Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 47(1), 1–17 Winter 2011
View this article online at wileyonlinelibrary.com (wileyonlinelibrary.com). DOI 10.1002/jhbs.20470

LETTING GO OF LITTLE ALBERT: DISCIPLINARY MEMORY, HISTORY, AND THE USES OF MYTH[1]

BEN HARRIS

In 2009 *American Psychologist* published the account of an attempt to identify the infant "Albert B.," who participated in Watson and Rayner's study of the conditioning of human fears. Such literal interpretations of the question "Whatever happened to Little Albert?" highlight the importance of historical writing that transcends the narrowly biographical and that avoids the obsessive hunt for "facts." The author of a 1979 study of how secondary sources have told the story of Little Albert relates his attempts to purge incorrect accounts of that story from college textbooks. He renounces such efforts as misguided and suggests that myths in the history of psychology can be instructive, including the myth that the identity of Little Albert has been discovered. © 2011 Wiley Periodicals, Inc.

In 1979, *American Psychologist* published "Whatever Happened to Little Albert," a review of psychologists' telling and retelling the story of a famous experiment that took place 60 year earlier. In that study, the behaviorist John B. Watson and his student Rosalie Rayner tried to condition fear in an infant they called "Albert B." (Watson & Rayner, 1920). Albert had been volunteered by his mother, who lived and worked at an orphanage adjacent to Johns Hopkins University. At the end of the experiment, the infant and his mother moved away and his fate became unknown. Although Watson and Rayner's report suggested that the infant's fear was transitory, they later editorialized (see Figure 1) that he probably suffered permanent harm ("The greatest enemy of babies," 1920).[2] By the 1960s, this alarmist message was being echoed by textbook authors and fervent behaviorists, who stood in awe of the powers of classical conditioning.

In titling my article "Whatever Happened . . . ," I was speaking metaphorically and ironically. While generations of curious Introductory Psychology students have posed that question literally, I wanted to transform it from a biographical one to something historical. I wanted to convert the reader's interest in the fate of a child into an interest in the role of "great

1. This is an expanded version of a talk given to the History and Philosophy of Science Department of Indiana University. The author thanks James Capshew and the many colleagues who have provided reactions to these ideas over the years, and one anonymous reviewer who gave helpful advice. He also thanks Hall ("Skip") Beck, Sharman Levinson, and Gary Irons for their gracious and helpful responses to inquiries about their work.

2. It is ironic that Watson and Rayner were willing to acknowledge what Beck, Levinson, and Irons don't: that there was no chance for any follow-up study of "Albert." At the end of their article they shift from reporting data to creating a playful, anti-Freudian myth. As an adult, Albert will go into psychoanalysis and be told that his fear of sealskin coats was caused by his being scolded for trying to play with his mother's pubic hair. Aware that myths depend on a suggestible audience, Watson and Rayner say that a persuasive psychoanalyst would be necessary to implant this false memory in the adult Albert. Unlike Hans Eysenck, these authors were aware that their anti-Freudian story was pure invention.

BEN HARRIS is a Professor of Psychology and Affiliate Professor of History at the University of New Hampshire, where he teaches and publishes in the history of psychology and psychiatry. He is the former Executive Officer of the Cheiron Society and former President of the Society for the History of Psychology. One of his interests is the portrayal of psychology in radio, television, and motion pictures. He has served as consultant to the BBC and WGBH (Boston) on projects in the history of psychology.

"The Greatest Enemy of Babies is FEAR." But Science Now Plans to Stand Guard at the Door of the Infant's Mind and Keep Out Those Fears Which Experiments Have Shown Are Not Instinctive, But Needlessly Acquired.

Jimmy is here swinging to and fro over a young abscess 20 feet deep. This sight would terrify most children.

A WORLD-WIDE fight against the greatest enemy of mankind—fear—may soon be started if the dream of a group of American psychologists is realized. This fight will be conducted along purely scientific lines and as a necessary preliminary to the main campaign an exhaustive study in infant psychology will first have to be made.

The infant mind, in fact, will be the main theater of action, for it is within the first three years of life that the thousands of fear states which afflict humanity are acquired.

This, at least, is the conclusion of scientists who have already been making experiments in infant psychology. And this will be their guiding principle in their attempt to eliminate misplaced fears from the lives of human beings.

Dr. John B. Watson, the celebrated New York psychologist, is a recently issued statement made an appeal for the founding of an institution where the human infant could be studied from birth to at least three years of age. It would lead, he said, to an untold wealth of new scientific conclusions and to a practical and common sense set of data upon the psychological care of the infant. He thought it was not too much to expect that an unfavorable bias for such a cause as this could be raised when more than the leaving from a million dollars was being spent, annually in the study of the sea insects, the coral and the jelly fish.

A shining illustration of the child mind from which all unnatural fears have been excluded is that furnished by little Jimmy Spicuse of New York, whose pictures appear on this page.

Jimmy foresees in 12 months old and has none of the commonly acquired fears of childhood and, to a limited extent, has eradicated his inherited fears. He is not afraid of the dark, the water, animals or great heights. From earliest infancy he has been taught to live a free, fearless and natural life.

His father owns a private park in upper Manhattan Island and Jimmy roams around in it without any clothes, winter and summer. He never learned to fear the common accidents of childhood and, therefore, cause to fear them. Likewise, if an animal is produced in front of a child at the same time a steel bar or tin pan is struck behind him, this animal will thereafter become a stimulus to fear. And, in most cases, all other animals resembling the one with which the experiment was made will evoke a similar fear.

In his article in the Scientific Monthly, Dr. Watson describes several successive experiments with an infant named Albert.

Between the ages of 144 and 173 days this child was introduced to dogs, cats, rats, pigeons and wild animals at the zoo. The tests were continued by taking the child to his chair in a dark room and building a bonfire in front of him. In no case did he exhibit the slightest fear. In practically every case he would reach out his hand and try to stroke the object.

One of the animals presented was a white rat. Later, at the age of 11 months and 5 days, the following experiment was made:

A white rat was suddenly taken from the basket and presented to Albert. He began to reach for the rat with his left hand. Just as his hand touched the animal the bar was struck immediately behind his head. The infant jumped violently and fell forward, burying his face in the mattress. He did not cry, however.

In order not to disturb the child unduly no further tests were given for one week. Albert was then brought back into the laboratory and the rat was suddenly presented without a sound. There was a steady thrusting, but no tendency at first to reach for the rat. The rat was then placed nearer, whereupon tentative reaching movements were begun with the right hand. When the rat nosed the infant's left hand, the hand was immediately withdrawn.

