gifted. No one has established that those who are so selected more often become creative scientists or artists in adult life. There is also no solid evidence regarding the relative efficacy of various enrichment and other programmes. Again we do not know the value of trying to teach creative problem solving, or inventiveness, as part of the regular curriculum for all students. Does it do more than improve performance on the actual kinds of tasks practised, or does it spread to better thinking and personality adjustment generally? Alternatively does it hinder the acquisition of basic achievements and logical thinking?

Clearly there has been progress in recognizing the needs of gifted children throughout the United States and Canada. Probably most large cities and urban areas now have regular programmes, though fewer rural and small town areas do. One had feared that, following the initial enthusiasm, there might be a strong reaction of the public, and educational administrators, against special provision being made for students who are already privileged. For even when segregation of gifted students in separate schools or classes is avoided, those receiving limited enrichment in their own schools are being favoured, and costing more to diagnose and educate. There is progress also in setting up courses of training for teachers of the gifted in many American universities, though much less in Canada. About 20 years back, a great many parents of gifted children were reluctant to make any demands, and afraid of their children being regarded as 'different'. But nowadays the various associations for parents, and others interested in gifted students, are giving much help by means of meetings, literature, etc., and promoting acceptance of their aims. The reaction may come, particularly if provision for the gifted becomes a political issue. We would be better prepared for it if we had better scientific, and more convincing, proof of the value of our aims and of current methods of carrying them out.

P.E. Vernon
University of Calgary

Knights, Robert M. and Bakker, Dirk J. (eds.) *Treatment of Hyperactive and Learning Disordered Children: Current Research*. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1980, 419 pp.

Treatment of Hyperactive and Learning Disordered Children presents papers from a recent NATO-sponsored international conference concerned with intervention strategies for children suffering from learning disabilities and/or hyperactivity. I would like to highlight a few of the major points made in each of the sections of the book so as to indicate something of the content of various papers. This discussion is then followed by some general comments regarding the proceedings as a whole.

In the section on early identification and prevention, Silver and Hagin make the point that there is no generally accepted model of reading. For this reason, they suggest, the validity of any predictive instrument aimed at identifying children who will later experience significant learning problems is somewhat suspect. Silver and Hagin have, despite these problems, developed an early identification scanning measure and describe their research on the measure.

Wedell's paper discusses certain of the methodological complexities which often as not plague early identification programmes. The Wedell paper presents cogent arguments for abandoning so-called early identification programmes in favor of an ongoing indepth analysis of the interaction between the child (his or her learning strategies, weaknesses and so on) and the learning environment. In contrast, Schenck et al. argue that traditional early identification programmes are essential to allow for intervention at a time when the child's nervous system is more plastic and responsive to change; and before the child has been subject to repeated learning failures. This first section of the text also includes an article by Gjessing delineating a number of subgroups of dyslexia based upon a functional analysis of observable learning difficulties.

The section on self-control techniques begins with a paper by Camp in which she suggests that psychoeducational training with aggressive boys may be a useful strategy for development of delinquency prevention programmes. The complexity of the problem is demonstrated by the fact that, as Camp herself notes, the boys in her sample used self-guiding speech in some circumstances and not others.

In the same section, Douglas discusses higher mental processes in hyperactive versus learning disabled children. She suggests that attentional problems in the learning disabled child are secondary to other primary difficulties, such as a language disability while those of the hyperactive are constitutionally based.

The papers in the section headed "diet manipulation" focus upon an evaluation of research concerning the efficacy of the Feingold diet in controlling hyperactivity. The Feingold diet involves the elimination of artificial flavouring and colouring agents and of foods containing salicylates (aspirin-like compounds) from the diet.

The major points which emerge from certain of the papers are that: a) a small subgroup of hyperactives may suffer from food allergies and be responsive to the diet; and b) there are many methodological problems with much of the research, for example, subject non-compliance with the diet. Controversies such as what is the appropriate dosage of aritficial colouring to be administered in experimental studies also plague this work. In general, most, if not all of the authors in this section, suggested that the Feingold diet when medically supervised (as it should be, due to its restriction of Vitamin C and other nutrients) may be a useful alternative to medication. However, Harley and Matthews point out that the diet might sometimes be used uncritically by parents to treat their children and may lead to postponement of medical, psychological, educational or other appropriate treatment modalities.

The papers dealing with "drug treatment" include the work of Ludlow et al. who discuss research revealing that with certain hyperactive children, stimulant medication may serve to improve impulse control while not improving cognitive functioning. Methodological problems in the research literature on drug treatment for hyperactivity are reviewed by Kinsbourne et al. Problems considered include for instance, under or overdosage, and inclusion of adverse responders in the sample.

Barkley et al. report important findings on the impact of stimulant drugs (administered to hyperactive children) upon parent-child interactions. The evidence suggests that hyperactive children, even on low dosages of stimulants, decrease their social interactions with parents, teachers and peers. The section concludes with discussion of a study by Ferguson et al. which investigated the factors influencing the rate of positive behavioral response of hyperactive children to stimulants.

The section on language training begins with Weithorn's presentation of some intriguing data concerning the relationship of language competence to levels of cognitive performance in hyperactive children. It appears that some hyperactives are able to mitigate the detrimental effects of overt motoric impulsivity on academic performance due to their high language maturity. Other papers in this section include that of Brack who describes various verbal imitation programmes with significantly language delayed children and a paper by Brown delineating appropriate strategies with reading disabled children who display *no* significant oral language problem. The section concludes with Blank's description of a useful communication model for the assessment and remediation of language disorders. The model allows for assessment of the child's language functioning in response to teacher demands.

