined by Pierre Bourdieu in 1986, and referred to cultural practices, knowledge, and behavioral attitudes learned through various environments, including school, home, and outside experiences (Portes, 1998). The definition of cultural capital that will be adhered to in this paper is Ann Swiddler's (1986) idea of a cultural "toolkit" (p. 273). Swidler (1986) describes cultural capital as a set of "symbols, stories, rituals, and world-views which people may use in various configurations to solve different kinds of problems" (p. 273). Rather than drawing a causal

relationship between culture and action, Swidler (1986) defines cultural capital as a provider of cultural components that order “strategies of action”, or patterns of behavior. Learning these cultural tools gives individuals an even playing field, and sometimes even an edge, in social, political, and professional situations.

4.2 Non-Dominant Cultural Capital

Cultural capital theory then, is a direct rebuttal to ideas that the culture of the poor harbors values different than that of core culture. It mandates that the poor have the same aspirations as middle-class Americans, but are blocked by strikingly different opportunities, experiences, resources and environments that do not provide them with the same cultural tools as their middle-class counterparts. An additional confounding factor is the existence of "non-dominant cultural capital," which are cultural toolkits created by marginalized cultures as an affront to the forced assimilation of dominant cultural practices (Carter, 2003). Students may find themselves navigating opposing forms of cultural capital depending on their setting. What is acceptable behavior at home or in peer groups may be considered undesirable in a school setting, and school-appropriate behaviors may be devalued by peers or family. Examples of behaviors that may provide dramatically different levels of cultural capital in different settings include speech patterns, dress, postures, attitudes, and topics of interest. There are growing concerns today that minority, low income, and urban youth are being punished in school for employing oppositional signifiers of cultural capital rather than employing signifiers of dominant cultural capital (Carter, 2003; Yosso, 2005).

These concerns speak to the need for afterschool programming to walk a delicate line. Youth still need to learn and use dominant cultural toolkits to succeed within the dominant

culture. However, teaching these dominant toolkits should not devalue non-dominant cultural capital that youth signify in home or peer situations. After school is a transitional time between school and home, and the encouraged behaviors should be a mixture of the two. To promote respect for the program and its overall goals, students must feel that their perspectives are respected within the program, rather than continuing the cultural attack students may feel in school settings.

This means a certain selectivity is necessary as afterschool programs choose the cultural tools they intend to pass on. For example, as ideals are narrowed down, external conformity, often emphasized during the school day, stands out as an overly simplistic and redundant mechanism to enforce. Instead, the most crucial and influential tools for success lie within the psyche of youth. These tools do not determine how others perceive and treat an individual, but instead, how an individual perceives and treats them self.

CHAPTER 5

SELF-EFFICACY

The actions and efforts youth put toward their futures and life goals relate strongly to their ideas of their own abilities and options. This idea was popularized by Albert Bandura, and given the label *self-efficacy* (Graham, Lepper, Henderlong & Pintrich, 2002). The construct of self-efficacy recognizes that internal processes such as beliefs, expectations, and feelings regarding a person's competence to formulate and carry out a particular course of action play an important role in determining external behavior (Jackson, 2002). Notably, self-efficacy is not a universal personality characteristic, and instead can vary from task to task (Jackson, 2002). Demonstrating this point, studies regarding self-efficacy have shown large differences between an individual's self-efficacy towards high school math and high school English (Bong, 2004). In other words, self-efficacy is domain specific.

Young people's self-efficacy beliefs can influence their decisions and actions in several ways. Beliefs can affect the kinds of settings that youth choose, as they are less likely to willingly enter an environment in which they feel inadequate. Self-efficacy can also affect how young people respond to problems and failures. People with lower self-efficacy beliefs have a greater tendency to give up faster, expend less effort, and focus more on emotions rather than solvable problems. While facing adversity, people with high self-efficacy become less frustrated and persist for significantly longer (Jackson 2002).

5.1 *Separating Self-Efficacy from Similar Constructs*

Conceptual differentiation between self-efficacy and similar theories is important to understand. One of the ideas most frequently confused with self-efficacy is *self-esteem*, although there are important differences between the two. Self-esteem is usually considered to be an individual's personality characteristic, specifically their overall feelings about themselves (Pajares, 2000). By contrast, self-efficacy is not meant to be an overall defining trait, and instead refers to a judgment about capability at a specific task, that is not necessarily indicative of their feelings about their self (Gist & Mitchell, 1992). While self-efficacy relates to ideas of self-confidence, self-esteem relates to ideas of self-worth (Pajares, 2000). Because of this, it is possible for students to have a generally high self-esteem, and still perceive themselves to be incapable of various school-related tasks. It depends on how important other influences, such as peer relationships, are in the individual's assessment of his or her self. This paper will focus more heavily on the development and importance of self-efficacy rather than self-esteem because of self-efficacy's more direct connections with youth decision-making, motivation strategies, and action.

A second similar, but importantly different, concept is that of *self-determination*. Self-determination is a construct that focuses on specific intrinsic and extrinsic forms of motivation that are tied into psychological needs for personal gain or growth. Specifically, the individual's experience of autonomy, competence, and relatedness are argued to be the single most important factors for creating high quality forms of motivation and engagement, including enhanced performance, persistence, and creativity (Graham et al., 2002). Self-efficacy theories focus on a single branch of self-determination theory: beliefs about one's competence and

personal power to do something. Additionally, self-efficacy theories do not frame self-efficacy as a form of motivation, but instead as a system of beliefs that influence behavior (Jackson, 2002).

