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“The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.”

- Karl Marx

The social institutions that comprise the structure of society - family systems, religion, education, politics, economics, and healthcare - depend on each other and have significant impact on one another (Ballantine, 1987). In this respect we can see that education, the institution that teaches skills and knowledge as well as culture and values, consists of more than just the learning process itself. The education system also interacts with and is influenced by other forces, such as religious beliefs and socioeconomic status.

Sociologists use theories as they attempt to make sense of these interactions and effects. Social theories offer a frame of explanation as to why things in society happen as they do, and thus help explain how society operates. They serve as tools that provide the framework for understanding and change, and they offer different ways to understand education in its social context. By applying theory, either one or a blend of two or more, to a societal problem it might be possible to find out what is going wrong and work on any necessary improvements. One such social theory is conflict theory, a macrolevel theory (study of society as a whole), which assumes that social behavior is best understood in terms of conflict and inequality between competing groups (Ballantine, 1987).

Conflict theory is built upon the analysis of class conflicts by Karl Marx, the German philosopher, political economist, and social theorist. Born in 1818, Marx studied philosophy at the University of Berlin but he later shifted his focus towards economics and politics (Elster, 1986). Marx’s ideas had a profound impact on sociological thought and theory, and as stated by Coser (1971), “underlying all of Marx’s mature writings is the search for social reality”. In
his analysis of social structure, Marx viewed the economic system as its major component and established that society is “economically determined” (Jost, 2006) and in constant competition over resources. He concluded that this competition is the center of every social relationship and is the primary force shaping social structure (Elwell, 2003).

Marx believed that a person’s class membership is related to capital, ownership of property, and the forces of production. Consequently, two classes exist within society - the bourgeoisie (the owning or ruling class) and, the class into which most people fall, the proletariat (the working class or laborers) (Elwell, 2003). These classes differ in their amount of control over and level of access to resources. As seen in these two social groups, the means of production shape the relationships between groups of people. The motive of all human action is economic and the dominant groups use their power to exploit those with less control (Coser, 1971). In order for those who own the means of production to make a profit they must pay the laborers less than the value of the product being produced, and because of such inequality it was believed that the proletariat would organize a revolution to expedite change (Coser, 1971).

Marx developed a model of social systems in which one class dominates the other, and he reasoned that this class struggle is what eventually leads to change. He believed that society would be transformed by a revolution led by the exploited class, though this prediction of an uprising to overthrow capitalism has never happened. This is how Marx believed that progress occurs; the power of the ruling group must be overthrown and different forms of privilege abolished in order to remedy social injustice and correct societal inequality (Elwell, 2003). Therefore, conflict is not necessarily negative since it is thought to
lead to greater equality and to changes that are of benefit to society.

Conflict theory views society as a battle for dominance among the competing social groups and feels that the primary cause of social problems is the exploitation and oppression of the subordinate groups by the dominant groups. Different individuals and groups in the social structure struggle against each other and compete for scarce and valued resources (Jost, 2006). Because of this, the powerful members of dominant groups create the rules for success and opportunity in society thus often denying subordinate groups chances to succeed and achieve. This ensures that the dominant groups remain in power and continue to control the livelihood of others. Limited resources lead to injustice and discrimination between social groups because they are in competition with one another for resources and survival (Fischer and Marek, 1970).

According to conflict theory, social institutions and class patterns are structured to maintain existing conditions (the status quo). Social institutions help to preserve the privileges of the most powerful groups and individuals within a society, while at the same time contributing to the powerlessness and oppression of others. The education system, which is the means of transmitting the values, beliefs, and social skills of the dominant culture from one generation to the next (Ballantine, 1987; Jost, 2006), is viewed negatively by conflict theory because this social transmission is seen as a power struggle that helps to maintain inequality between the social classes. Therefore, those who hold power can use education as a tool of control.

From conflict theory perspective, education reflects the inequality found in the class structure of our capitalist society, and inequality will continue to exist as long as capitalism
exists (Ballantine, 1987). As explained by Samuel Bowles, schools in the United States did not evolve to ensure equality for all, but rather to meet the need for the capitalist employers’ labor force to learn required skills and “provide a mechanism for social control in the interests of political stability” (Ballantine, 1987). Capitalist society depends on who controls the wealth, and power therefore remains in the hands of the dominant population. The education system reinforces this existing class structure and benefits individuals and groups who have the power to dominate and exploit others.

