

REFERENCES

- Chapman, P.D. (1988). *Schools as sorters: Lewis M. Terman, applied psychology, and the intelligence testing movement, 1890-1930*. New York: New York University Press.
- Goddard, H.H. (1910). Heredity of feeble-mindedness. *American Breeders Magazine*, 1, 165-178.
- Goddard, H.H. (1912). *The Kallikak family*. New York: Macmillan.
- Goddard, H.H. (1914). *Feeble-mindedness: Its causes and consequences*. New York: Macmillan.
- Gould, S.J. (1981). *The mismeasure of man*. New York: W.W. Norton
- Jensen, A.R. (1969). How much can we boost IQ and scholastic achievement? *Harvard Educational Review*, 39, 1-123.
- Lynn, R. (1990). New evidence on brain size and intelligence: A comment on Rushton and Cain and Vanderwolf. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11 (8), 795-797.
- Mackay, A. (1977). *The harvest of a quiet eye*. Bristol, UK: Institute of Physics.
- Rushton, J.P. (1988). Race differences in behavior: A review and evolutionary analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 9, 1009-1024.
- Rushton, J.P. (1990). Race, brain size and intelligence: A rejoinder to Cain and Vanderwolf. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 11, 785-794.

JOHN C. COLEMAN (EDITOR). *The School Years: Current issues in the socialization of young people (2nd Edition)*. London & New York: Routledge (1992). 209 pp. C\$87.50 cloth; C\$21.50 paper. (ISBN 0-415-06170-9).

In this book, John Coleman presents some of the major issues that affect the socialization of adolescents – these range from moral development and the influence of peer groups to the development of self and juvenile delinquency. Early in the introduction, the editor acknowledges that even though there have been major social changes since the first printing of the book in 1979, many of the issues that affect the socialization of young people have remained the same. Within this context, the seven chapters of the book focus on some of these issues.

The first chapter, written by Coleman himself, examines current perspectives of the adolescent process. In particular, he reviews both psychoanalytic and sociological theories on how young people develop. He then examines the concepts of puberty, cognition, and social relationships. One part of this chapter that is particularly noteworthy is Coleman's description of the "imaginary audience", a term that Elkind (1967) uses to describe the egocentricism characteristic of adolescence.

Peter Kutnick, author of the second chapter, examines the moral development of young people. In reviewing the literature in this area, Kutnick

describes the five types of theories that have had the most impact on the researchers on moral development. These include cognitive developmental theories which see the child as “an active agent and collaborator in the construction of their understanding of morality” (p. 26), social learning theories which view moral development as equivalent to socialization, and psychoanalytic theories which focus on the attachment relationship between children and their parents. In addition to these three broad theory classifications, Kutnick also reviews Relational Theory, which views moral development through the relationships that children have with others, and Cultural Theory, which examines moral development from an anthropological perspective.

Chapter 3, written by Sally Archer, examines gender role learning as a complex process formed in a strong societal context. In particular, she reviews the language concerning sex and gender, why and how gender roles are learned, the impact of socialization agents, and changes recommended for the learning environment. Like the two previous authors in this book, Archer examines her topic from psychoanalytic, social learning, cognitive developmental, and other perspectives.

The fourth chapter, written by Terry Honess, focuses on the development of self and promotes a research approach referred to as the “transactional framework.” According to the author, this framework supports the view that the “self” is to be found not inside people but in their talk. In other words, “social life is seen as the blocking and exercising of personal strengths and the overcoming of, or succumbing to, personal vulnerabilities” (p. 102).

The importance of peer groups is the focus of Phillida Salmon in the fifth chapter. She argues that previous research in this area has in many ways considered young people to be raceless, genderless, and classless – in other words, Salmon contends that research about peer groups needs to examine young people in the wider context of the world at large. She contends that factors such as race, gender, and social class must be taken into account when making wide-sweeping generalizations about the effects of peer groups on the development of young people.

David Farrington, in chapter 6, examines the issue of juvenile delinquency. More specifically, Farrington examines the variety of biological, personality, intelligence, and family factors that lead to delinquency. Following this discussion, the author also considers educational schemes that show promise for lowering delinquency rates in the UK and elsewhere.

Finally, Maurice Chazan, author of the last chapter, analyzes the relationship between home and school. Here, the author briefly covers the different roles and perceptions of parents and teachers, the association between home background and school achievement, the developing role of parents as power-brokers within schools, ways of improving home-school relations, and efforts to effect change in families.

Although all chapters have something to offer, three chapters deserve special attention in this review. Chapter 2, for instance, contains an excellent discussion of a dilemma many of our schools now face; more specifically, Kutnick questions how we can produce students who are strong moral citizens in a political climate that is obsessed with a return to the “basics”. The author contends that it is ironic that within such an educational climate, schools will still be blamed if students do not show concern for others, cannot articulate their feelings, and cannot engage in reflective thinking. Kutnick argues that, given the limited moral education that students are likely to receive in the coming decades, the examples set by teachers will continue to be of paramount importance.