In my research I have come across several art educators as well as advocates for entrepreneurial education who link their curricula with the development of self-efficacy (Ewing, 2010; Luftig, 2003; Rasheed, 2001; Jones, 1997; Rose, Jolley, & Burkitt, 2006). In many of these cases, a more appropriate term for the attributes they are discussing would be self-determination, because they discuss the connections between their educational topics and focus on developing a sense of control in youth as well as a sense of competence (Jackson, 2002). For the purpose of this paper, the term self-efficacy will include these associations with power and control, despite their more definitive associations with self-determination theory. The reason for this choice in terminology is the increasing notoriety of self-efficacy as an important tool for educational and life success, whereas self-determination has remained a theoretical framework for assessing motivation (Usher & Pajares, 2008; Jackson, 2002).

5.2 Self-Efficacy as a Cultural Tool

Self-efficacy has become acknowledged as a cultural tool that can be affected by socio-economic status (Gecas & Seff, 1989), parent's working conditions (Whitbeck et al., 1997), as well as race and ethnicity (Gecas, 1989). Self-efficacy has repeatedly been identified as a societal tool necessary to encourage and develop within at-risk youth (National Endowment for the Arts, et al., 2002; Pence, 2010; Whitbeck et al., 1997; Gecas, 1989). These scholars argue that self-efficacy is a tool that is learned, it influences one's abilities to obtain economic capital,

and it can vary depending on the overall level of prejudice and inequality experienced. In this view, self-efficacy is a form of cultural capital. Like cultural capital, it is a learned cultural toolkit of interpretations, knowledge, and attitudes that inform strategies of action tied to economic capital (Portes, 1998; Swidler, 1986).

Self-efficacy is a highly significant form of cultural capital in the lives of young people. As a determination of the level of effort, the length of perseverance, the amount of emotional control, and the environments and tasks visited, self-efficacy can be a critical factor in the overall life-path of a young person. The confidence and control felt by youth can determine their success in school, the jobs they apply for, the peers they choose to associate with, and life decisions they make. Self-efficacy plays a role in whether a young person is tempted to drop out-of-school or pursue post secondary education, join a gang or join a team, commit a crime or commit to civic engagement. In all of these situations, levels of self-efficacy can determine how long a young person might persevere and how much effort they put towards difficult life choices they must make. Students coming from low socio-economic neighborhoods with high rates of crime and poorly funded schools have additional obstacles to overcome, and these obstacles require additional perseverance. It is imperative that these youth have high levels of self-efficacy in order to combat the serious inequalities they face.

5.3 Self-Efficacy Beliefs About What?

Because self-efficacy is domain specific, the focus of self-efficacy programming must be the creation of positive perceptions within a specialized skill-set. How then, does an afterschool program teach self-efficacy in specific school subjects? One structure that has

shown results is simply constructing the program as an opportunity for tutoring. The greatest out-of-school determiner of academic success is the amount of time spent reading, and studies have shown that programs incorporating reading and tutoring as core activities can produce a measurable, significant improvement in the academic success of participants (Shumow, 2001; Carryl et al., 2005).

There is a catch to this approach, however. Tutoring based programs can be regarded as unstimulating or uninteresting to youth, and these programs can easily lose participants, particularly as the participants move onto junior high and high school (Quinn & Kahne, 2001; Carryl et al., 2005). This is a troubling fact because the most susceptible age for youth to begin participating in unlawful and/or harmful behaviors is in middle school and early high school, precisely the time when they are losing interest and dropping out of tutoring-based afterschool care (Coley, Morris & Hernandez, 2004).

How can an afterschool program appeal to these youth who are not interested in continuing their schooling after the bell has rung? Sports-related afterschool programming has shown little effect, and sometimes even negative effects on in-school success (Posner & Vandell, 1999; Coley et al., 2004). Instead, studies on behavioral outcomes of afterschool programs have shown that structured, intellectually challenging, social activities were more successful developing better academic and work habits and preventing anti-social or aggressive behaviors (Shumow, 2001; Coley et al., 2004).

While determining these alternative activities for older participants, program developers need to decide what skill sets should be focused on that will still aid in-school

success. What specific skills (and self-efficacy beliefs about these skills) will an individual use in multiple school subjects, post-secondary education, and in finding and advancing a career? Because self-efficacy beliefs are the goal, the skill sets must be specific. The program's focus must not be building up vague ideas such as: "I am smart," or, "I can do whatever I set my mind to." Firstly, these ideas are somewhat unrealistic, which older participants will easily notice, and secondly, these ideas are easily ruptured by a single failure. Instead, more teachable patterns of thought take shape in ideas like "I am good at (a skill), and when a situation comes up where I can use (a skill), I will be successful because I am good at it."

These specific skill sets, however, may be tools that are widely transferable to a variety of other applications and domains. There is a long list of highly-transferrable skills within the domain of art education and entrepreneurial education. These skills or behaviors include innovation, technological savvy, professionalism, negotiation, leadership, self-promotion and marketing, the ability to give and receive constructive criticism, academic risk-taking, flexibility, and divergent thinking (Rasheed, 2000; Simpson, 2003). All of these skills, although targeted in arts or entrepreneurship settings, are easily transferable between academic disciplines, as well as into the students' outside-life, and eventual futures as professionals.

