The Journal of Educational Thought, Vol. 11, No. 3 (1977) 243-252

REVIEW ESSAYS

ABSTRACT

During the past decade, sociologists have debated the possibility and/or desirability of a distinctive Canadian Sociology. With this debate as a starting point, the review analyzes the status of sociology of education in Canada, argues that important distinguishing characteristics of Canadian society and education call for an unique Canadian sociology of education, and then explicates both the state of the discipline and the relevance of the societal characteristics by a detailed examination of two recent textbooks.

ANNE MARIE DECORE**

Sociology of Education in Canada A Review Essay*

In the last ten years there has been considerable debate among sociologists in this country as to whether there is and/or there can be a Canadian Sociology. The first part of this overview examines the issues raised in the more general debate as they relate to the sociology of education. The second part of this essay looks at two recently published Canadian books in the sociology of education with particular reference to their contribution to the sociology of education in Canada.

I

Let me review this debate on a Canadian Sociology briefly. On the one hand, it has been argued that in Anglophone Canada, at least, the predominance of American and American trained sociologists has led to a sociology composed solely of American theoretical and methodological approaches that focus on substantive issues and problems derived from the American experience. Others of a similar nationalistic bent have pointed out that even those of us who are Canadian and/or Canadian trained will have difficulty in developing a Canadian sociology because our training has been largely at the hands of American sociologists — we are colonized.

On the other hand, it has been argued that the ideal of a universal and generalized sociology is in conflict with the emotionalism and particularism of a national sociology. As Jarvie puts it:

> . . . I persist in the view that nationalism is a dark force in the limited sense that it is inimical to science and cannot be reconciled with science. Canadians may have certain characteristics, a national style, preoccupations, and the like. This may have much sociological influence on the shape of scientific organization. But when a Canadian does science whether physics, economics, or anthropology, his work, I contend, can in no scientifically or epistemologically relevant sense be Canadian: it is only Canadian, if at all, in its being limited and not scientific enough![1]

Further, it is argued that the American experience is so similar to the Canadian that there can be no distinctly Canadian sociology. At best, one would have an American sociology with Canadian content. At worst, one would have a parochial sociology with fascist overtones.[2]

---

* The first part of this essay was presented at the Canadian Sociological and Anthropological Association Meeting, Fredericton, N.B., June, 1977.

** A. M. Decore is assistant professor in Educational Foundation, University of Alberta.

[1]I. C. Jarvie, "Nationalism and the Social Sciences," *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 1 (1976): 525.

[2]Jarvie.

As Felt[3] correctly points out there are three components of this argument as to what might constitute a Canadian sociology. The first has to do with personnel, the second with content and the third with distinctive theoretical thrusts. It seems to me to be useful to look at these three components but to narrow the discussion at this point to the sociology of education in Anglophone Canada.

Personnel

In a 1976 paper Card[4] pointed to the lack of interest in the sociology of education among sociologists and anthropologists as one reason for the paucity of work in this area in Anglophone Canada. While 1:7 Quebec sociologists and anthropologists listed the sociology of education as a specialization in the *1970 Directory of Sociologists and Anthropologists in Canada*,[5] the proportions were 1:19 in Ontario, 1:17 in the West and 1:71 in the Atlantic provinces. A rough tally from the *1973 Directory*[6] shows a considerable improvement in the proportions in Anglophone Canada. About 1:8 (114:950) sociologists and anthropologists listed the sociology of education as a specialization and the ratio was the same for Quebec and for the rest of Canada. It should be noted, however, that in Quebec the proportion who were educated in Canada was double that for sociologists in the rest of Canada.

If numbers make a difference, one should gradually see more publication in the sociology of education in Anglophone Canada, and we already are. How much this might contribute to a Canadian sociology is still open to question for several reasons.

1. Approximately two thirds of those specializing in the sociology of education received their training outside of Canada.

2. Of the remaining specialists in the sociology of education many have been trained in the American tradition. That is, where people are trained may be of little significance if all theory, methodology and problems are derived from the American experience.

To this the universalist would respond by pointing out that if there is nothing unique about Canadian society, the number of Canadian trained sociologists makes no difference and that if there is something unique about Canadian society, a well trained and objective sociologist ought to be able to study Canadian society whatever his origins — the question of personnel then becomes a question of content and distinctive theoretical thrusts.

