mies in Asia, high tariffs, and literary freedom, and this strong opponent of imperialism, protectionism, and censorship would have revealed a consistent strain of liberalism. Don't ask him about what social classes owe to one another, or about the obduracy of human cultures, or about the moral value of hard work, and you would not learn that he was, in fact, an arch-conservative.

At one point, in a jocular vein, Ladd and Lipset suggest that it might be "far less meaningful to ask an American intellectual today, 'Are you a liberal or conservative?' than to ask 'Are you *Commentary* or *New York Review of Books*?' " Indeed, they might have been well advised to have taken their jest seriously (though with less parochial examples). To ask people of learning what they read, and in which authors they find their guides, might well be to increase the chance of gaining entry into that screened interior of thought and feeling where political identities are cast. Conversely, to ask professors to place themselves in one of five positions on a prefixed scale is to run the risks inherent in coercing testimony. For one thing, the position rubrics—"strongly conservative," "moderately conservative," "middle-of-the-road," "liberal," "left"—are not bland résumés of political opinions; they are vernacular symbols with their own attractive and repulsive force. Though it can be shown that political opinions and position choices are statistically related, it cannot be known whether the self-styled "conservative" or "liberal" is responding to convictions in his mind or to the popularity of the labels. For another thing, both the referents and the fashionableness of these rubrics alter a great deal over time. The Carnegie survey, in one of its few calls for political retrospection, asked respondents to categorize the political views they held when they were college students. The conclusion drawn by Ladd and Lipset from these responses is that professors shift to the right as they get older no matter where they now are or what their starting point; the difficulty Ladd and Lipset slide over is that they cannot tell, with unstable yardsticks, whether it is people or labels that have aged and changed. Even more worrisome are the distortions that are inevitably introduced by the imposition of a single spectrum. The implication of the orderings here provided is that "left" is "liberal" only more so, and that "moderately conservative" is the same as "strongly conservative" only less. Perhaps, on certain issues, the differences between one position and another are merely incremental. But often, as we have lately rediscovered, the differences are qualitative and definitive, reflecting the implacable opposures of sobriety and fanaticism, reformism and revolutionism, the ethics of responsibility and the ethics of absolute ends. Not to realize that democratic politics may be a world rather than a degree removed from extremist politics is either to foreshorten the range of existing options or to give the rabid fringes an unwarranted gift of near-allies.

In a new work now being serialized in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, Ladd and Lipset conclude, on the basis of a yet more recent survey, that the American academic profession "is notably inclined toward liberal and egalitarian social programs," but that most of its members are "not radical," are "not disenchanted with the basic operations of the American polity," and are not inclined "to entertain sweeping economic or political changes." A careful reading of the substance of *The Divided Academy* would lead to a similar conclusion. On the strength of the factual evidence here presented, what stands out about this profession, aside from its liberalism, is its moderateness. For what it means, only 4 percent of all faculty respondents identified themselves in 1969 as "left," only 3 percent as "strongly conservative." On campus issues, the vast majority of respondents exhibited a distaste for student violence, an attachment to academic freedom, a capacity to distinguish demonstrations from disruptions and desired ends from repugnant means. In presidential elections (according to various cited polls), faculty members have long eschewed extremes, resisting the blandishments of third-party candidates. All in all, the specific findings of this volume paint a picture of an unusually temperate professoriate, one that is apparently far less given than its foreign counterparts to mount assaults against the social order.

