It follows, then, that Spring considers A. S. Neill important. Influenced to a certain degree by Reich (Neill, however, rejected Reich's emphasis on "sexual liberation"), Neill established Summerhill to put into practice some of his quasi-Freudian ideas. While granting Neill's significance for the "free school" movement (a symbol?), it is this reviewer's opinion that Neill's writings are characterized by a facile "romantic humanism" which concentrates on providing a small number of middle class youth with an atmosphere tolerant of their needs and idiosyncrasies, hoping to produce youth who would be "happy" in a world Neill secretly condemned. Alan Graubard sums up Neill's conception of education:

> Neill's conception of the function of education emphasizes the effect of freedom on the child's personality. The hope (and claim) is that free children will be self-motivated, integrated, able to seek out the learning they need in order to pursue interests that are truly their own, and, when they become adults, capable of choosing a way of life and work on the basis on considerations flowing from inside, rather than being ruled by externally imposed standards and goals.[6]

Two observations: Neill, like most radical reformers, in practice concentrates on pedagogical questions and does not broaden the critique politically so as to confront directly the sociological function of making children loyal and well-functioning members of society. Further, Neill's Summerhill is based on the illusion that one's own interests can be pursued. Neill's emphasis on choice flowing from the inside is, without concomitant structural changes in the organization of work and community, a more insidious form of social control.

What are Spring's general conclusions? Although I can agree in principle that the "goal of social change is increased individual participation and control of the social system" (p. 130), his strategies strike me as utopian, as unrelated to any concrete historical possibility. Spring would eliminate compulsory education: deschool society, radicalize the faculties of education — place education at the heart of society. These recommendations are distressing. Spring simply does not grasp how crucial schools are to the reproduction of capitalist society. As Herbert Gintis has argued in a seminal paper, "Toward a Political Economy of Education: A Radical Critique of Ivan Illich's *Deschooling Society*," "a radical theory of education reform becomes viable only by envisioning liberating and equal education as serving and being served by a radically altered nexus of social relations in *production*. Schools may lead or lag in this process of social transformation, but structural changes in the educational process can be socially relevant only when they speak to potentials for liberation and equality in our day-to-day labors. In the final analysis, 'deschooling' is irrelevant because we cannot 'de-factory,' 'de-office,' or 'de-family,' save perhaps at the still unenvisioned end of a long process of social reconstruction".[7]

A Primer might have been useful if Spring had taken his libertarian commitment to its logical conclusion. If Reich has the last word, does it not follow that the concrete aims of libertarian activity would be to get teen-age and even younger members of the working class to loosen generalized habits of respect and obedience, to oppose whatever doesn't make sense in terms of their needs as individuals and as members of a group, to participate in successful protest actions no matter how small the immediate objective, and to create a sense of community and brotherhood of all those in revolt?[8] Spring would not oppose these aims (in fact, his highlighting of them is one of the book's strengths): but nowhere in his primer does go beyond their simple postulation. Spring is a libertarian of sorts in rhetoric and a liberal in practice.

In the sixties possibly this little book might have contributed to a cultural conscientization. Today the book's ideas seem a little stale, lacking in energy and power. Stirner, Freire, Illich, Neill are not adequate for our historical period, the decade of the apocalypse, when even the stones cry out for concrete proposals rooted in historically imaginative, radical and precise analysis.

Michael R. Welton
Brandon, Manitoba

* * *

Benjamin Fine. *The Stranglehold of the I.Q.* New York: Doubleday & Co., 1975. Pp. 278. $7.95.

The author of this book, which was published posthumously by his wife, was at one time Education Editor of the *New York Times* and it must have been the last product of a long, distinguished journalistic career. It is a journalist's book, fast-flowing, hard-hitting, written in a popular style, and it has to be evaluated at this level. It is certainly not a scholarly book and the 'facts' often have to be taken with several pinches of salt.

