

These essays offer both expert and neophyte, a thoughtful and lucid analysis of the emergence and development of scholarly inquiry in education and its implications for policy.

Henry Hodysh  
The University of Alberta

Serow, Robert C., *Schooling for Diversity: An Analysis of Policy and Practice*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1983. 161 pp. \$18.00(U.S.). Available in Canada from the Guidance Centre, Faculty of Education, University of Toronto.

In light of current trends and issues in the delivery of education both in the United States and Canada, the appearance of this book is timely. In Alberta, for example, two major reviews are underway: first, of the goals and content of secondary education, and second, of all curricular material for potential sources of bias, intolerance and discrimination towards minority groups. If this text was intended to analyze socialization policy and practice in education with respect to minorities and provide educators and policymakers with the much needed research upon which to base policies, its readers will be disappointed. Such an analysis is incidental to what the author actually does — an attempt to assess the contribution public schooling in America has made to the creation of tolerant citizens and to propose a model of socialization for tolerance. Confining references to policy and practices to education in the United States as Serow does limits the book's usefulness. Only in a general way is it possible to extrapolate and apply the analyses to other educational systems, for example, Canada, where similar issues are under discussion. Serow's inquiry and consequent findings on the integration of racial and other minority groups into the American institutional mainstream is a much needed activity, but one that falls short of its aim.

In his introductory chapter, Serow explores the concept of social diversity in terms of how American schools have historically dealt with their heterogeneous populations. In defining the concept, he views social differentiation along racial lines first and ethnicity second; "tolerance socialization" is the inculcation of certain democratic norms that bring about better race relations. These definitions may accurately fit the American situation but not other social systems. His treatment of the concept of social diversity should not be dismissed completely, however, for Serow succeeds in pulling together certain basic principles useful to the student of the social and political foundations of education. A more serious problem from the outset is the author's normative stance. The development of ethnic and race relations in America is presented within a progressive movement of increasing social and cultural tolerance. Basing his claim that American society has experienced success as a multiracial and multiethnic society on the stability of its political and social systems, he is essentially equating social and political stability with social tolerance. Broadly compared to other nations (Lebanon, Rhodesia, Cyprus and Northern Ireland), the United States appears to be a relatively tolerant society in Serow's view. Serow obviously glosses over American racial and ethnic relations in making this highly questionable generalization. He fails to reconcile this conclusion with the "melting pot" concept characteristic until recently of American policy. The stability Serow speaks of may in fact be the result of certain political arrangements which hold groups in relatively stable structures. Furthermore, if diversity has become a principal concern in American education as the author claims, it is not because of a highly effective school socialization program, but more likely because the "melting pot" policy has not worked; interracial and ethnic problems remain unresolved. Serow further states that the school, charged with the task of developing tolerant citizens, has contributed significantly to the creation of a tolerant society. What should be hypotheses or questions that direct inquiry are conclusions drawn at the outset influencing the selection and treatment of theory, research findings and practical evidence.

Serow's review of relevant research and theory in the second chapter is particularly useful to the student investigating the whole area of the formation of attitudes conducive to social diversity and harmony. Reviewing major studies in sociology and political science literature, he concludes that no link has been found between the school — its instructional, climatic and organizational properties — and the successful social integration of diverse populations. In fact, Serow notes that although education has expanded in America, intolerance still exists. Analyzing certain basic questions in American education, he casts doubt on his earlier claims regarding the role of schooling in the whole process of socialization for diversity.

In his broad overview of standard references, Serow makes no attempt to delve into the dynamics of school practice and the manipulation of sociopolitical orientations. Although he does not explore the questions to any depth, he does succeed in provoking and probing so that the critical issues emerge clearly and forcefully, e.g., what keeps society together — consensus on basic values or tolerance for diversity? This identification of critical

issues serves an important function in the training of the student new to the field.

After discounting existing theories and approaches in the search for an analytic framework, Serow arrives at a functional notion of tolerance. This is the disposition which allows people to work in a socially diverse environment for the pursuit of individual and common goals. Within the context of the desegregation movement in American education, Serow argues for sustained daily contact between children of varying backgrounds as a prerequisite for the development of cooperative tolerant behaviour essential to the well-being of a diverse, democratic society. In other words, the answer, which he finds in desegregation research, is in structured arrangements. He expands this framework of functional tolerance and intergroup relations to include Kohlberg's levels of moral development, and builds a typology of intergroup behaviour which allows him to classify levels of tolerant behaviour. Measured against this typology, Serow admits that the United States has a history of severe social and economic inequality, dysfunctional group relations and racial antagonism. This seriously undermines his original premise. In attempting to explain levels of tolerance or intolerance, he looks at the school which sets norms for intergroup behaviour through its structure and climate, without actually identifying the origins of student attitudinal outcomes. This conclusion contradicts his earlier statements about the role of the school in affecting attitude formation.

Two separate chapters describe certain policies and programs in American education designed to facilitate social integration — mainstreaming of the handicapped and multicultural education. Serow's discussion of multicultural education is the more interesting and productive in that basic issues in cultural and social diversity are highlighted. His discussion of the merits and deficiencies of multicultural education indicates clearly the lack of direction in multicultural policy in North America generally. Serow believes that multiculturalism has a place in the curriculum, but only as a supplement to it. Socialization should be towards something that is common to all students. The problem with this conclusion is that although minorities under the doctrine of pluralism being excluded from separate development means inequality, socialization that occurs towards a common culture is, in fact, socialization towards a dominant culture. There is no socialization where all groups give up something equally for something common. Either way, minorities lose out. Commonality is an attractive idea, but no society works that way. It is an ideal prescription which overlooks power.

It is in his concluding statement that a more realistic stance is taken. Serow questions whether Americans, in fact, want a tolerant society and are willing to make the necessary sacrifices to effect certain institutional changes, including the schools. Had the inquiry at the outset been injected with an element of scepticism coupled with a comparative perspective, what is a clear, well-written, succinct book would have not been undermined by an ideological, ethnocentric bias so common in American scholarship.

Elaine V. Harasymiw  
Alberta Education

Osborne, Ken, *The Teaching of Politics: Some Suggestions for Teachers*. Toronto: The Canadian Studies Foundation, 1982. 84 pages.

The year 1968 saw the publication of *What Culture? What Heritage?*, which was a report of the inquiry organized by A. B. Hodgetts into the teaching of Canadian history in Canadian schools. This was the largest investigation of any subject area ever conducted in Canada. Hodgetts' account of the stifling teaching methods and boredom and apathy evident in classrooms became known and led to many actions to correct the state of affairs. An emphasis on Canadian Studies, initially sparked by Hodgetts' report, resulted in the founding of the Canada Studies Foundation in 1970. Since that time, the Canada Studies Foundation has sponsored a series of projects across Canada through which curriculum materials and teacher resources are developed. This monograph — *The Teaching of Politics* — is a result of the project based at The University of Manitoba which concerns itself with the teaching of politics in elementary and secondary classrooms.

Research in political behaviour indicates that the belief that formal instruction in politics will influence the thoughts and actions of persons in a society is somewhat uncertain. However, rather than suggest indifference or hopelessness, the current instructional notions support the need for the identification of more appropriate and realistic approaches education might take in the teaching of politics.

There is strong evidence to indicate that far too many students graduate from schools without having studied Canada's political system. They have virtually no idea of the system or how it works. There is also evidence to