INTRODUCTION

Challenges of the New Sociology of Urban Education

Karen A. McClafferty, Carlos A. Torres, and Theodore R. Mitchell

According to a report by the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the proportion of all public school students in the United States who attend urban schools has been increasing slowly over time, to the point where the proportion of students in urban schools was at 28 percent in 1990. The report also points out that urban schools tend to be larger, with fewer resources, and located in areas with higher poverty rates. The student populations in urban schools are also more likely to be comprised of people of color[1] or of students who have difficulty speaking English. In addition, children in urban areas are more often exposed to conditions that endanger their health and well-being, such as limited access to medical care and increased exposure to violence and crime.[2]

Each of these factors alone presents a challenge to the student who must cope with it. These factors compounded present an even greater challenge. Hence, the perception that students in urban schools are "disadvantaged" or "at-risk" is not surprising. Indeed, the NCES found that even after controlling for poverty, students who attend urban schools are less likely than their suburban or rural counterparts to complete high school. Those who do graduate are more likely to be unemployed or living in poverty. Given these findings, the characterization of urban schools as in a "state of crisis"[3] seems reasonable and even necessary. This perception has been reinforced recently by works such as Jonathan Kozol's *Savage Inequalities*, which, through rich description and disturbing statistics, emphasizes the enormous inequities that exist in many urban schools.[4] The media attention received by Kozol's book and oth-

3

ers like it has served to heighten awareness of the often drastic conditions of urban schools in the United States.

Another important point of the NCES report, however, is that the "often-cited bleak perceptions of urban schools and students may be overstated."[5] Indeed, the tendency in urban educational research to focus on problems and weaknesses is being challenged on many fronts, as researchers and practitioners alike realize the importance of highlighting both strengths and triumphs. In response, many researchers have begun to wrestle the spotlight away from the deficiencies of education, to shine it on the successes. Gloria Ladson-Billings, for example, describes the triumphs of teachers of African American students, calling them "dreamkeepers" because of their ability to enable their students to keep their dreams alive. She concludes her book by asserting her belief and hope that "if we can dream it, we can surely do it."[6] Similarly, Mike Rose argues that our criticism of public schools has become "one-dimensional . . . the humanity drained from it." In his contribution to a critique that "encourages both dissent and invention, fury and hope,"[7] Rose sets out on a journey to document the successes of public education. His rich descriptions of classrooms across the country highlight the greatest strengths of our efforts. It is in the voices of students and teachers—heard in works such as these—that an alternative vision of education can be found. Because these voices are often not easily heard through traditional positivistic research, the field of the sociology of education has begun to shift as well.

Viewed through a sociological lens, an analysis of contemporary urban education is increasingly an analysis of tensions, contradictions, and complexity. While both cities and the students in city schools have always been challenging and important subjects of inquiry, we are at a point in social history that increases this challenge enormously. More specifically, as the bodies of sociological theory for understanding cities become more complex, so too do the geographic and demographic structures of the cities themselves. As we begin to focus our theoretical frameworks more closely on making connections between the local and the global and the individual and the structural, these connections and characteristics become even more confounding.

CHANGING URBAN STRUCTURE

According to the U.S. Census, the proportion of people living in urban areas in the United States has been steadily increasing over the past fifty years.[8] Indeed, American cities—like cities everywhere—have been expanding and increasing in population and size since the end of World

War II. But as the cities change, so too do the ways in which we define them. To be sure, the definition of "urban" has never been simple or straightforward.

Urbanicity is perhaps most often discussed in terms of numbers. Frequently, this simply means population levels, with those of a certain size being deemed urban. Other distinctions have been based on population densities, with figures ranging from 1,000 to 10,000 persons per square mile serving as the line of demarcation. Although this type of analysis is important for many types of sociological inquiry that examine cities in broad scope, Louis Wirth, in a now classic discussion of the topic, notes its arbitrariness. He argues that this way of defining cities does not account for many of their significant social characteristics, and that attention to the many particularities of urban areas is necessary. With that in mind, he contends that "for sociological purposes a city may be defined as a relatively large, dense, and permanent settlement of socially heterogeneous individuals."[9] The result of this particular social structure, in his view, is the replacement of primary-group relationships with more impersonal, secondary relations, leading to lives more solitary and isolated than those of non–city dwellers.

