

Isis

Subscribe or Renew

Published by: The University of Chicago Press on behalf of The History of Science Society

Article DOI: 10.1086/664979

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/664979>

Focus: Textbooks in the Sciences

Introduction: The Secret Lives of Textbooks

Marga Vicedo*

* Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology, University of Toronto, 91 Charles Street West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1K7; marga.vicedo@utoronto.ca.

ABSTRACT

Textbooks have a low status in the history of science because they have been seen as mere repositories for scientific knowledge. But historians have recently shown how they play a number of roles that can illuminate different aspects of the history of science, from priority disputes to pedagogical practices. The essays in this Focus section aim to expand our vision of textbooks further by showing how they perform various hybrid functions in scientific development.

LOCATING TEXTBOOKS ON THE EPISTEMOLOGICAL LANDSCAPE

WHY DO TEXTBOOKS HAVE LOW STATUS in the history of science? To answer that question, I sketch the “received view” of scientific development, which combines a linear model of scientific production with a trickle-down model of scientific consumption (see [Figure 1](#)). Probably no one has ever accepted the received view in this simplistic form, but this sketch is useful for understanding the low status of textbooks in the history of science. In this framework, textbooks are passive receptacles of the bounties of scientific creativity and research. They serve as showcases for accumulated knowledge but do not contribute to scientific development. Their main role is to initiate the student into the well-established views and practices of specific scientific communities. For example, in several writings, including an

essay revealingly entitled “The Function of Dogma in Scientific Research,” Thomas Kuhn presented textbooks in the natural sciences as repositories of exemplars from the reigning paradigm within a field. Their main role, he claimed, is to “indoctrinate” students into the wisdom of the elders.¹



[\(21KB\)](#)

Figure 1. The received view of scientific development.

[Open New Window](#)

Over the last twenty years or so, sociologists, historians, and philosophers of science have dismantled the received view of knowledge production.² Historians of science have also discredited the “trickle-down” model of scientific popularization.³ In addition, recent work in the history of the book, pedagogy in science, and scientific communication has stimulated interest in science textbooks.

In the last decade, a growing number of historians of science have analyzed various texts used as textbooks and the roles they have played over time.⁴ Here, I can only point to some of the interesting things we can do by studying textbooks:

Explore their role in pedagogical and training practices to understand how scientists acquire knowledge of their specialized fields, learn what counts as science, and decide which paths are worth investigating.⁵

Study how they help form new disciplines in science in order to illuminate efforts to remake the disciplinary map of science.⁶

Trace the development of ideas by following the changing presentation of a particular concept, hypothesis, or view over time in different textbooks.⁷

Reveal the epistemological concerns of a field and the weight given to different tools and methods for reaching knowledge.8

Explore how scientists use textbooks in priority disputes.9

Illuminate the social context of science by analyzing how secular and religious influences, state decisions about education, economic pressures, and other social forces affect the production and commercialization of textbooks.10

This list is not exhaustive, but it should suffice to convince us that textbooks are important in the scientific enterprise. The essays in this Focus section encourage us to broaden our studies of textbooks in the history of science.

FURTHER AREAS TO EXPLORE

Examining the translations of three different chemistry textbooks from the 1860s from the “provincial” Russian language into the “metropolitan” German language, Michael Gordin shows how they became essential tools in disputes about credit and international recognition. His analysis also exposes limitations in the standard assumptions about the relationship between the center and the periphery in scientific development and exchange. Adam Shapiro illuminates how educational institutions in the United States after World War II helped regulate the production of textbooks and thereby exerted a strong influence on young students' perceptions of science. My essay questions the view that textbooks report scientific results but do not shape the process of scientific development. Focusing on the presentation of Harry Harlow's work on maternal deprivation in rhesus monkeys in psychology textbooks from the late 1950s to 1975, I argue that many textbooks provided meta-analyses of those experiments and their implications for human infant development. David Kaiser presents two physics books of the 1970s that became hybrid objects and reached hybrid audiences. Though they were first subject to the negotiations of authors and publishers who decided what “categories” they belonged in, Kaiser's analysis demonstrates that the lives of textbooks can diverge from their producers' expectations.