The combined stimulation of rat and loud noise was then offered and Albert showed the common symptoms of fear. After this had been repeated once or twice the rat was brought out alone and the baby began to cry as soon as he caught sight of the animal. A similar experiment made after 24 days had elapsed showed that the fear of the rat still existed in the child's mind and it was also demonstrated that this fear had been transferred in similar appearing objects such as rabbits, dogs, fur coats and cotton wool.

In commenting on these experiments Dr. Watson said:

"We see that the conditioned fear to the rat which was experimentally set up transferred to many other objects. The transfer was immediate and without any additional experience in connection with these other objects. In these transferred emotional reactions we thus would find a reason for the widespread change in the personality of children and possibly even of adults once even a strongly conditioned emotional reaction has been set up to any object or situation. It accounts for the many unreasoning fears and for a good deal of the uncleanliness of individuals to objects for which no adequate ground for such behavior can be adduced in the past history of that individual. The importance of such a factor in shaping the life of the child needs no further emphasis from us.

"At present we are engaged upon the study of methods by means of which such directly conditioned fear responses and their transfers may be removed. The importance of establishing methods for the removal of these undesirable reactions is apparent to all. That such conditioned reactions are present in the life of every child many persons can testify. We have repeatedly had children brought to us whose emotional life had been so warped and twisted by such factors that the formation of the stable habits by means of which the race must maintain itself was seriously interfered with. . . .

"The skeptic will be inclined to say that such things happen in the life of every day, but that the child immediately puts them aside and soon forgets or outgrows such happenings. We have not the full experimental data to combat this view, but we have the evidence to show that, in Albert at least, both the original fear of the rat and the transferred emotional reactions remained after a period of 30 days in which no experiments were made. Furthermore, the latter were still called out by the same objects which called them out in the above test. Our view is that such happenings are permanently impressed upon the growing child. They remain not only as a part of his reaction system, but also they tend to modify or prevent, by limiting the number of objects that he deals with, the formation of constructive habits. In other words, they modify his vocational future. When we consider that these conditioned emotional responses are being constantly set up in the lives of children, not only in the realm of fear but in the realm of love and rage, and that they bring in their train a host of transferred responses, we begin to realize the importance of the pre-school age of the child."

Dr. Watson later said that parents and family physicians should be on guard at the door of the infant mind and keep out these unnatural fears. In cases where conditioned fear responses were set up by accident, steps should be taken to remove them as soon as discovered. In order to do this, however, a great deal more data bearing on infant psychology will have to be compiled and placed in the hands of parents. It is for the purpose of making extensive experiments possible that he hopes to see an institution founded.

Little Jimmy Syracuse, 18 months old, who has been taught to live without fear—and without clothing, winter and summer. He spends all of his time in the open in his father's private park in upper Manhattan Island.

Fear of the water is another bogey of childhood—but Simone Blankhorn of Los Angeles makes high dives from her father's hand and swims like a fish.

FIGURE 1.
An example of Watson's claim that lifelong problems result from conditioning such as he performed on Albert (from the *Morning Oregonian*, August 6, 1922, p. 8).

experiments" in the history of a young science. As I have explained in decades of e-mail correspondence with curious strangers, I was not searching for a 60-year-old man afraid of rats and dogs. Rather, I was asking "Whatever happened to the *story* of little Albert in the hands of psychologists?" (Harris, 1980).

While I was trying to steer my correspondents toward the history of psychology, interest in the fate of an actual baby persisted. Thirty years after my article appeared, *American Psychologist* published an answer to the literal version of my article's title. In "Finding Little Albert," Hall Beck and two collaborators described the results of years of hunting for the identity of Albert's mother and the fate of her son (Beck, Levinson, & Irons, 2009). To the satisfaction of the editors of that

journal, the authors named Douglas Merritte (1919–1925) as the infant who was called "Albert B." by Watson.[3] At age 6 he succumbed not to an animal phobia but rather to hydrocephalus. Although his death so young meant little could be learned about him, the drama of the search for his identity was compelling enough to interest the BBC, which sent producer Polly Billam and a crew to Baltimore to film a recreation of Beck's sleuthing and discovery (S. Brown, personal communication, June 15, 2010).

Beck, Levinson, and Irons' article also inspired the editor of *The Psych Files* blog to devote an episode to the search for Albert, concluding with a photo of Hall Beck visiting the grave of Douglas Merritte. That blog inspired one viewer to proclaim that "Little Albert is and will stay the James Dean of Psychology, an Experimental icon." Another said that she "nearly had tears in [her] eyes at the sight of the grave . . . poor Douglas . . . he was a really sweet, cute little boy" (Pearson & Britt, 2010).

Unfortunately for those hoping for a tidy end to a 90-year-long saga, Beck, Levinson, and Irons are likely to have picked the wrong mother and child. Unable to access the relevant patient/orphanage records at Johns Hopkins University, the authors were unable to rule out the strong possibility that Douglas Merritte had a medical condition that ruled him out as the healthy baby that Watson filmed and showed to the world.[4]

Sleuthing and Debunking in the History of Psychology

What can we learn from this most recent search for a single participant in a very old psychology experiment? Stepping back, we can consider what motivates—and sometimes misdirects—historical research.

The impulse behind the search for Albert's identity is familiar to amateur and professional historians alike. For scholars in the history of psychology, correcting errors and establishing truths is a venerable tradition. For many of us, these tasks first established our identity as professional researchers, not just tellers of tales. As a historian, one hopes to distance oneself from the latter to reach into the past for a lesson that's useful today, without concern for its veracity. So one immerses oneself in the minutiae of past lives, long-forgotten apparatus, and obscure journal articles. And one finds plenty to discover—and to correct—in textbooks and other secondary sources.

It is satisfying, one finds, to uncover the unnoticed event in the lives of figures both minor and great, or to debunk a story that everyone else accepts. If one transcends the trivial, such work can add to our understanding of the past. Learning what happened when Francis Galton consulted a phrenologist, for example, helps us understand his life and the connection between the scientific and the personal (Fancher, 1998). Likewise, debunking the story that Wilhelm Wundt was a narrow empiricist helps us see more clearly the origins of psychology and the subsequent struggle over its scientific status (Danziger, 1979).

