Dissertations   Theses and Dissertations

1992

The Development of the Field of Sociology of Education in Europe and the United States, with Special Emphasis on the Contributions of Dr. Wilbur B. Brookover

William P. Fegan
Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation

Fegan, William P., "The Development of the Field of Sociology of Education in Europe and the United States, with Special Emphasis on the Contributions of Dr. Wilbur B. Brookover" (1992). *Dissertations*. 3197.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/3197

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIELD OF SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION IN

EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES, WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE

CONTRIBUTIONS OF DR. WILBUR B. BROOKOVER

by

William P. Fegan

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the School of

Education of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

May

1992

William P. Fegan

Loyola University of Chicago

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIELD OF SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION IN EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES, WITH SPECIAL EMPHASIS ON THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF DR. WILBUR B. BROOKOVER

My proposed aim in writing this dissertation is to trace and expand upon the history and development of the discipline known as Sociology of Education.

In order to get a complete picture of this field, we will begin with a general overview of the historical development of the Sociology of Education. In the second chapter, entitled the Social Foundations of Education, we will examine some of the social aspects that influence, and in turn are influenced by, education in our society. In the third chapter, we will be looking at the development of the field in Europe, looking at the contributions of some of the European educational sociologists, and here in the United States, likewise looking at the works and contributions of those individuals, especially Dr. Wilbur B. Brookover, who helped the field of Sociology of Education grow to where it is today. In the fourth and final chapter, we will take a look at the problems that must be dealt with in the field and the future prospects and directions that Sociology of Education might take.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to thank those members of my committee who helped me with this task. To Dr. Steven I. Miller, who suggested this topic to me, for his friendship, support and advice in this undertaking and for his most helpful editorial comments and suggestions. To Dr. Marcel Fredericks, who was my initial contact in the doctoral program, for agreeing to be on my committee and for his continued friendship and encouragement. To Dr. John Wozniak for his words of encouragement and wisdom ("Plato wrote about it.") and the friendship that we developed. To Dr. Joan Smith for agreeing to be a member of my committee and for encouraging me on.

The author would also like to thank Valerie Collier whose typing skills were utilized and greatly appreciated.

The author would like to express his gratitude to Susan Frissell for devoting numerous hours to proofreading this work.

The author would also like to express my thanks to those many friends and family who, through their support, encouragement and prodding have kept me going on this dissertation.

VITA

The author, William Patrick Fegan, is the son of John Fegan and Catherine (McCue) Fegan. He was born on March 7, 1949, in Chicago, Illinois.

His elementary education was obtained at Queen of All Saints Catholic School. His secondary education was completed in 1967 at Quigley Preparatory Seminary, Chicago, Illinois.

In September 1967, Mr. Fegan entered St. Mary of the Lake Seminary, Niles, now known as Niles College of Loyola University. He received his Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology in January, 1972.

In January, 1972, he entered St. Mary of the Lake, Mundelein, now known as University of St. Mary of the Lake, for graduate studies in Theology. In 1975, he received his Master of Divinity degree and was ordained.

In September of 1983, Mr. Fegan entered the Doctoral Program in Education at Loyola University of Chicago and in 1992, he completed his doctoral requirements.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

What is the Sociology of Education? How is this sub-field to be described? Does the word "sociology" in the title mean that the field "belongs" in the traditionally defined discipline of sociology, or, because "education" is in the title, does it belong instead to the field of education? When, where, how, and for what is the field of Sociology of Education to be used? Whether the Sociology of Education belongs in the field of sociology or in the field of education has been the topic of much discussion.

These questions have engaged theorists when looking at the field of the Sociology of Education. In the chapters that follow, the history and development of the field of Sociology of Education will be examined, with a view of trying to illustrate the central issues associated with this area of knowledge.

CHAPTER I

THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION:

AN OVERVIEW

As is the case with an overview of any field of study, in order to gain a better or clearer understanding of that field, one must look at its historical development. Such is the case with Sociology of Education which, as with many other academic areas, has had a specific historical evolution starting as Educational Sociology and developing into its present form, Sociology of Education.

When one looks at these two titles, Sociology of Education and Educational Sociology, they appear to be synonymous but, in fact, they represent different but related lines of development. In regards to Sociology of Education, the sociologically-oriented scientific approach to education is followed, while in Educational Sociology, the traditional emphasis has been an analysis of educational problems through the application of sociological principles or concepts to arrive at solutions. The focus then of this first chapter will be to trace the relationship of sociology and education. As Dr. D.F. Swift states:

The development of the discipline (and hence its value in society) follows from a mutually stimulating

2

relationship between theorizing and information
gathering. Consequently sociology and education have a
great deal to offer each other.[1]

Education has been a part of mankind since the

beginning of time. Our earliest ancestors were constantly

learning or being educated, perhaps not in any formal sense

as we know it today, but nevertheless they were learning how

to hunt, fish, and fit in with their tribe or group; in

short, how to function in their specific environment.

Another element that had to be learned if one was to survive

was how to defend oneself, for the environment was often

quite hostile with danger emanating not only from other

humans but also from nature as well as other species. This

type of education, or the learning of the basic necessities,

continued over the centuries, both informally at home and in

family settings. As the institution of education has

developed over time it has often been called the "most

preeminent social institution."[2]

As a social institution, education is a very large

part of, and is influenced by, all the other social

institutions, most importantly, the family, religion,

---

[1]Ivor Moorish, The Sociology of Education: An
Introduction (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1978), p. 31
(hereafter cited as Moorish, The Sociology of Education).

[2]Holger R. Stub, ed., The Sociology of Education: A
Sourcebook, 3rd ed (Homewood, IL: The Dorsey Press, 1975),
p. 1 (hereafter cited as Stub, The Sociology of Education).

politics, business, and leisure.[3]

With the institution of education playing such an important role in all our lives, and in all the other institutions of society, it seems quite natural that just as other institutions are, so education would likewise be studied and analyzed as an entity in which individuals act and are acted upon. The centrality of the institution of education was noted by Durkheim, often considered to be the founder of sociology of education, when he stated that education was a "social thing."[4] As Durkheim noted:

> ... it is society as a whole and each particular social milieu that determines the ideal that education realizes. Society can survive only if there exists among its members a sufficient degree of homogeneities, education perpetuates and reinforces this homogeneity by fixing in the child, from the beginning, the essential similarities that collective life demands.[5]

While interested in all the institutions that are operative in the life of a society, Durkheim expressed a special interest in the institution of education. He believed that education exerted a very real and profound influence upon the child by way of instilling within the child the proper social values of the particular society.

---

[3]For a more detailed explanation of these relationships see Ronald Corwin, A Sociology of Education (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965).

[4]Keith W. Pritchard and Thomas H. Buxton, Concepts and Theories in Sociology of Education (Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc.), pp. 12-13 (hereafter cited as Pritchard and Buxton, Concepts and Theories).

[5]Moorish, p. 31.

According to Durkheim:

> Education's special task is the methodical socialization
> of the young generation ... Education is the influence
> exercised by adult generations on those that are not yet
> ready for social life. Its object is to arouse and to
> develop in the child a certain number of physical,
> intellectual and moral states which are demanded and the
> milieu for which he is specifically destined.[6]

Thus, Durkheim believed that education could be used to accomplish two very important functions in a child's life: one, to prepare the child for integration into his or her society, and two, by so doing, limit the possibility of social disintegration of that society. It is necessary to note that when Durkheim was making these observations, he was doing so at a time when social disintegration was, in fact, taking place in France.[7] Even as he was growing up, Durkheim was faced with the disintegration of the Jewish ghettos of eastern France and their assimilation into the larger society. This occurrence Durkheim was later to analyze in terms of his famous concept of "anomie", which is a loss of social identity brought on by rapid societal changes. What could probably be considered the main cause of social disintegration in France was the industrialization that the country experienced. Previously, industry had been comprised of and dependent upon small, family owned and operated businesses. However, with industrialization, its

---

[6]Emile Durkheim, Education and Sociology (Glencoe, IL: The Free Press, 1956), p. 71.

[7]Pritchard and Buxton, p. 13.

mass production technology and other attendant consequences, the focus tended to shift from the family and the family centered business to the more individualistic, impersonal industrial factory and the old order began to crumble and disappear.[8] Regardless of the milieu and the time span in which Durkheim was working, the fact that he thought it was necessary to analyze and understand both the society in which one lives, as well as its educational system, illustrates his obvious social vision. His observations were valid then, and have continued to be over the years. As Moorish states:

> ... Durkheim ... urged that the profound transformations which contemporary societies were undergoing necessitated corresponding changes in ... education. ... never was a sociological approach more necessary for the educator.[9]

Moorish's interpretation of Durkheim's view is not only applicable to Durkheim's time, but it can be applied to any society, and particularly the United States, because of the great many technological changes that have taken place since the latter half of the 19th century. In order to be able to cope with these advances, the American educational system has also had to adapt and improve in order that those who are educated would be able to contribute to the functioning of society.

---

[8]Dominick La Capra, <u>Emile Durkheim Sociologist and Philosopher</u> (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985), pp. 27-39.

[9]Moorish, p. 31.

While Durkheim was a strong advocate of the use of the sociological method in analyzing the educational process, his principles regarding the relationship between sociology and education were not seriously considered or followed by American sociologists for many years.

Durkheim and his European contemporaries were attempting to be the first to analyze, from a sociological point of view, the various interactions inherent in the institution of education. On the other hand, American educators, although in agreement with European principles, were attempting, and at first succeeding, to apply sociological principles to educational problems in order to find solutions. Both groups were trying to accomplish the same goal, but through different means.

Although, initially, American practitioners opted to use the non-sociological approach, the basic concept of analyzing the educational institution was fully accepted. How readily the concept was accepted, and how popular the idea of applying sociological principles to education was in the United States, can be judged by the ideas' phenomenal rise in popularity.

Depending upon the perspective chosen, educational sociology first made its appearance in either 1883 in Lester Ward's "Dynamic Sociology," in which he maintained that education was a very important factor in promoting social progress, or in 1893 when Dr. W.I. Harris stated that in his

opinion, education was based upon sociology.[10],[11] While an argument can be made for both dates, with each having its proponents, it is commonly accepted that Ward's reference to educational sociology was first. Both Ward and Harris were clear in their positions and agreed that sociology and education were and, indeed should be, connected with each other. This attitude continued to grow and, in 1907, Henry Luzzallo introduced the first course to be taught on the subject, and published the first book on the relationship between sociology and education.[12],[13] That the subject matter was so widely accepted and grew so rapidly in popularity was evidenced by the fact that between the years 1910 and 1926 the number of universities offering a course in educational sociology increased to one hundred and ninety-four from only sixteen colleges and/or universities offering it in 1914. In reaction to the plethora of material being written about the field of sociology and education, E. George Payne, considered by many to be Durkheim's American counterpart, founded the Journal of

---

[10]Ronald Corwin, A Sociology of Education (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965), p. 57; Pritchard and Buxton, p. 13.

[11]E. George Payne, ed., Reading in Educational Sociology (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1932), p. 2.

[12]Pritchard and Buxton, p. 13.

[13]Payne, p. 3.

Educational Sociology.[14] This journal became the official

channel or pipeline, for dissemination of information

concerning the field of Educational Sociology.

During this time many changes were taking place in

American society, brought about mainly by the large influx

of immigrants bringing with them different cultural

patterns. Also attracting the attention of sociologists

were the changes created by the various complexities of an

industrialized society. Educators and sociologists felt

these changes would best be dealt with through education.

Sharing this common interest, both groups joined together to

study and possibly find a solution to these problems they

were facing.[15] However, it soon became evident that

educators and sociologists were unable to work together,

even though both groups were in general agreement about the

importance of education in the life of an individual. These

divergent views resulted in a wide and diverse range of

opinions about how the analysis of the institution of

education should proceed and what its outcomes should be.

Among the early sociologists, notably Lester W. Ward,

Alvin Good, C.A. Ellwood, and John A. Kinneman, there was

---

[14]Corwin, p. 56; There is some confusion about who is
the "father" of the sociology of education in the United
States. According to Pritchard and Buxton in Concepts and
Theories, p. 13, George S. Payne has been referred to as the
"father" of the sociology of education.

[15]Wilbur Brookover, Sociology of Education, 2nd ed.
(New York: American Book Co., 1964), pp. 4-5.

the belief that educational sociology was and should be, a means to social progress and the betterment of society. Other schools of thought included those sociologists who believed that educational sociology should be more concerned with fostering the aims of education, and those who perceived the purpose of the field as being merely the "application of sociological principles to the purpose of education."[16],[17] There were also those who subscribed to the idea that the purpose of educational sociology was the socialization of the child into his or her society; and still others who viewed educational sociology as a means by which teachers and others interested in education could receive some training in sociological principles. Additional theories arose later as attempts to further analyze the purposes of the educational system.

Many of those from the early years who claimed to be practitioners of educational sociology were, in fact, more likely to be educators who had little, if any, actual training in sociological methodology or theory.[18] Eventually, two schools of thought developed: the first analyzing the place or function of education in the community and society, while the second, although closely

---

[16]Ibid., p. 7.

[17]Francis Brown, <u>Educational Sociology</u>, 2nd ed. (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1947), pp. 35-36.

[18]Pritchard and Buxton, p. 13.

related to the first, dealt with looking more specifically at the social interactions in the school setting, as well as between the school and the community. The types of social interactions studied in the school setting were those that occurred between students and teachers, and the school and the community.[19] However, what becomes increasingly clear is that the analysis of education as an institution becomes increasingly dependent on sociological theories and methods.

In consideration of the rather varied and diverse schools of thought among those in the field of the sociology of education, it would seem that there was little or no consensus among the practitioners concerning the content and the direction in which the discipline should progress.[20] Because of these differences, it was not surprising that a split began to develop between the two groups--the sociologists on one side, the educators on the other. Among the many reasons why this split occurred was the fact that Educational Sociology as a discpline was relatively new within the traditional academic areas. There were some sociologists who believed that because the field of educational sociology was tied to the discipline of sociology, it must follow more closely the methods of empirical research and the theories of sociology. There

[19]Brown, pp. 109-209; Brookover, pp. 8-9.

[20]Walter R. Smith, "The Need of a Consensus in the Field of Educational Sociology," The Journal of Educational Sociology 1 (November, 1928): 385-394.

were those sociologists, in fact, who viewed educational sociology as theoretically unsound, and as having no real research methodology; in short, it was too pragmatic and practical in practice to fit into the discipline of sociology. At the same time, the educators who viewed educational sociology as a means of reforming society were also becoming disenchanted with the field. The anticipated reforms were, in reality, not happening. In addition, the immediate answers to educational problems that were supposed to be provided by educational sociology and its practitioners were conspiciously absent.

The disagreement between sociologists and educators over the future direction of the field of educational sociology continued to escalate as members from both groups moved further away from the area of educational sociology and toward their own respective disciplines.

