DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 407 456 UD 031 692

AUTHOR Hennon, Lisa
TITLE Urbanism in Educational Thought: Mobilizing the Teacher through Diversity and Community.
PUB DATE Mar 97
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, March 24-28, 1997).
CONTRACT RR93002016
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative (142) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Community Characteristics; *Cultural Differences; *Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Government Role; *Inner City; *Social Problems; *Urban Areas; Urban Problems; Urban Schools; Violence
IDENTIFIERS *Urbanism

ABSTRACT

Recent American educational research focuses on the differences between urban and nonurban schools. Ideas such as "inner city" are taken as self-evident and are imposed as a way to achieve a more just and equitable national system of schooling. The urban environment is singled out as violent. This essay takes the position that the distinction between urban and nonurban schools is not new, and that it has operated historically as a space of opposition between a "reasonable" place, person, or citizen, and the "other." Through this oppositional space, hierarchies of moral competencies are produced. This perspective destabilizes the ideas of "inner city" and "urban" by conceptualizing the oppositional space as urbanism and examining ways "the city" has been both a model and instrument of political reflection. The imposed logics of markets and multiculturalism are used to examine the current shift to regarding community as a moral plane for citizenship. New ways of looking at cities can bring out the study of discursive spatial relations of government at a distance that have entered into the constructions of the child, teacher, family, or community. (Contains 65 references.) (Author/SLD)

Urbanism in Educational Thought: Mobilizing the Teacher Through Diversity and Community

by Lisa Hennon

University of Wisconsin-Madison
Department of Curriculum and Instruction

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
March 24-28, 1997
Chicago

Session 26.31, Division B Symposium (3/26/97)
"Education Reform and Postmodern Constructions: Theory and Practice in Mobilizing the 'New' Teacher"

Lisa Hennon
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
University of Wisconsin at Madison
225 N. Mills St., Madison, WI 53706
Tel: (608) 255-6859
Email: lmhennon@students.wisc.edu

Urbanism in Educational Thought: Mobilizing the Teacher Through Diversity and Community

Recent American educational research focuses on differences among urban and non-urban schools. Ideas such as the "inner city" are taken as self-evident and are imposed as a way to achieve a more just and equitable national system of schooling. The urban setting is singled out as violent places in need of immediate attention by distinct political rhetorics understood as right-conservative and left-liberal/critical positions, yet each claims to be a new and effective way to think about and direct educational reform. The overall question raised by this essay is: *rather than focus upon violent places, what is the violence of this reasoning*? The argument is that first, the distinction is not new. Second, the distinction has operated as a space of opposition between a "reasonable" place, person, or citizen, and the Other. Through this oppositional space new hierarchies of moral competencies are produced. The purpose of this argument is to destabilize the ideas of "inner city" and "urban" by conceptualizing the oppositional space as urbanism. I examine the ways in which "the city" has been both a model and instrument of political reflection. The city's relation to governmentality can be thought of as having three historically discontinuous moral planes of the citizen in which schooling has played a constitutive role: national territory, national society, and national community. The current shift to community as a moral plane for citizenship is examined through the imposed logics of markets and of multiculture.

Outline

Urbanism and Governmentality
- What is "The Urban" Problem in Education?
- Urbanism as a Problematic of Governmentality
- The Problematic

Moral Planes of Schooling the Citizen: Territory, Society and Community
- Territory and the Ordering of Populations and Land
- Stratified Depths and Differentiated Details of Society
- Community: Return or Rotation?
  - Morality of Markets and Multiculture

Urbanism in Educational Thought: Mobilizing the Teacher Through Diversity and Community

by Lisa Hennon
University of Wisconsin - Madison
March 1997

In current American educational research, reform discourses focus upon differences among urban and non-urban settings. Ideas such as the "inner city" or "urban" school are taken for granted and unreflexively imposed as a way to achieve a more just and equitable national system of schooling. The urban setting is singled out as violent places in need of immediate attention for children, teachers, families, and communities. The "inner city" or "urban" schools are emblematic of the failure of educational reform. These ideas are taken up by political rhetorics understood as right-conservative and left-liberal/critical positions, yet each claims to offer a new and effective way to think about and direct educational reform of the American system of schooling and teacher education.

When two or more ideological positions employ the same distinction such as "the urban" as self-evident, it is worth examining the construction of that distinction, its underlying principles, the core construct upon which it is based, and the historical series of problematizations of which it is part. The overall question raised by this essay is: rather than focus upon violent places, what is the violence of this reasoning? The argument is that first, the distinction is not new, and second, the distinction has operated as a space of opposition between Reason and the Other; between the "reasonable" place, person, or citizen and Other. Through this oppositional space new hierarchies of social, cultural, and moral competencies are produced. The purpose of this argument is to make this violence visible and thereby destabilize the ideas of "inner city" and "urban" by conceptualizing the oppositional space as *urbanism*. Urbanism as a conceptual tool for analysis can provide ways in which to explore the more general question of how oppositional spaces are constructed in other national systems of schooling and educational reform discourses.

The argument proceeds in three stages. First, I repose the question of the "urban" problem by asking how urbanism relates to the problematic of governmentality. Posing the question differently allows an analysis of social change and relations of power to enter in, making room for new forms of intelligibility. Second, I ask how current distinctions and hierarchies of competencies are made possible. To answer this I combine the first and second question by examining the ways in which "the city" has been both a model and instrument of political reflection, particularly in constructions of schooling. The city's relation to governmentality can be thought of as having three historically discontinuous moral planes of the citizen in which schooling has played a constitutive role: national territory, national society, and national community. Through this schematic of historical analysis, I contrast the shifts in constructions of the child, teacher, family, and community as they are related to the formation of the citizen.

Finally, I ask what are the violent consequences of present reformulations of the citizen upon the moral plane of a national community. In their new configurations, constructions of the child, teacher, family, and community are each pathologized through the violent space of urbanism. I

examine this shift through the imposed logics of markets and of multiculture, which produce new competencies for the reasonable citizen and Other.

Urbanism and Governmentality

In announcing crises in American schooling, educational reform discourses use various theoretical lens to focus our attention upon differences among urban and non-urban (suburban, town, or rural) schools. We are urged to place these differences at the center of our thinking as a reform prerequisite. The language of these reforms indicate a shift not intelligible by a comparison of ideologies, theories or methodologies, but rather, as a shift to different logics of discourse that include terms like "professional", "consumers", "markets", "culture", "diversity", "community", "choice" and "risk". What interests me is the ways in which this language comes together in a discursive milieu where tensions are set up when making the "urban" distinction. For example, Goodlad (1990), in a list of proposed reforms for teacher education programs nation-wide, reports with dismay that

> with a few exceptions, the programs in our sample were oriented to suburban or relatively mildly urban school settings where participants did their student teaching. (We had hoped, and indeed expected, that urban universities would orient their curricula and teaching primarily, if not exclusively, to the urban environment, but this proved only occasionally to be the case) (Goodlad 1990, p. 254).

Throughout his discussion of the nation's schools is an insistence upon teacher education programs to be more connected to the communities which they serve by de-emphasizing an incoherent curriculum based mostly on a specialized field of theoretical research and instead providing a "professional" and more practical knowledge base for prospective teachers. As professionals, teachers can be agents of renewal who are prepared to participate in school decision-making. A tension arises when he does not elaborate upon how suburban or "mildly urban" schools differ from the "urban environment" and how that might shape a professionalized knowledge base.