The section on special training techniques contains papers on diverse topics. O'Leary et al. review literature on behavioral treatment for hyperactives and suggest that the literature indicates that this strategy is a viable alternative to medication. Cornoldi examines the impact of training of basic memory functions, such as spatial memory, upon cognitive functioning in learning disabled children. Hammes outlines research evaluating the relative adequacy of four perceptuo-motor training programmes in improving such processes in learning disabled children.

The final section of the book is entitled "theoretical approaches". In this section, Jones reviews selected literature on motor activities as a remediation for learning disorders and suggests a variety of refinements in the methodology of studies addressing this issue. Other papers present models of learning to read and of a diagnostic-prescriptive approach to the remediation of reading disorders.

The final paper by Kronick examines the presumed interactional deficits of learning disabled individuals both as the consequence of the primary deficit(s) (for instance, inability to make appropriate judgments) and as secondary symptoms (resulting from the reactions of others to the individual's learning disability).

In summary, I would recommend this book as a very useful overview of current theorizing and research in the area of the management of learning disorders and hyperactivity. It is noteworhty that not all the papers within a particular section are consistent in terms of conceptualization of the problem or intervention approach. This, I would suggest, is a valuable feature of the book in that it does suggest, implicitly at least, that each of the topic areas addressed is to date characterized by much controversy. This is a book best suited to those who already have a reasonable sophistication with the educational and cognitive research literature dealing with learning disordered and hyperactive children. Such a reader will be in a position to critically evaluate certain of the models presented and technical supportive data cited. Had each section also included an initial discussion of controversies regarding general methodological and conceptual issues in each of the areas discussed, the book would have been more suitable for those readers who have less familiarity with this field. The quality of the papers, in my view, is uneven. However, it is necessary to keep in mind that judgments of that type are likely to be somewhat biased depending on one's theoretical preferences.

In summary, I would highly recommend this book as a good opportunity for exposing oneself to alternative views and data interpretations expounded upon by a group of distinguished researchers.

Sonja Grover,
University of Calgary

D.P. Leinster-Mackay. *The Educational World of Daniel Defoe*. English Literary Studies Monograph Series, The University of Victoria, 1981. 103 p. $4.25.

The literature on Defoe is already very considerable, as the bibliography in this little volume bears witness, yet students of the eighteenth century will still welcome an opportunity to renew their acquaintance with that eager, busy, fascinating personage. Defoe was a man of many parts — novelist, journalist, political pamphleteer, business man, Government agent, Dissenter, adviser to his generation on a multitude of social issues and interpreter of his age to posterity. But many of his modern admirers may be surprised to learn that Defoe ranked in his day also as an educationist and they will be grateful for this introduction to the unregarded educational dimension of his career.

The author encounters some problem of organization. His introductory chapter, "Defoe and his England", endeavours to separate Defoe's life from the times in which he lived, even though, as is acknowledged, this causes some overlapping between the two sections. Again the author encounters, or creates, a problem later in the monograph by endeavouring to sustain a distinction between Defoe's reactions to contemporary educational situations on the one hand and his educational principles on the other. Here also the author acknowledges the problem:

> The line between reaction to situations and principles is not very clear; the one merges into the other, but the context for each . . . is even less clear.

Yet he perseveres with his distinction and so, having discussed Defoe's views on contemporary educational issues, he includes a further chapter in which "the general Defoean principle is abstracted from the particular Defoean situation." On the whole, the author's own forebodings concerning this arrangement would seem to have been justified but this does not really detract from a book which is both interesting and enjoyable. For one thing, to study Defoe is to be drawn into the complexities of a turbulent period of English history. Dr. Leinster-Mackay packs a great deal of information into a small space and reveals many little known facts about Defoe's career, for example, his participation in the Monmouth Rebellion of 1685 and the sad down-turn in his fortunes which resulted from the untimely death of his patron William III in 1702. Defoe's subsequent service under the Tories and his return to the Whig side after 1714 have earned him some reputation as a veritable Vicar of Bray, and perhaps Dr. Leinster-Mackay does not defend him against this charge as vigorously as he might. For Harley, the Tory leader whom Defoe served in Queen Anne's region, was incorrigibly moderate and even whiggish.

The book reveals clearly how Defoe was shaped by his early experience. He was raised in a pious Presbyterian family of modest means in an age when Dissenters were subject to very considerable harassment under the terms of the Clarendon Code. His father, James Foe, was ambitious for his son and sent him to the celebrated Dissenting Academy at Newington Green where he studied under Dr. Charles Morton, a distinguished teacher who would later be vice-president of Harvard University. Dissenting Academies usually provided a much broader education than that dispensed by more orthodox institutions and Defoe's experience at Newington Green made him a lifelong advocate of modern subjects rather than Latin in the schools. Also, having been excluded from the Universities because of his religion, Defoe became a fierce critic of Oxford and Cambridge for their slackness and corruption. On the other hand he himself was despised by the University-educated literary establishment because of his scant knowledge of the Classics.

Defoe was a man of his time in many ways. For example he offered much advice on the education of "Gentlemen", whose ignorance he deplored, and that of "tradesmen" who in his view needed a strictly utilitarian training. "Business does not . . . call for a liberal education, and it is the tradesman's mercy that this is so." Like most people in his day, Defoe accepted that social divisions were God-given and operated in the best interests of all. Everyone should therefore willingly accept his situation in life. Such a view, remarks Dr. Leinster-Mackay perceptively, was as philanthropic as it was selfish, since it was based upon the belief that human happiness depended upon the conscientious fulfillment of one's allotted function. Defoe was also a creature of his time in his attitude towards child labour; he was deeply impressed at the sight of a six year old earning his living, though