

Witkin and have produced some interesting results. Other concepts wait to be defined and these too may prove to be valuable.

The final theoretical view is unusual, since it presents the sociological perspective of Parsons and Bales. These theorists conceive of the child as an actor developing within a social system, the family, whose dynamics bring about the socialization of the child. Such a view moderates the emphasis that the psychologist places upon the growth of an individual person. As Parsons has pointed out in *The Social System*, all cultures regulate social and sexual behavior, control organized activities, and affect behavior of any sort through processes of symbolic communication. During socialization, the culture is mediated in personality development by the dynamics of the family as a social system. As a result, Parsons has done developmental psychology a very worthwhile service by pointing out the role of the social system in child development, by calling attention to the influence of the family upon the child and *vice versa*. However, it must be kept in mind that Parsons' analysis is theoretical; details of the theory await justification.

Professor Baldwin has also performed a worthwhile service: he has taken a theoretical perspective which in the original writings is often very confusing and difficult to follow and has presented a coherent, comprehensible review. This section alone is worth the cost of the book.

The final section attempts a prolegomenon to an integrated theory of child development, and reflects one of the two weaknesses of the book. The other is the general inadequacy of the critiques of the theories. Both of these, however, are probably extrinsic to the book and may more accurately reflect the primitive stage of theory in developmental psychology. It is Professor Baldwin's assumption that none of the current theories approaches the degree of rigor and clarity that an adequate theory requires. However, after reading the book, one can conclude that the seven years spent in preparation have produced a scholarly volume which will prove to be valuable to those interested in the problems of developmental psychology.

R. L. Hertzog

The University of Calgary

Dale L. Brubaker. *Alternative Directions for the Social Studies*. Scranton, Penn.: International Textbook Company, 1967. Pp. 63.

Brubaker has attempted to order the confused area of the aims of social studies teaching, and in doing so has isolated two major schools of thought. In one, the focus of social studies teaching is good citizenship (Brubaker calls this the majority position on value teaching); in the

other (the minority school) concern is primarily with critical thinking. Brubaker marshalls a good deal of evidence that teachers, schools and social studies curricula in U.S.A. can be dichotomized in this fashion, but it is one of the weaknesses of the book that he admits but treats too superficially the fundamental question as to whether this dichotomy *should* exist. One is prompted to ask, is it any more justifiable to accept the popular separation of value teaching and critical thinking than it is to condone the popular dichotomization of theory and practice.

Not only is the conclusion of the book weakened by an inadequate resolution of the problem of the relationship of critical thinking to value teaching, but in the final section Brubaker also accepts other grave inconsistencies in the objectives of social studies teachers. He goes beyond noting current inconsistency: he expresses approval of the situation, describing it as "democratic". At this point Brubaker's position appears to be an intellectual abdication from the strategic frontiers of the profession.

Brubaker's difficulty in this situation is illuminated by an incident from his own teaching.

The students had just finished a six-week unit, during which the United States and the Soviet Union had been compared. The teacher wanted his students to see that our way of life was to be preferred to life in the Soviet Union. He had done this by saying that, in the Soviet Union, there is a phrase, *Kto kovo* ("Who gets whom" or "Dog eat dog"), which describes much of what Soviet life is like. Hopefully, the teacher had continued, our way of life in the United States is more than *Kto kovo*.

The night after the teacher's "prescriptive jewel" was given to the students, a senior banquet was held, and the teacher attended. An administrator from the same school system was the guest speaker. He told the seniors that they had been on the "gravy train" long enough. He concluded, "When you get out into real life it's going to be 'dog eat dog.'"

Brubaker's footnote ("It is not the author's intention to castigate either the teacher or the administrator. The example is used simply to demonstrate the plurality of objectives in our schools") is too facile a conclusion.

Had Brubaker internalized the value position of Michael Scriven to whom elsewhere he refers with apparent approval he would surely not have attempted the unnecessary task of persuading American students that their way of life was to be preferred to that of the U.S.S.R. He would have been engaged in aiding students in the use of the approaches of historians and social scientists in examining the modes of social organization in the U.S.S.R. in historical context and as they both express and modify the value systems of contemporary Russians. It must be said in Brubaker's defence that he attempts a greater objectivity in a later chapter in which he undertakes a comparative study of objectives in Soviet and American schools. Nevertheless, an ethno-centric teaching incident such as the one Brubaker describes cannot be justified on other than an extremely superficial view of the nature of good citizenship.

Thus the central problem of the book is inadequately examined. Furthermore, the language of the book is subject to criticism for infelicitous expression.

This small volume, however, is not without merit and utility. It flows; it has shape; it is brief and it attempts a most needed service, the mapping of an area of great confusion. Though it may not advance the frontiers of the subject, *Alternative Directions in the Social Studies* is to be recommended as a helpful survey for the groups for which it was written, social studies curriculum committee members and secondary teachers in training.

Evelyn Moore

The University of Calgary