Each of the four books which are the subjects of this review has a different focus. Campbell deals with innovative programs in teacher training; Smith with creative teaching in the classroom; Barron with research and assessment of creative thinking; and Raph, Goldberg, and Passow with experimentation to provide school experiences to meet specific needs. These four volumes, however, have in common an appraisal of factors in the school situation which have possibilities for affecting intellectual growth.

Campbell and his associates describe a plan of school-community commitment to a number of novel projects related to pre- and in-service teacher education activities for meeting the needs of urban disadvantaged elementary school pupils. While provision is made for a research base for the various programs, the primary emphasis is upon trying new strategies for solving educational problems. The directors accept the inevitability of many failures in the course of achieving small successes, for “while we await the emergence of a grand plan, school is still being kept day to day.” At the time of this report the chief advantages are the positive attitudes reflected by the participants—pupils, student-teachers, teachers, administrators, and community leaders.

Smith’s book is the first of a seven-volume series which deals with his thesis that creativity exists in all children but the conditions for it to happen must be set. In discussing these conditions, Smith interprets current research on creativity in children and provides detailed illustrations of the application of principles derived from such research to classroom methodology. The program appears to be a promising one. However, objective evidence of its effects is still forthcoming.

Barron agrees with Smith that creativity is the formation of something new out of previous experiences. His book is the result of work at the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research, a division of the Univers-
sity of California at Berkeley, in studying “highly creative people, seeking clues in their lives and personalities to the nature of the creative process and to conditions that facilitate creative personal growth and achievement.” Adhering as it does to a basic psychological rationale, it is the type of objective study to which educators may look for guidance. As such, it is an excellent complement to Smith’s volume.

The supporting data are derived from interviews, tests, and living-in assessments of highly creative writers, mathematicians, and architects. Factors in creativity were found to include: freshness of approach to problems, constructiveness, and ability to set aside established procedures and to devise ones more appropriate. These are not measured by existing intelligence tests. In time, this outstanding contribution to the literature may have significant and vitalizing effects upon educational practice.

Beginning with a study of previous research on elements affecting achievement, Raph, Goldberg, and Passow found the results so inconclusive that several studies were undertaken in two high schools on methods of remediating underachievement. Three experimental groups of underachievers were studied: a homeroom group who were retained in a class taught by their homeroom teacher; a special geometry class composed of those with identified weaknesses in that subject; a class consisting of those needing group guidance and study skills. No significant differences were found between their achievement and that of their controls, who had not been specially grouped.

After considering many possible causes of underachievement, Raph, Goldberg, and Passow question whether intellectual functioning is such that students should be expected to perform equally well in all subjects and if the high school is too late to begin to develop academic strengths and feelings of success. In further support of Campbell, Smith, and Barron, it was noted that these underachievers were reluctant to work on assignments of a creative nature requiring independence in thinking and organizing. Implications for attention to these expres-}


—Reviewed by PATRICIA WALLER, Staff Associate, University of North Carolina Highway Safety Research Center, Chapel Hill.

This monograph reports a series of research studies concerned with investigating what is called the “helping relationship.” The studies are based on the premise that there are certain similarities basic to all helping relationships, independent of the particular profession represented by the helper. That is, if the helping relationship is to be effective, the helper will show certain characteristics, whether he is a psychiatrist, priest, teacher, nurse, social worker, or other helper. Furthermore, the studies reject what they term “an objective frame of reference” and prefer instead to focus on what they call a “phenomenological orientation.”

The five studies reported deal with counselors, elementary school teachers, Episcopal pastors, student nurses, and college teachers. All the studies are concerned with finding systematic relationships between judged effectiveness and inferences made concerning...
the helper’s perceptual framework. The particular perceptual characteristics investigated grew out of a seminar of faculty and graduate students focusing on the helping relationship. In most instances the perceptions were of self, others, and the helping relationship.

In all the studies except the one with nurses, a relationship was found between independent judgments of effectiveness and the perceptual inferences made by trained observers. Thus it was concluded that effective helpers “are characterized by a generally positive view of their subjects and a belief in the capacity of the human organism to save itself. . . . effective helpers tend to see the person they work with in essentially positive ways, as dependable, friendly, and worthy people.”

