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ample, whereas it seems a paradox that a therapist could cure a patient's pathological behavior by recommending that behavior, it is not a paradox to the therapist, who knows that recommending a behavior changes the way that the patient thinks about it. Likewise, whereas it seems a paradox that just-in-time manufacturing processes could simultaneously satisfy goals of quality and cost-efficiency, it is not a paradox to factory managers who work with these processes and understand them intuitively. Paradox is always a matter of perspective taking.

To their credit, not all of the authors of this volume accept the elusiveness of paradox with equanimity. By raging against it, they provide opportunities for insight. For instance, many objectively paradox by making it a property of things such as organizations, therapies, or manufacturing processes. Although this makes the concept more discussable and, seemingly, something about which one can study and theorize, one quickly sees that it is a misrepresentation. Paradox is a property of thought, not of things thought about—it is a state of mind, not of everyday reality. Thus, organizations are not paradoxical, although we may think about them in paradoxical ways.

Eventually, one sees in the authors' grappling with paradox the philanderer's dilemma of believing in the idea of one but being committed to more than one. The dilemma offers no easy or moral escape. One could abandon the idea of a single truth and adopt instead a permissonal pluralism that denies paradox and permits multiple, even contradictory, truths. However, this amounts to an anarchical relativism that makes a mockery of commitment and leaves nothing to worry or fight about.

Contribution of the book
The authors do not agree about what we should do about the demon paradoxes that curze organization theory and practice. Most suggest that we fight them, arguing that this will force us upon our wits and make us more thoughtful and creative. Others suggest that we sit back and enjoy paradoxes, arguing that this will at least keep us modest, if not amused. The editors advocate taking a "paradoxical perspective" toward organization theory that would make contradictory notions explicit and would consider their simultaneous presence and dynamic balance.

Except for the commentary by Starbuck, not enough attention is given to the dangers of taking paradox seriously. Paradoxes are hellish regions of nonsense that can entrap the unwary. Moreover, attempts to resolve them may be counterproductive because they commit one to old ways of seeing. Paradoxes scream out for rationalization, not for new ways of seeing. We gain understanding not by resolving paradoxes, but by giving them up. A fuller discussion of the dangers of paradox would have made for an interesting chapter in its own right.

One finishes this book realizing that its main contribution to the literature on organization change has more to do with attitude than with substance. It asks us to be alive to ideas and never to let matters rest. It asks us to be wise enough to ask of every proposition whether its antithesis is true. And it asks us to be humble enough to accept ideas that contradict our own. Paradoxically, the book asks us to repent the sin of paradox by repeating it with a vengeance—to pursue wisdom through foolishness and humility through arrogance.

Consensus and Controversy About IQ

Mark Snyderman and Stanley Rothman
The IQ Controversy, The Media and Public Policy
$24.95

Mark Snyderman is a law clerk in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit (Pasadena, California). Stanley Rothman, professor of government at Smith College (Northampton, Massachusetts), is coauthor, with R. L. Lichter and L. S. Lichter, of The Media Elite. Eric Turkheimer, assistant professor of psychology at the University of Virginia (Charlottesville), is coeditor, with E. D. Bigler and R. A. Yeo, of Neuropsychological Function and Brain Imaging.

Since the turn of the century, controversy about the heritability of intelligence and the use of standardized tests to make decisions about human lives has fueled the development of correlational analysis, regression analysis, factor analysis, path analysis, biometric analysis, and multiple abstract variance analysis. The IQ Controversy, The Media and Public Policy describes, among other things, a survey. This survey is based on a sample of 1,020 experts drawn from relevant fields in psychology, education, and sociology, of whom 661 (65%) responded to a mailed questionnaire. Questions addressed the respondents' qualifications, demographic characteristics, and general political opinions and four broad areas of controversy in intelligence testing: the nature of intelligence, the heritability of IQ, race and class differences in IQ, and the impact of intelligence testing.

The authors describe the results of the survey in the context of an account of the history of mental testing in America, one of the most familiar stories in the behavioral sciences. The provocative format makes the retelling interesting. Each section begins with a question from the survey, such as, "In your opinion, to what degree is the average American's socioeconomic status (SES) determined by his or her IQ?" The experts' responses are then compared with and contrasted to a history of opinion on the question and to a reasonably objective exposition of the relevant facts.

As the results unfold, two parallel themes are developed. First, there is a broad (although certainly not complete) consensus among experts about the nature, heritability, and appropriate use of intelligence. Second, this consensus is at odds with the view of mental tests that is presented in newspapers and magazines and on television and, therefore, with the widely held opinions of the informed lay public.

