of pluralist democratic freedom in Glenn’s view is respect for minority views. In effect, we are left with the proposition that collective and individual interests will always conflict at some point, and Glenn takes us no further.

There is an important silence in this book on political-economic dimensions of educational organization and practice. Glenn does mention that common school reform in Massachusetts was directed by liberal members of the rising middle classes, and that reform ideology was in part directed against working-class and farmer religious “enthusiasm.” But the main protagonists in his account are male members of religious sects. Common school ideology is mythical because it was sectarian in religious terms. But Glenn does not attend to the fact that this ideology had an explicit and implicit class and gender basis as well. He pays somewhat more attention to questions of ethnicity.

Surely the literature of educational reform has stressed these matters in the last two decades. There is an enormous volume of work on the relationship between Protestant ideology, capitalist accumulation, and, more recently, the subordination of women! While it is important to avoid a naively functionalist view of the common school as a reflex of industrial capitalist development, the common school activists who guided policy viewed society and elaborated conceptions of unity from the position of one social class, one gendered group, and often one ethnicity. They were not the only people who struggled over these questions, but educational activists, in Glenn’s entire book, were exclusively native-born middle-class men. No women of any class, and no working-class men, seem to have participated in religious controversy, and the fact that middle-class common school Christianity was patriarchal, that it elaborated a distinct set of principles for different classes of men, women, and children in social comportment, passes entirely without comment here.

Despite these important shortcomings, Glenn’s contribution to the historical literature of the common school is refreshing and controversial.

Bruce Curtis
Wilfrid Laurier University


What are teachers taught? How are the content and the role of teachers’ training influenced by the changing ideological context of the larger society? M’hammed Mellouki seeks to explore such questions by examining the preparation of teachers for Quebec’s Catholic public primary and secondary schools between 1930 and 1964. This study is the result of work undertaken while the author was a researcher at the Institut québécois de
the required route to a teaching career for all candidates—male, female, lay, and religious teachers. More than seventy normal schools were founded between 1940 and 1964 (mostly for women, directed by religious communities) and during the same period normal school enrolments rose from 3,434 to 14,421 (p. 330, tables 12, 13; p. 337, tables 26, 27). While barely 27 percent of all teachers in Quebec’s Catholic schools in 1945 possessed normal school diplomas, by 1964 the proportion role to 79 percent (p. 29).

Mellouki argues for a close link between the first substantial reforms introduced in normal school programmes in the 1930s, and the rise of new lay elites and reformist ideologies critical of the traditional clerical world view. He adopts the interpretation of analysts like Fernand Dumont and Yvan Lamonde who trace back to the interwar period the roots of the ideological and social “modernization” of Quebec associated with the Quiet Revolution of the 1960s. According to Mellouki, a new conception of teacher training emerged in the 1930s, a philosophy which would receive its most elaborate formulation from the Parent Commission on enquiry into education from 1961 to 1966.

Quebec’s network of normal schools underwent considerable expansion during the period studied. From 1898 to 1939, the majority of teaching candidates obtained their teaching certificates from the Central Bureau of Catholic Examiners, which organized annual qualifying exams. Much criticized, this system allowed untrained young candidates, mostly women, to become teachers without benefit of the formation offered by the province’s normal schools. Only with the abolition of the Central Bureau in 1939 did the normal school become

recherche sur la culture, and forms part of a larger research project on teacher training in Quebec from the origins to the present day initially directed by Thérèse Hamel. This published research paper breaks new ground in an as yet little-explored area but manifests the limitations of a preliminary work.

The study is divided into five chapters. The first provides an overview of the development of primary and secondary schools, normal schools and their clientele in the public Catholic school system since 1930. The second examines the emergence of a new teacher-training philosophy during the period 1935-53, while the third chapter analyses the important reforms introduced in the normal school programmes in 1953. The period 1953-62, years of expansion of public secondary schooling and growing criticism of the Quebec school system, is examined in the fourth chapter, while the final chapter deals with the work of the Parent Commission on enquiry into education from 1961 to 1966.
emotional development and individual needs of the students. The upgrading of admission requirements during the period studied allowed normal schools to devote more time to professional training rather than to general schooling. From a mere seventh-grade certificate in 1935, the entry requirement became eleventh-grade completion for both males and females as of 1953.