In a response to Wirth's article, Herbert Gans makes an important, further distinction between "inner city," "outer city," and "suburban." He notes that Wirth's analysis seems to apply only to those residents of the inner city—the area that surrounds the central business district. It neglects the surrounding residential areas (or, the outer city) and the less population-dense suburbs. Gans notes both the importance of and difficulty in distinguishing between these different types of areas, because it may be economics, interpersonal relations, or something else entirely that sets them apart.[10]

Researchers must make distinctions somewhere, however, and in such instances, the criteria used by the U. S. Census are of some value. The Bureau of the Census defines "urban" as any area populated by 2,500 people or more. Clearly, this definition is still too vague to be of use to the sociologist studying urban education, but the broader Census category of "Metropolitan Statistical Area" (or MSA) is useful and applicable in this context. This refers to a city with 50,000 or more inhabitants or an urbanized area (defined by the Census bureau) with at least 50,000 inhabitants and a total metropolitan population of 100,000 (or 75,000 in New England). Using these criteria, "urban" can be understood as the central city of the MSA, suburban as the towns and cities outside of the central city, but still within the MSA. Any area outside of an MSA is considered rural.

The use of the Census category "MSA" is particularly relevant at this point in social history because it more fully captures a very signifi-

cant shift in our city structures—the development of the megalopolis. As Robert Fishman notes, the largest cities at the beginning of the twentieth century typically measured one hundred square miles. The "new city" (the megalopolis) generally covers up to three thousand square miles. Encompassing both urban centers and suburban neighborhoods, these cities lack "what gave shape and meaning to every urban form of the past: a dominant single core and definable boundaries."[11] The difficulty in defining "urban," combined with this dramatic change in city structure, presents a great challenge to researchers. The city is no longer definable by geographic boundaries. Instead, it must be understood within the context of the surrounding region, which typically has characteristics quite distinct from the urban core.

The decentralization of cities, particularly evident in North America, is simultaneous with the gradual loss of the economic and political importance of the urban core (or "inner city").[12] The implications for urban education are enormous, as attention and resources shift away from the "city proper" and are dispersed to more affluent suburbs. Englert notes that this type of change results in a "severe concentration of poverty and social isolation of the inner-city from the mainstream of American life."[13] As more affluent residents depart for the outlying suburbs, the economy of the city becomes even more depressed. As a result, tax-supported services—such as schools—are at a great detriment. This is only compounded by problems with crime and violence, which are more common in cities than in suburbs or rural areas.[14]

As a result of the departure of the middle class from urban areas, some argue, the city is left with an impoverished "underclass." Often, this underclass is discussed in relation to people of color, most often blacks, because residential segregation is such a strong enforcer.[15] Residents of the ghetto, argues W. J. Wilson, have no ties to members of the middle and upper classes, because as individuals (in his analysis, blacks) move up the social ladder, there is an out-migration.[16] The end result is a lack of role models and "feelings of resignation originating from bitter personal experiences and a bleak future."[17] Massey and Denton echo this thought, arguing that "what set ghetto blacks apart from other Americans was not their lack of fealty to American ideals but their inability to accomplish them."[18] This concentration of "poor and minority children in inferior inner-city schools," it is argued, makes it difficult "for urban schools to respond effectively to the altered social context."[19]

Alternative analyses of urban life portray the city as space that is essentially at the mercy of dominant interests. For instance, Stephen Haymes argues that consumer capitalism "imposes structures of meaning on black narratives, consequently regulating how blacks come to know who they are as blacks."[20] The important aspect that these two

perspectives share is the distinction between urban and nonurban, and the consequent weakness of the former when compared to the latter. Clearly, these issues of race and class become issues of power as well.

