

migrants, another laboring situation, or in an inner-city setting similar to those in Wright's books" (p. 193). Second term they read *The Jungle*, *The Grapes of Wrath*, *Native Son*, discuss and write papers about them in the light of their own recent experience. Besides the impropriety of "playing at" being a migrant-worker, this suggestion has little appeal. A good novel like Steinbeck's can, by itself, make one feel what it was like to live during the Depression; Richard Wright can make one ashamed of how whites have treated blacks. I can neither resurrect the Depression (though some governments seem determined to try) nor change the color of my skin; but then I don't have to appreciate the works in question.

Another danger in the "field-work" approach is that it can lead to an indifference to the less dramatic human problems right at hand in the school environment. How do students treat their classmates or the maintenance staff in their schools? What of the army of filing clerks trapped in the school's administrative structure? All this enthusiasm to get out and experience the real world bypasses the reality of a student's day-to-day living. In my opinion, getting students to reflect on life as they are presently experiencing it can be an effective means of relating subject-matter to needs and interests.

Other authors deal with science and social science in the curriculum, and a mini-dispute arises between those who think that science needs to be enlivened and those who feel the problem lies in how far we've strayed from the tried and true paths. There are a few more bizarre contributions such as that of Gray Dorsey in "A Proposal for a New Division of the Curriculum" who says we must develop "ethicists" to deal with potentialities for technological and social changes, and the suggestion by Feliks Gross in "Thoughts on a Social Science Curriculum" that we can regain our sense of direction in higher education by having colloquia in ethics (p. 272)!

I would not recommend rushing out to buy this book because it fails

to take account fully of the how and why of curricular reform. Little attention is paid to past work on the curriculum (with Dewey as the most glaring omission) and not much is said in detail about the future. No mention is made, for example, of the new methods being developed for presenting the curriculum at Britain's Open University. Finally, not enough effort is spent on clarifying key terms like "experience," "educated," and "learning."

It is disappointing to see so little come out of a conference with such good intentions. Now that the rhetoric has died down on most of our campuses, the time is ripe for a reasoned appraisal of what we're up to. All too often, budgetary constraints, power struggles, or pressure tactics dictate how and what we teach. Our students deserve better. The best response to this book would be for faculty to use it to initiate discussion of the curriculum. If we, from our specialized perspectives, cannot take a broad view of university education, then the very idea of a curriculum of studies as an ordered whole seems laughingly out of date.

Brian Hendley

University of Waterloo and
University of London Institute
of Education

Garnet McDiarmid, ed.
FROM QUANTITATIVE TO
QUALITATIVE CHANGE IN
ONTARIO EDUCATION.
Toronto: OISE, 1976.
190 pp. \$6.00.

A retirement present may be a gold watch, a rare wine, a rocking chair. When an academic of the stature of Robert W. B. Jackson retires, the occasion is more suitably marked by the publication of a handsome volume of essays dealing with some great cause of education today.

From Quantitative to Qualitative Change in Ontario Education is thoroughly appropriate for this purpose. Only six dollars, it is one of the best buys available for, after suitably flattering remarks, each scholar con-

tributes one of his favorite themes. Most of the analysis is lucid, precise and well-documented and, collectively, the essays form a perceptive comment on education for any industrial society.

George Flower provides important background on the organization of OISE, its role within the Province, the need for still more graduate work in education and the growing co-operation among Ontario institutions. John W. Holland places demographic and economic factors and their political interpretations into perspective. William E. Alexander outlines OISE and Toronto examples of a problem central to Canadian education: goals are vague, so programs are of necessity disjointed, contradictory and non-cumulative. (The OECD *Review of National Policies for Education: Canada*, Paris: OECD, 1976, Chapter VII makes the same point very strongly). Judging from the examples reviewed by Alexander, the "solutions" proposed are imperfect still. In another essay, Jack Quarters analyzes youth culture(s) in confluence with the expectations of society and institutions, thereby clarifying some of the problems raised by Alexander. Unfortunately his account is too brief to develop major implications of "achievement" and the need for understanding between "hip" and "non hip" Canadians. Clive Beck reviews some of the dilemmas of relating education to basic human values and concludes that more should be done. In his chapter, "Trends in Society and Trends in Curriculum," Garnet McDiarmid picks up this thread and several others — like Harvey's democratization and Holland's aims. This final chapter proves to be one of the most incisive in the book.

The collection would be strengthened by attention to psychology and to more explicit analysis of the costs of qualitative rather than quantitative education. Initially, there is some repetition and the book would be more useful if it had an index, but readers will be indebted to its authors for their review of the literature and overall perspective. The book deserves to sell.

Douglas Ray
University of Western Ontario

**Thomas L. Good, Bruce J. Biddle,
and Jere E. Brophy.**
**TEACHERS MAKE A
DIFFERENCE.**
New York:
Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
271 pp. \$9.15.

We have seen that schools and teachers do have differential effects upon cognitive and non-cognitive student growth, even when relevant student characteristics such as IQ, SES or previous performance level are controlled. There are even limited stability data to show that some teachers retain their relative effectiveness during consecutive years. Clearly, some schools and teachers do make a measurable difference. Thus, the conclusion that schools or teachers have no effect on student growth is a fallacious overreaction to inappropriate data.

This introductory paragraph to the final chapter of this book by three highly regarded students of classroom life is an accurate assessment of the work they present in their book. It is comforting to educators to have seemingly obvious facts re-stated in the context of a careful examination of a wide range of research studies.

Educators have become accustomed to reading in their professional journals and texts that researchers have been unable to say anything of much practical value about the effectiveness of schools or teachers. The general public were then told about the overall lack of effectiveness of schools by Silberman, Holt and others. Finally, major government sponsored research such as the Coleman *Report* told policy-makers that schools made little difference in adult lives. The results have been serious: cut-backs in educational funding, less prestige for the profession and demands for accountability.

The focus of the book is to examine research which demonstrates how teachers vary in their influence on pupils. The ground is prepared for this task by examining the positions and research methods of the