As a new generation of historians of psychology emerged in the post–Vietnam War era, debunking textbook myths became a cottage industry. Soon we found them in one after

3. The United States census provided the information that the authors used to identify Albert's mother. Research into her family then led to a child of hers born at the appropriate time. A flaw in their approach that will likely prevent a follow-up are the assumptions that Albert's mother was listed in the 1920 census *and* that she was listed in a recognizable job category *and* that her address was indicated as the orphanage where Watson said his subject lived. Historians of this period recognize how unlikely it is that all those assumptions are true.

4. Apparently, Beck was told that the relevant records from the Harriet Lane Home had been destroyed (Beck, personal communication, July 26, 2010).

another psychological specialty: social, industrial-organizational, experimental, and clinical psychology (Graeber, 1986; Harris, 1979; Gillespie, 1991; Samelson, 1974, 1977).

Today, some psychologists see debunking myths as helping restore the health of their field. In social psychology, for example, revisionists explain that common misinterpretations of "the Asch effect" promote the false notion that individuals cannot resist social pressure (Jarrett, 2008). Likewise, distortions in retellings of the Kitty Genovese murder ("bystander apathy") blind us to ways in which groups can be helpful and cooperative. As a result, recent authors hope that "by debunking the [Kitty Genovese] myth . . . social psychologists [might] develop new insights into the problem of helping in emergency situations" (Manning, Levine, & Collins, 2007, p. 561).

Writing history, however, is not the same as collecting biographical trivia or debunking every incorrect account of past research.[5] Sometimes, an overly zealous search for minutiae or attack on myths become ends in themselves—obscuring our view of history. The debunker becomes obsessed with setting the record straight rather than understanding our relation to the past.

Such a figure appears in J. K. Rowling's *Harry Potter* books in the figure of Professor Binns, teacher of the history of magic at Hogwarts School (Rowling, 1999). As his name suggests, Prof. Binns' lectures are so full of trivial facts and dates that they should have been tossed in a trash can (a "bin") long ago. One sees his distorted view of history most clearly when his class becomes excited about rumors of the school's own history and the possibility that a secret cellar holds monstrous creature. In response, Binns becomes furious. He angrily proclaims "'It is a myth! It does not exist! . . . We will return, if you please, to *history*, to solid, believable, verifiable *fact*!' And within five minutes, the class had sunk back into its usual torpor" (Rowling, 1999, p. 152)

Part of the humor is Prof. Binns' equating history with trivialities that can be verified—lists of dates and names. He is blind to the importance of studying myths to understand how historical knowledge is created, disseminated, discussed, and revised. If he were teaching Introductory Psychology at a university, and recent revelations had not intervened, he might have already prepared a PowerPoint slide on the birth and death dates for Douglas Merritte, the newly identified "Little Albert."

An Autobiographical Tale

This article argues that we historians of psychology may commit the mistakes of Prof. Binns in our zeal to establish exactitudes and correct the historical record. It does so through a first-person account of a decades-long, quixotic campaign to improve the historical accuracy of textbooks in General Psychology. Focusing on the small but significant story of John Watson's attempt to condition fear in an 11-month-old infant, I tried to make textbook authors tell the truth. Now I have abandoned this campaign as futile and misdirected. Instead of tilting at texts, I have learned to enjoy bogus accounts of what John Watson and Rosalie Rayner did to the infant they called Albert. Here I will describe how my quest began, what I learned, and why I have abandoned it.[6]

In the fall of 1977, I began my first teaching position at a small university called Radford College. In the spring, I was in my second semester of lecturing to scores of undergraduates

5. As I have noted elsewhere, by the 1980s, a new generation of historians of psychology moved the field from an emphasis on debunking prior histories to simply writing good history (Harris, 1997).

6. Because of the autobiographical content, it is impossible to tell this story in the normal style of this journal and the author begs the reader's pardon.

FIGURE 2.
A highly retouched image from Watson's film, suggesting that Albert had no innate fear of a Santa Claus mask (from the *American Weekly*, October 7, 1927, p. 5).

and to a dozen master's-level graduate students in clinical psychology. Being an innocent assistant professor, I thought it best to actually *read* the research articles that I would be discussing in my graduate seminar. Since experimental models of psychopathology was the week's topic, I read Liddell's attempts to make sheep neurotic, I read Horace English's failed attempt make his son afraid of a duck decoy, and, finally, I read Watson and Rayner's 1920 article in the *Journal of Experimental Psychology*.

To my surprise, the article described how unsuccessful its authors had been in inducing fear in Little Albert. With lots of work they got Albert to cry sometimes and to exhibit a sort of approach-avoidance conflict when they would spring upon him various stimuli. I say "spring upon him" because I later discovered that they sometimes tossed animals at him, sometimes shoved things like Rosalie's sealskin coat at him, and their method of "presenting" him with a Santa Claus mask was to have Watson put it on and crawl toward Albert at eye level. (See Figure 2.)

In retrospect, what upset me most was discovering that I had spent the previous semester fibbing to scores of first-year undergraduates. That is, in my lectures in General Psychology I had been giving an explanation of stimulus generalization that used a fanciful version of the Watson and Rayner study as an illustration. Repeating the story that was in the department's mandated textbook, I had Albert initially conditioned to a white *rabbit*, with the fear then generalizing to a white rat and other similar objects.

Since I had long been interested in the development of psychology as a discipline, I channeled my embarrassment into a self-tutored program of learning everything I could about Watson and the origins of behaviorism in North America. Using Watson as an entry point, I then tried to learn what I could about the history of twentieth-century psychology. At the same time, one of my seminar students and I surveyed accounts of Albert in General Psychology textbooks. We also looked at how some prominent behaviorists told and retold the story in journal articles and books (Harris & Kinsey, 1978). Fortunately, I had simultaneously joined the Cheiron Society and started to read the *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*.

The Albert Study as Behaviorist Origin Myth

Most helpful in socializing me into this group was Franz Samelson, who encouraged me to see the Albert study in terms of Thomas Kuhn's *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, which I had read as an undergraduate (Kuhn, 1962). The Albert story had become, in Kuhnian terms, an origin myth for behaviorists in the 1960s and 1970s who wanted to extend the history of their approach *back in time* as far as possible. From that perspective, one could see successive generations of behaviorists and neobehaviorists using the Albert study to support their changing views of fears and phobias, and to pummel their opponents.

