

Urban Public High Schools: Self-Actualization vs. Citizenship?

By Jeffrey Guhin

from

THE CONTENT OF THEIR CHARACTER

INQUIRIES INTO THE VARIETIES
OF MORAL FORMATION

February 2018

Cite as

Jeffrey Guhin, "Urban Public High Schools: Self-Actualization vs. Citizenship?" in *The Content of Their Character: Inquiries into the Varieties of Moral Formation*, ed. James Davison Hunter and Ryan S. Olson (New York: Finstock & Tew Publishers, 2018), 21–41.

2

Urban Public High Schools: Self-Actualization vs. Citizenship?

BY JEFFREY GUHIN

INTRODUCTION

Public schooling has been an important part of American society since the time of the American Revolution, and it gained strength with the early nineteenth century development of common schools and the charismatic leadership of Horace Mann.¹ However, much of that focus was on elementary education. Historians agree—and Mann himself made clear—that these early common schools were about much more than literacy and numeracy: There was a real focus on both citizenship and moral character,

Jeffrey Guhin is an assistant professor of sociology at the University of California Los Angeles. His specialties include education, religion, theory, and culture. From 2013 to 2016, he was the Postdoctoral Abd el-Kader Fellow at the University of Virginia's Institute for Advanced Studies in Culture. He earned his PhD with distinction in sociology from Yale University.

for the good of the economy, American society, and the individual student's soul.

The status of high school education changed rapidly from the beginning of the twentieth century to its midpoint. In 1894, when "The Committee of Ten"² recommended that all students, nationwide, receive 12 years of education, including four years of high school, very few students underwent secondary education, and there was a sense that the only purpose of secondary school was as preparation for college. Indeed, college students themselves could be quite young, and there was not an especially clear sense (as there is today) of college age versus high school age.

By mid-century, however, comprehensive high schools had been established across the country, and the national high school completion rate had increased eightfold, from 6.4 percent in 1900 to 50.8 percent in 1940. It has generally increased since, with 81 percent of high school students graduating on time in 2013. The number differs along racial, regional, and socioeconomic lines, though the trend towards the generalized importance of high school as a legally required and socially regulated part of American life is clear.

During the so-called managerial revolution, an insistence that schools—especially urban schools—be more like factories combined with certain interpretations of "progressive education" to help make high schools more about training good workers. Later, concerns about students' success relative to other countries—especially the Soviet Union—furthered that trend. Moral and civic education seemed less important than a greater emphasis on numeracy, literacy, and critical thinking.

More recent national-level education efforts, especially the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and the Obama administration's Race to the Top program, have created deeper and more far-reaching organizational incentives (and punishments), in an attempt to improve specific student academic outcomes. Moral character and citizenship education again took a back seat to these reforms.³

Alongside these movements toward greater accountability in public schools have been two concurrent structural changes in American public education. The first has been the rise of charter schools, which are a hybrid of private and public schools in that they are publicly funded but enjoy more autonomy and lower levels of unionization than traditional public schools. The second is

the development of various post-collegiate urban education programs. These different urban education programs (such as Teach for America) also generally aim at increasing student “success” as measured by college placement rates and change in student socioeconomic status. Such a focus remains distinct from things like citizenship or moral character.

Urban Public Schools

Urban public schools have, since their founding, been concerned with promoting social mobility and remedying inequality through academic instruction and the imparting of skills. Nevertheless, urban public schools have also, since their founding, been concerned with promoting morality and citizenship.

Such moral and civic education can be divided into explicit moral and civic education and an implicit socialization into certain moral and civic understandings, habits, and orientations. This distinction is mirrored on the macro level. Education policy makers and voters may support schools in order to pursue implicit moral and civic purposes that are distinct from the schools’ explicit instruction in morals and civics. The public purpose of schools might or might not be providing moral education, yet its broader moral purpose might be to remedy immoral structures of inequality. There are, in other words, *moral and civic purposes* to schools that are distinct from *explicit instruction in morals and civics*.