Zeichner (1992) takes the urban orientation one step further by offering a description of the urban environment based on demographic terms to specify reforms in teacher education that are different from the one above. He argues that in demographic projections of a culturally diverse and changing student population, teacher education programs should orient themselves to preparing prospective teachers for large metropolitan school districts where diverse populations of the "child of color" are located. The crisis results from the deficiencies of prospective teachers who are "overwhelmingly white, female, monolingual, from a rural (small town) or suburban community . . . with very limited interracial and intercultural experience" (Zeichner 1992, p. 4). This argument joins with elements of multicultural education, a complex and varying set of practices, to promote the rights and freedoms of the child's "identity" to be appreciated, represented, and developed, though as Sleeter (1989) points out, choosing which identity to develop is problematic. "All people are members simultaneously of at least one racial group and language group, a gender group, a social class group, and other groups based on age, religion, and so forth" (Sleeter 1989, pp. 66-67). The demographics of identity, it would seem, do not resolve but increase the tensions of the urban distinction.

Doubts remain over the capacity of teacher education programs to solve the problem of a growing demographic disparity between prospective teachers and children in urban schools or the direction reform of teacher education should take. Gomez (1994) struggles with the problem of the beliefs and

attitudes prospective teachers bring with them when they teach Other people's children and notes the tensions inherent in the unequal gender relations female teachers face in the structures of the institution. Haberman, (1993, 1995) however, expresses no doubts in advocating alternative recruitment and training of teachers for multicultural urban schools to screen out the ideologically and "culturally incompetent teacher who might survive in a small town or suburb [but] will not last a day in an urban situation except as a failure or burnout" (Haberman 1995, p. 92). It is dysfunctional teacher education programs, he argues, that leads to 12 million children in urban schools being diagnosed as "at risk"--a label of which he is highly critical. The urban setting is multicultural, Haberman emphasizes, but he does not advocate multicultural curricula neither in teacher training nor in public schools.

But teachers and teacher education are not the only target of educational reform. Families and communities are brought into an urban focus: both families and communities may be viewed as "educationally deficient" or not sufficiently organized to be actively involved (Pallas et al. 1989). Reform proposals focus on how to change the communities and activities of parents to improve schooling. They share a similar vocabulary in talking about communities and families though their recommendations range from saving public schools to privatizing education. For example, Powell et al. (1985) propose to save public schools by arguing that parents of "unspecial" children in an "educational marketplace" will have to adopt a "greater consumer awareness" if they are to compete with special interests groups who have, unfortunately, diversified a common curriculum (pp. 309-321). Chubb and Moe (1990), on the other hand, make the opposite argument in favor of dismantling the national system of public schooling by holding up the urban school as an example of bureaucratic distortion of democratic governance and as the place where "troublesome clients" (i.e. parents and children) are located (p. 180). They propose that schooling be reorganized by following the examples of private schools and suburban school districts that allow administrators and teachers to practice "professional autonomy" and parents and communities to compete and negotiate in an "open market" where school "choice" and privatization become the tools of an "indirect" expression of democratic will.

Within the urban distinction made by all of the above reforms is an emphasis on community, its need for development and activism, and as the basis upon which schooling can be reformed. The relations of the child, teacher, and family are understood as part of a community that is understood either as multicultural or as markets.

What is "The Urban" Problem in Education?

The above examples of reform proposals using a language of multiculture or of markets invoke the urban distinction as a new approach to thinking about educational problems that are of national proportions. However, the framing of problems deemed worthy of educational research attention and reform are not derived from politically neutralized educational sciences. Reform discourses arise from and are legitimated by social, ethical, and ideological commitments and, more importantly, are based upon modern assumptions, reasoning, and categories of reason (such as "reform" or "progress") in striving for social justice and equality (Popkewitz 1984, 1991).

The current urban distinction is based upon a mode of reasoning about population, the demographics of its segments, sections, locations, movements and stability. I'm not suggesting this is a problem of accuracy, as if to say the numbers don't add up or that they should be done differently. (According to Palen 1995, current statistics indicate that the American population is 50% suburban, 48% urban, and 2% rural; the U.S. census

combines urban/suburban into "metropolitan statistical areas".) To put the question differently, how have we come to find these statistics meaningful in educational reform discourse? Reform-minded researchers assume that identifying and classifying types of school environments and their populations will enable both researchers and practitioners to better isolate reform variables, manipulate and hierarchize factors, set priorities, and write prescriptions. Lost to institutional and intellectual memory is the role the urban distinction has played throughout the history of American educational thought; it has become a self-evident reform parameter. Singling out for special study the educational milieu of cities and upon that basis developing a plan for reform of schooling nation-wide has occurred since the first decades after the establishment of the United States as a sovereign nation.

To understand the historical dimensions of this reasoning about "the urban" and its embeddedness in relations of power, I draw upon what Dean (1994) calls "critical and effective histories." In contrast to educational claims for new and effective reforms, strategies of a history of the present are both *critically interrogative* of the normative doxa of educational reform discourses and attempt to *effectively destabilize* commonly held assumptions. These intentions inform this essay. I relate urbanism to governmentality so that principles of its construction in discursive space and the city as its core construct are made visible.

Urbanism as a problematic of governmentality

A genealogy of liberal forms of government conceptualizes liberalism as problematizations of the state (Foucault 1991). Educational reform discourse can be read as situated within problematizations of liberalism. The mandate to educate citizens emerged with the formation of nation states to administer and regulate the citizen. This mandate has been under continuous reformulation in the modern welfare state (see for example Donald 1992; Hunter 1994). The modern welfare state is characterized in part by its distinct urban, bureaucratic, and industrial orders (Giddens 1990). In the following, I identify questions within the problematic of governmentality that enable an analysis of urbanism as it relates to the shifts in formulations of the citizen as constituted by schooling.

Gordon (1991) describes the historical analyses of these problematizations as a way to "understand liberalism not simply as a doctrine, or set of doctrines, of political and economic theory, but as a style of thinking quintessentially concerned with the art of governing" (p. 14). The "art of governing", or governmentality, provides a way to focus attention on the practices of governing which are not limited to the institutions and offices of government, but include the ways in which the production of knowledge is embedded in power relations. Governmentality does not conceptualize power as coercion, dominance, or ideological hegemony. As Rose describes the productive aspects of power in a liberal state, "Governing in a liberal-democratic way means governing *through* the freedom and aspirations of subjects rather than in spite of them" (Rose 1996, p. 155, original emphasis). Schooling constitutes the exercise of freedom and aspirations of citizenship.

An historical analysis of discourses on the art of governing identifies a series of problematizations of the state:

> First of all, the *state of justice,* born in the feudal type of territorial regime which corresponds to a society of laws . . .; second, the *administrative state*, born in the territoriality of national boundaries in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and corresponding to a society of regulation and discipline; and finally a *governmental state*, essentially defined no longer in terms of its territoriality, of its surface area, but

> in terms of the mass of its population with its volume and density, and indeed also with the territory over which it is distributed, although this figures here only as one among its component elements. This state of government which bears essentially on population . . . could be seen as corresponding to a type of society controlled by apparatuses of security (Foucault 1991, p. 104, my emphasis).

In the governmentalization of the state, the series of problematizations form a triangle: sovereignty-discipline-government. That is to say, sovereignty, regulation, and discipline are retained in government. In governmentalizing the state, however, these strategies, tactics, practices, and technologies of power are placed in new relations: sovereignty is not eliminated, it is made more acute; and discipline "was never more important or more valorized than at the moment when it became important to manage a population . . . . in its depths and details" (Foucault 1991, p. 102).