Unfortunately, in this volume, this picture is sometimes smudged by the authors' rhetoric and procedures. For greater ease in cross-tabulation, they combine "liberal" and "left" into a single variable, thereby suggesting that their antinomies can be escaped simply by an act of hyphenation. In stressing political divisions in the academy, they call attention to deviations from the norm, so that the fact that 35 percent of the social scientists scored "very liberal," or that 11 percent of the sociologists voted for Henry Wallace, tends to stand out in high relief. But most of all, by seizing on "intellectuality" as the major explanation for why some professors are biased toward the "liberal-left," and by defining this attribute as an inherent tendency to be "questioning, critical, socially disruptive," the authors employ words that are filled with exaggeration and that lend support, probably unintended, to a prime piece of antiacademic folklore. It is surely worthwhile asking why it is that members of research-centered universities, members of the social disciplines, Jewish members of all faculties, and high academic achievers generally are disproportionately liberal in their positions on public issues. But there is no reason, a priori, why one factor should be held to explain this, least of all a factor that is vaguely defined and may be undefinable (Is "intellectuality" a mental, social, or cultural trait? Does it appear full-blown or in varying amounts?) and that contains its own political biases (Are all "liberals" intellectuals? Are all "conservatives" of an uncritical and accepting mind?). As the authors themselves suggest, a number of alternative explanations—selective recruitment, ethnic traditions, political nepotism, associative patterns, the very demands of the subject of inquiry—can emerge from plausible speculation or be teased out of the surveyed facts.

WALTER P. METZGER
Department of History,
Columbia University, New York City

Social Transactions

The Social Psychology of Bargaining and Negotiation. JEFFREY Z. RUBIN and BERT R. BROWN. Academic Press, New York, 1975. xii, 360 pp. $16.50.

Bargaining and negotiation occur at all levels of social interaction: between husband and wife, between students and teachers, between labor and management, and, at the highest level, between nation states. Since bargaining is such a pervasive phenomenon, there is, of course, a long history of theoretical concern with the subject. Economists and mathematicians were the first to recognize the importance of its normative (prescriptive) aspects. Among social psychologists, however, interest in bargaining is of only recent origin, spanning the brief period of about 20 years.

Probably the first experimental studies directly examining the bargaining relationship were the classic ones of Deutsch and Krauss and of Siegel and Fouraker, both published in 1960. There were also some concurrent theoretical developments in social psychology. Most notable was the work of Thibaut and Kelley and of Homans, who interpret social interaction as an exchange of rewards among the participants. They assume that the participants mutually attempt to maximize rewards and minimize costs, and if such a "social contract" were to be broken one or more of the participants could be expected to

withdraw from the relationship. More important, they proposed the use of "outcome matrices" (derived from game theory) for the study of social psychological processes.

The normative approach (used by game theorists) assumes that the only incentives operating in the bargaining situation are those based on the payoff matrix. Other motivational processes, such as guilt, benevolence, and the sense of justice and equity, are assumed to be incorporated in the payoff values. In direct contrast to that approach, the emphasis of this book is on exactly those motives which game theorists "sweep away" into the payoff matrix. In describing one of their own studies, for example, the authors postulate that the mere presence of an audience motivates the bargainer to seek positive (and avoid negative) evaluations from the audience. This hypothesis is based on the finding that a bargainer who has been publicly humiliated is more likely to save face by retaliating against the other bargainer than to maximize tangible outcomes.

In the preface, the authors note that there have been more than 1000 articles and books devoted to their subject since 1960 alone. Hence, an integrated review of theory and research in bargaining is certainly appropriate. To that end, this work gives a selective review of studies based primarily in the "social psychology laboratory" and covers over 500 studies reported in over 40 journals through the period 1960 through 1974. Additional books and articles are included in a comprehensive bibliography.

The first three chapters introduce the reader to a variety of bargaining situations, provide a theoretical perspective for the remaining chapters, and describe the major research paradigms that have been used in the study of bargaining. Bargaining is defined (in keeping with dictionary definitions) as "the process whereby two or more parties attempt to settle what each shall give and take, or perform and receive, in a transaction between them" (p. 2). Though the terms "bargaining" and "negotiation" are used in different types of contexts, the authors treat them as interchangeable and use "bargaining" to refer to both types of transactions. This is a very broad definition, and as a consequence of adopting it the authors include a variety of research paradigms under the category of "bargaining": the two-person prisoner's dilemma game, the Siegel-Fouraker "bilateral monopoly" paradigm, the Deutsch-Krauss "trucking" game, and the Vinacke-Arkoff coalition game. Though definitions are arbitrary, many investigators (including the reviewer) would prefer to restrict the term to a situation in which offers and counteroffers are made prior to any transaction. This would be consistent with the distinction made in game theory between cooperative and noncooperative games. In the former case, communication and side payments are allowed, whereas in the latter they are not.