In 1965, for example, Hans Eysenck wrote a little book titled *Fact and Fiction in Psychology*. In it he lampooned Freudians for their use of the case of Little Hans, which he dismissed as self-serving psychoanalytic folklore, full of distortions. In a chapter titled "Little Hans or Little Albert?" Eysenck used the story of Albert's conditioning to assert the power of behavioral psychology and the foolishness of psychoanalysis. Ironically, his version of Watson and Rayner's study showed exactly the sort of self-serving, fantastic inventions that he attributed to his enemies the Freudians. Albert, in Eysenck's hands, is a motherless orphan who is "quite fond of white rats" (Eysenck, 1965, p. 123). Adding a Dickensian touch, Eysenck said that he "used to play with them a lot" (Eysenck, 1965, p. 123). In Eysenck's description, the conditioning procedure is Pavlovian. A loud noise was sounded when Albert attempted to play with the group of rats that Watson's kept in his laboratory. The result, Eysenck claimed, was "a severe rat phobia" (Eysenck, 1965, p. 124).

In the 1970s, I found, the Albert study was rediscovered by the neobehaviorist Martin Seligman, who used it to support his preparedness theory of conditioned fear. Albert's fear never generalized to wooden blocks, he asserted, because they were a contraprepared stimulus. By contrast, after only a couple of trials fear easily transferred to hair and fur—stimuli that Seligman considered prepared by evolution (Seligman, 1971). Among the many things that Seligman failed to notice in Watson and Rayner's article was that the wooden blocks were a toy that Watson introduced to Albert, not a neutral stimulus. Moreover, Albert continued to enjoy playing with the hair of Watson's two female assistants.

Fortunately for me, the behavioral upsurge of the 1960s was being supplanted by the so-called cognitive revolution in the 1970s, and when I submitted an article to *American Psychologist* it reached an editor (Sandra Scarr) who was willing to see gentle fun poked at behaviorists and textbook authors. So it was published without significant revision (Harris, 1979).


Can Science Determine Your Baby's Career Before It Can Talk?

Prof. Watson's Interesting Study of Hundreds of New-Born Infants to Find Out from the Way They Behave While Still in Their Cradles What Sort of Work They Can Do Best When They Grow Up

A Long Series of Experiments Like This Showed That Babies Are Not Naturally Afraid of Animals or of Furry Objects in General. Fear Was Produced in This Baby Only When the Sight of the Dog Was Accompanied by the Sound Made by Striking a Steel Bar with a Hammer.

One of the Tests Which Exploded the Popular Idea That Babies Will Reach for the Moon or Anything Else They Can See. The Psychologists' Recent Experiments Showed That Normal Infants Can Be Taught to Reach for Things Only When Brought Within 20 Inches of Them.

One of the Tests of a Baby's Muscular Reactions to Show His Control of His Feet and Legs and How They Respond to the Stimulation of Different Objects.

Professor John B. Watson, Who, with His Wife, Made the Unusual Psychological Study of Babies.

FIGURE 3.
An article promoting Watson's work, illustrated with photos from his 1920 motion picture (in the *Chicago Herald & Examiner,* January 8, 1922, p. 8).

TILTING AT TEXTBOOKS

Having surveyed the extent of textbooks' distortions, I next began a one-person campaign to correct their portrayals of the Albert study. My leverage with publishers and authors was a 16-mm film that Watson had made of his research (Watson, 1923). Although Watson's first biographer pronounced it lost forever (Cohen, 1979), I traced it to the University of Michigan film unit, where a copy was found in an unmarked box under a stairwell. (See Figure 3.)

Now I had a piece of the true behaviorist cross. Like holders of such relics, I wanted to exploit it to advance my cause, which was my revisionist historical perspective. Once the word spread that I had made stills of Watson, Rayner, and Albert from the movie, I could tell textbook photo editors that if they wanted to use an image they would need to submit to me the

draft text of their author's description of the Albert study. I then chided them about inaccuracies that I noticed, such as the claim that Albert was conditioned to a rabbit, that he was a child rather than an infant, and line drawings showing that he grew up to be afraid of toys and dandelions.

While this gave me a sense of importance, it was not an effective method for increasing the historical accuracy of texts. I discovered that there is an inexhaustible supply of errors that can be introduced by a textbook author. After a few years it became clear that I would have to move from editorial advisor to a volunteer, meddling copy editor. I would have to dispute individual sentences, phrases, and even single words. Not only would that require more energy that I had to invest, but it still would not guarantee accuracy of content and tone. I learned that skilled authors can convey a misleading interpretation of the Albert study at the same time that they are disclaiming it in a sentence or phrase that I might have suggested.

I now think of this as the nudge-nudge, wink-wink law of indirect discourse (Idle, 1969), with a corollary applicable to textbook authorship. Applied to the Watson and Rayner study, this meant that a textbook author could echo Eysenck's bogus claim that Albert developed a lifelong fear in one or two conditioning trials, even if the author prefaces this with the phrase "although we don't know what happened to Albert in later life." In one textbook, an author inserted the single word "presumably" before his claim of a phobia's creation, making his text technically accurate but consistent in its inaccurate message (Santrock, 1997).

Moving from the experiment to its significance, I now realize that there are innumerable ways to celebrate John B. Watson as a heroic empiricist and the father of all the behaviorisms that followed. Through shadings of meaning, a clever author can always get across the image of Watson as a lone, courageous theorist and experimenter, battling hereditarian dogma and the prejudices of ordinary people, including Albert's meddlesome mother. Blocking that message would require rewriting much of the text, beginning with Chapter 1.

More Recent Telling of the Albert Tale

It is fortunate that I stopped trying to correct mistaken textbook accounts of Albert, because just keeping track of their recycled errors is a daunting task. This I verified in the early 1990s when I looked through a stack of texts that a student had collected in a survey of textbook coverage of the Cyril Burt scandal. In preparing this article I looked at more recent texts, but I do not claim to have made a thorough or scientific sample.

In the Albert stories told by the texts I examined, what seems most amusing are the minor errors of detail brought on by the authors' combination of pedagogical need and ahistoricism. In 1993, for example, Kelly Shaver and Roger Tarpy turned Watson's white laboratory rat into a pet albino rat. The albino part is a mystery but the false detail of "pet rat" seems clear. It allows them to say that Albert's fear was "irrational because the pet rat was tame" (Shaver & Tarpy, 1993, p. 106). Thus, they don't have to challenge students' implicit belief that a laboratory rat would be inherently fear-arousing. That means, however, that they must not mention Watson's theory of human emotion—which challenged the recapitulationist notion that infant fears were inherited from pre-human ancestors (Noon, 2005).

