presented three specific strategies, each with case examples. Often in other sections of the book, this reader was left wishing for more examples. Moving on to problem identification, Conoley and Conoley comment that "The process . . . is more difficult than most consultants believe" (p. 53) but then do not deal with it further, leaving one to wonder about issues, pitfalls and strategies. Another section on consulting for organizational change suggests the efficacy of teaching client groups self-analysis as a means of overcoming the ineffectiveness of a consultant trying to be both expert observer and interpreter. Perhaps this might be a skill to be used in assisting with problem identification.

Consulting for macrosystem change will be of particular interest to those working with disabled children or involved in placement decisions. The chapter begins with a child-oriented overview of the law and its interpretation, including precedents from litigation. Although obviously based on American statutes and legal processes, many of the examples will be familiar in nature to Canadians. Consultants are cautioned about the need to work within a framework of due process, and are encouraged to use their training to help people work together, to negotiate among the stakeholders, and to foster partnerships with parents.

In a time of political eulogies about "grass-roots decision making" it is interesting to read the statement, "Change, elusive as it is, proceeds more smoothly from the top down" (p. 83). Conoley and Conoley offer a straightforward presentation of the role of the consultant in facilitating organizational change. Organizational boundaries, the "focus on yesterday," and the pros and cons of internal consultants are all dealt with. Consultants are warned about being so ideologically focused that they are willing to intervene regardless of the organizational possibilities for success.

The final chapter on the consultant as trainer recognizes that training is unlikely to be influential unless it is accompanied by follow-up consultation, a statement that is pragmatic but that could be perceived as somewhat self-serving when made by a consultant seeking a contract.

School Consultation: Practice and Training, Second Edition provides a concise overview of the topic. Excellent as a textbook or "first read," the book may be found somewhat limited by practitioners who have a good grasp of the essentials of working with various groups in a school setting. As such, it still offers useful reminders; often those of us in the field can become so focused on outcomes that we neglect to apply the process knowledge we have as counsellors.


Reviewed by: R. Vance Peavy, University of Victoria.

This is a book of thirteen chapters, nine of which originated at a 1989 symposium on Postmodernism and psychology held in Denmark at Aarhus
University's Centre for Qualitative Research. The contributors are all well-known researchers and writers in what I think of as the movement for a psychology suited for the twenty-first century. In humanities, art and philosophy, the world we are moving into is often described as “postmodern.” This term is ambiguous and defined in many different ways. In fact it is consistent with postmodern thought to resist any once and for all time definition. The essays in this book explore the possibilities for a discipline of psychology in the context of a postmodern world; and explore how psychological thinking has to change in order to become adequate for meeting the challenges posed by life in postmodern culture.

Readers who are interested in how the paradigm shift in the sciences as identified by Kuhn (1970) is finally beginning to migrate into the social sciences, including psychology and its applications such as counselling and therapy, will find this a very compelling collection of essays. I found all of the essays of interest to myself as a researcher, writer and counsellor educator. Each reader will probably respond to different essays in different ways. However, I will single out one which I found particularly provocative.

This is an essay on “postmodernism and human sciences” by Patti Lather who teaches qualitative research and feminist pedagogy at Ohio State University. Just a year earlier than the publication of the present essay, Patti Lather’s (1991) brilliant book, Getting Smart, opened up new lines of thinking about emancipatory research and practice important in both psychology and education. In research and in practice, how do we move from our positivist preoccupations with “truth” toward the productivity of language within what Bakhtin (1981:358) has termed “the framing authorial context?” Lather poses further questions for us:

- in our research how do we frame meaning possibilities rather than closing them off?
- how do we create multi-voiced, multi-centred texts from our data?
- how do we deconstruct and reveal the ways in which our own desires as emancipatory enquiries shape the texts we create?
- why do we do research? To give voice to subjugated knowledge? As another version of writing our self? To capitalize on our privileged position in academe to further our own careers and wealth?
- what can we do in research and practice to increase the reflexive process lays open our easy and often mindless use of “imposed and provided forms”?

Lather sees practice as an “engine of innovation” and argues that the legitimacy of knowledge depends upon its descent down from theory into the level of practice and becoming immanent in it. In this regard, Lather's position is quite similar to another contributor, Donald Polkinghorne who writes: “the criterion for acceptability of a knowledge claim is the fruitfulness of its implementation . . . the epistemology of practised has shifted from metaphors of correctness to those of utility” (p. 162).

I recommend this volume of essays as stimulating reading for anyone who is trying to keep up with, and comprehend, the rapid and complex changes
and transformations which are occurring within social sciences, society and applied disciplines such as counselling and therapy. It should prove of special value to researchers and supervisors of research who are working to revise, deconstruct, and reconstruct research methods and purposes to meet the needs and relevance claims of the postmodern era.
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Reviewed by: Ronald Warner.

A classic is a classic even if it takes a year or two to discover it. Talley’s study is a must for counsellors and may be a classic. The interest in briefer and more cost-effective models of psychotherapy is increasingly attractive for many agencies and clinics—including university counselling centres—facing the challenge of providing quality service in an era of increasing demands and diminishing resources. Joseph Talley’s book is an important contribution to the brief therapy outcome literature because it is the most scientifically rigorous study, that this writer has examined, of the effectiveness of treatment at the lower end (number of sessions) of the brief therapy continuum range.

Talley’s contribution to the psychotherapeutic outcome literature is that he provides rigorous empirical evidence (beyond client satisfaction) of the effectiveness of treatment lasting from one to seven sessions. The research design included control groups, and psychometric indicators of therapeutic change, as well as a sophisticated measure of client satisfaction. This study, undertaken at Duke University Counselling and Psychological Services Centre, involved 95 clients (who received a mean of 2.4 sessions) and 12 therapists with a predominantly psychodynamic treatment style. The research design employed a random control group as well as two comparison groups, and utilized four psychometric instruments; the Zung Self-Rating Depression Scale, the Zung Self-Rating Anxiety Scale, the Visual Analogue Depression and Anxiety Scales, and the Beck Depression Inventory. Also incorporated into this design was a 16-item Client Satisfaction Index.

The pre-treatment administration of these depression and anxiety symptom oriented scales indicated significantly higher scores for the clinical group than for the control and comparison groups. And at post-treatment there was no significant difference between groups on any of these meas-