CHAPTER 6

ENTREPRENEURSHIP IN EDUCATION AND YOUTH CULTURE

Education in Entrepreneurship has traditionally been a study area reserved for college business majors and select vocational high schools. The opportunities for youth to receive education in entrepreneurship are limited, but interest in providing greater access has been growing in educational studies (Kourilsky, 1995; Rasheed, 2000; Plane, 2009). Some educators are becoming concerned with the current structures of today's school system and its role in training students to be "job-takers" rather than "job-makers" (Kourilsky, 1995, p.9). For the purposes of this paper, the term "entrepreneur" will be defined as an individual that creates, controls, and retains responsibility of a new business, venture, or organization (Rasheed, 2000). In literature and studies regarding entrepreneurship, (Kourilsky, 1995; Gibb, 2005; Plane, 2009) the behaviors and attributes associated with entrepreneurs are generally recognized to be: self-confidence, self-esteem, need for achievement, risk-taking, internal locus-of-control, and creativity.

These attributes are typically looked at in entrepreneurship education as measurements for an individual's likelihood to begin and be able to maintain his or her own business. Educators, however, have begun to look at these attributes as traits that lead to youth successfully attempting academic, extracurricular, and higher-level activities (Kourilsky, 1995; Rasheed, 2000; Clawson & Coolbaugh, 2001; Simpson, 2003; Forrestel, 2004; Plane, 2009). Students with a high need for achievement, an internal locus of control, and a healthy dose of self-confidence are likely to avoid instances of negative peer pressure, maintain high academic goals, and pursue paths towards a sustainable career rather than an opportunistic paycheck.

These students will likely have high self-efficacy beliefs towards their abilities to find creative solutions to problems both in and out of school, and will thus be less likely to fold under the external pressures thrust upon them from unstable home, school, and neighborhood environments.

The second reason educators are paying more attention to entrepreneurial attitudes, is the growing opportunities for youth to actually engage in creating their own businesses. Today's world holds a particularly unique role for entrepreneurs as the Internet has created a completely new venue for small businesses and individuals with few resources. The obvious examples of successful entrepreneurial endeavors online include Google, Facebook, YouTube, Twitter, Flickr, eBay, Amazon, and Groupon. Outside of these major success stories, however, lie an extensive sea of successful artists and business owners who sell services and products through websites such as Etsy, Craigslist, eBay, Amazon, Alibaba and personal blogs. The services may range from merchandise, such as t-shirts; services, such as dating databases; or content supported by advertising, such as free online comics.

Recently, a great number of online businesses have been started by minors, as well as young adults fresh out of high school. Juniorbiz.com recently compiled a list of their twenty five most successful American entrepreneurs under the age of twenty four, and eighteen of those businesses were started online (Tart, 2010). The young entrepreneurs included a fifteen-year-old magazine publisher, a nineteen-year-old photographer, and fourteen web-based service owners ranging from the age of sixteen to twenty three. The estimated worth of some of these young businesses have grown into the double digit millions (Tart, 2010).

The difference between many of these young entrepreneurs and majority of adult entrepreneurs is that their businesses were started on accident. These young people were creating media they enjoyed and just happened to attract a large number of clients for their services. Participating in Internet culture is a modern-day hobby and leisure activity for young people, and occasionally it can pay off. What it takes is the confidence and belief that their idea or created media has value to others. This relatively simple belief determines how much effort is put into presenting, organizing, and sharing their creations for others to consume.

Believing that their ideas and creations have value is a key learning outcome of entrepreneurial education (Kourilsky, 1995). Not all youth will go on to become multimillionaires, or even to start their own businesses, but all youth should hold beliefs that their ideas and personal skills have both monetary and social value. These beliefs are specifically lacking in poor urban communities, where youth are leaving high school and accepting minimum-wage jobs rather than pursuing college or a career (Aud et al., 2010; Rasheed, 2000).

Encouragingly, research on entrepreneurial education is demonstrating that these ideas can be taught. Through vocational training in entrepreneurship, youth can gain a sense of control in their lives and a way of looking at adversity that is healthy and applicable to many real-life situations (Rasheed, 2000).

Howard S. Rasheed, founder of the Institute for Innovation, conducted a study on the effects of entrepreneurial education, and the resulting data provided evidence that entrepreneurial education improved student levels of self-efficacy (2000). Participants in the

study showed significant increases in their levels of achievement motivation, feelings of personal control, and self-esteem. The control group in Rasheed's study, which continued with their regular school schedule, showed no change in these areas.

The results of this study have promising implications for youth living with difficult circumstances. Students with a greater internal locus of control are less likely to subscribe to negative peer pressures, to participate in socially undesirable behaviors, or to express emotion through violence (Rasheed, 2000).

The main question resulting from this study is, "how?" How can entrepreneurial education be implemented in schools as the arts and other non-core subjects are being stripped away by budget cuts and increased focus on standardized testing? How does entrepreneurial education fit into the non-vocational structures of today's public schools? How can entrepreneurial programs attract and keep the interest of youth who feel culturally alienated by the dominant values imposed in public schools?

These questions have been answered by several out-of-school art programs that will be discussed later in this paper. Entrepreneurial education can seamlessly fit into an art curriculum, and these afterschool and summer art programs have freedoms that public schools do not. They have the opportunity to create their own organizational culture that best supports their participants, they benefit from the perception that art classes are fun and leisurely, and they have fund-raising systems built into their structure to collect resources for participant activities. The creators of these programs are often entrepreneurs themselves, and the programs are products that are both desirable and meet the needs of their target audiences.