Another considerable factor related to the characteristics of urban areas is the significant demographic shift in recent years.[21] The almost constant flow of new residents has contributed to the development of the megalopolis, described above. Most recently, the accompanying demographic shift has been characterized by the relative increase in numbers of people of color. Englert, for example, notes that between 1993 and the year 2000, the overall growth rate of the Mexican American population in the United States is expected to be 46%. The growth rate in the African American population is projected to be 23%. In sharp contrast, the white population is expected to increase by only 7%.[22] Kretovics and Nussel paint the following picture of urban demographics:

> The minority population of Washington, DC is 73%; 66% of which are black. Detroit has 79% minorities; 76% of which are black. In these cities there are virtually no white children attending public schools. Those that remain are usually from economically depressed families. . . . Hispanic concentrations are noteworthy in other cities. In New York City, the total minority population is 56.8%; 29% black and the remainder mostly Hispanic. In San Antonio, the minority population is 64% of which 56% is Hispanic. In El Paso, the minority population is 74% of which 69% is Hispanic.[23]

Certainly, a portion at least of this demographic shift stems from increasing immigration—a phenomenon occurring worldwide. OECD reports the United Nations' estimate that, in 1993, "100 million people—almost one in fifty of the world's population—were living outside their native country, double the number in 1990."[24] Because the majority of immigrants arriving today settle in urban areas, cities are experiencing particularly dramatic population shifts.[25] The impact of these changes on one school district is described by Dworkin and colleagues in this volume.

The relationship between immigration and education has historically been a difficult one. As is often the case, schools have been seen as an antidote to the perceived related problems. Toward the end of the nineteenth century, for example, when immigration from non–northwestern European countries was on the rise, American schools took on the task of "Americanization." In 1909, Professor Ellwood P. Cubberley of Stanford University described the new wave of immigrants as "illiterate, docile, lacking in self-reliance and initiative, and not possessing the Anglo-Teutonic conceptions of law, order, and government . . . their coming has served to dilute tremendously our national stock, and

to corrupt our civic life."[26] While it would be surprising to hear it in such crass terms today, similar sentiments relating to the need to "Americanize" the immigrant population still exist. The issue of language—a strong indicator of national identity—is a particularly relevant and poignant example of this persistence.

Consider, for example, the debate concerning bilingual education. Conservative supporters of bilingual education do not see it as a means to maintain the ethnic identity of a particular group (as liberal supporters often do), but rather as "a means to speed the assimilation of non-English speakers."[27] Thus, students are often forced to surrender a vital part of their culture if they are to succeed in school. Similarly, Antonia Darder argues that schools serve to "civilize" marginalized students as they are taught their appropriate roles in the economic hierarchy.[28] They must find a way to mediate the differences between their home culture and the culture of the school in order to negotiate their education with any success. Thus, although the terminology and techniques may have evolved into something a bit more subtle, the "Americanizing" function of primary and secondary schools remains and, as a result, students of color "learn" their roles and experience increasing marginalization from the curriculum.

Bilingual education reforms are but one example of the many reform initiatives that characterize American urban education today. Politicians, policy experts, practitioners, and community members all contribute to the ongoing effort to allow city schools to thrive and succeed. Their energies are directed to all levels, from the notion of a national curriculum to the emphasis on the importance of the individual student's engagement with her work. The following section provides a brief overview of some of these efforts.

CURRENT EDUCATIONAL REFORM

In recent years, a variety of educational reforms have addressed the problems with urban education in various ways. Curriculum, school governance, and teacher training—among others—have each received attention. Public interest in the topic has been increasing, arguably as a result of the release more than a decade ago of "A Nation At Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform."[29] At the time, the report was the subject of intense media attention, as the "failure" of American schools was brought to our attention. By some estimates, more than six million copies have been circulated through direct distribution and journal reprints.[30] The report continues to receive attention as support for more recent reform initiatives such as Goals 2000 is sought.[31]

The goals laid out in "A Nation at Risk" address a wide range of factors including standards, curriculum, teachers, and school funding. It was a true "clarion call" for this country, appealing to the fears and concerns of public officials, educators, parents, and students. It warned that if something was not done, America was at risk of losing its stature as a world superpower. But the authoring committee's methods of fixing the schools served a particular purpose and, "all in all," Hlebowitsh argues, the report "was more of a political treatise than a thoughtful statement for the reform of American public schools."[32] Nevertheless, it had grabbed the nation's attention and created a framework for understanding educational reform. This framework is still evident in more current reform initiatives such as President Bush's America 2000 and President Clinton's Goals 2000. Both of these are rooted in top-down reform strategies and both, to varying degrees, push for a national curriculum. Despite widespread political support, the notion that standardization of curricula will make education more rigorous for both students and teachers is nevertheless problematic.

