

of the study and that the women, when revisited, said they experienced the interviews as cathartic, that they and their children looked forward to the weekly interviews, and that they felt a sense of loss when the project ended. Each woman was interviewed by a member of her own race, and was paid \$150 for her and her child's or children's participation. The richness of the data reflects sensitive and thorough fieldwork.

Reading this book is a good antidote to the still-fashionable "it's-what's-inside-that-counts" intrapsychic ideology. Such an approach easily leads to blaming the victim. These women did not, as the fashionable phrase goes, "give their power away"; they had no power to give. Their experiences were characterized by an "unusually high level of stress-provoking situations, many of which are unreasonable or out of their immediate control, by limited options for coping effectively, and by difficulty in achieving the desired outcomes of coping efforts" (p. 194). The authors state that any one of these factors could erode the woman's belief in a consistent world, a belief that would allow her to act effectively upon it. A belief in one's ability to make some difference in what happens is essential to a feeling of well-being (at least in Western industrial society). I have always found that the locus-of-control studies that assume that it is realistic for everyone to have an internal locus of control have no relationship to the real world. Some people who believe one *can* control (and therefore *should* control) one's life, simply show ignorance of how society works. If indeed it were the case, sociological variables would not be as powerful as they are. It is no wonder that so many of the women were depressed, and that this significantly affected their interaction with their children. One woman said, "I begin to question my own worth. I begin to question my role here on earth" (p. 196).

The women suffered from both personal and institutional discrimination. They most fre-

quently reported that the discriminators were white men. Being on welfare stigmatized them, and the regulatory process dehumanized them. Fifty-four percent of the women volunteered the information that they were not told about benefits to which they were entitled, such as extra money for a pregnancy diet. It was difficult for them to get and to keep jobs. "The frustrated desire to work is a particularly strong associate of high depression, since whether a woman is employed or not is a strong predictor of depression" (p. 92). Yet even the women who were not employed had almost no free time for themselves, and relative availability of free time is associated with fewer depressive symptoms.

The presence in the sample of women who had been reared in middle-class homes and are now paupers adds to the literature demonstrating that it is almost impossible to support children on the salaries most women make in our occupationally segregated society. Attorney Flo Kennedy stated that every woman is just one man away from welfare; that alternative is equally unsatisfactory. Yet the presence of a father with low involvement in child rearing and household tasks was no improvement over having no father when the children were studied. The most stressed mothers were those who were single and those with larger families.

All of you who have students who believe in the American mythology that people can achieve whatever they want if they *really* want it and try hard should assign this book. It should also be included in methods courses to show that it is possible to research people in a way that helps rather than objectifies the subjects. Certainly all social work students and other members or future members of the "helping professions," including medical students, should read it. I would love to force the entire Reagan cabinet to read it and think of how much good the funds they want for one missile could do for these forty-three families.

Administrative versus Critical Perspectives in Communication Studies

Communication Yearbook 5, edited by MICHAEL BURGOON. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1982. 885 pp. \$44.95 cloth.

SUE CURRY JANSEN
Empire State College

This is the decade of communication: of International Information Order, and ET; of silicon chips, Chomsky, Habermas, the New grammarology, backyard satellites, mega-

bytes, Pacman, Foucault, and electronic terrorism. Yet, the sanctuaries whence this edition of the *Communication Yearbook (CY5)* has come appear virtually untouched by the current revolution in global power-knowledge.

The year might be 1952. Certainly the essential bone of contention was already much chewed over then: the relative merits of what Paul Lazarsfeld called "Administrative" and "Critical" traditions in communication research. The geopolitics of the editorial decisions are also vintage '52. *CY5* is billed as an international roundup of representative research in communications, but the Mississippi River is the Archimedean point of this global survey. Of the seventy-seven authors and coauthors represented, only one is affiliated with an institution outside the United States. Three decades ago, such provincialism might have been dismissed as simply naive, but at a time when the most volatile issue in international communications (and in international communication associations) is American cultural domination of international media, naivete can no longer be assumed or excused.

CY5's pluralist claims are also suspect. They extend only to those who have embraced "the behavioral science perspective." This epistemological fiat disqualifies all researches undertaken within the Critical mode of inquiry. Such paradigmatic policing is often quite legitimate, but in a volume where the most visible theoretical controversy is the Administrative-Critical polarity, ground rules that deny the opposition a voice replace debate with ritualized debate.

Some individual authors are scrupulously fair in their assessments of Critical theory (cf. Everett Rogers's "The Empirical and Critical Schools of Communication Research" and Willard Rowland's "The Symbolic Uses of Effects"). However the net effect of *CY5's* in absentia portrayal of the Critical perspective is to abort the synthetic quest Rogers espouses and to polarize further the two traditions by encouraging internecine battles and metatheoretical obfuscations. The result is a volume lavishly packed with dazzling statistical displays but relatively barren of substance.

Three types of articles are included: (1) disciplinary reviews and commentaries that address topics of general interest to communication scholars; (2) overviews that describe developments in designated specialties; (3) research addressed to specialists in eight areas: information systems, interpersonal communication, mass communication, organizational communication, intercultural communication,

political communication, instructional communication, and health communication. In my judgment, only seven of the forty entries merit serious study. In addition to Rogers's and Rowland's essays cited above, these include Bowers and Bradac, "Issues in Communication Theory"; Parks, "Ideology in Interpersonal Communication"; McPhee and Poole, "Mathematical Modeling in Communication Research"; Wolf, Abelman, and Hexamer, "Children's Understanding of Television"; and Wendt, "Uncle Sam and the Bad News Bears."