6.1 Entrepreneurial Education Within Art Education

Recently a large series of out-of-school art programs with entrepreneurial twists have been implemented in areas of need (Clawson & Coolbaugh, 2001; Simpson, 2003; Forrestel, 2004; Quinn & Kahne, 2001). The programs offer underprivileged youth opportunities to create, display, and sell artworks. These tools have an entrepreneurial edge, and are modeled from the fact that working artists must employ entrepreneurial behaviors to make a living. The development of these programs shows that educators are starting to get creative in how they empower and engage with youth who come from homes and schools with limited resources.

Programs like these have a large range of both attainable and lofty goals. Reading through the various missions of different programs, I found it helpful to re-organize these goals based upon whether they were physically taught by the organization, facilitated by the organization, or a consequence of attending the organization's program. To understand the relationship between the program actions and results, I've organized a collection of program goals into a system of three tiers. This system is similar to the evaluation system used by the U.S. Department of Justice when they surveyed the achievement of program goals for at-risk youth enrolled in urban, out-of-school art programs (Clawson & Coolbaugh, 2001).

The skills that are simple to teach, and simple to measure improvement in, are typically not the ultimate goals of the programs. These skills are often used as a platform to teach other skills, and are placed within the bottom tier of program outcomes. These first-tier outcomes are the development of basic skills, usually artistic skills, such as mixing paint or creating clay vessels.

The second tier outcomes are typically skills that are not being directly taught, but are still necessary to learn in order to complete the assigned tasks. Within these entrepreneurial art programs, the skills in this tier can usually be divided into three categories: personal (confidence, control, and problem-solving), interpersonal (communication, collaboration, and emotional skills), and professional (organizational and presentation).

The final tier of organizational goals are usually related to the outside applications of the other learning goals. These applications are usually based in decision making inside and outside of schools. Common tier three goals of these organizations are improving grades, raising graduation numbers, raising college attendance, reducing gang participation, reducing teen pregnancy, reducing teen violence, reducing the use of illegal substances, and reducing other illegal behaviors such as theft and vandalism (Clawson & Coolbaugh, 2001; Simpson, 2003; Forrestel, 2004; Quinn & Kahne, 2001).

Looking at these goal structures, the overlap of art entrepreneurship programs and more traditional entrepreneurship programs become much more apparent. Initially, tier one goals for entrepreneurship might appear quite different from that of art education, because they have a high focus on developing skills in technology, assessing and responding to social needs and desires, and product development (Kourilsky, 1995). With more serious consideration however, these goals are the same as those belonging to many art programs. Art programs with the right resources are able to teach technology skills through web-design, video-editing, graphic design, and photo manipulation. They also teach accommodation of societal preferences within standards and principles of design, and they most certainly teach product development through the creation of functioning, artistic objects for sale. Within such

programs students learn the laws of supply and demand by tapping into design trends, and using common artistic entrepreneurial tactics such as creating a limited number of editions. Creating and selling artwork is a form of self-employment with practical entrepreneurial lessons.

Comparing the goals of tier two (personal, interpersonal and professional) and three (outside decision-making), there is no noticeable difference between those of entrepreneurial education and art programs with entrepreneurial inspirations. Tier two goals for entrepreneurial education are also within the constructs of personal management, social interactions, and professional development. Tier three goals are the same as well, and both program types ultimately hope to improve the decisions and quality of life of their participants.

Finally, the two program types structure the realization of their goals in the same fashion. Both structures believe that by directly teaching tier one goals such as screen-printing skills, youth will be indirectly learning tier two goals such as confidence and communication, and that tier two goals will have both an individual and collective effect upon tier three goals such as the students' grades and the overall graduation rates of the community.

6.2 Examples of Entrepreneurial Out-of-School Art Programs

To best understand how these goals are approached, I have collected information about a few programs that exemplify this out-of-school entrepreneurial art programs approach. The first two programs serve as exemplary organizations that have successfully integrated themselves into the communities in which they are a part. The final three programs were all

assessed in a YouthARTS report, and will be discussed together. Implications of positive attributes of all five programs will then be discussed.

6.3 Artists for Humanity

Artists for Humanity, is a non-profit organization established in Boston, Massachusetts in 1992. This organization offers underprivileged youth an opportunity to engage with entrepreneurship through art-making. This program is offered during summer and afterschool hours, and students are encouraged to create and sell their work as the development of professional skills.

The program started after artist Susan Rodgerson helped several of Boston's Martin Luther King Middle School students create a mural at their school. Several of these students subsequently met with Rodgerson in her studio to discuss and create art, and by the end of the summer, Rodgerson suggested that the students find ways to make money and support their own artistic development. The youth decided the most marketable form of art in their neighborhood would be personalized airbrushed t-shirts, and their small business received an unexpectedly large amount of support from local community groups as well as local colleges and businesses. The students selling these shirts subsequently decided to put their earnings towards a larger quantity and higher quality of art materials, and eventually the group came up with the idea of creating a more structured community of young artists. The group began working with local community groups to borrow venues for art making, art shows, and art sales (Jain, 2003).