Corresponding to the series that has constructed the triangle of governmentality, I link the moral plane of territory to the sovereign nation with its systems of administration and regulation; the moral plane of society to the installation and intensification of disciplinary technologies; and the moral plane of community to current problematizations of liberalism that suggest new relations of territory, regulation, discipline and control in governmentality. I do not suggest that these planes should be read as historical periods where one plane displaces the previous. Their separation serves as an analytic device for examining educational reform discourse. The urbanism of current educational reform discourse still depends upon the role of geographic territory, and indeed, has intensified American debate over schooling. At a time when populational shifts to the "exurban" world of towns and suburbs, there are also shifts in the economic base of school funding, and a shift in language. The community becomes the premise of educational problems and pathologies. Neither techniques of discipline nor regulatory mechanisms have disappeared; they have recombined to construct new technologies for the government of community. Relating urbanism to governmentality helps identify questions to raise, not about "the urban" problem, but rather, about its historical role in educational reform discourse.

The Problematic

Current arguments in educational reform discourse can be situated in problematizations of liberalism. *The mandate to school the citizen can be stated as a repeated questioning of four themes: (1) the nature of a liberal-democratic nation; (2) the form its system of schooling should take; (3) the citizen that schooling should produce; and (4) the social order envisioned as the outcome of that citizenship.* In each of these themes urbanism as a discursive space in educational discourse plays a pivotal role in constructing reasonable places, persons, citizens and Other. Used as an analytic construct, different questions can now be raised: How has urbanism operated in the making of sovereign nations and the organization and regulation of a national territory? How has urbanism systematized the government of this territory and populational processes through an intensification of the sovereignty of nation and of disciplinary technologies? What are the competencies of a reasonable citizen--the capacities, virtues, attitudes and aspirations--constituted by schooling? How has urbanism been a horizon for envisioning a social order as an outcome of citizenship? And finally, what are the shifts or discontinuities in the constructions of a schooled citizen?

In the following section, I trace out the three discontinuous spaces, or moral planes, territory, society, and community. I focus upon the shifting constructions of the child, the teacher, the family, and the community in their role in the formulation of the citizen.

Moral Planes of Schooling the Citizen: Territory, Society, Community

The role of the city as it relates to governmentality has been both as model and as instrument. In contrasting these moral planes, I foreground three aspects: the role of the city, changes in statistics as applied to populations, and the reorganization of modern space, place, and time of a national territory. The relations of child, teacher, family and community undergo transformations as educational reform discourse shifts from one moral plane to the next.

Territory and the Ordering of Populations and Land

By the end of the 16th century, European feudalism had given way to a new order, a sovereignty of nations and an order of nation states. The city played a role as model for envisioning a social order dependent upon the correct relations of the population to the nation. Toulmin (1990) argues that the social order of nation states was given a Divine legitimacy by the scaffolding of Modernity that he calls "Cosmopolis".[1] Cosmopolis is a view of the social world as a world-wide order that follows law-like principles for which nation states were best fitted. "The comprehensive system of ideas about nature and humanity . . . [was] a social and political, as well as a scientific device" (p. 128). The nation state had a social order whose laws were to be studied and maintained.

Sovereign states ruled through the administration of national and colonial territories using the science of police: "Police is a science of endless lists and classification. . . . [In aspiration it is] a knowledge of inexhaustibly detailed and continuous control" (Gordon 1991, p. 10). The science of police was linked to the city as a model for governing the geographic territory of the nation (Foucault 1984). The open spaces and relations of the architectural aspects of the city were seen to consist of a central square with connecting roads, buildings, and public spaces. When applied to territory, the science of police administered the geographic relations of populations. The map and the census were two ways in which a national identity could be imagined and regulated (Anderson 1991). The administration and regulation of a national territory was conceived of as a "physical infrastructure of connection and mobility" and cities were both places of assembly of populations and part of the infrastructure of exchange and communication (Gordon 1991, p. 20).

In the early national period of the United States, the city served as an administrative model for the areas considered to be "unsettled"--that is, for newly acquired territories outside the original thirteen colonies.[2] These territories were classified as under public domain and as a source of revenue for the federal government. For example, the Land Ordinance of 1785 envisioned territories as an open space to be landscaped for administration. Maps of "empty" territory were a powerful way in which to imagine an expanding nation. As Harley has phrased it, the production of maps "create a spatial panopticon" (Harley 1996, p. 439). The envisioned landscape arranged a hierarchy of cities, towns, townships; areas for further development of the nation's infrastructure such as rail lines and canals; areas for mining and forestry enterprises; and agricultural settlements, all of which were available for purchase and private ownership. The allocation of land and distribution of population used the rectangular system of dividing up land on survey maps into townships. Each township was precisely six miles square, with 36 sections each containing 640 acres. The Land Ordinance of 1785 adopted early colonial practices by setting aside two

sections in each township to provide means to fund schools, primarily through land rents (Fite 1991, p. 877).

The land policies for schooling were difficult to enforce until the nested hierarchy of federal, state, county, and local governments could be established. Settlers, speculators, mining companies and so forth were busy clearing "raw" land for their own purposes, so the sections set aside for schools were usually worthless in generating funding. Once a territory gained statehood, state educational agencies had but a rudimentary structure and few mechanisms of administrative authority (Kaestle 1983). Urbanism was an effective tool by which to think and organize territory into potential towns and cities, but regulation was not enough. To use Rose's words, it was a "utopian dream of a regulative machinery that will penetrate all regions of the social body, and administer them for the common good" (Rose 1996b, p. 155).

For settled areas of the early national period, the role of the ideal city as model constructed the citizen. The enlightened citizen, who at a moment's notice would drop all other allegiances except to the new nation, was naturally endowed with virtues by practices of private ownership: intelligence, discipline, sacrifice, and simplicity came from participation in family, work, and civic life (Kaestle 1983). Literacy rates were relatively high, but beyond instruction in the reading of religious texts, schools played a minimal role. In rural areas and towns, where school enrollment outpaced cities, district or neighborhood schools were set up voluntarily for literacy training, mental discipline through memorization and recitation, and obedience. Independent pay schools in cities were voluntarily established and provided a more specialized curriculum related to technical or skilled occupations.

The enlightened citizen of reason began to be outnumbered by an international populational shift and internal migration to American cities, rural enclaves, and settlements. At no other time before 1830 or after 1860 did cities grow at such a rapid rate, expanding the proportion of unlanded populations of industrial laborers and urban and suburban poor (Palen 1995).[3] At the same time, however, populational dispersal to outlying suburbs, townships and territories was encouraged by American expansionist land policies.

The dynamic of dispersal and concentration of a large influx of immigrants and intermingling of indigenous and European settlements created, in the eyes of educational reformers, a crazy quilt of unregulated schooling. Educational reform discourse took up the themes of national unity and social stability. Charity schools were established to serve a mix of urban and suburban poor; most adopted the popular monitorial or Lancasterian school model to teach discipline in following an elaborate routine of a standardized and precise examination through recitation (Kaestle 1983). Extrapolating from the successes of charity schools in cities, educational reform discourse advocated a national system of "common schools" to consolidate and incorporate the district schools outside of cities into a "graded" system (infant, primary, grammar, and high schools). Reform had two targets: the low enrollment of urban children from poor, immigrant families, and the barriers of "local" control exercised by immigrant, ethnic and racial enclaves of "provincial" locations: city neighborhoods, rural areas (in the North and Midwest), and regions (such as the South).

