

is faithful to his announced purposes and has produced a clear, concise, highly readable account. We wish for more information and a broader context. These are the characteristics of a successful work.

Joseph M. Hawes
Kansas State University

W.B. Barbe and J.S. Renzulli (ed.) *Psychology and Education of the Gifted* (Third Edition). New York: Irvington Publishers, 1981. xi + 519 pp. \$16.95

This is a revised edition of earlier volumes edited by Barbe. The majority of the 48 articles it contains differ from those included previously, with considerable advantage in being more up to date. Also Renzulli, whose work on gifted children is widely known, has become coeditor. Perhaps he pushes his own approaches to the topic somewhat unduly; he is sole or part author of 8 articles. Even Torrance has only 3. The organization of the contents into 8 well-defined sections is an improvement. But in other respects the editing is rather careless. Many of the articles refer to Figures which are missing; frequently too, the whole or part of the lists of references is omitted.

Views will naturally differ widely on what sort of contribution should or should not be included. Generally the volume as a whole gives quite a good survey of the whole area at the present time, which would be useful, not as a textbook, but as a book of supplementary readings in courses for teachers of the gifted. Just half the articles in the book seem to me worth reading. Most of the other half are harmless but have little new to contribute, and the rest are representative of the kind of 'waffle' that is all too common when teachers and psychologists talk or write about gifted children and creativity.

First there are five articles which might be called classics, dating from 1954-1962; a summary by Terman of his life's work on gifted children, Guilford on Structure of Intellect, Roe on eminent scientists, MacKinnon mainly on architects, and Virgil Ward's analysis of the basic concepts in identification and treatment. H.B. Robinson, Roedell and Jackson describe a long-term follow-up, at the University of Washington, of very bright children, identified at 5 years or earlier. Treffinger, Renzulli and Feldhusen give a useful discussion of the difficulties in identification; and Renzulli, Hartman and Callahan describe the Scale for Rating Behavioral Characteristics of Superior Students (SRBCSS). However no evidence is supplied that teachers are more accurate in using this than in their ordinary nominations.

R.L. Ellison *et al.* report on the value of biographical inventories for selecting artistically talented; and Kreitner and Engini classify the available tests and other methods for assessing musical talent. Julian Stanley's Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth (SMPY) is the longest and 'meatiest' chapter in the book. He makes a strong case for acceleration rather than the enrichment of such students.

In the section on treatment, Treffinger gives some practical rules on stimulating self-directed learning. J.C. Gowan's analysis of the nature of creativity is interesting; and Treffinger and Gowan list a large number of published programmes for stimulating creativity in the classroom, for all children, not just the most gifted. Later, Feldhusen and Treffinger outline their 1977 book on useful programmes. An article by R.A. Goodale describes useful measures for handling gifted children in the ordinary classroom. Callahan and Renzulli's article is the only one to provide some evidence of the beneficial effects of brain-storming and other divergent thinking techniques. J.B. Nelson and D.L. Cleland's discussion of the desirable characteristics for teachers of the gifted is one of the most original; and W.E. Bishop's reports an empirical investigation into the abilities and personality traits which differentiate teachers recommended by gifted students from those not recommended. The results are sometimes surprising, and certainly useful.

In an article first published in 1964, Torrance gives an outline of his views on encouraging creativity, including 21 hints to teachers. M.J. Fine provides much useful guidance for parents, and Callahan summarizes the differences between gifted girls and boys, and the difficulties of the former in combining intellectual aspirations with conventional marital adjustment.

What sort of an overall picture does the book give of giftedness and creativity in the 1970s? Though much research has been published since the early 60s, it does not seem to have produced any considerable advances in our understanding of the topic. Fortunately, perhaps, there is less emphasis nowadays on divergent thinking tests. But we still have to rely on rather unsatisfactory methods of identification — intelligence tests, teacher nominations (or better, behavioral ratings), and information from the parents and the child himself or herself. No progress has been reported in discovering children from disadvantaged backgrounds who are potentially highly

gifted. No one has established that those who are so selected more often become creative scientists or artists in adult life. There is also no solid evidence regarding the relative efficacy of various enrichment and other programmes. Again we do not know the value of trying to teach creative problem solving, or inventiveness, as part of the regular curriculum for all students. Does it do more than improve performance on the actual kinds of tasks practised, or does it spread to better thinking and personality adjustment generally? Alternatively does it hinder the acquisition of basic achievements and logical thinking?

Clearly there has been progress in recognizing the needs of gifted children throughout the United States and Canada. Probably most large cities and urban areas now have regular programmes, though fewer rural and small town areas do. One had feared that, following the initial enthusiasm, there might be a strong reaction of the public, and educational administrators, against special provision being made for students who are already privileged. For even when segregation of gifted students in separate schools or classes is avoided, those receiving limited enrichment in their own schools are being favoured, and costing more to diagnose and educate. There is progress also in setting up courses of training for teachers of the gifted in many American universities, though much less in Canada. About 20 years back, a great many parents of gifted children were reluctant to make any demands, and afraid of their children being regarded as 'different'. But nowadays the various associations for parents, and others interested in gifted students, are giving much help by means of meetings, literature, etc., and promoting acceptance of their aims. The reaction may come, particularly if provision for the gifted becomes a political issue. We would be better prepared for it if we had better scientific, and more convincing, proof of the value of our aims and of current methods of carrying them out.

P.E. Vernon
University of Calgary

Knights, Robert M. and Bakker, Dirk J. (eds.) *Treatment of Hyperactive and Learning Disordered Children: Current Research*. Baltimore: University Park Press, 1980, 419 pp.

Treatment of Hyperactive and Learning Disordered Children presents papers from a recent NATO-sponsored international conference concerned with intervention strategies for children suffering from learning disabilities and/or hyperactivity. I would like to highlight a few of the major points made in each of the sections of the book so as to indicate something of the content of various papers. This discussion is then followed by some general comments regarding the proceedings as a whole.

In the section on early identification and prevention, Silver and Hagin make the point that there is no generally accepted model of reading. For this reason, they suggest, the validity of any predictive instrument aimed at identifying children who will later experience significant learning problems is somewhat suspect. Silver and Hagin have, despite these problems, developed an early identification scanning measure and describe their research on the measure.

Wedell's paper discusses certain of the methodological complexities which often as not plague early identification programmes. The Wedell paper presents cogent arguments for abandoning so-called early identification programmes in favor of an ongoing indepth analysis of the interaction between the child (his or her learning strategies, weaknesses and so on) and the learning environment. In contrast, Schenck et al. argue that traditional early identification programmes are essential to allow for intervention at a time when the child's nervous system is more plastic and responsive to change; and before the child has been subject to repeated learning failures. This first section of the text also includes an article by Gjessing delineating a number of subgroups of dyslexia based upon a functional analysis of observable learning difficulties.

The section on self-control techniques begins with a paper by Camp in which she suggests that psychoeducational training with aggressive boys may be a useful strategy for development of delinquency prevention programmes. The complexity of the problem is demonstrated by the fact that, as Camp herself notes, the boys in her sample used self-guiding speech in some circumstances and not others.

In the same section, Douglas discusses higher mental processes in hyperactive versus learning disabled children. She suggests that attentional problems in the learning disabled child are secondary to other primary difficulties, such as a language disability while those of the hyperactive are constitutionally based.

The papers in the section headed "diet manipulation" focus upon an evaluation of research concerning the efficacy of the Feingold diet in controlling hyperactivity. The Feingold diet involves the elimination of artificial flavouring and colouring agents and of foods containing salicylates (aspirin-like compounds) from the diet.