Even if one accepts this line of thought, the dominance of American sociology (especially its functionalist and positivist varieties) has led to some interesting lapses in the sociology of education in Anglophone Canada. For example, except for Martin[7] and Stebbins[8] who operate from a symbolic interactionist perspective, there is little work of an interpretive nature. The work of British

---

[3]L. F. Felt, "Nationalism and the Possibility of a Relevant Anglo-Canadian Sociology," *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 1 (1975): 377-379.

[4]B. Y. Card, "The State of Sociology of Education in Canada — A Further Look," *Canadian Journal of Education* 1 (1976): 16.

[5]D. M. Connor and J. E. Curtis, *Directory of Sociologists and Anthropologists in Canada*, 2d ed. (Montreal: Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, 1970).

[6]J. E. Curtis and R. D. Lambert, *Directory of Sociologists and Anthropologists in Canada*, 3d ed. (Montreal: Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association, 1973).

[7]W. B. W. Martin, *The Negotiated Order of the School* (Toronto: Macmillan Company of Canada, 1976).

[8]R. A. Stebbins, *Disorderly Classroom: Its Physical ann Temporal Conditions*, Monograph in Education, 12 (St. John's: Memorial University, Faculty of Education, 1974).

sociologists such as Young, Bernstein, Lawton and others has inspired very little emulation in Canadian sociology of education. A committed positivist would, of course, argue that studies in the interpretive vein lead only to a relativistic paralysis and get neither the sociology of education nor sociology anywhere. Still, it is curious that in Canada little attention has been paid to work so prominent in recent British sociology of education. As Jarvie, shortly after condemning the sociology of knowledge, points out; "It is the proliferation and the pluralism of institutionalized science that prevents dogmatism, ideology and propaganda from completely usurping debate."[9]

Canadian Content and Theoretical Thrusts

Having noted this interesting bit of myopia, I want now to return to what seems to me to be the crucial question. Is there something unique in Canadian society — something unique enough to merit an emphasis on Canadian content in the sociology of education or even the development of some new and/or modified theoretical approaches in the sociology of education?

I do not intend to review what has been said elsewhere about what differentiates Canadian from American society except to the extent that those observations apply to education. One such observation is made by Professor S. D. Clark when he notes that in contrast to the United States "What was (is) problematic in the Canadian context, however, was (is) the very survival of Canadian society."[10] More specifically and nationalistically, prior to the first great war, Canadian survival was problematic because of her dependence on Europe, particularly Britain. Since that time the dependence has shifted to the United States but survival is no less problematic. Examples of this dependence include the economy, the media, sociology, and *education.* American dominance in publishing particularly in textbooks for primary, secondary and tertiary levels has been given some attention though not by sociologists.[11] The branch plant nature of other aspects of higher education has been the subject of a ten year debate — the most recent statement of which is the Symons Report.[12] At the primary and secondary levels little has been said about the fact that what goes by the name of innovative education, either organizational or curricular, has seldom been innovative. It has been transplanted from the United States, often after being abandoned there. In the organizational area such things as composite high schools, homogeneous groupings and open area schools are some examples of transplanted innovations. In the curricular area we have adopted such things as new math, head start and individualized instruction. Despite the pervasiveness of the relationship of dependency in education, as elsewhere, it is not a matter to which sociologists of education have devoted much attention even though it has implications for both the content of the sociology of education in this country and for the theoretical approaches used.

I do not mean to make a blanket condemnation of borrowed innovations but I do think, that our lack of reflection on this matter is a sad commentary on the sociology of education and on sociology generally. This is particularly so because educators often adopt or even devise educational innovations without

---

[9]Jarvie, p. 525.

[10]S. D. Clark, "Sociology in Canada: An Historical Over-view," *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 1 (1975); 231.

[11]For example See S. Repo, "From Pilgrims Progress to Sesame Street: 125 Years of Colonial Education," in *The Politics of the Canadian Public School,* ed. G. Martell (Toronto: James Lewis and Samuel, Publisher, 1974), pp. 118-133; and T. H. B. Symons, *To Know Ouselves: The Report of the Commission on Canadian Studies,* 2 vols. (Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1975), 1:195-197.

[12]Symons.

regard to the educational institution as a whole. As sociologists, we ought to be able to point out that a particular innovation has unseen ramifications for many parts of the educational institution and the society even though it may be directed at some specific educational problem.