"Provincial" locations were places where children and families resided outside the discursive space of reason. Their "provincialism" violated the world view of Cosmopolis by subordinating allegiance to the nation to their insistence on "local" or "community" control. Provincialism, particularly in the maintenance of diverse ethnic languages, was argued to be an impediment to national unity and social stability. "Great care should be taken to

eradicate provincialism and to procure that purity and uniformity of language so much to be desired. It will operate as a bond of national brotherhood" argued an Illinois state superintendent of schools (Kaestle 1983, p. 99). To remediate these areas of unreason required a means to regulate and systematize schools and to reconstruct the teacher.

The teacher had to perform an enlarged role in unreasonable places by providing moral education in place of the family. Moral education took the form of moral discipline, for example, in the instruction of obedience to standardized routines as exemplified by the monitorial systems of city schools. The moral component of the teacher became more pronounced when an administrative hierarchy was established. Male teachers moved up in the hierarchy to local, county, or state supervisory roles while the proportion of female teachers rose. Moral education was a combination of the natural moral influence believed to be a quality of (some) women and a regulation of their training. Educational reform discourse advocated a professionalization of teacher education through normal schools, short term institutes, and professional publications. Nearly a century after the Land Ordinance of 1785, the land policy of the Morrill Land Grant Act of 1862 would be more successful in installing a means to professionalize education by allocating 30,000 acres of federally owned land to established states. Although by 1900 fewer than 4% of teachers received any of this training, the joining of administrative mechanisms to the expertise of a professionalizing field of education in colleges and universities created techniques for the intensification of discipline, regulations, and national sovereignty in the twentieth century.

To summarize, educational reform discourse before the American Civil War used the city as model and instrument to envision the national territory and to resolve problems of national unity and stability. The oppositional space of urbanism worked in two ways. On the one hand, it could oppose the city to the country to target provincialism and to advocate consolidation and incorporation of unreasonable populations into a national system of schooling. On the other, it could oppose the ownership of land and property to the growing working class and pauperization of urban populations by systematizing schools to discipline the skills and attitudes of work, punctuality, and compliance required for economic participation (Gordon 1991, p. 31).

Urbanism and the science of police allocated and distributed the population to land through an administered, regulated, and disciplined moral plane of territory. The opposition "local control" as provincialism is ironic given the current arguments in educational reform which tend to advocate a "return" to involving families and communities in "local" control of schooling either through privatization and school choice or through the solicitation of teachers and families to be more actively involved. In the nineteenth century, however, "local" was outside the space of reason in urbanism and was used to separate the child from families and communities through the moral interventions of the teacher.

By the turn of the twentieth century, the moral plane shifts to society and intensifies the disciplinary technologies and national sovereignty of governmentality. This shift involved changes in statistics and changes across territory that altered the relations of space, place, and time. Administrative mechanisms could begin to be applied to the temporal and spatial relations of the population of the territory and not merely to the physical infrastructure of communication and exchange. The space of the "local" shifts, constructing the community as a project of political reflection. Governmentality would be exercised through the construction of a different citizen whose allegiance, obligations, and aspirations for citizenship shifted to

a national society. Nevertheless, the surface of territory still requires mechanisms to regulate the flows and processes of population.

Stratified Depths and Differentiated Details of Society

With the establishment of the common school in most states by the turn of the twentieth century, the moral plane of the citizen had shifted to society. This shift entailed changes in modes of reasoning about space and time and in modern statistical reasoning.

In the early national period, the science of police was applied to the surface of the territory. It ordered the territory into places by establishing regulatory mechanisms. In a sense, the space of territory became *stabilized* into a hierarchy of places (e.g. state boundaries, legal limits of counties, cities, towns and townships, and school districts). The territorial stabilization of schooling raised different kinds of problems, however, and modern statistical reasoning was used to organize schooling temporally. We can think of this organization of time as a separation of *space* and *place*. Giddens (1990) argues that "pre-modern" practices of time were intimately linked to *place*. In day-to-day life, "when" is connected to "where".

To give an obvious example of the social organization of time, during the early national period the "when" of schooling was based on "where" the school was. Enrollment in rural schools fluctuated according to the seasonal variations in agricultural labor. Similarly, the varieties of infant schools, independent pay schools, and early charity schools were organized around the temporal rhythms of the populations they served. For example, infant schools were organized around the schedule of working mothers. Once consolidated and incorporated, however, into a national system of "common schools" and the establishment of a graded system made possible only in cities where large populations were concentrated, the "when" of schooling became thought of, not in terms of where the school was *geographically*, but in terms of where it was *socially*. Giddens describes these relations as fundamentally distinct from the "pre-modern" world:

> The advent of modernity increasingly tears space away from place by fostering relations between "absent" others, locationally distant from any given situation of face-to-face interaction. . . . *What structures the locale is not simply that which is present on the scene: the "visible forms" of the locale conceals the distanciated relations which determine its nature* (Giddens 1990, pp. 18-19, my emphasis).

I use the "distanciated relations" of Giddens' conceptualization of space as a way to think about the governmental relations of urbanism and the constitution of the schooled citizen in the moral plane of society. No longer thought of in terms of variations across the surface of territory, schooling became a function and element of social space--a space constructed through social position and distance, not geographic location. The governmentality of social space can occur "at a distance" and no longer relies upon the physical presence of control or regulation. Urbanism at this time assumed two functions. Its core construct, the city, was used as a way to frame *social* problems and to ignite collective responses and social reform movements as well as a way to measure and indicate the accomplishments of social reform. American social and educational theories reformulated the city as simultaneously an *urban locale* and a symptomatic problem and achievement of an urban *social order* of a modern nation.

During the nineteenth century, once the space of the territory became stabilized, a new kind of statistical calculation became possible. The rise of social sciences devoted to the study of laws governing the appropriate ordering of society invented new ways to think about its relations. Osborne

(1996) draws out these distinctions by contrasting the science of police to modern statistics. The science of

> police tended to equalize subjects, [whereas] modern statistics began to differentiate; it became a technology of individuation; and statistics became, in effect, an instrument, not simply for the policing of a territory, but for the determination of individual difference and the regulation of citizenship (Osborne 1996, p. 104).

By the end of the nineteenth century and into the twentieth, social laws would be cast in statistical form. As Hacking notes, there was an "avalanche of numbers". The American census for example, was first used to determine the boundaries of electoral districts. This means of statistical gathering, as a science of police, simply counted the population in terms of territory. However, by 1880, the number and kinds of questions being asked about the American population had grown from four to over 13,000. Processes of population were being related in different ways. "New kinds of people came to be counted" (Hacking, 1991, p. 183).

Though certainly related to industrialization during the decades of the Civil War, and to the influx of immigrants and internal migrations to cities, these social changes do not explain in any straightforward or direct way the shift in statistical applications. As Hacking argues, "There arose a certain style of solving practical problems by the collection of data. Nobody argued for this style; they merely found themselves practising it" (Hacking 1991, p. 192). The city as model for this mode of reasoning structured ways of thinking about social reform during these decades. For example, biological conceptualizations of a healthy social body were modeled on the city; that is to say, a healthy social body had the architectural contours of the city--its organization, relations, and pathological areas. The emphasis was on what made the social body unhealthy: deviance and abnormality. The social sciences studied the moral health and hygiene of cities in order to implement public health initiatives and urban design and planning (Driver 1988, Weingart 1994). Educational sciences adopted similar assumptions about the necessity to design and plan schooling as a system to simultaneously meet the needs of cities and to insure a national social order. As Rose writes, "[p]lanned and socially organized mechanisms were to weave a complex web that would bind the inhabitants of a territory into a single polity, a space of regulated freedom" (Rose 1996, p. 164).