Furthermore, “effective helpers appear to see themselves as one with mankind, as sharing a common fate. Poor helpers, on the other hand, have a tendency to see themselves as apart from others, as different from them.” “Effective helpers apparently tend to see their tasks more as freeing than controlling.”

It appears to this reviewer that this body of research makes certain assumptions about the nature of man which may or may not be warranted. For example, in the report on teachers the researcher discusses the characteristics of a good teacher. “Teachers need to see others as aids rather than as threats to self. This is difficult if not impossible for those who have inaccurate, distorted perceptions about the nature of people.” Would it follow that a Jew in Nazi Germany could not be a good teacher? What about a militant black in our own society?

As another example: The effective pastor is characterized as seeing the other person, as “more able than unable. The pastor perceives the other person as having the capacity to deal with his problems and believes that he can find adequate solutions to his problems. Contrariwise, the (ineffective) pastor doubts the capacity of the other person to handle himself or his life.”

What does such a belief imply regarding work with mental retardates, psychotics, or brain-damaged patients who may be quite unable to solve their own problems? Do we leave them to flounder, or do we exclude them from our definition of human so that we can continue to perceive “others as able, defined as seeing another person as having the capacity to deal with his problems and believing he can find adequate solutions to his problems”? There just may be some problems for which there are no really adequate solutions.

In addition to being unable to accept totally the philosophy on which this research is based, this reviewer is concerned with the kinds of conclusions that are made on the basis of the research reported. For example, the first conclusion, from the study of elementary teachers, reads, “Apparently in teaching as in counseling there is a strong relationship between the perceptual organization of the person and his effectiveness as a professional worker.”

What was actually found was an agreement between judged effectiveness of teachers (judgments being made by principals and curriculum coordinators) and ratings made by trained observers concerning the inferred perceptions of the teachers. However, a much more parsimonious explanation of the findings might be that the principals and coordinators, as well as the trained observers, were able to recognize effective teaching. Once such a judgment is made by the trained observer, it automatically follows that the teacher will be seen as perceiving others, themselves, and the teaching task in the desirable way.

One would not need to be very sophisticated to predict that good teachers, as opposed to poor teachers, would tend to see the teaching task as “freeing rather than controlling,” or “involved rather than uninvolved.” Likewise, one hardly needs training to judge that an effective teacher would tend to see others as “worthy rather than unworthy” or “friendly rather than unfriendly.”

In the study of nurses the major finding was that there were “high positive relationships between the perceptual and behavioral variables. The student nurses who perceived themselves positively also tended to be open to their experience, self-accepting, and sensitive to the feelings of others. Conversely,
student nurses who perceived themselves negatively were less open to their experience, less self-accepting, and less empathic in regard to the feelings of others."

The statements would read more accurately, "The student nurses who were seen as perceiving themselves positively also tended to be seen as open to their experience, self-accepting, and sensitive to the feelings of others. Conversely, student nurses who were seen as perceiving themselves negatively were seen as less open to their experience, less self-accepting, and less empathic in regard to the feelings of others."

The "perceptual and behavioral variables" were all inferred by the same judges responding to the same written protocols, and the simplest explanation of the relationships found is that the variables being judged were similar. It appears more a measure of reliability of judgments than findings about the perceptions of nurses.

Throughout these reports, the discussion of how the helper perceives himself, other people, and the helping task is not based on reports by the helper himself, but rather on judgments made by observers of how the helper perceives. It appears to this reviewer that such a procedure may be a violation of the espoused philosophy of the research. How can one take the position that the observer is better able than the helper himself to report the helper's perceptions? Isn't this saying the helper is more unable than able? And if we see him in this light, how can we possibly hope to help him?

Regardless of the interpretations made of the findings, these researchers have demonstrated that it is possible to obtain consistency in independent judgments made by supervisors and trained observers of teachers, counselors, and priests. Such a consistency suggests that there are indeed certain kinds of behavior that are associated with effective helping relationships. How exciting it would be if Professor Combs and his associates would continue their research to determine just what are these commonalities and how they can be effected rather than leaving the entire problem hanging in the vague, indefinite limbo of perception.


—Reviewed by KENNETH H. OSTRANDER, Assistant Professor of Educational Administration, University of Washington, Seattle.

