

standing. Further, once some understanding has been reached, specifically about the constraints understood to be inherent in the actual, then, what actually is the case can be transformed in terms of possibilities and visions.

This sensible argument leads Goodlad to the second reason for writing his book: to proffer a prescription for the transformation of the American compulsory schools. The prescription is a rich one incorporating within it considerations of what should be the case about curriculum, pedagogy, school organization, school and community relationships, and teacher preparation. As the pages turn, the vision of future possibilities matures and with this maturation comes greater challenge to educators, policy makers, and parents alike. The prescription is a thoughtful one in which logistical considerations are carefully addressed. At times, it is clear that Goodlad has anticipated his critics, particularly the ones whose justification for any projected school reform is lodged in economics. At other times, it is clear that Goodlad has let his mind range in a carefully studied and yet free way. It is at these moments that we find Goodlad hopeful, humble, and clearly at his best.

The limitation of this book for a Canadian audience is quite obvious. Goodlad has written a book for Americans, and that was as it should have been. However, the book requires a careful study by Canadians for three reasons. First, there is much in the descriptions that speak to the Canadian compulsory schooling system. It is up to Canadians to sort out what applies and what does not, and to relish what provokes. Second, the book should remind all Canadian educators that a similar study has not occurred in Canada but clearly should. If we are to improve our schools, and it is difficult to argue against their improvement, for while they are generally regarded as good and effective places, they are not ideal places. Therefore, it behooves us to amass the kind of information such as that found in *A Place Called School* in order to ground our reforming efforts in what actually is the case about Canada's schools. Third, *A Place Called School* is as much a vision about what is possible as it is anything else. No society can have too many visionaries, and currently in Canada, schooling as a place of practice and field of study is suffering from a paucity of dreamers. We have had great ones in the past. People such as Ryerson, Neatby, Hall and Dennis have enriched our schooling debate and enabled the progression of our places called school. Currently, most of the Ministries of Education across Canada are engaged in regular forays into our schools, riding on the backs of reforming steeds. Too often, the direction and substance of their jousts have been shaped by peeking across the 49th parallel. When questioned, many policy makers have justified their actions by claiming that there is nowhere else to look. This is sad indeed.

Alfred North Whitehead once said that style is the ultimate morality of the mind . . . the exclusive privilege of the expert. If this is the case, and to my mind it is, then, from my years of reading Goodlad's myriad of written works and listening to some of his presentations, I am developing a sense of Goodlad's style. Something of the man has come to infuse the written and presented word. It is more a result of his style rather than his words that he makes it tremendously clear that schooling is a social good, not to be forsaken, taken for granted, nor lightly. He sees schooling as people who must be empowered in order to reform themselves. Nonetheless, such reform will not be done by people like Goodlad. Only school people will reform the way they live together and the ends they hold. Yet, Goodlad knows some things about schooling that most of us do not, has dared to dream in a way few others have dared, and has had the courage to share all of this. Though such sharing, Goodlad will help to empower those whose task it will be to reform a place called school. It is through this essential conversation that Goodlad's morality and understanding speak and give voice to the style of the man.

Diane L. Common
University of Lethbridge

Marsh, Colin, and Stafford, Ken, *Curriculum: Australian Practices and Issues*. Sydney, Australia: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1984, 290 pp.

This book will encourage teachers who have an aversion to esoteric theory devoid of practical considerations, to read, think and act in an informed manner when they are considering planning curriculum activities for their students. I read the book in two sittings and it was only after I put down the 290 pages, the 370 referred to bibliographic entries and supporting glossary that I realised how supportive the text was in the theory and practice of curriculum at a generalisable level.

