types (or groups) of individuals which affect the nature of the relationships among teachers and the students they manage. In three chapters she addresses the effects of exceptional children, problem children, and other adults in the school on classroom relations. Finally, she ends her book with a brief consideration of the influence of a broad range of factors external to the classroom and the school on the nature of managed relations there.

One presupposition that seems to underpin Roberts' principles of proper classroom management is that in matters of personal conduct children should be exposed to and learn from the consequences of their actions. This notion is clearly not new and is firmly embedded in our pedagogical and parenting folklore. Roberts presents examples that are variations on Rousseau's and Spencer's theme which can be cautiously encapsulated by the shop-worn example: the burnt child dreads the fire. The distinction between natural consequences (those that follow from a person's confrontation with the laws of nature, without human interference) and logical consequences (those that are arranged or applied by a teacher or parent) would have been most useful to Roberts.

Many of Roberts' principles for proper management can be classified quite safely within the rubric of logical consequences. Implicit within the idea of logical consequences are knowing the rules about proper conduct, enduring the consequences if the rules are violated, and subsequently, choosing to act according to the rules. Such a discrimination seemingly would have justified Roberts' discussion of punishment as a somewhat separate entity from her analysis of proper management practices.

Roberts' focus on the word "management," rather than on the narrower "discipline" seems to be what enables her to look at classrooms in an enlightened fashion. Management denotes the judicious use of means to accomplish ends; the handling of someone in graceful, studied action; the conducting or supervising of something. What is significant to the definition of management is the responsibility of the manager for those whom are managed and for the ends of the management process. It is clear that discipline can be equated to the socializing ends of schooling, and the practice of discipline in our classrooms would necessarily serve us well in this case. However, schools are institutions in which we intend to educate our children. Education, by definition, denotes something more than discipline as means and socialization as goal. Education, as a goal, would be ill-served by discipline as a form of conduct in our classrooms.

It is unfortunate that we have lost one very potent and useful definition of the word management. The *archaic* definition of management is moderation (as in conduct) from respect for the feelings of another. Management, in this archaic sense, incorporates within its definitional horizon notions of consideration and indulgence. It is this meaning of management which seems to flavour Roberts' conceptual stance and practical prescriptions. It is this subtle flavour that creates her novel roux in which many of the customary ingredients are immersed. Essentially a different dish is prepared and served.

Unfortunately, Roberts failed to grapple with the significant relationship between management as means and education as end. Had she done so, *Child Management in the Primary School* might have become much more than a sensible piece of thinking about the way students and teachers should get along in the classroom. Not only would she have turned our heads, but, she might have turned our language and our presuppositions about, and encouraged us to think further about the ways to bring about our most valued goal of schooling — an educated young Canadian.

Dianne L. Common
University of Lethbridge

Loukes, Harold, Wilson, John, and Cowell, Barbara. *Education: An Introduction.* Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1983. 138 pp. $4.95.

Intended for teachers and student-teachers, this is an unusual and thought-provoking book.

John Wilson and Barbara Cowell wrote this book after the death of Harold Loukes. (p. xii) It was based upon Loukes' unpublished writings. Most of Loukes' published writings dealt with moral education, religious education and the education of young children and adolescents. This book was written as an introduction to the study of education. Loukes was Reader in Education at Oxford University and it is possible that he intended to publish a book like this. The manuscript for Loukes' seminars on 'The Pedocratic Oath', a large quantity of fragmentary notes, Wilson's recollections of students who attended his seminars form the basis of this book. (pp. ix-x)

Using this material of Loukes, Wilson and Cowell develop ideas about education that have their roots in "clarity, common sense and freedom from various kinds of prejudice", (p. vii). Education, in their view, is

essentially an interpersonal transaction. Therefore, the intelligent student of education, who thinks carefully about people and learning, is better able to understand education than the professional educator. In short, a special personal kind of philosophical analysis combined with psychological insights would help one better understand the reality of education.

Widely accepted educational theories or contemporary educational practices are of little help. The kinds of psychological and sociological disciplines ordinarily applied to education also lack usefulness. In psychological research, for example, children are viewed as subjects, and in the actual classroom the children cannot be considered in this way. The moral development of the children is most important. The children cannot be considered in an impersonal manner. Sociological analysis is in many cases inappropriate. The aims of sociology make it very difficult for the sociologist to really understand the moral context of the school. The authors think that, "... we actually know very little about education. 'Research' has not told us very much, and most of its so-called 'findings' are questionable." (p. 30) Because educational theory is in a very early stage, it will be a long time before it will be useful.

Books by educationalists are a waste of time. The authors suggest, "What one needs is courage, patience and a clear head — an unwillingness to tolerate nonsense, jargon, prejudice, journalistic chit-chat, high-minded statements about the 'aims of education' and anything phoney." (p. 31) Such statements by Wilson and Cowell seem dramatic. To this reviewer, such statements, though they may contain some truth, are exaggerated. This tends to raise one's level of scepticism about the book as a whole. On what basis should the readers give their ideas more weight than others who are studying education from different perspectives? Are the problems of education as simple as the authors seem to indicate? Can most of the problems of education be sorted out with simple logic?

The authors suggest that common sense could do much to improve the quality of education. As they see it, the problems of education stem from such things as the disruptive behavior of some students in classrooms, the teaching of subjects in an integrated and confused manner, politicians, administrators and porters telling teachers what to do, and various kinds of irrationality. These irrationalities include such things as fantasies about the human mind, a belief in behaviourism, an addition to sociology and idealogy, an obsession with egalitarianism and the fear of ideas like punishment, competition and segregation. (p. 25) The authors devote chapter four to discipline and authority. Chapter five is given to teaching a subject.

As the authors see it, the problems have greatly limited education at the present time. Only in very rare cases where teachers are given power and remain uncorrupted is education as it could and should be. Even though there is not much chance for it now, it is worth exploring the model for his/her students. Teachers need to be better than most people. The moral quality, especially of a teacher's life, should be on a high plane. To this end Loukes proposed a 'Pedocratic Oath' for teachers. This would correspond to the Hippocratic Oath for doctors. The Pedocratic Oath would include a commitment to the profession, a commitment to education and a rejection of exploitation. (pp. 10-13) The authors agree that education is essentially a moral activity. There is a need for moral behavior for educational authorities at all levels. The essential qualities of a good student or learner are moral.

In the past there was a clearer set of expectations by society regarding moral ideals and the role of the teacher. A teacher's job was to teach. It was not to be a social worker or parent. It was the job of the students to learn. If people generally understood this, then some of the problems of education might be overcome. Teaching could often be done most efficiently if the students were put into groups according to their ability to learn. In the past these ideas were better understood. Also, teachers were given more authority to deal with pupils who disrupted the learning of other students.

On the other hand, in educational research there is a need to look forward. Much of what passes for educational research, according to the authors, is not research at all. Here there is a need to look at the methods used by the physical scientists. In the history of science there was a need to break away from astrologers' ideas to get at the truth. In the same way, educational researchers need to break away from fantasies and mythologies in order to find the truth in the field of education. It is hoped that this will take place in the future.

Perhaps the best way to consider a book such as this is the way the authors recommend. They suggest "... this book is not intended primarily as something for the reader to agree with. Naturally, we hope he may agree with some of it, but what matters is that it should help him to clarify what he thinks." (p. 31) There are many ideas in this book with which the reviewer does not agree. However, the book has caused much rethinking on his part.

John Schaller
University of Regina