BOOK REVIEWS

of the concept, anomie, to selected categories of deviant behavior. Short looks at gang delinquency, Dunham at mental disorder, Lindesmith and Gagnon at drug addiction, and Snyder at alcoholism as these behaviors may, or may not, be illuminated by the notion of anomie. Clinard and Lemert provide introductory summaries and Merton writes a closing resume.

The spirit of this collection is happily critical and some interpretive fashions among sociologists take a drubbing. For example:

Some of the alleged responses to anomie such as "retreatism" and "double failure" do not fit the facts of drug addiction. Snyder, however, finds these ideas useful in understanding drunkenness. Their relevance to mental disorder remains moot.

The notion of anomie appears of questionable value as an explanation of urban, gang delinquency.

Lemert, and Lindesmith and Gagnon, demonstrate the difficulties inherent in the vogue of "deviance" as an idea substituting for the tired "pathology" and "problems" approaches to "bad" behavior. These writers show that "deviance" is being used without being defined and that it may prove disappointing as an explanatory framework.

The volume ends with a valuable inventory of research on the correlates of anomie, anomia, and alienation prepared by S. Cole and H. Zuckerman. Inspection of this inventory tells us about the deficiencies of anomie as an organizing idea. No clear index of anomie as an "objective fact" or condition of the social order is developed (cf. Merton's definition, pp. 226-27). In place of such an index, much of this summarized research uses social status or attitudinal measures, such as Srole's anomia scale or an aspiration or alienation score, that may or may not reflect response to anomie.

One is left with the uncomfortable feeling that many of the correlations are spurious, and that Occam's razor would cut away the verbal scab of anomie and reveal sociologists talking only about some of the consequences of being poor and desperate where the investigators had thought they were studying a distinctive quality of a social system.

GWYN NETTLER

University of Alberta, Edmonton


This little book is an outgrowth of a conference among the principal participants in 49 separate research and demonstration projects in psychiatric rehabilitation (Research Conference on Rehabilitation and the Management of Mental Disorders, N.Y.C. 1959). One could have some fun, at no one's expense, by attempting different or additional subtitles to the book; for example: "How Not To Do Research," or "What Went Wrong?" This game would offend no one, since the conferees were so very candid about the difficulties they encountered and, therefore, quite disarming. They and the authors of the volume are to be commended for exceedingly honest reporting. After reading this book, one may well wonder how many published studies are thoroughly "cleaned-up" renderings of what really happened. Since all the projects discussed were well under way or completed in the late 1950’s, we can only hope we have come a long way since then in the development of research technology. The volume nicely highlights the problems of those who tried to effect changes in rehabilitation practices through research and demonstration.

Kandel and Williams neatly classify the projects, giving characteristics and aims: those clearly rehabilitation programs (prehospital, inpatient, and posthospital), those involving studies of basic processes, and those with both service and basic research aims. They then go on to discuss various types of operational (research and program) problems resulting from resistances offered by persons whose cooperation was necessary to the projects and by the properties of social systems which resist change. The book goes on to tell—in large part in the conferees own terms—of attempts to solve these operational problems. Finally, there is a discussion of general and specific methodological issues and problems.

By design, the authors offer no text in methodology, no rules for work in rehabilitation projects; nor do they appraise the projects they report upon. They do attempt, however, "... to apply some useful sociological concepts to an analysis of the ways in which these problems manifest themselves and of the causes behind them." The Pearsonian scheme applied seems to offer—to this interactionist reviewer—simply a convenient way of presenting the data. Though sketchy, the data are better than the analytic scheme and escape its embrace. In any case, a reader, of whatever theoretical and methodological persuasion, can find materials here for amusement, concern, wonder, or deep thought on the combination of good intentions and methodological naiveté manifested in the conduct of most of the projects reported.

Kandel and Williams maintain enough objective distance from the conferees to allow for separate appraisals of each. As for the projects themselves, it takes some stretch of the imagination to regard many which went by the name "research" to be research. Many had no clear objectives or design; and many that did, experienced such drastic operational changes that before and after studies on the operations themselves would be more instructive than similar studies on the institutional changes effected. Most of the projects seemed to make up in ideological zeal what they lacked in research and even demonstration technique. Little wonder that so many professional persons and laymen resisted these efforts designed supposedly "for their own
good.” The modes of resistance described would fill the hearts of political revolutionists and resistance fighters with delight.