THE SAMPLE SCHOOLS

I visited two high schools each in Charlotte, North Carolina; San Diego, California; and New York, New York. Each school received around 15 to 20 field visits over roughly three months in Charlotte (January 2014–March 2014) and San Diego (April 2014–June 2014), and over roughly six months in New York City (February 2015–June 2015). Interviews were conducted with around 20 students and 10 adults per school. The table on page 24 provides some key data for the six schools. To protect their identities, the schools are referred to by aliases, and the numbers have been approximated.

Urban Public High School Sector: The Six Sample Schools

Category	Heritage School	Dream School	Center School	Everybody School	Four Ships School	Service School
City	Charlotte	Charlotte	San Diego	San Diego	New York City	New York City
Locale	City	Suburb*	City	City	City	City
Total Students [†]	1500	2000	1200	1200	700	350
Classroom Teachers	100	120	60	65	45	25
Black Students (%)	65	30	10	15	20	30
Hispanic Students (%)	25	20	65	45	65	67
White Students (%)	3	45	15	25	10	1
Asian & Pacific Islander Students (%)	5	5	5	10	2	2
Students of Two or More Races (%)	2	5	5	5	3	0
Free-Lunch Eligible Students (%)	75	40	60	50	75	85
Reduced-Lunch Eligible Students (%)	10	10	15	15	10	5
Magnet School?	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Title I School-Wide?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Source: National Center for Education Statistics. Free or reduced-price lunch eligibility refers to whether the student meets the criteria for federally subsidized lunches under the US Department of Agriculture's National School Lunch Program. Title I eligibility refers to whether a school meets the criteria for federal assistance to schools with a high percentage of low-income students. Data refers to the 2014–2015 school year.

* This school, while technically in a suburb, was in most ways as urban (in terms of placement within residential neighborhoods) as the other Charlotte School. It was also part of the Charlotte school district.

† All figures in this table are approximated to preserve the schools' confidentiality.

The three districts were chosen because each is famously committed to education reform.⁴ I chose two schools in each district so that I could distinguish between district-level and school-level effects. It was difficult to get access to schools for a three-month ethnography, and so to some extent I studied the schools I could find. However, each within-district set provides useful organizational and demographic points of comparison.

MORAL IDEAS, FRAMEWORKS, AND LANGUAGES

My research produced a straightforward result. Urban public schools were dedicated to two layers of morality: a commitment to “helping” for teachers and to “self-actualization” for students. There was a kind of “moral invisible hand,” a sense in which the schools’ public duty to the nation was best served by helping each student *as an individual* be successful in whichever way they chose. The teachers’ commitment to helping, which motivated their teaching, was reproduced within students only to the degree that such helping was primarily interpreted as a means of self-actualization.

Thus, the schools’ moral vision was a bifurcated one, with teachers understood to be people whose lives were primarily about helping, and students understood to be people whose lives were primarily about self-realization. Whether that self-realization could resemble the lives of the adults in the building—whether, in other words, I should say that a life of service is itself better than a life of individual ambition—was left up to each individual student to decide. To the degree that teachers were more assertive about imparting this commitment as a universal moral requirement, it was idiosyncratic to their own commitments rather than a part of their job requirements. It was also the case that such a commitment would always have to be both temporally and organizationally secondary to the schools’ primary institutional commitment: to get students into college, and, as such, into a comfortable position in the middle class.

I encountered four critical moral ideas in these schools, with some ideas more important than others, and some ideas

appearing in some schools but not others: (1) self-actualization, (2) grit, (3) respect, and (4) compassion. The moral framework and language for each of these tended to be a combination of solidarity for teachers and individual self-expression for students, though there was a sense of liberal tolerance as well.

Self-Actualization

Self-actualization was by far the most important moral idea in any of the schools, on both an aggregate and individual level. It represented what schools were supposed to do according to administrators and to district, state, and federal programs. It was what the teachers and principals wanted for the students, and what the students themselves wanted.