This last statement probably applies equally to sociologists of education whether in Canada or elsewhere. Canada, however, is characterized as a pluralistic society and contrasted with the American melting-pot. The notion that Canada is pluralistic and more tolerant of ethnic minorities than is true in the U.S. dates back at least to Lipset's article in the first issue of the *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*.[13] It has also been a topic of considerable theoretical and empirical interest in sociology of late. In addition, Canada is a country that is officially bilingual and in some parts of the country, education is denominational. While one might question whether ethnocultural groups, except for Francophones in Quebec, have preserved their cultures more clearly than their American counterparts, and while we might question Canadian tolerance of minorities, official bilingualism and publicly supported denominational schools exist. This being so, it seems legitimate to ask if American educational philosophies, programs, and practices are always suited to Canadian educational needs.

Denominational and bilingual education have been continuing concerns in education in Canada. Historians and, in the case of bilingual education, linguists and psychologists have directed their attention to denominationalism and bilingualism. These two enduring educational concerns have had and have important implications for the structure, organization and process of education in Canada but sociologists have only occasionally concerned themselves with either.[14]

Related to concerns about denominational and bilingual education is the fact that jurisdiction over education is constitutionally a provincial responsibility. As a consequence, control over education is more centralized in Canada than in the United States but less centralized than in Britain or the U.S.S.R. This jurisdictional difference is an obvious distinguishing feature of Canadian education that one would expect might be reflected in work in the sociology of education in Canada. Yet in sociology, organizational studies of education are conspicuously few. For example in the *Canadian Review*, of twenty-eight articles comments or reviews dealing with the sociology of education that have appeared since 1964 two have examined teacher-student interaction[15] and one has examined academic stratification of students.[16] Not one article has examined the social organization of the school or the organization of education at a more macro level. This is not to say that there are no sociological studies of relevance to

---

[13]S. M. Lipset, "Canada and the U.S.: A Comparative View," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 1 (1964): 173-185.

[14]For an exception See J. E. Havel, "Some Effects of the Introduction of a Policy of Bilingualism in the Polyglot community of Sudbury," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 9 (1972): 57-71.

[15]A. J. C. King and R. A. Ripton, "Teachers and Students: A Preliminary Analysis of Collective Reciprocity," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 7 (1970): 35-48; and W. B. W. Martin, "Teacher-pupil Interactions: A Negotiation Perspective," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 7 (1970): 17-34.

[16]R. Breton, "Academic Stratification in Secondary Schools and the Educational Plans of Students," *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropolgy* 12 (1975): 529-540.

this area;[17] however, the organization of the school and the organization of education remain largely the province of educational administrators. It may be that the fact of provincial jurisdiction makes these concerns too sloppy for the generalist to look at, for not only is Canada different but also her provinces differ from each other.

As I have pointed out there are several areas of education that have not been studied extensively by Anglophone sociologists. Other aspects of education in Canada have received considerably more attention. The work of Porter;[18] Pederson and Farell;[19] Pike;[20] Breton;[21] Porter, Porter and Blishen;[22] Harvey;[23] Fleming;[24] Clement;[25] and a host of others whose work appears in articles, covers the broad area of education and social class. Questions of mobility; access to education; equality of opportunity; social factors affecting aspiration, expectation and achievement are covered in this literature. While one might raise questions about the theoretical models that underlie some of this work, one can say that a considerable body of work with a Canadian content is available in the area of education and social class.

I have touched on some of the important distinguishing features of Canadian education and Canadian society.

1. Canadian dependency
2. Pluralism, denominationalism and bilingualism
3. Provincial jurisdiction over education
4. Social stratification and mobility

There are other areas of relevance that might have been included here but the examples used I hope, illustrate that there is something unique about education in Canadian society, something that ought to make the content and the theory of the sociology of education distinguishable from its American counterpart. To emphasize the distinctive aspects of education in Canada or event of Canadian society does not mean that generalization is impossible, but only that generalization to the American case cannot be complete. The Canadian case may,

---

[17]For example see J. R. Seeley, R. A. Sim and E. W. Looseley, *Crestwood Heights* (New York: Basic Books, 1956); M. P. Maxwell and J. D. Maxwell, "Boarding School: Social Control, Space and Identity," in *Social Space: Canadian Perspectives,* ed. D. I. Davies and K. Herman, (Toronto: New Press, 1971); R. Breton with collaboration of J. MacDonald and S. Richer, *Social and Economic Factors in the Career Decisions of Canadian Youth* (Ottawa: Information Canada and Manpower and Immigration, 1972); and G. Martell, ed., *The Politics of the Canadian Public School* (Toronto: James, Lewis and Samuel, 1974).

[18]J. Porter, *The Vertical Mosaic: An Analysis of Social Class and Power in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965).