Although these essays deal with diverse fields (chemistry, biology, psychology, and physics) in different periods and places, one salient theme runs through them: the ability of textbooks to break free from the

constraints normally imposed by their genre. We encounter textbooks that function much like scientific texts (Gordin, Vicedo) and others that move into the popular arena while at the same time popular books are brought into the classroom (Kaiser). Although we cannot forget that at many levels state supervision, academic trends, and market forces impose limits on the plasticity of the genre (Shapiro), the stories presented here reveal that authors' intentions and readers' responses sometimes transcend those limits. Thus, these essays emphasize the plasticity of textbooks and their ability to play hybrid roles.

If historians of science decide to go beyond common views of textbooks, we will find that their changing functions in diverse fields have much to teach us about scientific development. I will mention just two areas worth pursuing: the roles of textbooks in the history of epistemology and in the history of science popularization. The analysis of how textbooks present results and methods of research can help illuminate the historical trajectory of what Peter Galison has called the “toolkit of argumentation and demonstration” in the sciences. What role have textbooks played in supporting and legitimizing specific tools and procedures to justify knowledge claims at different points in history?¹¹ Textbooks can also help us analyze the complex ways in which we acquire our beliefs in and about the different sciences. Textbooks are read not only by students in a specific discipline, but also by teachers who choose among them for their classes, by reviewers, by competitors, and by a large number of students who will not pursue further studies in the specialized field. At the college level, thousands of undergraduate students use textbooks in different courses. While a textbook provides specific training for those who continue in the relevant area, the same text serves as a source of more general scientific ideas for those who move on to other areas. In that way, introductory textbooks influence scientists in a discipline—but also nonscientists and scientists in other fields. They influence different audiences in different ways, sometimes providing specialized knowledge in one field, and other times contributing to a more “popular” general understanding of other areas.

This Focus section also suggests that, as we expand our views about textbooks, we will find little uniformity among the different sciences. Indeed, the study of textbooks can increase our awareness of the diversity of the sciences in different times and places. That will be a very good thing.

This Focus section was organized by Marga Vicedo.

Thanks to Michael Gordin, Juan Ilerbaig, David Kaiser, Bernard Lightman, Adam Shapiro, and Mark Solovey for helpful discussion and suggestions.

¹ Thomas S. Kuhn, “The Function of Dogma in Scientific Research,” in *Scientific Change*, ed. A. C. Crombie (London: Heinemann, 1963), pp. 347–369; Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 3rd ed. (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 1996), pp. 136–138; and Kuhn, “The Essential Tension: Tradition and Innovation in Scientific Research” (1959), rpt. in Kuhn, *The Essential Tension: Selected Studies in Scientific Tradition and Change* (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 1977), pp. 225–239.

² It is impossible to cite here all the relevant literature, but it would include the following very influential history of science books: Steven Shapin and Simon Schaffer, *Leviathan and the Air-Pump: Hobbes, Boyle, and the Experimental Life* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1985); Martin J. S. Rudwick, *The Great Devonian Controversy: The Shaping of Scientific Knowledge among Gentlemanly Specialists* (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 1985); Peter Galison, *Image and Logic* (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 1997); and Mario Biagioli, *Galileo, Courtier* (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 1994).

³ See, e.g., James A. Secord, *Victorian Sensation: The Extraordinary Publication, Reception, and Secret Authorship of Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 2000); and Bernard Lightman, *Victorian Popularizers of Science: Designing Nature for New Audiences* (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 2007). See also Terry Shinn and Richard Whitley, eds., *Expository Science: Forms and Functions of Popularisation* (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1985); and Andreas W. Daum, “Varieties of Popular Science and the Transformations of Public Knowledge,” *Isis*, 2009, 100:319–332.

⁴ David Hamilton, “What Is a Textbook?” *Paradigm*, 1990, 3:5–8; Jill G. Morawski, “There Is More to Our History of Giving: The Place of Introductory Textbooks in American Psychology,” *American Psychologist*, 1992, 47:161–169; Anders Lundgren and Bernadette Bensaude-Vincent, eds., *Communicating Chemistry: Textbooks and Their Audiences, 1789–1939* (Canton, Mass.: Science History Publications, 2000); David Kaiser, ed., *Pedagogy and the Practice of Science: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2005); Kathryn Olesko, “Science Pedagogy as a Category of Historical Analysis: Past, Present, and Future,” *Science and Education*, 2006, 15:863–

