> Can education change so that our students can become present-day seers? Surely, it is possible to make many of the changes we have suggested. Most of them seem entirely practical financially, structurally and pedagogically. But the question may, nevertheless, induce negative responses from many persons simply because any sort of change in schools is so difficult to make. Change in the direction we envision requires commitment, a willingness to abandon self-interest and the comfort of well-entrenched methods. Education, obviously, can be changed. Will it change? (p. 205)

Noddings and Shore have put forward a bold hypothesis based on a careful analysis of "what is" and "what might be." Whether the concept of intuition as defined by the authors can stand up to the scrutiny of philosophers and psychologists, and whether the pedagogical implications can actually be validated by practising teachers remains to be seen. This book deserves to be widely read by scholars and teachers who are concerned with stretching the minds of students beyond the sufficient to the possible.

W.R. Unruh
University of Calgary

Harling, Paul. (Ed.), *New Directions in Educational Leadership.* London and Philadelphia: The Falmer Press, 1984, 426 pp., (paper).

It is an interesting experience to review a collection of papers dealing with a national school system one left twenty years ago. On the one hand, there is a sense of *déja vu*. Looking back with the joint benefits of hindsight and all that has been learned in the interim leaves the impression that not much has changed. On the other hand, there is also the realization that things are no longer quite the same.

Part of the *déja vu* comes from the similarity between schools in different parts of the English-speaking world. They are all places in which adults, with greater or lesser degrees of skills, patience, and accomplishment, try to bring children and adolescents to learning. The problems of managing the facilities and encouraging the people to reach and maintain high levels of effectiveness are similar, whatever may be the political and administrative structures outside the school. Despite this, it is still a major fault of educators that our outlook tends to be limited to our jurisdiction. We remain centred in our own region, largely unaware of the experience of others. It is thus a useful exercise to look at the self-analyses of those operating and studying in other places, where organizational cultures and things taken for granted may be different from our own. The parallels and the differences provide a mirror against which to compare our own situations and experiences.

Studies of leadership and its problems at different levels of a country's educational system provide a cross-sectional portrait of that system; all of its problems appear on management desks sooner or later. The impression given by this collection of papers on leadership in British education is that in the aftermath of local government reorganization in the 1970's, and with a deteriorating economic climate, all is not well.

The editor defines leadership as "efforts to shape the behaviour of groups of people, or individuals within an organization or system in such a way that benefits will ensue and the purposes of the organization or system will be fulfilled" (p. 3). Not ringing poetry, perhaps, but certainly an appropriate point of departure for this wide-ranging collection of specially commissioned and "completely revised" papers. The selection covers the field of British education well, dealing with holders of line and staff leadership positions in primary and secondary schools, local education authority hierarchies, and further education. There are papers dealing with Her Majesty's Inspectors, educational politics at the national and local levels, control of curriculum, and the influence of teachers' unions.

Papers on education and local government, national policies for education, and the role of Chief Education Officer of a local authority together set the context for the rest of the collection. That context is one of ideological conflict among the national political parties over educational policy, a conflict echoed at the local level through national party involvement in local councils. The papers by Hornsby, Hunter and Pile together set out the effects of increased politicization of local government in Britain, and the increased size, complexity and scope of educational services. The papers also deal with the effects of the change on education from its formerly unique status among local government services to a new status as one of a number of services whose most senior local officials report to an even more senior country or municipal executive, who in turn reports to the local council.

Hornsby, in particular argues in this context for "a more positive role in leadership" (p. 120), for the (national) Department of Education and Science, especially in matters of curriculum. The implication is that a vacuum has come to exist in terms of professional leadership in educational matters, and that vacuum may come to be filled by others who do not necessarily have the long-term interest of children and society at heart. Brighouse, writing of the unprecedented publication activities of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools in the late 1970's, indirectly points out the dangers of such a vacuum in a context of intense political conflict over educational policy. "Such a flurry of activity (on the part of H.M.I.'s) may have been designed to avoid less welcome, over-prescriptive, even damaging initiatives by politicians" (p. 92). Educators world-wide should pay attention to this British experience.

In light of the discussion provided of the demands on Chief Education Officers in this political context, Canadian and American superintendents, who are becoming the subjects of a body of literature of their own, might consider as relatively matter-of-fact their problems of dealing with boards of trustees.

The overall impression created by this collection is thus not a pleasant one. But all is not doom and gloom. Sometimes the mood is lightened by the terminology, instances of which bring to mind the description of the North Atlantic as an ocean on either side of which live peoples separated by a common language. The use by Murgatroyd and Reynolds of the term "pupil pursuit work" to identify an inspectorial technique in which "one of the senior staff will sit in and watch the teacher teach" (p. 291) brings to mind images of fleeing children. The fault here is the reviewer's, not the author's.

This is a well-assembled collection of insightful articles. It presents a cross-sectional portrait of British education in the late 1970's and early 1980's which will be useful both for comparativists and students of school administration. As with most collections, however, one must select from it with care.

Arthur M. Schwartz
University of Calgary

Holmes, Brian. (Ed). *Equality and Freedom in Education.* London: Allen and Unwin, Inc., 1985, 259 pp., $11.50 (paper).

In an era when comparative education is flooded with literature, Brian Holmes' *Equality and Freedom in Education* deserves serious attention by scholars in this field.

Undertaking the monumental tasks of comparing six major educational systems in the world — British, French, American, Russian, Chinese and Japanese — the book is highly systematic, thorough and informative. It is systematic in the sense that the educational systems discussed are easily compared with each other through the structure of the text: Aim, Administration, Finance, Structure and Organization, Curriculum, Teacher Education and Higher Education. It is thorough and informative in the sense that each section reveals the historical changes leading to the present state of affairs, with additional data to drive home the descriptive account and further readings to permit in-depth exploration.

The central theme of accommodating the conflicting principles of ensuring equality of opportunities and the individual's freedom of choice is well illuminated in different social structures. Indeed, the choice of the title for each chapter dealing with the respective countries provides strong clues as to why the problem of achieving both the equality of treatment and individual flexiblity of choice is hard to resolve. In the case of England, the national educational policy is severely compromised by many local education authorities with different philosophies. In France, the tradition of liberty is at odds with a centralized system professed to ensure equality of resource allocation. In America, the extreme legal protection of individual freedom defies attempts to equalize opportunities for all. In Russia, the cultivation of a talented 'new Soviet man' runs counter to the political ideology of egalitarianism. In China, the forces for preserving tradition and the urgent need for change have led to dramatic shifts of direction. In Japan, the severe competition for the prestigious higher institutions challenges equal opportunity for the masses.

Given the careful structure of the book, one might wonder about the need for a detailed introduction provided by the editor himself. Perhaps a summary section highlighting similarities and contrasts in attempts to achieve the uncompromising principles would be less repetitive and more rewarding to the readers.