Many 'discipline-based' books begin with an analysis of the definitional aspects of the field. This one is no different. The authors use an utilitarian thrust to minimise the dissatisfaction felt in the curriculum field at the lack of tightness in the definitional arena that exists between the concepts of curriculum and instruction. They point out that the emphasis in the chapters is concerned with how to build a curriculum not on why certain procedures should be adopted. The definition adopted by the authors is, with minor modification, the accepted status quo definition within the field. Thus under this umbrella they present thumbnail sketches of Tyler's Rational Prescriptive Objectives-Based model, Walker's Deliberative Approach and Rowntree's Technology approach to curriculum decision making. The Models are used as a vehicle for putting forward the proposition that curriculum planning involves making value judgements at a number of levels. Whilst recognising that teachers plan, the authors assert that what they are often doing in practice is diametrically opposed and at times counter-productive in terms of a theoretical orientation to better decision-making. The thrust of the argument here is to build a case for theory. They offer four groups of theories for consideration: Information Processing, Personal, Social and Behavioristic, without opting for any preferred theory. In analysing the various philosophical, sociological, historical and psychological bases for each, the authors rightly conclude that the level of theorising within the curriculum field is at times immature and incomplete.

This conclusion is not surprising given the confusion that exists within the literature on the basic premises that constitute education, curriculum and instruction as fields of study. The reconceptualists (for example, Pinar), however, are currently reconceiving fundamental concerns, questions and priorities about the field of curriculum enquiry. It is hoped that once their prescriptive and descriptive accounts are formalised for theoretical analysis, the curriculum specialist will have a documentation of events that will lead to new waves of theoretical insights (a paradigm shift) aimed at overcoming this deficit.

The authors themselves offer useful categories that provide principles for design, implementation, instruction and evaluation independently of a mega theory. The statement that "teachers don't merely instruct: they act upon certain priorities which they have planned (explicitly or implicitly) prior to the teaching event" (p. 22) highlights the dilemma facing the theory builder who wants to incorporate a descriptive component into a prescription for action. In discussing the theorists' contribution, the authors sketch enough information on Taba, Tyler, Carl Rogers, Oliver and Newman and Skinner's insights to the curriculum debate that would enable any neophyte to begin her/his own planning framework. In their analysis of the influences of curriculum workers on Australian curriculum, Bruner, Tyler, Taba and Wheeler rank highly.

Evaluation, as a key issue in curriculum design, receives a thorough treatment as an application paradigm. The authors examine the issue by clarifying the various definitional attributes of evaluation, assessment and measurement. The definition of evaluation as an ongoing activity involving a set of procedures enables them to set up a comparative chart on evaluation as a continuum of activities that range from goal-orientated quantitative models to intuitive-qualitative ones. Such an analysis, of course, puts evaluation at a different order of magnitude than that of running class tests, as it incorporates not only the results of curriculum but also the procedures and processes used in arriving at the product. Representative writers in the field are assessed as to their contribution to each of the four models. The writers, Tyler (1949), Stake (1967), Parlett & Hamilton (1972) and Eisner (1977) are classified according to their contribution to evaluation emphases, purpose, key activities and teacher's role. The reader is left to decide which one or which combination of writers best suits his/her particular application to evaluation. The authors thus are true to the descriptive analytical nature of the book and avoid the general prescriptive suggestions of the average 'how to' curriculum text. Nevertheless, the practical examples of the application of the above writers' perspectives on evaluation of self, colleague, material (package), and student are well illustrated through examples of cases.

The contextual dimension for the analysis of curriculum in Australia is presented as a historical account. The use of a historical timeline in the form of a table detailing major reports, legislation, commissions and their recommendations or processes from 1823-1976 is an excellent summary of the detail of the chapter. In addition, the authors catalogue the major leading educationalists, their influence on curriculum thinking, and provide a brief description of their lasting effects on education in general. Within the contextual area the printed word of ways the Australian scene is dominated by text and reference material of an overseas flavour. It is refreshing to note that like Canada, Australia has a growing literature, though sparse, on Australian curriculum issues.