In contrast to the ideas of Karl Marx, Max Weber differed in his version of conflict theory. Marx regarded society in terms of class conflicts and saw social class as being based in economic determinism, especially in relation to the ownership of property. Weber, however, believed that sociologists must study social actions instead of social facts and social structures, claiming that class involves subjective meanings (verstehen). Weber felt that this should be the focus when studying human interactions and social systems, as ideas were the independent variable that shaped the economic system (Schutt, 2004). He felt that there are many economic factors shaping class formation and he looked at power and status as well as economic class (Ballantine, 1987). Weber noted that control of all types of wealth (not just the means of production) determines one’s degree of power, and his theory deals with conflict, domination, and groups struggling for wealth, power, and status in society (Ballentine, 1987). One of Weber’s major contributions to conflict theory was in the concept of stratification; he elaborated on Marx’s work and also used the concept of class, but for Weber a class is where a set of people occupy the same objective economic condition. Weber’s definition of class overlaps with that of Marx in many ways, yet there are significant
differences, such as the absence of exploitation in Weber’s concept of class relations and the fact that he attributed the concept of class to a series of contrasts with characteristics of stratification, especially status (Schutt, 2004).

According to Weber, class differences result from economic differences which may have no direct relation to property, and he felt that the primary activity of schools is to teach particular “status cultures”. Schools are shaped by the interests of society’s dominant groups, and these groups differ in cultural status and power, not only in property ownership. Schools reinforce existing inequality by making assumptions based on class status. Inequality between the schools themselves contributes to unequal opportunities between the higher and lower classes. A person’s social worth is often determined by their education level, and “The superiority of the well-educated over the ill-educated is understood as comparison between innately superior and inferior human beings” (Levitas, 1974).

Sociological theories offer different approaches in their views of society and they can provide different insights into inequality. One theory is not superior to the others, and none are without limitations. Perhaps the primary limitation of conflict theory is that it overemphasizes economic relations and the dimensions of class and class struggle and places too little emphasis on the individual (Ballantine, 1987), including the impacts of gender, race, and other significant components of humanity. Conflict theorists assert that the domination of the lower class by the upper class is preserved because schools reproduce the hierarchical class structure that is a part of capitalist society. This structural reproduction is the underlying cause of educational inequity and will persist as long as capitalism continues to exist (Kellner, 2000). However, this is only a partial explanation since social class alone does
not explain children’s school achievement; in addition to social class, there are other relevant factors that are important to consider, such as biological and psychological factors. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that inequities in education will end if capitalism were abolished.

For many people education is the primary way to achieve upward movement on the social ladder, and the success of each child greatly depends on the quality of education that he or she receives. Since, according to conflict theory, society is held together by the ability of the dominant class (the haves) to control the subordinate class (the have nots), education can also be viewed as a tool of oppression. It can be a way to exploit and oppress disadvantaged groups by denying them an education that will allow achievement and success. Inequality in the educational process determines which students have the tools to be successful in the future.

Schooling is a powerful force in both the distribution of power and the access to resources. One of the most important resources in today’s world is the use of and access to technology, both in the classroom as a teaching tool and in the home. It is a tool that can strengthen the learning process and because of its great educational and informational value it can be considered an element of control by elite groups in society. Educational institutions serve the interests of those who dominate the economy, namely the upper class, and not all social groups may have the same level of access to technology.
"Every child in America deserves a chance to participate in the Information Revolution"

- Bill Clinton

Technology is quickly changing the world around us -- the way we live, the way we communicate, and the way we learn. Every aspect of modern life in the United States is affected by technology, from employment to communication to education. People must be able to use technology effectively to be successful in a world distinguished by the rapid development of new types of information and means of communication. We have become increasingly dependent on technology as it continues to pervade our lives on a daily basis, but it also has an important role as a means to support and enhance learning. Learning environments that integrate technology play a large part in preparing students to be successful in our society, and it is important for schools to produce technology competent students who are prepared for the world ahead of them.