The educational reform discourse from the late nineteenth to the mid-twentieth century adopted this style of thinking. Modern statistics enabled the invention of technologies that stratified and differentiated schools, their populations, and their relation to other social institutions such as the industrial work place, occupational structure, and colleges and universities. In the early twentieth century, educational reform discourse shifted from a concern for national unity and social stability to the adoption of the notion of an ordered society. Order had two related meanings. First, order referred to the world view of Cosmopolis in which the law-like social order of the nation state required the citizen's loyalty and regulated freedom. Second, order also referred to the use of statistical applications to create mechanisms of social control rearranging how that loyalty and freedom was practiced.

Educational reform discourses adopted the notion that society was made up of layers, as in Eliot's four layers of a "civilized society" in which the top layer was the leading class, or Draper's "leaders of the intellectual life of the city (in Tyack, p. 130). Ideas like "social efficiency," "scientific curriculum making," and "mental measurement" came to dominate educational reform discourse, and statistics were gathered on a vast range of social attributes of the population thought to be pertinent to education. From Taylor's scientific management of occupational tasks, to Bobbit's application of

scientific management to schools and curriculum, to Snedden's "activity analysis" of "adult life performance practices" to identify educational "objectives", the population was differentiated into layers, segments, and social positions. Scientific management eventually "provided the language and hence the conceptual apparatus by which a new and powerful approach to curriculum development would be wrought" (Kliebard 1992, p. 97). The citizen of the moral plane of society was located socially and subjected to an intensification of disciplinary technologies.

The organization of the "common school" in cities rearranged political participation. Educational reform discourse argued for an efficient management of schools by professionalizing the system of governance. City politics, based upon neighborhood or ward systems of electing or appointing school officials, was displaced by what Tyack calls the "corporate model" (Tyack 1974). Imagining the city as the basic political unit of organization, ethnic, immigrant, and racial neighborhoods could no longer argue for "local" control; their allegiance was to the nested social and political hierarchy of the city, state and nation .

The attitudes and performance of citizenship became an explicit focus of educational reform. Located in social space, the schooled citizen was instructed in the fulfillment of social obligations and responsibilities. For example, the *Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education: A Report of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education, Appointed by the National Education Association* (1918) organized and differentiated the curriculum in terms of social roles based on Snedden's "adult life performances". The adult performances of a reasonable citizen were: health, command of fundamental processes, worthy home-membership, vocation, citizenship, worthy use of leisure, and ethical character. Citizenship was the performance of these social roles and entailed the knowledge of social agencies and institutions and proper social relations "between members of the chosen vocation, between different vocational groups, between employer and employee, and between producer and consumer (p. 13). The purpose of the Cardinal Principles was to coordinate the secondary school and the performance of citizenship with other institutions associated with the city: the family, elementary school, work, technical training, social agencies, and colleges or universities.

Notably the social arrangements of the child, teacher, family, and community shift. Urbanism produced new competencies required of the citizen. If we imagine the above report as a mapping of social space of the city, then the oppositions become clearer. Citizenship is based upon a performance of social roles and of one's place in a social order. It ruled out other forms of political and cultural organization and participation and set up obligations between the school and social hierarchy. The community is placed in nested relation to the city, the state and the nation. Citizenship meant recognizing one's responsibilities as a "member of neighborhood, town or city, State, and Nation" (p. 14). Within the hierarchy, the individual was ranked as child, adult, citizen. The teacher was constructed to be an American to instruct the child in the social roles and capacities of citizenship, such as acquiring "habits in cooperation", "collective thinking" and "collective responsibility" as "attitudes and habits important in a democracy (p. 15).

To summarize, the stabilization of the territory into a hierarchy of places and the advent of modern statistics produced new relations of a social order. "Distanciated relations" of governmentality regulated the spatial relations of population and territory, its processes of exchange and communication, and the ordering of social positions. The application of modern statistics enabled a social order to be envisioned and controlled. Urbanism reconstructed the citizen in educational reform discourse, devaluing

identification with immigrant, ethnic, racial neighborhoods except as it was placed in the hierarchy of city, state, and nation. The teacher was reconstructed to intervene between the child and the family and the community.

In current educational reform discourse, the city becomes the model to disassemble. Urbanism after mid-twentieth century valorizes "local" political participation, but the "local" locale has changed. The "community" in current reforms has a nostalgic tinge of a more authentic and effective form of political participation. But we can't think of "community" in terms of its geographic boundaries when reading current discourse. Populational concentration and dispersal since the 1940s has altered the landscape of national territory.

Community: Return or Rotation?

Since mid-century, the national landscape has changed. There have been major national and international populational shifts in which millions of people have emigrated or migrated to American cities at the very time when industry and commerce have dispersed (Tyack 1974; Palen 1995; Sassen 1996; Shapiro 1992). These shifts have reorganized the relations of populations and territory. Patterns of residential practices could be described as spatial strategies of *enclosure* and *internment*. Collectives have used zoning devices and design features to enclose and protect "desirable" populations, and "undesirable" populations have been controlled and interned at the sites of publicly subsidized and low-income housing in both city neighborhoods and suburbs. Blakely & Ames (1992) argue that the new residential "enclosures"--private developments, walled and enclosed communities--serve as "private refuges without responsibility for a larger society" (p. 436). In the more open, public places of cities, the barricaded and policed schools are protected from the surrounding "community" and its dangers. As a result, some school districts are severely underfunded.

Efforts to equalize the system of public schooling have been undermined by these spatial strategies. For example, in the last two decades opinions have changed on issues of racial desegregation. Since the first proactive desegregation laws were enacted, the demographic characteristics of school districts have clustered populations primarily around economic similarities and differences among racial, ethnic, and immigrant populations (Clark & Rose 1994; Denton & Massey 1991). Innovations that have been introduced to redistribute student populations, such as bussing and "paired schools" have been met by equally innovating spatial strategies practiced by families and collectives who demand "local" control--a control which cannot occur, they maintain, if they children are transported daily out of the neighborhood (Rossell 1994). Similarly, magnet schools, alternative schools, and "schools within a school" have redistributed student populations in ways to which a notion of a geographically "local" school no longer applies.

We can think of the redistribution of teacher populations in a similar way. In the U.S., for example, the National Center for Education Statistics tracks the movement of newly hired teachers within and across states or "sectors": the Northeast, Midwest, South, and West (The *Condition of Education* 1994, p. 111). At another level of fact-gathering, teacher education programs track the movement of new teachers into employment. According to Tom Kelley, Director of the UW-Madison Education Placement and Career Services (EPCS), "midwestern states prepare two-thirds of the teachers trained in the United States today" (EPCS 1994). Two teachers out of every three are being trained in ten states and are being dispersed to the remaining forty, particularly to areas with severe teacher shortages, including "inner cities". Joining administrative mechanisms to expertise regulates a populational flow of professionals, producing new attributes such

as "geographic mobility" to be governed. While at mid-century it was customary to think of teachers being trained and taking teaching positions within sixty miles of their original residences, this is no longer the case.[4]

In light of these populational dispersals and concentrations of children, families, teachers, industry and commerce, and the spatial strategies of enclosure and internment, current educational reform discourse that makes an urban distinction and emphasizes the community as the premise of educational reform needs to be examined. In relation to the problematic of governmentality, urbanism is operating upon a different space. Critical social theorists relate these changes to problematizations of "new" liberalisms and identify new strategies, tactics, and practices of governmentality. The space of the social has shifted, they argue. In what I have called the moral-technological plane can no longer be conceived of as a "horizontal" space of the surface of territory; nor can it be conceptualized as the "vertical" layers of society. The creation of communication networks and circuits regulating the flow of objects, information, and persons has created a "striated" space in which new modes of regulation and technologies of control and of managing "risk" are possible (Barry 1996; Hardt 1995; Deleuze 1992). This shift entails an emphasis, not on "social control" of early twentieth century discourse, but rather on "community control" (Cohen 1985).

