Obviously one cannot adequately summarize a summary, and every reader, whether sociologist, educationalist, politician, doctor, psychologist or parent, will be more interested in some points than others. However, here are a few of the perhaps more unexpected findings, to whet the appetite.

Background differences do not usually result in greater divergence of abilities at the secondary stage (though there is some uncertainty since we cannot readily allow for likely regression of extreme groups towards the mean). Douglas concludes, therefore, that the divergence found at 11 years was mainly an artifact of working for the 11+ examination.

Although able lower working-class children are handicapped educationally in many ways, as compared with middle class, their teachers tend to be more biased in their favour than against them. The major reasons for their poor performance and early leaving seem to be lack of interest in academic schooling and rebelliousness against school discipline.

Boys at public schools do not do better at G.C.E. or stay on longer than boys of equivalent ability and social class at grammar schools. Boys and girls at other independent schools are considerably less successful.

The eldest boy in a family of two children is considerably superior, better even than the only child. This does not hold for eldest girls. Though girls are usually behind boys in mathematics, those who are only children are not.

Early sexual maturers tend to be slightly superior in abilities throughout their careers; i.e. there is no sudden spurt of ability at puberty, and late maturers do not catch up later.

Left-handedness is *not* associated with inferior achievement, nor with stuttering or emotional disturbance.

Delinquent boys are more frequent in families where parents are divorced or separated, but not in other types of broken home. Roman Catholic boys are not more apt to be delinquents than non-Catholics.

Sudden death of a parent does not affect success, but prolonged father absence, unemployment, or parental illness do.

Some agreement was found (though we are not told how much) between assessments of emotional disturbance from parental reports of symptoms, from teacher ratings and from pupil questionnaires. These assessments did not differ appreciably in different types of school, or for different social classes, but were associated with reduced achievement.

P. E. VERNON.

MAN'S INEQUALITY

Fight for Education: A Black Paper. Edited by C. B. COX and A. E. DYSON. London: The Critical Quarterly Society. 1969. Pp. 80. Price 5*s*.

Accepted contemporary doctrine among educationists calls for a very far-reaching egalitarianism, a reluctance to inflict disagreeable routine learning on the child, and enthusiastic encouragement of letting him find his own way and learn how to think for himself. When these laudable aims result in cramming of all levels of ability into large classes, with a very low teacher-pupil ratio, in holding up the development of the more intelligent out of a belief that it is bad for anyone to find himself excelled, and in an ultra-permissiveness which fails to equip the citizen-to-be with any capacity for self-discipline, one may feel that, perhaps, some other values might be held in mind. So at least think the contributors to 'Fight for Education', a vigorous and thoroughly enjoyable polemical pamphlet with a number of very famous contributors (e.g. Kingsley Amis, Robert Conquest, Angus Maude). They would like to see children not all provided with the same educational diet but each provided with what is apposite to his needs. This, of course, means varying the curriculum for the bright, the average and the dull. How otherwise are we to get the best out of our children? And is there not something to be said for the pursuit of excellence, for the spread of scholarship, even for learning how to put in hard and frustrating work in order to achieve?

Tap a man's knee, and his leg will kick. The pamphlet obviously hit on a sensitive (an inflamed?) spot, and its reasonable suggestions have been met with unreasoning fury. Mr. Edward Short gave it a lambasting, without counter-arguments or counter-facts, and the press have joined in at the same level ('a trivial document by some elderly reactionaries', *Evening Standard*; 'much of (it) . . . tendentious cliché supported by superficiality piled on superficiality', *Sunday Times*). However, the points made by the authors are serious ones, and they should be met and discussed at a serious level. What was once liberal and humane educational theory seems to have become petrified, and may well be no longer either realistic or even humane.

