

## Reviews

whereby actors in pursuit of common interests try to arrive at a settlement or arrangement with each other or a third party" (p. 6). The greater part of his book consists of descriptions and analyses of various forms of the negotiating process and constitutes a significant contribution to the literature. Martin has examined the process by which, to use Waller's phrase, the "perilous equilibrium" of power and authority in the school is both threatened and maintained.

This reviewer found the description of symbolic interactionism somewhat inadequate, although the concepts are of prime importance to an understanding of Martin's study. Readers new to the field may wish to consult Martin's sources, David Silverman's concise description in his book *The Theory of Organizations*, and Berger's and Luckmann's *The Social Construction of Reality*.

An annoying weakness of the book stems from Martin's analytical terminology. Two key terms are *closed negotiation* and *open negotiation*. The definition of *closed negotiation* — "characterized by explicitly given directives and explicitly stated consequences of not following them" (p. 34) — seems to contradict his earlier use of *negotiation* as the "pursuit of common interests" (p. 6). The terminology becomes even more confusing upon Martin's unsubstantiated adoption of the teacher's point of view (p. 35) and his subsequent categorization of pupils as *non-negotiables*, *intermittently negotiables*, and *continuously negotiables*. According to Martin, *non-negotiable* pupils are of two types: "the passive, quiet ones" and those with "undisciplined styles." Readers may justifiably wonder what is meant if teachers are described as engaging in *extra-trivial* (p. 26) *closed negotiation* (p. 34) with *undisciplined non-negotiable* (pp. 37-38) pupils.

Martin has attempted to provide participants and observers with a much-needed conceptual framework which systematically accounts for the nature of the multiple social interactions which take place daily in schools. Although encumbered by a

lack of established terminology, the book has succeeded in identifying, analyzing, and illustrating key features of the process of negotiation which maintains and changes the social order of schools.

James H. Balderson  
University of Alberta

Frank Spitzer and  
Elizabeth Silvester, eds.  
MCGILL UNIVERSITY THESIS  
DIRECTORY:  
VOLS. I and II.  
Montreal:  
McGill University, 1975-76,  
2000 pp. \$40.00.

The publication of the two-volume *McGill University Thesis Directory* will help to overcome a failing in Canadian bibliography: an incomplete listing of thesis titles. Although an estimated 80,000 graduate theses have been turned out by Canadian universities over the years, many have never been properly recorded. One reason for this is the relatively late development of national and international bibliographies. The National Library's *Canadian Theses* dates from 1946 and the United States' dissertation abstracts series began publication in 1933.

The merit of the *Directory* is not only its comprehensive character — over 10,000 McGill thesis titles from 1881 to 1973 are listed — but the inclusion, under separate headings, of the Department in which the thesis was earned as well as the name of the student's supervisor. This additional information is a bonus for researchers who will be able to identify more easily the sources of expert knowledge.

Education researchers will find the *Directory* useful in several respects. In addition to 200 "Education" theses listed from 1911, there are numerous works on schools to be found under other disciplines, for example, a 1907 M.A. thesis in Political Science is en-

titled "The Schools of Manitoba" and a 1965 M.A. thesis in Sociology bears the title "Variations in Social Control Styles of High School Teachers."

The *Directory* is, however, more than a telephone book of thesis titles, their authors and sponsors. On the one hand, it is a definitive record of McGill's thesis achievements since the second half of the last century. On the other, it is a portrait of an institution in transition, of how a nineteenth century university steeped in the teaching of liberal studies gives way in the twentieth century to a university oriented more to scientific research and advanced study. Thus we find that the theses listed in the years before 1900 at McGill were exclusively in Law or Divinity. By 1940 the situation had changed dramatically. Of the seventy-five thesis titles listed in that year fifty-eight were in the Sciences.

The compilation of this work was a major undertaking for which the University community owes the compilers a vote of appreciation.

Roger Magnuson  
McGill University

Sidney Hook, Paul Kurtz and Miro Todorovich, eds.  
**THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE CURRICULUM: THE NEED FOR GENERAL EDUCATION.**  
New York:  
Prometheus Books, 1975.  
281 pp. \$10.95.

This book consists of twenty-eight essays, most of which were presented at the second national conference of the University Centers for Rational Alternatives held at Rockefeller University in September 1973. The general theme has to do with the need for general education and the necessary components of the university curriculum. These are dealt with in sections headed: The Humanistic Dis-

ciplines, The Place of Science and the Scientific Outlook, Problems and Dilemmas of the Social Sciences, and Reflections on the Curriculum. The contributors are primarily academics, with some administrators and a reporter from the *Wall Street Journal*.

On the whole, one could ask the same questions of the book as it asks of the curriculum: why are these topics dealt with? to what end? how are they connected? There is not much interplay among the authors and little basic disagreement. Detailed proposals for curricular change are skimpy; nor is it made clear what is the relationship between "the philosophy of the curriculum" and "the need for general education." Surely the former need not entail the latter. Nor is the latter necessarily based on philosophical analysis and arguments.

A philosophy of the curriculum should attempt to bring out pre-suppositions about the subjects to be studied (Why astro-physics but not astrology?), critically examine proposed general aims (What constitutes an "educated person?"), and consider possible means to desired ends (Is it appropriate to indoctrinate students to become good citizens?). Some of the authors in this volume take one or the other of these approaches but none effectively includes them all. None of them pays much attention to the work of Dewey on the curriculum, which is unfortunate since he is one of the very few modern thinkers who took care to consider pre-suppositions, arguments about ends, and the feasibility of means. A quick look at his *The Child and the Curriculum* (Chicago, 1902) would raise a number of basic questions that do not get asked in this book.

Sidney Hook, in his contribution, "General Education: The Minimum Indispensables," does list the student needs which define required areas of study in the curriculum: the need to communicate, to have at least a rudimentary knowledge of his/her mind and body and his/her place in the world of nature, to understand how society functions, to know of the conflict of values and ideals in our