Central to the transformations of teachers’ curriculum and of the discourse on professional formation, according to Mellouki, was the increasingly important role of psychology. In the interwar period, and particularly during the 1940s, developmental and educational psychology gained an audience among educators and intellectuals and was established as a field of university study and practice in French-speaking Quebec. The study of child psychology was first introduced into the male normal school programme in 1935, and in 1938 into the female normal school programme. The Catholic educational authorities’ new preoccupation with the psychological underpinnings of human development was reflected in the major reform of the elementary school curriculum in the late 1940s following the introduction of compulsory schooling. Psychology and related disciplines (intelligence testing, mental hygiene, etc.) became an integral part of normal school curriculum as a result of major reforms in 1953 which now officially defined the normal schools as institutions of professional formation.

Beginning in 1961, the Parent Commission of enquiry into the Quebec school system would enshrine the educational and social ideals of democratization and rationalization growing in popularity during the preceding decades. The Parent Commission Report consecrated the philosophy of active pedagogy and the teacher’s role as guide, professional, and trained specialist. The author notes a feeling of “déjà vu” on reading the conclusions of the Commission. He claims that it was in fact when the normal schools seemed to be best performing their role that the authorities moved to abolish them in a symbolic act of renewal, transferring complete control of teacher training to the universities in 1969.

The study is based on a wealth of published primary sources, including education department documents, reports, and submissions to commissions of enquiry, as well as teacher-training textbooks. Statistics and other information on the normal schools, their programmes, and their students are compiled in an impressive array of tables and figures in the annexes. Yet the author’s conclusions might have been enriched had he tapped certain archival collections, such as the papers of the Department of Education at the Quebec National Archives. The inclusion of excessively long quotations from programme descriptions, regulations, and proceedings also mars the work. It is regrettable that the analysis is not more firmly anchored in the socio-economic, political, and ideological context. While the author does refer to changes in the larger society, this background is often only partially sketched. Moreover, one would like to know more about the
origins of the philosophical rupture of the 1930s.

In his concluding chapter Mellouki suggests that future research projects should examine the repercussions of the Parent Commission's recommendations concerning teacher training in the period after 1966. He also points out the interest of analysing the evolution of the various new professional groups, such as guidance counsellors, which emerged during the period. Other avenues, beyond the scope of the present study, also beg to be explored. Like most of the research in Quebec educational history, Mellouki's work examines only the Catholic sector. To what extent, if any, was there interaction among the English-Catholic, English-Protestant and French-Catholic educational sectors within Quebec and in North America? Moreover, what and how did teachers actually teach? Indeed, in what ways did the new concern for child and adolescent psychology influence the classroom experience?

Despite its limitations, Mellouki's book offers material and insights for a reinterpretation of Quebec's educational development prior to the Quiet Revolution. The issues raised by this valuable study merit further attention from analysts sensitive to the links between educational reforms and other dimensions of social change.


What is so troubling about contemporary curriculum historians, Daniel and Laurel Tanner seem to be telling us in their most recent volume, is the single-mindedness with which they embrace a 1960s-style revisionist interpretive framework. They go on to claim that the accounts which these scholars offer depict the American public school in decidedly negative terms as an agency of social control and characterize the curriculum as an instrument for producing and reproducing an inegalitarian and oppressive society. The Tanners believe that this interpretation, which has dominated the work of curriculum historians for almost three decades now, offers an inaccurate and distorted history of the development of the course of study. Their purpose in writing their *History of the School Curriculum* is to correct the record by examining, in their words, "the great struggle for a more complete realization of the democratic potential of American society through the transformation of the school and the reformation of the curriculum" (p. xiv).

The Tanners are, however, bothered by more than the mistakes which they attribute to the revisionists. They also claim that their accounts are dishonest:

By the late 1970s, critics of radical revisionist historiography

Wendy Johnston
Université de Montréal