Chapter Five is concerned with the practical steps that a teacher can and should take to become involved in curriculum development. The key roles are fairly familiar but worth repeating. They are curriculum receiver,

modifier, developer and, of course, researcher. A further analysis of roles is offered using Walker's (1978) analysis as a base for site-specific or generic involvement in curriculum. The site-specific case used to highlight the organising framework is that of School Based Curriculum Development (SBCD). For Australia, with highly centralised bureaucracies controlling curriculum at the various State (Provincial) levels, this analysis as a new dimension to curriculum development needs consideration in any discussion of the directions for theory making. With the National Curriculum Development Centre pointing the way and State Departments adopting and modifying the concept, SBDC made some headway into the national schools. However, as a lasting contribution to curriculum within the schools and within professional debates much needs to still be done at both a theoretical and practical level to make this curriculum event a positive force at the school level. The most popular form of curriculum is of the generic category where teacher roles are fairly firmly entrenched within the receiver and modifier dimensions. The authors use a naturalistic model of curriculum theory (after Wise, Walker, Shaw) to highlight the need for evaluations, pointing out that in the generic model, it is important to have evaluative data about the programme both at the development and adaptive stage of development.

Developing the curriculum means (in terms of the theme of the book) translating curriculum into classroom reality. The assertion is made and defended, that as a result of theorising, the teacher prioritises goals and makes explicit the assumptions underlying the particular curriculum approach to be adopted. This is an excellent piece of curriculum theorising. The magic is thus taken out of the reasons why some things are included/excluded from curriculum. The concept of value preferences and decision making priorities as an integral part of the curriculum making process is generally not taken into account explicitly when curriculum theory is being built. The Reconceptualists are making mutterings about new directions for theory and herein could lie a rich avenue for curriculum definitional research. Two approaches to curriculum organisation are used to highlight the decision making process as a reflection of the prioritising. These are the Subject Centred Approach and the Integrated Approach. In order to examine the various approaches that have occurred within the Australian context an interesting time line approach is developed that could be useful for comparative studies. The period 1790-1980 is examined within the contexts of purposes of schooling, scope of subjects, methods used, type of teacher training, influence of examinations and special comments related to the above. The summary is brief but the conclusion is reached by the authors that time allocation to subjects, despite the rhetoric of official statements, has remained relatively unchanged over the last 130 years. This conclusion adds weight to the assertion that the system is geared towards the Subject Centred Approach to curriculum development.

Although the definition of curriculum offered in the beginning of the book appears to limit the theoretical analysis to events immediately concerning the school, the authors implicitly accept a political component into the definition when they include an analysis of levels of decision making at the local state and federal levels. The political component consists of ministers of the state and federal governments, unions, subject specialists at universities and at the professional association level, parents and citizens (friends, PTA), lobby groups, national agencies (CDC), etc. The Reconceptualists within the curriculum field would, of course, include these groups within the definitional aspects of the term curriculum. However, the authors discount by definition the above groups within their analytical framework. The excellent case study of M.A.C.O.S. (Man A Course of Study), an overseas import developed under the auspices of Bruner and adapted for use by the CDC for Australian Schools (after discussion and modification by each state), is used to highlight the influence of lobby groups. M.A.C.O.S. was implemented in all states. After a brief entrance in Queensland (State) schools, it was withdrawn by the state premier on the advice from religious fundamentalists groups as being not suited to the state's children. This withdrawal as a curriculum event, cannot be explained under the definition accepted in many orthodox curriculum texts including this one. It can thus be asserted that the definition of all the experiences that a learner has under the direction of the school (and its modifications to include planned experiences etc.) limit curriculum theorising to the base level, the school. This section of the book highlights implicitly the need for curriculum theory to incorporate the political in trying to understand curriculum as it happens. To do otherwise is to leave too much unsaid. It is my contention that the present paradigm adopted by the vast majority of writers in the field of curriculum and instruction confuses the two. Further, the present paradigm has been extended to its limits. What is needed is a paradigm shift away from the traditional school base, as the encompassing pool of knowledge within curriculum theory, towards a more comprehensive definition that includes political value preferences and decision making prerogatives. The distinction between instruction and curriculum theorising would be enhanced and better theories could be built based on a more comprehensive analysis of the real world. The curriculum umbrella as a branch of educational theory could then be developed as an organising principle for better instruction.