It was obvious that continuing dissension among sociologists and educators concerning educational sociology was an important contributing factor in its attempt to organize itself as a discipline. Other factors responsible for this growing division included a lack of adequate research techniques; lack of training of individuals in research methodology who, nevertheless, attempted it; and the fact that courses included under the heading of educational sociology had, in reality, very little to do

with the field.[21]

All these factors were responsible for the gradual lessening of interest in, and the essential demise of, the field of educational sociology. With both sociologists and educators moving away from the field in favor of their own discipline, educational sociology had great difficulty organizing itself into a viable discipline. As noted earlier, interest in educational sociology had been declining for several years; however it was not until 1963 that the field of educational sociology was officially revised. In that same year, the name of the field's official journal was changed from the Journal of Educational Sociology to the Sociology of Education. As the official journal of the sociology of education, its title change was accompanied by a revision of its editorial staff, which was now made up of individuals trained in sociology and empirical research methods. Therefore, the majority of articles included in the reorganized journal were orientated more toward sociological theory and methodology. As Pritchard and Buxton note:

> It is now becoming customary to refer to the sociology of education rather than the old and now suspect terminology of educational sociology. On the whole, too, the new emphasis has come about because sociologists themselves have started to take an interest

---

[21]Ann Parker and Robert J. Parelius, The Sociology of Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1978), pp. 2-3; Pritchard and Buxton, pp. 15-17; Orville G. Brim, Sociology and the Field of Education (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958), pp. 9-10.

in education as a field of study.[22]

The renaming of the field of educational sociology and its attendant changes in scope of study and approach to the subject might, at first glance, appear to be the creation of an entirely new discipline. However, while most of the dramatic changes were initiated in 1963, many in the field had previously expressed thoughts and made statements years before concerning needed changes. Among those declaring such thoughts was R.C. Angell, who stated that in his estimation the school was not and must not be considered an isolated object of study, as once maintained by educational sociologists. He believed, instead, that the school should be considered as a source of data whose functions needed to be analyzed, in relation to other institutions in society, and the effects and influences they exerted upon one another. Operating from this viewpoint, Angell preferred to refer to the field of the sociology of education, with the emphasis on sociology. "Educational Sociology," stated Angell, "is merely a branch of the pure science of sociology."[23]

In the preceeding pages, an overview has been given of the historical development of the field of the sociology of education, beginning in its early years when the field was

---

[22]Pritchard and Buxton, pp. 18-19.

[23]Robert Cooley Angell, "Science, Sociology, and Education," <u>Journal of Educational Sociology</u> (1978): 406-413 in Brookover, <u>Sociology of Education</u>, p. 10.

referred to as educational sociology, to the time of its revision in 1963 when it became known as the sociology of education. In the chapters to follow, the development of the field of the sociology of education will be explored, both in Europe and in the United States. In addition, the unique contributions made by Dr. Wilbur Brookover to the field of the sociology of education will be examined as well as how his influence helped shape the field in the United States.

CHAPTER II

THE FIELD OF SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION

As the field of the educational sociology develops
historically, the social foundations of education emerges as
a major part of its development. Just as it can be said
that education as an institution exists and functions under
various formats, it can also be said that it does not stand
by itself. There are many additional factors at work in
societies which determine how each particular society and
the individuals in that society will function. These
operative factors affect all aspects of society and each
plays an instrumental role in the various interactions that
occur in society.

In an effort to more fully understand what these
additional forces or factors are, and how they influence the
field of education, the writer will explore the development
of the area known as the social foundations of education.

The social and/or educational foundations as an area
of study did not come about only as a reaction to one
person's theory: its beginning can be traced back to the
year 1928, and the place, Teachers College, Columbia
University. It was during that year that a group of

professors at Teachers College met in an attempt to
formulate an approach to the examination of the effects and
ramifications upon education exerted by the various forces
active in our society.[1] As teachers of education-related
disciplines, William Kilpatrick, Harold Rugg, John L.
Childs, R. Bruce Rays, George Counts, Jesse H. Newlon,
Goodwin Watson, Kenneth D. Benne, and R. Freeman Butts,
among others, were trained in such subjects as philosophy,
political science, social psychology, and religion.[2]

Beginning in 1928, this group of scholars continued
their biweekly meetings, "almost uninterruptedly," until
1941.[3] The discussions that ensued were remarkable in
their variety of topics. As one member of the group stated,
"... the sky was the limit, the uttermost reaches of man's
... cultures were too, and every new angle in the scholars
reseaches and interpretations in the sciences and arts."[4]

---

[1]William H. Kilpatrick, "Social Factors Influencing
Educational Method in 1930," The Journal of Educational
Sociology 8 (April 1901): 482-490 (hereafter cited as
Kilpatrick, "Social Factors").

[2]Steve Tozier and Stuart McAninch, "Social Foundations
of Education in Historical Perspective," Educational
Foundations: A Journal 1 (Fall 1986): 9 (hereafter cited as
Tozier and McAninch, "Social Foundations").

[3]Harold Rugg and William Withers, Social Foundations of
Education (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955), p. 515 in
"Social Foundations," Tozier and McAninch, p. 9.

[4]Harold Rugg, ed., Readings in the Foundations of
Education (New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia
University, 1941), p. 225 (hereafter cited as Rugg,
Readings).

As might be expected in such an interdisciplinary group, individual discussion would naturally center around that which was relative to each scholar's own particular field of expertise. Most discussion, however, focused on how each discipline was related to the field of education. There were some who believed that the Kilpatrick group met more for socializing and conversation than for scholarly pursuits. Even though the Kilpatrick group did meet informally, its purpose was primarily to explore the ways in which their disciplines could and did relate to the field of education.[5]

Unlike many groups where each member discusses his or her viewpoint without much being accomplished, the Kilpatrick discussion group did come to a consensus and reach decisions concerning the various topics explored. In the course of their discussions and dialogues, these men agreed that the societal and cultural issues of their time must be understood by teachers if they were to educate the public. Thus, it was believed that for educators, in general, rather than taking several different courses, e.g., educational psychology, in different academic areas, the courses should come under one heading. This would provide educators with a broader base of knowledge to call their own, and from which they could work and develop. Coupled

---

[5]Charles J. Brauner, <u>American Educational Theory</u> (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), pp. 202-220.

with this theory was the belief that the various separate

courses from all the disciplines would eventually comprise

what would come to be known as the "foundations" for the

field of education; namely, the psychological, sociological,

economic, historical and philosophical perspectives on

education, brought together in one area of study. One

particular course within the field of foundations, Education

200F, would become the basic or core course offered in the

foundations of education area.[6]

Unlike most college courses completed in one semester,

Education 200F was designed to cover two semesters, or a

full year of work. Those enrolled in this course of study

received eight credit hours toward the fulfillment of the

educational foundations requirement for a degree from

Teachers College.[7] Designed to be an integrative course,

Education 200F combined the approaches of many different

disciplines. It was the intention of the faculty members at

Teachers College that Education 200F would provide a

collection of diverse ideas from separate, yet related

areas, thus providing students with a much broader

background in all the educational foundations. However,

---

[6]Kenneth D. Benne in Tozier and McAninch, "Social Foundations," p. 9.

[7]Lawrence A. Cremin, David A. Shannon, and Mary Ellen Torousens, A History of Teachers College, Columbia University (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954), p. 139 (hereafter cited as Cremin, et al., A History of Teachers College).

this same faculty did admit to and later realized that
although there were advantages to the integrative approach
to learning, there were also inherent disadvantages as well.
The foremost advantage of offering Education 200F was that
individuals who were enrolled in the course would be exposed
to all the foundations areas, which would better prepare
them to deal with contemporary educational issues, as well
as understand a changing society. On the other hand, there
were those who believed very strongly that multi-exposure to
all foundations areas might be a disadvantage. Presented
with a wide range of ideas, argued those against this
approach, would prevent the student from achieving
competency in one specific area. This controversy continued
for some time, causing considerable discussion. However,
Education 200F was implemented and eventually accepted. Its
increasing popularity ultimately led to the decline of
specialization in any one field of study.[8] Therefore, the
advent of Education 200F was proclaimed by some as one of
the primary educational contributions resulting from the
Kilpatrick Discussion Group, and a demonstration of how a
variety of scholarly approaches could be integrated in a
meaningful fashion.[9]

Much of what the Kilpatrick Discussion Group explored

---

[8]Rugg, p. V.

[9]Rugg and Withers, in Tozier and McAninch, "Social
Foundations,: p. 515.

and the resulting course, Education 200F, was greatly
tempered and influenced by what was at that time the all-
consuming issue facing society: The Great Depression. This
was a time during which the great economic collapse
engendered not only a serious decline in the standard of
living but also feelings of fear, helplessness and anxiety
among the growing population of the United States.[10] It
was during this time of crisis that men such as George S.
Counts and Harold Rugg, among others of the Kilpatrick
Group, began their work. In view of what was happening
around them, they determined that the institution of
education must redirect and refocus its mission. Before,
and during the 1930s, the institution of education (at the
primary and secondary levels) was influenced by the
philosophy of progressivism, with its emphasis on the
individual being educated. The reformers who advocated this
redirection proposed that education assume a broader
societal, social reform oriented direction.[11] While the
reformers advocated redirection and reform, they did not

---

[10]Robert Goldston, The Great Depression: The United
States in the Thirties (Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill
Company, Inc., 1968), pp. 29-67. For a more detailed look
at the economic and psychological impact of the Great
Depression, the reader is directed to Robert Goldston's
book, The Great Depression: The United States in the
Thirties (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1968).

[11]Richard Van Scotter, John D. Haas, Richard J. Kraft,
and James C. Schott, Social Foundations of Education 2nd ed.
(Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1985),
pp. 60-61 (hereafter cited as Van Scotter, et al., Social
Foundations).

totally break away from their original progressive
principles. However, these principles were not only still
adhered to, but they were also more developed in response to
the reform emphasis of the time. This group became known as
the "reconstructionists" and their philosophy known as
"social reconstructionism." Among those who espoused this
concept were George S. Counts, the movement's leading
advocate; Harold Rugg, and other members of the Kilpatrick
Discussion Group; and, Theodore Brameld, a reconstructionist
advocate.[12] Professing much the same philosophy as did
Counts, Rugg and others, Brameld held that reconstructionism
as a concept would have its greatest appeal during times of
social unrest, such as the Great Depression. As Van
Scotter, et al. note, reconstructionism was more readily
accepted in times of social crisis, as a vehicle of response
to societal turmoil.[13]

When considering the basic principle behind social
reconstructionism--basic reform of the existing society--it
becomes necessary to look at how this principle was
implemented to bring about such changes. Kilpatrick's group
believed that the only way societal reform or change could
occur was if educators actively supported and advocated the
idea of change. If teachers themselves believed in the idea
of reform, they would then pass these same ideas onto their

---

[12]Kilpatrick, pp. 483-490.

[13]Van Scotter, et al., p. 62.

students, hopefully influencing future generations.
Awareness and support of the new ideals by the teachers
would make it easier for them to convince their students,
therefore enabling a changed society to take root and
grow.[14] In his writing, Kilpatrick states that how
societal factors of the 1930s affected or influenced the
educational system was, in fact, the central issue to be
dealt with. Many educators felt that during the thirties,
education as an institution would have to learn to adapt to
the changing societal makeup if it was to properly prepare
students to live in a changing society.[15]

Considering their various philosophies about how one
must learn to adapt to a changing society, Kilpatrick,
Counts and others might well be thought of as radicals.
However, although they advocated reconstructionism as a
philosophy of education, they could hardly be thought of as
radicals. While it is true that the reconstructionist
called for a change in educational practices, that call was
merely in response to, or as a result of, the drastic and
often violent changes which occurred in society during the
1930s. What social reconstructionism and its advocates
called for was a re-examination, re-evaluation and
improvement of the existing social order, in the hopes of
finding an answer to the current social problems and to more

---

[14]Cremin, et al., p. 251.

[15]Kilpatrick, pp. 483-488.

quickly restore a state of normalcy. The best way to achieve this end, they believed, was through education with teachers acting as a conduit between the system and the students. In order to produce this effect, however, it would first be necessary to expose the teachers to a variety of educational theories and methods, rather than specialization, which was then the existing practice of the colleges and universities. As Counts notes,

> ... in this way schools of education would train the workers, study the methods and processes, and contribute to the development of the programs and philosophies of all major educational agencies.[16]

The Social Foundations of Education as a field of study would later accomplish what Counts stated; in effect, it would become the center or focal point around which a new educational system would evolve. Not only would the teachers become educated but, more importantly, as they became more familiar and comfortable with the changes occurring around them, they would, in turn, through their teaching transmit new ideas about change and reform to their students. The students would then be receiving, learning, and, hopefully, incorporating into their lives a basic foundation, as well as some new ideas about society.

The reconstructionist philosophy was then a reiteration of the importance of education in shaping the values of any existing society. It is through the

---

[16]George S. Counts, "What is a School of Education?" The Record 30 (April 1929): 649.

institution of education and its practitioners, that the
mores and attitudes unique to a particular culture are
perpetuated. Understood in relation to society, mores and
attitudes can be analyzed and consideration given to their
impact upon the student and the educational process as a
whole. For example, social class could be examined in
relation to its effect upon an individual or group of
individuals in a school setting, or if a change occurred in
society that precipitated the re-evaluation of some of the
educational practices or policies, it would then be said
that the social foundations of that society were also being
examined.[17],[18] Thus, if those problems or factors that
influence education, such as juvenile delinquency, family
instability, rapid social change and/or racial strife, are
being studied, their relationship to the institution of
education would consequently also be examined.[19] By
simultaneously examining the social foundations factors

---

[17]W. Lloyd Warner, Robert J. Havighurst, and Martin B.
Loeb, Who Shall Be Educated? (New York: Harper & Brothers,
1944), pp. 1-15.

[18]William O. Stanley, Education and Social Integration
(New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College,
Columbia University, 1953), pp. 1-13.

[19]Richard L. Derr, "Social Foundations as a Field of
Study in Education," Educational Theory 15 (April 1965):
152-160 in John H. Chilicott, Norman C. Greenberg, and
Herbert B. Wilson, eds., Readings in the Socio-Cultural
Foundations of Education (Belmont, California: Wadsworth
Publishing Company, Inc., 1968), p. 21 (hereafter cited as
Chilicott, et al., Readings in the Socio-Cultural
Foundations.

operative in the educational institution and their interactions with societal sphere, it was hoped that the Social Foundations of Education as a field of study would result in a deeper and fuller understanding of the complex relations between the two.[20]

In this chapter, the area of education known as Social Foundations has been examined along with its place and function in society, in general. In Chapter III, European and the American societies will be explored in relation to how the sociology of education, with its various nuances, came into being and developed in those countries.

---

[20]Harold Rugg, ed., Readings, p. XI; Dorothy Westby-Gibson, ed., Social Foundations of Education: Current Issues and Research (New York: The Free Press, 1967), p. vii.

CHAPTER III

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE FIELD OF SOCIOLOGY OF

EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES AND EUROPE

In chapters one and two, the reader was introduced to
the field of sociology of education. In the first chapter,
the development of the field of sociology of education was
traced from the beginning, when it was known as educational
sociology, up to and including that time when the viewpoint
of the sociologist became the dominant influence and the
field came to be known as sociology of education. Chapter
two dealt with that area of sociology of education known as
Social Foundations, and examined how various aspects of
society and education impact upon one another, as well as
the foundation upon which education is based and society is
built.