[19]E. Pederson and M. Farrell, *Background and Personal Factors Associated with I.Q. Change in an Inner-City School Population* (Montreal: McGill University, Faculty of Education, 1969).

[20]R. M. Pike, *Who Doesn't Get to University-and Why?* (Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1970).

[21]R. Breton et al.

[22]M. R. Porter, J. Porter and B. R. Blishen, *Does Money Matter? Prospects for Higher Education* (Toronto: York University, Institute for Behavioral Research, 1973).

[23]E. Harvey, *Educational Systems and the Labour Market* (Don Mills: Longman Canada, 1974).

[24]W. G. Fleming, *Educational Opportunity and the Pursuit of Equality* (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall of Canada, 1974).

[25]W. Clement, *The Canadian Corporate Elite: An Analysis of Economic Power* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1975).

however, provide useful insights about other societies. That is to say, that while it is unlikely that work in the sociology of education in Canada will become divorced from theoretical work done elsewhere or that it will generate new theoretical approaches; it is possible, even probable, that theoretical insights based on the Canadian experience may modify and extend existing theory making that theory more useful both in the Canadian context and in other societies.

The conclusion that there are some distinguishing features of education in Canadian society, leads one back to the earlier considerations about personnel. In order for the sociologists of education to study education in Canadian society they must have at least some knowledge of the socio-historical background of Canada as well as some knowledge of its distinguishing features. The neglect of some aspects of education by sociologists reflects the newness of the discipline in Canada, the training that sociologists have received and I suspect sometimes a lack of concern for and/or knowledge of the socio-historical background.

A final comment about Canadian content in the Sociology of Education is necessary. Even if one were to conclude after all that the universalist argument that there is nothing unique here holds, one could still argue for Canadian content. Much of the teaching of sociology of education is directed at teachers. The content ought to be Canadian, if only to make that sociology more understandable and useful to them.

II

The importance of Canadian content in the teaching of the sociology of education is particularly relevant to the second task of this essay which is to examine two books in the sociology of education published recently in Canada. My intention is to look at Pat Duffy Hutcheon's *The Sociology of Canadian Education;*[26] and Richard A. Carlton, Louise A. Colley and Neil J. MacKinnon's *Education. Change, and Society*: *A Sociology of Canadian Education*[27] in the light of my more general observations about the sociology of education in Canada.

Pat Duffy Hutcheon's *The Sociology of Canadian Education* represents a pioneering effort in that it is the first Canadian text published in the Sociology of Education. It is designed to introduce the beginning student to sociological concepts useful in the study of education. These concepts are developed and linked together in a meaningful progression from the micro to the macro levels starting with the classroom and the concepts of socialization and social organization and ending with the institution and the concepts of culture and values with a concluding section on the significance of sociology for the study of education.

Although the book is integrated at the conceptual level it suffers from the lack of a clearly articulated theoretical perspective or alternatively, a delineation of a number of possible theoretical perspectives that might be used in the sociology of education. Occasional references to Marx, Durkheim, Weber, Piaget and others are accompanied by only the briefest of theoretical elaborations, if any at all. The author frequently cites the work of Dewey usually in substantive terms and occasionally in theoretical terms but again with only limited explication of his theory.

This reluctance to delve into the realm of theory is probably related to the audience to which the book is directed though I would argue that it under-

---

[26]P. D. Hutcheon, *A Sociology of Canadian Education* (Toronto: Van Nostrand Reinhold 1975).

[27]R. A. Carlton, L. A. Colley and N. J. MacKinnon, *Education, Change and Society*: *A Sociology of Canadian Education* (Toronto: Gage Educational Publishing, 1977).

estimated the abilities of that audience. The fact that the book is designed for junior undergraduates probably accounts also for the author's reticence in introducing empirical evidence to give substance to her discussion of concepts. It should be noted that there is an extensive annotated bibliography of relevant Canadian references and another of general references at the end of each chapter. This failure to make use of relevant Canadian and other references within the body of each chapter represents an important missed opportunity.

Throughout the book crucial questions and dilemmas in education are raised but are only briefly explored. In chapter one the relationship betwen socialization and individuality versus conformity is raised but is pursued only momentarily. Similarly, chapter six asks whether equality of opportunity is an obtainable goal in a highly stratified society. Although the question is pursued with more vigor than in the case of individuality-conformity, there is much left unexplored. At the conclusion of chapter three a case study raises the question of why student protest arose in a school that had been particularly progressive in dealing with student rights and student participation? Neither this question, nor related ones about who protests and why protest has declined are among those raised for discussion. Again this area might have been better dealt with in the body of the chapter. Instances such as those exemplified above abound throughout.