Many arguments for a standardized curriculum are clearly tied to those found in "A Nation at Risk"—education must be improved in order to maintain (or improve) this nation's stature. Michael Apple rightly argues that this push must be understood within the larger context if its implications are to be sufficiently appreciated. To be more specific, "a national curriculum and national testing needs to be situated within larger ideological dynamics in which we are seeing an attempt by a new hegemonic bloc to transform our very ideas of what education is." More precisely, Apple notes the current political context that prizes the market over the individual and "in which democracy becomes an economic, not a political, concept and where the idea of the public good withers at its very roots."[33] Indeed, this neoliberal ideology has enormous implications for urban education, some of which deserve attention here.

The call for more clearly defined standards comes simultaneously with a push for decreased federal intervention and increased privatization in schooling. Amy Stuart Wells and Jeannie Oakes refer to this as "simultaneous centralization and decentralization," noting that many believe freeing schools "of bureaucratic constraints while assuring that all students meet the same standards will lead to greater equality of opportunities across schools and districts."[34] At the root of today's reform efforts is the idea that if market principles are applied to education, schools will be forced to improve in order to survive. Most often, this manifests itself in debates concerning school choice, a principle which encompasses vouchers as well as magnet and charter schools.

The debate surrounding school choice is a heated one. The preface

to a 1995 issue of *Daedalus*—devoted to the issue of equity in American schools—points out that there is a strong belief that public schools are expendable: "if schools do not quickly measure up to what are perceived to be yesterday's standards, parents will be invited to send their children to private facilities, helped to do so by some form of governmentally-supported voucher system."[35] In contrast, there are many who believe that the market is a biased system which cannot solve social, economic, and educational problems and, in fact, will only increase inequality.[36]

Chubb and Moe are strong supporters of the push for school choice. They, like many other neoconservative theorists and policymakers, see the choice as the impetus to school improvement. Specifically, they assert that

> schools of choice tend to be more informal, professional, and unified around a common mission than regular schools of assignment are. Their teachers are more autonomous, more excited about their work, more influential in decision-making, and happier with their overall situations. Students are more satisfied with their chosen schools; dropout and absenteeism rates are down; achievement scores are up. Parents are better informed, more supportive, and participate more actively.[37]

But as rosy as this picture sounds, critics and skeptics of school choice point to the inherent inequities in a market-driven educational system.

Opponents of school choice worry, for example, about the implications for those students not traditionally served by public education. Jonathan Kozol, for instance, worries that if we "strip away the fancy language" that schools will become "a triage operation that will filter off the fortunate and leave the rest in schools where children of the 'better' parents do not need to see them."[38] As Cookson warns, "markets as power structures are ill-suited to providing the kinds of human services that are needed in a stratified and deeply unequal society."[39]

Roslyn Mickelson (in this volume) draws attention to the importance of recognizing both the dangers and opportunities of one form of privatization—corporate interest in school reform. Through her description of one community's experience with these issues, the ways in which these more macrotrends manifest themselves at the local level become clear. Her analysis reveals that it is not a simple issue, and that it must be examined from all aspects before accepted or dismissed. Indeed, as Amy Stuart Wells (also in this volume) makes clear, the neoliberal agenda of privatization and market-driven policy plays differently in different contexts. Her comparative analysis of charter schools in the United States and grant-maintained schools in England highlights the struggle over the very meaning of these political contexts.

Inherent in many of the school choice reform movements is the idea

that individual schools can and should be better-suited to local needs. Local control of schools (or decentralization) can be found in many successful cases including the recent school reform in Chicago. There, political leaders seeking to improve the city's public schools drew on "a well-established network of community-based organizations" and "opted for an unparalleled level of parent and community control."[40] The goal and result was that "the distance between the site of political activity and its consequences was radically reduced. Individual political accountability is now personal, immediate, and sharply drawn."[41] As Mirel notes, "no other reform effort has so clearly targeted the central bureaucracy as the source of the system's educational problems nor has any governance change given so much power to parents to oversee the education of their children."[42] The issue of decentralization, then, is obviously complex and worthy of careful attention.

