Bernard J. Gallagher III *The Sociology of Mental Illness.* Engle-
wood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1980, 357 pp.

For those interested in psychiatric sociology and the soci-
ology of mental illness, Bernard J. Gallagher's *The Sociology of
Mental Illness* will be a welcome arrival. As teachers and students
of this subject are by now well aware, one of the major dif-
ficulties confronted when attempting to understand mental
illness is that it is approached from quite different theoretical
perspectives. No doubt this reflects the complexity of the phe-
nomenon. Nonetheless, the problem of comprehending theories
and research from different academic approaches remains en-
demic to this area. Too often one gets only one part of per-
spective on the subject. Recognizing this problem, Gallagher
set out "to review the sociological research on mental illness and
to briefly summarize the position of other schools of thought as
well" (pp. ix-x). His contribution rests largely on the fact that he
has achieved his goal and presented theories and research from
different fields and done so in a readable and well-organized
manner. Key concepts and terminology are clearly presented
and explained, facilitating a common universe of discourse that
has previously been lacking. Indeed, Gallagher's eclectic approach
makes this book useful as both an introductory text and as a
reference source for major research and literature within the area.
The section on "The Social Epidemiology of Mental Illness" is
an especially welcome synthesis of sociological aspects of mental
illness.

Despite the generally high quality of this book, there are
some weaknesses that must be pointed out. First of all, for a
book entitled *The Sociology of Mental Illness* one would expect
a more detailed presentation of the societal reaction or labeling
approach, since this is one of the major sociological contributions
to understanding mental illness. As it stands, Gallagher's presen-
tation fails to explain *how* labels contribute to mental illness by
affecting others' conceptions, which then hinder normal inter-
action and facilitate the development of mental illness. In short,
the social psychological dynamics of labeling have not been
delineated fully. Second, the critical sociological insights of

"existential psychiatrists" such as R.D. Laing and David Cooper, who locate the etiology of mental illness in the alienating structure of modern interpersonal relations have, for the most part, been ignored. Third, the historical dimension of mental illness is underdeveloped; six pages on the history of the treatment of the insane simply fail to do justice to this important facet of the subject. In particular, Gallagher ignores "medicalization," the socio-political process through which classes of deviant behavior come to be defined as medical in nature and part of the domain of medical or quasi-medical professions. The social context and political consequences of the medicalization of deviant behavior have attracted the attention of a small but growing group of scholars of late, and their work has contributed much to our understanding of the psychiatric paradigm as a means of social control. By ignoring this research and by equating the "medical model" with a strictly biogenic view of mental disorder (p. 13), Gallagher fails to deal with issues that are of central sociological importance. A final problem concerns the citations format. Citations are in the form of page-bottom footnotes, and there is only a selected bibliography rather than a complete list of citations at the end. Together with the lack of a name index, this makes it very difficult to refer to Gallagher's treatment of particular authors or works.

We hasten to emphasize, however, that the above-mentioned flaws are hardly fatal to the book. It remains an excellent introductory text that presents an eclectic body of material concerning mental illness. It is definitely a worthwhile contribution to the area and we recommend it highly.

University of Kansas

John B. Harms and
Herbert H. Haines

Bennett, H. Stith, On Becoming a Rock Musician, Amherst, Ma.: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1980.*

The area of rock music as a sociological phenomenon, while quite contemporary and important, remains understudied by social scientists. One must question this lack of research in an area that is allegedly related to youth, drugs, and even social revolution. Bennett's work is a welcome addition to this body of knowledge. His theoretical perspective allows us to view the world of the rock musician from an ethnomethodological (or ethnomusicological) standpoint. Similar to the classic work of Becker with jazz musicians, Bennett "takes on the role" of a rock musician. By doing so, he is able to arrive at how an individual takes on the label of rock musician.

Though the primary goal of Mr. Bennett is to describe a sociological process, how one goes about becoming a rock musician, a secondary but quite enlightening view emerges: an objective "up-to-date" way of looking at the "business of sound." Each step of the process is thoroughly explored and by the end of the book one feels quite knowledgeable of the subject through this vicarious experience. During each step of the training of a rock musician an analogy to classical music training is apparent. An instrument is procurred and one declares the desire to be a musician. Next, one learns to imitate the music of others, i.e., practice scales and etudes (classical music) or memorize sets (rock music). Unlike the classical musician, however, the rock musician, needs membership in a group. The classical musician develops individually and independently of a group (until later on in his or her career). As the musician progresses, the accumulation of sound equipment becomes quite important,

---

*A somewhat unique approach was taken in order to review this book. The preface to Bennett's book states that the book is of equal interest to both the social scientist and the musician. With this in mind, it was decided that both a social scientist and also a professional musician review it. The social scientist has a strong interest in ethnomethodological research. The musician is a formally trained, professional musician.