
—Reviewed by Nyda Young, San Francisco, California.

To a fledgling, nonmilitant, somewhat ambivalent Women's Libber, this is an alternately grand and irritating book. It is an anthology of writings about women from Genesis to Hugh Hefner. As pure entertainment, its scope alone makes it worth reading.

Many of us require occasional reassurance that the Movement is not a radical, or lesbian, conspiracy to sever us in cold blood from the other half of humanity. This book does not resolve that dilemma. While the editors decry the “terrorists” such as the Society for Cutting Up Men, they do include the SCUM manifesto. But there are also, Shakespeare, Ibsen, and Shaw as well as Woolf, Mannes, and Friedan. And the book unquestionably offers some fascinating peeps at the accumulated stereotypy that has generated the slow burn that many women are beginning to feel.

I was apprehensive about the section called “The Nature of Woman: Who Is She?” Would they really try to construct a definitive, single concept that must necessarily include Raquel Welch, Eleanor Roosevelt, Lucretia Borgia, and Twiggy? I was pleased to find that they did not. The most that the Movement can tell us, as I think this section of the book basically does, is who we aren’t.

The book has some questionable devices. Among them is the sarcastic little black box containing the remains of Helen Gurley Brown, with the coup de grace being the reference to her as Mrs. Brown—tantamount to an epithet in the Movement. I found this unpalatable and at odds with the editors’ implied sympathy with Dana Densmore’s concept of sisterhood. Also, while the selections are about evenly divided between male and female authorship, most of the male contributions are either negative or noncurrent, or both. Even in “Towards Freedom,” the last section, we find little evidence that men are
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TO CURRICULUM DEVELOPERS

the Teacher Teacher

You can't afford guesswork . . . and you don't need expensive consultants for productive in-service training. With programmed workshop packages ready to work for the in-service director, your teachers get efficient and effective training that has been tested and proven.

HERE ARE THREE MUSTS...

- FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS Designing Effective Instruction is a unique workshop that guides teachers in the efficient planning of effective instructional programs. DEI contains about 20 hours of instruction, discussion, and exercises.

- FOR SUBSTITUTE TEACHERS The Substitute Teacher - An Idea Exchange is a half-day workshop that gives substitute teachers new and experienced opportunities to share experiences and ideas. The three units are aimed at problems that can be solved before they ever come up, at problems that might be faced during the day, and at problems substitutes occasionally encounter just because they are substitutes.

- FOR TEACHER AIDES The Teacher Aide Workshop is a workshop from GPT which provides an invaluable opportunity for both teacher and aide to start the year on a solid ground of understanding an orientation to the classroom, ways in which an aide can be of most use, and an opportunity for the teacher and aide to discuss classroom routines, philosophies, and ways of handling problems. Mail coupon below for full details.


— Reviewed by Wilma S. Longstreet, Associate Professor of Education, University of Michigan, Flint.

A School for Tomorrow, edited and in part authored by Jack R. Frymier, proposes a formidable plan for the future of American education. It places the development of the autonomous individual, respected in his differences and encouraged toward significant decision-making activities, at the center of educational goals; it then concentrates all its efforts upon the modes of organization that might make such an emphasis feasible. The results are several significant contributions: a superb chapter regarding the clarification of goals, a system of categories for curricular/information retrieval, a careful analysis of the range of instructional strategies and their logical applications in a school for tomorrow, an evaluative procedure which would distinguish subjective and objective observational data while making use of both, and a plan for the administrative organization of a school perceived primarily as an information processing system.

This is a significant book and it ought to have significant influence upon the future of education. It is precisely for this reason that I feel compelled to deal with the controversy that it has stirred up in me. It offers numerous systems for the revision of major aspects of public education, and I personally disagree with very little of what is said. It is rather what is not said that gives me con-
siderable concern. It is almost as if, having decided that the autonomous individual is the proper goal of education, there were no further need to discuss the contexts within which the regular exercise of autonomy would be achieved. It is almost as if it made no difference whether Johnny learns to be autonomous in the use of the adding machine or in the use of highly complex computers.