Chapter III will examine in detail how sociology of
education and its adjunct, Social Foundations of Education,
evolved in both Europe and the United States.

Early European Civilization and Education

It was in the fifty century A.D., when both the Roman
empire totally collapsed and the Greek influence on learning
had diminished almost to the point of being non-existant,

that education in the area known as Europe began to develop an identity of its own.[1] As the Greco-Roman empire floundered, their achievements also suffered to such an extent that by the year 600 A.D., literacy and learning in Europe had reached their lowest levels in history. This educational, as well as intellectual and cultural deprivation, continued for quite some time, not changing until Charlemagne ascended to the Frankish throne in the year 716 A.D. One of Charlemagne's goals was to bring about a re-emergence or rejuvenation of the Frankish people coupled with a rejuvenation of the educational process, which would provide Europe with its own unique and particular educational program.[2] This educational program, however, was not readily available to the great masses of people but was instead restricted to the clergy and nobility.[3] The educational revitalization initiated by Charlemagne unfortunately did not survive him. What is now known is that after his death in 840 A.D., interest in

---

[1]George A. Rothrock and Tom B. Jones, Europe: A Brief History, revised and expanded 2nd edition, Vol. 1 (Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1975); James Bowen, A History of Western Education, Vol. 2 (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1975).

[2]Bowen, pp. 1-2.

[3]William W. Brickman (Ed.), Educational Roots and Routes in Western Europe (Cherry Hills, NJ: Emeritus, Inc., Publisher, 1985), pp. 123-152; Mary Jo Maynes, Schooling in Western Europe (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1985), pp. 7-31.

education and intellectual activity once again declined.[4]
During this time, the nobility expressed no interest in or
desire for academic learning, but, rather, were more
concerned with achieving proficiency in such non-academic
pursuits as riding, hunting, and swordsmanship. The
academic or intellectual pursuits and tasks were assigned to
the clergy, who themselves were becoming largely unschooled.
It was not until the year 910 A.D., when the Cluniac Reform
was started, that education enjoyed a limited rebirth;
limited in that it had to follow the techniques and rules of
monasticism. Under the heading of the Cluniac reform, using
the name of the monastery at Cluny, this monasticism called
for a return to a strong sense of religious discipline which
excluded the great majority of people.[5] Those that
benefitted were limited to only those clergy who lived by
the monastic rule. Whatever the reasoning may have been
most, if not all, of the monastery schools had no interest
or desire in providing an education or learning atmosphere
for anyone outside their confines. Because of this
discriminatory attitude, the monastic school lost its
popularity and was no longer depended upon to provide public
education. The gap that resulted was left to be filled by

---

[4]Bowen, pp. 27-29.

[5]James Mulhern, A History of Education: A Social
Interpretation, 2nd edition (New York: The Ronald Press
Company, 1959), p. 229; Bowen, pp. 27-29.

the successor of the monastic school, the cathedral school.[6]

The appearance of the cathedral or parish school was not new. As early as the year 509 A.D., and again in 511 A.D., churches had been instructed to maintain a school to advance the education of the people of the parish, particularly those young men who expressed an interest in becoming priests. Because there were few isolated instances where this directive was followed, there remains no knowledge or record of any general widespread acceptance of the instruction that all parishes were to establish and maintain their own schools.[7] However, what is known is that during this same period of time, there were a number of monasteries that assumed the task of educating the people.[8] As maintained above, however, these monastic schools tended to be rather elitist. Oftentimes, when a bishop or parish priest wanted to have a school in his parish, he was unable to do so, simply because the parish did not have the facilities or the necessary funds needed to implement the directive. Nevertheless, the directives were quite clear that each parish was to establish and maintain a school. There were some parishes, although very few, that somehow did manage in spite of the hardships, to establish

[6]Mulhern, pp. 258-261.

[7]Bowen, p. 31.

[8]Mulhern, pp. 227-228.

functioning parish schools.[9] Overshadowed at first by the monastic schools, and hampered by the unwillingness or inability of the local bishop or parish to maintain a school, the cathedral schools, nevertheless, continued to grow in popularity to such an extent that by the end of the tenth century they began to appear in increasingly large numbers. However, even as these schools grew in numbers, their availability to the general populace became more and more restricted to include only clerics or cleric-oriented individuals, creating the same problem that led to the eventual demise of the monastic schools.

Not only was the education offered in the parish schools geared mainly toward those who were interested in the priesthood, which in itself had a rather limiting effect, but it was also limited by the fact that most of the parishes of the time simply could not maintain a school due to financial and structural inadequacies. Unless the parish was located along one of the main trade routes, and most were not, its financial and structural resources were rather meager. However, quite often some of the bishop's churches (the cathedral) upon which the responsibility of maintaining a school ultimately rested, were located on trade routes enabling them to prosper and, therefore, provide the education that people sought.[10] Even though the cathedral

---

[9]Bowen, pp. 30-31.

[10]Bowen, p. 32; Mulhern, p. 232.

school was supposed to be for all people, the education one was offered in these schools was principally religious in its direction and conservative in its way of thinking. Schools remained this way until approximately the middle of the eleventh century, around the year 1050 A.D., when a new interest in learning began to emerge.[11] This revived interest in education was brought about in conjunction with the renewed interest in the cities of Europe. The population at this time had not lost interest in the city or city dwelling; rather, for many of the people who tried to make a living, scant as it may have been, the city or town was the focal point of their lives. Over the years, during the ninth and particularly tenth centuries, these "burgs" or "municipia" became the base from which the traders of the day operated.[12] As more and more of these traders and merchants appeared in the cities, trade routes of commerce began to appear. As these trade routes grew, the cities also prospered. Best known, yet not the only city to benefit from the increased commerce, was the city state of Venice, originally a defensive settlement for those fleeing the marauding barbarians and the Lombards. Some of the other cities that followed Venice's example included Genoa,

---

[11]Bowen, p. 32.

[12]Bowen, p. 33.

Pisa, Orleans, Reims, and Paris.[13] As these cities and
others grew as a result of the increasing volume of
commerce, so too did the quest and need for education. As
the volume of commerce increased, the number of individuals
involved in the buying and selling of goods also increased.
The traders, and those with whom they were dealing, realized
they needed to be able to read the bill of sale, interpret
prices, and learn basic addition and subtraction. In short,
they needed to be educated. It was at this time that the
cathedral schools rose to prominence in response to this
need for learning. However, this need required more than
the traditional mode of education could provide. Something
new was needed and the cathedral schools were able to answer
that need. While the style of traditional education had
been conservative with what was said and taught simply
accepted, there was now critical questioning of why and how
things were to be accomplished. A renewed interest in
learning became apparent and the cathedral schools were the
focal point of this renewal.[14] It was not, however, merely
the existence of the schools that brought about the change.
As is true in every case, a school building by and of itself
does not constitute an educational process. Rather, it is
made up of individuals who convey the thoughts and ideas to

[13]See Rothrock and Jones, Europe: A Brief History, Vol.
1, for more detailed explanation of the development and
growth of the early European cities.

[14]Bowen, p. 32.

be taught, as well as those individuals who are the recipients of those ideas. Some of the individuals who contributed largely to the renewed interest in education were Anselm of Aosta (1033-1109), a monastic, yet still widely known; Peter Abelard (c.1079-1142); Roscellinus of Compiegne (c.1050-1125); Gilbert de la Porree (1076-1154); and Bernard of Chartres (b.c.1114-1130).[15] Each of these individuals, as well as their contemporaries not mentioned, contributed in their own unique way to the ongoing interest and renewal in education. Because of their efforts, even though the field of sociology of education was yet to be developed in Europe, these individuals must be considered the forefathers of European Sociology of Education. While some may disagree about whether these individuals are the forefathers, if one were to examine the circumstances in which these individuals worked, one would see that there is merit to the claim. During this time, society was changing dramatically and being called upon to help meet and understand the changes taking place. As cities were growing there was a renewed interest in education, which these individuals and their contemporaries helped to foster. It is this interaction between society and education that is part of the foundation of sociology of education. While

---

[15]Refer to Rothrock and Jones, Europe: A Brief History, Vol. 1 and Bowen, pp. 40-155, for a more detailed explanation and listing of the early prominent individuals in European Education.

there was no way to consolidate the various ideas and/or
thoughts and communicate them, these men and their
contemporaries did contribute to the growth of, and
interaction between, education and the society of the time.

In time, tremendous changes began to take place in
Europe, politically, economically, and in matters of
religion.[16] However, the quest for knowledge continued to
remain strong, although it may not have been of the same
intensity due to societal changes over the years.
Irrespective of how much change or upheaval was occurring at
any particular time, there were always some individuals who
would support educational ideas. Among these individuals
were John of Salisbury (1110-1180), who was part of a new
phase in European education; Adelard of Bath (1110-1140);
and Dominic Gundissalinus (no dates fl. twelfth century)
already an advocate of education. These were not the only
individuals actively involved in education. There were also
groups, notably the Franciscans and the Dominicans, who,
after a slow start, exhibited great influence upon education
between the years 1250 and 1280 A.D. The quest for
education and learning continued through men who contributed
significantly, including Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274), Duns
Scotus (1265-1308), William of Occam (1300-1349). Later,
between the years 1546, when members of the public were
allowed into their classes, and 1586, at which time they had

---

[16]Rothrock and Jones, Vol. 1.

162 colleges with a sizeable number open to the public, the Order of the Society of Jesus made notable contributions in the development of formal education.[17] If one were to compile a list of all the individuals and groups involved in education in early Europe, it would be enormous. For our purpose, it is sufficient to say that all those involved were deeply concerned about providing education for the people.

The ideas and concerns expressed during this time were unfortunately not well organized, as would occur in later years. From the above, it would appear that these men and their ideas about education, could possibly be considered the intellectual forerunners of the Educational Sociologist/ Sociologist of Education of today.

The University

As time progressed, European society expanded, both in number of people and in social complexity. Up until this time, the cathedral school had been able to provide the education that was needed. However, new demands arose in the eleventh and twelfth centuries that called for a higher degree of education which would prepare individuals to handle the "increasingly sophisticated administrations of both church and state."[18]

The cathedral school had provided a general type of

[17]Bowen, pp. 79-88, 149, 157, 420.

[18]Bowen, p. 105.

secular education that now was not enough to handle the new demands. Also there was no uniformity among the cathedral schools' curriculum, since each school, being part of a different cathedral, had a different educational sequence - the teachers were not of the same competency, studies followed no particular set pattern and the students had no way of showing that they were learning anything.[19] This is not to say that all education up to this point was deficient for that was hardly the case. Individual schools, such as the ones where Peter Abelard at Paris and Fulbert at Charles taught, enabled individuals to develop the skills of "reading aloud, singing, writing and all the other studies necessary for the servants of God who seek true knowledge."[20] This was more than adequate until the latter part of the twelfth century when the need arose for a more advanced curriculum. What was needed now was a curriculum that would help train doctors, lawyers, schoolmasters, clerics and others who would play increasingly important roles of the developing cities of Europe.

In light of the new demands, students started studying along different curricular tracks and organizing themselves into groups modeled after the craft guilds. The Latin term for these guilds was "universitates" (singular

---

[19]Bowen, p. 108.

[20]Bowen, p. 106.

"universitas")[21] with the intent being able to provide a certain degree of uniformity and to provide a set of standards for the masters (teachers) and students alike.

By the end of the twelfth century, there were institutions of education being founded to meet the new demands. Institutes of higher education were founded at Bologna, which became the legal center of Western Europe, and at Paris, which was the center of philosophical and theological studies. Other institutes for higher education were established in cities such as Padua (1222), Naples (1224), Oxford (c. 1180), Cambridge (1209), Vienna (1365), Heidelburg (1385), to name just a few. Universities were also established in Spain in 1220 and in Scotland, Poland, Hungary, Sweden and Denmark by the fifteenth century. These institutions provided the people of the day with the higher education that was needed to function in society. However, by the beginning of the sixteenth century, the inadequacy of these institutions and their curricula became a cause for concern. By the end of the fifteenth century many individuals, such as Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536), Martin Luther (1483-1546), Philip Melchthon (1497-1560), Thomas Moore (1478-1535), Juan Luis Vives (1492-1540), and Joannes Sturm (1507-1589) among others, not only questioned the inadequacy but made various suggestions at resolving the

---

[21]Mulhern, p. 279.

problem.[22] But none of the suggestions totally answered
the problem and the issue of the inadequacy of the
traditional universities and their curricula persisted
through the years with no lasting resolution or explanation
being found until the beginning of this century.

Early Modern Contributors in Europe

If questioned when and how Sociology of Education
began in Europe and was formally recognized as such, it
would be necessary to go forward to the beginning of the
20th century to France, and look at the work of Emile
Durkheim, whom many consider to be the founder of Sociology
of Education.[23] A philosopher by training, Emile Durkheim
(1858-1917) was known for his interest in education, as well
as sociology.[24] He did, in fact, show great interest in
education's place and function in society, including his
earliest teaching days when he conducted a study of the
German school system while visiting that country during the
years 1885 and 1886.[25]

---

[22]Bowen, pp. 330-398.

[23]Keith W. Pritchard and Thomas H. Buxton, Concepts and
Theories in Sociology of Education (Lincoln, Nebraska:
Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1973), p. 13.

[24]La Capra, Dominick, Emil Durkheim: Sociologist and
Philosopher (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago
Press, 1972), p. 35.

[25]Emile Durkheim, The Evolution of Educational Thought,
trans. Peter Collins (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul,
1927); Emile Durkheim, Moral Education, trans. Everett K.
Wilson and Herman Schnurer (Glencoe, IL: The Free Press,
1961).

At the turn of this century, Durkheim was making some of his memorable and more important contributions to the areas of sociology and education. In dealing with the close connection between the two areas, he stated that "in every time and place education is closely related to other institutions and to current values and beliefs."[26] Another area in which Durkheim was very interested was the relationship which existed between schools and society. In analyzing this relationship Durkheim found that it was in the classrooms of the educational institution that the societal values, beliefs and mores were perpetuated.[27] There were other areas, the functions of education, cross-cultural research, and the social system of the school and classroom, that Durkheim felt were important enough to analyze.[28]

While Durkheim was analyzing the educational institution, an interesting phenomenon was occurring in Europe. The nations of Europe, whose lifestyles had changed in the previous century from a rural, agarian one to a factory dominated, city dwelling one, were now becoming economically interdependent as a result of the increased

---

[26]Jeanne Ballantine, The Sociology of Education: A Systematic Analysis (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1983), p. 9.

[27]Ballantine, p. 9.

[28]Wilbur Brookover, Sociology of Educatgion, 2nd edition (New York: American Book Company, 1964), p. 4.

production of goods and the improved methods of

transportation. Along with this, in many European states,

there was a trend toward the establishment of the modern

democratic state with universal sufferage and majority rule.

