

Even though I do not agree with Carnoy's conspiratorial interpretation of history, I do concur with his contention that attempts should be made to reorder the priorities of most societies in the world and, most importantly, that, if effective change is to occur, the economic and social systems should be restructured first. I also agree that one should not forget the school as an important force that needs to change along with society. He correctly criticises Jencks, who implies that schooling is not a significant factor in explaining individual income and, *therefore*, that it does not have to be considered in a plan for change. Jencks asserts that, during the 1960s in the U.S., changing school quality had little effect upon social and economic inequality and, to reduce this inequality, society should concentrate foremost on political action to equalise income distribution. Carnoy agrees that the latter should be done, but he stresses that there should also be a change in the distribution of schooling.

Carnoy takes a stand half-way between Silberman, who feels the alternative to the present schools should be "open classrooms" (freedom of movement and individualised instruction), and Illich, who would like to destroy schools altogether and build learning networks. Carnoy feels that only a society in the process of liberation can decide whether to have schools or not and, until that time, his alternative choice would be "free schools" like the Washington, D.C., mini-school based on the Freire method of making children and adults politically aware — "to demystify that which is subjective and to have children discover that institutional organization and purpose is not derived from 'natural order' but from people's minds" (p. 367).

I shall conclude this review with several questions that pertain to Carnoy's alternative school. Firstly, his new school will attempt to solve one of society's evils, hierarchical institutions, but what about consumerism and the emphasis on technological improvements and the efficiency cult that pervade society — how will these values be changed in free schools?

Secondly, if schools are to be restructured by enlightened reformers, who is going to ensure that these changes are not co-opted by the "powerful"? Just as the missionaries and their schools became pawns in the systems of British and American imperialism, who will stop these "free schools" from being manipulated by the "elite"?

Thirdly, he mentions briefly the possibility of changing other hierarchical structures in society, such as the family, but what of other institutions that help shape values, such as the mass media, churches, youth clubs? If you do not change these, what will the effect of non-hierarchical schools be?

Finally, I would like to encourage Carnoy to describe in more detail the type of school that he envisions as a good alternative to traditional, hierarchical, teacher-centred schools (in this book we get only a snapshot view) and to try to predict the possible conflicts and problems that will be encountered in establishing them. We have had enough ideological rhetoric about why schools should be changed, but we have barely begun to describe how and in what ways this change should occur. Why did he not pursue a study of societies that had begun to change their economic structures and examine how their schools were changing? He does suggest that "in China and Cuba, schools serve a much more vocational function. The dichotomy between school and work is greatly reduced, and the work place rather than some institution external to the work place serves to select people for various roles" (p. 8). Perhaps he can turn, in his next book, to examining just what the function of schooling is in those societies undergoing this kind of major societal change.

Jan Currie
The University of Calgary.

* * * * *

David B. Tyack. *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974. 353 pp. \$12.50.

David Tyack has set himself an ambitious task in this, his most recent effort. He describes his book as an "interpretive history of the organizational revolution that took place in American schooling during the last century." Relying heavily on the paradigms of historians Michael Katz and Raymond Callahan, and of sociologists Arthur Vidich and Joseph Bensen, Tyack locates the sources of administrative change in economic and technological transformations occurring in American society throughout the 19th and 20th centuries.

Increasingly over time, goes his argument, changes in forms of production, of human association, of decision-making, and in ways of thinking and action which he calls "urban," were becoming central in the lives of most Americans. Changes in the modes of school organisation both expressed and facilitated the transformation of America from a village to an urban society.

Like Katz before him, Tyack is describing a series of organisational changes that ultimately wrested control of the schools from lay community leaders, and vested it instead in a coalition of elite professionals. Like Callahan, Tyack documents the emergence of organisational models for education which owe their character to a wedding of the business mentality to the educational enterprise.

The emergence of a corporate-bureaucratic model of school organisation represents, for Tyack, an unfortunate commitment to a uniform system of schooling — to a "one best system," created over time, by crusading educational reformers, captains of industry, social workers, and a variety of others who somehow understood that a new industrial order required a new kind of educational re-organisation. Tyack documents the evolution of a commitment to order and efficiency; to the division of labour as it had been in the factory; "to the punctuality of the railroad, to an educational chain of command and coordination . . ." He follows, in a variety of cities, efforts "to centralize educational control by allocating powers and functions through hierarchical organization; to establish networks of communication that would convey information and directives and would provide data for planning the future; to substitute impersonal rules for informal individual adjudication, to regularize procedures so that they would apply uniformly to all in certain categories; and to set objective standards for admission to and performance in teacher role, whether superintendent or third grader. Efficiency, rationality, continuity, precision, impartiality, became watchwords of the consolidators." It is significant that the impulse toward centralisation and to corporate models of management emerged in cities in the north, south, east, and west, spreading over time into rural areas as well.