The remaining chapters are devoted to a review of empirical studies classified according to the following scheme: (i) effects of the structural context of bargaining (for example, restricted versus unrestricted communication and availability of information, availability of threats, types of outcomes and incentives, the number of parties involved, third parties [mediators]); (ii) effects of the behavioral dispositions of the bargainers (personality and ability); (iii) effects of interdependence of the bargainers (power imbalance and motivational orientation); and (iv) effects of tactics and strategies. This classification scheme is quite exhaustive, and considering the wide variety of studies reviewed (and the emphasis on nontangible incentives), it is not unreasonable. Yet the categories are not mutually exclusive—many studies suggest that there are likely to be complex interactions among the effects of many independent variables—and there seems to be no cohesive theme connecting the various chapters. What this suggests is that a taxonomy of bargaining situations is sorely needed.

The need for a taxonomy, moreover, points to one of the major problems in current bargaining research: the lack of a general theoretical model to integrate and organize the results of a large number of studies. This makes it extremely difficult to review the bargaining literature in a coherent and systematic fashion. There are, however, several theories the authors could have used to integrate at least part of the literature—for example, Siegel and Fouraker's "Level of Aspiration" model of bargaining, Osgood's GRIT hypothesis for the reduction of tensions, and studies that attempt to test the two apparently opposing theories. There are, in addition, many studies that are directed toward the effects of the reward structure (payoff values) of the situation, and the development of theoretical models based on tangible outcomes. In this connection, the emphasis of the book on nontangible motivational processes, to the exclusion of tangible incentives in the bargaining situation, is probably its main weakness. Rubin and Brown's review is likely to give the false impression that social psychologists are not concerned with the effects of reward structure. Rewards are one of the main reasons for bargaining in the first place, and, subtle as the distinction may be, it is important to distinguish between research directed toward the major variables that affect the process and outcomes of bargaining and research that uses a bargaining paradigm to study other social psychological phenomena (personality, sex differences, and so on).

Despite its limitations this is a highly commendable effort. It is the most comprehensive review available of the empirical literature on "bargaining" and deserves serious attention from social scientists interested in the social psychological factors underlying the process and outcomes of bargaining.

SAMUEL S. KOMORITA
Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, Champaign

Thin Surfaces

Monolayers. Papers from a symposium, Atlantic City, N.J., Sept. 1974. E. D. GODDARD, Ed. American Chemical Society, Washington, D.C., 1975. xii, 372 pp., illus. $23.95. Advances in Chemistry Series, 144.

The book under review is a collection of papers presented at a memorial symposium for N. K. Adam. Reminiscences of their association with Adam by James F. Danielli and by M. C. Phillips give the book a personal touch and some historical perspective: "He took up the study of monolayers following the remarkable contribution made by Irving Langmuir. The field at that time needed a first class experimentalist who could work with rigour and dispassionate exactness." Through the years, theory and experiment in the field have become more and more sophisticated, and a great deal of impetus has come from the students of the structure and properties of biological membranes.

A symposium proceedings usually provides an instant picture of the state of the art. Considering the constraints set by symposium logistics, the 25 papers on work originating in six countries present a rather rounded picture, although one does miss some authors and some aspects, for example, transport through monolayers. Appropriately, some 40 percent of the papers are on monolayers of biological interest, those on lipids, proteins, glycosides, and enzymes. On the theoretical side, there are papers presenting refinements in the measurement and analysis of thermodynamic properties of monolayers, for example, one on entropies of compression and one on equations of state. There are also papers on refinements in the analysis of electrical double layer properties of monolayers, for example, a discussion of the discreteness of charge effects and a pa-