In all the changes brought about by the Industrial

Revolution (c. 1750-1850) and the Second Industrial

Revolution (c. after 1870),[29] what has been referred to as

the phenomenon of social disintegration was beginning to

take place.[30] As a sociologist, it was natural for

Durkheim to be concerned with the topic of cultural change,

and to apply a sociological perspective to the analysis of

these events, the results of which showed how the

disintegration could best be managed to prevent its spread

or repeated occurrence.[31]

Being a sociologist, Durkheim realized that if a

society was to continue to exist there had to be a way in

---

[29]James Westfall Thompson, Franklin Charles Palin and John J. Van Nostrand, <u>European Civilization: A Political, Social and Cultural History</u> (New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc, 3rd Printing 1946), pp. 820-870, 990-993; Mulhern, pp. 425-430.

[30]Pritchard and Buxton, p. 13.

[31]Simpson, George (translator), <u>The Division of Labor in Society</u> with an introduction by George Simpson (New York: MacMillan Co., 1933); Spaulding, John A. and Simpson, George, <u>Suicide: A Study in Sociology</u> (Glencoe, Ill: Free Press of Glencoe, 1951); for a more detailed explanation of the works by Durkheim, the reader is directed to Coser, Louis A. and Rosenberg, Bernard, <u>Sociological Theory: A Book of Readings</u> (New York: MacMillan Co., 1957), pp. 105-110; 171-180; 480-490; Giddens, Anthony, <u>Emile Durkheim</u> (New York: The Viking Press, 1979), pp. 26-53.

which the values of that society could be passed on to future generations. Parents could teach their children values, but something more was needed; some vehicle whereby all the values that contributed to the functioning of a society could be taught to each new generation. That vehicle, Durkheim concluded, was the institution of education.[32]

Durkheim's analysis of the educational system, as related to other aspects of society, viewed education as being an integral part of society as a whole. Thus, education is...

> ...a collection of practices and institutions that have been organized... integrated with all the other institutions, and express them...[33]

Following from this, Durkheim stated that each society's structure was reflected and maintained by the educational institution through the transmission of cultural values and social ideals, thus becoming an agent of social change.

> It is only the image and reflection of society. It imitates and reproduces it..., it does not create it.[34]

In conjunction with his view of society, Durkheim held

---

[32]Durkheim, <u>The Evolution of Educational Thought</u>; Durkheim, <u>Moral Education</u>.

[33]Steven Lukes, <u>Emil Durkheim: His Life and Work</u> (New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1972), p. 129.

[34]Dominick La Capra, <u>Emile Durkheim: Sociologist and Philosopher</u> (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985), p. 214; Lukes, p. 129.

that there is an ideal of what man should be. This "ideal", however, is largely determined by the specific milieu to which each individual belongs. How this ideal is realized is the focus of education which has as its function to develop in the child:

> 1) a certain number of physical and mental states that the society to which he belongs considers should be possessed by all its members; (2) certain physical and mental states that the particular social group (caste class, family, profession) similarly considers ought to be possessed by all those who compose it.[35]

Education thus becomes the formal and institutionalized means by which the individual becomes indoctrinated into the particular social milieu of which he or she is a member.

Max Weber (1864-1920)

While being a sociologist and contemporary of Durkheim, Weber's theories differed from his. Durkheim was interested in the institution of education and used his expertise to study and analyze it; while Weber never dealt directly with the institution of education, nor with the field of Sociology of Education.[36] He did, however, as a sociologist, study and write about other aspects of society, such as politics and science, bureaucracy, and status group

---

[35]Anthony Giddens (Ed.), Emile Durkheim: Selected Writings (London: Cambridge University Press, 1972), p. 203.

[36]Brian J. Ashley, Harry Cohen, and Roy G. Slatter, An Introduction to the Sociology of Education (London and Basingstoke: MacMillan and Co, Ltd, 1971), p. 77.

relationships.[37],[38] Weber's analyses of these aspects of society were used extensively to explain various aspects of the educational milieu, both around the turn of the 19th century as well as today.

While Weber himself never directly dealt with the institution of education, his analyses and theories concerning various aspects of society were found to be very useful in analyzing portions of the educational system. For instance, when Weber did his analysis of bureaucracy, he pointed out that the best leaders at the different levels of the bureaucratic organization are chosen by examination. Applying this principle of rational expert leadership to the educational institution, we can see that the more competent and professional individuals are those whose qualifications to be leaders are measured by examination.[39]

Weber is also known for his work on status group relationships. Weber noted that in society there are certain people who are drawn together for any number of reasons, be it where they live, their economic situation, political outlook, to name a few. This principle of status group can be applied to the school where there will be

---

[37]Ashley, Cohen, and Slatter, p. 77.

[38]Ballantine, p. 10.

[39]Jeanne H. Ballantine, The Sociology of Education: A Systematic Analysis (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1983), p. 10; Paul Hongsheim, On Max Weber (London: Collier-MacMillan Limited, 1968), p. 117.

groups which will allow some individuals to join, the

"insiders", and there will be some not allowed to join, the

"outsiders." Those within the group will feel supported and

received while those on the outside will feel looked down

upon and rejected. Weber's theory dealing with the conflict

that arises because of the differences in status is

especially relevant if it is applied to how certain

students, particularly minority students, are dealt with in

our schools.[40]

In one instance where Weber actually dealt with

education, he stated that it is the function of the school

to teach individuals the skills necessary to fit into

society. As society changes, the requisite skills will

change also, as will the function of the school.

Individuals are continually trying to move upward in the

economic system. For this reason, new skills are needed and

the educational system is looked to to provide the training

necessary to acquire those skills.[41]

While Weber was formulating his sociological

principles, some of which would be used to study certain

aspects of education, there were others who were also

---

[40]Dirk Hasler, <u>Max Weber: An Introduction to His Life
and Work</u> (Oxford: Polity Press in association with Basil
Blackwell Ltd., 1988), pp. 49, 113; Ballantine, <u>The
Sociology of Education</u>, p. 10.

[41]H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Eds. and trans.), <u>Max
Weber: Essays in Sociology</u> (New York: Oxford University
Press, 1958), pp. 122-133.

creating theories to analyze the educational system. Across the channel in Great Britain, Herbert Spencer, an earlier contemporary of Durkheim and Weber, was studying and analyzing the various relationships between society, the individual, and education.

Herbert Spencer

Herbert Spencer (1820-1903) preceded both Durkheim and Weber, as did August Comte (1798-1857). Spencer and Comte were considered to be the founders of the field of sociology. Comte was afforded this honor because he invented the name sociology for the science which studied society through observation and exploration of the social organization as a whole.[42] Spencer, knowingly or unknowingly, limited himself to theorizing about, rather than analyzing and studying society and education. In his theoretical approach to the study of society, he arrived at several conclusions; two of which were tied very closely to his view of education. In the first of these theoretical approaches, the natural progressive evolution of society, Spencer stated that in both society and education there was a natural progression, or evolution in how things would occur, and that there should be no interference with that progression. Spencer believed the individual would learn

---

[42]Marcel Fredericks, Paul Mundy and John Lennon, <u>First Steps in Sociology: Society Culture, Personality (SCP) A Synopsis of Selected Sociological Concepts and Theories</u> (Chicago: Loyola University, 1982), pp. 23-25.

from his or her own individual experiences, and because of this, the functions of the educational system in an individual's development must be kept to a minimum. It was this notion that the individual could develop alone, this individualism, that permeated all of Spencer's sociological theories.[43]

Spencer's second major theory followed along the lines of an organicist; one who believes that an organism grows and develops through the interaction and the inter-relatedness that occurs between the numerous parts that constitute the whole. Using this train of thought, Spencer theorized that society was very similar to an organism, in that society also grows and develops by relying heavily upon the inter-relatedness and interaction between the individuals (the parts) who make up the society (the whole). Although following the organicist theory rather closely, Spencer did make a few changes. The first of these changes involved Spencer's belief that while in an organism the parts exist for the benefit of the whole and "consciousness" is located in a specific area, in society the whole (society) exists for the benefit of the individual (the parts), and the "consciousness" is spread throughout the system. Just as an organism grows, changes, and develops, so does society and the educational system, which is most

---

[43]Andreas M. Kazamias, ed., <u>Herbert Spencer on Education</u> (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University; Teachers College Press, 1966), p. 37.

often a mirror reflecting the pattern of society.[44]
Spencer postulated that the educational system that is
operative at any one particular time, in any society, is
very dependent upon the whims or nature of mankind, which is
continually in a state of flux due to evolution.[45]
Spencer, as a theorist, was very strongly committed to the
idea that an individual needed no outside help or
interference (as Spencer referred to it), to develop and
learn. Durkheim, however, took issue with the evolutionist
theory of Spencer. Durkheim felt that Spencer was reducing
mankind's growth to being merely based on instinct.
Durkheim stated:

> The determining cause of a social fact should be sought
> among the social facts preceeding it and not among the
> states of the individual consciousness.... The function
> of a social fact ought always to be sought in relation
> to some social end.[46]

Spencer, Durkheim, and to a lesser degree, Max Weber,
contributed greatly to the early growth, development, and
formal recognition of the field of Sociology of Education in
Europe. Their theories and analyses were widely read and
applied by many, and continue to be relevant to educators
today, especially those who are also interested in the place

---

[44]Herbert Spencer, <u>First Principles of a New System of
Philosophy</u>, 2nd ed. (New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1868),
p. 61.

[45]Ibid., p. 127.

[46]Robert Nisbet, <u>The Sociology of Emile Durkheim</u> (New
York: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 247.

and role that the educational institution has in society. However, as good as the theories, concepts, and analytic conclusions were, the development and interest in sociology of education declined, and, in fact, all but ceased. In France, interest in the ideas and principles of Durkheim seemed to have been lost after the 1920's.[47] In Germany, where much of the theoretical and technical work had been done, the rise to power of Adolph Hitler and National Socialism brought a halt to any further development of sociology of education.[48]

English Contributors to Sociology of Education

When we examine the case of England, however, we can see that interest in education and its relationship to class, social mobility, and occupation remained strong.[49] Still, it was not until 1936 that a sociologically-orientated analysis, and, hence, the actual development of the field of sociology of education in England, was initiated by Sir Fred Clark. Following his appointment as Director of the London University Institute of Education, Clark applied his sociological background to support the study of education, as evidenced by the following statement:

we propose to accept unreservedly what may be called the

---

[47]P. Lapie, "Morale at Pedagogie Paris," Alcan 27, 237 as found in Jean Floud and A.H. Halsey, "The Sociology of Education," Current Sociology 7: 166.

[48]Floud and Halsey, p. 166.

[49]Ibid., p. 167.

sociological standpoint and to exhibit as well as we can its concrete application to the field of English education.[50]

Clark firmly believed that education should be studied from a sociological standpoint using that method to help plan an appropriate course of studies. The key here is that Clark felt there had to be planning in education. This viewpoint was not unanimously accepted by those in the educational system, even though Clark had the support of Karl Mannheim, a very well known and prominent individual in the area of the "Sociology of Knowledge."[51] Mannheim was a sociologist and, similar to Clark, approached education from the sociological standpoint. Mannheim felt that by analyzing society and becoming aware of its needs and faults, we would be better able to plan suitable educational programs that would address specific problems and issues. As Mannhein wrote:

> Sociologists do not regard education solely as a means of realizing abstract ideals of culture, such as humanism or technical specialization, but as a part of the process of influencing men and women. Education can only be understood when we know for what society and for what social position the people are being educated.[52]

---

[50]F. Clark, Education and Social Change (Sheldon Press, 1940), p. 1 as found in Ivor Moorish, The Sociology of Education: An Introduction (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1978), pp. 31-32.

[51]K. Mannheim, Man and Society: In An Age of Reconstruction (Routledge, 1940), p. 271 as found in Ivor Moorish, The Sociology of Education: An Introduction (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1978), p. 32.

[52]Mannheim, Man and Society, p. 271 as found in Moorish.

Both Clark and Mannheim believed that education was a vital part of society and that planning was necessary if the educational system was to function properly.[53]

Mannheim proposed the analysis of society in such a way that its shortcomings and ills could be pinpointed, thus enabling those individuals responsible for education to devise a system which would answer those problems, and possibly lead to a better society. This approach, which called for planned education, was referred to by Mannheim as the "Third Way", and resembled a school of thought somewhere between the "laissez-faire" approach espoused by Spencer and the "totalitarian" approach that caused Mannheim to leave Nazi Germany. This Third Way approach to education, however, called for a planned system to meet and answer the needs of an organized democratic society in which there was agreement upon a common course of action. The problem with this particular approach, however, was that not all societies were democratic in their structure, and in those that were, rarely would there be "total agreement on a common course of action."[54]

Karl Mannheim was a theorist who in his early years

---

[53]Ivor Moorish, The Sociology of Education: An Introduction (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1978), pp. 32-35.

[54]K. Mannheim, Diagnosis of our Time (Routledge, 1943; 7th impression, 1962), pp. 4-11, 71-72 et passim, as found in Ivor Moorish, The Sociology of Education: An Introduction (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1978), pp. 32-33.

covered a wide and rather diverse range of areas of thought.[55] However, it was not until 1933, when he fled from the oppression of the National Socialists (Nazis) in Germany and settled in a somewhat self-imposed exile in England, that he could apply his theories to a society and an educational system to see if they would work.

Because of World War II the development of the field of sociology of education shifted to the United States. Although aware of what was taking place in Europe, American scholars began to examine ideas and theories involving the sociological analyses of education formulated by Durkheim, Weber, Mannheim and others. Applying the theories of these European sociologists to American sociology of education were such scholars as Willard Waller (1899-1945), Wilbur Brookover, Florian Znaniecki (1882-1958), Petrim Sorokin (1889-1968), and Elaine Forseyth Cook and Lloyd Allan Cook, among others.[56]

Even before these American sociologists began to apply the theories of Durkheim, Weber, and Spencer, there already existed a strong interest in the area of sociology of education as early as 1883. It was in this year that Lester

---

[55]For an in depth look at those areas the reader should check Colin Loader, The Intellectual Development of Karl Mannheim: Culture, Politics, and Planning (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

[56]Keith W. Pritchard and Thomas H. Buxton, Concepts and Theories in Sociology of Education (Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publication, Inc., 1973), p. 15.

Ward stated in his book, <u>Dynamic Sociology</u>, that education
has a very definite role in the transformation of
society.[57] He asserted, "Education is the mainspring of
all progress. It is the piston of civilization."[58]

During these early years, the area known as
educational sociology was developed. However, many of those
who conducted research had limited training in sociology,
and thus, the findings that resulted were often not based
upon scientific methods. In addition, those participating
in such research were educators, and, consequently, the
examination of educational theories tended to be biased or
distorted.[59]

While the great majority of those who were researching
the area of educational sociology did not have a background
in sociological methods and theory, there were some who did,
notably John Dewey (1859-1922), William James (1842-1910),

[57]L.F. Ward, <u>Dynamic Sociology</u>, as found in Keith W.
Pritchard and Thomas H. Buxton, <u>Concepts and Theories in
Sociology of Education</u> (Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional
Eductors Publications, Inc., 1973), p. 13.

[58]Lester Ward, <u>Unpublished Manuscript on Education</u>, p.
311 reported by Elsa P. Kumball, <u>Sociology and Education: An
Analysis of the Theories of Spencer and Ward</u> (New York:
Columbia University Press, 1932), p. 216 as found in Ronald
G. Corwin, <u>A Sociology of Education</u> (New York: Appleton-
Century-Crofts, 1965), p. 57.