The program has its own 23,500 square foot, energy-neutral facility called the EpiCenter. The center hosts a gallery for the display of participant work, offers rented space for catering

benefits and business events, a retail store for participant work, and additional flexible spaces for future entrepreneurial endeavors of the group ("Arts Facility Puts Programming to Practice," 2006). In 2005, the EpiCenter was the 11th recipient of the Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design Platinum rating in the United States for its high level of sustainability. The design of the building allows the organization to raise additional program funding by selling excess solar energy back to the city ("Artists for Humanity EpiCenter Receives LEED Platinum Rating," 2005). On top of sale of energy, the organization makes a great deal of revenue from the rental of space, grants, and the sale of artwork and community services. The innovative array of income sources tapped by the organization acts as a large-scale exemplar for the participants to model their own businesses from.

Participants in the program are taught methods of pricing and seeking out buyers for their art. Participants are paid hourly for their work, and receive a fifty percent commission of the art they sell. The remaining fifty percent is returned to the organization to fund materials and facilities. By 2003, the total earnings from the sales of student work had surpassed 1.3 million dollars (Jain, 2003). Artists for Humanity is repeatedly approached by local businesses and community groups to erect murals and corporate banners. Additionally, it has been approached by larger businesses to produce custom shirt designs, including the Boston Red Sox and Gillette (Jain, 2003). The small business model of the program arms the students with real world experience in the production, marketing, negotiation, and promotion of their art.

6.4 Little Black Pearl

A similar program to this model is the Little Black Pearl located on the South Side of Chicago. The program was first started in 1994 by Monica Haslip, a media marketing manager

turned community organizer (Reed-Woodward, 2008). Two years prior to beginning the program, Haslip had been working as the senior Midwest marketing manager for Black Entertainment Television, but chose to quit her high-profile job to develop youth arts programming. The program began humbly in Haslip's basement, eventually growing and moving to a new 40-thousand-square-foot facility in 2004 (Reed-Woodward, 2008). The program's two main missions are to provide youth empowerment through art and entrepreneurship, and to invigorate and economically develop the local community through organized events and the entrepreneurial endeavors of these youth (Little Black Pearl Art and Design Center, 2011). The program offers classes in photography, music, ceramics, woodworking, glassblowing and painting to youth and adults, as well as digital and video arts programming.

Students between the ages of 10 and 19 may sign up for seven-week classes, where they create functional art to be sold in the Little Black Pearl Art and Design Center Shop. Proceeds from these sales go to both the center, for providing additional classes, and to the young artists. Within classes, students are exposed to both business and artistic processes. During the course of the class students are responsible for budgeting a credit of \$1,500 to purchase raw materials through the organization for their proposed projects. While working within this budget, students learn lessons in negotiation, business transactions, contracts, licensing and insurance (Benson, 2004).

Like the Artists for Humanity, the innovative design of this facility serves multiple purposes, including a source of income. The website advertises the state-of-the-art conference spaces for rental at prices between ninety and eight hundred dollars an hour depending on the space (Little Black Pearl Art and Design Center, 2011). The center brings in money through

these rented spaces, as well as through donations, grants, and community-owned stores and cafes within its doors. The student art store serves a second purpose as a gallery to display student work. High profile politicians such as Representative Bobby Rush and Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton have purchased work from the participants (Benson, 2004). The variety of functions within the center provide safe spaces for youth to pass time, eat healthy food, and participate in community-centered events and programs.

6.5 *YouthARTS*

A study conducted by the U.S. Department of Justice surveyed the strengths, weaknesses, and participant growth of at-risk youth enrolled in three urban out-of-school art programs in the cities of Atlanta, Georgia; Portland, Oregon; and San Antonio, Texas (Clawson & Coolbaugh, 2001). The assessment committee, called the YouthARTS Development Project, used a system of surveys, skills assessments, focus groups, personal interviews, probation officer feedback, academic data, and court information to measure the various impacts of the program on enrolled youth with delinquent backgrounds.

The three programs, the Fulton County Arts Council in Atlanta, GA, the Regional Arts and Culture Council in Portland, OR, and the San Antonio Department of Arts and Cultural Affairs in San Antonio, TX, all follow a similar structure of providing adult role models to mentor youth with skills in the arts and entrepreneurship. The program structures are very similar to those of the Little Black Pearl and of Artists for Humanity, with the exception of the participants. These programs specifically seek-out youth with criminal or delinquent records, in the hopes that their programming might provide a needed positive outlet. The intended outcomes of the programs were to develop art skills, develop personal and emotional management skills,

develop communication and cooperation skills, improve attitudes towards school and the future, improve self-esteem and self-efficacy, and to increase the community involvement of the youth. An intended impact from these outcomes is an improved school attendance level, school appreciation, and an increased amount of effort extended towards school (Clawson & Coolbaugh, 2001).

Unfortunately, a large number of participants dropped out from the study, and the researchers were unable to maintain consistent control groups for comparison throughout the complete research period. This incomplete data renders the collected results, although very positive and promising, unfit to be generalized to academic success or diminished delinquent behaviors (Clawson & Coolbaugh, 2001). What can be learned from these studies, however, were structural successes and failures in the programs in maintaining participant interest and attendance.

Surveying the three art programs, YouthARTS found that the programs were most successful when the participants were given freedom to collaborate on the types of activities and projects they would be participating in. A second factor that was associated with success was the qualifications of the instructors; the students found greater motivation and interest in their projects when they were working with highly qualified artists as opposed to the staff members with limited artistic experience. A similar finding was that the youth, who were often very guarded in their adoption of the activities, were significantly more likely to participate fully after seeing staff members participate in and exemplify the processes and ideas being learned (Clawson & Coolbaugh, 2001).

