research brings to light, must be able to set those facts into a context of past developments. He must be aware of what "education" at a given time and place in the past actually meant to those who provided it and to those who experienced it. Without at least a basic knowledge of this nature Sherman's suggestion that each student "identify an interest in education, research it historically and teach about it in [a] class" (p. 126) of his peers will almost certainly result in the uncertainty that Sherman mentions. Worse still, it will likely result in something that is not history.

My second criticism is based on Sherman's understanding of the term "historiography," or perhaps I should say lack of understanding. Historiography is more than just "the study of how history is done and what is involved in doing it" (p. vii). It is also the history of how history has been done in the past and how and why this has changed over time. Sherman pays lip service to this change but his approach is basically ahistorical. He notes in his introduction to Chapter 3, "The Nature and Value of History," that change has occurred; he could hardly have chosen two better examples to illustrate change than Carl Becker's 1931 Presidential Address to the American Historical Association and Howard Zim's 1970 article on radical history. But he omits any comment on why such change has taken place or on its significance in relation to the study of history.

To further compound the omission, this new edition is introduced by Sol Cohen's *The History of the History of American Education 1900-1976: The Uses of the Past.* This article goes some way towards documenting and suggesting reasons for the changes that have taken place in the writing of American educational history in this century. But Sherman dismisses its significance with the glib comment "It should be useful to note where it [the history of education] has been and where it may be going (p.1)". Apparently, as far as Sherman is concerned, any point of view at any point of time in the past is simply another "perspective" and all are equally valid in the present. In other words, one does not need to use historical method when dealing with past writings on the history of education — only when dealing with historical facts themselves. To my mind, this is a gross and unforgivable error on the part of any historian. However, perhaps it explains the inclusion of several thirty-, forty- or even fifty-year-old essays and numerous suggestions for the further reading of a similar vintage without any editorial or historiographic comment by Sherman. Age alone does not necessarily diminish the value or validity of a piece of historical writing but it may well add a different significance. To omit any comment on this point in a book which purports to teach historical method is a serious weakness.

One final comment must be made. Revisions of publications are sometimes made more with the interests of the publisher than those of the reader in mind. But in this case Sherman assures us that the purpose of a second edition is to bring the book up-to-date. Why then the lack of up-to-date material? Of the new additions in the revised edition, the most recent (with the exception of Sherman's own contribution in Chapter 4) was published in 1979. More than half predate the publication date of the first edition. Likewise the extensive lists of suggested further readings contain only a handful of recent titles.

Understanding History of Education, then, does not live up to the promise of its title; it offers little enlightenment on the problems of writing history, less still on the history of education.

Gilliam Weiss
University of the South Pacific,
South Australia

Slavin, Robert E. *Cooperative Learning*. New York: Longman Inc., 1983, ix + 147 pp., $39.50.

Robert Slavin's purpose in writing *Cooperative Learning* was to describe the status of cooperative learning research. He accomplishes this goal by first establishing selection criteria and then grouping the investigations into four categories: academic achievement, intergroup relations, mainstreaming of academically handicapped students, and other non-cognitive outcomes. He devotes a chapter to each of these research topics. Along the way, Slavin defines important concepts and briefly describes cooperative learning methods. He concludes by summarizing the major findings of research and by suggesting directions for future investigations.

Before reviewing the research, Robert Slavin makes a number of important distinctions. He maintains that cooperative incentives, cooperative task structure and cooperative motives are not synonymous with cooperative behavior. Cooperative behavior is the actual activity of two or more persons which through coordinated effort facilitates goal achievement. This differs from cooperative incentive structure wherein two or more individuals are reinforced on the basis of their collective performance. Cooperative task structure involves two or more persons who work together on a particular task. Cooperative motives are predispositions to behave cooperatively rather than individualistically or competitively. All of these phenomena constitute cooperation, but they are rarely found in a pure state.

He further distinguishes between group productivity and individual learning. Group productivity refers to the results of cooperative behavior such as building more stable towers with additional blocks, whereas individual learning is an inferred process related to relatively permanent changes in students' behaviour tendencies. Increased learning produces higher achievement. The significance of this distinction should not be underestimated in that cooperation may result in higher levels of group productivity without realizing concomitant increments in individual learning. While group productivity is not without value, individual learning is more important for students.

The descriptions of cooperative learning strategies are accurate, but at times too short to provide the uninitiated reader with a thorough understanding of how teachers promote cooperative learning. Greater detail would have been helpful. For example, the description of the jigsaw technique omits reference to teambuilding and follow-up activities such as "fishbowling" which are important to the success of jigsaw classrooms. Given the main purpose of the book, however, this shortcoming is tolerable, especially in the light of the additional references provided by the author. A useful table compares cooperative learning methods in relation to four characteristics: specific group rewards, task specialization, group competition, and equal opportunity scoring procedures.

Robert Slavin identifies the design features necessary for adequate field research as follows: a duration of at least two weeks; the presence of a control group which is assumed to be equivalent to the experimental group through randomization, or through statistical control of pretest data; when special achievement tests are used, equal opportunity for all groups to learn the material, or when standardized test are used, no special teaching for the tests; equal instructional time for all groups; and the control of teacher effects by rotation of teachers across groups. Only studies which met these criteria were included.