For example, I had a telling conversation with a senior at Four Ships School in a small room off the counselors' office. He was describing how a particular guidance counselor at the school really cared about the students, saying "she not only wants us to get into college, but she also wants us to succeed. By doing that, she'll make sure that we don't come out with a lot of loans, because that's not good." The interview questions immediately followed up on that thought.

Interviewer: What does that mean, "to succeed"?

Student: "Succeed" will mean getting a college degree and being independent. It's not about the money to me; it's more about doing what you love...whether you get paid well or not. That's what determines success for me—if you wake up every day now because of the fact that you have the opportunity to do what you love.

Interviewer: [Nods.] What about helping people? Does that matter?

Student: [Nods.] Yeah, of course. I feel the greatest currency there is, is helping others.

Interviewer: Look, everyone says that, right? But for real though?

- Student: [Enthusiastically.] Yeah!
- Interviewer: Someone's going to be like, "Hey man, you can make \$100,000—or more than that—and be one of these guys, works on Wall Street, who kind of screws people over, gets some really messed up wages for their workers, but you are bringing home *bank*," versus someone who does OK, middle class, typical life, but you know you're helping people; you know you're making a difference. There's a lot of people, they choose the money.
- Student: That's true, but for me personally, it's not really about the money to me. To be honest, money comes and goes; it doesn't last forever. People who base their whole life off of money, they don't get the full fulfillment of accomplishment and enjoyment. I feel like someone that really loves their job and loves what they do doesn't care about the paycheck, whether it's a lot or little.

Note what happened when I steered the conversation toward the boy's saying that helping people is what matters. It would not have been especially surprising if the student had said that the best thing in the world was to help people, or something like that. Indeed, he said something similar after being asked, "What about helping people? Does that matter?" The question was almost intentional coaching. It's hard to say in response to something like this that helping others isn't important.

But when the possibility of making lots of money was raised a second time, the student did not shift the frame of reference back to helping others, but rather to questions of loving your job and "the full fulfillment of accomplishment and enjoyment." For the student, the real moral of the story seemed to be doing what you loved and fully expressing yourself, reaching your full potential. That is a story I saw consistently throughout my research in all six schools. Working hard and being your best self was by far the

most important moral value I encountered, at least in terms of what was expected for the students.

I found similar themes in our conversations with faculty and staff. At Service School, I was talking to an administrator about the school's goals for the students. I said, "You mentioned going to college or at least trying to get some sort of career. Are there other characteristics besides career readiness or college preparedness that you would want to see in your graduates?"

Yeah. I want them to feel like they have an active voice.... Too many times, our kids feel like their opinion doesn't matter.... I don't like when I see kids that say, "My voice doesn't count." It's like they're deflating; they're defeated already.... There are kids, they come in and they don't think that they can make any change. A lot of our after-school clubs are what kids want. They have no idea, but if a couple of kids come up to me and say, "Hey, I want to start—would you start an anime?" There's a group of five, and I'm like, "Listen, if you can find a teacher who wants to do anime and so on, we'll do it."

This was a moral story about student empowerment and teachers facilitating self-expression and ambition. It was not, interestingly, a story about inculcating the school's social justice commitments in the students. Of course, a fair response might be that the teachers were simply providing their students with a sense of agency, an awareness that they are free to make choices that will benefit them and, quite possibly, the rest of the world. Yet there is a tendency in some of these conversations to confuse agency as a means with agency as an end. Another way of putting this might be that in our efforts to remedy inequality, some of us—whether teachers, policy makers, or voters—can lose sight of the differences between gaining greater equality and ensuring the common good.

This correlated, of course, with student testing, to the extent that testing accomplishes what it claims—that is, challenging students to excel and cultivate their abilities to pursue whichever careers they choose. I asked a teacher and coach at Center School about what his ideal graduate would look like, and he described such a student the following way:

I would want them to be an independent thinker, to be creative, to be a problem solver, to know right from wrong, and choose right the majority of the time, a high percentage of the time. Nobody can be the perfect person all the time, but at least try to be a good person.... That's why I enjoy athletics so much, because a lot of those characteristics and values are communicated and taught and practiced during a sport, during the competition.