The "community" as Rose conceives it is no longer only a geographically bounded territory; it is a discursive space of new moral relations in which individuals have obligations and allegiances to multiple and heterogeneous communities (Rose 1995, 1996a, 1996b). The "community" is a project of political reflection, and governmentality aligns the capacities and aspirations of the citizen with the aims of government (Popkewitz 1996). Rose argues that community activism may have begun as a form of resistance and challenge to authority but has since been transformed into an expert discourse (Rose 1995). Whatever claims there are in educational reform discourse to a past where "community" or "local" control was exercised cannot be interpreted as an emancipatory return. The moral space of the community is more properly imagined as a rotation in which the regulation and administration of territory and the disciplining of society are reorganized as the government and self-government through community.

In urbanism, "inner city" or urban communities are pathologized and are subjected to more invasive interventions and control (see e.g. Murray 1995), while non-urban communities are naturalized and valorized as more "authentic" modes of collective citizenship, freedom, and allegiance. Ironically and paradoxically, the authenticity of community is determined through an expert discourse to construct it. Educational reform discourse has shifted to logics of markets or of multiculture, both of which reconstruct the citizen and community. Current constructions of the child, teacher, or family are not possible without this construction of community. Urbanism as an oppositional space produces new competencies, attitudes, and aspirations. In the following, I focus on constructions of the teacher and family in the morality of markets and of multiculture.

Morality of Markets[5]. As urban schools are characterized as emblematic of failure of urban institutions and structures, reforms target those institutions for disassembly. In related fields, criticisms of the state, of its bureaucracies and institutions such as mental hospitals, penal institutions, and "common" public schools, has been called a move to "destructuring". As Cohen argues, however, these moves simply create new structures which privatize governmental functions (1985, p. 124). He investigates the trend to "community control":

> When matters such as boundary blurring, integration, and community control take place, the result is that more people get involved in the

> "control problem" . . . . In order to include rather than exclude, a set of judgements have to be made which "normalizes" intervention in a greater range of human life. The result is not just more controllers (whether professionals or ordinary citizens) but also an extension of these methods to wider and wider populations. The price paid by ordinary people is to become either active participants or passive receivers in the business of social control (Cohen 1985, p. 231).

Proposals to privatize schools and give them over to the "indirect democratic control" of the "open market", or to rally parental involvement in the "educational marketplace" control shifts the locus of control from society to community as *market* (e.g. Chubb & Moe 1990; Powell et al. 1985). The management of risk through markets places the population in relations of providers of services as commodities and consumers as clients. When urban communities are distinguished by their "troublesome clients", families and children are pathologized for their inability to participate in economic citizenship. This participation is not only an economic relation; it is termed as "active", "involved", and "responsible" for community welfare. Active and involved parents who seek out the expertise of "autonomous professionals" are the constructions of a reasonable citizen and a reasonable community. "Government through the activation of individual commitments, energies, choices, through personal morality within a community setting is counterposed to centralising, patronising and disabling social government" (Rose 1995, p. 10). The pathological family or community is a risk and subject to more invasive techniques of control. Excluded from this reasonable space are those who fail to or refuse to participate in a morality of markets logic.

Morality of multiculture. I borrow the term "multiculture" from Young (1995) who conceptualizes it as a logic in which the reasoning about sameness and difference produce new hierarchies of identity. Current educational reform discourse produces new social and cultural competencies attached to identity. Multiculture or "diversity" are key terms of inclusion, but they are understood in normative demographic terms. A predominant understanding of multiculture that informs educational research is: social class, ethnicity, culture, and language (Zeichner 1992, p. 1). With this definition, teachers and students are seen as becoming increasingly different: the majority of the student population are "children of color" who are "more likely to be poor, hungry, in poor health, and to drop out of school than their white counterparts"; in contrast, the prospective teacher, as I presented earlier, differs on all the key demographic terms (Zeichner 1992, pp. 1-4). While this portrayal accurately represents demographic difference, the logic of multiculture sets up oppositions from which new competencies are derived.

In the fifties, sixties, and seventies, theories of cultural disadvantage or cultural deprivation characterized the urban child as lacking or deficient in certain basic competencies for schooling and for citizenship. The new valuations in the above argument dislodges cultural deficiency from the child and relocates it in the teacher. The teacher lacks "intercultural and interracial experience". These categories are based in part on studies that generate "profiles" of prospective teachers (e.g. Zimpher 1989). Prospective teachers are "culturally insular", they have limited "geographic aspirations" and a "limited cultural world view" and need teacher education programs to expand "their cultural horizons" if the "educational pipeline" is going to serve the "profile" of tomorrow's schools (Zimpher 1989, pp. 27-30).

Just as the "child of color" is Other in educational discourse, the teacher must be reconstructed to enter that space by acquiring new attitudes, competencies, and aspirations. In the discursive milieu of schooling, the child as Other depends upon the teacher to construct his or

her identity. In order to be able to do this, the teacher must aspire to a *flexible* and *mobile* identity, both geographically and culturally, as a national resource of American multiculture to be dispersed to places in crisis. The identity of the "child of color" is made *stable* and *immobile* through, for example, new behavioral and psychological norms (e.g. Murrell 1993). The sounding of crises in educational reform discourse based on the morality of multiculture still positions the child as Other for whom compassionate and caring teachers must be constructed.

In general, in both logics of markets and logics of multiculture, the major limitation of educational reform discourse making the urban distinction is its insistence upon studying schools as separate places or locales and premising reforms on community interventions. The violence of urbanism is both physical and symbolic. In the sense that Bourdieu (1992) uses cultural capital and symbolic violence, urbanism sets up new oppositions, new forms of cultural capital and new ways in which symbolic violence operates in unequal relations of power. The child, teacher, family, and community are each pathologized and othered through the construction of places of crisis in the "inner cities" and "urban" schools.

Urbanism repeatedly draws research attention to places that have "problems", or to places that have "problematic populations," or to places with "troublesome clients", or to places with "heterogeneous" or "multicultural" or "diverse" or "minority" populations in need of special attention, as exemplified by the reform proposals I presented in the first section. The "distanciated" spatial relations (geographic and social) of governmentality and its reasoning go unexamined. "Unreasonable" categories of the child, teacher, parents or communities are left unquestioned. It is assumed that places, which are separate or apart in physical or geographical space, and the people who inhabit those places, can be studied, understood, and reformed in isolation. Change is understood to reside in the individual. Furthermore, orienting teacher education to the urban school has led to recommendations for community participation and exploration (e.g. Goodlad 1990; Haberman 1993, 1995; Ladson-Billings 1994; Noordhoff & Kleinfeld 1990; Weiner 1989; Zeichner 1992, and Grant & Koskela 1986). However, it is a community of an expert discourse. As Rose writes:

> "Communities became zones to be investigated, mapped, classified, documented, interpreted, their vectors and values explained to enlightened professions-to-be in countless college courses and to be taken into account in numberless professional encounters" (Rose 1995, p. 7).

