

educational history. Drawn from Jones' doctoral dissertation and based on extensive archival research, these essays and that of Timothy Dunn whose "Teaching the Meaning of Work: Vocational Education in British Columbia, 1900-1929" challenges earlier interpretations of the history of vocational education, show how deficient the standard accounts of schooling may be. Perhaps it is Jones' work which best underlines the formidable task of writing a "complete" educational history. His inquiry into the strategies adopted by educators like J. W. Gibson to solve the problems of rural schooling, bring out much of the behind-the-scenes controversy among teachers, principals, and superintendents, and the conflict over philosophies and policy making. It is clear from a reading of these chapters that one prerequisite to understanding how the schools were shaped is in more thorough investigation of the social, economic, and political contexts in which educational decisions were taken.

In summary, the Jones, Sheehan and Stamp collection can be warmly recommended to a number of constituencies: certainly to educational historians who might well profit from an example of editorial collaboration that still advances historiography; to teachers who are in need of a critical perspective; and to the lay readership which searches for intelligible prose explanations in Canadian history. Perhaps if we were always to keep the last constituency in mind first, the task of policy makers and committed educators in shaping the future of schooling would be considerably enhanced.

Jorgen Dahlie  
University of British Columbia

## **Tasks and Social Relations in Classrooms: A Study of Instructional Organization and its Consequences.**

Steven T. Bossert, *Tasks and Social Relations in Classrooms: A Study of Instructional Organization and its Consequences*. Cambridge Mass.: Cambridge University Press, 1979, Pp. 119, \$4.95.

This is very important monograph that will be of great interest to teachers, prospective teachers, and professors of education and sociology. The monograph is written by a young American scholar as part of his Ph.D. dissertation in Sociology at the University of Chicago (under the direction of Charles Bidwell). It is one of those rare dissertations that not only deserves to be published but also deserves to be read. Moreover, it is written in a style that can be understood and appreciated by teachers, undergraduate students, and professors.

In a nutshell, the monograph examines how the structure of activities, particularly the nature of common, recurrent instructional tasks, shapes the behavior of teachers and pupils. The study is based upon many interviews with both teachers and pupils and an extensive period of observation, over two years, in several elementary classrooms. The monograph provides an in-depth examination of how variations in certain forms of instruction, specifically recitation and individualized instruction, affect teachers' use of classroom control, the allocation of instructional assistance among pupils, the formation of peer groups, and the development of norms for group competition and cooperation.

The monograph links these issues with the extensive research that has been conducted in industry. Some readers may be amazed to discover that there has not been very much research on the nature of classrooms and the social relationships that develop. Bossert argues persuasively that this is a very important topic in order to understand the way in which different pupils learn and form attitudes towards school.

Of course there is Robert Dreeben's book *On What is Learned in School* (1968) in which a number of propositions about the differences between families and schools are postulated, but there are very few empirical analyses of any of Dreeben's propositions. In Bossert's work, the notion of universalism, as presented by both Parsons and Dreeben, is examined. That is, Bossert examines whether children are treated in accordance with their needs in both recitation activities and individualized instruction activities. The results show that there is much more unjust treatment in recitation activities than in individualized instruction activities. Teachers who use individualized instruction are able to provide individual assistance when necessary but teachers who use recitation have few opportunities to provide individual assistance, and when assistance is given, the top achievers receive a disproportionately high share.

Moreover, Bossert also shows that certain teachers are more likely to use these two basic types of presentations to different degrees. That is, some teachers almost always use individualized instruction while others almost always use recitation. Thus, elementary school pupils are generally locked into classrooms stressing different types of organization which, in turn, influence the interaction patterns between the pupils and the teacher. There is strong indication that this also affects achievement and attitudes towards school.

In this book it is critical to distinguish clearly between recitation and individualized instructional activities. Here, the author fails a little because the reader must piece together sentences from a number of different places in order to obtain a clear definition of these two concepts. In a broad sense, recitation "is usually characterized by full class participation, one member at a time, a single topic and task, and teacher control over topic and pupil participation." "By contrast, individualized instruction atomizes the work activity and often involves substantial pupil choice over the topic and method of completion." (p. 10)

Even with this definition, it is not absolutely clear how Bossert classified the classroom activities into the two categories. He recognizes this problem in Chapter 2 and explains his position by arguing that others (Flanders, etc.) who have used standardized methods of classifying interaction patterns have often failed to obtain meaningful information because they were too inflexible. That is, they set up their categories before exploring the classrooms in order to determine what was taking place. Bossert, on the other hand, entered the classrooms and then decided on the type of classification system he would use once he obtained information on what was taking place. Even then his classification system remained relatively flexible in order to obtain as much meaningful information as possible.

As a result, this type of analysis takes us away from the psychological model of classroom interaction which generally suffers from the assumption that teacher personality or expectations are the primary determinants of classroom behavior and that classroom structure can be characterized as a system of exchanges between a single teacher and different pupils. The psychological model often ignores the collective properties of classrooms and instruction and how these may determine teacher-pupil and peer relations.

We must commend Steve Bossert for examining some of these issues. Now we need more research on related issues and research within schools with different social and structural characteristics—perhaps lower SES schools and open area schools would be two worthy extensions of the present study. More importantly, we need teachers and prospective teachers to become increasingly aware (and concerned) about the manner in which they structure their classroom activities and how this structure has dramatic effects upon their pupils. Through such concerns the education of children cannot help but be improved.

Rodney A. Clifton  
University of Manitoba

## **Educational Futures: Anticipations by the Next Generation of Canadian Scholars.**

Kas Mazurek, ed., *Educational Futures: Anticipations by the Next Generation of Canadian Scholars*. Butterworths, 1979, Pp. 269.

*Educational Futures* is a collection of fifteen essays by sixteen authors, one of the essays being jointly authored. The essays, although perforce grouped under five sub-headings, are so wide ranging in content that it must be seriously doubted whether being published in their present form can be justified. We are told that the authors belong to that group called (or that they constitute it) the "next generation of Canadian scholars." The purpose here is not to question their scholarship but rather to examine whether the essays warrant being published, at least in their present form.

The five headings indicate the essays are on, respectively, cultural identity, politics and education, education and social consciousness, practical and curriculum issues, and school and community issues. But as has been already said, none of the essays within any of these topic areas addresses itself to anything like the same subject matter, except perhaps the first two essays.

Editors usually, if not always, garner essays or previously published articles into book form in such a fashion that the essays/articles all materially relate to a particular *topic*, not because of what fifteen or sixteen authors happen to be thinking at a given time. If one does, however, have a consuming interest in what is currently occupying the academic and scholarly energies of a group of education students, then of course, the book is worth its cost at any price. On the other hand, *Educational Futures* may serve to acquaint, say, first year education students with wide ranging concerns and issues that seem to be generally accepted as legitimately within the province of education.

For example, if the book was used as a first year text the student might learn that professionalism "serves *only* (my italics) as an artificial status barrier between teachers and other groups" and that "teachers are state workers" not professionals (p.111). Students then can move on to read a discussion of art and perhaps learn of "the truth of the sea" (p. 128). Perhaps it is a trifle unfair to juxtapose these quotations; nevertheless they represent the extreme