In 1992, James Laird and Nicholas Thompson were equally unwilling to confront students' prejudices about rats as fearful objects. They had Watson arranging for Albert to get "used to petting a tame white rat" before the attempt at conditioning (Laird & Thompson, 1992, p. 205). They also turn Albert into a "patient in a hospital where Watson worked" (Laird & Thompson, 1992, p. 205). Perhaps this was because they thought it unbelievable that Albert's mother would volunteer him as an experimental subject. Equally likely, they were unfamiliar

with the early twentieth-century custom of wet nurses living in hospitals accompanied by their own babies (often illegitimate). A third, most probable explanation is that the authors read in someone else's text a quote from Watson and Rayner about Albert being taken "from the hospital" the day of their final tests of his fear. Since they didn't read the Watson and Rayner article, they didn't realize it was the hospital where Albert was *raised*, not the place where they tested him.

The largest number of textbook errors seem to center around the properties of the objects and animals to which Albert's fear might generalize. As Watson's film shows, the rat that Watson used was white, the rabbit was brown or gray, and Rosalie Rayner's sealskin muff/coat was black. However, many authors insist on their right to make *a priori* predictions of the dimensions along which stimuli generalize. For them, these details are an inconvenience. One solution is to invent a white fur coat, or a white piece of fur, or to suggest that the rabbit, fur coat, package of cotton, and dog that Watson used were all white and fluffy or white and furry (e.g., Hock, 1992; Weiten, 2008). A less dramatic solution is to drop whiteness as a feature of the stimulus generalization and suggest that it was furry objects (Gerrig & Zimbardo, 2005) or "small animals and odd looking masks [!]" (Kalat, 2005, p. 618) that Albert learned to fear.

All of these errors are significant, a neobehaviorist would explain, because they reflect a species-centric view of the universe. From this perspective, the stimulus dimension(s) that strike humans as most important are declared the stimulus dimensions along which the conditioning *will* generalize. Thus furriness or whiteness is deemed most important and other factors drop out of the story. Thus only a handful of texts mention Albert's playing with the hair of the two female research assistants while reacting negatively to Watson's own hair (e.g., Lilienfeld et al., 2010).

My Role in All This

One question that I asked myself after quitting the business of policing texts was what effect, if any, I and my 1979 article had on textbooks. One false detail that I may have helped eliminate is Watson's having removed Albert's fear through some sort of systematic desensitization. This formerly popular fiction seems hard to find in texts published since the mid-1980s. My hunch is that that variation of the Albert story reflected a desire for an ending that was both happy and demonstrative of behaviorism's powers.

Now that I helped draw attention to Albert's departure sooner than Watson wanted, the story of Albert's deconditioning may have become too fanciful a tale. So those wishing a tidy ending insert the story of Mary Cover Jones deconditioning Peter instead (Jones, 1924), with credit given to Watson for supervising Jones' dissertation. If that sounds like a feminist step forward, it is sometimes accompanied by a criticism of Albert's mother. Watson wanted to decondition Albert, texts assert, but Albert's mother aborted the study (Lahey, 1992). That is the message in a text that students tell me is in wide use in my own department (Wade & Tavris, 2006). Others, however, want to insert an ethics lesson in a chapter on learning theory and echo my point that Watson failed to use the last month of his contact with Albert to remove his fears (e.g., Wood, Wood, & Boyd, 2006).

In looking at how difficult it is to improve textbook accounts, I've come to appreciate how many nonintellectual factors affect the authors and editors of textbooks. More specifically, it seems as if visual images can overwhelm written or spoken messages. Because I offer dramatic images of Little Albert, and because these are not self-explanatory, I may have contributed as much error as I have eliminated. For example, when I supplied Prentice Hall with the still photo of Watson in the Santa Claus mask for a text, I didn't realize that the photo captions were written

by production staff who don't necessarily read the book they're working on. Perhaps because the photo was a third- or fourth-generation copy, the caption in this text discusses "Baby Albert" and his fear of "white furry objects such as the clown mask [Watson] is wearing in this photo" (Worchel & Goethels, 1989, p. 255).

Another example of image triumphing over substance arose in my relation with Philip Zimbardo, author of one of the biggest-selling texts in North America, *Psychology and Life* (1988). This was begun by Floyd Ruch in the 1940s, then became Ruch and Zimbardo. In 1988, Zimbardo was sole author; he had read my article, and I provided a photo of Albert, Watson, and Rayner. In his text he cobbled together his and Ruch's old version, part of my article's message, and new details generated by his imagination. The result was an engaging account notable for its self-contradiction and intellectual sleight of hand. As in the Ruch and Zimbardo text, there is a "Close-Up" on Watson and Rayner. This time it's titled "Little Albert and the White Rat," and it has been expanded to an entire page, with the photo taking up a quarter of the space (Zimbardo, 1988).

In it, Zimbardo has rewritten Watson and Rayner's narrative to suit his ideas of what happened, which he passes off as Watson's "laboratory notes." These describe how Albert was "transformed . . . into a 'cry baby' fearful even of Santa Claus" in only 12 days (Zimbardo, 1988, p. 267). That is, Albert had become phobic by the second of four occasions he was tested by Watson.

At the time that this text appeared, Zimbardo was making a television program called *Discovering Psychology*, a General Psychology course in 26 episodes (Zimbardo, WGBH, & APA, 1989). I provided his producers with Watson's film and they edited it and used portions of it in the episodes on developmental psychology, learning, and so forth. Now, I thought, the author of a best-selling textbook could literally see what Watson did, see the less than convincing results, and read the details in Watson's silent-film captions.

Rather than help increase Zimbardo's accuracy, the Watson film provoked someone in his project to accomplish something that even Hans Eysenck could not. He (or she) doubled Watson's sample size. In *Discovering Psychology*, viewers see first one and then a *second* subject that Watson is said to condition. The first is Albert and the second is a little girl that Watson filmed and who had arrived in Watson's lab with a fear of one animal that generalized to others, as Watson showed by testing her and filming the result. In the caption, Watson clearly indicates that this was a naturally occurring fear, but the few seconds of footage that I supplied must have been visually too tempting. So the girl joined Albert in an experimental cohort.[7]

The Limits of Debunking

In reviewing my attempts to induce authors to write more credible accounts of Little Albert, one might question my judgment if not my sanity. What I did, it seems, was to become emotionally over-involved with my subject. Although my article had tried to move the discussion from the realm of "true facts" to that of history, I lagged behind, fussing about correct and incorrect details, defending Albert's honor against those who would brand him a lifelong emotional cripple.