CHAPTER 7

APPLICABLE LESSONS AND CONNECTIONS TO MY OWN EXPERIENCES

Demonstrated by the above study, youth need to feel that the roles and activities in which they partake are meaningful. The youth should have a voice and a designated role within the community that is taken seriously by the program administrators. While the activities should be challenging, they also need to result in a moment of recognition. The programs in this study used art shows and sales as recognition of student achievement, and it was noted that such events had the highest attendance rates (Clawson & Coolbaugh, 2001). These are the moments where self-efficacy beliefs achieve greater inflation, and students internalize and remember the significance of their accomplishments.

Summarizing the strategies of these entrepreneurial programs in this way, my own experiences teaching at the leadership camp appear to support these assertions. Overall, the general lesson that is supported by the success of these programs, is that the structures of out-of-school programs need to confirm the value of their participants. This need, explained above, can be broken down into several manifestations in these programs.

7.1 Participant Control

The first way these programs affirmed the value of the youth was by showing respect for the independence, ideas, and interests of their participants. Giving control to young people shows trust and respect in their characters and abilities. This is exemplified in the creation of the Artists for Humanity program. Working with students on their school mural, Susan Rodgers left much of the decision-making to the young people, and this mutual respect encouraged the students to return again and again to her studio for help and advice. The program Artists for Humanity was

largely created by the young people, leaving no need for recruitment, because they were recruiting themselves (Jain, 2003).

This is demonstrated to a lesser extent in the Little Black Pearl Program, the Fulton County Arts Council, Regional Arts and Culture Council, and the San Antonio Department of Arts and Cultural Affairs. Youth attending these programs were not necessarily designing the programs themselves, but they were free to choose their classes and processes. They were artists, and they made their own choices as artists. At the Little Black Pearl, they were also given responsibility of their own budget, giving them control over their resources, rather than being told what they could and could not do.

At my leadership camp, when I was teaching lessons that were "activities," small projects meant to fill up an hour with little or no input from the participants, there was clear resistance. The participants were aware that their time was being taken from them, time that they could have used towards their own interests, such as basketball. Changing my approach, the participants had greater say in what they wanted to do and they could choose any material or process. This was particularly true my second summer with the gift-challenge. The only restraints I gave the participants were the time, which they were required to keep track of and allocate appropriately, and that a gift or gifts must be completed and given by the end of class. Other guidelines, such as the materials and the recipients were negotiable, although I did try to guide participants towards gifts for others different in age and gender than themselves.

7.2 Mentor Collaboration and Professional Ways of Working

The second reinforcement of participant value in these programs, is that young people need to know that they are working in valuable, professional ways. Participants should feel their time and intelligence are being rewarded by activities that are not imitations, but real-world processes. This was especially affirmed in the collected responses from the YouthARTS study. Participants were more likely to participate if they saw their adult mentors participating in a similar capacity (Clawson & Coolbaugh, 2001). Being an active artist and entrepreneur and teaching children art and entrepreneurship, not only gives the instructor credibility, but it models to the youth that the activities they are participating in are respected and embraced by successful adults. Again, this same model is repeated in the Little Black Pearl Program and in Artists for Humanity, as the founders and employees were all working artists that collaborated with the youth as often as they mentored them.

When I changed my curriculum and introduced the game and gift challenges at my camp, one hour was not enough time. The students could not complete the tasks alone. This meant that I had to become a participant as well, working with each student, problem-solving, and demonstrating my own artistic processes. The divide between teacher and students was no longer apparent, and students were able to see how an adult used the same tactics they were using. This kind of teamwork both validated the work they were creating, but it also built a mutual respect and trust between us as artists.

7.3 Real-World Value

Possibly the most important manifestation of participant value were the shows and sales at the end of each of these out-of-school programs. This is the most direct affirmation of the

importance of the student's participation. Their artwork was literally funding the programs, both by sales, but also through visitor donations to shows. Not only was their work important to the program, but it was important to others, as strangers saw value in the work, bought the pieces and put them in their homes. These artworks are not just something these youth made, they are pieces of the youth, and extensions of their bodies and minds. The idea that another person, who does not know you, finds a part of you interesting enough to keep on display in their office, living room, or yard, is an incredible expression of personal value.

Within my camp experience, I found adding that additional moment of validation changed everything for the projects. It changed the amount of effort put into the techniques, it changed the amount of thought put into the ideas, and it changed the amount of pride the participants felt towards their work. The gift challenge showed each child that they had the power to create an object that would be cherished and valued by another, while at the same time, showing the gift recipient that they were also cherished and valued. In the end, the participants only took home pictures of their recipients holding the gift they had made. In my opinion, these pictures are the most valuable things the kids at camp were sent home with, and these pictures would likely be kept much longer than any projects they would have made for themselves.

CHAPTER 8

CONCLUSION

The obstacles faced by youth growing up in poor urban communities are considerable. The dominant culture of the schools is not always best equipped to support the growth and development of youth coming from underprivileged backgrounds. Still, to succeed in this society, these youth must learn the cultural toolkits necessary to navigate dominant culture as they attend school, look for jobs, and build or maintain political power for their communities. These tools are not necessarily academic, and are thus learned through cultural and social education. Important examples of cultural capital tools in contemporary society are: professionalism, negotiation, communication, collaboration, emotional control, leadership, self-promotion, the ability to give and receive constructive criticism, and flexibility.