[59]John Dewey, <u>The School and Society</u>, found in Keith W.
Pritchard and Thomas H. Buxton, <u>Concepts and Theories in
Sociology of Education</u> (Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional
Educators Publications, Inc., 1973), p. 13.

and C.J. Pierce (1839-1914).[60]

In the early years of the movement, evidenced in the work that was being done and in the results published, interest in the relationship between education and sociology remained consistent. This can be witnessed by the following facts: By 1914, a large number of institutions of higher learning were offering courses entitled "Educational Sociology"; in 1916, Columbia Teachers College, recognizing the importance of this area of study, established a department of Educational Sociology; and lastly, by the mid-nineteen twenties, there were nearly 200 institutions of higher learning offering courses in the subject of Sociology of Education.[61,62,63]

When considering the large number of universities offering courses in the area of educational sociology, and the number of individuals conducting research into the subject, it was only natural that a vehicle by which ideas and information could be exchanged would evolve. This vehicle for exchange came about through the energy and sponsorship of E. George Payne who, in 1925, organized the

---

[60]Jean Floud and A.H. Halsey, "The Sociology of Education," Current Sociology 7, no. 3 (1958):165.

[61]W.B. Brookover, "Sociology of Education: A Definition," American Sociological Review 14 (June 1949):407.

[62]Ibid., p. 407.

[63]Harvey Lee, Status of Educational Sociology (New York: New York University Book Store, 1932), p. 5.

National Society for the Study of Educational Sociology, and
in 1928 founded the Journal of Educational Sociology.[64]
With the Society and the Journal, there were now two avenues
whereby those who were involved in both the study of
sociology and the study of education could exchange ideas
and theories. In both the Journal and the Society,
sociologists were taking the position that education should
be analyzed following the sociological method. On the other
hand, educators were equally adamant that any analysis of
education should be performed principally from an educator's
perspective, while sociological principles should remain
needed but ancillary modes of analysis. Because of the
disagreements as to how the subject area should be defined,
further developments in the field of Educational Sociology
gradually declined. Interest continued, however, and
gradually the field became referred to as the Sociology of
Education.[65]

It was not until the late 1940's that the field of
sociology of education was subjected to a long and hard
analysis. It was discovered that the field was in upheaval
and in danger of being dissolved as a legitimate area of

---

[64]Floud and Halsey, p. 165; E. George Payne, Principles
of Educational Sociology: An Outline (New York: New York
University Book Store, 1928), p. 20; Pritchard and Buxton,
p. 14.

[65]Jeanne Ballantine, The Sociology of Education: A
Systematic Analysis (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1983),
p. 11.

study. Wilbur Brookover, who was to become a leading figure in the area of sociology of education, pointed out that much of the material being taught under the guise of sociology of education had little or nothing to do with either sociology or education.[66] However, the main reason for the turmoil was the controversy that existed between the sociologists and the educators. On the one hand, the sociologists held that sociology of education was really a branch of sociology, while on the other hand, the educators believed that it was very much a part of the field of professional education. This tension between the two groups resulted in several subdivisions, dissension, and a gradual decline in interest in sociology of education as an area of study.[67]

Although the number of individuals interested in sociology of education declined in the late 1940's, interest was never completely lost. There remained several individuals who were concerned enough to pursue the study of the relationship of society and education. These included Neal Gross, Charles Bidwell, Robert Havighurst, and Wilbur Brookover, sociologists who were thoroughly trained in sociological methods and theory.

With the onset of an ever-increasing number of sociologists entering the field, and the increasing use of sociological methods in analyzing the educational milieu, a

---

[66]Brookover, pp. 407-408.

[67]Ibid., pp. 407-415.

sociological dominance and control began to manifest itself.
Along with the infusion of new people came a renewed
interest in the area of sociology of education as an
academic subject of study.[68]

At the same time these events were taking place, the
controversy between the sociologists and the educators
continued. The chaos and confusion caused by earlier
disagreements worsened, resulting in the development of two
separate schools of thought, Sociology of Education and
Educational Sociology. The former was concerned with
educational issues and problems from a sociological
viewpoint, while the latter considered educational issues
from the perspective of the professional educator.[69]

It was during this time of renewed interest in
sociology and education that Brookover's ideas gained
prominence. Along with Willard Waller, Brookover was one of
the pioneers in the field of Sociology of Education.[70]

<u>Development of Education in the United States</u>

The early immigrants who settled America were most
often transplanted Englishmen who brought with them the
culture, philosophy, and ideals of their homeland. These

---

[68]Pritchard and Buxton, p. 19.

[69]Gale Edward Jensen, <u>Educational Sociology</u> (New York:
The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1965), pp. 6-8.

[70]This inference was taken from an interview with Dr.
Brookover, that was taped, with permission on May 8, 1986.

transplanted attitudes and values influenced life in all its
aspects during the colonial days, even to the point of
having a "class centered, dual system of schools" similar to
the system in England.[71]

The belief that the colonies in America were merely an
extension of English society and ideology remained dominant
for some time. However, the people who made up the
population of the thirteen colonies gradually started to
drift further and further away from what many thought of as
the mother country. The dictates of law from across the sea
began to lose their impact and meaning on a people who
increasingly wanted to be governed by their own laws.
Finally, in 1776, the colonists declared their
independence.[72] After defeating the British and winning
their independence, the colonists started to develop their
own ideas of society, formulate their own philosophy, and to
organize new forms of government and education, as well as
other institutions.

Most of the institutions that contributed to the make-
up of American society were formed by the founding fathers,
with only minor variations occurring over the last two
hundred years or so. However, the institution of education
has changed dramatically and continues to adapt to changing

----

[71]Gerald L. Gutek, Education in the United States: An
Historical Perspective (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:
Prentice Hall, 1986), pp. 1-22.

[72]Ibid., p. 24.

societal conditions. Specifically, in the nineteenth
century, education became more accessible to larger segments
of society, thus preparing more people to become involved in
the development of the country.[73]

In the middle of the twentieth century, however, a
fundamental structural change occurred in American
education. The perception of the United States as the most
scientifically and technologically advanced nation in the
world was challenged. In 1957, the Soviet Union launched
the space satellite, "Sputnik,"[74] and to many people, this
dramatic shift in status between the two nations appeared to
be connected to the decline of the educational system.

In reality, there was no one system or person to which
the blame could be attached. The Soviet Union's surprising
outmaneuvering and surpassing of the United States in the
race to be first into space, was the result of their
recognizing what would be needed to enable them to be first.
The Soviet Union included in their educational system much
more attention to such courses as mathematics, science, as
well as regular courses. On the other hand, the United
States was content to follow an educational program that
focused very little attention on mathematics and/or science.
The Sputnik incident changed this outlook, however, as it
made the American government realize that a tightening of

---

[73]Ibid., pp. 53-54.

[74]Ibid., pp. 279-280.

academic standards was absolutely necessary, as was more emphasis on mathematical and science courses.

It was at this time that closer attention was paid to all the research and analysis of education that had been conducted previously. This is not to say that no interest had been shown in the years proceeding Sputnik, for that was hardly the case. One need only look at the writings and research of those individuals mentioned earlier in order to see that interest in the study of the educational institution had been serious, if, however, a little disorganized and chaotic. Nevertheless, in the 1950's, when the shocking surprise of the Soviet Union in space took place, the demand for a more rigorous educational program was heard, resulting in the questioning, researching and analysis of the educational system. It was found that the use of the sociological method and theories that were applied in the analysis of society could be applied to the study of educational aspects. Hence the area of study known as Sociology of Education began to develop as a distinct discipline, notably through the work of Brookover and others.

Wilbur Brookover And The Renewed Interest in Sociology of Education

In an attempt to answer the questions raised by those calling for educational reform, Brookover analyzed the factors that he believed had contributed to and influenced

the institution of education.

As the outcry for improved educational programs increased, so did the realization of the importance of education in our society. No longer was education to be viewed as something that occurred in an individual's life apart from the other aspects; neither being influenced by nor influencing the other aspects of society that are operating in the individual's life. Now, the importance of education and the influence it exercised upon both the individual and upon society as a whole was generally recognized and widely accepted. In conjunction with this increased recognition and greater acceptance was the realization by sociologists that the field of education provided a rich and easily accessible area for research and analysis.

With this outlook in mind, Brookover assumed the task of scrutinizing the institution of education. His research and analysis was not merely a basic study of an educational program in and of itself, but rather a two-part analysis: the first part consisting of a detailed analysis of the various social relationships within a school which comprised the social structure of the school, and the second area consisted of looking at the place the school occupied in the community in which it was located.[75] Although Brookover

---

[75]Brookover, p. 412, printed text of a paper read at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Society held in Chicago, December 28-30, 1948.

may have focused part of his work around these two general areas, the areas themselves were not new. Years earlier Robert Angell and E.B. Reuter made similar statements regarding the focus of the sociologist who is studying the field of education.[76] The difference between the research by Angell and Reuter, however, was that after they made their pronouncements they did nothing to substantiate their work. Brookover, however, did complete the research and analysis necessary to confirm his statements.

To reiterate, after Sputnik, Americans started wondering if something was lacking in their educational system. Because of these concerns and questions, attention started to focus upon the work of sociologists who showed an interest in the educational system. Even though Brookover had been researching and analyzing the field of education during the preceding years, closer attention was now paid to his theories and findings. Brookover was no stranger to the educational system; he was a high school teacher for several years before teaching at the university level. In addition to being a teacher, Brookover was also a sociologist who had a very strong, very definite interest in the workings of the educational system, and who used his sociological

---

[76]For a fuller examination of their work see Robert Cooley Angell, "Science, Sociology, and Education," Journal of Educational Sociology 1 (March 1928):406-413; and E.B. Reuter, "The Problem of Educational Sociology," Journal of Educational Psychology 9 (1935):15-22.

perspective and techniques in his analysis and research.[77]
While many of the areas that Brookover examined were those
that had been identified by others who preceeded him, he,
nevertheless, added new depth and insight in terms of
theoretical insights and empirical findings. A good example
of theorizing, without doing the necessary empirical
research for corroboration, was done by Angell and Reuter.
While these two men made statements concerning the areas to
be studied that were very similar to those made by
Brookover, it was Brookover's research that actually
substantiated extended insights into the actual workings of
the educational system.[78],[79]

Brookover, in his book, Sociology of Education, states
that the educational system is closely tied to the various
aspects of society. He notes that if new members are to
join a society, the beliefs, values and skills endemic to
that particular society must somehow be passed from the
older members to the newer members. That transmission might

---

[77]Information derived from an interview with Dr.
Brookover, May 8, 1986.

[78]Robert Cooley Angell, "Science, Sociology, and
Education," Journal of Educational Sociology 1 (March,
1928):406-413 as found in W.B. Brookover, "Sociology of
Education: A Definition," American Sociological Review 14
(June, 1949):412.

[79]E.B. Reuter, "The Problem of Educational Sociology,"
Journal of Educational Sociology 9 (September, 1935):15-22
as found in W.B. Brookover, "Sociology of Education: A
Definition," American Sociological Review 14 (June, 1949):
412.

occur in ordinary everyday interaction between the various

members of society. Or, it may occur in the very formal,

almost ritualized setting of a school in which an

individual, namely the teacher, undertakes the task of

teaching certain values and beliefs.[80]

The perpetuation of the culture of a society is only

one of the ways in which the educational system is related

to society. Education is also influential to and influenced

by the race, ethnic background, socio-economic status, and

geographic location. It has been shown that these

characteristics have a definite influence upon the type of

education that an individual receives, which in turn impact

upon the society in which the individual lives.[81]

Brookover was influential in identifying and studying the

various factors impinging upon the process of schooling.

Some of these will now be examined in more detail.

Wilbur Brookover and Sociology of Education

As a teacher in the high school system in Indiana,

Brookover was not only a part of the educational process but

very aware of how the educational system worked. It was

during this time that he started taking courses in his

leisure time, eventually earning his Doctorate from the

---

[80]Wilbur Brookover, Sociology of Education, 2nd edition
(New York: American Book Co., 1966), pp. 16-17; Wilbur
Brookover and Edsel Erickson, Society, Schools, and Learning
(Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), pp. 26-28.

[81]Brookover and Erickson, pp. 40-41.

University of Wisconsin (in 1943). Brookover, at first, was undecided about which area to concentrate on, sociology or economics. And, it was not until his third summer when he completed a course entitled "Social Institutions" taught by Kimball Young, that he decided upon sociology as his area of contentration. During that course, Professor Young made several suggestions regarding topics that students could choose for their papers. Brookover chose to write about teachers and the educational system. Brookover thought he would be able to apply his experience and firsthand knowledge to the subject. The paper was so well received that when Brookover began working on his Masters thesis, Young urged him do further research in his chosen area and apply it to his thesis. Brookover expanded his thesis topic to include the role that students themselves play in the educational system. In light of the interest shown by Brookover in this area, and considering that very little other work was being done, Professor Young urged Brookover to further pursue the subject, encouraging him to establish himself as the "expert" in the field of Sociology of Education.[82]

Brookover took Professor Young's advice and continued to analyze the educational system. This further analysis dealt with such areas as the influence that teachers exert

---

[82]The Information of the early development of Dr. Brookover came from an interview that the author had with him on May 9, 1986.

in education; the role that students play in the educational system; and, the relation between the school and community of which it is a part. In short, he analyzed many of the central aspects of the educational system. Even though this area of study was still officially called Educational Sociology in 1949, Brookover wrote an article entitled "Sociology of Education: A Definition" in which he outlined those areas that he perceived as comprising the field of sociology of education. These were the <u>relation</u> of the educational system to the other aspects of society; the school as a <u>social system</u>, which included cultural transmission, social stratification, and teacher-pupil relationships; the <u>interactions</u> between the school and the community and; the influence and impact that teachers, pupils and the school exert upon another as they develop.[83] Brookover's article was also significant because many of the advocates of educational sociology were confused and/or disillusioned about the content and direction of the field, therefore, they welcomed Brookover's article for the direction it afforded them.

After his high school teaching career, Brookover taught first at Indiana State Teachers College, and later at the University of Wisconsin, combined with a brief stint in

---

[83]Wilbur Brookover, "Sociology of Education: A Definition," <u>Sociological Review</u> 14 (1949):407-415.

the U.S. Navy as Educational Service Officer.[84] When

Brookover returned from naval service, and was lecturing at

the University of Wisconsin, he was able to continue his

work along the same lines that he had espoused in his

article. Along with Brookover, there were other

individuals, such as Leslie Zeleney, LLoyd Allen Cook, among

others, who were interested in the sociological analysis of

the educational system. Together with these individuals,

Brookover compiled papers about the sociological analysis of

education. These results were then submitted to the <u>Journal</u>

<u>of Educational Sociology</u> for publication. More individuals

would now have access to the research involving the field of

education and would see the direction in which the

relationship between the two fields was headed. The heavy

emphasis upon the sociological approach was so obvious that

at the urging of many, Brookover included, the <u>Journal of</u>

<u>Educational Sociology</u> was renamed the <u>Journal of Sociology</u>

<u>of Education</u>. The Journal was now restaffed by those

individuals who were more sociologically inclined, thereby

reflecting the direction the field was taking. Those

individuals involved could now share with their fellow

sociologists, and possibly involve them in, the research and

analysis presently being conducted in the field of Sociology

of Education.