Needless to say, irrelevant autonomy is absurd, and Frymier recognizes as much when he notes that the curriculum of tomorrow must reflect the "fundamental problems facing all mankind" (p. 283). Furthermore, Teal and Reagan in their excellent chapter on goals acknowledge that the educational concepts of meeting individual "needs" and/or "interests" and/or "growth" are not sufficient sources for the development of goals. They subsequently express a commitment "to promote what is worthwhile" (pp. 73-75). Anderson and Duvall also acknowledge the importance of dealing with "valuable" information (p. 224) in a school for tomorrow. Yet, nowhere is a cogent case made for the development of criteria regarding the kinds of information that would be "valuable" or "worthwhile" (the inferences of these terms may be quite different). It is a disquieting omission in a book full of systems and criteria.

Regardless of the flexibility planned for an educational retrieval system, decisions about the greater value of some kinds of information over other kinds will have been built into the system. Such decisions ought to be made not only in full awareness but in full public view.

The failure to deal with any hard content choices (even of content perceived as process or as concepts) reflects a traditional unwillingness among American educators to cope with the essential difference between an autonomous individual who makes his decisions in the light of alternatives that are either socially available or that he believes ought to become socially available and an asocial individual who is concerned primarily with his own uniqueness—it is the difference between independence as a function of a democratically-oriented society and individuality as a function of introverted reflection and development. While both can flourish within the individual, the latter really cannot be handled by any form of planned schooling; the former urgently needs criteria whereby its educational development will become neither indoctrination of the masses nor the totalitarian imposition of the individuality of the few over the many.

These are the criteria which are central to the development of autonomy in a democratic society but which continue to be avoided and have sadly been avoided in this very excellent book by Frymier and his colleagues at Ohio State University.


—Reviewed by Joseph Moray, Associate Professor of Elementary Education, California State University, San Francisco.

Recently there has been heightened interest in the use of games to stimulate students' interest in school work, and to provide activities for learning centers and open classrooms. Educational Games for Fun includes games for arithmetic, history, geography, science, and language arts. For each game, grade levels are suggested, and there are directions which may be read directly to the students.

The arithmetic games offer, for the most part, rather thinly disguised drill, despite the claim by the publisher that these are "thinking games." Even where strategy is involved, as in a Nim-type game entitled "Tricky Arithmetic," the strategy indeed becomes merely a trick; there is no attempt to suggest how discovering a pattern may lead to a winning combination of moves.

The history and geography games are all name games: contests in naming people and places. The "Word Games" section, which comprises more than half of the book, provides appealing activities in spelling, word usage, and dictionary skills, including such old favorites as "Teakettle" and "Ghost."
The games included in this book tend to be more recreational than educational. For educational purposes, the book is simply not in the same class as resources like the School Mathematics Study Group’s “Puzzle Problems and Games Project,” or Evelyn Spache’s “Reading Activities for Child Development.”


—Reviewed by Loren Barratt, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; on sabbatical at the University of Utrecht, The Netherlands.

This book should have been titled “The Experimental Literature on Children’s ‘Learning’” with emphasis on the word experimental and with learning in quotes. The studies chosen for review fit a narrow definition of what is learning, namely those studies done in laboratory settings predominantly in the United States, though some Russian work is cited by those of the behaviorist faith. Even in the chapters that deal with language, for example, “The First Words,” the emphasis is on the Russian view of language as a second signal system, while recent developments in psycholinguistics that have so dramatically shifted the focus of the psychology of children are totally ignored.

The related renewal of interest in Piaget’s work is discussed superficially, and no citations from Piaget’s extensive bibliography are given. Reference is made to the reviews of his work by Flavell and by Ginsburg and Opper. Studies of classroom learning have been consciously omitted.

Even with a conclusions section at the end of each chapter and a last chapter of “General Conclusions,” the book is not an organized whole. Each chapter is a separate review of the literature dealing with some experimental task, for example, transposition, paired associates, etc. “We end up with an exposition that is disjointed but that is
nevertheless representative of the current state of our knowledge" (p. xiii).

In the preface, Stevenson says that it is his "hope that the book will serve students in psychology and education as a guide through the profusion of studies and divergent theoretical positions that are represented in the experimental literature on children's learning" (p. v). My own view is that the book will be most useful to graduate students who wish to know how experimental psychology has chosen to study learning in children.


—Reviewed by Percy Bates, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Each of these books deals with the currently popular but elusive concept of accountability in American education. Each deals with the subject from a different point of view: Olson and Richardson handle teacher accountability; Sciara and Jantz, curriculum accountability; and McNeil, general educational accountability.