In my narrow-mindedness, I was acting like those who interpret my article concretely, echoing the 1950s television police detective who demanded "Just the facts, Ma'am." We who teach history in a psychology department know the type, a student or colleague who thinks it

7. A related sleight of hand was used by producers at WGBH to imply that Watson had a nursery full of subjects.

nice to have in the department someone who can provide interesting trivia from the past and settle disputes over who sailed with Freud to the U.S.

A friend who teaches English literature once told me that she encounters the equivalent type when she tries to move students toward a literary sensibility. That is, she wants them to enjoy multiple perspectives that one finds in good literature, rather than insisting on finding the one true viewpoint. When she teaches E. M. Forster's *Passage to India*, for example, there is always one student in a class of 30 who comes up at the end of the final exam, puts down her blue book, takes my friend aside and says *sotto voce*, "OK, I've finished the course, so you can now tell me, please, what *did* happen in those caves?" I was close to acting like that student in my over-involvement with detail.

The other type I was resembling is the advocate of a school of psychological thought that practices historical advocacy. Radical behaviorists, for example, spend significant time defending B. F. Skinner from writers who depict him as a clod or a sadist who put his infant daughter in a conditioning box. Driving out historical error is to them as important as keeping accurate laboratory records. From their perspective, the historical record is a grand, chronological version of the laboratory notebook. In my own way I was acting as advocate–historian, pestering others about the exact color of Watson's rabbit. It didn't feel as such, however. I thought I was nobly debunking the origin myths spread by successors to Hans Eysenck and Joseph Wolpe.

The problem is that exposing origin myths can be just an excuse for antiquarian rumination. Worse, it can be a cover for presentist special pleading. Adrian Brock and Kurt Danziger have shown this to be true among writers on Wilhelm Wundt (Brock, 1993; Danziger, 1979). Showing that Wundt was not the Titchnerian introspectionist or proto-Nazi that the Americans made him out to be is the first, debunking step. The second, *re*-bunking step is claiming Wundt as the first cognitive psychologist or the first something or other that is the author's subdisciplinary affiliation.

Another example is the revisionist literature on the Hawthorne study, that 1930s study of women in an electrical plant, in which the management changed lighting levels and supervisory style, and measured worker output, morale, and such. In the 1970s this was pronounced an origin myth for the field of industrial-organizational psychology. Then, behaviorists and advocates of group dynamics spent a decade arguing over what exactly happened in the relay assembly room at the Hawthorn plant (e.g., Parsons, 1974). It took the historian of science Richard Gillespie to wrestle the story away from the presentists trying to advance their particular school of psychology (Gillespie, 1991). In regard to Albert, I don't know what *my* presentist agenda might have been. Perhaps it was freeing behaviorism from the psychological dogmatists who held much of the franchise rights.

Little Albert Defense Group

What I should have done was more closely follow the lead of Richard Marshall, who used humor to skewer Eysenck and others he found pompous and wrongheaded. It was Marshall who in 1984 wrote the British Psychological Society's *Bulletin* as the General Secretary of the apocryphal Little Albert Defense Group or "L.A.D." That group, he said, "have been rallying support where it counts—'A' level psychology students" (Marshall, 1984, p. 136). Sarcastically, Marshall praised a recent text that invented a variation of the "Albert was desensitized" happy ending. Psychologists need to tell the Albert story the way they *want* it to end, and so his society would help defend textbook authors against spoilers from the history of psychology like Ben Harris.

FIGURE 4.
Proposed campaign badge for Little Albert Defense Group.

Because I had recently begun making stills from Watson's film, I sent Marshall a prototype of a campaign badge for his organization, suggesting that he expand his brief to include suppression of the Watson *film*. It was, I suggested, a motion picture that might inflict harm on those believing the various Albert myths. In a satire of a campaign of Margaret Thatcher's, a horizontal bar across the image from the Watson film read "Ban Videonasties—Now!—L.A D.S." (see Figure 4).

BEYOND DEBUNKING

One of the reasons I became overly involved in debunking, I think, was that I emphasized "origin myths" in my analysis and neglected "cultural myths." New to the history of science, I wanted to be associated with the high-status T. S. Kuhn rather than low-status sociologists, anthropologists, and—perish the thought—Jungians. Now that I'm less insecure I can better appreciate the benefits of seeing myths from an interdisciplinary viewpoint.

Also, I failed to understand how important the study of myths is to general historians. As William McNeill explained in his essay "Mythistory . . . ," good historians respect how similar myths are to historical writing. Because "one person's truth is another's myth" (McNeill, 1986, p. 13), studying myths is an important job for any historian. Thus, "to be a truth-seeking mythographer is . . . a serious calling" (McNeill, 1986, p. 22).

With this in mind, I have informally studied apocryphal Watson stories like any folk myth or urban legend, examining the methods of expression and following the story's diffusion through the populace. Stories of Watson's sexual research on Rosalie Rayner, for example, are fun to track—one can now see them circulating via electronic mail. Not only are they are widely circulated, but they can all be traced back to their originator, the late James McConnell, textbook author and professor at the University of Michigan (Benjamin, Whitaker, & Ramsey, 2007).

In viewing Little Albert as a cultural myth or legend, I asked myself what implicit beliefs and values have been shared by psychologists, and how have various legends of Watson and

Albert expressed or supported those values? John Burnham and others have written about Watson's iconoclastic environmentalism fitting the culture of the 1920s (e.g., Burnham, 1968; Harris, 1984). And in the late 1920s, one can see the popular press modifying Watson's warnings about fearful children when the national mood was one of optimistic economic expansion. But what about the fit between tales of Watson's research and a more recent era: the 1960s and beyond? I offer some speculations.

First is the legend of Watson's sex research. In the era of the Vietnam War, some psychologists and institutional managers began to see psychology as possessing a unique ability to manipulate the individual. To psychology students, that belief was expressed most energetically by James McConnell, an award-winning textbook author, experimentalist, and charter member of the Science Fiction Writers of America (Rilling, 1996). One reason for the popularity of his introductory text was his including in each chapter a short, fictional story to increase student interest. To the public, McConnell became known for his claims of conditioning planaria, and for his boast that behaviorism had developed the ability to eliminate deviant behavior. It was this latter boast that provoked the Unabomber to send him a letter-bomb (Rilling, 1996).

Relevant to the Watson mythologies, one can read McConnell's story of Watson's sex research to be about manipulation, about subjugation and control, not just about sex. As expressed by McConnell, psychology and its technologies give mankind the potential to turn friends and relations into laboratory subjects (McConnell, 1985). That's what he had Watson doing to Rosalie Rayner. Thus, the McConnell-initiated sex stories express the dark side of the behavioral-managerial worldview in the late twentieth century.