These lessons, discussed as "tier two" skills in this paper, have the potential to affect the greater life opportunities and decisions of the individual, such as: improved grades, higher potential for high school graduation, higher potential for attending college, and reducing peer temptations such as gang participation, teen pregnancy, the use of illegal substances, theft, and vandalism (Clawson & Coolbaugh, 2001; Simpson, 2003; Forrestel, 2004; Quinn & Kahne, 2001).

Afterschool programs have shown an ability to teach many of these skills, and afterschool art programs teaching entrepreneurship have a unique edge in this campaign. The explicit and implicit demonstrations of youth value lend themselves to building strong youth efficacy in these programs. This efficacy can motivate participants to remain in these programs and continue to learn the cultural and professional skills necessary to succeed in our contemporary entrepreneurial society.

REFERENCES

- Adejumo, C. O. (2002). Promoting artistic and cultural development through service learning and critical pedagogy in a low-income community art program. *Visual Arts Research*, 36(1), 23-34.
- Artists for Humanity EpiCenter Receives LEED Platinum Rating. (2005). *Environmental Design + Construction*, 8(11), 12,14. Retrieved March 3, 2011, from ABI/INFORM Trade & Industry. (Document ID: 948865151).
- Arts Facility Puts Programming to Practice. (2006). *Building Operating Management*, 53(2), 78. Retrieved March 3, 2011, from ABI/INFORM Trade & Industry. (Document ID: 989439481).
- Aud, S., Hussar, W., Planty, M., Snyder, T., Bianco, K., Fox, M., Frohlich, L., Kemp, J., Drake, L. (2010). The Condition of education 2010 (NCES 2010-028). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.
- Beckett, M., Borman, G., Capizzano, J., Parsley, D., Ross, S., Schirm, A., & Taylor, J. (2009). Structuring out-of-school time to improve academic achievement: A practice guide. *National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education*. Retrieved from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides>.
- Benson, C. (2004). Chicago Youth Develop Business Skills and Artistic Talent. *Crisis* (15591573), 111(5), 12. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.
- Bong, M. (2004). Academic motivation in self-efficacy, task value, achievement goal orientations, and attributional beliefs. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 97(6), 287-297.
- Carryl, E., Lord, H., & Mahoney, J. L. (2005). An ecological analysis of afterschool program participation and the development of academic performance and motivational attributes for disadvantaged children. *Child Development*, 76(4), 811 – 825.
- Carter, P. L. (2003). "Black" cultural capital, status positioning, and schooling conflicts for low-income african american youth. *Social Problems*, 50(1), 136-155.
- Clawson, H. J., & Coolbaugh, K. (2001). The youth arts development project. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*, 1–16. (Report: NCJ–186668)

- Cohen, P. (2010, October 17). 'Culture of poverty' makes a comeback. *The New York Times*, p 1A.
- Coley, R. L., Morris, J. L., & Hernandez, D. 2004. Out-of-school care and problem behavior trajectories among low-income adolescents: Individual, family, and neighborhood characteristics as added risks. *Child Development*, 75(3), 948-965.
- Cosden, M., Morrison, G., Albanese, A. L., & Marcias, S. (2001). When homework is not home work: Afterschool programs for homework assistance. *Educational Psychologist*, 36, 211– 221.
- Downs, A. (1978). The impact of housing policies on family life in the united states since world war II. *Daedalus*, 106(2), 163-180.
- Ewing, R. (2010). The arts and Australian education : Realizing potential. *Australian Education Review*. Retrieved from <http://research.acer.edu.au/aer/11>
- Forrestel, P. (2004). Empowering youth: A Framework for evaluating community-based art education. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Florida, Gainesville.
- Fusarelli, L. D. (2004). The potential impact of the no child left behind act on equity and diversity in american education. *Educational Policy*, 18(1), 71-94.
- Gecas, V. (1989). The social psychology of self-efficacy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 15, 291-316.
- Gecas, V. & Seff, M. A. (1989). Social class, occupational conditions, and self-esteem. *Sociological Perspectives*, 32(3), 353-364.
- Gibb, A. (2005). Towards the entrepreneurial university: Entrepreneurship education as the lever for change. NCGE Policy Paper 3, NCGE, Birmingham.
- Gist, M. E. & Mitchell, T. R. (1992) Self-efficacy: A theoretical analysis of its determinants and malleability. *The Academy of Management Review*, 17(2) 183-211.
- Graham, S., Lepper, M. R., Henderlong, J. & Pintrich, P. R. (2002) Motivation. *Encyclopedia of Education Online*, 5(2), 1690-1701. Retrieved From: http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?&id=GALE%7CCX3403200422&v=2.1&u=uiuc_uc&it=r&p=GVRL&sw=w
- Grossman, L. (2010, December 15). Person of the year 2010: Mark Zuckerberg. *Time*. Retrieved from

http://www.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,2036683_2037183_2037185,00.html.

Halpern, R. (2002). A different kind of child development institution: The history of afterschool programs for low-income children. *Teachers College Record*, 104(2), 178-211.

Jackson, J. W. (2002). Enhancing self-efficacy and learning performance. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 70(3), 243-254.