I asked the teacher if he felt there was an administrative push to do that work on trying "to be a good person," and he said he didn't.

I think that a lot of times you make this decision early in your teaching career whether you want this to be a big part; I don't think this is isolated to this school either. I know that I got into teaching partially because I want to teach these values; I want to teach good character. Not that I'm perfect, but I think the world would be a better place, or society would be better, if we did teach these things. A lot of times I will talk about choices people make, whether it be fictional characters or historical persons or whatever, but I don't think at the admin level—at the administrative level—that's really pushed. I don't think at the district level it's pushed. I wonder if it's pushed in our society, in the American society in general....

I am the product of 12 years of Catholic schools. I remember distinctly we had a course *Reverence for Life*, which had nothing to do with religion and everything to do with decision-making. It was just all about that, and I wish we had a class like that here. Unfortunately, though, I think politics get in the way. When you talk about test scores and Common Core standards and things like this, none of them ever mention character.... I think a big part of it is testing. I think that what I've heard from other teachers and from people in the community is that teaching character is much too complicated and it would be too difficult to come

to a common set of values, which I don't agree with, but I've heard that be the reasoning for why we don't do it.... I think if you look at different societies, different religions, different any-sort-of-background,... these are all things that I think that across the world people could agree on.

Despite the teacher wishing a class like this existed, he felt there wasn't sufficient opportunity to teach those sorts of morals in his classes, and he had to do so idiosyncratically on his own or within his classroom. That's something I heard repeatedly in my interviews and conversations with teachers, except for the two New York Schools, whose principals both told me their schools would have been very different had they not made a conscious effort to buck the district focus on test scores.

Grit

The virtue most important to succeed on tests is, of course, grit. Various teachers mentioned the word in my interviews, but even when they did not, many mentioned qualities that were similar.

I asked a teacher at Center School about the kind of students she wanted to produce. She answered,

I want them to be able to not have a false sense of entitlement and self-confidence. Too many kids leave here thinking they're completely prepared, and they deserve to go to college, or they deserve to have whatever job it is, because they are who they are. They don't get that you go out into the world and you earn that. You prove that. You work for it.

I received such comments from many of the teachers. Her response to my follow-up question was also typical. When I asked whether there was anything else she could think of, she said,

You see someone in need and you step up. Whether they ask you or not, you see the need and you fill it. You are that good person. I try to do that in the halls. I've been trying to get ASB [student government] to understand that.

That focus on individual achievement first and then, when all is said and done, also helping the world was something I came across constantly. Here's an English teacher at Four Ships School—a place that was much more concerned with fostering citizenship and interpersonal relationships than any of the other schools—responding to my question about her end goal for a student:

I want somebody who's ready for life. I want somebody who's ready for life and who genuinely cares about reading and learning and understanding more. I don't know that we always accomplish that. I don't know that that's always the end student that we achieve by end of four years, but that's my ideal.

I then asked for other characteristics, and she responded,

Someone who's able to both be on time, to walk into a place on time to present themselves professionally, to both speak and write in standard American English, in that regular, academic, formal way. Also to care. I do think that caring about something, about the world around you, about an issue—it may be not the same issue that I walk in caring about, but you should absolutely, you should care about making the world a slightly better place than you found it.

Note that the way she described caring actually assigned it a greater weight—"absolutely"—than a professional demeanor, but she mentioned it only near the end of her description, and only after she was prodded for more characteristics. That paradox is central to what I saw: Teachers really do want students to be caring people; it's just not the first thing they work toward or think about. They want students to be their best selves, and to the extent those selves are people whose first priorities are service, that's wonderful. But service becomes one among many means of self-actualization rather than a necessary part of any flourishing human life.