No one who has ever heard the oft-cited intelligence-tests-are-all-meaningless lecture from a well-read but misinformed cousin in the insurance business will be surprised by these results. It is nonetheless startling to see the discrepancy between the views of experts and those of the public documented in such detail. A majority of experts believe that there is a consensus about the abilities comprised by IQ is a significant and SES difference heritable. The ability in the An is almost 0.6. I believe that, although
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comprising the term intelligent, that IQ is a significant determinant of SES, and that SES differences are at least partially heritable. The measure estimate of heritab-

ility in the American White population is almost 0.6. A substantial majority believe that, although intelligence tests can be and are misused, they are valid tools for educational placement and college admission.

Coverage of the intelligence-testing controversy by the American media is discussed as part of the historical account and in a content analysis of media coverage at the end of the book. Although the content analysis is problematic, the fundamental conclusion is incontrovertible: The field of intelligence testing is often presented as a hotly contested dispute between environmentalists, personified by Leon Kamin, and hereditarians, represented by the late William Shockley. Such a presentation misses the boat for two reasons, as documented by the survey: (a) There are significant areas of agreement among experts in testing, and (b) this agreement, where it exists, is more in the direction of valid tests and genetic influence than the popular media would lead one to believe.

The analysis of media coverage is in two parts. The first part is a formal content analysis involving content and objectivity ratings of all coverage of intelligence and testing in three major newspapers, three newsmagazines, and the three major television networks. The second is a more discursive, excoriating attack on the content of media coverage.

The results of the content analysis itself are not terribly incriminating of press coverage. About 20% of all newspaper articles are rated as biased, and a majority of the biased articles are anti-testing. The articles surveyed include editorials, letters to the editor, and book reviews, for which there is not the same expectation of objectivity. Only 10% of regular newspaper stories were rated as biased; although almost all of these are anti-testing, biased editorials were two-thirds protesting. Apparently dissatisfied with these results, the authors conclude as follows:

As many of those who have studied the news media have noted, media bias is more often reflected in the selection of stories than in a biased accounting within any given story. . . . The determination of such bias and inaccuracy in media accounts of testing requires a more detailed analysis of the specific content of news stories and, particularly, the media's use of expert opinion. (p. 201)

The authors then proceed to roll out the heavy artillery. In the next chapter, citing quotations and ratings of the specific content of stories, they document extensive inaccuracies, misinterpretations, and elisions in the press coverage of testing issues. Nevertheless, their outrage does not always seem justified by the figures that they report. Most newspaper reports allowed for substantial genetic influences on IQ, and almost half for some genetic influence on racial differences; a large majority report favorably on the validity of the SAT. The authors deride the generally negative coverage of the work of Arthur Jensen, Richard Herrnstein, and William Shockley. Jensen, in particular, has certainly been treated unfairly; it does little good, however, to express outrage that newspaper reports interpret what the authors euphemistically describe as "differences in intellectual skill" (p. 222) as allegations of Black inferiority, which is exactly what they are and exactly why they are controversial.

However compelling the documentation of the discrepancy between scientific opinion and media coverage, the most difficult question remains "Why?" In a final chapter titled "The New Sociology of Science," the authors propose a disturbing explanation. The American media, they suggest, have, in the past 30 years, come increasingly under the control of politically liberal journalists who systematically distort news coverage to advance their political beliefs: "Most important, however, journalists quite naturally tend to report those scientific findings that accord with their own judgments and, in so doing, they influence public perception of the truth of various scientific propositions" (p. 257). Even worse, according to the authors, many scientists are guilty of the same distortions or, at least, a cowardly underemphasis of controversial results.

No evidence for these explanations, outside of documentation of the bias itself, is presented in the book, although it is implied throughout. The authors do attempt to document their assertion that the opinion of scientific experts is colored by their political beliefs; thankfully, they can't make it stick. This analysis, buried at the end of an unrelated chapter, is based on correlations among composite variables measuring political persuasion and attitudes toward four aspects of intelligence testing. None of the correlations was greater than 0.4, and multiple regression analyses were uninformative. Somewhat grudgingly, the authors concede that the experts seem to be keeping their science separate from their politics.

