Another direction the intrapsychic change may take in a political translation is action on behalf of men who have been oppressed and beaten down: the majority of homeless are men; the majority of those in prisons are men of color; the majority of those in detox centers are men; AIDS kills disproportionately more men than women. However, both Keen's and Bly's central contextual metaphor is the Earth—the psychological and spiritual alienation of men from the earth. Hopefully, a sense of husbandry, particularly in the face of the remorseless destruction of its beauty, may draw many more initiated, fierce gentlemen into environmental wars against developers, toxic waste producers, nuclear power plant advocates, and other anti-earth types.

These two works represent a preliminary stage in what may be a profoundly significant and healthy change within our culture, arguing eloquently for a paradigm of masculinity that is considerably different from both the traditional stereotype and from the more recent "male-as-perpetrator" model. This paradigm provides researchers in educational foundations, e.g., researchers examining the school as institutionalized role socialization, with a language and a conceptual network that brings into focus dimensions of masculinity unavailable to date, and particularly to the ongoing discourse on gender. Some would dismiss the assertion of positive manhood as self-serving and avoidant of the guilt and moral responsibility men should feel for what they have done. So be it. If men are to move toward a fuller and deeper meaning of themselves, ostensibly an aim of education, guilt is but part of the landscape; it is not where they are going.

Education and the Social Sciences

Understanding Schools: The Foundations of Education. Gary Clabaugh and Edward Rozycki. New York: Harper & Row, 1990. Pp. 655.

PATRICK M. SOCOSKI
Westchester University

Understanding Schools: The Foundations of Education is adventurous—in terms of its sheer size (twenty-one chapters comprising 655

pages); and in what it attempts to do for the student. In a foreword to the student, the authors state:

> This text in the Foundations of Education is designed to help you gain the competence based on knowledge that is the distinctive characteristic of a learned professional. Only when you have learned to think clearly and systematically about educational issues can you act with the integrity that comes from knowing what you are doing. The alternative is to accept standard formulations from others and simply to do what you are told. And that is hardly ethical when you are dealing with the lives of children and the future of our nation. (p. xviii)

The authors clearly posit lofty goals for the text. They are concerned with promoting the acquisition of the interpretative, normative, and critical perspectives associated with foundational studies. But have they succeeded? That is, will the textbook work to promote their goals?

In answering this question I will address two possible criteria for an effective textbook and make some observations about how well *Understanding Schools* meets these criteria. They are (1.) Does the text acquaint students with topics, issues, and subjects that tend to comprise foundational studies? (Of course, there is disagreement about what "core" studies might be in foundations, as well as about the desirability of a "core" itself. I will assume that foundational studies amount to problems and issues that scholars in the field tend to occupy themselves with.) (2.) Does the text contain adequate pedagogical features to allow students to reach desired learning outcomes? Is the text suitable in a practical way, i.e., can it be used effectively with the target audience under typical learning conditions?

Regarding the first criterion, I have several observations from reading the text and will restrict these to those most salient. The first concerns themes. Throughout the book several themes recur. One is images of the school as temple, a factory, and as a town meeting. In the temple image, schooling is nurturant and formative. The authors note:

> The principal is the moral leader, a high priest. Teachers are clergy. Students are novices being inducted into the order. What is studied is good; what is ignored is ignoble. (p. 41)

This depiction suggests that the school is a "moral community," according to the authors.

Another image of the school is as factory. As in the previous image, basic authority is not questioned. Production is all-important, and

> The principal is Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or Production Manager—"Instructional Leader" to use a term very much in vogue.

> Teachers are workers or supervisors to students being, respectively, raw material or workers. (p. 43)

In this image of the school testing outputs determine success. Infractions are defined in terms of their reducing production, and hence, efficiency.

In the town meeting, we are told to picture the school in political terms. Here the school is a type of

> . . . political marketplace where morals count for little—perhaps, at best, to create confidence about promises. What really matters are knowledge, position, and power. Negotiation is the process by which concerns are dealt with. Appeals to morality or efficiency are just part of this process. (p. 44)

The authors admit that these are idealized types, but that nonetheless schools function in these ways. These quotations suggest something about the tone of the text. It is clear that the authors are encouraging the reader to develop a critical perspective. Elsewhere the authors acquaint the reader with conflict and controversy in education with the same bluntness. They explain that many people believe that there is no place for conflict in the school. Yet conflict serves several functions. Borrowing from Lewis Coser's *The Functions of Social Conflict* (New York: Free Press, 1956), the authors identify ways in which education conflict serves Coser's five basic functions of conflict (connection, definition, revitalization, reconnaissance, and replication) (pp. 84, 85). In this case, as in most others, the authors capably adapt concepts from sociology, organizational theory, and other disciplines associated with foundational studies.

Regarding the second criterion, which addresses the pedagogic adequacy of the text, several observations seem important. In terms of audience, the book is too advanced for a typical freshman class. These learners need basic information before they can develop a critical attitude. For example, the chapter on philosophy of education begins with a critique of the "isms" approach. While the critique is worthwhile and well-grounded in recent literature, I'm afraid it would be beyond many freshmen.

The authors should not be faulted for their ambition. Rozycki and Clabaugh admit that the book will be only partially completed in many courses. Of course, this bothers those who like to reach closure by covering an entire text in a semester. On the pedagogically positive side, the instructor's manual has several sound features. Included is a list of "Distinctions and Analytical Techniques Used." For example, chapter 18, "Learning and Teaching," lists the following: "Learning in School and Out; Generic vs. Multiplex learning; Wittgenstein's elephants; Causal errors in educational thinking; Learnability and Teachability: Criteria; Sum-

mative vs. Ascriptive learning; Telling, Initiation, Training and Nurturing" (Instructor's Manual, p. 1). In addition, the manual contains the following features for each chapter: chapter synopsis, notes to instructor, lead-in questions for the chapter, answer to end-of-chapter questions, test items, suggested activities, and overhead transparency masters.

The authors put much effort into the instructor's manual. This is commendable, given the short shrift additional questions and supplemental exercises are given in foundation texts. Ornstein and Levine's *An Introduction to the Foundations of Education* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Press, 1989) probably comes closest to matching the pedagogic features of *Understanding Schools*.

In conclusion, this book is an ambitious attempt to be a useful foundations text in undergraduate teacher education. Rozycki and Clabaugh have drawn from considerable experience and scholarship in the foundations arena. There are problems with this text, but it is still rare to find an undergraduate foundations text that attempts to do as much as this one does.

Copyright © 2002 EBSCO Publishing