Jain, V. (2003). Not-So-Starving Artists. *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, 1(2), 66-67. Retrieved March 3, 2011, from ABI/INFORM Global. (Document ID: 684917811).

Jones, J. E. (1997). A lesson in teaching art self-confidence from drawing on the right side of the brain. *Art Education*, 50(2), 33-38.

Kane, T. J. (2004). The impact of afterschool programs: Interpreting the results of four recent evaluations. New York: W. T. Grant Foundation.

Kourilsky, M. L. (1995). Entrepreneurship education: Opportunity in search of curriculum. *Business Education Forum*, 50(10), 11-15.

Kugler, M. R. (2001). Afterschool programs are making a difference. *NASSP Bulletin*, 85(626), 3-11.

Lauer, P. A., Akiba, M., Wilkerson, S. B., Aphorp, H. S., Snow, D., & Martin-Green, M. (2006). Out-of-school time programs: A meta-analysis of effects for at risk students. *Review of Educational Research*, 76, 275-313.

Little Black Pearl Art and Design Center (2011). The Business of Art. Retrieved from <http://www.blackpearl.org/rent/>

Luftig, R., Donovan, M., Farnbaugh, C., Kennedy, E., Filicko, T., & Wyszomirski, M. (2003). So what are you doing after college? An Investigation of individuals studying the arts at the post-secondary level, their job aspirations and levels of realism. *Studies in Art Education*, 41(5), 5-19.

Mahoney, J. L. (2000). School extracurricular activity participation as a moderator in the development of antisocial patterns. *Child Development*, 71(2), 502-516.

National Endowment for the Arts, et al. (2002). The art in peacemaking: a guide to integrating conflict resolution education into youth arts programs.

- Neill, M. (2003). Leaving children behind: How no child left behind will fail our children. *The Phi Delta Kappan*, 85(3), 225-228 .
- Pajares, F. (2000, January 27). Schooling in America: Myths, mixed messages, and good intentions. Paper presented at Emory University, Cannon Chapel, Great Teachers Lecture Series. Retrieved from <http://www.emory.edu/EDUCATION/mfp/pajaresgtl.html>
- Patten, P., & Robertson, A. S. (2001) Focus on afterschool time for violence prevention. ERIC-Cass Virtual Library. Retrieved from <http://ceep.crc.illinois.edu/eecearchive/digests/2001/patten01.pdf>
- Pattillo-McCoy, M. (2000). Black picket fences: Privilege and peril among the Black middle class. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pence, E. R. (2010). Becoming upward bound: Ritual, self-esteem and the production of belonging. Unpublished master's thesis, Humboldt State University, California.
- Plane, K. (2009). Reconciling the competing policy platforms in TVET? Promulgating 'the 6Es plus education' for youth through social partnerships. *International Handbook of Education for the Changing World of Work*, 2357-2371.
- Portes, A. 1998. Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 24, 1-24.
- Posner, J. K., & Vandell, D. L. (1994). Low-income children's afterschool care: Are there beneficial effects of afterschool programs. *Child Development*, 65(2), 440-456.
- Quinn, T., & Kahne, J. (2001). Wide awake to the world: The arts and urban schools—conflicts and contributions of an afterschool program. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 31, 11-32.
- Rasheed, H. S. (2000). Developing Entrepreneurial Potential in Youth: The effect of entrepreneurial education and venture creation. Working Paper. University of South Florida. Hypertext available at: <http://www.usasbe.org/conference/s2001/proceedings/papers/063.pdf>
- Reed-Woodward, M. A. (2008). Take the lead. *Black Enterprise*, 38(10), 114. Retrieved from EBSCOhost
- Roach, J. L. & Gursslin (1967). An evaluation of the concept "culture of poverty". *Social Forces*, 45(3), 383-392.

- Rose, S. E., Jolley, R.P., & Burkitt, E. (2006). A review of children's teachers' and parents' influences on children's drawing experience. *International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 25(3), 341-349.
- Shumow, L. (2001) Academic effects of afterschool programs. ERIC-Cass Virtual Library. Retrieved from <http://ceep.crc.uiuc.edu/eeearchive/digests/2001/shumow01.html#pierce>
- Simpson, D. (2003). Community-based art and entrepreneurship programs for inner cities: Designing a quality art program model. Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (AAT 3131023)
- Swidler, A. (1986). Culture in action: symbols and strategies. *American Sociological Review*, 51(2), 273-286.
- Tart, N. (2010). Top 25 young entrepreneur success stories. *JuniorBiz*. Retrieved from <http://juniorbiz.com/top-25-young-entrepreneurs>
- Usher, E. L., & Pajares, F. (2008). Sources of self-efficacy in school: Critical review of the literature. *Review of Educational Research*, 78(4), 751–796.
- Venkatesh, Sudhir A. (2002). *American project: The rise and fall of a modern ghetto*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Welsh, M. E., Russell, C. A., Williams, I., Reisner, E. R., & White, R. N. (2002). Promoting learning and school attendance through afterschool programs: Student-level changes in educational performance across TASC's first three years. *Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates*.
- Whitbeck, L. B., Simons, R. L., Conger, R. D., Wickrama, K. A. S., Ackley, K. A., Elder, G. H. (1997). The effects of parents' working conditions and family economic hardship on parenting behaviors and children's self-efficacy. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 60(4), 291-303.
- Wilson, W.J. (1996). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital? A critical race theory discussion of community cultural wealth. *Race Ethnicity and Education*, 8(1), 69–91.