

Reviews

Learning from Our Lives: Using Educational Biographies with Adults. Pierre Dominicé. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2000. xxiii + 206 pages. ISBN 0-7879-1031-7. \$29.00

This contribution to the Jossey-Bass Higher and Adult Education series is authored by the Swiss educator, Pierre Dominicé, as a “European contribution to the U.S. debate on adult education” (xxi). The author is at least somewhat familiar with the United States and (of interest to readers of this journal) theological education through studying at Union Theological Seminary in New York.

Following an introductory Preface and first chapter (“Learning as an Active Search for Meaning”), the book proceeds in chapters 2 and 3 to discuss the construction of an “educational biography approach” the author used at the University of Geneva (13) and its relation to the prehistory, history, and development of educational biography. With chapters 4, “How Adults Educate Themselves,” and 5, “Exploring Adult Ways of Learning,” the author considers more directly matters of objectives and results, and considers other literature in the field. Chapter 6, “Learners’ Needs, Motivations, and Dreams,” provides opportunity for Dominicé to reflect on such matters as the title suggests based on his years of experience. Chapter 7, “Helping Learners Put Words to Their Lives,” despite the implication of the title, includes less how-to instruction than theoretical underpinnings and commentary upon objectives and results. The eighth chapter, “Giving Evaluation Another Meaning,” is more directly suggestive of practical applications of biography-based pedagogy. It also includes a consideration of an important moment in the author’s own learning biography: “evaluation was for me the key that opened the door to the world of the biographical approach” (166). The final chapter, “Creating Conditions for Successful Learning,” focuses attention “on being an adult educator” (187), suggests avenues for further consideration, and suggests various benefits which more and regular practice of educational biography might achieve.

The author is nothing if not a promoter of this approach, as is evident from the first chapter – with its promises of “empowerment” (7) and “multi-disciplinary insights” (8) – to the last – with statements such as “Educational biography is a tool that could

help societies find political resolutions ...” (187). More importantly, he is a seasoned and well-informed messenger, including various examples from, and reflections on, years of teaching and research. Many, as I do, will appreciate this work as affirming and building on such things as “experiential learning and situational cognition” (6), “self-directed learning” (12), “practice-based learning” (57), the value of subjectivity (“In other words, being subjective is a way to be scientific” [140]) and local and generational knowledge (92, 182), and so forth; as questioning epistemological presumptions and working to define/describe “*an adult hermeneutics*” (85; emphasis his); and as a reaction against both “the narrowness of the exclusively empirical and statistical approaches of the last decades” (34) and the more market-driven aspects of “continuing education” – a term used by the author disparagingly and in contrast to “adult education” (183).

Still, I find myself frustrated with the book. From early on, Dominicé is wary of doing “research according to the classical models of social science,” such as “trying to build [statistical] clusters according to age, school background, or profession” (23). Further bolstered by the recognition that “hermeneutics is more and more recognized as a methodology for interpreting qualitative data...” (25), he states/concludes, “Subjectivity is no longer seen as opposed to quantitative findings” (27). Fair enough. Yet, he himself seems locked into maintaining the opposite at all costs – that quantitative findings are opposed to hermeneutics and subjectivity. Why not include/consider some statistical data to support, enhance, and clarify the reflections/interpretations?

Further, if it is indeed a “new epistemological perspective” (28) for “a new profession” (92) that he is after, then why not define that perspective and methods? I have repeatedly written the word “clarify” and/or put question marks in the margin next to such statements as, “Because quantitative data are not a necessary condition of validity for me, many biographies, resulting from years of research, contribute to my relevant hypotheses” (77) and “I am more preoccupied by the relevance of the ideas or hypotheses generated by the analysis of educational biographies than by any generalization based on quantitative data” (86). Precisely at those points where description and definition could further a scholarly discussion or

debate, the relevant hypotheses, ideas, and methods of analysis remain shrouded in mystery or lack of clarity (see also pages 83–87).

I find very few typos. There is the occasional awkward phrase, presumably a consequence of the author writing “in a language that is not my own” (172). One potentially offensive example should be changed in any subsequent edition: “Having mixed cultural roots, and being part Jewish and part colored ...” (91). The book contains a helpful index and bibliography, which can serve as a springboard for further reading and research.

With some hesitation, given such concerns as are indicated above, I recommend this book to educators working with an adult population. There is much to engage and be engaged by, both in considering how one might teach and, indeed, how one has learned and does learn. Writes Dominicé: “We are not educated until we can give meaning to our education – in some ways we are not educated until we can educate ourselves” (80).

