Kornhauser, James Coleman, and Charles Tilly. Furthermore, rather than the key agents involved in the militarization of social research being either rabid conservatives or academic mercenaries, she emphasizes that many of them had high ideals about the value of applied research and were vitally committed to democratic principles, often working within a pragmatist tradition. The most striking figure here is Robert Boguslaw, who played a central role in elaborating Project Camelot yet was an idealist who believed passionately in the expert as "scientific crusader for participatory democracy" (p. 39) and after moving to Washington University in St. Louis increasingly indulged his interest in existentialist philosophy. Rohde thus demonstrates the general enthusiasm which many American social scientists had for contributing to a militarized American political mission in a way that would be unimaginable in most nations and indeed that proved untenable in the aftermath of the Vietnam War protests.

Rohde's fascinating account rarely strays from an institutional history. It would have been interesting for her to have extended her interests into the intellectual cross-fertilization between the military and the social sciences, for instance through tracing the scientific debate about the causes of revolution and insurgency, which were a key point of contact in the 1960s, or in the debate about quantification and humanist approaches to social research (as figured notably in the writings of C. Wright Mills, who gets surprisingly little coverage here). It would have been useful to have explored how cultural anthropology's interests in "national character," which proved so significant in the 1940s, were reworked and adapted in later decades, for instance as part of the country-specific handbooks that were prepared as part of psychological warfare strategies in the 1970s (p. 127). Immanuel Wallerstein's related discussions of the development of area studies in the postwar American social sciences are certainly relevant to the analysis here, as are George Steinmetz's reflections on the significance of positivist methods, but readers will need to draw these links for themselves. However, there is no doubt that Joy Rohde has performed sterling service in this thorough and detailed book that will be a valuable building block for further critical reflections on the role of the social sciences in projects of governance.

The Allure of Order: High Hopes, Dashed Expectations, and the Troubled Quest to Remake American Schooling. By Jal Mehta. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. vii+396. $29.95.

Ethan Schrum
University of Virginia

In *The Allure of Order*, Jal Mehta has written a big, wide-ranging book that offers many things to many audiences. Scholars of history, political science, and sociology will find material of interest, which is appropriate since the book is published in the Oxford University Press Studies in

Postwar American Political Development series. *The Allure of Order* will also appeal to educational researchers and practitioners through both its analytical material and the prescriptions for the future of American education that its final chapters offer.

After introductory and methodological chapters, the book considers three episodes during the 20th century in which reformers attempted to rationalize American schools. Chapter 3, "Taking Control from Above: The Rationalization of Schooling in the Progressive Era," mostly recapitulates findings of classic works on the history of American education. Chapter 4, "The Forgotten Standards Movement," recovers "nascent accountability efforts of the 1960s and 1970s [that] provided the bridge from the district-level rationalization of the Progressive Era to the state and federal accountability movements of the contemporary period" (p. 65). A key factor was the Coleman Report of 1966, which shifted policy attention from inputs of schooling to outputs of schooling. In its wake, a new generation of educational reformers offered a "production-function view" (p. 68) of schooling and became enamored with the possible application to educational management of systems analysis and planning, programming, and budgeting systems (PPBS), technocratic tools developed in the RAND Corporation and the U.S. Department of Defense. Surprisingly, Mehta says nothing about former RAND staffer Alexander Mood, the federal official who hired James Coleman to write the famous report. This chapter is an important contribution, though Mehta oversimplifies in claiming that this "forgotten standards movement" reflected a scientific management that was "in basic form . . . largely unchanged" (p. 75) from Taylorism in the Progressive Era, overlooking the alterations that Stephen P. Waring has traced (*Taylorism Transformed: Scientific Management Theory since 1945* [University of North Carolina Press, 1991]).

The heart of the book is chapters 5–8, which aim to explain how standards-based reform and accountability politics triumphed in American education after 1990, first at the state level and then at the federal. Chapter 5 traces the "long shadows" (p. 84) of *A Nation at Risk*, the infamous 1983 report that proclaimed a "rising tide of mediocrity" (p. 87) in American education; Mehta concludes that its greatest lasting impact came from how its authors defined the problem. Positioning his work in the literature on social scientific analysis of how problem definitions get set in policy making, Mehta argues that the construction of the report suggests a "selective synthesis, or bricolage" perspective on problem setting. In so doing, he "seeks to balance structure and agency" (p. 86). The new problem definition launched by *A Nation at Risk* held that the purpose of education was to be "a tool of economic development" (p. 99). This framing "enduringly increased the agenda status of schooling, drawing in more powerful political and business elites for whom improving the quality of schooling was now a central concern" (p. 98). One indicator of this shift is that the percentage of governors' state-of-the-state speeches devoted to education leaped after 1983.

Chapter 6, "A 'Semiprofession' in an Era of Accountability," draws on the sociology of professions to "explain the movement toward educational standards and accountability" (p. 118). Mehta argues that teaching has never achieved full professional status and has been a semiprofession at best. Moreover, the teaching profession has lost status since the 1960s, partially due to a general decline in status among all professions, but partially because of the rising power of teachers' unions and their adoption of "industrial-style bargaining" (p. 150). The latter trend has reduced teachers' "moral power" (p. 33), a theoretical concept Mehta has developed with Harvard colleague Christopher Winship. The resulting diminished public trust in teachers, Mehta says, has made American education more vulnerable to rationalizing reforms. The trends in teacher unionization "further institutionalized teachers as labor rather than as professionals ready to control their own sphere" (p. 6). In making this argument, and particularly by highlighting developments in the 1960s, he correctly downplays the claim that neoliberalism has been the primary force behind accountability movements in education and elsewhere. While this sociology of professions approach has promise, it does not yet explain the rationalization of schooling, since he provides no direct evidence of specific situations in which a lack of trust in teachers motivated policy makers' advocacy of standards and testing.

Mehta then turns from the "macro account" of chapters 5 and 6 "to a micro account of why specific policies were selected in particular legislative contexts" (p. 155)—namely, the case study states of Maryland, Michigan, and Utah, which have distinct political environments. He explores how standards-based reform became the preferred policy "enacted in 42 states before federal legislation began to encourage it in 1994 and in 49 states before it became required under No Child Left Behind in 2001" (p. 156). Mehta's detailed examination of state-level activity deepens our understanding of the road to No Child Left Behind, moving beyond the primarily federal-level accounts provided by Patrick J. McGuinn (*No Child Left Behind and the Transformation of Federal Education Policy, 1965–2005* [University Press of Kansas, 2006]) and Jesse H. Rhodes (*An Education in Politics: The Origin and Evolution of No Child Left Behind* [Cornell University Press, 2012]).

Despite this accomplishment, historians might question parts of Mehta's account due to the lack of documentation for sources. He states that he "examined several thousand pages of documents from state libraries and archives" (p. 297), yet he does not once cite a specific archive as the source of a document. This practice is especially troublesome in his account of standards-based reform in Maryland, where he quotes two memoranda for which he provides no archival location. Another quibble is that Mehta does not consider the influence of other large-scale historical changes, such as the changing demographics of American schoolchildren and increasing cultural conflict, on the rise of schools as an important national political issue and on rationalization as a favorite technique for improving them.