Chapter 3 is also noteworthy although, in my opinion, for less laudable reasons. More specifically, in her attempts to explore gender role learning, Archer presents a limited view of two significant issues – the basis of school textbooks and the public messages sent to young men and women about appropriate role enactment. I contend that Archer’s stand on textbook bias is weak and insupportable. In her words, “textbooks in fields such as history and the sciences continue to be androcentric, exhorting the accomplishments of males and ignoring or giving minimal note to the efforts brought to fruition by females” (p. 73). My experience with recently-published school textbooks in these areas has been quite the opposite; in other words, I have found that in most recent publications, every effort has been made to recognize the accomplishments of women in the past and the present. Few educated people would argue that in the past, women should have been given greater opportunities so that more of them would have reached their full potential. However, if Archer is implying that we rewrite history in order to balance the gender scales, I believe that we would do more harm than good. On this note, I am reminded of the words of Dalhousie philosopher William Hare who, in his book *What Makes a Good Teacher?* (1993) states: “Education includes not only opening our eyes to possibilities but also rubbing our noses in reality” (p. 83). I think that Archer

should be cognizant of this point when she makes her argument about the androcentricity of the books we use in schools.

Another issue that I wish to debate is Archer's contention that societal expectations for males and females have remained constant over time. She maintains that the public message sent by all sides is that "the adult male is to be valued and the successful female must ensnare the best possible catch" (p. 74). Although I agree that the mass media of the 1990s continues to be a major force in promoting traditional gender roles, nowhere in her discussion does Archer acknowledge the positive societal changes that have evolved over the last few decades. Nowhere, for example, does she discuss the current emphasis on directing females into nontraditional professions such as engineering and the sciences. Nowhere does she acknowledge the introduction of mentorship programs that encourage young women to learn from successful female professionals. Finally, nowhere does Archer mention the countless classroom teachers who believe in breaking down traditional stereotypes and do so by continually reminding their female students that they are limited only by their own imaginations. Because of these important omissions, I contend that Archer presents an unbalanced view of gender role learning and the positive changes that have been made over the past few decades.

Perhaps the most engaging chapter in the book is Chapter 6 in which David Farrington makes three important points about juvenile delinquency. First, the author argues that one of the major problems in this area is the difficulty in using legal definitions of delinquency. For example, the boundary between what is legal and illegal is often poorly defined and subjective, as when bullying in school evolves into criminal violence. Furthermore, the legal definitions that rest on the premise of intent, are often difficult to measure reliably and validly and often change over time. The author contends that these factors and others make it difficult to use legal definitions of delinquency to examine this issue.

Second, in his discussion of the personality factors that are believed to contribute to delinquency, Farrington discusses Eysenck's (1977) theory which views delinquency as essentially rational behaviour which is inversely related to the strength of peoples' consciences. In other words, Eysenck argues that delinquents tend to be those who do not build up strong consciences; moreover, he predicts that those who score high on measures of extroversion, neuroticism, and psychoticism are those most

likely to have the weakest consciences and, therefore, most likely to be delinquents. Studies conducted by Farrington and others have shown that Eysenck's theory has some utility in predicting which individuals will eventually become delinquents.

Finally, Farrington advances his own theory of delinquency which integrates many of the previous theories reviewed in this area. Farrington proposes that "the major factors fostering anti-social tendencies are impulsivity, a poor ability to manipulate abstract concepts, low empathy, a weak conscience, internalized norms and attitudes favouring delinquency, and long-term motivating influences such as the desire for material goods or status with peers" (p. 151). Farrington concludes his argument by stating that short-term situational influences such as boredom, frustration, alcohol consumption, and opportunities to offend are often factors that determine if anti-social tendencies are translated into delinquent acts.

Overall, *The School Years: Current Issues in the Socialization of Young People*, edited by John C. Coleman, provides a well-rounded overview of some of the major issues concerning adolescent development. Although some chapters present stronger arguments than others, most are engaging and all selections provide a useful summary of the competing theories that have been advanced in the study of the socialization of young people.

DAVID MANDZUK *University of Manitoba*

REFERENCE

Hare, W. (1993). *What makes a good teacher: Reflections on some characteristics central to the educational enterprise*. London, ON: The Althouse Press.

R. J. STERNBERG & R. K. WAGNER (EDS.) *Mind in Context*.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
245 pp., ISBN 0-521-41114-9.

Whenever psychologists gather to talk about intelligence, Charles Spearman is listening at the door. Spearman (1863-1945) found that many different mental tests correlate with one another, and argued that the factor common to all is general intelligence, or *g*. There has been much spoken and written about intelligence since Spearman and most of it takes *g* for granted. In this world view – Sternberg and Wagner call it "g-eocentric" – what people carry around in their heads is *g*, and *g* is what enables them to perform academic and related tasks.