Frederick W. Weidmann
Union Theological Seminary

Approaches to the Study of Religion. Edited by Peter Connolly. London and New York: Cassell, 1999. xv + 286 pages. ISBN 0-304-33709-9 (paper).

Guide to the Study of Religion. Edited by Willi Braun and Russell T. McCutcheon. London and New York: Cassell, 2000. xii + 560 pages. ISBN 0-304-70176-9 (paper).

Each of these books offers an overview of current approaches to and issues in the study of religion. They differ in terms of goals, contributors, audience, depth, and self-conscious positioning with respect to current debates in the field. *Approaches* is aimed at undergraduates and offers a useful introductory overview of seven theoretical areas of the study of religion (anthropological, feminist, phenomenological, philosophical, psychological, sociological, and theological). *Guide* is an essential volume for scholars and advanced students of religion. Its thirty essays, each centered on one term, critically discuss a variety of analytic categories, explanatory concepts, and theoretical allegiances of the field (e.g., Classification, Comparison, Colonialism, Cognition, Discourse, Gender, Myth, World).

Approaches tends to prioritize the historical genealogy of theoretical approaches to religion rather than highlighting recent work. This will be more to the liking of some instructors than others. This emphasis also stands in some tension with the book’s goal: “to

help students ... reflect upon their choice of methodological specialization” (8). Any such series of brief overviews is necessarily limited, yet significant areas of research are omitted, for example: recent theory of ritual and myth, cognitive/naturalistic approaches, rational choice theory, and work on the rhetoric and politics of ethnographic writing. Such caveats aside, *Approaches* offers a solid overview of many important theories and methods in the study of religion. Each chapter covers its ground with clear writing, appropriate definitions of key terms, and concise summaries of key positions and issues. This book is well worth considering as a lower-level undergraduate theory/method text.

Guide is a more ambitious collection, oriented to scholars and advanced students. It is comparable to, and nicely complements *Critical Terms for Religious Studies*, edited by Mark C. Taylor (University of Chicago Press, 1998). Several of *Guide*’s chapters make substantive contributions to theoretical discussions in the field. Jeppe Sinding Jensen’s overview of structuralisms is an outstanding synopsis, casting intriguing light on cognitive studies and arguing for a reconsideration of structuralist approaches. Burton Mack makes a case that the study of Early Christian origins is poised to contribute to a new social theory of religion. Other essays critique vague or ill-used concepts and work towards their clarification: Fitzgerald on “experience”; Guthrie on “projection”; Ryba on “manifestation”; Anttonen on “sacred.”

Approaches and *Guide* differ dramatically in reflexive awareness of their own positioning with regard to recent theoretical debates. Editorially, *Approaches* is strongly rooted in a *sui generis* view of “religion.” Readers daunted by this choice of frame will be cheered by Clive Erricker’s suggestion that the attempt to use comparative methods in order to isolate the essence of religion “appears to be a task that the religionist has invented for him or herself based on prior supposition rather than attention to the phenomenon itself” (92). In turn, readers disheartened by this abandonment of the essentialist high ground might be cheered by Frank Whaling’s extended argument for “inter-connectedness between theology and religious studies” (232, cf. 238). This spectrum of views is valuable, but, given the variety of stances among the included essays, an introduction that described these tensions rather than simply taking sides might better serve students.

Guide is explicitly and consistently against the *sui generis* view. Taken as a whole, it is a contribution of signal importance to the study of religion as many of the essays converge on an attempt to find a middle ground between essentialist and constructivist positions. Individual contributions explore naturalistic, anthropological, or sociological approaches, empha-

size economic and political relations, and lay groundwork for more empirically oriented work. Standouts include essays by Gustavo Benavides on “stratification,” Sam Gill on “play,” Bruce Lincoln on “culture,” Tomoko Masuzawa on “origin,” and Hans Penner on “interpretation.” *Guide* contributes to relational views that move beyond naïve metaphors of construction to explore networks of interactions among the raw materials of religion. (Yet the fact that *Guide* – unlike *Approaches* – says nothing of neurophysiological studies of religious experience, for example, Persinger, d’Aquili, Newberg, suggests a reticence to deal with this other essentialism that looms large with accelerating technological advances.)

Both books would require attentive framing by instructors for effective classroom use. *Approaches* is stronger on explicit methodology and, in general, gives clearer examples of theory application, but gaps in coverage and meta-theoretical tensions should be noted for students. *Guide*’s dense network of themes contains nuances and contrasts that warrant providing guidance even for advanced students.