The beliefs that stories of Little Albert convey are more complex. First, they seem to say that psychologists can impose order on a confusing, disorderly world. That's Eysenck's message when he uses Albert as a model for human phobias in general. And that's why few notice how messy Mary Cover Jones's account of her subject Peter actually was. The fearful Peter had a sister who had died, an unemployed father, and parents who were *afraid* they couldn't put food on the table. His mother suffered from frequent crying spells and used *fear* to discipline young Peter, telling him that someone would abduct him from his home (Jones, 1924). It's much neater to say that Peter's fear could be fully explained and removed by classical conditioning.

The other belief implicit by the Albert saga is that psychologists have social power because they have relentlessly pursued their work; they have gone to the laboratory or the clinic and found *data*. The data is the source of their authority. That's why textbook authors love to talk about Watson even though they must include a disclaimer that his work would be unethical today. To them, Watson is heroic. He undertakes work that no one else would. He unemotionally pursues the truth while surrounded by the superstitious. Unfortunately, his perfectly designed experiment on Albert was cut short by the infant's ignorant, ungrateful mother. Blackmailed by his wife, betrayed by Albert's mother, Watson becomes a tragic figure, a victim of his single-minded pursuit of science. A chief benefit of this myth is that it has Watson handing off to the next generation of behaviorists, and it preserves the fiction that Watson changed psychology and did so by logic and experiment.

Historians see Watson's legacy and his influence differently. Similar to its competitor Freudianism, Watson's version of behaviorism won more popular than academic support during its founder's lifetime. Much of that was due to its ambiguous message, and to the influence of second-order popularizations such as George Dorsey's *Why We Behave Like Human Beings* (1925). Among North American psychologists, it was other behaviorisms—not Watson's—that came to dominate by the late 1930s, as research became more quantitative,

more positivist, and more associationistic (Samelson, 1985). Watson's greatest influence came from his articulation of the expansionist desires of a young profession—one seeking prestige and independence from competing disciplines. As an ambitious applied psychologist, he showed his colleagues how to *promise* social utility, how to address practical problems, and most importantly how to carry one's message to those with financial and social power (O'Donnell, 1985). That's the story the textbooks are reluctant to tell.

The Cultural Significance of "Finding Little Albert"

To conclude, I return to the recent discovery of Little Albert's identity. Although I had long been a consultant to that project, I was frustrated to read (in manuscript form) its final result: a hunt for a missing child with little historical context. When asked to serve as a referee by *American Psychologist*, I suggested that the authors be encouraged to first present their research at a conference on the history of psychology. There, they would find colleagues who could help them add historical questions and dynamics to their story. Contrary to my advice, the paper was published with only minor alterations.

No one likes to have his or her advice rejected, but I now think the article is valuable to historians for the reaction it has evoked—from the journal's editors and the public at large. While its identification of Albert is likely to be another historical myth, what happened after its publication illustrates how psychology fits into the public's consciousness in the current era.

For the general reader, the discovery of Little Albert's identity turned him into the hero of a saga. Sagas and other mythical stories need characters, a plot, and a conclusion. Without the identification of Albert, he has only a walk-on part in the story of John B. Watson's brilliant career and flawed character. Albert then appears in Watson's popular writing, but the images and story lines are controlled by Watson and his publishers. One such story has Watson give Albert a phobia while showing his own sons how to grow up free of fear (Watson, 1930). (See Figure 5.)

Once Albert becomes a real child, however, he can join the ranks of other research subjects who deserve recognition and recompense. A prominent, recent example of such a story is the case of Henrietta Lacks, a poor black woman whose cancer cells were preserved, cultured, and used in research leading to many important scientific discoveries (Skloot, 2009). Disguised by a pseudonym created by researchers at Johns Hopkins University, Lacks was unacknowledged for decades. Furthermore, neither she nor her family knew the fate of her tissues and they received no compensation. When the story of her unwitting gift to science was told in January 2010, one commentator pronounced her "the most important woman in the history of medicine" ("Five Reasons," 2010).

Simultaneously with Henrietta Lacks' emergence from obscurity, the saga of Little Albert's discovery was brought to a wide audience by a blog sponsored by a publisher of psychology textbooks. Although Albert contributed data to psychology rather than medicine, the former profession has its own history of exploitation and less than fully ethical behavior. From Stanley Milgram and Philip Zimbardo to torture-enablers in the U.S. military, psychologists have been known for manipulating subjects with insufficient concern for damaged psyches (Fromm, 1973; Kaye, 2009; Nicholson, in press; Stockman, 2009). While today's psychologists have ethical codes they are told to follow, in the popular imagination there are countless unknown and uncompensated victims from past eras.

As a stand-in for those former subjects, the rediscovered Little Albert serves the public well. His fate can be tracked down and he can be memorialized, praised for his courage. Flowers can be left on his grave. Equally important, the *psychologists who located him* can

DR. JOHN B. WATSON HAS TWO YOUNG SONS WHO CAN SWIM, SKATE, BOX, HANG FROM TRAPEZES, STAND ON THEIR HANDS AND GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE

lie in their accustomed beds and bathe in their own bathtub. Every week-end all winter they go to a week-end club in the country, where it is cold and rough. They can hardly wait for Fridays to come, when they don their woolen shirts and boots and go skiing, skating, sledding or hiking—but they are equally buoyant when they come back Sunday evenings and cheerfully greet us all.

It is important for every human being's happiness to become part of his environment and not to require an especially created environment for his happiness. It is for this reason that we make every effort to keep the world as wide open as possible to our youngsters, but at the same time encourage any hobby in work or play in which they exhibit particular interest or excellence, because it is equally important for the stability of their futures that they should excel in some particular.

Much to the surprise of many people, our children's small superiorities so far have not been in the academic field, where they just make the grade, but they can swim, ice skate, hang from trapezes, stand on their hands, box and get along with people.

not long by the first of January, 1930, he could not go to his week-end camp. Bill agreed that the punishment was fair enough, and said he was going to try his best to stop his nail biting, but he could not live up to it for any consistent length of time, so January arrived and young brother went to camp and Billy stayed home.