And how to make sure that self-advancement occurs? Grit. These sorts of emphases on comportment and self-advancement can also be found in charter schools and teaching programs such

as Teach For America.* In a classroom of a former TFA teacher at Heritage School who now worked with current TFA teachers across the Charlotte area, I saw posters that emphasized self-comportment and the value of grit.

This teacher cared deeply about teaching students to make the world a better place, something that came up regularly in my one-on-one conversations and in many of her class discussions. It was simply secondary to more specific concerns about achievement and the capacity for achievement. This was, in some ways, a necessary problem. For example, she and her colleagues in the English department spent a lot of time helping students improve their capacity to sit still and just read. Silent reading was, for her, an important use of class time, even if it might take away valuable minutes from explicit instruction. It could not simply be assumed that students would read at home, and helping them develop the self-discipline to read for increased lengths of time would prepare them for college-level reading, for standardized test-taking, and for the kind of grit that would be required of any long-term plan.

As I hope is clear, I do not wish to denigrate an emphasis on grit or self-actualization. I simply want to emphasize how these values were often divorced from broader questions of what that grit or self-actualization ought to be directed *toward*.

Respect

Another value I heard about regularly from both students and teachers at all six schools was respect. In all cases, respect meant making sure others thought you were worthy of their esteem and appreciation. Yet, of course, in different organizational settings and in different roles, different forms of esteem are necessary. In the words of a teacher at Heritage School,

Some, when you have them, they hate you. They make your life as difficult as possible, and then the second

* There is a tremendous focus on grit and comportment in both charter schools and educators influenced by teacher programs like Teach for America. See, for example, Joanne Golan, "The Paradox of Success at a No-Excuses School," *Sociology of Education* 88, no. 2: 103–119. For more on grit, the classic author is Angela Duckworth; see especially Angela Duckworth, *Grit: The Power of Passion and Perseverance* (New York: Scribner, 2016).

you don't have them, they're going to come and talk to you. I feel like I'm OK with bonding with my kids when I have them, but after I have them, I think that's when it happens, and they'll come in and they'll talk about, "Well, I got really mad at this teacher, and I cussed her out." You cussed her? Why do you think that that's okay? A student yesterday called me by my first name, and I tried and explained that that is a sign of disrespect. I don't even think I got myself across, but it's small things like that where to live, to be successful in life, you have to learn how to speak to people, what's respectful, what's disrespectful.

She said that for some students, "it's a different mindset," by which she meant that there are different ways of thinking about respect. For some, it is simply a matter of polite interactional courtesies (think of a mother telling her child to "be respectful" when the child does not say please or thank you). This is still a matter of making sure people recognize each other as worthy of some level of esteem: To say please or thank you is ultimately to acknowledge someone else's status as one to whom politeness is due. Yet for some, such issues of respect are more or less superficial: They do not feel personally *disrespected* if someone is *impolite*. For others, politeness and respect are much more necessarily linked, often because of a lack of status in other capacities or because of an organizational culture that highlights propriety in interactions. In other words, to say that some students treat respect with "a different mindset" is to say that the threat of being "disrespected" via an improper interaction is a much more salient part of everyday life. As the Heritage teacher put it,

If they feel like they're being disrespected by a teacher, then they have every right to curse at them. You've got to...not cut them *slack*, but you've got to understand that that's where they're coming from. I was not taught that, but it's all about they have to make sure that they're feeling respected. They've felt disrespected by me, and I have heard about it. That's really big on their priority list, which I understand, but sometimes, you don't feel respected, and you can't cause a big stink about it.

For many students, this insistence on respect was a cultural scheme they could turn on and off in different contexts provided they felt they were in safe space and respected by their teachers and classmates. Various students told me that they could alternate back and forth between different ways of behaving in different classrooms and even in different peer groups. However, for certain students, a focus on respect as one of the most salient parts of their lives made their need for respect far less flexible and not as able to change across organizational settings.