Forty-one field studies of the effects of cooperative learning on academic achievement met Slavin's design criteria. Sixty-three percent of these studies demonstrated positive results. The strongest effect on achievement derived from specific group rewards based on members' learning. Black students gained more than Anglo-American students. In addition, the influence of cooperative learning on achievement was primarily motivational. Slavin embellishes the discussion of cooperative learning and achievement with an attempt at model building. His attempt, similar to efforts elsewhere in the book, is not very helpful, especially when he graphically represents the various relationships.

The research on cooperative learning and intergroup behavior supports contact theory. This theory states that prejudice is reduced by equal status contact between minority and majority group members when such relations are supported by authorities, and when there is a realization that the individuals involved have common goals and a common humanity. Ten of the thirteen studies showed positive intergroup relations effects. A table, similar to those in other chapters, succinctly summarizes important features of the investigations and their results. Slavin suggests that future research should determine the crucial components of cooperative learning for intergroup relations.

Frequently, "mainstreaming" academically handicapped pupils means placement in a regular classroom where they are again segregated. Cooperative learning on the other hand promises true integration. Seven of the ten studies related to cooperative learning and mainstreaming showed positive effects. Cooperative learning overcomes resistance to friendship and interaction between regular and handicapped pupils while at the same time it enhances the academic achievement of both groups. A concern for future research is that long-term benefits are not sustained.

The influence of cooperative learning on non-cognitive outcomes such as self-esteem, pro-academic norms, locus of control, time on task, liking of class, liking of classmates and cooperation is generally positive. For example, the research on self-esteem produced eleven of fourteen studies with favourable results. Future

research, Slavin suggests, should identify the source of the positive findings related to non-cognitive variables. Are the results due to changes in the classroom incentive structure, task structure, feedback systems, authority processes, and/or teacher's roles?

Slavin concludes with a discussion of several unresolved issues. Variables such as specific group regards, task specialization, long-term retention, scoring methods, subject specificity effects and new cooperative learning methods all require further, more detailed study in relation to academic achievement. The unresolved issues related to intergroup relations and acceptance of mainstreamed students are associated with the generalizability of the effects of out-of-class relationships. Moveover, it may be that the variables that produce the effects observed in cross-ethnic relations are different from those that are important in cross-handicap relations. Finally, a list of seventeen theoretical and practical issues which must be resolved are listed. These issues are fertile ground for the creation of future research hypotheses.

After beginning students of cooperative learning have read introductory texts such as *The Jigsaw Classroom* (by E. Avonson, N. Blaney, C. Stephan, J. Sikes and M. Snapp, published by Sage Publications in 1978) and *Learning Together and Alone* (by D.W. Johnson and R.T. Johnson, published by Prentice-Hall in 1975), they, like their more advanced colleagues, will find this volume informative and provocative.

Daniel McDougall
University of Calgary

Willinsky, John. *The Well-Tempered Tongue; The Politics of Standard English in the High School*, New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc., 1984, 183 pp., $23.15 (hardcover).

Given the current panic over academic standards and the related enthusiasm for returning to "the basics," John Willinksy's study of the teaching of English seems timely indeed. Against the background of recent sociolinguistic and sociological studies of language mastery and school achievement, Willinksy presents a case study of the teaching of English in a Canadian high school. A crucial feature of Willinsky's account is his intention to treat "standard English" as a social fact, to critically expose the social construction of the standard. Throughout, his investigation highlights the persistence of a politics of inequality in the face of recent attempts to develop an enlightened language curriculum policy based on the current state of knowledge in linguistics.

Willinsky begins his analysis with a historical overview of the emergence of standard English and its place in the school curriculum. The historical constitution of standard English as a prestige form is shown to be a political fact, the imposition of a definite moral order associated with the development of the nation state and the rise of the bourgeoisie. The educational significance of the prestige form is associated with the school's role in contributing to a more efficient division of labour in society. Willinsky notes that the attempt to explain social inequality in terms of essential (or "natural") rather than socially constructed differences has remained constant, although the locus of essential difference has shifted. Thus during the 1960's, language replaced earlier notions of intelligence and motivation as an explanation of inequality of educational outcomes, marking a shift from a biological to an environmental explanation of difference. This shift has posed a dilemma for teachers. They can no longer naively rely on the older moral posture of imposing the standard; they are to cease disparaging working-class English or Black English. Yet, perhaps unavoidably, they continue to insist on the superiority of their own way of speaking English.

Willinsky observes that in educational literature and policymaking, this dilemma is handled through a new ideology of language teaching which officially renounces a judgmental, correction-oriented approach in favor of modelling the standard against a background of linguistic neutrality and value relativism. Non-standard English is no longer to be regarded as wrong; rather, it is just different. But non-standard English is also *not* what teachers exemplify or recognize. The new ideology thus glosses over the persisting divisive effects of the standard's use on academic achievement and identity formation.

Having set forth an overview of the ideological significance of standard English in both the wider culture and the schooling process, Willinsky turns to his study of English instruction in one Nova Scotia high school.