---

[6]Alan Graubard, *Free the Children* (New York: Vintage Books, 1974), p. 14.
[7]Herbert Gintis, "Towards a Political Economy of Education," pp. 31-32.
[8]Bertall Ollman, p. 22.

The book's overall message is clearly expressed in its title. It rides the crest of the current wave of hostility to IQ and other kinds of testing that is sweeping the U.S. It represents one of the swings of the pendulum that are so characteristic of American life. Standardized testing — essentially mechanized testing — of all kinds was for a long time big business in the U.S. and was used in every conceivable school, vocational, business, or military context, when other countries still often clung to the homely, teacher-made test of acquired learning (now re-discovered in America under the name 'criterion-referenced test'). No doubt, often such standardized testing was overused, or misinterpreted; one example of such misuse would be the fact that, according to Fine, in some states funds have been distributed to schools on the basis of student scores on standardized tests. (However, Fine does not tell us whether greater funds were allocated for higher or for lower average scores — if the latter, it would be an example of 'positive discrimination' — would it then be misuse?)

Now comes the swing of the pendulum in the other direction and with it this book whose thesis is that ALL standardized testing is WRONG — whether of intelligence, vocational aptitude, achievement or whatever. The trouble is that the author never comes to grips with selection as a fact of life, at least in our society, and does not face the logical question as to which is the most efficient tool for this purpose.

These are issues to which this review will address itself, although it will have to deal with them summarily and hence somewhat dogmatically and it will have to confine itself to the educational scene. Longer expositions are available, e.g. in Vernon[1] or in Cleary *et al.*[2]

Standardized tests have to be discussed in the context of guidance and selection for certain forms of education. The fact is that society finds guidance and selection necessary or desirable procedures for its continued running. One function of selection, for instance, is to allot educational resources whenever demand for them outstrips supply. This may happen at as late a stage as entry to Law School or Medical School, or, at the other end of the spectrum, when educational resources are limited for the treatment of handicap. Another function of guidance and selection is, of course, to save individuals from too many experiences of demoralizing failure and guide them, instead, towards experiences that will be helpful for their development.

The question then arises by which method we can perform guidance and selection most efficiently and fairly and the test for such efficiency and fairness must be how well a given method predicts an individual's likelihood of success in a chosen area of study, without bringing in extraneous considerations, such as his race or family background.

It is easily forgotten that selection took place long before standardized testing came into vogue. In the earlier part of this century selection for selective secondary schooling in Europe ('grammar school' in England, 'Gymnasium' in Germany) at the age of 10 to 11 was based partly on the ability of parents to pay fees and partly on the results of unstandardized tests of English (or other native language) and arithmetic. (On the basis of the latter, 'scholarships' were awarded to those in need.) When it was found, in the English county of Northumberland, in the 1920's, that relatively too few children from rural schools as compared with town schools gained grammar school places, the lower school achievements of the rural children were attributed to the poorer quality of education in remote rural areas. To redress the balance standardized intelligence tests were introduced into the selection process, since they were thought to be less dependent on direct school experiences. The intelligence test was intended to be 'an instrument of social justice'. It proved to be precisely that, for the proportion of rural children admitted to grammar schools rose after its introduction. The abandonment of the IQ test and the substitution of teachers' judgment in its place in Hertfordshire in the 1950s produced the reverse result, namely an increase in the proportion of middle class children gaining grammar school places. Thus, in certain situations, the use of an intelligence test can mark a decided advance towards greater equitability in selection.

It may, of course, be argued quite justifiably that the basic fault lies in selection itself at such an early age and that the answer would be the provision of broader educational opportunity at the secondary stage. Such provision, which exists in North America and towards which Britain has moved, postpones the need for selection of the more formal kind. Standardized tests, which provide a base of common norms, are useful mainly when children coming from different schools are to be compared. They have also recently been found of value in spotting high talent in mathematics. When it is a question of placement

---

[1]P. E. Vernon, *Intelligence and Attainment Tests,* (London: University of London Press, 1960).