The demand for a well-educated workforce has increased as our society has become more technologically oriented, prompting the need for improvements and reforms in education. Schools are representative of the society around us. Children being educated in the 21st century cannot gain the skills necessary to succeed without a more technically advanced education. Schools must now prepare their students to be competent in a world that is continuously impacted by new advances in information technologies. Technology enriched classrooms provide enormous opportunities for interaction and collaboration, helping students to develop skills such as independent learning, critical thinking, problem solving, and decision making (Kosakowski, 1999). These are important traits that are highly valued and important both inside and outside of the classroom, and technology that can be used for such
learning are of enormous educational significance. As society becomes more digitally advanced, everyone will need proficiency in technology just to be informed citizens. For these reasons, technology can be seen as the means of production in the social institution of education, with information, knowledge, and more advanced skills becoming the end product of the production process. Social class determines who benefits and who is denied opportunity to benefit from technology as an educational resource, and conflict theory provides insight into the reasons why.

As students use technology in the classroom (such as the internet for research, working in groups on an interactive problem solving project, or using software to develop presentations), there is a tendency for them to experience greater control over their own thinking and learning. The National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering (1995) emphasize the importance of technology in promoting educational opportunities for all students, stating, "Technology deployed in education can help remove inequities between the schools of the inner city and the suburbs, between cities and rural districts...Technology can become the force that equalizes the educational opportunities of all children regardless of location and social and economic circumstance". But such a vision has not been realized, as students from inner-city communities who have not in the past experienced equal learning opportunities, and who perhaps could benefit most from high-technology learning tools, often do not have equal opportunities to use these applications in productive ways. Whether they have sufficient access to these means of information and the skills necessary to use them impacts the rest of our society. In this sense, education, which in the past has been a way for a poor child to move out of poverty, is now a component of the
system that confines them to the lower class. The same technologies that can be used to benefit and empower some people can be a means of exploiting and controlling others, and it is in this way that schools, which are powerful societal institutions, can be used as tools for one group to exert power over others.

While computers can be found in inner-city schools about as much as in other schools, the difference is found in terms of adequate machines and internet availability in the classroom, and even more so when looking at more advanced uses such as conducting research on the internet (Barton, 2004). While wealthier suburban school districts can afford state of the art technology and equipment, inner-city schools will often have to do their best with out-of-date instructional materials. However, and perhaps more importantly, it has been found that equalizing internet resources at school may have little effect on inequality in internet use because students also gain valuable skills and experience by having computers available at home (DiMaggio, et al., 2004). Unfortunately, many in our society who are at the bottom of the socioeconomic ladder often do not have the luxury and convenience of home internet access. Fewer families in low income communities have home computers than do families in more affluent communities (Benton Foundation), and minority and low-income families, who make up the vast majority of inner-city neighborhoods, are therefore increasingly isolated from the knowledge and information necessary to survive and thrive in our technology dependent society.

The term “digital divide” was developed in response to a U.S. Department of Commerce report titled “Falling through the Net” (2000) which showed this inequality and increasing disparity between poor and affluent families' access to technology and the
internet; simply stated, the gap between the students and families with access to information
technology and those without it. More recently this definition has been expanded to mean
"the gap between those who have access to and can effectively use information technologies
and those who cannot" (Wilhelm, 2001). As of the year 2000, more than 100 million Americans
were still not online. This report showed that minority families were still far behind whites in
having home access to computers and the internet. At the time, 70 percent of minorities were
not connected to the internet, with income and education being the primary factors in
determining who is and who isn’t online. The report affirmed that “individuals’ economic and
social well-being increasingly depend on their ability to access, accumulate, and assimilate
information” (Attewell, 253). A more recent study (Kadel, 2006) using data from 2003 showed
that households with high-speed, broadband access were approximately 26% white, 14%
African American, and 13% Hispanic. Internet users (at home or elsewhere) were
approximately 65% white, 45% African American, and 37% Hispanic.