Two chapters in this volume pay particular attention to issues of local control and reform. The first is a conversation with Ted Mitchell, who serves as advisor to Los Angeles Mayor Richard Riordan on educational matters. His insights into programs such as LA's LEARN (Los Angeles Educational Alliance for Restructuring Now), which emphasizes the importance of local control and school autonomy, bring these issues to a very concrete level. Similarly, a conversation with three former superintendents of schools in Los Angeles about their experiences and thoughts on urban education is presented in another chapter. Their ideas about educational research and practice—based on years of first hand experience as practitioners and policymakers—highlight the importance of critical reflection from the national policy level to the classroom.

Indeed, classroom-level urban educational reform, focused on curricular issues, is a critical component that must not be overlooked. Often, these initiatives take the form of multicultural education, a concept rooted in ideas about teaching students of color that has been expanded to include gender, sexual orientation, and a myriad of other student characteristics.[43] The concept has taken many forms through the years, often according to the political perspective of he or she who is advocating it. Sleeter and Grant, for example, have identified five categories of interpretation, ranging from teaching to bring students into the mainstream to preparing them to question and challenge the status quo.[44] The former is more acceptable to neoconservatives, who advocate a common culture and are therefore often skeptical of (or even adverse to) multicultural movements. The latter is more popular with those who perceive education as a means to social change. Each of these extreme positions is discussed in slightly more detail below.

Norman Podhertz, an early and notable neoconservative, referred to the integration of women and minorities into the curriculum as a

"brazen assault on the entire concept of the classics." Furthermore, he called multiculturalism a "'vulgar' plot to undermine Western civilization itself."[45] Similarly, a 1992 article in *National Review* described multicultural education as "a systematic dismantling of America's unitary national identity in response to unprecedented ethnic and racial transformation."[46] According to Dorrien, the very term "multicultural" is rejected by neoconservatives who believe that this type of education is actually a rejection of all culture (i.e., the common culture) in favor of an empty "diversity." Many neoconservatives argue that the addition of these "other" voices overloads educators and thereby threatens the quality of education.

Neoconservative Diane Ravitch makes a distinction between pluralistic and particularistic forms of multiculturalism. Pluralistic multiculturalism, she argues, rejects the notion of the "melting pot" (which essentially erases ethnic differences) and rather emphasizes the idea that "we must listen to a diversity of voices in order to understand our culture, past and present."[47] Particularistic multiculturalism touts the idea of a "national culture," and posits that this culture is comprised of a diverse mix. Multicultural education allows for a richer, broader interpretation of that culture.

Pluralistic multiculturalism is typically acceptable to neoconservatives, who are amenable to highlighting differences and accepting diversity, provided those who are outside the mainstream assimilate and reshape themselves according to hegemonic ideals.[48] As noted above, neoconservatives advocate an "official knowledge" or a common culture to which others should be exposed, maintaining their own culture only for its folkloric character. In this sense, multicultural education does little to empower individuals, and a great deal to create conformity. Perhaps because there is room for such varied reconceptualization, multiculturalism has been criticized for being "mired in liberal ideology" and offering "no radical change to the current order."[49]

As noted above, however, there are numerous other theorists who do not perceive the potential of the curriculum as simply limited to elaboration on a canon. Educational theorists such as Paulo Freire,[50] Michael Apple,[51] and others warn that unless the curriculum encourages critical reflection, students merely serve as depositories of whatever "knowledge" the teacher chooses to impart. The curriculum, according to Apple, should be "a complicated and continual process of environmental design."[52] A concrete illustration can be found in the work of Ladson-Billings, who describes successful teachers in urban schools. Through culturally relevant teaching, she argues, students are empowered "intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes."[53] In order to

be effective, the curriculum must be co-constructed, not prescribed from above, as in the case of reform initiatives such as the push for a national curriculum, for example.

What is clear from the initiatives described above is that educational reform is now being approached from a variety of perspectives and on numerous levels. At the national level, standards and testing are proposed as a means of "restoring rigor" to our educational system. At the state and community levels, school choice programs such as vouchers and charter schools are intended to decentralize control of the system. And at the classroom level, new curricula are being explored to engage and empower individual students and teachers. And just as reform efforts recognize and address numerous levels and perspectives, so too do the sociological theories that frame them.