Near the beginning of my fieldwork at Service School, I observed a conversation in the principal's office between the principal and a 10th grade girl, around age 15, named Juana (an alias). Juana was now living with her grandmother because she was prevented from living with her parents by a court order. She'd had a rough childhood, and she was in the office that day to talk about a fight she and some other girls had gotten into. In the course of the conversation, it was revealed that there had been a long-simmering "beef" between various blocks in the neighborhood, and that many of the girls had been taunting each other over social media during the school's recent week off. They returned angry, all sensing unforgivable slights. A fight was just about inevitable.

Yet what was interesting about Service School was the degree to which they took conflict resolution seriously: Any students who got in a fight were required to do a "mediation" together. (Of all the schools I studied, Service School was by far the most explicitly concerned about the moral formation of their students.) So the principal asked, "Will you be able to talk to Lizette?" (the other girl, also an alias).

"I can talk to her, but if she lies to me, I'm going to punch her in the face," said Juana. "I can't let that happen. How you gonna lie *right to my face*? No, no. I'm sorry, Ms, but no. I won't do it."

The principal went on to remind Juana that Juana had a good heart but that she was pigheaded—the principal's words. The principal continued that she was worried Juana's stubbornness and impulsiveness would get her in trouble. A teacher who had broken up the fight came in, and both the teacher and principal tried to convince Juana that she needed to be calm and just let people say what they wanted to say, but Juana wouldn't hear it. "You're a kind person," said the principal. "I see that. And you've got a real chance here, and you don't get many chances, so you can't let yourself fall off track."

Yet the way her principal and teacher framed this story to Juana wasn't necessarily the only way to understand it. Juana wasn't just struggling with impulse control and stubbornness, as though everyone were actually on the same page in terms of virtues to emphasize and vices to limit. Rather, this was a story about radically different conceptions of the good. For Juana, the good person, and the good life, was marked by respect, honor, and the saving of face. To disrespect her, to lie to her, was not simply to do something annoying that required her patience to overcome; it was to fundamentally insult her worth as a person, and the only way to respond was to demand reparation for that wrong, whether through violence or otherwise.

I asked the principal about this after Juana had left, and she said that contending with this attitude was one of the biggest challenges at their school. She said she had to be careful, because she would never tell a student she disagreed with their parents.

Of course, in many cases, the parents and children did not practice what sociologist Elijah Anderson calls "the code of the street."⁵ There were many, many students from low-income neighborhoods in the schools I studied, as in all of America's urban schools, who did not believe that fighting was the appropriate solution to their problems or that the maintenance of honor was the most important virtue.

Juana, however, was *not* immoral; she was not even necessarily struggling to do what she believed was right, but simply having trouble accomplishing it. She was doing what she believed was the right thing when she got into these fights.

Compassion

Alongside the focus at all six of the schools on student achievement, the teachers, staff, and administrators all deeply prized compassion, especially in each other, and then to some extent in their students. On my first day at Center School, I sat in on a faculty meeting in which two people won awards: a teacher and a student. The student was praised for his work ethic and drive; the teacher was praised for her compassion and willingness to help. That more or less exactly captured the tension I'm describing here. The direction towards which the teachers' compassion encouraged the students varied, but it was usually something like the award ceremony at Center School I described above.

One of the most moving interviews I conducted was with a teacher who had been a community organizer. He certainly made sure that in his lesson plans he educated students about social problems that affected their communities. I asked him how he saw his role as a teacher.

I burned out on being a union organizer for a number of years and was on the road and living out of hotels most of the time, and just took some time and kind of wandered back to school and did it.

I think I started out with a lot...saw the role of a teacher as being more of a social justice...kind of closing the education gap, that kind of thing a lot more than I do today, where I kind of feel like the role of schools and teachers is pretty limited within the broader structure of things that our students face and think. You know, the Eric Garner [death]⁶ really was disturbing for me, where I was just kind of like "oh, even if I teach the kids to write a little bit better, if they're just going to get choked out by the police and nobody cares...."