Having provided a framework for the field, Brookover

---

[84]Interview with Dr. Brookover, May 9, 1986.

could now move ahead with further research. Following the outline which he compiled, Brookover began to study the first area he identified: the relation between education and other aspects of society.

<h2 style="text-align:center">Education and Societal Factors</h2>

For any society to continue to exist, there are certain aspects that new members of the society must learn. Included in these essential aspects are a common language, certain modes of behavior related to survival and the values that are part of the society.[85] These aspects make up what is commonly referred to as the culture of a society. Every society has it own particular culture and all are different. For example, the culture shared by the people of the United States, with slight variations, is much different than that shared by the people of India in language, lifestyles, etc. Still, there is one aspect which is common to all societies: new members must learn the culture if the society is to continue.[86] In order to learn these cultural values there must be teachers to teach them.

According to Brookover, there are two types of teachers and teaching situations: the <u>informal</u>, or continuous pattern, and the <u>formal</u>, or highly structured and organized pattern. In the informal method, the new members

---

[85]Ralph Linton, <u>The Tree of Culture</u> (New York: Alfred Knopf Co., 1955), as found in Brookover and Erickson, p. 23.

[86]Ibid.

of a society learn the appropriate ways to conduct
themselves by observing older members who later become the
teachers. This type of education is an ongoing process. In
the second instance, during those times when more particular
emphasis is needed on certain types or roles and when
certain modes of behavior need to be taught, there are those
individuals who are designated, trained and entrusted with
the task of educating students. This formal education takes
place in our schools today.

Learning is not, however, an either/or situation. The
misconception is that an individual learns by one moethod or
by another method. More correctly, people learn by both
methods, with overlapping between the two. Irrespective of
which method happens to be operative at the time, whether it
be the informal, or teaching by example method, or the
formal teaching in a school method, the fact remains that
one of the primary functions of education is the
transmission of culture.[87] Brookover also analyzed the
relation between education and an individual's class,
status, race, and/or ethnic affiliation. In a sense, these
areas of analysis coincide with the transmission of culture.
This can be seen if we consider two individuals from two
different cultural backgrounds, such as a male Caucasian
from an affluent suburb and a black male from the inner
city. The former may attend school in an area which spends

---

[87]Brookover and Erickson, pp. 26-28.

significant amounts on the educational system, thus,
providing a higher quality of education. The latter
individual, on the other hand, may attend school in an area
in which the necessary funds are not available;
consequently, his or her opportunity for quality education
is not available. As demonstrated, this glaring discrepancy
in quality of education does not allow for certain
individuals to receive the education to which they are
entitled. As Brookover proved again in his research, this
inequality was perpetuated partly by racial background,
until various legal decisions prohibited this from
happening.[88]   There were other reasons for inequality in
education, which included ethnicity, geographic location,
and/or the socio-economic status. These factors, in turn,
have a bearing upon the type of occupation and the level of
education attained by members of the family. Often, when a
child enters the educational system, certain
characteristics, such as those mentioned above, will play a
determining role in the type of education he or she
receives. This tendency to rely on outside factors to
explain educational outcomes can lead, unfortunately, to
some erroneous conclusions. Thus a child who is from a
lower socio-economic background, or who was raised in a very
strong ethnic family where the cultural heritage played a
major part in the child's personal make-up may be

[88]Ibid., pp. 119-120.

stereotyped. As a result, the child might be placed in an educational track different from the main stream curriculum, a form of discrimination or segregation which may limit his/her education. As Brookover notes, this limitation can be tragic, particularly when children have ability and are capable of high achievement.[89]

Role of the School in Education

Another area scrutinized by Brookover, was the role the school played in the educational pattern. As all of us are aware, school is the place where teaching and learning takes place. Brookover was aware of these facts; however, he believed there was more involved and that the school was not simply a building in which teachers taught a subject and students learned that subject. According to Brookover, there existed within the school a social system, or student culture distinct from, yet co-existing with, the institutional structure. Outside the school walls the student followed the cultural patterns of the society in which he or she lived. But once inside the confines of the school among fellow students and friends, a different

---

[89]Wilbur Brookover, Charles Beady, Patricia Flood, John Schweitzer, and Joe Wisenbacker, Schools Can Make a Difference as Indicated by a Study of Elementary School Social Systems and School Outcomes (East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, College of Urban Development, 1977); Brookover and Erickson, pp. 46-56; Wilbur Brookover, Richard J. Gigliotti, Ronald D. Henderson, and Jeffrey M. Schneider, Elementary School Social Environment and School Achievement. Final Report of Cooperative Research Project No. 1-E-107. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, College of Urban Development, July 1973.

culture (the student culture) became operative. As observed by James Coleman:

> This setting apart of our children in school-which takes on ever more functions, ever more extra-curricular activities-for an even longer period of training has a singular impact on the child of HIGH SCHOOL AGE (sic). He, or she is cutoff from the rest of society, forced inward towards his own age group, made to carry out his whole social life with others his own age. With his fellows, he comes to constitute a small society, one that has most of its important interactions <u>within</u> itself, and maintains only a few threads of connection with the outside adult society...it is a separate sub-culture...with languages all their own, with special symbols, and, most importantly, with value systems that may differ from adults.[90]

Coleman's observations dealt with the high school student and, to some extent, the college student. Brookover noted that the reason there is very little written about the elementary-age student is because, for that age level, the parents are still by and large the most significant influence in the child's life; the teacher being looked upon as the surrogate parent when the child is in a classroom setting. However, as Brookover stated, there is not much research in the literature to support this statement.[91]

In addition, Brookover believed there was a significant factor in the educational system that must be considered a by-product of the student culture within the school; namely, a students' self-concept and its effect upon achievement in school. To study this relationship Bookover,

---

[90]James S. Coleman, <u>The Adolescent Society</u> (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1962), p. 3.

[91]Brookover and Erickson, p. 68.

Erickson, Joiner, and others devised a three part study of self-concept and school achievement that involved a particular group of students from the seventh grade through the twelfth grade. That basic hypothesis that ran through the entire study was that a students' self concept had an effect on the students' ability to learn. The first part of the study, released in 1962,[92] dealt with students to the seventh grade level. The results of this part of the study showed that self concept was significantly related to school achievement. The second part of the study, released in 1965,[93] dealt with the same group of students at the ninth grade level. This report showed that both self-concept of ability and school achievement were significantly increased by involving parents who represented the importance of academics to their children. In the third and final report of this study, released in 1967,[94] the same students at the

_____

[92]Wilbur B. Brookover, Ann Paterson, and Shailer Thomas, "Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement," U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project, Number 845 (East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1962).

[93]Wilbur B. Brookover, Jean M. LePare, Don E. Hamachek, Shailer Thomas, and Edsel L. Erickson, "Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement II," U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project, Number 1636 (East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, Michigan State University, 1965).

[94]Wilbur B. Brookover, Edsel L. Erickson, and Lee M. Joiner, "Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement III," Education Cooperative Research Project Number 2831 (East Lansing: Office of Research and Publications, College of Education, Michigan State University, 1967).

high school level now were dealt with. At this level it was found that those individuals perceived as significant others in the students' life had a profound impact on the students' self-concept, which had a definite effect on his/her school achievement. To sum up these three studies, it can be stated that these longitudinal studies have shown that there is a definite correlation between a students' self-concept and his/her school achievement.[95]

To illustrate this conclusion, let us take the example of a student entering the education system. Quite frequently, the student will be evaluated by his or her peers by such non-academic characteristics as family background, SES level, and the amount and type of family income. Based upon the result of the peer evaluation, the individual may or may not be allowed to join the "in group". Consequently, if the student is accepted into the right crowd or group, he or she will have a better attitude in regard to the experience of school, which might very well be reflected in the student's achievement. Conversely, if a student is not accepted by the in-group, he or she might possibly allow the rejection to affect his or her whole outlook on school, the result being poor performance. Here it should be stated that the vast majority of research conducted on the relationship between non-academic

---

[95]Wilbur B. Brookover and Edsel L. Erickson, <u>Society, Schools and Learning</u> (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971), pp. 104-106.

characteristics such as family background, SES, and geographic location, and school achievement has dealt with the secondary or high school level. Before Brookover's research (1973), there had been very few studies completed that dealt with this phenomenon at the elementary level of education.[96] The results of Brookover's study followed very closely those results of other researchers in higher education settings; namely, that even at this level in the educational process, non-academic characteristics did contribute to the social climate of the school, which in turn influenced achievement. More significantly, Brookover's work demonstrated that if the climate of the school was conducive to learning, any student, regardless of ethnicity or SES, could achieve at a high level.[97]

Role of the Teacher

Although not the first to do so, Brookover analyzed the role played by the teacher in the educational system. Willard Waller, in his book, <u>Sociology of Teaching</u>, also analyzed in some detail, the role of the teacher. He wrote:

> The teacher represents...the formal curriculum, and his interest is in imposing the curriculum upon the children in the form of tasks...(which are) graded numerically .... The teacher represents the established order in the school, and his(her) interest is in maintaining that order....[98]

---

[96]Wilbur B. Brookover et al., pp. 13-25.

[97]Ibid., p. 25.

[98]Waller, p. 195; Brookover and Erickson, p. 81.

For the most part, Brookover concurred with Waller's conclusions. However, Brookover believed there was something more to being a teacher than just standing in front of a classroom of students, dispensing facts, and judging whether or not the material was learned. When in graduate school, Brookover wrote a paper in which he stated that a teacher should try to be a part of the student body by interacting with the students and taking part in their activities. Brookover believed this to be true until later when he read Waller's book, in which Waller stated that the teacher who tries to "join" the student body will "lose all the privileges and exceptions that will accrue to him...as a member of the teaching group."[99] Reading this, Brookover changed the direction of his paper and rewrote it. Later, when doing further research, he discovered that the data did show that those teachers who were perceived as friendly and congenial were, in fact, less effective.[100] Brookover, however, did believe that an understanding of the teacher's role was crucial to an understanding of the educational system. In fact, he believed it was so important that in his outline of sociology of education topics to be covered, he included the role of the teacher in terms of the teacher-student relationship; the personality, or the image,

[99]Ibid., p. 213.

[100]Information taken from interview with Dr. Brookover, May 6, 1986, taped with permission.

the teacher conveys to students; and how the teacher effects the students. In his book, Waller had discussed the very same topics.[101] Brookover's results corroborated the conclusions that Waller arrived at.

School and the Community

When continuing to assess Brookover's contribution to the development of Sociology of Education, it becomes imperative to consider the relationship between the school and the community. As a sociologist, Brookover was interested in the various aspects of the community; as an educator, he was involved in the functioning of the school. As sociologist of education, he was concerned with the operation of the school as it related to the community and the influence of a community's various aspects upon the functioning of the school. This issue of school-community relations had also been covered by Waller, whom Brookover relied upon as he developed his Sociology of Education outline. Subsequent research has been completed by various individuals who also analyzed school and community relations from various approaches.[102]

In his attempt to arrive at what he thought was an acceptable and adequate outline of the field, Brookover found it necessary to say what sociology of education is not as well as what the field is. Sociology in its title does

---

[101]Waller, p. 212.

[102]Boocock, pp. 251-260.

not imply that it is merely a science of educational

sociology, nor is it a technology of education. It is,

however, the scientific analysis of those relationships and

interactions between students, teachers, schools and

communities.[103] Brookover then proceeded to outline these

areas, thus providing the sociologists of education who have

followed him with a framework upon which they could base

their research. Individuals such as Florian Znaniecki, Jean

Floud and A.H. Halsey, Robert Havighurst and Daniel Levine,

Lloyd Allen Cook and Elaine Forseyth Cook, and Caroline

Hodges Persell used Brookover's outline as a guide while

other individuals, such as Neal Gross, Jeanne Ballantine,

and Robert Havighurst and Bernice Neugarten used Brookover

as a guide and also cited him in their works.[104,105,106,107,108,109,110,111]

---

[103]Wilbur Brookover and David Gottlieb, Sociology of Education, 2nd edition (New York: American Book Company, 1964), pp. 1-12. Originally published in the American Sociology Review 14 (1949):407-415.

[104]Florian Znaniecki, "The Scientific Function of Sociology of Education," Educational Theory 1 (August, 1951),:69-78.

[105]Jean Floud and A.H. Halsey, "The Sociology of Education, (with special reference to the Development of Research in Western Europe and the United States of America," Current Sociology 7 ((1958):165-193.

[106]Robert J. Havighurst and Daniel U. Levine, Society and Education (Boston, London, Sydney, Toronto: Allyn and Bacon, 1979).

[107]Lloyd Allen Cook and Elaine Forseyth Cook, A Sociological Approach to Education, 3rd edition (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1960).

Summary

Even though the focal point of the field of Sociology
of Education has shifted to the United States, we must not
overlook the contributions made by influential European
scholars. Emile Durkheim, Max Weber and others recognized
the important role that education plays in society. They
not only recognized the role, they analyzed the relationship
between education and society. When circumstances arose in
Europe that prevented further development in the field,
American sociologists of education took up the task.

After the shift had occurred, individuals such as
Willard Waller and Wilbur Brookover took the theories that
had been first developed in Europe and adapted and further
developed them for use here in America. The analyses done
by these individuals, particularly Brookover, provided an
outline of the field for those who were to come. The
results of the research conducted by these early

---

[108]Neal Gross, "The Sociology of Education" as found in
Robert K. Merton, Leonard Bloom, and Leonard S. Cottrell,
Jr., eds., Scoiology Today-Problems and Prospects (New York:
Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1959).

[109]Caroline Hodges Persell, Education and Inequality: A
Theoretical and Empirical Synthesis (New York: The Free
Press, A Division of MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc.), 1977.

[110]Jeanne Ballantine, The Sociology of Education: A
Systematic Analysis (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice
Hall, Inc., 1983).

[111]Robert Havighurst and Bernice Neugarten, Society and
Education, 2nd edition. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.,
1962).

practitioners of the field hopefully will provide a
springboard for further research in the field of Sociology
of Education.

CHAPTER IV

THE REMAINING PROBLEMS, PROSPECTS, AND DIRECTIONS
WITHIN THE FIELD OF SOCIOLOGY OF EDUCATION

In the preceding chapters, the field of sociology of
education has been examined from several different
perspectives. In the first chapter, a historical view was
taken to illustrate the growth of the field. In chapter
two, we examined those elements of society, or social
factors, that exert some degree of influence upon the
educational system. In chapter three, the focal point of
this work, the development of the field of Sociology of
Education as it occurred first in Europe and then in the
United States was covered. The works of those individuals
whose contributions to the European development of the field
were studied as well as those contributions of the early
practitioners of the field in America, with particular
attention paid to the contributions of Wilbur Brookover,
considered to be one of the pioneers and an authority in the
field of sociology of education here in the United States.
Consideration of these areas has shown where the field of
sociology of education has come from, and how it has evolved
today. However, one question still remains: "Where is

Sociology of Education going (the future)?" In order to answer this question, we must look at the future of the two areas of Sociology of Education: society and education.