THE NEW SOCIOLOGY OF URBAN EDUCATION

Like much social theory, the sociology of education has adopted and incorporated many of the tenets of what has come to be called postmodernism. As Henry Giroux has articulated, postmodernism is largely a reaction to the modernist notion that there is a referent point (or metanarrative) from which all individuals work and that truth exists independently of these individuals.[54] This idea is challenged by postmodernists as restrictive and totalizing. The claim is that in a diverse society such as ours, the wide range of cultures cannot possibly be explained or guided by a single, absolute truth. Essentially a challenge to the positivistic notion that there is an answer for us to work toward in one correct way, postmodernism has been instrumental in reshaping the direction of the sociology of urban education.

In recent years, sociologists of education have called not only for the incorporation and recognition of both qualitative and quantitative approaches, but also for the bridging of the two.[55] Apple (in this volume), in his in-depth discussion of the theoretical tendencies of the sociology of education in the United States, refers to the bridging of various traditions in theory, noting that "a little trespassing may be a good thing here." Similarly, Raymond Morrow (also in this volume) argues that we must develop a critical theory of methodology in order to allow for critical-emancipatory knowledge. Hence, in both theory and research, the trend toward making connections between what were previously seen as dualisms or oppositional concepts is increasingly common. As Wallerstein explains, "If we are to be serious about utopistics, we must stop fighting about nonissues, and the foremost of these nonissues is determinism versus free will, or structure versus agency, or global versus

local, or macro versus micro."[56] Instead, if we are to work toward a more just society, our research must not be limited to one or the other, but dedicated to a broader, more all-encompassing scope.

Hence, the new sociology of education has an important role to play in the improvement of our urban schools. In his chapter included in this volume, for example, Geoff Whitty argues that sociology can and should be used to understand current educational policy. Through an analysis of contemporary social theory and current educational reforms such as school privatization and the reconceptualization of the teaching profession, Whitty argues that "sociologically informed studies of education policy can . . . help to provide lenses which are at some variance with the taken-for-granted assumptions of much contemporary education policy." And it is through these lenses that we may begin to perceive hope and, in turn, change.

Ayers and Ford argue that if city schools are to be improved (in their words, "saved"), we must "create the collective capacity to imagine a dramatically different world, and summon the collective courage to sustain that vision as we work toward making that imagined world real."[57] Indeed, this hope can be found in the voices of students, teachers, and administrators who have the power to bring about the change. This hope can also be found in research that respects these voices and seeks to understand them within a larger context.

Many of the chapters in this volume are presented within the framework of the incorporation of a plurality of voices and the bridging of gaps between research and practice, school and community. For instance, Dworkin and colleagues present an excellent example of the potential for universities to contribute to local school reform. Through their ongoing project assisting school districts with forecasting their changing demography, they have been able to help local school leaders better understand the implications of these important changes. Similarly, Fenning, Wilczynski, and Parraga conclude that if high school violence policies are to be effective and relevant, they must be formulated with a greater degree of input from both parents and students.

In slightly different ways, the chapters from David Keiser and Peter McLaren also give voice to the students of urban schools. Keiser's rich description of his students' lives and writing offers a compelling lens through which to understand the potential of critical pedagogy for combating nihilism in urban schools. Similarly, McLaren offers a thorough analysis of a very particular aspect of many urban students' lives— gangsta rap. Through his labeling of this genre as an oppositional practice, McLaren allows us to more fully understand the connections between the individual, culture, and society in the urban context.

Education is a source of both hope and frustration. Alternately por-

trayed as saviors and as scapegoats, schools are expected to please the body politic, serve individual students, and often work within unreasonable parameters, with insufficient funding and resources. This is particularly the case with urban schools, where political strength is often minimal, student populations are particularly diverse, and resources are especially scarce. Unless the conditions within these schools are better understood so that all of our students are being served, we will deny them their own successes and deny ourselves this vast and critical resource.

Recent sociological theory provides additional, useful lenses for understanding the issues particular to urban education. With increased attention to individual voice and to understanding the interconnectedness between the individual and society at large, sociologists of education have the potential to contribute to a project aimed at more equitable, just, and rewarding experiences for the students in our urban schools and the creation of more productive and prosperous members of our urban societies.

