As one works his way through Corry's addresses, it becomes increasingly clear that the author, rather like a Canadian Fichte, is speaking less to scholars than to the broad public. Like the early nineteenth century German philosopher, he lectures the nation on the relationship between society and education. Maintaining the view that the contemporary university has shed its ivory tower casing, thus necessitating a redefining of university-community relations, he sets out to re-educate the public in its new role before the university.

His major thesis is that the present century has seen the university wrenched from its private moorings and thrust into the mainstream of society. No longer does the university practice an institutional form of rugged individualism, given to serving its own ends and paying little or no heed to the larger problems of society. No longer are the universities cozy institutions serving a select clientele and operating on the periphery of daily life. Universities have submitted in spirit to the right of eminent domain. In short, they have become institutions of public interest.

And although universities as institutions of public interest have a duty to serve their benefactor, it does not follow, reasons Corry, that they must kow tow to every whim of society. Universities must have freedom to make their own decisions and manage their own affairs within the larger context of societal goals. The unique and paradoxical role of the modern university in a democratic state is demonstrated by the fact that while the institution depends heavily on the public for moral and financial support, it has a continuing responsibility to criticize society. One wonders whether the university can both be principal and agent in the educational enterprise.

Roger Magnuson
McGill University

H.H. McAshan.
WRITING BEHAVIORAL OBJECTIVES:
A NEW APPROACH.
New York: Harper and Row, 1970. 116 pp. $2.50.

The title of this little book suggested that it might be quite useful to the teacher educator. I looked forward to something like Pipe's *Practical Programming* — a small "how to do it" text (but with a respectable amount of theory) that would fit into a flexible course in Educational Psychology and lend itself to realistic exercises for future teachers. In the past I have asked my students to devise, for specific units of work, behavioral objectives and test items following Bloom's *Taxonomy* (or as illustrated in Hedges' *Testing and Evaluation for the Sciences*), and I hoped to find something of the same kind in this book.

I soon found on examining Mr. McAshan's text that he deals chiefly with the formulation of objectives at the macro level, that is, for general curriculum and system-wide units. Perhaps examples of the kind of objectives he is concerned with will illustrate the point:

"To develop the ability of seventh-grade students to measure lengths in metric system and other standards as measured by a written teacher-made test in which 75% of the students measure correctly 8 out of 10 objects using two different standards for each object" (p. 42).

"To increase the learning achievement in word study skills of second grade students as measured by the Primary I Battery of the Stanford Achievement Test for Word Study Skills on which 90% of the students score at grade level or above" (p. 48).

Mr. McAshan is concerned, quite rightly, that objectives be written very specifically. Through a rather

elaborate framework he introduces us to what he calls communication checks, which are devices to ensure that the reader will know from the phrasing of an objective exactly who is the learner, what behavioral change may be expected, and the implied behavioral domain according to Bloom's *Taxonomy*. As may be seen from the examples given, he is also concerned with clear statements of evaluative techniques and criteria for success. The kinds of statements his technique produces are, I believe, very useful in the first step in curriculum design, that is, for drawing up main or overall objectives. On the other hand he appears to offer little help when it comes to reducing "developing ability" and "increasing learning achievement" to specific objectives at the level of the individual lesson or activity. There are, nevertheless, many useful points made in passing, such as on the relationship between needs and goals, the dangers of rigidity that may accompany behavioral objectives, and the difficulties that ensue if procedures are incorporated into the statements of objectives.

My chief criticism of the book, and it is a major one, concerns the way in which it is written. It is supposedly designed in light of "several learning strategies usually associated with programmed instruction." If this is so, I would hesitate to place it in the hands of students in whom I hope to nurture a positive, or at least open, attitude towards programmed instruction for certain phases of education. Mr. McAshan introduces us to a veritable thicket of jargon in Chapter Two and it requires infinite patience to hang on as he gradually develops our comprehension of these terms in subsequent chapters. I question the placement of the "evaluative measures" at the beginning of each chaper, and particularly the format for those heading Chapter One, which begin thus: "Quality education refers to the effectiveness of any educational program in meeting its own ...." If this was designed to convince me that I needed to read the chapter, there was no problem! In any case, on the next page I found the sentence with the three words I should learn: "Quality education refers to the effectiveness of any educational program in meeting its own specifically defined objectives."

Having worked my way through the book, I am not convinced that I really need to clutter my mind with terms such as "specific non-instructional objectives" and "minimum level behavioral objectives" in order to understand and, hopefully, remember the points the author is making. These may be useful to the researcher and curriculum specialist, but I fear it is the kind of thing that would defeat my purpose in working with teachers in training or with experienced teachers in worshop situations. I do not mean that what Mr. McAshan is saying is not worthwhile; I just wish he could have said it in a simpler and more graceful manner. Perhaps it is egoism or inappropriate self-confidence, but I feel I could accomplish in lectures and discussions the same objective, but without the elaborate terminology. However, I must admit that my ideas, and certainly my repertoire of examples, have been enriched by having worked my way, in spite of irritation, through this book.

Gerald McKay
McGill University

William Oliver Martin.
REALISM IN EDUCATION.
New York: Harper and Row.
1969.
198 pp. $2.95.

This is an outstanding book and is perhaps the only work of its kind which uses an analytic, as well as what the author calls a