Questions that bear more specifically on Canadian society are likewise passed by or missed entirely. Cultural pluralism is mentioned in chapter seven and a case study relating to bilingual education is given at the end of the chapter; however, the opportunity to explore these related and vitally important questions in Canadian education and Canadian society is left unexploited. Denominationalism in Canadian education, a related issue, is never mentioned.

Mention is made that the British North American Act gives jurisdiction over education to the provinces.[28] Though the author notes that this has led to a somewhat decentralized system of education, no other organizational implications are indicated. Neither is there any mention of why the Act is framed as it is, nor of its importance vis a vis cultural pluralism, mobility, equality of opportunity, and regional disparity.

An excellent coverage of the considerable Canadian literature on social class, mobility, access to education, equality of opportunity, and social factors affecting aspiration, expectation and achievement, is available in the bibliographies at the end of chapters one and six. Also, Hutcheon includes in her bibliographies in chapters two to five Canadian material on the social organization of the school and the classroom. Since this area is not one that has seen great activity on the part of sociologists, the material is drawn from a variety of related fields. Unfortunately, the wealth of material in these bibliographies never surfaces in the body of the relevant chapters.

Including material contained in these and other bibliographic references in the body of the text would have done much to make the book a sociology of Canadian education. At the same time, including the substantive material in the text would have made it more useful for the beginning student.

Carlton, Colley and MacKinnon's recently published *Education, Change, and Society*: *A Sociology of Canadian Education* represents a useful contribution to sociology, to the sociology of education and to education. While the subtitle of this book is the same as Hutcheon's title, the similarity between the two books is limited. *Education, Change, and Society* is a book of readings and includes articles previously published elsewhere as well as a number of articles written

---

[28]Hutcheon, p. 121.

especially for this book. Like any book of readings, the format has both strengths and weaknesses. The problem of integrating material presented on a variety of subjects and in a variety of ways by different authors is somewhat alleviated in *Education, Change, and Society* by overviews of greater depth and breadth than are often used to introduce collected articles. As with other books of readings, one strength of this book lies precisely in the fact that the material included in it represents a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches to a wide array of related subjects. The notable exclusion in this volume is the relative absence of the Marxian perspective.

Another distinguishing feature between these two sociologies of Canadian education lies in the audiences to which they are addressed. While Hutcheon's book is designed for the beginning student; Carlton, Colley and MacKinnon's book is designed for the senior student: the student of sociology who possesses a considerable theoretical and methodological sophistication. Indeed in Part 3: "The School and Social Selection," the level of empirical analysis is probably beyond the ken of all but senior sociology majors bound for graduate school.

It is in terms of their content that the *Sociology of Canadian Education* and *Education, Change, and Society* differ most. Carlton, Colley and MacKinnon have included material that examines education at every level — from the societal level to the individual level, from the preschool level to the adult level. The educators have also been sensitive to those characteristics of Canadian society and Canadian education that distinguishes it from other societies. This focus is particularly evident, as one would expect, in the first two parts of the book where the focus is on education and society — its institutions, values, and subcultures.

After a short but comprehensive overview of the sociology of education, Part I directs the reader's attention to the interface between education and society. Part I contains a number of excellent articles some of which focus on the Canadian context and others which are more general. Although the temptation is to discuss a number of these articles individually and at length the temptation must be largely resisted. Rush in the lead article extends work on economic dependency in Canada in considering its relation to the occupational structure and education while Lockhart looks at the relationship of political and economic factors to changes in education in Ontario over the last decade. Two other articles in this section look at aspects of the interaction of society and education in the Prairies and Nova Scotia. Of the two articles that do not focus specifically on education in Canada, Dandurand's on "Education and Power" is the more interesting in that it builds on the work of Bourdieu.[29] On the whole this portion of the book is a satisfying one and one that indicates the growth of the sociology of education in Canada over the last decade in areas beyond the earlier focus on stratification, mobility and education.