This “digital divide” has been a major issue of concern for urban communities, as
many inner-city schools are poorly equipped and cannot provide access to up to date
computers, technology education, and internet access for their students. A key assumption of
conflict theory is that society is based on class divisions which are determined by their
economic relations. Under the capitalist mode of production, the lower class experiences
alienation, and this relates to the digital divide as they are excluded from the empowerment
that can be achieved through internet access. Those who remain without access (or the skills
and resources to attain access) are further alienated just by being excluded from the
awareness of the benefits that the internet holds.
But the problem is not one of mere access; if this were the case disparities could be resolved simply by giving everyone a computer with internet access. Attempts to resolve problems by simply adding technology without making any other changes rarely succeed. Such an attempt to bridge the digital divide in Ennis, Ireland demonstrates that computers alone are not sufficient (Warschauer, 2002). In this situation the town in Western Ireland was given the equivalent of 22 million US dollars to implement their vision of what an “information age town” should be (including an internet-ready computer for every household, among other initiatives) and was encouraged to implement a technology plan as quickly as possible. However, a visit three years later showed that advanced technology had permeated the world of the Ennis residents with little preparation. Training programs were not sufficiently accompanied by awareness programs to show people why they should use the new technology in the first place. This shows that beyond the inequalities of access, it is important to look at what people are doing with the technology in order to understand what the digital divide means. The modern concept of a digital divide points to disparities not only in terms of access, but also training, skills, and the actual use of technology to improve education and promote class equality.

According to the Benton Foundation, there has always been a gap between those people and communities who can make effective use of information technology and those who cannot. Without fair access, the gap between the technology “haves” and the “have nots” will widen, worsening the already present disparity in the quantity and quality of educational resources that are available to different groups because of their location or socioeconomic conditions. Increased access to and use of technology in the area of education facilitates
positive social change, and more than ever this exclusion keeps many from gaining cultural capital and further reinforces social stratification. The concept of a digital divide has helped bring attention to a critical social issue: does technology such as the internet reinforce class divisions and marginalization, or does it help the move toward equality?

Since as early as 1993, when fewer than 3% of the population had used the internet, it has been noted that some kinds of people used it more than others and those with higher internet access also had greater access to education, income and other resources that help people get ahead (DiMaggio et al., 2004). The Benton Foundation has stated that social class is a bigger determinate of home internet use than any other factor, and the reason for this might be explained by looking at cultural capital. The French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu concluded that culture adds to the wealth of a particular class, with cultural capital being defined as “the possession of certain cultural competencies, bodies of cultural knowledge that provide for distinguished modes of cultural consumption” (Rojas, et al., 2000). From an educational viewpoint, the term cultural capital does not include material wealth, but rather the various non-economic forces of a particular class, such as academic goals and availability of different resources, that influence academic success. Thus, cultural capital is any advantage a person has which will give them a higher social status whereas it “serves as a resource that people can use to gain or maintain power and privilege” (Dumais, 2005).

As discussed in Yosso (2005), the knowledge of the upper and middle classes are considered valuable in a hierarchical society. If a person is not born into a class whose knowledge is already viewed as valuable, it is theorized that formal education can be used as a means of social mobility. However, it has been said that “the school’s valuation of the
cultural capital of the upper classes and its depreciation of the cultural capital of the lower classes are the most important mechanisms of social reproduction within the educational system” (MacLeod, 1995). While cultural capital is not only exhibited in and passed down by the upper classes, these specific forms of knowledge, skills and abilities are usually valued by the more privileged groups in society, an example of this being computers and the ability to use them proficiently. Our society overflows with information, and homes with internet access have an advantage over those that do not. A higher percentage of middle and upper class students have access to a computer at home and they can therefore learn various technological skills before arriving at school. These skills are valued in the educational setting, and therefore the cultural capital of these students puts them at a significant advantage over ethnic minorities and first generation Americans.

Schools themselves are not the distributors of cultural capital, but they do serve the interests of the elites by rewarding the cultural capital of the predominantly white middle and upper classes. It is said by Naville (1963) that “acquired knowledge has always been, to a certain extent, the distinguishing sign of the elite…”. It is fairly obvious that the internet generally reflects the culture, tastes, and interests of the higher classes and not ethnic minorities and lower class citizens, and for this reason cultural capital is essential in examining digital inequality and why some groups of people are not connected to the web. It is common to think that as the price of home computers and internet connections becomes more affordable people of lower income levels will readily purchase and use them, but research has shown that ethnicity and class play a large role in the use of the internet (Rojas et al., 2000) and it can be seen that poverty is not the only issue that is a barrier to
information technology. Norris (2004) states that, “While income explains race differences in home computer ownership, whites are still more likely to own a home computer than African Americans at all income levels”. Research shows that, as of 2001, only 50% of Hispanics (who are the fastest growing ethnic group in the United States) over the age of eighteen had used the internet, with about half accessing the web from home computers (Norris, 2004).

