BOOKS

John Herbert and David P. Ausubel, editors. *Psychology in Teacher Preparation.* Monograph Series No. 5, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1969. Pp. 128.

This monograph is composed of invited papers given at the International Conference on Psychology in the Teacher-Preparation Curriculum (April 4-6, 1968) held at The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, Toronto, Canada. The majority of the papers are by Canadian and American educational psychologists.

With few exceptions, most of the papers are an uninteresting combination of sound (or not so sound) analyses of the state of education, and educational psychology, and ventillations of personal (or collective) frustrations. Pessimism is pervasive, rationalized by the speculative fantasies of what might be. All agree that educational psychology as it is now taught is in a lamentable condition: few constructive alternatives are provided which might reverse the mortal decline of this ailing adolescent. The tone seems reminiscent of apologies one would expect to have heard forty years ago. But then, it is a generally accepted fact that technological societies tend to prolong the pleasures, and miseries, of adolescence. Much of what is said is already in the public domain: one wonders why a conference was assembled to repeat it.

The diversity of the content makes it editorially difficult to organize. There are, however, four sections: (1) The Problem (papers on the nature of the discipline), (2) Issues and Positions (the potential relevance of educational psychology), (3) Programs and Proposals (what changes in content, organization, and presentation are necessary to make educational psychology relevant to teacher-preparation?), (4) The Future (whither educational psychology?).

All contributors seem to agree there is a problem: there is little consensus as to where the problem lies. There is even less agreement as to remedy. Cures recommended in some of the papers include: basic encounter groups (Corman); heuristic teaching styles, or, the message is the style (F. J. McDonald); articulation of fundamental commitments or beliefs (Jackson); nothing makes a difference (Stephens); reform of textbooks (Robinson); serendipity (Herbert and Williams).

There is, nonetheless, something of value in the monograph. Analyses of the problem by F. J. McDonald and Corman are well done. Commentaries of the papers, on the whole, are excellent. These give the volume substance. After the pessimism of the preceding papers, the paper by Belanger is refreshing and welcome. In it, Belanger describes a proposed

course in which some educational psychologists were going to try to be relevant. Upon finishing this paper, the reviewer wanted to tug Belanger's sleeve and ask, Well, what happened? The reply, thankfully, is given in the subsequent paper. This latter paper also gives the most reasonable alternative for concerned educational psychologists: "Leap into the thick of the battle constructing conceptual modes of learning on the one hand and work directly with beginning teachers on the other" (p. 115).

The conference, and possibly the monograph, might have one salutary effect. If more educational psychologists start asking themselves what they are doing, and what may be its relevance to teaching, it is extremely likely that we might aid in developing better teacher-preparation programs. Hopefully, we might even provide some answers for frustrated teachers. In any case, it's a good place to start.

Raymond L. Hertzog
The University of Calgary

Harold J. Noah and Max A. Eckstein. *Toward a Science of Comparative Education.* Collier Macmillan Canada, Ltd.: 1969. Pp. 222.

Toward a Science of Comparative Education illustrates the increasing concern of many comparative educationists with the use of empirical research and quantitative data to test hypotheses regarding the relationships between education and society. This book, in particular, advocates a marked departure from the more usual approaches to comparative education as found in the work of Nicholas Hans, George Z. F. Bereday and Brian Holmes.[1]

Explaining the evolution of their book the authors chronicle previous work in comparative education as a point from which to analyze the use of scientific method. Unfortunately, this, together with later sections on scientific method, does not adequately prepare the average student for the leap into the world of theory and hypotheses.

The book is divided into four parts. These are "The Development of Comparative Education," "The Method of Science," "The Method of Science in Comparative Education," and "Conclusion." Part one offers the student historical background and reviews in a systematic way some of the more distinguished contributors to comparative studies in education, as well as discussing their value as a phase of development in the field. Particular attention is given to methodological considerations and the way they reflect aims as well as the technological limitations of the age. The authors show the gradual but certain evolution of systematiza-

[1]Nicholas Hans, *Comparative Education: A Study of Educational Factors and Traditions* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1958); George Z. F. Bereday, *Comparative Method in Education* (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964); Brian Holmes, *Problems in Education: A Comparative Approach* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965).