J. B. S. Haldane, who was a lifelong champion of the under-privileged, had no doubt that education should be tailored to meet the range of individual needs (*The Inequality of Man*, 1937). With courses arranged to fit the average boy, he wrote, it is hard for the intelligent to learn more than his fellows. Like Spearman, J. B. S. believed that 'every normal

man, woman and child, is a genius at something as well as an idiot at something'. One should aim at an education which would enable the individual to follow his bent; and the exceptionally versatile child should not be compelled, as now, to limit the field of his studies at an early stage. 'I do not believe that a recognition of the inequality of man would be a blow to democracy (or rather to representative government based on universal suffrage).' Perhaps the wisdom of the biologist will one day inform the councils of the social scientist!

ELIOT SLATER.

I.Q. TEST PERFORMANCE

Intelligence and Cultural Environment. By PHILIP E. VERNON. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd. 1969. Pp. 264. Price 45*s*.

The controversial nature of cross-cultural differences in intellectual ability that may exist continues to promote excited discussion, not all of which is very informed. Nobody bothers to define what they mean by intelligence; few, if any, consider that inferiority in some abilities may be a cultural asset. The author has made a refreshing attempt in this book to dispel some of the obscurity surrounding this important topic.

The contents fall into several major parts. In parts I and II, Vernon elaborates on Hebb and presents his notions of intelligence A, B, and C (genotypic, phenotypic, and as measured by tests, respectively), reviews the literature, and discusses factors influencing the mental development of children. Throughout these sections, detailed and comprehensive discussion of relevant sources is presented in an economical style which is impartial and easy to read. In part III, the author considers the application of tests to non-Western cultures, and provides a most useful scheme for conceptualizing factors affecting test performance. He has described such factors as extrinsic or intrinsic. Extrinsic factors include such things as inability to understand instructions, difficulty in making responses correctly because of the use of complex scoring techniques such as computer-scored multiple choice, and inability to understand the relevance of time in a speed test. The importance of such factors in affecting test performance of even non-immigrant children in the psychiatric clinic has almost certainly been under-estimated in the past and probably still is in many places at present. All clinical psychologists and all psychiatrists who interpret and act upon test results, could do worse than to copy a list of these factors and keep it well in sight.

Parts IV and V deal with the author's own studies, in which he selected a battery of cognitive tests and administered them to 100 English and 40 Hebridean children, and later to carefully selected samples of 40 to 50 children each from Jamaica, Uganda, Canadian Eskimos and Canadian Indians. All subjects were boys aged 11 years. These parameters were chosen because the author considered that addition of girls would have complicated the analysis; the age of 11 was selected because most pupils have acquired moderate skill with English by then in all the samples studied, and are nearing the completion of their primary schooling.

In each case, results are presented to highlight the patterns of abilities shown in different cultures rather than to emphasize the general superiority of one group over another. The attempt is made to relate cross-cultural differences in patterns of ability to the social and psychological characteristics of each culture.

Vernon concludes by suggesting that the results imply a list of some eighteen factors to be relevant to poor test performance. These include extrinsic factors, such as unfamiliarity with test conditions, or test anxiety, which affect intelligence C. Factors such as birth injury, malnutrition, linguistic stimulation in early childhood, absence of magical beliefs, are suggested as affecting intelligence B, and genetic factors are, of course, implicated for intelligence A.

The author's final words strike a somewhat pessimistic note in suggesting that improvement of educational methods may not be as practicable as has been hoped. Teachers, particularly in developing countries, are so imbued with traditional, highly mechanical techniques that faced with classes of up to 60 and with few facilities they succeed only in getting across peripheral skills such as spelling and mechanical arithmetic. The author considers that language teaching and modification of selected child-rearing techniques may offer greater success, and that changes of attitudes and values are of far greater importance than is merely increasing the material standards of a community.

Both for the clinician faced with numbers of immigrant and other working-class patients, and for the educational psychologist who is trying to devise 'culture-fair' tests, the book can be thoroughly recommended.

L. BARTAK.

DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES

Determinants of Infant Behaviour IV. Ed. by BRIAN FOSS. London: Methuen and Co. 1969. Pp. 304. Price 70*s*.