Approaches’ contributors are seven British scholars, each with significant prior publications drawing on the theoretical approach that they present. *Guide*’s thirty-one contributors – from nineteen institutions in the U.S. and twelve elsewhere – include many of the world’s leading theorists of religion. (*Guide*’s editors have made effective and refreshing use of Canadian and European expertise.) The range of voices, especially in *Guide*, is impressive. Yet, the exclusive reliance on North American and European scholars in these state-of-the-art overviews (with the qualified exceptions of Chidester working in South Africa and Fitzgerald in Japan) tells us something significant about the field. In addition, only one of the seven authors in *Approaches* is a woman and only two of thirty-one in *Guide*.

Both volumes have notes and lists of suggested readings after each chapter, and *Guide* has a valuable eighty-page list of works cited. Both have useful indices, including names and terms. However, given *Guide*’s explicitly critical and reflexive orientation, a more ambitious index would have helped readers to better trace the conceptual networks linking its various articles. For example, entries for body, boundaries/difference, cause/correlation, construct, ethics, explanation, interests, method, perception, reflexivity, *sui generis*, or theology would have added to the book’s value as “a direction-whispering companion” (5).

Both volumes are organized in a useful manner. Most chapters in *Approaches* have the same three-part structure: historical developments, principle characteristics, and issues and debates. This facilitates using the book in undergraduate theory/method courses with

either a thematic or historical emphasis. *Guide*’s essays are grouped in three sections: issues related to defining and describing religion, descriptions and evaluations of theoretical systems and analytic categories, and “aspects of the making of the scientific study of religion as a Western intellectual enterprise” (16). This editorial trajectory, from issues of concept formation to reflection on the status of scholars of religion “as intellectual, social, and political actors (17)” lays down an effective springboard for a graduate or advanced undergraduate course on theory/nature of religion.

Steven Engler

Mount Royal College, Calgary

Critics Not Caretakers: Redescribing the Public Study of Religion. By Russell T. McCutcheon. *SUNY Series: Issues in the Study of Religion.* Edited by Bryan Rennie. Albany, N.Y.: SUNY, 2001. xxi + 266 pages. ISBN 0-7914-4944-0. (cloth \$68.50, paper \$22.95.)

For those already familiar with McCutcheon’s work, this collection of essays, most of which have been published previously, does not represent a large amount of new material. However, those reading McCutcheon for the first time, as well as those previously acquainted with his theoretical perspectives, will find a strong and coherent argument for the critical study of religion in public space, generally, and the academy, in particular. Moreover, McCutcheon steps outside of the boundaries of the typical Religious Studies Department and into the broader university arena in order to engage conversations about pedagogical practice and theoretical issues facing all teachers on the college level in the humanities and the social sciences.

McCutcheon genuinely attempts to address and alleviate the concerns of those critics who would contend that he advocates doing away with the practice and study of religion all together. For instance, he states plainly in the Preface, “[This book] is also not directed at readers who misread my work as an extended effort to deny that the notion of ‘religion’ exists. . . . Simply put, I have no interest in what religion *really is* . . . ; instead, my interest has everything to do with *how* (i.e., description) and *why* (i.e., explanation) human communities divide up, classify, and ontologize their *ad hoc* social worlds in particular ways” (xi, author’s emphases). Whether he will be successful in persuading them remains to be seen.

The book is divided into four parts containing a total of thirteen essays. The first three sections lay out McCutcheon’s theoretical stance and methodological project, particularly with regard to the role of “redescription,” explanation, and theory in dealing

not only with the critical study of religion as such but also in addressing the plethora of problematic issues that confront us as scholars of the humanities and social sciences participating in public discourse. The fourth section, "Going Public: Teaching Theory," contains four essays "specifically concerned with how we can address issues of theory and critical thinking at the one site where we have unimpeded access to the general public: the university classroom. If there is one place where we have the ability to persuade the public of the relevance of our field's fundamental differences from theological scholarship, then it is surely our classes" (xiii). It is without a doubt that these last four essays will be of most interest to the readers of *Teaching Theology and Religion*, and where I feel McCutcheon makes one of his greatest contributions to the field of religious studies.

The first of the four chapters in this fourth section deals, in general, with the fundamental premise of the book's title, namely that as scholars of religion, our task in the classroom should not be to teach tolerance, the value of and respect for difference, or the enhancement of cultural diversity and personal religious exploration and experience, but rather to ask "transgressive questions" and to resist, on historical and material grounds, the essentializing of very disparate and localized human social actions and exchanges.