Social class also plays an important role in shaping the values that support the stratification system. Conflict theory views stratification in terms of struggle between the “haves” and “have nots”, and social stratification can thus be explained as the division of society into classes that have unequal amounts of wealth, power, and status. The members of each specific class hold the same amounts of scarce resources and share values and a similar lifestyle which is transmitted through generations. These groups of people are ranked in a hierarchy based on socially differentiated characteristics, thereby creating social injustice (Wilson, et al., 2003) in the unequal accessibility to privileges and resources (such as technology). This system of domination results in inequality where those with the most resources exploit and control others, and there is blocked mobility in the system because the lower classes are denied equal opportunities (Harris, 2003). Digital inequality, the pattern of social stratification that results in the unequal access and use of information technology, prevents the talents of those at the bottom from being discovered and used. Therefore, the more stratified a society, the less likely that society will benefit from the talents of all its citizens (Harris, 2003).

It is one thing to sing the praises of technology as an educational supplement, but the path toward successful implementation is another issue altogether. Evidence of effective
technology integration can be found in schools where the focus is not on the technology itself, but rather on the learning that is taking place. But even when computing access is about equal, students in high-poverty schools use their computers more for remedial learning, while students in low-poverty schools are more likely to work on projects that enhance critical thinking skills (Kadel, 2006). Another barrier to successfully integrating technology into the learning curriculum is an obvious one: funding. Almost all schools in our nation now have computers, but computers are virtually useless as a learning tool without the funds and resources to train teachers and maintain the equipment. According to Harrington-Leuker (1999), urban school districts have a difficult time integrating technology into their classrooms and training teachers in its use. The same factors that make any type of reform difficult in urban schools - limited resources, low expectations of students, poverty, the large size of schools - can deter effective technology use. Appropriate funding and professional development are key ways of supporting equitable access and use of technology so that meaningful learning is realized for all students.

In modern society it is education and schooling which have increasingly become the mode of formation of elites (Naville, 1963), but children from disadvantaged backgrounds can become engaged students and reach their academic potential if they are provided with sufficient opportunities and resources. The use of computers can lead to improved technological proficiency and greater self-confidence among these inner-city students, and the implementation of high-technology learning tools can assist in leveling the playing field to ensure equivalent educational opportunities for all students in all schools. However, by viewing the educational system as a means of control by those in power and the elite we can
see that, even though the goal of our education system is to educate all children, school systems operate in a way that excludes the economic lower-class and minorities. Class is one of the principle factors that shapes “who gets what” (Harris, 2003) in our economically driven society. Sociological, political, and economic trends indicate that access to information technology is, and is likely to remain, restricted by class, race, and geography (Schon et al., 1999) as disparities between educational opportunities for children from low-income and those from upper-income homes persist.

People are not treated as equals in the social institution that possibly has the greatest effect on their life-chances, their education, and without improved access to and implementation of technology in schools, technology itself may assist in widening the gaps between the rich and the poor and inner cities will continue to be isolated from economic and educational opportunities. Reforms in educational systems do not happen in isolation; the efforts to improve schools and properly educate all children are an important part of the continuing attempt to create a more equitable society. While access to information and technology does not in itself change the class systems that lead to inequality and injustice, the issue of unequal access is important because “it is likely to reinforce inequality in opportunities for economic mobility and social participation” (DiMaggio et al., 2004).
"In every child who is born, under no matter what circumstances, and of no matter what parents, the potentiality of the human race is born again."

- James Agee

People use their learned knowledge to attain their goals, and because a higher level of education is necessary for success in today’s world there should be equal access and opportunity for all children (regardless of their socioeconomic status) to receive the best education possible. Our nations children do not have equal access to computers and the internet, which results in a gap between the children who are benefitting from the learning tools that technology offers and those who are not. As a future professional in the field of Instructional Technology, I have a strong concern for equality of learning opportunities and
effective, progressive use of computers and the internet in education. Children from low-income families in urban areas are often left behind with less opportunity to use computers as educational tools, and because of the high value that such access holds in modern daily life, this is a significant inequality.