Yet, much credit must go to the conferees for having so quickly come to realize some of their errors in field-work management; for example: failure to take a good, advanced look at the system they intended to change, failure to specify goals, to properly enlist the help of others, and to concern themselves with timing the introduction of changes. Many of the solutions to problems posed by these oversights are quite good. Credit must be given, too, to the authors for so fine an organized selection of statements and vignettes on problems and solutions. The book may not, in fact, be a text in methods of research but it certainly bears examination by researchers, by students, and certainly by all would-be researchers for a listing and brief discussion of common and painful events which frequently accompany institutional and community projects. This is a modest book which gives what it promises.

LEONARD SCHATZMAN

University of California Medical Center, San Francisco


Psychiatric Ideologies and Institutions is further evidence, along with the work of Dunham, Blau, Hughes, and Becker, of vitality in the tradition of intensive, methodologically-concerned case study.

This book explores the relationships of ideologies and social organization in the operation of two different kinds of metropolitan mental institutions—a large state hospital (Chicago State Hospital), and a much smaller psychiatric division of a private hospital (the Michael Reese wing of the Chicago Institute for Psychosomatic Research and Training). The authors include both professional and nonprofessional ideologies in their analysis.

To establish a base for postulated psychiatric ideologies, three modes of ideology are inferred from the literature, with a meaning obvious from their prefixes: somatotherapeutic; psychotherapeutic; and sociotherapeutic. Diagnostic questions were set up to discriminate these modes in an attitude questionnaire, and the questionnaire was then mailed to a sample of 485 psychiatric “professionals” (M.D. psychiatric practitioners, social workers in psychiatric settings, clinical psychologists, psychiatric nurses, and occupational therapists). The responses do scale into distinguishable modes, although the total return rate—58 percent—is too low, and the distinction between psychotherapeutic and sociotherapeutic responses is not entirely satisfactory. Fortunately these ideological modes can be inferred with some confidence in their validity not only from the previous literature on psychiatric institutions, but also from the authors’ descriptions of operations in the two hospitals selected.

In the book, the concept of ideology is employed by the authors as a summative term to describe modes of the organization they found as they observed and interviewed patients and personnel in the state and private hospitals. The inclusiveness and penetration of their analysis will certainly make this book a classic in the field of institutional medicine, and probably in the more general field of modern professional relationships. In institutional medicine it will join such other works as Greenblatt, York and Brown, From Custodial to Therapeutic Care in Mental Hospitals (which I was disturbed not to see cited), and it is a significant extension of the studies of Blau, Scott, Goode, and Merton in the service professions.

The study describes in rich detail the necessary “mapping” or structure (both internal and external) of the mental institutions for both patients and personnel that follows from, or is expressed by, the treatment ideologies. The systematic description of this mapping shows both limitations and potentials in private and state hospitals which have hitherto not been explored either by medical or sociological research. As one small example of new dimensions in the book, the harmony between the “somatic” oriented psychiatrist and the “sociologically” oriented ward and service staff is shown to make unexpected sense when the consequences for patients of these two apparently opposed philosophies are made clear. The indifference of the “somatic” psychiatrist to social or psychological therapies may render him much more permissive to manipulation of the sociological environment of the patient by aides, attendants, psychologists, or social workers; more permissive than the “psychologically” oriented psychiatrist, who superficially might appear the closer ally of sociological manipulation.

This work justifies a very long review. In short space, perhaps the best thing I can say is that it should be read by everyone concerned with mental treatment or research. The authors’ contribution does not lie in the design or basic idea of the study—this has been anticipated by other students of mental hospitals. It lies rather in the completeness of their description of hospital organization processes, which is matched to my knowledge nowhere in the literature. Every page will suggest further research or operational testing.

A final word to the professional sociologist: Part of the excellence of this analysis derives from the attention given by the authors to acceptance, field placement, and execution of the project. Undoubtedly this contributed to the great depth and range of the data secured, and this should be pondered by all of us concerned with field research. The perceptive reader will see, however, that a price has to be paid for complete acceptance of sociological research projects. Certain conclusions, which are implicit in this book, on the lethal effect of American private medical office practice on sustained careers for psychiatrists in public service