

Part II covers topics such as: learning theory and socialization; psychoanalytic theory and identification; Erikson's stage theory; the role of the family, media, and school in the process of socialization; discipline and adjustment; discipline through the curriculum; behaviour modification; and punishment.

Part III covers topics such as: what is exceptionality and special education; gifted children; mentally retarded children; learning disabled children; children with sensory and multiple handicaps; psychological and educational aspects of bilingualism in Canada; approaches to teaching French in Canada today; characteristics of the learner in becoming bilingual; other approaches to language learning; psychological perspectives on Native Education; various theories of Native Education; and understanding cultural differences in the classroom.

Part IV covers topics such as: fundamental concepts in measurement and evaluation; reliability and validity of measurement; implications for standardized tests; cognitive abilities and performances at school; group differences in cognitive ability; I.Q., sex and school achievement; measuring affective behaviour; techniques of measurement and observation; sociometry in the classroom; ethical considerations; learning of psychomotor skills; assessment of psychomotor skills; and personal factors affecting psychomotor learning.

By far, the thing that makes *Ed. Psych.* truly distinctive and worthy of special attention, is in the treatment the authors give to the important Canadian issues in bilingualism and Native Education. Bilingualism is explored through the use of categories such as: language skills in bilingualism; bilingualism and intelligence; sex, social class, aptitude, and attitudes of the learner; balanced and unbalanced bilingualism; and the "handicap" vs. "asset" approach in assessing other-language (other than English or French) children entering the Canadian school system. There is also a review of the types of programs for use with other-language children. The insightful and sensitive overview of the historical context of Native Education is especially note worthy. This analysis, coupled with a consideration of some supplementary and alternative approaches to Native Education, helps to bring out the differences in the attitudes and values between Native culture and the dominant school system, and provides educators with the awareness and the tools necessary to better facilitate the learning of these unique peoples.

Well written, thoroughly researched, and surprisingly readable, *Ed. Psych.* is a work that is accessible to professional educator, student of psychology and layperson alike. It is as good an introduction to educational psychology as one could ask for and its thoughtful Canadian perspective makes it necessary reading for all staff and students in faculties of education across this country.

Fred Mathews  
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

Adelman, Clem and Alexander, Robin, *The Self-evaluating Institution: Practice and Principles of Educational Change*. Toronto: Methuen, 1982, 212 pp., \$14.95.

The two authors of this book were separately and independently involved in attempts to foster what they call "collective self-evaluation" in two Teachers Colleges in the United Kingdom. Each author was engaged as an evaluator in both conceiving and conducting an evaluation project. During the projects they met and found that the projects were characterized by important issues and problems in common, even though in approach and context they were quite different. They decided to write about their experiences and reflections. Hence this book.

In the book, evaluation is broadly defined. To be evaluative is not only to make judgments about the worth and effectiveness of educational intentions, processes and outcomes, but also about the relationships between these and about the frameworks for resources, planning and implementation relevant to such ventures. Institutional self-evaluation, the focus of the book, is defined as the means

by which individuals and groups "find out about and judge their own and each other's activities as these contribute to the institution's collective endeavours" (Adelman and Alexander, p. 24).

The authors, in saying that the focus of self-evaluation in each case was curriculum evaluation, are careful to distinguish between (1) judging the quality and feasibility of course proposals and curriculum packages prior to their implementation (what they refer to as validation), (2) judging student performance on a course (what they refer to as assessment) and (3) judging the efficacy of course organization and teaching-learning processes in action (what they refer to as course or curriculum evaluation). This distinction is drawn in order to make clear the point that course or curriculum evaluation is much less common in the United Kingdom than validation and assessment. They believe that if comprehensive institutional evaluation is to occur, all three are equally necessary and complementary if one is to know what actually happens in relation to what was intended.

Impetus has been given recently in the United Kingdom to the process of formal public institutional evaluation by the Council for National Academic Awards (CNAA) acting as a main validating body. The CNAA has begun to push the idea of "institutional self-analysis" according to a set of criteria to be used to judge whether those institutions it has validated externally are able to make an appropriate self-analysis. The CNAA appears to be assuming the need to focus, with respect to such criteria, on management and resources rather than solely concentrating on content of courses and teaching. To Adelman and Alexander, the crucial question is "whether the way in which management is conducted is appropriate and/or effective in fostering the educational practices of institutions." (p. 15). This question becomes a major focus in the analyses of their case studies.

