

about a change in the learner. Jackson illustrates "modes of operation" (p. 124) that he sees functioning in transformative learning. While he acknowledges that "most, if not all teaching situations can operate to some degree within either dominant tradition" (p. 131), he is nevertheless worried about the influence of technology, educational research and social class distinctions skewing the direction teaching will take.

Common to each essay is Jackson's belief that "teaching can never be reduced to a formula" (p. 52). In "Real Teaching" he says "there is no such thing as 'genuine' teaching. There is only an activity that people call teaching, which can be viewed from a variety of critical perspectives" (p. 95). As to "The Future of Teaching" he concludes by saying "the health and future development of teaching depend upon most teachers maintaining a balanced view of both the means and the ends of pedagogy" (p. 114).

It is evident that Philip Jackson has considered deeply the questions he has raised in *The Practice of Teaching*, and his observations should provide rich grounds for thought about the art of teaching. For this reason, it is a book to be recommended to both experienced and novice teachers.

Murray McPherson  
University of Manitoba

Egan, K. (1986). *Teaching as story telling: An alternative approach to teaching and curriculum in the elementary school*. London, Ont.: The Althouse Press, 122 pp., \$5.95 (paper).

Teaching as story telling is an important book because it focuses attention on a powerful way of teaching which, though rooted in antiquity and in many religions, is nevertheless under-utilized in today's classrooms. But Egan will not be satisfied with "full utilization" unless the stories are the substance of education. They cannot merely be the vehicle by which the substance is transmitted. They are the meaty substance and not the sugar coating. The reason that stories must be the substance is that they deal with meaning and they depend upon the use of imagination by the students.

The use of student imagination in listening to stories is a point well made and Egan properly connects the point with the characteristic undernourishing of the affective domain that is a constant source of criticism of the typical classroom. But one of the reasons this reviewer is especially sensitive to such undernourishment is familiarity with statements of objectives from various governments and school systems which invariably give prominent attention to the affective domain. They give such objectives lip service, but that seems to be the end of it. All the prizes

go for high marks in the traditional school subjects and no recognition at all is given to excellence in humanity, sensitivity to beauty or just plain character. So this reviewer is supportive of Egan's message that we should attend to the affective domain, to student imagination, and that stories are perhaps the best available vehicle for the task.

On the issue of Egan's reluctance to accept the "concrete to abstract" principal this reviewer is cautious. Egan's point that youngsters deal with causality in stories is well taken but it may be worthwhile to reflect on the problem of causality as Piaget viewed it. Piaget took a Popper-like approach to the problem of children's reasoning by looking for the boundary conditions on reasoning. He wanted to know the conditions under which youngsters could not or did not reason well. His studies of young people demonstrated that younger children do not reason as well as older children. The implication of this observation is that we should not normally expect young children to reason well. Such an implication is not in conflict with Egan's view that we should give youngsters more experience with life and its causal relations through stories. If Piaget is right, however, caution should be exercised in using the proposed Egan approach so that stories with causal inferences would be properly graded. It is possible of course that the Egan approach is sufficiently powerful that it can speed up the progress of youngsters in their movement towards formal reasoning. This hypothesis can be empirically tested and I should hope that it will be. It will be tested informally, in any event, as teachers shift emphasis towards more teaching as story telling and they observe the consequences.

Egan's proposal to teach social studies using the story form does not present too much of a departure from conventional wisdom. Identifying binary opposites as he suggests is an established idea although not widely used, and the examples Egan chooses certainly illustrate his point. Youngsters can grasp the contrast when it is within their domain of interest, and teachers possess the professional judgement needed to determine the boundaries of the domain of interest of particular groups of youngsters. There is nothing to prevent teachers from using Egan's approach and indeed some teachers seem to use it based on their own intuitions about how to teach. In order that a more complete utilization of this powerful concept be achieved, there is need of instructional materials that are especially prepared for the purpose, as Egan notes.

The teaching-as-story-telling approach is more of a departure from conventional wisdom when it is considered for use in mathematics and science rather than social studies. The idea that students will be interested in the human problems of antiquity that lead to some of the developments of mathematics and science concepts is not new. In fact many teachers, and indeed many textbooks employ such an approach to launch their instructional programs. It is considered a motivational device in such cases, whereas for Egan it is central to the program. According to conventional analyses however, the difficulty seems to be in the abstract nature of mathematics and hence the need to begin with something concrete. Egan's alternative is to use human interest stories to get meaning into the minds

of the students. He uses the fundamental mathematical concept "threeness" to show how to build in the human side of mathematics but there is clearly much more to be done before the approach is ready for general use in the mathematics classrooms.