880; and Josep Simon, *Communicating Physics: The Production, Circulation, and Appropriation of Ganot's Textbooks in France and England, 1851–1887* (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2011). For historiographical reflections and further references see Andrew Warwick and David Kaiser, “Kuhn, Foucault, and the Power of Pedagogy,” in *Pedagogy and the Practice of Science*, ed. Kaiser, pp. 393–409; John Hedley Brooke, “Introduction: The Study of Chemical Textbooks,” in *Communicating Chemistry*, ed. Lundgren and Bensaude-Vincent, pp. 1–18; Bensaude-Vincent, “Textbooks on the Map of Science Studies,” *Sci. Educ.*, 2006, 15:667–670; José Ramón Bertomeu-Sánchez, Antonio García-Belmar, Lundgren, and Manolis Patiniotis, “Introduction: Scientific and Technological Textbooks in the European Periphery,” *ibid.*, pp. 657–665; and Gregory A. Myers, “Textbooks and the Sociology of Scientific Knowledge,” *English for Specific Purposes*, 1992, 11:3–17.

⁵ David Kaiser, *Drawing Theories Apart: The Dispersion of Feynman Diagrams in Postwar Physics* (Chicago: Univ. Chicago Press, 2005); and Pedro Gutierrez Bueno, “Textbooks: Audiences, Teaching Practices, and Chemical Revolution,” *Sci. Educ.*, 2006, 15:693–712.

⁶ John Nisbet, “Early Textbooks in Educational Research: The Birth of a Discipline,” *European Educational Research Journal*, 2002, 1:37–44.

⁷ Diane B. Paul, “Textbook Treatment of the Genesis of Intelligence,” *Quarterly Review of Biology*, 1985, 60:317–326; Andrew S. Winston, Bethany Butzer, and Mark D. Ferris, “Constructing Difference: Heredity, Intelligence, and Race in Textbooks, 1930–1970,” in *Defining Difference: Race and Racism in the History of Psychology*, ed. Winston (Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 2004), pp. 199–230; F. B. Steuer and K. W. Ham, “Psychology Textbooks: Examining Their Accuracy,” *Teaching of Psychology*, 2008, 35:160–168; and Ronald P. Ladouceur, “Ella Thea Smith and the Lost History of American High School Biology Textbooks,” *Journal of the History of Biology*, 2008, 41:435–471.

⁸ Mary M. Smyth, “Certainty and Uncertainty Sciences: Marking the Boundaries of Psychology in Introductory Textbooks,” *Social Studies of Science*, 2001, 31:389–416; Smyth, “Fact Making in Psychology: The Voice of the Introductory Textbook,” *Theory and Psychology*, 2001, 11:609–636; and Andrew S. Winston and Daniel J. Blais, “What Counts as an Experiment? A Transdisciplinary Analysis

of Textbooks, 1930–1970,” *American Journal of Psychology*, 1996, 109:599–616.

⁹ Bernadette Bensaude-Vincent, “A View of the Chemical Revolution through Contemporary Textbooks,” *British Journal for the History of Science*, 1990, 23:435–460; and Michael D. Gordin, “The Textbook Case of a Priority Dispute: D. I. Mendeleev, Lothar Meyer, and the Periodic System,” in *Nature Engaged: Science in Practice from the Renaissance to the Present*, ed. Jessica Riskin and Mario Biagioli (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, forthcoming).

¹⁰ Philip J. Pauly, “The Development of High School Biology: New York City, 1900–1925,” *Isis*, 1991, 82:662–688; John Rudolph, “Turning Science to Account: Chicago and the General Science Movement in Secondary Education, 1905–1920,” *ibid.*, 2005, 96:353–389; and Antonio García-Belmar, José Ramón Bertomeu-Sánchez, and Bernadette Bensaude-Vincent, “The Power of Didactic Writings: French Chemistry Textbooks of the Nineteenth Century,” in *Pedagogy and the Practice of Science*, ed. Kaiser (cit. n. 4), pp. 219–251.

¹¹ Peter Galison, “Ten Problems in History and Philosophy of Science,” *Isis*, 2010, 9:111–124.

© 2012 by The History of Science Society. All rights reserved.

JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization helping the academic community use digital technologies to preserve the scholarly record and to advance research and teaching in sustainable ways.

©2000-2012 ITHAKA. All Rights Reserved. JSTOR®, the JSTOR logo, and ITHAKA® are registered trademarks of ITHAKA.