Each of the texts reviewed is intended to be used in the preparation of administrators for elementary schools. This review is addressed to instructors of administration courses who might be contemplating their use. A review of each text was made by imagining what impact each might have on students. The reader can perhaps judge the suitability of the texts given his knowledge of his particular students.

All three texts attempt to cover the tasks of elementary school administration, such as administration of the lunchroom, the transportation system, the library, the school plant facilities, and audio-visual materials. They all also cover the areas of pupil personnel administration, public relations, staff relations, curriculum planning, and financial administration. Each has a section that aims at having students reflect upon personal strengths, weaknesses, and values. The text by Jenson and associates provides the most extensive treatment of what might be called personal guidance for the prospective administrator. Their use of case studies is particularly effective.

One striking difference between the texts is their use of lists of administrative principles, guidelines, objectives, criteria, and inventory-like questions. For example, a partial listing of recommendations for the management of custodians reads as follows:

1. Make the custodian a member of the
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2. Develop a cooperative relationship between the teaching staff and the custodian. Various ways may be identified in which such cooperation can be mutually beneficial.

3. Work with the custodian in developing a statement of duties and responsibilities to ensure an understanding of expectations by all staff members.

The listing style was used to cover basic principles of grouping children, advantages and disadvantages of team teaching, criteria for an adequate school library, ways in which the community can contribute to school activities, suggested activities for parent-teacher groups, procedures for selecting new staff members, procedures for conducting parent-teacher conferences, as well as many other administrative tasks and functions. Kimbrough used less than 6 such listings. Jenson and associates used upwards of 30, and Stoops and Johnson used in excess of 50 listings. In a similar manner the reviewer found that Kimbrough and Jenson used far fewer pictorial and schematic presentations than did Stoops and Johnson.

The level of verbal difficulty was higher in Kimbrough's treatment of elementary administration than in either of the other two texts. The difficulty, however, is one of a relative nature. From the point of view of difficulty, Kimbrough's text should be suitable for most graduate classes in elementary administration. Kimbrough sets out to familiarize students with the vocabulary of the social sciences as applied to organizational behavior. He gives particular emphasis to social systems theory. In comparison to Kimbrough, Stoops and Johnson seem to have ignored mentioning contributions from the social sciences or other areas of administration such as business and public administration.

The text by Jenson and associates lies somewhere in between the other two. For example, they referred to the ideas of Chester Barnard, Bernard Bass, August Hollingshead, Herbert Simon, John Pfiffner, and James March. However, whereas Kimbrough attempted to develop a conceptual framework via social systems theory for reflecting upon elementary administration, Jenson and associates make no such attempt at the development of a systematic conceptual framework based on social science theory. Consequently Kimbrough's treatment of school administration appears to be less fragmented in its organization and thought trains relative to the other two texts. His text should be of value to students who are attempting to develop a unified approach to administration.

Kimbrough's text is probably a greater challenge to students than either of the others. The challenge comes not only from the somewhat higher level of verbal and conceptual abstraction but from other sources as well.

Some students who see themselves on the verge of accepting administrative responsibilities for the first time have numerous concerns about their being capable of handling the job. Texts such as the one written by Stoops and Johnson can be reassuring to the administrative neophyte that he is learning the "nitty-gritty" of administration and will be prepared when the time comes.

Another source of challenge to the student who would use Kimbrough's text might arise because the image which Kimbrough projects of the administrative situation is not necessarily consistent with the aspiring administrator's hopes and dreams. Kimbrough sees the administrator as one who must contend with and perhaps in some situations even give in to social pressures. Kimbrough draws the student's attention to the hard realities of community power structure, conflicting viewpoints among professional educators, and irrational behavior among staff members. For those students who have decided to enter the ranks of administrators because they could finally do something, Kimbrough's image of administration can challenge their tendencies to oversimplify the complexities of organizations and to overemphasize their powers as an administrator.