Why, then, the scientific, as well as journalistic, reluctance to follow the science of intelligence testing to its harshest conclusions? The experts' responses to the survey reveal certain exceptions to the generally favorable climate of opinion about testing. Almost 90% of the respondents thought that creativity is inadequately measured by intelligence tests; 70% felt measurement of achievement motivation is lacking; and 75% indicated that adaptation to the environment is underrepresented. Although experts believe that intelligence can be measured, at least as it is narrowly defined, and that measured intelligence is a good, indeed the best available, predictor of performance in school and on the job, the fact remains that intelligence is an inadequate description of human characteristics or even of human abilities. Such a statement is not an indictment of the concept of intelligence, but rather of our collective failure to discover methods of measuring other human abilities. It is remarkable that creativity cannot be measured with any validity after IQ is controlled. If it could be, highly creative job applicants with slightly lower IQs might be selected by tests and welcomed by employers, and job selection by testing would be a much less bitter pill.

The authors describe the media's view of testing as "more consistent with the opinion of a disappointed test taker than that of those who know most about tests" (p. 247). Put yourself in the position of someone who has just been denied a job because of a low test score: Given that you believe your intellectual and non-intellectual abilities qualify you for the job and that the test is correlated 0.5 with job performance, is it rational for you to throw in your lot with the 25% of the variance predicted accurately by the test, or with the 75% that is not? In fact, the political controversy about testing is between two rational positions at odds with each other, not between rational testers and "disappointed" test takers. Given the empirical fact of Black-White phenotypic IQ differences, the most efficient course for employers would be to consider race as well as IQ in making employment decisions. Such a practice is not permitted because, in a complex world, efficiency is not the only justification for behavior.

Bias in journalism and inaccuracy in science are always deplorable, and this book deserves praise for exposing the bias and inaccuracy surrounding the intelligence controversy. Scientific caution is another matter. The theory of intelli-
Saying Goodbye to Simple Models of Social Support

Alan Vaux
Social Support: Theory, Research, and Intervention
ISBN 0-275-92611-X. $47.95

Alan Vaux is associate professor of psychology at Southern Illinois University (Carbondale). Karen Rook, associate professor of social ecology at the University of California, Irvine, is coauthor, with P. Pietromonaco, of the chapter “Close Relationships: Ties That Heal or Ties That Bind?” in W. H. Jones and D. Perlman (Eds.) Advances in Personal Relationships, Vol. 1.

The topic of social support has soared in popularity over the past two decades, stimulating a flood of studies. As a result, keeping up with the empirical literature on social support presents a formidable challenge. Undaunted, the author of the current book has compiled a comprehensive review and analysis of work on social support. This volume differs from most previous books on social support, which have been either edited volumes (e.g., Cohen & Syme, 1985; Gottlieb, 1981; Sarason & Sarason, 1985) or volumes with a narrower focus, such as support interventions (e.g., Gottlieb, 1983). It includes chapters that address the historical origins of interest in social support, problems in defining and measuring support, theoretical models linking support to stress and well-being, empirical evidence regarding the effects of support, research on subgroup variations in support, and issues involved in designing and implementing support interventions.

Despite such a range of topics, the book does not sacrifice depth for breadth. The author has succeeded in producing a book that makes a solid contribution to the literature. Vaux’s careful dissection of current controversies and his fresh theoretical insights will appeal to specialists in the field. His thorough coverage of major conceptual issues and empirical findings will satisfy those who wish to become better acquainted with work in this area. Vaux is a thoughtful, articulate, and engaging writer who clearly has a firm grasp of a voluminous and unwieldy literature. The chapters are well organized and include numerous summary sections, tables, and figures to aid the reader’s comprehension. Vaux’s analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the literature is evenhanded, exaggerating neither the achievements nor the shortcomings of social support research.

Theoretical and measurement issues
Vaux takes the position, introduced early in the book, that social support should be viewed not as a single construct but, rather, as a higher order metaconstruct that subsumes several distinguishable theoretical constructs. He attributes the lack of definitional consensus and the inconsistency of empirical findings in support research to failure to differentiate conceptually distinct components of the support metaconstruct. Vaux urges us to view social support in terms of three primary components: support network resources, specific supportive behavior, and subjective appraisals of support. Others have advocated similar distinctions among resources, behaviors, and appraisals, but Vaux goes beyond merely urging such distinctions to examine the interrelationships of these components.

Life-course variations in social support
Another asset of the book is a detailed review of research on the links between social support and social status. Vaux first examines whether social support varies as a function of gender, marital status, ethnicity, or socioeconomic status. He then considers whether variations in social support account for variations in rates of psychological disorder among subgroups of the population. For example, do differences in support help to explain well-documented differences in psychological disorder between married and unmarried individuals or between men and women? He concludes from the available evidence that social support mediates the effects of marital status but not gender; whether social support mediates the effects of ethnicity and socioeconomic status remains unclear.
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