[2]T. A. Cleary, L. G. Humphreys, S. A. Kendrick and A. Wesman, "Educational uses of tests with disadvantaged students," *American Psychologist,* 30 (1975), 15-41.

in certain courses within schools and decisions are flexible and easily reversible, teachers are perfectly capable of comparing and rank ordering their own students and making decisions — or giving guidance — on the basis of tests tailored to measure achievement in their particular courses. ' . . . the best single predictor of a future academic record is usually the past academic record . . .' (Clearly *et al.* 1975, p. 34). It is in such informal settings that exclusive reliance on standardized tests may have undesirable backwash effects on the content of courses and other methods may have greater advantages. However, it is generally agreed that school achievement, whether measured by standardized or course-based tests, depends more heavily on school or home background than does a more broadly based intelligence test. In the end it is the flexibility of the system that provides the best safeguard against a mistaken decision, rather than one or other method of selection.

The justification of any selective instrument must be that it predicts academic performance. If middle class children tend to do better on such a test than working class children, then this does not render the instrument worthless, since they will also perform better on the criterion which the test predicts. But we have to be sure that the criterion is socially relevant and useful. And the predictive efficiency of a test must not rest solely on its ability to predict future from past success, but must include the ability to forecast when a child might overcome environmental handicap, presently noticeable in his achievements (cf. the case Northumberland, cited above).

The alternatives to tests that Fine recommends are, I am afraid, not necessarily better in a selection situation. We have already discussed teacher-made examinations, which he favors. He also seems to be much taken by 'divergent-thinking' or creativity tests. However, as much research including my own, has shown there is considerable overlap between these abilities and conventional, 'convergent' abilities, represented by the traditional IQ tests; furthermore, correlations between socio-economic status and divergent tests are often found to be of roughly the same magnitude as between socio-economic status and convergent tests. Creativity tests simply introduce a slightly different kind of bias, as would possible tests of motivation, or interviews which are particularly susceptible to class or racial biases. While for certain purposes each of these methods might prove useful, especially in combination with standardized tests, each of them carries its own danger. We have to recognize that to select some always means to reject others. With each alternative method we simply discriminate against a different set of persons. We can all agree, however, with Fine's plea for better-trained teachers and inspirational teaching, while having our reservations whether this will solve the perennial problem of matching differential human abilities to different kinds of education.

The book is well-meant and makes a sincere humanistic plea. It is full of interesting information which, however, cannot always be trusted — e.g. I understand that there are no published data available for the test of Negro slang, which Fine praises, let alone data showing that it predicts academic aptitude. It is doubtful also whether any self-respecting school system would base a serious decision on a child, as he claims, on a single IQ figure obtained years earlier. Having a propagandistic aim the book often oversimplifies the issues. It also overstates its case, is repetitious and in the final analysis, therefore, cannot be taken seriously.

Hugh Lytton,
The University of Calgary.

* * *

William Kessen (editor). *Childhood in China.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1975. Pp. xvi, 241. $3.95 (paper).

Education's crucial role in Mainland China is evident in the hard-fought battle over its direction. In the 1950s theoretical education to produce specialists threatened to dominate Mao Tse-tung reversed the trend with a half-work, half-study emphasis intended to promote socialist ideals. When a similar "elitist" education effort gained ground in the early 1960s, Mao countered with the Cultural Revolution. So far, Mao has succeeded in having schools produce youths who are enthusiastic Communists, in linking schools with factories and farms, in having universities run factories and send their students to work in other factories. It is yet to be seen whether or not China's ideological remolding will survive Mao's personal direction.

How China raises its young was the question pursued by 13 American child psychologists, including Urie Bronfenbrenner. In late 1973 they visited schools in Canton, Peking, Sian, and Shanghai. While in their experience the expectation is that school will produce change and some dissent in youths, they found that the Chinese have uniform expectations of proper behavior which their children achieve with little conflict. The child experts entered Mainland China full of questions. They left without full answers but convinced that they "had seen a radically different way of raising new generations."