

contemporary peace activists. Its core assumption is that the security of one nation cannot be rooted in the insecurity of another. Collective action requires more than a vision, but, as an alternative to "Peace through Strength" and the continuing arms race it has brought us, "Common Security" offers a challenging new beginning.

WILLIAM A. GAMSON  
*Department of Sociology,  
Boston College,  
Chestnut Hill, MA 02167*

## Ideals of Psychologists

**The Rise of Experimentation in American Psychology.** JILL G. MORAWSKI, Ed. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 1988. xx, 220 pp. \$24.50.

The persistent tendency of psychologists to equate genuinely scientific work with experimental research is examined in this collection of essays dealing with episodes from the late 19th century to the very recent past. In addition to this common theme there is agreement among the contributors that experimentalists' research designs and findings have always been somehow shaped by social circumstances. The essays are diverse in focus and argument, however: some of them analyze the fabricated social situations of the laboratory, whereas others describe the social characteristics of those involved in research as either members of the professional community of psychologists or subjects of experimentation; the "experiments" discussed range from laboratory projects to a longitudinal study of a selected population (but are nearly all experiments involving human subjects—a skewed sample of experimentalist research).

If psychologists intended their research to have practical implications, historians easily identify the social values sustained by their work. Henry Minton shows that Lewis Terman's study of gifted children, charted in 1921 and still continuing, was designed to persuade the public that an aristocracy of the talented should lead them. Others might have viewed Terman's data as documentation of the workings of the American class system, but to Terman they indicated that intelligence was inherited and was linked to successful performance in all spheres of life; naturally his subjects came from relatively prosperous families, were physically fit and psychologically well adjusted, and enjoyed (if they were male) notable careers. Richard Gillespie's account of the experiments conducted at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company between 1924 and

1933 reveals them to have rationalized the shift of control over production from workers to a psychologically oriented managerial sector new to American industry. Initiated by plant managers and subsequently elaborated by Elton Mayo and his colleagues from the Harvard Business School, the experiments were heralded as demonstrations that workers' productivity was determined by their psychological attitudes. Contrary to social science myth, however, Mayo's conclusions were consistent with the plant managers' expectations. And Jill Morawski analyzes the efforts of prominent—male—psychologists to prove that conventional sex roles were "natural." From the early years of this century, feminists argued that natural sex differences were inaccessible to psychological inquiry: human nature was thoroughly masked by the training both males and females received from birth. But men such as Robert Yerkes postulated that (un-socialized) primates exhibited nearly human nature and contrived primate experiments that supposedly revealed the inevitability of male dominance.

Minton, Gillespie, and Morawski all treat psychologists' efforts to appeal to the potential markets for their services and thus to establish professional roles for themselves, as sages or practical consultants. The other contributors to this collection are also concerned with psychologists' creation of a distinct professional identity, but they focus on changes psychologists effected in their research styles and rhetoric that enabled them to present a collective front to outsiders. Gail Hornstein relates how in the late 19th and early 20th centuries psychologists were persuaded that their findings would not be genuinely scientific unless they were expressed in quantitative form and how they managed to suspend consideration of questions about the significance of those research projects that were susceptible to quantification. In no small part, the quantitative ideal was the cause of the experimentalists, and their professional dominance was consolidated by an elite (and all male) network of psychologists joined in the society of experimentalists, described here by Laurel Furu-moto, founded by E. B. Titchener in 1904.

All the other contributors analyze psychologists' management of the experimental situation itself. Kurt Danziger traces changes in the modes of identifying experimental subjects—represented in the 19th century as virtual collaborators in research and subsequently increasingly described as passive subjects—and argues that this shift in the language of research reports is an index to psychologists' delusion that their experimental subjects were incapable of conscious calculation and, in the laboratory at

least, unaffected by the experiences they had had as social beings. By the 1950s, as Jerry Suls and Ralph Rosnow report, researchers had begun to recognize the negative consequences of the authority they had established in the laboratory, observing that the established social relationship between subjects and researchers made the former likely to respond as the latter expected (not least because subjects were neither naïve nor unconscious). Initially, this observed pattern was seen to mandate reform of experimental procedure, but, as Benjamin Harris shows, by the 1960s psychologists had also become concerned about its ethical implications and instituted post-experimental "debriefing"—sessions in which subjects' potential resentment at being experimentally manipulated could be allayed. To Harris, "debriefing" procedures denote psychologists' persistent determination to render their experimental subjects thoroughly passive, but Karl Scheibe construes recent research developments differently. To Scheibe, both concerns about the accuracy of experimental results and debates about the ethics of research procedures are manifestations of fundamental disciplinary change, indications that many psychologists now question the scientific ideal embraced in the 19th century.

Obviously, it is the triumph of this scientific ideal, predicated on positivist, mechanistic, and operationalist assumptions, that this collection variously chronicles. The authors, all but one of them psychologists, have evidently turned to historical inquiry in order to determine how an ideal they find untenable was embraced. Because their work exposes the premises underlying conventional practices, their colleagues should find it useful in resolving their discipline's present dilemmas. For readers who are not psychologists, this book has value—perhaps unanticipated—as a primer on some current debates in the field.

HENRIKA KUKLICK  
*Department of History and Sociology of Science,  
University of Pennsylvania,  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6310*

## Social Science in Law

**Reforming the Law.** Impact of Child Development Research. GARY B. MELTON, Ed. Guilford, New York, 1987. xii, 307 pp. \$30. Guilford Law and Behavior Series.

Reforming the law is a complex enterprise. Legislators make and remake law in response to various mixes of political and policy considerations. Judges embellish legislated rules and legislate rules of their own,