

A visit by the author some two years later (Spring, 1974) revealed that the school had undergone further reconstruction: parents, particularly women, had sought new opportunities for personal development in work, political activity and in further training, changes that the author suggests emanate not just from "pedagogical preference alone, but, . . . from a 'realistic' conscious recognition of the social parameters that define this school today" (p. 126).

Throughout, the author applies a rich repertoire of sociological constructs from diverse and sundry sources to identify and illuminate the phenomena in emerging social organizations. The book is a well written and referenced chronicle of a research posture that "turn(s) conventional methodological procedure on its head; 'instead of allowing our methods to determine our stance toward every day life, we allow our stance to determine our methods'" (p. 23) There are times when the reader may strain to capacity as he attempts to negotiate the comparatively new terms imbibing new concepts as well as familiar terms carrying new and possibly unfamiliar meanings. This is no doubt due to the author's tight and condensed writing style. The reader who "stays with it", however, will be amply rewarded for his efforts in the expanded range of interpretations that the book affords and in the enlarged possibilities of systematic study of evolving and on-going phenomena in any definable collective.

Viewed, however, as an unfolding drama of human commitment and struggle to give shape to a new mode of schooling, one cannot help but see participants as actors who are being buffeted about by social forces or tendencies of which they are ostensibly unaware—a stark manifestation of social determinism. How might individuals in groups resist the tendencies toward "compartmentalization," "seriality" and the establishment of "pledge groups" in order to preserve the sustaining sense of community? How does a group combat "sociable talk," a preference for the "concrete" over the "philosophic," and a declining "commitment"? These are some of the anomalies that afflict any group pursuing common aims.

This work does much to excite the "sociological imagination." But can we expect that the next venture by some group to establish a "free school" will be any more informed, with its prospects for significant educational change and accomplishment any more enhanced? The author, particularly in view of his apparent support of the free school as an educational alternative (he was engaged for a period of time in the school as a practicing teacher), would not have compromised his integrity and responsibility as a research-scholar had he offered some insights, based upon his research and personal experience, into the ways and means of organizing collectivities among parents and teachers who are attracted to more autonomous and open school structures.

Pursuing this point further, it would have been intriguing to know whether the author, as participant as well as observer, alerted his cohorts—parents and teachers—to the emerging processes in which all were immersed and which, simultaneously, were the object of his study. Did he, for instance, offer interpretations of group tendencies deemed dysfunctional in attaining further clarification and realization of group goals? In general, researchers and practitioners both continue to presume that, through enlarged understanding, we can predict more accurately; and through more accurate prediction, we can exercise more effective control over the social environment in order that legitimate and worthy goals are more likely of attainment. Admittedly, however, such extension of concerns into the *realm of political and pedagogical practice* threatens to propel the sociologist into the intra- and inter-personal arena of human experience and action and thus, understandably, beyond the acknowledged boundaries of his field of enquiry.

John O. Fritz
The University of Calgary

Avigdor Farine, *Les Diplômes en Sciences de l'Éducation, Étude sur la concordance entre l'emploi et la formation universitaire*, Faculté des Sciences de l'Éducation, Université de Montréal, mai 1975, pp. 1-99, tables 101-145.

Since the Great Charter of 1961 and the Reforms stemming from the Parent Report, Québec education has undergone a profound democratization. At the heart of these educational reforms has been, according to the Parent Report, the training and improving of the teaching corps. One result was the creation of the *Faculté des Sciences de l'Éducation* of the *Université de Montréal*, which celebrated its tenth anniversary in June. In an era of increasing concern over manpower planning and the university's rôle in that planning, it is appropriate that Professor Farine (and his colleagues) have surveyed the graduates of the Faculty (to 1973) in an effort to determine the relationship between teacher-training and employment.

For students of Québec's educational change, the study has two revealing aspects. Through cross-sectional design, by comparing graduates of the Faculty from 1965 to 1969 with those from 1970 to 1973, the study allows one to perceive one effect of the educational changes in Québec during the sixties. It is suggested that, although on the surface fewer students from working-class and agricultural backgrounds attended the Faculty in the second period, in fact more students from these groups are able to attend university, and as a result teachers are more and more recruited from the rising middle classes (p. 36). The greatest benefit of the school revolution has been the increasing enrollment of women in the Faculty. This is attributed to the fact that the more democratic secondary schools and the *Cegeps* were not so limited in their access as were the classical colleges. As a result, by 1971-72, more women than men were enrolled in the Faculty at least in the first level (p. 33).

Related to this is the cross-sectional comparison of attitudes of graduates in the two periods. Among the findings was the fact that more graduates of the first group (1965-1969) found their university studies useful as far as their job was concerned (p. 60). This may be related to the greater ease with which those graduates found jobs (during a period of rapidly expanding enrollments) (p. 59). A question not specifically discussed in the monograph is the extent to which students in the later period are more critical of university in general; until studies are made of more faculties, it would be difficult to determine if this dissatisfaction were more than job-oriented. But it is to be noted that fewer of the 1965-1969 group were working in the area of university speciality, and that a sizeable portion of those who had changed found university work too theoretical (p. 60). The fact of change is not surprising, given the longer work history of the earlier graduates. On the other hand, graduates from the 1965-1969 period were more likely to return to university to take the same studies as they did during the first degree (p. 61). and, finally, the earlier graduating classes had a better perception of the rôle of the university than did their younger colleagues (p. 72). The data suggest the nature of the shift in attitudes between the two groups of graduates and to that extent revealed some concerns for the Faculty.