In light of the recent events of September 11, 2001, I would argue that McCutcheon, ironically perhaps, makes his most challenging statement on the opening pages of chapter 10 in which he remarks on the difficulty, even the virtual impossibility, of attempting to explain Hitler in a manner that does not immediately lead to what seems to be a "slippery slope of empathy" (155) in which all is forgiven as a consequence of its being understood. McCutcheon states that he "juxtapose[s] these two sites [viz., the politics of explaining Hitler and the role of the scholar of religion as teacher] to make a point regarding attempts to explain religion per se, as opposed to theological and humanistic scholarship that, taking religious impulses as a merely given, simply aims to describe the diversity of religions, to identify the factors that contribute to religious change and conversion, and to interpret the deep and enduring meaning of religious symbols" (156). We find ourselves in an analogous situation in any attempt to explain someone like Osama Bin Laden and the attack on the World Trade Center in a way that avoids accusations of being sympathetic to such actions as well as escapes the danger of acting as apologists for Islamic religious traditions. It is a difficult and precarious position in which we find ourselves as scholars of religion in the public arena, but we cannot shun our responsibility as academics on the grounds that our area of inquiry is

somehow privileged and self-obviously special and above explanation.

Critics Not Caretakers puts forth theoretical ideas that will provoke considerable controversy, and McCutcheon is well aware of that fact. But better to incite debate in hopes of refashioning the field and moving forward than to be content with our current state-of-affairs having little to say to our academic peers outside of the department much less the thinking public beyond the walls of our institutions.

Scott S. Elliott
Drew University

The Question of God: An Introduction and Sourcebook. By Michael Palmer. New York: Routledge, 2001. xvi + 357 pages. ISBN 0-415-22387-3 (paper).

Michael Palmer's *The Question of God* is an introductory textbook on the philosophy of religion. Textbooks on this subject typically cover a wide range of issues such as divine attributes, religious experiences, the problem of evil, life after death, and so on. Palmer's book, however, solely focuses on a single problem: the existence of God. The book discusses six classic arguments for the divine existence: the ontological argument, the cosmological argument, the argument from design, the argument from miracles, the moral argument, and the pragmatic argument. Each chapter contains both a historical and a philosophical discussion of an argument and excerpts from relevant philosophical literature. Palmer's discussion is clear and sophisticated, and the sources drawn from philosophical texts are carefully selected. The book also offers revision questions, biographical sketches of key thinkers, figures, and bibliographies, all of which teachers and students should find helpful.

Given that the book essentially covers only a single specific issue in the philosophy of religion, my initial concern was that students could derive limited value from it. It might not, in fact, be suitable for introductory students, who need to be familiar with broad philosophical issues. Fortunately, this worry was unfounded.

First, by examining the arguments for the existence of God, students can study the history of philosophy in general. Many important philosophers have devoted themselves to these arguments for over two thousand years. Throughout this textbook students will read Plato, Anselm, Aquinas, Descartes, Hume, Pascal, Kant, James, Moore, Flew, Swinburne, and others; as these names suggest, it covers both important classic debates and on-going contemporary discussions.

Second, through a study of these arguments, students can learn general philosophical concepts and

ideas, since the problem of divine existence has involved a number of fundamental philosophical issues. For example, in order to contrast the ontological argument with other arguments, Palmer introduces the concepts of *a priori* and *a posteriori* (2–3). By understanding its apriority, students will discover why the ontological argument appears unique when compared with others. As another example, Palmer discusses the metaphysics of causation and induction through Hume's criticisms of the cosmological argument and the argument from miracles (58–72; 172–203). Hume's empiricism involved in those issues could be challenging for students who have no philosophical background but again, they are nicely explained.

Third, a study of the arguments for the existence of God is helpful in training students' logical and critical reasoning skills. Palmer introduces not only the arguments themselves but also objections to the arguments and then further rebuttals from proponents of the arguments. One of the most remarkable debates introduced is the one on "Findlay's paradox" (19–22). It is well known that Kant provided a strong argument against Anselm's ontological argument. But J. N. Findlay went further and proposed, by examining Kant's argument, the "ontological argument in reverse"; a formal disproof of the existence of God. Palmer discusses how Findlay derived this paradox and how Charles Hartshorne and Norman Malcolm tried to refute it. As they follow the flow of this sort of debate, students will acquaint themselves with the manner of philosophical argumentation and reasoning. Teachers using this text can organize in-class discussions with revision questions provided in each chapter.