By applying conflict theory and looking at the concept of cultural capital, I have become aware that the level of importance that a culture perceives information technology to be in their lives, as well as the importance given to education, affects their technology choices. According to Norris (2004), culture is learned and it affects how people approach the world, especially when their culture is not the dominant culture. It is important to consider that how one’s culture relates to the dominant culture, and vice versa, is key in how an individual may perceive information technology and its use in education (both in schools and at home). We tend to forget that the computer itself has risen from “white, male culture”, and while the internet enables us to take advantage of new opportunities for accessing information and learning, such technology also creates new demands for its users. Individuals must be aware of the possibilities presented by the internet before they will perceive it as something important to them, and they must also develop skills that allow them to effectively use these technologies in a learning context. The availability of seemingly unlimited information demands that we develop critical evaluation skills so that these resources can be used intelligently. To use information technology effectively individuals must be able to adapt to a constantly changing environment, and many people may need help in getting the skills required to make computers useful in their lives. As a technology coordinator it will be vital for me to inform people of all social classes about the benefits of technology enhanced
education programs, and assist in establishing curricula and assessment for low-income children that reflects engaged learning to the highest degree. It will also be important that teachers in inner-city schools always have support available and training to assist them in integrating technology into their teaching, though lack of financial resources will most likely be problematic in this area.

The role of society must also be addressed when planning to implement technology in schools. Capitalist society seems more concerned with profits than with the responsibility to provide an equal education to all children. It continually produces injustices, and in a society where education is organized to achieve capitalist goals, public education serves to sort people out and determine who will learn the skills to be successful and who will receive just enough basic education to make an adequate living. It does this through the education system which includes racially and economically segregated school districts that receive different levels of funding. According to Kozol (1991), “…white suburban schools have approximately twice the funds per student as compared with urban schools”. He explains that a local tax based on the value of homes and business within a given district raises the initial funds for schools, and to compensate poorer school districts, they are provided “sufficient funds” to bring them to an estimated equal level of the richer districts. But the poorer districts are only given enough money to provide a minimum of basic education to their students, they aren’t provided funds that are equal to the level of the higher district. This may guarantee that every child receives an education, but, as truly equal educational opportunities for all children can only be accomplished through equal school funding, they don’t receive an equal education.
In applying social theory to the implementation of educational technology, I have realized there are certain questions which must be considered, such as whether equal access to technology is being provided in lower-class schools, when it is provided does it involve access to the same quality of learning experiences by providing use of computers in intellectually powerful ways, and do specific groups differ in their views on the use of technology. It may be easy to think of our society as classless with equal opportunity for all, but there is an overlap of class and race and in the United States class is greatly related to one’s income (Jost, 2006). Thus, low income and low socioeconomic status are intermingled with issues of race and and location.

Conflict theory shows that social class plays a significant role in determining the ways in which technology and information resources are used educationally. Social stratification is another concept that deserves attention while working in an academic environment, as it has a major impact on a person’s chances for a fair and equal life, and education itself stratifies people to serve the interests of the elite groups so that they hold their high social standing. When students in poor schools do not have the same resources as students in middle-income and wealthy schools, those with sufficient resources are the ones who are positively affected, not the schools whose impoverished students can greatly benefit from technology as an learning tool. If one group of students has more learning opportunities, financial support, and resources in the area of technology, then digital inequalities and injustice become obvious. Students in suburban schools clearly have more opportunities and advantages in regard to computer access and use than those in the inner-cities.
Technology can open new doors for students and provide not only new ways of learning but important skills that will benefit them throughout their lives. Home ownership of computers is a continuing inequity in American society, and schools play a critical role in ensuring equal opportunity for less advantaged children to experience the benefits of the more intellectually powerful uses of computers. Education can provide the skills and competencies that will not only improve individuals’ lives but create a better society as well, but before this can happen the inner-city technology divide must be completely eliminated.

While the mere presence of a computer in a classroom does not guarantee a perfect learning environment, and internet access at home does not automatically guarantee better performance in school, when used properly they provide tools that can greatly benefit students as a powerful educational supplement and can serve as an effective partner in classroom education and beyond. As stated by Jones, et al. (1995), technical equity can summed up by the following statement: "Technology is a tool that gives everyone an equal chance to learn....Universal participation, as a policy goal, means that all students in all schools have access to and are active on the information highway in ways that support engaged learning. Inequities will be reduced because everyone will have equal access and equal opportunity to learn". If technical inequities are not diminished, the students in America’s schools will always be impacted by these divisions of class.
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