High school is a terrible, awful time for a lot of kid's lives, and it certainly was for me. In a weird sort of way, I think of myself more as like a high school hospice nurse than as someone who is really restructuring the way that the system works. Where it's like, it's kind of an ugly, terrible time, and I'd like to be as nice and kind to kids getting through that time as I can—[that's] kind of the way I've begun to rethink my job a little bit.... And that wasn't where I was at, that's not why I started teaching....

I do think a lot more in terms of those soft skills and more of just kind of, optimistic...not worldview, but an optimistic approach to learning at least.... I feel like those are my bigger successes. Less than the discrete bits of content that they learn and more of just kind of an approach to learning where they're going to be able to embrace challenges and be able to han-

dle setbacks and stay in the game.... I've really tried to structure that government class in that way, where we're doing standards-based grading but in kind of a fake way where growth ends up being a quarter of their grade...so it's more about pushing them to meet their individual goals than the bigger standards....

Here was a teacher who was committed to social justice in his teaching, but who had decided that in some ways, the best he could do was to be a kind presence and help students with their individual goals. I met many teachers like this, and even teachers who were a bit more ambitious acknowledged they could only touch the students they could touch.

For obvious reasons, administrators had more power to make real change in students' moral and civic development, but even they felt hamstrung by district and governmental requirements. It was only the two New York City principals who felt they had any real authority to turn their schools into places that could help students become moral leaders and good citizens. It was also the case that all too often these government classes felt like hoops for students to jump through rather than means of formation.

CONCLUSION

In my sample, I did not see urban public schools place a tremendous emphasis on student indebtedness to the world at large except inasmuch as students owed it to themselves, and to the world, to be their best selves. In this sense, there was understood to be a kind of "moral invisible hand" at work, with students helping the world simply by becoming the best selves they could be.

That is not to say these schools were places without virtue. As I have described, there were often heroic commitments by teachers to show compassion to their students and to model such a compassionate life as a meaningful way to live. Yet there was also a wariness—from both teachers and students—to say that any kind of life is necessarily better than any other (so long as that life is not causing harm). Yet in the absence of a stronger ethical sensibility that could carry throughout the school community, students were left to find larger ethical

visions that might work for them. For some, that vision was a kind of materialist self-advancement, yet for many it was a sense of self-actualization, a need to “be yourself,” whatever that “self” might be. To the extent students were committed to altruism, solidarity, or broader public virtues, it was always through this diffuse institution of individualism, of insisting that what you most owe the world is your own self-realization.

That emphasis on self-actualization is in many ways an improvement upon an education system that insists urban high school students have nothing much to give; and, to be clear, massive inequalities between schools and school districts could still provide ample evidence that much less is expected of (and promised to) certain schools rather than others. Yet despite the ongoing inequality in American public schools, what remains striking is how a broader ideology of individual self-actualization extends across the education field. I have argued that this goal of self-actualization is in some conflict with a goal of compassion, not so much because they are necessarily at odds but because in the schools I studied, compassion only makes sense to the degree that it is a means of self-actualizing.

Think of antibullying programs, for example. The administration provides them—thankfully—in the schools I studied. Nevertheless, antibullying is not the same thing as pro-citizenship. Even the most active of antibullying strategies calls for bystanders to intervene as citizens to stop *bullying*—that is, explicit harm from one to another.

Yet what of the many students I saw sitting alone at lunch, some so nervous not to look like “losers” that they stood in the hall, quickly eating their lunches before they went somewhere else? It is by no means a requirement of self-actualization to go help these students feel less alone. Maybe an aggregate of actualizations is not quite enough.

ENDNOTES

1 For more on Mann and the early era of American education, see Carl Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society, 1780–1860*, (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983). For the most famous critique of Mann and early American education reform, see Michael B. Katz, *The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid-Nineteenth Century Massachusetts* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2001). For a communitarian critique, see Charles Leslie Glenn, *The Myth of the Common School* (Oakland, CA: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 2002). For an important and sensitive rejoinder to these critiques, see Johann N. Neem, *Democracy's Schools: The Rise of Public Education in America* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2017).