A final, minor point: the pragmatic argument is included in this book. Should it have been? As the name suggests, the argument purports to show that, in practical terms, it is more advantageous to believe in God than not. Palmer devotes his last chapter to Pascal's (286–301) and James's (302–324) versions of the pragmatic argument, but it is not strictly speaking an argument for the existence of God, since the argument is based on the very assumption that there is no sound proof for the existence of God.

Overall, Palmer's book is highly recommendable as an introduction to one of the most interesting and profound issues in the philosophy of religion. The book tells readers why so many philosophers throughout history have been puzzled and fascinated by the question of God.

Yujin Nagasawa
Australian National University

What They Don't Tell You: A Survivor's Guide to Biblical Studies. By Michael Joseph Brown. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 2000. xv + 157 pages. ISBN 0-664-22220-X.

Many students who sign up to take an Old or New Testament course in college or seminary are shocked to discover that the academic study of the Bible is quite different from anything they ever encountered in Sunday School. Some take to it like ducks to water, but many others are confused, disconcerted, and even angered by it. Professor Brown's small paperback volume is a godsend for professors struggling to help such students come to terms with biblical studies. It is short, accessible, even humorous. It explains many of the assumptions that have so permeated the academic lives of biblical scholars that we have sometimes almost forgotten that there is any other lens through which to view the Bible and are thus hard put to meet students on their own ground.

Michael Brown writes in a down-to-earth fashion. He begins with a prolegomena:

Prolegomena. I love that word. Basically, it means all that "stuff" that has to be said before you get down to what it is you actually *want* to say. Biblical studies is rife with prolegomena. Although biblical scholars make the whole thing look easy, that is only because they have already absorbed all the necessary prolegomena. Unfortunately, sometimes those scholars are not forthcoming about all the prolegomena that make biblical studies successful. So, after spending many hours in class teaching my students the "rules" for interpreting texts – rules that I learned over the course of twelve years – I decided I should write down some of these rules of thumb for biblical studies so that students would have a handy guide available when they study the Bible. (xiii)

In the first of five chapters, Professor Brown focuses on how the aims of academic biblical studies differ from those of Bible study in faith-based communities. He makes a distinction between what it meant for the ancient authors and their audiences – which is the heart of the historical-critical method of studying the Bible – and what it means to the reader today, the usual core of Bible study in churches. In presenting the various methodologies used by biblical scholars, he goes beyond historical-critical perspectives and includes postmodern methodologies as well. However, because most academic Bible courses still begin with historical-critical methodology, his emphasis is there.

Chapter 2 provides nineteen rules of thumb for the fledgling student to follow in order to read and interpret texts along scholarly lines. My favorite is rule of thumb number ten, "the Bible means what it says, and says what it means, except when it doesn't."

The first two phrases refer to the likelihood that some texts were intended to be taken rather literally, as for example Matthew 7:12a, "In everything do to others as you would have them do to you." The latter phrase in rule ten suggests that other texts, like the one in the story of the Good Samaritan that says, "Go and do likewise" (Luke 10:37), require that readers apply the general principle to the particularities of their own experience, rather than mindlessly heed the command.

Chapter 3 contains five more rules of thumb, this time for understanding biblical scholarship (as opposed to the Bible). Probably the most important is the first one, rule of thumb number twenty, "most biblical scholars can't agree on lunch, much less the precise meaning of a text." This rule, though a bit of an exaggeration, is helpful to students who tend to accord biblical scholars more authority than we deserve, even when ironically these same students are uncomfortable with our conclusions. This rule reminds them that biblical scholars are only human and that although we agree on many things, we also disagree on much. Students must sort through it all and make decisions for themselves.

In the fourth chapter, Professor Brown presents four more rules of thumb, this group intended to help students survive biblical studies with their faith more or less intact. Here, the last two, rules number twenty-seven and twenty-eight, are especially helpful. Rule twenty-seven goes like this: "If your faith can't stand a little shaking, perhaps there wasn't much of a foundation there in the first place." This rule helps at least some students develop a healthy perspective on their own personal faith. Similarly rule twenty-eight, "faith is not like dominoes; when one part falls, it doesn't mean that all of it will fall," enables students to avoid the all-or-nothing mind-set in which any decision to disagree with whatever their faith tradition has taught them suggests that that tradition is totally without merit.