This complex of attitudes and reform impulses emerged neither uniformly nor full-blown. Indeed, educators such as Horace Mann, William Torrey Harris, and Calvin Stowe, who, in the 19th century, identified a need for more centralised administrative direction, gradually forged an ideology and a style of reform in the presence of considerable community resistance. The nature of resistance varied from one city to another and was effectively, if not completely, overcome between 1890 and 1940 by "administrative progressives such as Cubberley and Strayer," in the 20th century.

The story of administrative reform, as Tyack tells it, is a story of contention — between advocates of professional control and advocates of community control; between ward bosses and school centralisers; between urban villagers and urban cosmopolites; between ruralites and urbanites; between administrators and teachers; between men and women; between rich and poor; between Catholic and Protestant; between immigrant and native; between German-speaking and English-speaking; between segregationists and integrationists. Paradoxically, for all of his emphasis on conflict, the story of centralisation and professionalisation is not, for Tyack, a story of devils and angels, of oppressor and oppressed, of good folks and bad folks, but of people who were puzzled and frightened by changes surrounding them, and who used what power they had, and what authority they could muster, to control the direction of change.

The strengths of this book rest on Professor Tyack's commitment to moderation in interpretation, to a unique tolerance of ambiguity in human motives, and in his appreciation of diversity and pluralism in American society — reflected, we should note, in the wide range of cities and of interest groups defined into his study.

The principal weakness — a weakness born, I think, of a premature synthesis — inheres in a definition of urban that is simply too broad and all-encompassing. For the purpose of analysis, Tyack treats everything that happens in city schools, from the status of teachers to the nature of the curriculum to the emergence of testing, pupil classification, and vocational education, as a function of urbanisation. Because of Tyack's broad and loose definitions of "urban" and "urbanisation," there appears to be nothing that went on in city schools that cannot somehow be explained by the process of urbanisation itself.

Yet, there is considerable evidence suggesting that the structure of education (through which, according to Tyack, the process of urbanisation can be documented) does little to explain the

evolution of some of the educational practices which he defines into his study. For example, Tyack has included lengthy and evenhanded discussions of the feminisation of the elementary school in cities, emphasizing the subordination of women to men within a structured hierarchy, and documenting inequalities of salaries between male and female teachers and between administrators who tend to be men and teachers who tended to be women, but it is neither urban organisation nor even a uniquely urban need for large corps of teachers that explains discrimination. In isolated rural areas as diverse as Brush County, North Carolina, and Hardin County, Iowa, women consistently earned less than men, and were rarely involved in decisions about hiring, about textbooks, about the locations of schools, and the like. The status of women was no more elevated in rural areas than in urban areas and structural changes in the organisation of education bear no inherent relationships to the feminisation of schooling nor to the relative status of men and women.

Yet another example of an unfortunate tendency to explain educational practices as consequences of urban re-organisation can be seen in Tyack's characterisation of teacher authority. In rural areas, he argues, the authority of school teacher inhered in the person, not in the office of the schoolmaster, whereas in city schools, teachers derived respect because of the authority vested in an office created by bureaucracy and hierarchy. Yet we find that teachers in almost every setting consistently distinguished their office from their person within the classroom. Even in one-room schools of the countryside, teachers used a whole arsenal of measures to distinguish their office as teacher from their relationship as parent, confidante, or friend. As a New Hampshire teacher of the 1830s explained: "On the playground, we stood on a common level, but in the classroom I was recognized as master." In short, rural teachers created hierarchy within their classes, regarded the division of roles as proper and necessary to the educational process, and maintained formal relationships in the absence of an urban bureaucracy.

It seems plausible to speculate that the evolution of a corporate-bureaucratic model of school organisation in cities represents an institutional extension of values which inhered in village America, rather than an institutional transformation arising solely in response to changing demographic and technological patterns. To pose, as Tyack has done, an inherent opposition between the needs of the village and the needs of the city may be meaningful, but is as yet undocumented. Indeed, it is possible that the reorganisation of American schools can best be understood as a gathering of consensus rather than as a resolution of conflict; that the concept of urbanisation needs redefinition.

The book is elegantly written and has become required reading in both my History and Foundations of Education classes.

Barbara Finkelstein
The University of Maryland

* * * * *

Donald Edgar (Editor). *Sociology of Australian Education*. Sydney: McGraw-Hill, 1975. Pp. 467, \$12.95 (Australian).

Goodman has stated that

Sociology of education as a separate discipline for study and research by education students and scholars is a very recent arrival on the Australian scene.¹

Those interested in the sociology of education in Australia are not yet well-served with introductions, text-books, and volumes of readings. Publication of new work in the field, therefore, is an important event.

Selected papers from a conference organized by Melbourne's La Trobe University in late 1972 have provided the basis for *Sociology of Australian Education*, which is a book of readings. According to the editor, the origin of the conference lay in his curiosity about the apparent lack of research on sociological aspects of education in Australia (p. ix). Both the

¹R. Goodman, "The Sociology of Education in Australia," in *Social Science Perspectives on Australian Education*, R. Browne & W. Simpkins (Eds.), (Melbourne: Macmillan, 1972), p. 40.