2 For more on The Committee of Ten and twentieth century school reform, see Diane Ravitch, *Left Back: A Century of Battles Over School Reform* (New York: Touchstone, 2001). See also David B. Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974).

3 For an important critique of contemporary school reform (and a break from her earlier work), see Diane Ravitch, *The Death and Life of the Great American School System: How Testing and Choice Are Undermining Education*, 3rd ed. (New York: Basic Books, 2016). A classic analysis of the failure of ongoing education reform efforts can be found in Charles M. Payne, *So Much Reform, So Little Change: The Persistence of Failure in Urban Schools* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2008). For a defense of much in contemporary education reform, see Greg J. Duncan and Richard J. Murnane, *Restoring Opportunity: The Crisis of Inequality and the Challenge for American Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press; New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 2014). For a broader political view, see Jal Mehta, *The Allure of Order: High Hopes, Dashed Expectations, and the Troubled Quest to Remake American Schooling* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015). Much of the current scholarship in the study of education concerns contemporary school reform: It is a massive field. For more on Teach for America, see Patricia Maloney, "Schools Make Teachers: The Case of Teach for America and Teacher Training" (PhD diss., Yale University, 2012). For more on charter schools, see Ron Zimmer, Brian Gill, Kevin Booker, Stephane Lavertu, Tim R. Sass, John Witte, *Charter Schools in Eight States: Effects on Achievement, Attainment, Integration, and Competition* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2009), as well as Jack Buckley and Mark Schneider,

Charter Schools: Hope or Hype? (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009).

4 For more on San Diego education reform, see Richard Lee Colvin, *Tilting at Windmills: School Reform, San Diego, and America's Race to Renew Public Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2013); Frederick M. Hess, ed., *Urban School Reform: Lessons from San Diego* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2005); Linda Darling-Hammond, Amy M. Hightower, Jennifer L. Husbands, Jeannette R. LaFors, Viki M. Young, and Carl Christopher, *Instructional Leadership for Systemic Change: The Story of San Diego's Reform* (Lanham, MD: R&L Education, 2004); and Lea Hubbard, Hugh Mehan, and Mary Kay Stein, *Reform as Learning: School Reform, Organizational Culture, and Community Politics in San Diego* (New York: Routledge, 2006). For more on Charlotte's education reform, see Pamela Grundy, *Color & Character: West Charlotte High and the American Struggle over Educational Equality* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2017); Tim Quinn and Michelle Keith, *Within Reach: Leadership Lessons in School Reform from Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools* (Charlotte, NC: Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, 2011); and Stephen Samuel Smith, *Boom for Whom?: Education, Desegregation, and Development in Charlotte* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004). For more on New York City education reform, see Heather Lewis, *New York City Public Schools from Brownsville to Bloomberg: Community Control and Its Legacy* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2013); Jennifer A. O'Day, Catherine S. Bitter, and Louis M. Gomez, eds., *Education Reform in New York City: Ambitious Change in the Nation's Most Complex School System* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2011); Michael Fullan and Alan Boyle, *Big-City School Reforms: Lessons from New York, Toronto, and London* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2014); and Eric Nadelstern, *10 Lessons from New York City Schools: What Really Works to Improve Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2013).

5 See Elijah Anderson, *Code of the Street: Decency, Violence, and the Moral Life of the Inner City*, (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1999).

6 "Medical Examiner Rules Eric Garner's Death a Homicide, Says He Was Killed by Chokehold," NBC 4 New York, last modified August 21, 2014, accessed August 8, 2017, <http://www.nbcnewyork.com/news/local/Eric-Garner-Chokehold-Police-Custody-Cause-of-Death-Staten-Island-Medical-Examiner-269396151.html>; "Cop cleared in chokehold death of

Eric Garner,” Larry Celona, Kirstan Conley, and Bruce Golding, *New York Post*, last modified December 3, 2014, accessed August 8, 2017, <http://nypost.com/2014/12/03/cop-cleared-in-eric-garner-chokehold-death/>.