As most Americans are aware, American society has changed dramatically over the years. Around the turn of the century, American society was, primarily, an agricultural society, with 38 percent of the labor force employed in the agricultural sphere.[1] These individuals were for the most part unskilled, being primarily concerned with how to plant seeds and harvest crops. This situation, however has changed. There are still some who work in the agricultural sphere but the percentage of those involved is now less than 5 percent of the labor force and these individuals must understand the newer, more complex methods involved in farming, such as choosing the right and best seeds, preparing and properly fertilizing the ground so the seeds will grow, irrigating the land to assist in the growth process, harvesting at the right time, using the most cost efficient method, and marketing their crops.[2]

Not only have changes occurred in the agricultural sphere but also in the industrial sphere, as well. In the early part of this century, it was commonplace for the males

_____

[1]Ralph W. Tyler, "Education: Past, Present, and Future," as found in Louis Rubin, ed., Educational Reform for a Changing Society: Anticipating Tomorrow's Schools (Boston, London, Sydney: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.), p. 178.

[2]Ibid.

in the family, when they were of age, to engage in manual
labor, whether it be in factories, the mills, etc. Manual
strength and dexterity were what was needed. Unlike earlier
times, however, the emphasis has now shifted to focus upon
intellectual strength to accomplish today's jobs. Before
the turn of the century, the labor force included those
involved in producing material goods. Today over 60 percent
are involved in non-material producing professions.[3]

With the requirement for employment moving away from
manual strength and toward a more intellectual emphasis, the
door has been opened for more women to enter the job market.
Another major change in American society, this influx of
women in the work force can be traced back to when, out of
necessity, women started working in the factories during the
second World War. During, and after the war years, working
women played an important part in the work world. Now, with
such professions as health care, social services,
management, and science, many more women are entering the
world of business.

In the political sphere, the United States is unique
among the nations of the world. Not only because we have
built ourselves up into one of the superpowers of the world,
but because we have done so without any major changes in our
system of government. We continue today to enjoy the same
basic form of government that was established over 200 years

---

[3]Ibid.

ago.

In all the aforementioned changes that have occurred
in American society, education has played a major role. As
the newer techniques and concepts were developed and
promulgated, those who remained "to work the land" had to
somehow learn and understand how to use what was being made
available to them. Education provided the means to learn.
As the emphasis shifted from manual labor-oriented jobs to
intellectual professions, education was instrumental in
helping individuals develop the necessary intellectual
skills. In order for the same basic form of government to
have lasted and functioned for so long, the major tenets had
to have been passed on from generation to generation.
Education provided this means of transmission, and has been
involved in every aspect of change that has occurred.
However, education has not been a mere bystander, but,
rather, an active participant in all societal changes.
Education has played an active, vital role and has,
consequently, undergone some radical changes over the years.

The early settlers of this nation arrived in America
with the hope of beginning a new life. These individuals
left their country for several reasons, but primarily to
escape religious and/or political persecution. These groups
brought with them to the new land a wide and unique variety
of cultural habits from their various countries. These
cultural habits, or mores, formed the framework around which

these early settlers began to develop their "new life."

In the earlier years, education was taught on an informal basis, with most education taking place in the family setting or in the local church. It was not until the year 1642 that formal schools were established as a result of Massachusetts having passed a law requiring parents to make certain that their children could read and understand the basic principles of religion and the laws that governed the colony. There were other schools established during this time but there was no organized system; merely a group of community schools that were geared to the communities in which they were located and by whom they were controlled. One commonality among all the schools was their European style of education consisting of different types of schools and schooling for the different classes of children.[4] Even though the early settlers were at first still very European in their way of thinking and acting, toward the end of the 17th century they began to build an identity of their own. Change took place with the enlightenment in Europe, and its effect was being felt across the ocean in the new world. One of the effects was that education was no longer considered to be a community centered, religious-dominated local undertaking. Rather, it was now thought of as the means by which people would learn those things required to

---

[4]Sanford W. Reitman, Education, Society, and Change (Boston, London, Sydney, Toronto: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1977), pp. 64-65.

fulfill all the duties necessary to enable them to assume their rightful place in society. This would appear to be the right direction in which education should head. However, there were two obstacles that prevented the idea from developing further: first, it said nothing about being available to all individuals; and, second, when proposals were made to expand the availability of education, the governing bodies in the various colonies and states voted them down.[5] Even though these proposals were vetoed, the ideas asking for education being made available to all individuals had been brought out into the open and discussed, even though it would be years before education for all would become a reality.

Although there had been many prominent individuals who supported the idea of education for everyone (which would, in fact, become the public school), it was not until the late 19th century, in 1880, that the public school system in the United States was constructed as a free, tax-supported, compulsory, and universal system.[6] No longer was education to be restricted to the sons and daughters of professionals and land owners. With the establishment of public schools at the elementary and secondary levels, and the founding of landgrant colleges, which were established by the Morrill Act of 1862, which was passed as a response to the demands

---

[5]Ibid., pp. 66-70.

[6]Ibid.

of the common folk that their children have available to
them a college education, education up to the highest level
was now available to all.[7]

After the landgrant college upheaval in 1862, all
further changes that occurred in the educational sphere were
part of an evolutionary and growing process, just as the
society around it was likewise growing and evolving. There
were some major changes of note over the years, most notably
the expansion of the high schools and the establishment of
junior colleges, but these occurrences were part of the
growing process.[8]

It is interesting to note that every major change in
the educational system in America shared a common
characteristic: a new educational institution was created
to answer the growing demand of more and more individuals
taking advantage of the opportunities available to them and
entering the school system. More and different types of
educational institutions were then needed to meet those
demands. As the demands of soceity grew, the challenges
that education faced also grew. With all the changes that
have occurred and are still taking place today, there have
arisen problems and difficulties that must be considered.

While some of these problems have occurred due to the
complexity of some of the changes, there are others that are

---

[7]Tyler, p. 180.

[8]Ibid., pp. 180-181.

more basic. One of the problem areas was the family. Those
known as the "Baby Boomers" made up an era that helped bring
about an increased interest in education during the
1960's.[9] As the baby boom generation reached school age,
it was realized that more facilities would be needed, with
the requisite number of teachers to staff them, in order to
adequately handle the increasing number of students. Along
with the facilities and teachers and better training for the
teachers, came new ideas and innovations in the educational
systems itself. During these years of increasing
enrollment, education was considered a priority with the
necessary funding made available and used for the
educational benefit of the children. The inevitable,
however, occurred. Those of the Baby Boom generation
reached maturity, and the generation to follow consisted of
fewer children. The birth rate had been declining, with the
exception of some minor upswings, since 1961.[10] A
declining birth rate produced fewer students with a decline
of almost 3,500,000 students between the years 1972-1982.
This decline necessitated the closing of some of the

---

[9]For a more detailed explanation on the "baby boom"
era, the reader is directed to read D. Quinn Mills, Not Like
Our Parents (New York: William Morrow & Company, Inc.,
1987).

[10]Kenneth E. Boulding, "Predictive Reliability and the
Future," as found in Louis Rubin, ed., The Future of
Education: Perspectives in Tomorrow's Schools (Boston,
London, Sydney: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.), 1975.

schools, as well as the loss of teaching jobs.[11]

Together with a declining enrollment came a change in
the social class composition among school-age children. The
population of the schools changed to reflect a different
socio-economic standing, race, and class. In light of an
increased awareness concerning environmental issues and
population control, middle- and upper-class couples were
having fewer children while those considered lower-class
were having more children, thus providing more students for
the educational system. Because children from poor families
cannot always afford tuition, the city must levy additional
taxes to cover the unmet costs. This problem is compounded
because the areas in which poor families most often live are
not high revenue-producing areas. Consequently, less money
is raised by the school board to finance the educational
institution. In addition to financial difficulties is the
dilemma that in many school areas the population has
changed, and the existing studies and policies were aimed at
what may, at one time, have been an all-white middle class
dominated school environment, whereas today, it is likely
that the students from those same schools will consist
mostly of various minorities. Projections forecast that by

---

[11]National Center of Education Statistics, "The
Condition of Education," Statistical Report, 1980 edition,
U.S. Department of Education, p. 17 as found in Jeanne H.
Ballantine, The Sociology of Education: A Systematic
Analysis (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall,
Inc.), pp. 384-385.

1990, one in five high school students will be non-white, thus invalidating earlier studies on specific school populations.[12] Those earlier studies must be redone and the resultant policies rewritten if they are to reflect today's school populations. This implies that procedures used to gather the pertinent information, which in itself must be determined, must be formulated if information is to be gathered and analyzed. Evaluation of existing programs and any future ones must be conducted to determine if they are applicable to today's situation and if they will be adequate to answer future goals and questions. This is where the future sociologists of education will play a vital role, provided they receive the necessary training. Today, in the field of Sociology of Education most if not all, of the practitioners are well-versed in the methodology necessary to conduct future analyses in the field. This is primarily because most of the practitioners have sociological as well as educational backgrounds.

In view of how rapidly things are changing and the complexity of the situations, the days of gathering and analyzing data without the aid of computers are no longer viable. Data can now be processed, and results made readily available. Problems may occur if those wanting to analyze data are not computer-literate, requiring those who

---

[12]National Institute of Education, "Declining Enrollments: The Challenge of the Coming Decade," as found in Ballantine, p. 386.

understand the process to complete the computer work. After the material is fed into the computer and an analysis is completed, the question becomes: "Does the researcher understand the statistical print out and what do the statistics reveal?" From this simple illustration one can understand that future sociologists of education must have training in both statistics and computer-use if they are going to be able to conduct research, and properly interpret the resulting statistical data.

The implication is not that future sociologists of education will only be statisticians who simply work with numbers and interact with computers. Future practitioners in the field of sociology of education will, however, be required to acquire obtain first-hand experience in the areas they will be studying. Acquiring this experience may be done through teaching, thereby interacting with co-workers, students, administrators, and the total school system. Similar to the many school systems and individual schools that have a staff psychologist to work with those students experiencing psychological problems, schools of the future may consider employing a sociologist of education on their staff. Therefore, when problems arise involving SES, race, cultural or class differences they can be dealt with immediately by someone skilled in providing an understanding

of the situation.[13]

Along with the dramatic changes in society and education over the years has also come the changes in the field of sociology of education, itself. From the initial work of Emile Durkheim in France, to the research of Wilbur Brookover in America, there have been continual modifications and improvements made in the methodology uses to study education. Among these improvements are new research techniques that have been devised to study and understand particular areas in the educational institution; the role and training of teachers, work begun by Waller and continued by Brookover, which needs to be studied further; and an increase in attention given to the impact that the heavily minority-laden school population will have upon curriculum and standardized tests. Additional examination must also be given to the traditional areas: socialization, role differentiation, etc.

There is much still to be accomplished, and a tremendous amount of material yet to be collected. With minorities already comprising a considerable portion of the population in America, it is only natural that schools reflect this increase. By the 21st century minorities will outnumber whites in our schools, where curriculum and policy were formulated to meet the needs of the white population.

---

[13]Bernard Sklar, "Needed: A Sociologist for the School," Intellect (October 1973): 50-52.

The curriculum will have to be re-evaluated in light of the needs of the changing school population. Those policies that guided the school system will have to be reformulated and rewritten so that the schools will be responsive to and reflect the various cultural changes that will occur in American cities.

These changes in curriculum and policy are substantial, but they are only a portion of the task that lay ahead. The student sub-culture will be drastically different because of the many different nationalities co-mingling; student to student interaction must be analyzed.

Being a teacher will become an even more interesting occupation. The teacher of the future, who may have been accustomed to teaching white dominated classes, will be faced with classes where minorities form the majority. The teacher will need to be sensitive and responsive to a variety of nationalities.

These areas for further research are the ones that have been a concern for all sociologists of education. In the future, however, the practitioners of the field will be dealing with a multi-cultural, no longer merely a white dominated, educational system. The system must be responsive to the needs that will be reflected. This will be the task for future practitioners in the field of sociology of education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Reports

Brookover, Wilbur B.; Paterson, Ann; and Thomas, Shailer.
     Self Concept of Ability and School Achievement. U.S.
     Office of Education Cooperative Research Project,
     Number 845. East Lansing, Michigan, Michigan State
     University: Office of Research and Publications, 1962.

Brookover, Wilbur B.; LePere, Jean M.; Hamachek, Don E.;
     Thomas, Shailer; and Erickson, Edsel L. Self Concept
     of Ability and School Achievement II. U.S. Office of
     Education Cooperative Research Project, Number 1636.
     East Lansing, Michigan, Michigan State University:
     Office of Research and Publications, 1965.

Brookover, Wilbur B.; Erickson, Edsel L.; and Joiner, Lee
     M. Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement
     III. Third Report on the Study of the Relationships
     of Self-Concept and Achievement and Final Report on
     Cooperative Research Project No. 2831 entitled
     Relationship of Self-Concept to Achievement in High
     School. East Lansing, Michigan, Michigan State
     University: Human Learning Research Institute,
     February 1967.

Brookover, Wilbur B.; Beady, Charles; Flood, Patricia;
     Schweitzer, John; and Wainbaker, Joe. Schools Can
     Make a Difference as Indicated by a Study of
     Elementary School Social Systems and School Outcomes.
     East Lansing, Michigan, Michigan State University:
     College of Urban Development, n.d.

Brookover, Wilbur B.; Gigliotti, Richard J.; Henderson,
     Ronald D.; and Schneider, Jeffery M. Elementary
     School Social Environment and School Achievement.
     Final Report of Cooperative Research Project No. 1-E-
     107. East Lansing, Michigan, Michigan State
     University: College of Urban Development, July 1973.

Brookover, Wilbur B.; Ferderbar, Joseph; Gay, Geneva;
     Middleton, Mildred; Posner, George; and Roebuck,
     Flora. Measuring and Attaining the Goals of
     Education. Alexandria, Virginia: Association for
     Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1980.

94

Riotto-Hacklenbroach, Jeannine M. Ethnicity and Level of
     Occupational Aspiration Among High School Seniors.
     Ed.D. Dissertation, Loyola University, Chicago,
     January, 1980.

Articles

Brookover, Wilbur B. "Sociology of Education: A
     Definition." American Sociological Review 14 (June
     1949):407-415.

_____. "The Social Role of Teachers and Pupil
     Achievement. American Sociological Review 8 (August
     1943):389-393.

_____. "The Implications of Social Class Analysis for
     a Social Theory of Education." Education Theory 1
     (August 1951).

_____. "American Needs in New Social Class Theory
     of Education." The Education Digest 17 (November
     1951).

_____. "Teachers and the Stratification of American
     Society." Educational Digest 19 (1954):3-6.

Brookover, Wilbur B.; Shailer, Thomas; and Peterson, Ann.
     "Self-Concept of Ability and School Achievement."
     Sociology of Education 37 (1964):271-278.

Durkheim, Emile, translated by Sherwood D. Fox. "Sociology
     and Education." Education and Sociology. Glencoe,
     Illinois: The Free Press, 1956.

Floud, Jean and Halsey, A.H. "The Sociology of Education
     (with Special Reference to the development of research
     in Western Europe and the United States of America)."
     Current Sociology 7 (1958):165-193.