The final chapter surveys contemporary issues in Australia as its organising focus. A claim counter claim format is used as the issues are discussed. This is followed by a critical appraisal of alternative curriculum designs. The issues in themselves are interesting and highlight the diversity of areas that are of concern to curriculum workers in Australia. These issues are: multicultural/aboriginal education, transition from school to work, moral education, non-sexist education, computer education, gifted and talented children, and leisure education. This last chapter is sketchy. Although it offers a mixture of facts and assertions regarding Australian contemporary issues, it could just as easily have been omitted without doing any damage to the rest of the book.

In general terms there has been maintained throughout the book a creditable mix between academic fringe dwellers and hard core discipline centred ideals, assertion and hard evidence, conjecture and fact. The case studies draw the themes together. The notorious time dimension of the task of teaching that restricts teacher development on the job (and as a consequence curriculum planning and thinking) is well-documented as a source inhibiting teacher involvement in experimentation and innovation. Thus the brief thumbnail sketches, tables, graphs, timelines and summaries allow professionals in the field to quickly read the salient points prior to serious study of a practical guide to curriculum development.

Darol M. Cavanagh
University of Wollongong
New South Wales, Australia

Dunlop, Francis, *The Education of Feeling and Emotion*. London: Allen and Unwin Inc., 1984, 129 pp., \$7.50 (paper).

This book is very interesting and very good.

It begins with a discussion of two contrasting philosophers, R. S. Peters and John MacMurray, on the nature of emotion and its place in human existence. For Peters, emotion is closely connected with beliefs, and the educational task is the development of appropriate appraisals (a moral matter) and the control and canalisation of passivity, achievements the validity of which lies in their conformity to rationality and social norms. This view the author regards as too intellectual, and the contrasting position of MacMurray is elaborated, according to which the world can be encountered and felt without any intervening scheme of publicly testable concepts or language; the ideal action is spontaneous expression, keeping us in touch with the heart and maintaining personal wholeness. This point of view is regarded as not intellectual enough, and Dunlop's skillful treatment of the two philosophers leaves one ready to believe that the truth will probably incorporate elements from each.

There then follows a general survey of the affective sphere. This is as good and as comprehensive a review of the literature on emotion as exists anywhere. Here are found Langer, Reid, Bantock, Findlay, Brentano, Osborne, Whitehead, Kenny, Midgley and Tanner; also Hillman, Claparede, Duffy, James, Arnold, Leeper, Pradines, Marshall, Dumas, Polanyi, Bridges and Gasson; further Lersch, Strasser, Scheler, Sartre, Maslow, Bollnow and Ingarden. Emotion is analysed in relation to psychic disturbance, conation, perception, cognition, upheaval, sentiment, attitude, mood, depersonalization, excitement, appraisal, impulse and feeling. Thus the difficulty and complexity of the subject are well exhibited; yet the author still succeeds in deriving some specific results from the survey.

One of the results is the claim that it is necessary to think of the human mind in terms of stratification. The affective occupies one layer, thinking and willing another. Integration and balance are the outcome of self-discovery and self-realization. Also, feeling is indispensable for value, since value requires experience of the world directly whereas thought apprehends not the world but a matrix of principles and criteria. The largest enemy of feeling, and of life, is the increasing technicizing of existence through technology.

Suggestions with regard to the education of feeling and emotion are given. Dunlop's view is that the matter is not inescapably moral, but involves development. His remarks, however, are by no means limited to what follows from the discussion so far. Predictably, literature and other arts are seen as important, since they are expressive, and literature is reckoned most important because it is in language that the subtleties of feeling are