There is some considerable appeal to the Egan approach which stems from a natural human antipathy towards a mechanistic approach to education. "The" objectives approach is frequently assumed to be a mechanistic approach and that assumption is not without merit. However it is also true that a person can have objectives for education that are essentially those which the Egan approach is likely to achieve. It may be that "the" objectives approach is inadequate because the objectives stated are inadequate. Under such circumstances it may be more useful to keep the objectives approach and find the right objectives rather than reject the approach itself.

As the process of identifying the objectives unfolds in the Egan approach, it is not clear to this reviewer how Egan deals with the issue of who decides the objectives of education. We know that Dewey and his followers clearly indicate that the client's objectives must be in focus. It cannot be the needs of some particular power group. Egan may be able to take care of this difficulty, but it is not clear from the present work just how it can be done. Since it is not a part of the Egan approach to come to grips with the host of issues involved in selecting objectives it would appear that Egan has presented an instructional strategy rather than a curriculum design mechanism. Whether or not it is more than an instructional strategy is of little consequence to this reviewer because it is needed either way. Egan has given us something very useful and potentially powerful and the instructional category into which it falls can be determined later.

There is need of attention to the selection of stories. We could place ourselves in the position of selecting stories that have the effect of achieving big brother's objectives rather than the student's objectives if we are less than clear about what objectives we wish to pursue or achieve, whose objectives they are, and why we wish to promote them. It may be argued, of course, that by stating objectives we may be reducing our chances of achieving the objectives we select. There is another possibility, however, and that is, that by proper use of evaluation we will know the extent to which we have achieved the objectives.

Perhaps a word or two may be in order on the shift that has taken place in evaluation in the last two or three decades. Whereas classical evaluation deals exclusively with assessing the performance of individual persons, there is now some serious attention given to program evaluation and that deals with assessing the "performance" of the curriculum. Thus instead of monitoring people, we monitor curricula. Such a shift towards program evaluation and away from person evaluation may be exactly what is needed in order to demonstrate clearly the power of the story form in delivering a high quality of educational service. As well, it may help to persuade those theorists with a natural abhorrence of the objectives approach to see both objectives and evaluation as tools which they can

use to foster a fundamental shift in education towards a better balance between affective objectives and purely cognitive objectives.

Howard Russell  
Ontario Institute for Studies  
in Education

Walker, D.F. & Soltis, J.F. (1986). *Curriculum and aims*. New York: Teachers' College Press, Columbia University, 116 pp., \$8.95 U.S. (paper).

*Curriculum and Aims* is written with two different applications in mind. It is intended for use as one component of a series of five books which collectively might form the text for an undergraduate course in foundations of education. The authors suggest that it may be used, alternatively, as a primary text for a full course on curriculum and aims. As I was asked to review only *Curriculum and Aims* I will assume the second purpose, primarily.

*Curriculum and Aims* closes with a brief reference to three orientations to curriculum, namely the transmission, transaction and transformation positions. The book itself falls naturally into a combination of the first two of these. It is assumed that the reader has no previous substantial knowledge of curriculum theory. Hence, one purpose is to transmit this knowledge to him. A second purpose is to cause the reader to think actively and develop his own conceptions about curriculum. In this sense, the book is transactional.

As an approach to describing the content of the book I will draw upon the questions posed by Tyler in his model for curriculum. First, what objectives do the authors intend the reader to attain? Perhaps these are to be able to describe a variety of approaches to curriculum, to demonstrate how these relate logically to aims, and to develop and describe a personal position relating curriculum and aims. Second, what learning experiences are provided to enable the reader to attain these objectives? The approach taken is to expose the reader to a range of curriculum perspectives from Plato to Peters, repeatedly calling for reflection upon the implications of each. Third, how are the learning experiences organized so as to maximize their cumulative effect? The authors allow for several possibilities but it is clear that they favor the use of some or all of a set of nineteen vignettes each relating and directly referenced to particular pages in the text book. Each causes the reader to reflect upon and generate his own position on issues relevant to the topics raised. Indeed, it is primarily in this way that the book becomes transactional in orientation. Ultimately, through a consideration of such questions