Preparing teachers as professionals who serve communities undercuts the activist assumptions when "services" are dispensed through expertise.

Summary

An analysis of urbanism as an oppositional space shows that it has historically operated to regulate, discipline, and produce techniques of self-government through constructions of the reasonable citizen. It does so by producing categories of the reasonable and enlightened citizen and Other. In the early national period, urbanism helped to construct, order, and regulate the relations of population to territory. From the late 1800s to the middle of the twentieth century, urbanism was instrumental in constructing an ordered social space. And currently, urbanism constructs the community as a project of political reflection, using the city to exemplify the deviant community. In these shifts of the moral plane of the citizen, from territory, to society, and to community, the "common" public school has been a generic place represented in isolation; the "urban" or "inner city" school is its other.

To study the urban school by what can be "seen" as present in its physical locale (as in the surrounding "community, the key actors "present" on the scene, and the system of "local" administration and control) or to study the urban school in terms of its place in relations of dominance and oppression ignores these shifts. In criticizing "outside" state intervention or "top-down" regulations and reforms, these binaries of inside-outside or top-bottom reinscribe the notion that place or locale are more important than the discursive spatial relations of "government at a distance" that go into constructions of the child, teacher, family, or community. The purpose of this argument has been to destabilize our notions of "the urban", to question the self-evident categories of reason in current educational reform discourse, and to create discursive space for new forms of intelligibility.

END NOTES

[1] I include the notion of "Cosmopolis" from Toulmin into urbanism for two reasons. First, it distinguishes urbanism from what historians of American education have called the views of "cosmopolitan" educational reformers (e.g. Kaestle 1983; Tyack 1974). These histories characterize educational reformers as "cosmopolitans" or "cosmopolites" in opposition to "localists" based upon their experiences and perceptions of urban life, a causal and ideological association I wish to avoid. I am not arguing an ideological distinction nor from the standpoint of "experience", which is how educational reform discourse today presents the crisis in education. Second, urbanism includes the aspirations of nationalism and patriotism as attitudes produced by schooling that construct the Other as outside of reason.

[2] Gitlin (1992) argues that the envisioning of territory as an empty space to settle a *national* frontier in a succession of "fall lines", as was reiterated by Turner's (1893) thesis, enabled early policy makers and later historians to overlook the *international* patchwork of these territories and the intermingling of Europeans with indigenous populations. Consistent with my argument is the envisioning of territory as a national boundary for developing a national identity in the population.

[3] Palen's (1995) history of the suburbs is an attempt to incorporate the historical complexities of suburban patterns in the U.S. Historically, concentrations of the poor were found in the suburbs or on the periphery of cities until motorized transportation and industrialization reversed this pattern.

[4] See Wisniewski & Ducharme (1989) for a discussion of the "parochialism" and "provincialism" of those who enter the teaching profession and teacher education. Given populational shifts of the last few decades, this characterization can hardly be the case today.

[5] For this and the following discussion, I refer primarily to the reform proposals discussed in the first section. Where additional texts are analyzed, I will cite them fully in the text.

REFERENCES

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism.* London & New York: Verso.

Barry, A. (1996). Lines of communication and spaces of rule. In A. Barry, T. Osborne & N. Rose (Eds.) *Foucault and political reason: liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 123-142.

Blakely, E. and Ames, D. (1992). Changing places: American planning policy for the 1990s. *Journal of urban affairs.* Vol. 14, No. 3/4, pp. 423-446.

Burchell, G. and C. Gordon, P. Miller (Eds.). (1991). *The Foucault effect: studies in governmentality: with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Castel, R. (1991). From dangerousness to risk. Burchell, G. and C. Gordon, P. Miller (Eds.). (1991). *The Foucault effect: studies in*

governmentality: with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 281-298).

Chubb, J. and Moe, T. (1990). *Politics, markets and America's schools.* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Clark, G. and Rose, H. (1994). Introduction: The Brown decision and schooling in urban America: Where do we go from here? *Urban geography.* Vol. 15, No. 5, pp. 415-520.

Cohen, S. (1985). *Visions of social control: crime, punishment, and classification.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Dean, M. (1994). *Critical and effective histories: Foucault's methods and historical sociology.* New York: Routledge.

Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the societies of control. *October 59,* Winter, pp. 3-7.

Denton, N. and Massey, D. (1991). Patterns of neighborhood transition in a multiethnic world: U.S. metropolitan areas, 1970-1980. *Demography.* Vol. 28, No. 1, February.

Donald, J. (1992). *Sentimental education: schooling, popular culture and the regulation of liberty.* London & New York: Verso.

Driver, F. (1988). Moral geographies: social science and the urban environment in mid-nineteenth century England. *Transitions, Institute of British Geography,* Vol. 13, pp. 275-287.

Dumm, T. L. (1993). The new enclosures: racism in the normalized community. In R. Gooding-Williams (Ed.). *Reading Rodney King: reading urban uprising.* New York: Verso, pp. 178-195.

Educational Placement and Career Services. (1994). *University of Wisconsin-System: 1993 survey of employment status for education certification graduates.* Tom Kelley (Dir.). Educational Placement and Career Services, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Fite, G. (1991). Public land policy. In E. Foner & J. Garraty (Eds.) *The reader's companion to American history.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin, pp. 877-880).

Foucault, M. (1991). Governmentality. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.) *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault.* University of Chicago Press, pp. 87-104.

-----(1984). Space, knowledge, and power. In P. Rabinow (Ed.) *The Foucault Reader.* New York: Pantheon Books, pp. 239-256.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The consequences of modernity.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Gitlin, J. (1992). On the boundaries of empire: connecting the west to its imperial past. In W. Cronon, G. Miles, and J. Gitlin (Eds.) *Under an*

open sky: Rethinking America's western past. New York & London: W.W. Norton & Co., pp. 71-89.

Gomez, M. L. (1994). Teaching education reform and prospective teachers' perspectives on teaching "other people's" children. *Teaching and teacher education.* Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 319-334.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). *Teachers for our nation's schools.* San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Gordon, C. (1991). Governmental rationality: an introduction. *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault.* University of Chicago Press, pp. 1-52.

Grant, C.A. and Koskela, R.A. (1986) Education that is multicultural and the relationship between preservice campus learning and field experiences. *Journal of educational research.* March/April, Vol. 79, No. 4, pp. 198-204.

Haberman, M. (1993). Predicting the success of urban teachers (The Milwaukee trials). *Action in teacher education.* Fall, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 1-5.

----- (1995). *Star teachers of children in poverty.* West Lafayette, Indiana: Kappa Delta Pi.

Hacking, I. (1991). How should we do the history of statistics? In G. Burchell, C. Gordon & P. Miller (Eds.) *The Foucault effect: studies in governmentality: with two lectures by and an interview with Michel Foucault.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 181-196.

Hardt, M. (1995). The Withering of civil society. *Social text 45.* Vol. 14, No. 4, Winter, pp. 27-44.

Harley, J. (1989/1996). Deconstructing the map. In J. Agnew, D. Livingstone & A. Rogers (Eds.) *Human geography: an essential anthology.* Blackwell publishers, pp. 422-443.