Part II: Cultural Pluralism and the Educational Mosaic covers a broad range of topics. In the lead article Curtis, Kuhn and Lambert compare U.S. and Canadian data in a "test of the common belief that North American education works to dampen ethnic and religious prejudice and in-group/out-group conflict within the system." This is followed by Lamontagne's article on classical education in Quebec which though it would add to students understanding of education in Quebec, may prove somewhat tortuous in its recasting of Parsons four function scheme. Three other articles, Lee and Lapoint on a community

---

[29]P. Bourdieu, "Cultural Reproduction and Social Reproduction," in *Knowledge, Education and Cultural Change,* ed. R. Brown (London: Travistock Publications, 1973), pp. 71-112.

in conflict over French language schooling, Denys on religious socialization in Separate Schools, and Grygier on education and integration among Italian immigrants, give the reader some insight into these important concerns in Canadian education. The remaining articles deal with aspects of native education, a subject that has until recently been the subject of more interest to sociologists than other topics covered in this section but that is nonetheless significant. Although the individual reader might wish that articles concerning education and other ethnic cultural groups had been included, this section provides a good sampling of the Canadian mosaic.

Earlier reference was made to the methodological complexity of many of the articles in Part III, one might note here also that none of the articles in this section make use of the Marxian or neo-Marxian view of the school as a selection agency. In other respects the articles included here are broadly representative in their conceptual orientations and their focus ranging over the area of the effects of SES, sex, I.Q., self-concept and role crystallization on achievement, aspiration and expectation.

Until recently sociological interest has focused more on material covered in the preceeding section and less on the school as a complex organization and on socialization and student-teacher interaction. These last two areas of concern are included in Parts IV and V of *Education, Change, and Society* and together with the first two parts of the book are indicative of the recent growth and development of the sociology of education in Canada. A relatively short section, Part IV includes Hall's review of work in industrial sociology to suggest directions for the study of education as well as Spady's work detailing the relations among social control, authority, teacher effectiveness and empathy that result in pressures and conflicts for teachers and administrators. The two other articles here report on research dealing with private schools and ambiguities in the teacher-counsellor role. One area not included that will, hopefully, be the subject of future sociological attention concerns the organization of education at the level of provincial departments and local boards.

Education students will find Part V of particular interest since it focuses on classroom concerns. Of the three articles on socialization, one by Loosemore and Carlton is of note to sociologists because it extends the work of Becker and Goffman to the role of the student-teacher and to teachers in training because it provides a new perspective on the student-teacher role. Stebbins article on teachers definitions of tardiness deserves note because it represents the growing interest in the interpretive perspective in Canadian sociology of education. The final article by Doyle should also be of considerable interest to the prospective teachers and teachers in its demonstration of the significance of play activities for the interaction patterns of children. Again, though this part is relatively comprehensive a useful addition might include something on peer grouping and classroom interaction.

Innovation and Renewal are the subject of the concluding part of *Education, Change, and Society*. Articles by Arikado and Fullan, Eastabrook and Biss deal with factors that facilitate the adoption of innovations in the schools while MacKinnon's article addresses problems in adult retraining. The importance of these selections lies in the fact that they consider some of the constraints to innovation. None of these articles, however, consider the possibility that certain innovations because they conflict with structural features of mass education or of society might be unworkable. Selby's article "The Myth of Local Control in Ontario Education" extends the observations of Fluxgold[30] and Martell[31]

---

[30]H. Fluxgold, "Fool's Gold: The Politics of Education in Ontario," *Canadian Forum* (January 1975): 21-26.

[31]G. Martell, "The Schools, the State and the Corporations," in *The Politics of the Canadian Public School, pp.* 3-36.

and leads to the question of whether innovation is always innovative? This article is the best in this portion of the book and might easily have fit in Part I or even Part IV of the book.

Overall *Education, Change, and Society* represents a good selection of material for the teaching of the sociology of education in Canada.

Both Hutcheon's and Carlton, Colley and MacKinnon's publications are indicative of the growing interest in the sociology of education in Canada and the latter book indicates that this interest covers a broad theoretical, methodological and substantive expanse. This development in the sociology of education is indicated too by the forthcoming publication of Wilfred Martin's book, *The Sociology of Education: The Çanadian Context.* It is unfortunate that this new addition to the literature was not yet available for review.

RESUME

Au cours des dix dernières années, les sociologues se sont demandé si une sociologie proprement canadienne serait possible et souhaitable. Partant de ces débats, le présent article analyse le statut de la sociologie de l'éducation au Canada. D'importantes caractéristiques propres à la socieété et à l'éducation canadiennes plaident en faveur d'une sociologie de l'éducation typiquement canadienne. L'examen detaillé de deux manuels scolaires récents permet de comprendre l'état actuel de cette discipline et la pertinence des caractéristiques de cette société.