Editors' introduction

We welcome you to the inaugural issue of the *Berkeley Review of Education (BRE)*, housed at the Graduate School of Education at the University of California, Berkeley. In recent months, this university has been in the headlines—a sort of nostalgic sentiment for more rebellious times—as State budget cuts have forced layoffs, furloughs, fee hikes, and reductions in programs and course offerings. Staff, faculty, and students have protested these changes for fear of what they mean for the future of the university, the diversity of its student body and faculty, and the accessibility of its resources. We take this outcry to be a reflection of the fears that grip the U.S., and the world in general, at the dawn of the second decade of the twenty-first century. With dramatic economic, political, and social changes taking place, we are forced to question our assumptions and to raise a critical lens to beliefs long taken for granted. It is within this historical situation that we launch a journal committed foremost to publishing original work that is at the forefront of analyzing and thinking about how such changes affect and are enacted through educational institutions, in both their formal and informal guises.

The purpose of the *BRE* is to foster critical discussion concerning issues of diversity and equity in education in order to refine our collective understanding of what equity and diversity entail. Scholars who research and write about educational settings have tended, most often, to define diversity in racial or ethnic terms and equity as the inclusion of diverse racial and ethnic groups in educational institutions or as the dissemination of so-called "best practices" to those groups. Both diversity and equity have, in this way, been held up as ideals to be attained. Too seldom, however, have education scholars examined the structures and forces that enable, and are indeed founded upon, the mechanisms of differentiation and exclusion that diminish the diversity of educational systems and produce unequal outcomes among groups. These common assumptions about what is meant by diversity and equity go unquestioned, and the difficult discussions that may illuminate how to define, let alone achieve, diversity and equity have been unrealized. The *BRE* is devoted to publishing work that offers empirical and theoretical insight into these questions from interdisciplinary perspectives. This inaugural issue, which includes articles by educationists, anthropologists, and sociologists, reflects this commitment while laying the groundwork for the kind and caliber of publications that are to come. We believe that this variety of perspectives is most suitable to raising questions, investigating phenomena, and proposing answers about education.

The articles published in this inaugural issue address three central components of diversity and equity: that of *space*—how it shapes and is shaped by the social interactions that take place in it, the ways it includes and excludes—that of *(in)visibility*—the hidden structures that enable inequality—and that of *achievement*—its measures and outcomes and the ways those are wielded in systems of accountability.

In "The postcolonial ghetto: Seeing her shape and his hand," La Paperson invites us to reconceptualize urban space as a "post+colonial ghetto," to see the exercises of power and the practices of freedom that define life for those who live in it. Paperson's post +colonial framework offers a reconceptualization of urban schooling by challenging taken-for-granted notions of inclusion, enabling us to imagine a reality beyond the colonial structure in which people live, to define solidarity beyond traditional ties to the nation-state, and to engage schools in a broader agenda of decolonization. In telling of the

closing of East Oakland Community High School, and in remapping the relationship between the ghetto, the colony, and the empire, Paperson moves us away from an understanding of ghetto space as depopulated and of the ghetto subject as always reacting, defined only in opposition to colonialism, and towards a view of the people of the ghetto as "not just subjugated but a[s] subjective actor[s]."

Marilyn Cochran-Smith, Ann Marie Gleeson, and Kara Mitchell, in "Teacher education for social justice: What's pupil learning got to do with it?", fill a lacuna in the social justice education literature by linking the outcomes from a teacher preparation program with a focus on social justice to K-12 student learning. In so doing, the authors make us question the notion of accountability measures that are not contextualized within the goals of teacher education programs. Drawing on evidence collected as part of the Qualitative Case Study (QCS) project at Boston College, designed to explore the relationships between teacher preparation and student learning, Cochran-Smith and her colleagues found that "K-12 pupils who were provided with more cognitively complex classroom assignments were more likely to produce higher quality work." Such findings suggest that the turn to testing assessments as the sole measure of learning give short shrift to the myriad ways teachers are taught to teach, the ways they actually do teach, and what their students learn.

In "Race, class and whiteness in gifted and talented identification: A case study" Kathleen Barlow and Elaine Dunbar recount a 15-year effort to diversify the student body of a magnet school in the second largest school district in a large Midwestern state. Using Cheryl Harris' framework for evaluating whiteness as property, Barlow and Dunbar show how the selection of students for a gifted and talented education program was used as a means to retain and perpetuate white privilege. This privilege is unseen, or at least taken for granted, by the people who wield it. Barlow and Dunbar illustrate how exposing white property interests "can guide the appropriate use of power to undo the biases of white property and enable all children to receive the educational opportunities that best serve their interests, talents, and needs."

Na'im Madyun and Moosung Lee, in "Neighborhood ethnic density as an explanation for the academic achievement of ethnic minority youth placed in neighborhood disadvantage," contest extant explanations for the effects of ethnic concentration on the academic achievement of students living in neighborhoods populated largely by recent immigrant groups. Comparing Hmong and White students from similar neighborhoods, their study "aims to examine the association between neighborhood ethnic density and neighborhood disadvantage and how this density/disadvantage linkage influences the academic achievement of ethnic minority adolescents." The authors found that in their sample of 3,185 Hmong and White students, Hmong students from neighborhoods with high crime and high poverty rates outperformed their Hmong peers from less disadvantaged neighborhoods as well as their White peers from similar neighborhoods. Significantly, the authors also found that higher ethnic concentration in Hmong neighborhoods was correlated to higher student achievement. Such findings challenge social disorganization theory—the idea that neighborhood poverty, crime, and racial-ethnic diversity negatively influence a "community's capacity for . . . social control of individual development."

All four of these provocative articles offer us a lens through which to re-view our prevailing understandings of diversity and equity. By addressing the various themes of space, (in)visibility, and achievement, the authors help us to focus on various institutional structures that organize bodies and minds in multiple spaces to effect differentiation and

exclusion. Through their engagement with these themes, the authors push us to rethink what we consider education and its aims in the twenty-first century. We look forward to continuing this conversation in future issues, and we invite scholars from diverse intellectual traditions to offer their framings and interpretations of diversity and equity in divergent learning contexts.

On the occasion of publishing this inaugural issue of the *Berkeley Review of Education*, we would like to thank the many people who have made this publication possible. First, we thank the authors, who, with their thoughtfulness and diligence, have truly made this issue the best it can be. We thank our faculty advisors, Dean P. David Pearson and Professor Randi A. Engle, for their guidance and support. Thank you to our reviewers, who did a superb job in guiding authors and in making recommendations to us. And finally, a big thanks to our funders, the Graduate School of Education, the Graduate Assembly, and the Associated Students of the University of California.

The Editors