Hunter, I. (1994). *Rethinking the school: subjectivity, bureaucracy, criticism.* New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kaestle, C. (1983). *Pillars of the republic: Common schools and American society, 1780-1860.* New York: Hill and Wang.

Kliebard, H. [1986](1992). *The struggle for the American curriculum, 1893-1958.* New York and London: Routledge.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Murray, M. (1995). Correction at Cabrini-Green: a sociospatial exercise of power. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, Vol. 13, pp. 311-327.

Murrell, P. (1993). Afrocentric immersion: Academic and personal development of African American males in public schools. In T. Perry

and J. Fraser (Eds.) *Freedom's Plow: Teaching in the Multicultural Classroom.* New York: Routledge.

Noordhoff, K. and Kleinfeld, J. (1990). Shaping the rhetoric of reflection for multicultural settings. In R. Clift, W. R. Houston, and M.C. Pugach (Eds.). *Encouraging reflective practice in education: an analysis of issues and programs.* New York and London: Teachers College, Columbia University, pp. 163-185.

Osborne, T. Security and vitality: drains, liberalism and power in the nineteenth century. In A. Barry, T. Osborne & N. Rose (Eds.) *Foucault and political reason: liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, pp. 99-122.

Palen, J. (1995). *The Suburbs.* New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Pallas, A., G. Natriello, and E. McDill. (1989). The changing nature of the disadvantaged population: Current dimensions and future trends. *Educational researcher.* June-July, pp. 16-22.

Popkewitz, T. S. (1991). *A political sociology of educational reform: power/knowledge in teaching, teacher education and research.* New York & London: Teachers College, Columbia University, Teachers College Press.

----- (1984). *Paradigm and ideology in educational research: the social functions of the intellectual.* London and New York: The Falmer Press.

----- (1996) The Administration of Freedom: The Redemptive Culture of the Educational Sciences (unpublished).

Powell, A., E. Farrar, and D. Cohen. (1985). *The Shopping mall high school: Winners and losers in the educational marketplace.* Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rabinow, P. (Ed.) (1984). *The Foucault reader.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Rose, N. (manuscript 1995) The death of the social? Re-figuring the territory of government. *For economy and society special issue: radically rethinking regulation.* F. Pearce and M. Valverde (Eds.) Revised.

-----(1996a). Governing "advanced" liberal democracies. In A. Barry, T. Osborne and N. Rose (Eds.) *Foucault and political reason: liberalism, neo-liberalism and rationalities of government.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 37-64.

-----(1996b). Governing enterprising individuals. *Inventing our selves: Psychology, power, and personhood.* New York and Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, pp. 150-168.

Rossell, C. H. (1994). The progeny of Brown: from the old freedom of choice to the new freedom of choice in four decades. *Urban geography.* Vol. 15, No. 5, pp. 435-453.

Sassen, S. (1996). A new geography of centers and margins. In R. LeGates and F. Stout (Eds.). *The city reader.* London & New York: Routledge, pp. 69-76).

Shapiro, M. J. (1992). Spatiality and policy discourse: Reading the global city. *Reading the postmodern polity: political theory as textual practice.* Minneapolis & Oxford: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 86-103.

Toulmin, S. (1990). What is the problem about modernity? *Cosmopolis: The hidden agenda of modernity.* Chicago University Press, pp. 5-44.

Turner, F.J. (1901) The significance of the frontier in American history. In *The Frontier in American History.* Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, pp. 1-38.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). *The one best system: a history of American urban education.* Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. *The Condition of Education*, 1994. Washington, D.C.: 1994.

Weiner, L. (1989). Asking the right questions: an analytic framework for reform of urban teacher education. *The urban review.* Vol. 21, No. 3, pp. 151-161.

Weingart, P. (1994). Biology as social theory: the bifurcation of social biology and sociology in Germany, circa 1900. In D. Ross (Ed.) *Modernist impulses in the human sciences 1870-1930.* Baltimore & London: John Hopkins University press, pp. 255-271.

Winchester, H. & White, P. (1988). The location of marginalized groups in the inner city. *Environment and planning D: society and space,* Vol. 6, pp. 37-54.

Wisniewski R. and Ducharme, E. R. (Eds.) (1989). *The professors of teaching: an inquiry.* Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Young, Robert J. (1995). *Colonial Desire: hybridity in theory, culture, and race.* London & New York: Routledge.

Zeichner, K. (1992). Educating teachers for cultural diversity. *National center for research on teacher learning, NCRTL.* Special report, September. Michigan: Michigan State University.

Zeichner, K. and Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard educational review.* February, Vol. 57, No. 1, pp. 23-48.

Zimpher, N. (1989). The RATE project: a profile of teacher education students. *Journal of teacher education.* November-December, pp. 27-30.

TM026618

AREA 1997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

UD031692

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Urbanism in Educational Thought: Mobilizing the Teacher Through Diversity and Community	
Author(s): Lisa Hennon	
Corporate Source: University of Wisconsin at Madison	Publication Date: 3-24-97

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic/optical media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) or other ERIC vendors. Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following options and sign the release below.

Check here
Permitting microfiche (4"x 6" film), paper copy, electronic, and optical media reproduction

Sample sticker to be affixed to document

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 1

Sample sticker to be affixed to document

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Level 2

or here
Permitting reproduction in other than paper copy.

Sign Here, Please

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic/optical media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

Signature: Lisa Hennon	Position: Graduate Student
Printed Name: LISA HENNON	Organization: University of Wisconsin at Madison
Address: 514e Teacher Education Bldg. 225 N. Mills St. Madison, WI 53706	Telephone Number: (608) 255-6859
	Date: 3-31-97

OVER

CUA

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
Department of Education, O'Boyle Hall
Washington, DC 20064
202 319-5120

February 21, 1997

Dear AERA Presenter,

Congratulations on being a presenter at AERA[1]. The ERIC Clearinghouse on Assessment and Evaluation invites you to contribute to the ERIC database by providing us with a printed copy of your presentation.

Abstracts of papers accepted by ERIC appear in *Resources in Education (RIE)* and are announced to over 5,000 organizations. The inclusion of your work makes it readily available to other researchers, provides a permanent archive, and enhances the quality of *RIE*. Abstracts of your contribution will be accessible through the printed and electronic versions of *RIE*. The paper will be available through the microfiche collections that are housed at libraries around the world and through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service.

We are gathering all the papers from the AERA Conference. We will route your paper to the appropriate clearinghouse. You will be notified if your paper meets ERIC's criteria for inclusion in *RIE*: contribution to education, timeliness, relevance, methodology, effectiveness of presentation, and reproduction quality. You can track our processing of your paper at http://ericae2.educ.cua.edu.

Please sign the Reproduction Release Form on the back of this letter and include it with **two** copies of your paper. The Release Form gives ERIC permission to make and distribute copies of your paper. It does not preclude you from publishing your work. You can drop off the copies of your paper and Reproduction Release Form at the **ERIC booth (523)** or mail to our attention at the address below. Please feel free to copy the form for future or additional submissions.

Mail to: AERA 1997/ERIC Acquisitions
The Catholic University of America
O'Boyle Hall, Room 210
Washington, DC 20064

This year ERIC/AE is making a **Searchable Conference Program** available on the AERA web page (http://aera.net). Check it out!

Sincerely,

Lawrence M. Rudner, Ph.D.
Director, ERIC/AE

---

[1]If you are an AERA chair or discussant, please save this form for future use.