With this volume we seek to contribute to the evolving conversation surrounding these issues. Through the inclusion of sociological inquiry that is as diverse as it is rigorous, it is our intention to illustrate how critical it is that we begin to view urban education through a more complex and rich set of theoretical and empirical lenses. As we move into the next century, it is imperative that we recognize that it is only from this more comprehensive perspective that the sociology of urban education can sufficiently contribute to the improvement of our cities' schools and the empowerment of our cities' students.

NOTES

1. No terminology that differentiates between ethnic and/or racial categories is wholly acceptable. Ethnic or racial "minority" implies a numerical underrepresentation that is not necessarily accurate; use of the term "nonwhite" implies that "white" is a norm; and the phrase "people of color" implies that white is not, in fact, a color. We have chosen the phrase "people of color," however, because we believe it has greater political poignancy than the alternatives.

2. Laura Lippman et al., *Urban Schools: The Challenges of Location and Poverty* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics [Report 96–184], 1996).

3. H. Kantor and B. Brenzel, "Urban Education and the 'Truly Disadvantaged': The Historical Roots of the Contemporary Crisis, 1945–1990," *Teachers College Record* 94.2 (1992): 278–314.

4. Jonathan Kozol, *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools* (New York: Harper Perennial, 1992).

5. Lippman et al., *Urban Schools*, p. xii.

6. Gloria Ladson-Billings, *The Dreamkeepers: Successful Teachers of African-American Children* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1994), p. 143.

7. Mike Rose, *Possible Lives* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1995), p. 4.

8. U.S. Bureau of the Census, *1990 Census of Population, Social and Economic Characteristics, United States* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1993).

9. Louis Wirth, "Urbanism as a Way of Life." 1938 essay reprinted in *Metropolis: Center and Symbol of Our Times,* ed. Philip Kasinitz (New York: New York University Press, 1995), p. 64.

10. Herbert J. Gans, "Urbanism and Suburbanism as Ways of Life: A Reevaluation of Definitions," 1991 revision in *Metropolis: Center and Symbol of Our Times,* ed. Philip Kasinitz (New York: New York University Press, 1995), pp. 170–95.

11. Robert Fishman, "Megalopolis Unbound," in *Metropolis: Center and Symbol of Our Times*, ed. Philip Kasinitz (New York: New York University Press, 1995), p. 398.

12. Philip Kasinitz, *Metropolis: Center and Symbol of Our Times* (New York: New York University Press, 1995).

13. Richard M. Englert, "Understanding the Urban Context and Conditions of Practice of School Administration," in *City Schools: Leading the Way,* ed. Patrick B. Forsyth and Marilyn Tallerico (Newbury Park, Calif.: Corwin Press, 1993), p. 20.

14. David C. Berliner and Bruce J. Biddle, *The Manufactured Crisis: Myths, Fraud, and the Attack on America's Public Schools* (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1995).

15. Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton, *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993).

16. William J. Wilson, *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987) and William J. Wilson, *The Declining Significance of Race* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

17. Wilson, *The Truly Disadvantaged*, p. 159.

18. Massey and Denton, *American Apartheid*, p. 171.

19. Kantor and Brenzel, "Urban Education," p. 29.

20. Stephen Haymes, *Race, Culture, and the City: A Pedagogy for Black Urban Struggle* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1995), p. 41.

21. Thomas J. La Belle and Christopher R. Ward, *Multiculturalism and Education: Diversity and its Impact on Schools and Society* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1994).

22. Englert, "Understanding the Urban Context," p. 8.

23. Joseph Kretovics and Edward J. Nussel, *Transforming Urban Education* (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1994), p. 44.

24. Mike Duckenfield, *Schools for Cities* (Paris: Organisation for Co-Operation and Economic Development, 1995), p. 14.

25. See, for example, Dennis Carlson, "The Politics of Educational Policy: Urban School Reform in Unsettling Times," *Educational Policy* 7.2 (1993):

149–65 and A. Portes and R. G. Rumbaut, *Immigrant America* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990).

26. Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School* (New York: Vintage Books, 1964), pp. 67–68.

27. J. Citrin, B. Reingold and D. P. Green, "American Identity and the Politics of Ethnic Change," *Journal of Politics* 52.4 (1990): 1126.