Bowers and Bradac attempt to summarize and synthesize communication theory. They construct a conceptual scaffolding that is remarkably parsimonious, clear, and comprehensive. Their definitional exercises are exemplars for formalists in any field. However, their designation of the two competing paradigms as the "motion" and "action" models and their explications of each bring more fog than light to terrain that has already been extensively mapped by others.

Parks presents a tightly argued, carefully documented, and effectively written critique of "the ideology of intimacy." He advocates rejection of psychotherapeutic canards regarding self-disclosure and mental health. He contends the ideology of intimacy upholds untenable hypotheses, such as: self-disclosure enhances interpersonal attraction, self-disclosure confers therapeutic benefits, in the good old days relationships were more meaningful and communities were closer. Contra the ideology of intimacy, Parks points out that communication research demonstrates that interaction is a dialectical process of revealing and withholding. He therefore urges communication scholars "to get off the couch" (p. 70) because psychotherapy has little to offer them.

McPhee and Poole construct a lucid and balanced apology for mathematical modeling. They outline the advantages of modeling, the distinctive features of models of social phenomena, and the steps in modeling. McPhee and Poole maintain that, when properly used, mathematical models can bring increased rigor, clarity, and inferential power to social theorizing, but they also acknowledge the dangers of modeling ("Modelers' Sins"), which include the "Law of the Hammer," whereby modelers become so enamored of the putative superiority of mathematical techniques that they attempt to force-fit phenomena into mathematical molds; the "Sin of Nonrejectability," which is commonly committed by modelers who rely on descriptive models; and

the "Sin of Superfluity," where the use of mathematics is largely ceremonial, a matter of creating an impressive effect by adding a false aura of rigor. McPhee and Poole maintain that modeling need not distort theory, but they recognize that modeling is not always appropriate. They conclude with a warning: Because sophistication in modeling instruments is developing faster than theory in social science, there is a danger that modelers' fascination with their tools may accentuate existing tendencies toward methodolatry.

Wolf, Abelman, and Hexamer's methodological critique of conventional techniques for probing effects of television on children's cognitive and behavioral patterns is simple but imaginative. They propose an approach that allows children to construct accounts of reality by processing information based on their own observations and inferences. The result is an easy-to-use question-asking procedure that effectively synthesizes ethnomethodological insights and learning theory.

Wendt uses the concept of ethical relativism to analyze U.S.-Soviet differences in understanding human rights. He contends that the legalistic arguments for human rights conventionally invoked by the United States are not only based on weak legal precedents and

loose logic but also serve as a foil for cultural imperialism. However, he contends that a strong case for a basic human right, freedom from torture, can be secured by three types of arguments: commonsense, indigenous, and conformist. Wendt finds the conformist argument especially compelling: "If we hold to the cross-cultural ideal of respect for difference, we must profess it uniformly; if we insist that the ethics of culture-weaving are valid for international but not domestic fabrics, then we no longer have a tenable position" (p. 586).

These essays are the high points of an otherwise disappointing collection. More typical are contributions that address such topics as simulations of binary diffusion theory, relational coding of conversation analysis, models of decisionmaking, fractionation scales for ICA audits, scales of communication competence, and formalization of congruity theory. In sum, most entries in *CYS* are narrowly conceived. Their theoretical groundings lie in revisionist (but not transcendent) versions of the functionalist "effects" approach pioneered by Lazarsfeld. Methodologically, they defer to the "Law of the Hammer." The result is a volume that does a disservice both to Lazarsfeld's memory and to ICA members.

Development Planning in the Third World: Are We Meeting the Challenge?

An Introduction to Social Planning in the Third World, by DIANA CONYERS. New York: Wiley, 1982. 224 pp. \$35.95 cloth.

The Social Dimensions of Development: Social Policy and Planning in the Third World, by MARGARET HARDIMAN and JAMES MIDGLEY. New York: Wiley, 1982. 317 pp. \$41.95 cloth.

Thinking about Development, by LISA PEATTIE. New York: Plenum Press, 1981. 198 pp. \$19.95 cloth.

M. A. ALLAN
SUNY/Old Westbury

Following World War II, nations emerging from colonial status looked to planning as a means to accelerate the development process necessary for improving the level of living of their people. In the three or more decades that have passed, Third World leaders have become disheartened in their quest to achieve equitable socioeconomic development, and perceive themselves to be caught on the horns of a dilemma: Development is imperative to the solution of their problems, but development generates further problems.

The problems of poverty, inequality, and unemployment in the Third World still seem gargantuan in spite of massive infusions of

Western capital and technology, and it seems appropriate, therefore, to step back and assess the relationship between the social sciences and development planning. Toward this end, the works by Conyers, Hardiman and Midgley, and Peattie are timely.

Development in Third World societies has not figured prominently in the idiom of communication in the social sciences. Available knowledge about development is criticized as being fragmented, anemic, and lacking in heuristic synthesis and breadth of systematic empirical data from diverse national contexts (Portes, 1976; Chirot, 1977; Dore, 1977; Allan, 1979, 1981). The three books reviewed here