The second area of significance of the study relates to the nature of the students in the Faculty. For example, men tended to be more mobile than women: about one-third the men were born in Montréal, while almost half the women were (p. 34). Moreover, women tended to be younger: few women between 25 to 40 attended, partly because of family obligations during this period (p. 34). On the other hand, men were more likely to be married and with children (p. 35). In terms of access to the university, more daughters of men from the professions, administration or business were likely to attend the Faculty (p. 35), while more men came from working class or civil servant backgrounds (p. 36). A conclusion drawn from these statistics is that teachers are drawn from a rising middle class (p. 36). An interesting finding was that more women benefit from financial assistance of their families (p. 36). This may be related to the fact that they are younger and unmarried. Other sociological findings included the fact that women were more likely to go out and work after the first diploma, and that administration still tended to be a male preserve.

A number of implications arise from the study. On a theoretical level, the study provides information on the effects of the educational revolution of the sixties, as well as a composite picture of the type of student in the Faculty. Because of the importance of the university generally in training people, manpower planning becomes a consideration. Professor Farine indicates that the *Faculté des Sciences de l'Éducation* needs a better co-ordination between training at the university and the job market. Particularly important would be improvement in the quality of the programme offered so the young graduate would be better prepared for teaching. But equally important would be the need to offer programmes related

to the demands of the job market and to provide that information to the student. In addition, the Faculty must provide a series of programmes for "recyclage" (pp. 89-90). One could add that the same considerations might be made for other Faculties (and other universities) and as studies become available on graduates of other faculties, manpower planning could be more effective. Equally it is incumbent on students to realize that the university training cannot be substitutes for practical experience and to be more realistic about the nature of the job market.

Robert J. MacDonald
The University of Calgary

James Axtell. *The School Upon a Hill: Education and Society in Colonial New England*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974. Pp. 298. \$15.00.

Back in 1968, James Axtell gave us *The Educational Writings of John Locke* (Cambridge University Press), establishing himself as a refined scholar bursting with enthusiasm for his subject. Now we can accept with gratitude Professor Axtell's *The School Upon a Hill*, a book evincing no intervening loss of zest for the historian's task. To his credit, moreover, Dr. Axtell attempts here a more hazardous venture, fraught with such pitfalls as beset the daring. Little wonder, then, that his new volume invites comments of two quite different sorts.

In my judgment, the most satisfying way to read *The School Upon a Hill* is to receive it as the richly-embroidered work of a master stylist. If you do this, you learn of a child's spiritual preparation, of New England customs regarding birth, feeding, dressing, weaning, of the importance of one's calling in life, of tension between the vagaries of wilderness existence and the 17th century "great chain" cosmology, of "suffocating paternalism" in colonial colleges, and of the Indian as neighbour, warrior, and example. This is what the book deals with and what makes it a generous source of contemporary advice on education. My only quarrel with it in this light is a certain Menckenesque flippancy that prompts the author to toss off such lines as "trust your souls to the ship of state and don't rock the boat," or "just as familiarity may breed contempt, it may also simply breed."

Your perusal of his Foreword and Afterword will confirm, though, that Dr. Axtell scarcely offers *The School Upon a Hill* as a mere source book. Indeed, by means of those prefatory caveats whereby educational historians traditionally declare their hands as revisionists, he alerts you to what he believes is new and fresh in his approach. First, he will strive for a "waist-high" view of colonial education, a youngster's notion of what it was like to grow up in colonial New England. Secondly, he will emphasize the deliberate in education, for, "otherwise we will spend our time and energy floundering around in total history and tilting at metaphysical windmills." In either case, I find the book's content less persuasive than its intent.

To be fair, the writer of *The School Upon a Hill* concedes the need for imagination and empathy in order to counterbalance those normative adult sources from which he attempts to draw a child's vision of approaching adulthood. Just the same, longish quotations from Cotton Mather and others about how children ought to be raised, extended passages on law, and detailed particulars concerning Indian warfare overly detract, I think, from an effort to depict New England education as a colonial boy or girl might have envisioned it. Oddly enough, James Axtell's best chapter, "The Collegiate Way," provides not a waist-high perspective but an ingenious, face-to-face rendition of how adult students probably felt when they were "treated like irresponsible children . . ."

As for deliberateness, I find it difficult to reconcile Professor Axtell's definition à la Bailyn or Cremin of what education might consist of with the attention he affords cold meetinghouses, children out of wedlock, sexual customs, childbearing, wetnursing, orphan status, Indian agriculture, ideals in names, the imperatives of biology, and a diversified