In conclusion, the reviewer imagines that the student headed toward positions in socially stable school systems may benefit from the rather direct and relatively uncomplicated presentations of Jenson and associates and of Stoops and Johnson. Those headed
toward socially dynamic school systems will benefit more in studying from Kimbrough’s text. Similarly, students who are attracted to administration because they enjoy the “hurly-burly” of personal involvements may find grist for their intellectual mills in Kimbrough’s text. Those who see administration primarily in terms of procedures development and implementation will feel more compatible with the texts by Jenson and associates and the one by Stoops and Johnson, particularly the latter one.


—Reviewed by JOHN R. STEVENSON, Coordinator of Instruction, ESEA Title I Elementary Schools, Columbia Public Schools, Columbia, South Carolina.

The four books being reviewed here are, probably without exception, welcome additions to the growing body of literature pertaining to the education of the so-called disadvantaged youngster.

The book by Fantini and Weinstein appears to be the one of this group of books which is more likely to make the greatest impact on the reader. It is an exciting book which, as Frank Riessman points out in the foreword, would be impossible for those involved in education to ignore. The position is taken by Fantini and Weinstein that our usual system of educating youngsters “is inadequate for all children, and its obvious failures with the poor are actually the symptoms of a much more sweeping, if less obvious fault.”

The authors have written an excellent chapter defining that part of the population which is found to be disadvantaged. As contrasted with the writers of some books and articles dealing with the disadvantaged, these authors do not confine themselves to just one segment of this group, that is, urban slum children or rural Negroes.

Some readers, rightly or wrongly, will object to the authors’ use of the term, “The Phoney School,” in their discussion of the formal curriculum which exists in many, if not most, of our schools today. Fantini and Weinstein categorize the curriculum in the “phoney school” as being (a) antiseptic, (b) semiantiseptic, (c) nonessential, or (d) remote.

In the latter half of their book, Fantini and Weinstein attempt to describe a “relevant” curriculum through the presentation of a model for developing such a curriculum. It is to their credit that they were able to present their position with regard to a “relevant” curriculum as concisely as they have. However, some readers will be skeptical of the presentation for precisely this reason. A thoughtful reading, perhaps a rereading, of the second half of the book might dispel many of the questions and doubts one might have on this point.

The book by Rees is apparently an outgrowth of the author’s participation in a conference for school inspectors of Great Britain at Dartington College in Devon, England, during the summer of 1966.

This book would be quite appropriate for readers whose contact with, or background information on, the disadvantaged is limited. The two chapters which describe “representative” compensatory programs and some of the centers of study and sources of information should be of particular importance to one who is interested in pursuing the study of disadvantaged youngsters. This book contains a very extensive bibliography which could be described along with the two chapters mentioned as the strengths of the book.

The third book reviewed here consists of
17 papers which have been put into 6 sections. Some of the papers are descriptive in nature, some analytical, and the others are propositional. The editor of this book, Professor Passow, is well known for his work on education in urban areas, and the present volume verifies his stature and ability as an insightful editor.

Part I is especially helpful in establishing a frame of reference for the reader, particularly the papers by Passow and Elliott and Goldberg. The paper by Fantini and Weinstein is useful here; however, the model which they present is better understood in their own book, in which they were able to develop in more detail the rationale for the model.

One may differ with some of the conclusions reached, or ideas discussed, by any of the writers. In the main, however, this book should be of value to those who seek insight into the difficulties surrounding the task of providing educational opportunities for the disadvantaged. One might, for example, not be as full of praise concerning the “positive consequences” of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as Dr. Regina Goff, whose paper on “Title I Promises Fulfilled” is included in this book, seems to be. This should not mean, however, that one cannot be optimistic about the potential value of Title I.

The paper by Dan Dodson on “Education and the Powerless” is especially recommended and, in the opinion of this reviewer, is alone well worth the price of the Passow book.

The fourth book being reviewed was edited by Amos and Grambs. It is a must for those who are actively engaged in counseling the disadvantaged. As is the case with the work by Passow, this is essentially a book of readings. Its topics are related to counseling the disadvantaged; however, many of these readings would be of value to all educators.

If this reviewer were to read this book in its entirety again, the chapter by the Smollenburgs would be read immediately after the introduction by the editors.

The editors of this book have included an excellent final chapter on, “Where Do We Go From Here?” which sets forth some directions that may be followed by counselors and by those who train counselors.