28. Antonia Darder, *Culture and Power in the Classroom: A Critical Foundation for Bicultural Education* (Westport, Conn.: Bergin & Garvey, 1991), p. 6.

29. National Commission on Excellence in Education, *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. [On-line.] Available: http://www.ed.gov/pubs/, 1983.

30. G. Holton, "A Nation at Risk Revisited." *Daedalus* 113.4 (1984): 1–27.

31. D. Tanner, "A Nation 'Truly' at Risk." *Phi Delta Kappan* 75.4 (1993): 289–97.

32. P. S. Hlebowitsh, "Playing Power Politics: How *A Nation at Risk* Achieved its National Stature," *Journal of Research and Development in Education* 23.2 (1990): 88.

33. Michael Apple, "The Politics of a National Curriculum," in *Transforming Schools*, ed. Peter W. Cookson Jr. and Barbara Schneider (New York: Garland, 1995), pp. 364–65.

34. Amy Stuart Wells and Jeannie Oakes, "Tracking, Detracking, and the Politics of Educational Reform: A Sociological Perspective," in *The Sociology of Education: Emerging Perspectives*, ed. Carlos A. Torres and T. R. Mitchell (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1998), p. 161.

35. American Academy of Arts and Sciences, "American Education: Still Separate, Still Unequal," *Daedalus*, Fall 1995, p. ix.

36. Gary Orfield and Carole Ashkinaze, *The Closing Door: Conservative Policy and Black Opportunity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991).

37. John E. Chubb and Terry M. Moe, *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1990), p. 209.

38. Jonathan Kozol, "The Sharks Move In," *The New Internationalist*, October 1993.

39. P. W. Cookson, *School Choice: The Struggle for the Soul of American Education* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), p. 499.

40. Anthony S. Bryk, David Kerbow, and Sharon Rollow, "Chicago School Reform," in *New Schools for a New Century: The Redesign of Urban Education*, ed. Diane Ravitch and Joseph P. Viteritti (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), p. 168.

41. Ibid., p. 169.

42. Jeffrey Mirel, "School Reform, Chicago Style: Educational Innovation in a Changing Urban Context, 1976–1991," *Urban Education* 28.2 (1993): 117.

43. Gloria Ladson-Billings and William F. Tate, "Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education," *Teachers College Record* 97.1 (1995): 47–68.

44. C. E. Sleeter and C. A. Grant, "An Analysis of Multicultural Education in the U.S.A.," *Harvard Educational Review* 57 (1987): 421–44.

45. Gary Dorrien, *The Neoconservative Mind: Politics, Culture, and the War of Ideology* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1993), p. 355.

46. Lawrence Auster, "The Forbidden Topic," *National Review* 44.8 (April 27, 1992): 43.

47. Dorrien, *The Neoconservative Mind*, p. 359.

48. Carlos A. Torres, "State and Education Revisited: Why Educational Researchers Should Think Politically about Education," *Review of Educational Research* 21 (1994): 255–331.

49. Ladson-Billings and Tate, "Toward a Critical Race Theory of Eduation," p. 62.

50. Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (New York, Continuum, 1970).

51. Michael Apple, *Official Knowledge: Democratic Education in a Conservative Age* (New York: Routledge, 1993).

52. Ibid., p. 144.

53. Ladson-Billings, *The Dreamkeepers*, p. 18.

54. See, for example, Henry A. Giroux, *Living Dangerously: Multiculturalism and the Politics of Difference* (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), and Henry A. Giroux (ed.), *Postmodernism, Feminism, and Cultural Politics: Redrawing Educational Boundaries* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1991).

55. See, for example, Scott Davies, "Leaps of Faith: Shifting Currents in Critical Sociology of Education," *American Journal of Sociology* 100.6 (1995): 1448–78; Hugh Mehan, "Understanding Inequality in Schools: The Contribution of Interpretive Studies," *Sociology of Education* 65 (1992): 1–20; and Immanuel Wallerstein, "Social Science and the Quest for a Just Society," *American Journal of Sociology* 102.5 (1997): 1241–57.

56. Wallerstein, "Social Science and the Quest for a Just Society," p. 1255.

57. W. Ayers and P. Ford (eds.), *City Kids, City Teachers: Reports from the Front Row* (New York: The New Press, 1996), p. 87.