Accountability: Curricular Applications is a book of 20 readings organized in a manner that divides the material into three broad areas: accountability as a concept, application to the curriculum, and programs in action. The articles are appropriately selected, are well written, and provide a wealth of information. In addition, the authors provide "bridges" between the articles and give a continuity and consistency that are often missing in books of readings. This book would be especially useful for the beginner in the area of educational accountability.

Accountability in American Education is a more detailed book of readings consisting of 55 articles. It provides a tremendous amount of information and deals with the subject of accountability from almost every conceivable angle. Although the reader may be somewhat overwhelmed by the abundance of information on the subject, he will be equally impressed with the in-depth and comprehensive coverage of the subject matter. The book has something for everyone with an interest in the subject of accountability in education, including taxpayers, state and federal officials, teachers, administrators, and school board members. The reader will have to be selective, however, since each subject heading includes several articles of unequal quality. The editors might have taken a bit more care in matching articles to subheading. While the beginning reader may find it useful in particular areas of interest, the book is more likely to be of value to university professors and students for reference or supplemental reading.

Toward Accountable Teachers provides information about the improvement of instruction and the correction of existing practices in the absence of accountability models. The author shows a great deal of knowledge about and sensitivity to teachers and the teaching process. He suggests practical solu-
tions and instrumentation to accomplish accountability in teaching. Any teacher seeking information and techniques for improvement in the framework of accountability will find this book worthwhile and useful; it promises to have a constructive influence on the process of improving teacher performance.

Since each of these books deals with the subject of accountability and provides information on problems, potential forms, and current practices, a prospective reader would do well to let his own professional interest be his guide in selecting any or all of the volumes for his bookshelf.


—Reviewed by D ARRELL S. WILLEY, Professor of Education and Associate Director, Educational Research Center, and SHARON WOODEN, Assistant Professor, Department of Elementary and Secondary Education; both at New Mexico State University, Las Cruces.

Hosford’s work represents a unique approach in the pure and applied aspects of instructional theory construction. This document follows a theory-building precedent set by the National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration some 15 years ago. That precedent was premised upon classical tenets of sociological theory building.

Sound scholarship is represented by having met the logico-scientific requirements of theory: (a) cautious definition of terms will meet the test of external/internal criticism; (b) boundary conditions or the nature and number of constraints delimiting the theory; (c) an efficient and sufficient listing of what is known and applicable; (d) can generalize beyond the information/data given in three ways: (1) explains events; (2) attempts to resolve conflicts, and (3) above all, will generate an array of testable hypotheses.

The author’s background in mathematical and physical sciences is called upon in that a taxonomy of rationale, axioms, nine laws/rules are combined with 133 postulates. A number of the postulates are illustratively processed employing a pedestrian mathematical notation mode. Such an application permits a reasonably nonsophisticated reader to check the effectiveness of the statements. Attractive use of Venn circles, much like that used to depict “new math” sets and rings, visually resolves the ground rules discussed in a parallel narrative. In brief, pains have been taken to see that concepts do not elude the reader.

Reader-users are guided to “plug in” an author-supplied postulate or devise a personal example and complete the processing act. Thus a novice can be led quickly through the act of validating a facet of a personal theory of instruction. Convergence methodology undergirding the Hosford steps bear the label “Referent Theory of Instruction.” An intriguing dimension for the future is that a set of tools or a new mode of researching instruction has been supplied for the scholarly community. Simulation and gaming of instructional decisions via a computer have been advanced by years. In effect, many volumes of traditional narrative have been compressed into lean hard muscle tissue.

Hosford has hewn a comfortable line between the rigidities and exactitudes of classical deduction and the oft-described laboratory method. Shortcomings of the beginning Referent Theory are readily conceded by the author. One value-mislabeling error was detected: outcomes were held to be good if positive connotations emerged, and conversely negative = bad. More consistent with his scientific stance, good might be described as effective and bad = ineffective. Such neutral terminology would have left the book a bit nearer total objectivity.

In a summative fashion, serious-minded scholars in curriculum and instruction are a stride nearer meeting the 1963 challenge thrown out in Jerome S. Bruner’s “Needed: A Theory of Instruction.”