The concern of the authors is that the CNAA model of validation offers an extremely restricted basis for institutional self-analysis because, most of all, it is a means for appraising intentions. Only slightly is it a means for appraising processes and products. For Adelman and Alexander, evaluation is justified only if it provides for questioning existing practices and orthodoxies, and only if it provides alternative answers to problems of teaching and learning. Their approach to evaluation is premised on a view of teaching and learning as themselves problematic "and of improved professional practice as requiring a climate of critical commitment leading to what they term 'the theorizing institution.'" (p. 28)

In chapters two, three and four, the authors report on the contexts of their separate evaluations and on the two projects themselves. They write up their experiences as rather penetrating case studies. Their experiences at 'Charlesford' and 'Enlands,' written as cases, provide the evidence they refer to in the later chapters of the book as they reflect on their experiences and draw conclusions.

From their comparisons, Adelman and Alexander draw a number of interesting and significant conclusions. One of them seems to me to overshadow the others. It becomes a major focus for the last chapters of the book — that not only is evaluation a question of the adequacy of courses and programmes, it is also a question of the institutions' "ways of organizing themselves to cope with change and professional development on the basis of systematic appraisal of their work." (p. 145)

For the authors the problem above all others appears to be that the means for educational management in general and for educational and course innovation in particular are inconsistent with the kind of approach these two value. Their case studies revealed to them that the ideal state of harmony between evaluation, academic management and educational innovation in their respective institutions did not exist. In other words, the basic concepts of rationality, democracy, professionalism, the pursuit of excellence and the furtherance of knowledge were honoured more in the rhetoric of management, innovation and evaluation than in the reality of each.

Indeed, the case studies revealed to the authors that the deepest inconsistencies lay in the area of management. Their proposed solution to this problem is to have management become adequately reflexive, responsive and decisive at all levels. In other words, they want institutions to become "theorizing institutions" not only with respect to the substance and practice of education but also with respect to management. This means that in all day-to-day decision-making processes, the institutions would be imbued with reflection on action and on the need and justification for actions of particular sorts.

The inconsistency and incongruency outlined above exist, say Adelman and Alexander, because there is a clash of epistemologies — a clash between the prevailing epistemology of management ("with its emphasis on [minimum] consensus, finality, proof, stability and efficiency") and the epistemology of evaluation in education ("with its emphasis on value-pluralism, hypothesizing, change and the improveability of educational thought and practice"). The authors argue that if the management in institutions were prepared to let the epistemology of evaluation inform styles and processes of management, the inconsistencies they are concerned about would be lessened considerably.

It is with respect to the view that institutions can be 'theorizing' about education and management that I have some reservations. Elsewhere in the book Adelman and Alexander say, quite correctly I believe, that the problem of institutional change and innovation is basically a *political* problem. If this is so, then in relation to their desire to have institutions engage continually in self-reflection about both desirable education and desirable management, they have posed, it seems to me, a very difficult dilemma.

To argue for a 'theorizing institution' is to assume that the membership form a community of scholars governed in their decision-making by rational-participatory norms "where the emphasis is on the professors' professional freedom, the need for consensus and democratic consultation and the call for a more humane education." (Baldrige, J.V., *Academic Governance*, p. 7). This view of the institutional world as a collegium fails, I believe, to deal adequately with the problem of *conflict* within institutions and the political fact that many of the decisions occur after prolonged battle and do not represent a consensus at all but rather represent one group prevailing on an issue over other groups in spite of the wishes of the others.

An alternative to the collegium model as a way by which to understand evaluation and change in higher education institutions is the political model. This alternative suggests that any attempt to understand the management of change is best undertaken by means of a political analysis in which the following assumptions are made.

1. Conflict is natural and to be expected in a dynamic institution and is not necessarily symptomatic of a breakdown in the institutional community.
2. It is natural that the power blocs and interest groups will attempt to influence institutional policy, thereby enhancing the chances that their values and goals will be given priority.
3. Most major decisions in all institutions are governed by small groups of political elites and different elites may govern different decisions.
4. Bureaucratic formal authority is severely limited by the political pressure and bargaining tactics that group exert against authorities.
5. The institution is greatly influenced by external interest groups (p. 10).

If these assumptions are correct and institutions are inevitably political, then to argue for a theorizing institution is perhaps to ask for more than can be delivered. The value-pluralism which is basic to the theorizing institution also gives rise to internal political conflict. That is to say, it is the very conflict of values over what constitutes 'desirable education' and 'desirable management' that leads to political conflict within institutions which in turn makes the achievement of rational participatory decisions so different to achieve.

The exercise of intelligence or rationality in institutional decision-making inevitably comes under attack by self-interest. The ensuing political conflict, according to my argument, compounds the problem of ever achieving the prospect of the fully-fledged "theorizing" institution.

In spite of the reservations described above, I recommend this book. It provides a useful introduction to the field of institutional evaluation. It provides detailed descriptions of the evaluation process and clarifies a variety of issues raised by evaluation as a form of research. However, I especially recommend it because it is, as Colin Lacey says in a review in the *The Times (London Higher Education Supplement)* (Feb. 11, 1983), centrally about the internal politics of institutional evaluation and change.