Gross, Neal. "Some Contributions of Sociology to the Field
     of Education." Harvard Educational Review 29 (Fall
     1959).

Herrington, George Squires. "The Status of Educational
     Sociology Today." The Journal of Educational
     Sociology 21 (November 1947):129-139.

Landis, Judson T. "The Sociology Curriculum and Teacher
     Training." American Sociological Review 12 (February
     1947):113-116.

Miller, S.I. "New Directions for the Sociologist of

Education: Theory, Policymaking and
Professionalization." Madrid: Consejo Superior De
Investigaciones Cientificas, Institute De Sociologia,
"Jaime Balmes", 1976.

Miranda, Evelina Ortega. "Introduction to Educational
Foundations." Educational Theory 24 (Summer 1974).

Tozer, Steve and McAnich, Stuart. "Social Foundations of
Education in Historical Perspective." Educational
Foundations (Fall 1986):5-32.

Znaniecki, Florian. "The Scientific Function of Sociology
of Education." Educational Theory 1 (August 1951):69-
78.

Books

Adler, Mortimer J. and Mayer, Milton. The Revolution in
Education. Chicago, Illinois: The University of
Chicago Press, 1958.

Anspach, Charles L. (Ph.D.) and Congdon, Wray H. (Ph.D.).
Problems in Educational Sociology. New York,
Cincinnati, Chicago, Boston, Atlanta, Dallas, San
Francisco: American Book Company, 1935.

Ashley, Brian J.; Cohen, Harry; and Slatter, Roy G. An
Introduction to the Sociology of Education. London:
MacMillan & Co., LTD, 1971.

Ballantine, Jeanine H. The Sociology of Education: A
Systematic Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:
Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1983.

Banks, Olive. The Sociology of Education. New York:
Schocken Books, 1968.

Besag, Frank P. and Nelson, Jack L. The Foundations of
Education: Stasis and Change. New York: Random House,
1984.

_____. Sociological Perspectives in Education: Models
for Analysis. New York, Toronto, London, Tel Aviv:
Ritman Publishing Corporation, 1970.

Boocock, Sarane Spence. Sociology of Education: An
Introduction (Second Edition). Boston: Houghton
Mifflin Company, 1980.

Boone, Richard G. Education in the United States: Its
History From the Earliest Settlements. Freeport, New

York: Books for Libraries Press, 1971 (reprint).

Bowen, James. A History of Western Education: Vol. Two - Civilizations of Europe Sixth to Sixteenth Century. New York: St. Martins Press, 1975.

Boyce, Eugene Maxwell. The Coming Revolution in Education: Basic Education and the New Theory of Schooling. New York, London: University Press of America, 1983.

Brembeck, Cole S. Social Foundations of Education: Environmental Influences in Teaching and Learning (Second Edition). New York, London, Sydney, Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1971.

Brim, Orville G., Jr. Sociology and the Field of Education. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1958.

Brickman, William W., Ph.D. Educational Roots and Routes in Western Europe. Cherry Hill, NJ: Emeritus, Inc. Publisher, 1985.

Brookover, Wilbur B. and Gottlieb, David. A Sociology of Education (Second Edition). New York: American Book Company, 1964.

Brookover, Wilbur B. and Erickson, Edsel L. Society, Schools, and Learning. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1969.

Brown, Francis J. Educational Sociology (Second Edition). New York: Greenwood Press, Publishers, 1954.

Chilicott, John M., Greenberg, Norman C., and Wilson, Herbert B (Eds.). Readings in the Socio-Cultural Foundations of Education. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1968.

Cole, William E. and Cox, Roy L. Social Foundations of Education. New York: American Book Company, 1968.

Cook, Lloyd Allen and Cook, Elaine Forsyth. A Sociological Approach to Education (Third Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1960.

Corwin, Ronald G. A Sociology of Education: Emerging Patterns of Class, Status, and Power in the Public Schools. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Division of Meredith Publishing Company, 1965.

_____. Education in Crisis: A Sociological Analysis of Schools and Universities in Transition. New York,

London, Sydney, Toronto: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,
1974.

Cowell, F.R.   <u>Values in Human Society: The Contributions of
Pitirim A. Sorokin to Sociology</u>.   F. Porter Sargent:
An Extending Horizons Book, 1970.

Counts, George S.   <u>The Social Foundations of Education</u>.
New York, Chicago, Boston, Atlanta, San Francisco,
Dallas: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.

Cremin, Lawrence A.; Shannon, David A.; and Torousens,
Mary Ellen.   <u>A History of Teachers College, Columbia
University</u>.   New York: Columbia University Press,
1954.

Demaine, Jack.   <u>Contemporary Theories in the Sociology of
Education</u>.   London and Basingstoke: The MacMillan
Press, LTD, 1981.

Durkheim, Emile.   <u>The Rules of Sociolgial Method</u>,
translated by Sarah A. Salovay and John H. Mueller,
edited by George E.G. Catlin.   New York: The Free
Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.,
1966.

Edgar, Earl E.   <u>Social Foundations of Education</u>.   New York:
The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc.,
1965.

Egan, Kieras and Nadaner, Dan (Eds.).   <u>Imagination and
Education</u>.   New York and London: Teachers College,
Columbia University, 1988.

Fenton, Steve with Reiner, Robert and Hamnett, Ian.
<u>Durkheim and Modern Sociology</u>.   Cambridge: Cambridge
University Press, 1984.

Fox, Sherwood D. (translator).   <u>Emile Durkheim: Education
and Sociology</u>.   Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press,
1956.

Freund, Julien.   <u>The Sociology of Max Weber</u>.   New York:
Paantheon Books, A Division of Random House, 1968.

Giddens, Anthony.   <u>Emile Durkheim</u>.   Edited by Frank
Kiermode.   New York: The Viking Press, 1978.

Giddens, Anthony (Ed.).   <u>Emile Durkheim: Selected Writings</u>.
Cambridge: University Press, 1972.

Glazer, Nathan.   <u>Ethnic Dilemmas 1964-1982</u>.   Cambridge,

Massachusetts and London, England: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Goode, William J.; Furstenberg, Frank F., Jr.; and Mitchell, Larry R. (Eds.). <u>Willard Waller: On the Family, Education, and War</u>. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Gutek, Gerald L. <u>Education in the United States: An Historical Perspective</u>. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1986.

Hall, Raymond L. <u>Ethnic Autonomy-Comparative Dynamics: The Americas, Europe and the Developing World</u>. New York: Pergamon Press, Inc., 1979.

Hansen, Donald A. and Gerstl, Joel E. (Eds.). <u>On Education: Sociological Perspectives</u>. New York, London, Sydney: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1967.

Havighurst, Robert J. and Levine, Daniel U. <u>Society and Education</u>. Boston, London, Sydney, Toronto: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979.

Havighurst, Robert J. and Neugarten, Bernice L. <u>Society and Education</u> (Second Edition). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1962.

Hilgard, Ernest R. (Ed.). <u>Theories of Learning Instruction Part 1: Perspectives on the Relationship Between Learning Theory and Educational Practice</u>. Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Honigsheim, Paul. <u>On Max Weber</u>. Translated by Joan Rytine, Michigan State University. London: Collier-MacMillan Limited; New York: The Free Press; East Lansing; Michigan: Michigan State University, 1968.

Jensen, DeLamar. <u>Renaissance Europe: Age of Recovery and Reconciliation</u>. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company, 1981.

Jensen, Gale Edw. <u>Educational Sociology: An Approach to its Development as a Practical Field of Study</u>. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.

Kasler, Dirk. <u>Max Weber: An Introduction to his Life and Work</u>. Cambridge: Polity Press in Association with Basil Blackwell, 1988.

Kazamias, Andreas M. (Ed.). <u>Herbert Spencer on Education</u>.

New York, Teachers College, Columbia University:
Teachers College Press, 1966.

Kerr, Anthony. <u>Schools of Europe</u>. Court Place -
Westminister and Maryland: The Canterbury Press, 1961.

Kettler, David; Meja, Valker, Stehr, Nico. <u>Karl Manneheim</u>.
Chickester: Ellis Horwood Limited; and London and New
York: Tavistock Publications Limited, 1984.

Kimball, Elsa Pevorly, Ph.D. <u>Sociology and Education: An
Analysis of the Theories of Spencer and Ward</u>. New
York: Columbia University Press, 1932.

King, Edmund J. <u>Education and Development in Western
Europe</u>. Reading, Massachusetts, Menlo Park,
California, London, Dan Mills, Ontario: Addison-Wesley
Publishing Company, 1969.

LaCapra, Dominick. <u>Emile Durkheim: Sociologist and
Philosopher</u>. Chicago and London: The University of
Chicago Press, 1972, 1985.

Lachmann, L.M. <u>The Legacy of Max Weber</u>. Berkeley: The
Glendessary Press, 1971.

Lawson, Robert F.; Rust, Val D.; and Shafer, Susanne M.
(Eds.). <u>Education and Social Concern: An Approach to
Social Foundations</u>. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Prakken
Publications, 1987.

Loader, Colin. <u>The Intellectual Development of Karl
Mannheim: Culture, Politics, and Planning</u>. Cambridge,
Melbourne, Sydney, London, New York, New Rochelle:
Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Lucas, Christopher J. <u>Foundations of Education: Schooling
and the Social Order</u>. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey:
Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1984.

Lukes, Steven. <u>Emile Durkheim, His Life and Work: A
Historical and Critical Study</u>. New York: Harper &
Row, Publishers, 1972.

Mannheim, Karl and Steward, W.A.C. <u>An Introduction to the
Sociology of Education</u>. London: Routledge & Kegan
Paul, 1962.

Maynes, Mary Jo. <u>Schooling in Western Europe: A Social
History</u>. Albany: State University of New York Press,
1985.

Merton, Robert K.; Bloom, Leonard; and Cattrall, Leonard
    S., Jr. (Eds.). Sociology Today: Problems and
    Prospects. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959.

Miller, Steven I. An Introduction to the Sociology of
    Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman
    Publishing Company, Inc., 1977.

Mills, D. Quinn. Not Like Our Parents: How the Baby Boom
    Generation is Changing America. New York: William
    Morrow and Company, Inc., 1987.

Mitzman, Arthur. The Iron Cate: An Historical
    Interpretation of Max Weber. New York: Alfred A.
    Knopf, Inc., 1969.

Moorish, Ivor. The Sociology of Education: An
    Introduction. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1978.

Mulhern, James A. A History of Education: A Social
    Interpretation (Second Edition). New York: The Ronald
    Press, 1959.

Nisbet, Robert. The Sociology of Emile Durkheim. New York:
    Oxford University Press, 1974.

Ottaway, A.K.C., introduction by W.O. Lester Smith.
    Education and Society: An Introduction to the
    Sociology of Education. London: Routledge & Kegan
    Paul L.T.D., 1953.

Pardius, Ann Parker and Pardius, Robert J. The Sociology
    of Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-
    Hall, Inc., 1978.

Pavalka, Ronald M. (Ed.). Sociology of Education: A Book
    of Reading. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock
    Publishers, Inc., 1968.

Payne, E. George, Ph.D. (Ed.). Readings in Educational
    Sociology, Vol. 1. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc.,
    1932.

Peel, J.D.Y. Herbert Spencer, The Evolution of a
    Sociologist. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers,
    1971.

Persell, Caroline Hodges. Education and Inequality: A
    Theoretical and Empirical Synthesis. New York: The
    Free Press, A Division of Macmillan Publishing Co.,
    Inc., 1977.

Pritchard, Keith W. and Buxton, Thomas H. Concepts and Theories in Sociology of Education. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1973.

Reavis, George H., Ph.D. Factors Controlling Attendance in Rural Schools. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1920.

Reitman, Sanford W. Education, Society, and Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1981.

Ringer, Fritz K. Education and Society in Modern Europe. Bloomington and London: Indiana University Press, 1979.

Rothrock, George A. and Jones, Tom B. Europe: A Brief History (Revised and expanded Second Edition). Chicago: Rand McNally College Pub. Co., 1975.

Roucek, Joseph S. and Associates. Sociological Foundations of Education: A Textbook in Educational Sociology. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1942.

Rubin, Louis (Ed.). The Future of Education: Perspectives on Tomorrow's Schooling. Boston, London, Sydney: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.

_____ (Ed.). Educational Reform for a Changing Society: Anticipating Tomorrow's Schools. Research for Better Schools, Inc. Boston, London, Sydney: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.

Rugg, Harold and Withers, William. Social Foundations of Education. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955.

Rumney, Jay. Herbert Spencer's Sociology. New York: Atherton Press, 1966.

Scarr, Sandra. Race, Social Class, and Individual Differences in I.Q. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 1981.

Schermerhorn, R.A. Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research. New York: Random House, Inc., 1970.

Scimercca, Joseph A. Education and Society. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

Sorokin, Pitirim A. Sociological Theories of Today. New York and London: Harper and Row Publishers, 1966.

Spencer, Herbert, introduction by Talcott Parsons. The Study of Sociology. Ann Arbor: Ann Arbor Paperbacks, The University of Michigan Press, 1966.

Stub, Holger R. (Ed.). The Sociology of Education: A Sourcebook (Third Edition). Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1975.

Swift, D.F. Basic Readings in the Sociology of Education. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1973.

Thompson, James Westfall; Palm, Franklin Charles; and Van Nostrand, John J. European Civilization: A Political, Social and Cultural History. New York: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., Third Printing, 1946.

Timasheff, Nicholas S. Sociological Theory: Its Nature and Growth (Third Edition). New York: Random House, 1967.

Vaigey, John. Education. London and Basingstake: Macmillan Press, L.T.D., 1971.

Van Scotter, Richard D.; Haas, John D.; Kraft, Richard J.; and Schott, James C. Social Foundations of Education (Second Edition). Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1985.

Wacker, R. Fred. Ethnicity, Pluralism, and Race: Race Relations Theory in America Before Myrdal. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, A Division of Congressional Information Service, Inc., 1983.

Waller, Willard, Ph.D. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: Russell and Russell, 1961.

Webb, Eugene J.; Campbell, Donald T.; Schwartz, Richard D.; and Sechast, Lee. Unobtrusive Measures: Nonreactive Research in the Social Sciences. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company, 1966.

Westby-Gibson, Dorothy. Social Foundations of Education. New York: The Free Press, 1967.

Werstler, Richard Emerson. The Schools of Europe. Adrian, Michigan: Svenk-Tuttle Press, 1967.

Wexler, Philip. Social Analysis of Education: After the New Sociology. London, New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1987.

White, John Ponsford. The Aims of Education Restated. London, Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982.

Wolff, Kurt H. (Ed.). Emile Durkheim. Waltham, SU,
     Massachusetts: Brandeis University, 1960.

Zimmerman, Carle C. Sorokin, The Worlds Greatest
     Sociologist: His Life and Ideas on Social Time and
     Change. Saskatron, Saskatchewan, Canada: The University
     of Saskatchewan, 1968.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by William P. Fegan has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Steven I. Miller, Director
Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Marcel Fredericks
Professor, Sociology, Loyola

Dr. John A. Wozniak
Professor Emeritus, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Joan K. Smith
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies and Associate Dean, Graduate School, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

March 30, 1992

_____
Date

Steven I. Miller, Ph.D.

_____
Director's Signature