The final brief chapter concludes with the author's personal reflections about the transformative power of biblical studies. He speaks of his own transformation and that of students he has taught. Professor Brown has given the field of biblical studies a wonderful tool for helping students make the transition from the kind of Bible study that is usually done in churches to the kind that dominates the academy. This tool should help alleviate student anxiety and ease the burden on instructors. It may usefully be employed in both undergraduate and seminary level programs.

Alice Ogden Bellis
Howard University School of Divinity

Learning from CHANGE: Landmarks in Teaching and Learning in Higher Education from CHANGE Magazine 1969-1999. Edited by Deborah DeZure. Sterling, Va.: Stylus Publishing, 2000. xxvii + 460 pages. ISBN 1-57922-002-9.

In the late 1960s vast changes underway in the university context prompted the creation of a number of institutions intended to support thoughtful reflection upon higher education. These institutions included the weekly newspaper we now know as *The Chronicle of Higher Education* as well as the bi-monthly periodical *Change*. *Change* is now the core publication of the American Association for Higher Education.

This edited collection draws upon the first three decades of the magazine's archives, exploring the diverse ways in which it has pursued its mission of "building shared vocabulary and understanding about academic work" (xviii). As DeZure notes in the introduction, this collection attempts: "(1) to capture the richness of the conversation in this ongoing national (and now international) 'town meeting' about teaching and learning; (2) to illuminate these 'conversations' by tracing the continuities, discontinuities, and changes over time; and (3) to suggest ways in which these trends offer lessons, opportunities, and inspiration for the future as we step into the new millennium" (xxii).

The book succeeds at all three of these tasks, as well as being a rich and absorbing read. Divided into several categories the articles cover such areas as: promoting a culture of teaching and learning, issues surrounding the creation and support of learning communities, various philosophies and psychologies of teaching, assessing student learning, evaluating teaching, teacher narratives, media and technology challenges, and so on.

Many authors whose work has become quite well known are represented, among them: Parker Palmer, Lee Schulman, Ernest Boyer, Sharon Parks, Kenneth Bruffee, and Peter Elbow. Many other writers whose voices are only now gaining national prominence can also be found here – people such as Randy Bass – prompting this reviewer to marvel at the discernment of the editors of the magazine in their ability to identify and publish innovative work.

There are many ways in which this collection could prove useful to the readers of *Teaching Theology and Religion*. At a minimum it is a brief and clear introduction to important debates from the last three decades concerning teaching and learning in the higher education context. This collection would be a very good text for a graduate seminar that prepares students for the teaching component of their vocation. Administrators who are hungry for an introduction to research on assessment and evaluation, but who

have little time for discerning where or how to enter that vast discussion, will find good summary pieces here. Similarly, staff who seek to recruit and retain diverse students for various kinds of colleges will find much that is useful.

Many of these articles would be great conversation starters for faculty retreats. I can imagine, for instance, using the following quotation by Diana Chapman Walsh to begin a discussion about faculty vocation: “The key to inspiring teaching (as opposed to, say, efficient or entertaining teaching or even teaching that promotes learning of specific course content) lies in sustaining an intellectually vital and engaged classroom. This, in turn, requires nourishing the inner lives of the professoriate. We risk reducing the profession to a set of skills or sensitivities by promoting other agendas for faculty – mastering technology, evaluating outcomes, developing learning contracts. We must take care that these skills and sensitivities enliven the academic agenda without deflecting the attention and sapping the spirits of teachers who are also scholars and whose scholarly excursions infuse their teaching with deeper meaning” (46).

Many of the articles included in the collection have tables and charts associated with them that convey

complex information in vivid and concise ways. Barr and Tagg’s chart comparing educational paradigms, for instance, lays out very clearly the main distinctions between an instruction paradigm and a learning paradigm (198–199). Batson and Bass’s chart of epistemological differences between print culture and digital culture is an excellent tool for exploring the educational implications of the shift from one to the other. The collection also provides substance both theoretically and practically. Palmer’s classic essay on “a movement approach to educational reform” is included here, as well as Welty’s exemplary outline for promoting “discussion method teaching.”

The book’s primary flaws are inevitable in a work of this kind, and hardly insurmountable. Many of the articles are excerpted, leaving this reader at least, hungry for the complete essay. This is also a mainstream collection. Even though the magazine is entitled *Change*, it is change within the fairly standard parameters of American higher education. You will not find here writing by the more radical people (either left or right) working within the higher education context.

Mary E. Hess
Luther Seminary