Each of the books reviewed cites numerous references which sidetracked this reviewer because of his own personal interest. In most instances these references provided additional insight into other aspects of understanding and working with disadvantaged youngsters and their teachers.


—Reviewed by RONALD T. HYMAN, Associate Professor, Graduate School of Education, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.

One thing is clear: educators specializing in social studies have before them the great task of reconsidering that part of the curriculum which they claim as their domain. Judging from what these three books include, the area of social studies, at this point, lacks the dynamism and sense of mission attractive to teachers and students alike. With a few exceptions the material is orthodox. There is little evidence of any ongoing discussion—proposals and counterproposals—for alternative directions and foci for the present as well as the future curriculum.

According to these books, the social studies educators have accepted the notion of “structure of the disciplines” and have closed the door on further change. Structure is “in” and all else shall remain forever “out.” So much the worse for social studies and for those involved in the field.
The Lowe book is out of date and contributes almost nothing. The book is based on a series of workshops directed by Lowe at an almost undisclosed date. (One short, uncut footnote, however, reveals the year as 1965.) Lowe offers a long and, in 1969, unnecessary summary of Bruner's *The Process of Education* as the presentation of the concept of structure—since his own group started out convinced of the value and existence of structure.

The remainder of the book consists of Lowe's reports and judgments of the presentations by the eight academic consultants in history, geography, sociology, anthropology, economics, and government who were asked to treat the structure of their disciplines. Yet, interestingly enough, only two of the eight consultants presented a structure for their fields. The others denied that there was a structure or conspicuously evaded the topic. Hence, we are left with a book that begins convinced about structure but ends by contradicting itself. Rather than devote himself in 1969 to summarizing everybody else, Lowe would have contributed more constructively to his field had he spent his time delving into the concept of structure and its pertinence to the curriculum so as to advance the early works of others. Or, he could have investigated the alternatives to structure, which he never even mentions in his book. He might have shown by contrast just why he believes in the superiority of structure.

The book by Gross, McPhie, and Fraenkel is an undistinguished and lengthy collection. Though there are several interesting pieces (by Dewey, Rugg, and Michener, for example), for whose reprinting we are thankful, the total effect is an unnecessary book with a cluttered framework. After a section devoted to the structure of the various social science disciplines, the book becomes a conglomeration of uninspiring nuts and bolts articles on classroom practices. From the inclusion of a cross-reference chart to current methods books, the reader's inference is that this anthology has tried to be a supplement to
everything available. Yet it has failed to be something worthwhile itself.

The anthology by Feldman and Seifman offers the reader a good opportunity to study the current scene. Each of the three parts—structure, models, and strategies—is designed to have a keynote, theme article followed by supporting, illustrative ones. This is a good idea but it does not come off in Parts 2 and 3, since the articles do not follow from their leads. Nevertheless, the articles are worthwhile for giving insight into what the “structure crowd” has been doing in the 1960’s. It is precisely because the book assumes that structure is the answer for the social studies that the lone article (by Newman) offering an alternative to structure should not have been excerpted so as to eliminate that part of the article which attacks so forcefully the structural approach.

The section on models in the Feldman and Seifman book is all too short. What is worse, most of the articles do not present models for the social studies. Worse yet is that such a section is altogether absent from the book by Lowe and that by Gross, McPhie, and Fraenkel. Yet the development, criticism, defense, and use of alternative ways to conceive of the social studies curriculum are exactly what is needed today to infuse into classroom activity the needed dynamism with which to meet the future. Contrary to Seifman’s claim in his own article, social studies specialists would do well to explore the uniqueness of their field rather than to emulate the pattern set by mathematics and science specialists.

As a result of (a) the virtually unquestioned acceptance and emphasis on structure today and (b) the lack of projection into the future, these books have excluded entire areas of concern. For example only, material is missing dealing with: creativity; humanistic trends for reforming schooling; existentialism; law; empirical research on teacher and pupil verbal behavior; learning styles; the future world where the computer and leisure time will most likely be of greater importance than today; and schemas for analyzing social science content into knowledge and belief categories. What these books exclude, therefore, indicates to us that social studies specialists would do well to reevaluate themselves to revitalizing their field on a broad front rather than to be devoted by faith to a monolithic, questionable framework.
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