We wondered how sad the parting would be! But not at all—Billy got everything organized that he wanted to do at home and seemed quite delighted with the situation. He did a lot of reading, worked in his workshop and cleaned out his toy box. (Part of the punishment was that he could not make any social engagements, so naturally he was restricted to his own company most of the time). I felt that in a way I had scored a minor triumph in this situation for predicting that you can't spend eight years teaching a babe to be adaptable, and then expect a mere matter of week-ending at home to be a sufficient stimulus to make him let his nails grow, although the effort was apparent. I feel convinced that the final stimulus will be discovered eventually, but meanwhile the Watsons go right on experimenting.

Upon the subject of independence and ad-

FIGURE 5.
The sons of John B. Watson and Rosalie Rayner Watson, praised for their fearless and extraverted demeanor (from *Parents' Magazine,* December 1930).

stand in for the profession and for all their colleagues who failed to care enough about their subjects or patients. Thus, *Finding Little Albert* is an uplifting story. It is no wonder that the American Psychological Association was glad to see it told, regardless of its veracity.

REFERENCES

Beck, H. P., Levinson, S., & Irons, G. (2009). Finding little Albert: A journey to John B. Watson's infant laboratory. American Psychologist, 64, 605–613.

Benjamin, L., Whitaker, J., Ramsey, R., & Zeve, D. (2007). John B. Watson's alleged sex research: An appraisal of the evidence. American Psychologist, 62, 131–139.

Brock, A. (1993). Something old, something new: The "reappraisal" of Wilhelm Wundt in textbooks. Theory & Psychology, 3, 235–242.
Burnham, J. (1968). The new psychology: From narcissism to social control. In R. H. Bremner, D. Brody, & J. Braeman (Eds.), Change and continuity in twentieth century America: The 1920's (pp. 351–398). Columbus: Ohio State University Press.
Cohen, D. (1979). J. B. Watson: The founder of behaviourism. Boston: Routlege.
Danziger, K. (1979). The positivist repudiation of Wundt. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 15, 205–230.
Dorsey, G. A. (1925). Why we behave like human beings. New York: Harper & Brothers.
Eysenck, H. J. (1965). Fact and fiction in psychology. Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books.
Fancher, R. E. (1998). Biography and psychodynamic theory: Some lessons from the life of Francis Galton. History of Psychology, 1, 99–115.
Five Reasons Henrietta Lacks Is the Most Important Woman in Medical History. (2010, February 5). PopSci, p. 1. Retrieved September 24, 2010 from http://www.popsci.com/science/article/2010-01/five-reasons-henrietta-lacks-most-important-woman-medical-history.
Fromm, E. (1973). The anatomy of human destructiveness. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Gerrig, R. J., & Zimbardo, P. G. (2005). Psychology and life. Boston: Pearson/Allen and Bacon.
Gillespie, R. (1991). Manufacturing knowledge: A history of the Hawthorne experiments. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
Graeber, W. (1986). The small group and democratic social engineering, 1900–1950. Journal of Social Issues, 42, 137–154.
Greatest Enemy of Babies Is Fear, The. (1922, August 6). The Morning Oregonian, p. 8.
Harris, B. (1979). Whatever happened to little Albert? American Psychologist, 34, 151–160.
Harris, B. (1980). Ceremonial vs. critical history of psychology. American Psychologist, 35, 218–219.
Harris, B. (1984). "Give me a dozen healthy infants . . .": John B. Watson's popular advice on childrearing, women, and the family. In M. Lewin (Ed.), In the shadow of the past: Psychology portrays the sexes (pp. 126–154). New York: Columbia University Press.
Harris, B. (1997). Repoliticizing the history of psychology. In D. Fox & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), Critical psychology: An introductory handbook (pp. 21–33). London and Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
Harris, B., & Kinsey, N. (1978, August). The textbook history of Little Albert. Paper presented at the 86th annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario.
Hock, R. R. (1992). Forty studies that changed psychology: Explorations into the history of psychological research. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
Idle, E. (1969). Nudge nudge. In G. Chapman, J. Cleese, T. Gilliam, E. Idle, T. Jones, & M. Palin (Eds.). How to recognise different types of trees from quite a long way away. British Broadcasting System.
Jarrett, C. (2008). Foundations of sand? The Psychologist, 21, 2–5.
Jones, M. C. (1924). A laboratory study of fear: The case of Peter. Pedagogical Seminary, 31, 308–315.
Kalat, J. W. (2005). Introduction to psychology, 7th ed. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
Kaye, J. (2009, July 24). Former top Navy psychologist involved in pre-9/11 prisoner abuse case. The Public Record. Accessed on September 25, 2010, from: http://pubrecord.org/special-to-the-public-record/2722/former-psychologist-involved-pre-911/.
Kuhn, T. S. (1962). The structure of scientific revolutions. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Lahey, B. B. (1992). Psychology: An introduction. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.
Laird, J. D., & Thompson, N. S. (1992). Psychology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
Lilienfeld, S. O., Lynn, S. J., Namy, L. L., & Woolf, N. J. (2010). Psychology: A framework for everyday thinking. Boston: Pearson/Allyn & Bacon.
Manning, R., Levine, M., & Collins, A. (2007). The Kitty Genovese murder and the social psychology of helping: The parable of the 38 witnesses. American Psychologist, 62, 555–562.
Marshall, J. R. (1984). Little Albert defence group [Letter to the editor]. Bulletin of the British Psychological Society, 37, 136.
McConnell, J. (1985). Psychology and the scientist: John B. Watson: Man and myth. Psychological Reports, 56, 683–705.
McNeill, W. H. (1986). Mythistory and other essays. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Nicholson, I. (in press). "Shocking" masculinity: Stanley Milgram, "obedience to authority" and the "crisis of manhood" in Cold War America. Isis.
Noon, D. (2005). The evolution of beasts and babies: Recapitulation, instinct, and the early discourse on child development. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 41, 367–386.
O'Donnell, J. M. (1985). The origins of behaviorism: American psychology, 1870–1920. New York: New York University Press.
Parsons, H. M. (1974). What happened at Hawthorne? Science, 183, 922–932.
Pearson Education & Britt, M. (2010, January 5). The psych files, episode 114. Retrieved June 13, 2010, from http://www.thepsychfiles.com/2010/01/episode-114-video-finding-little-albert/.
Rilling, M. (1996). The mystery of the vanished citations: James McConnell's forgotten 1960s quest for planarian learning, a biochemical engram, and celebrity. American Psychologist, 51, 589–598.

Rowling, J. K. (1999). Harry Potter and the chamber of secrets. New York: Arthur A. Levine Books.
Samelson, F. (1974). History, origin myth, and ideology: Comte's "discovery" of social psychology. Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior, 4, 217–231.
Samelson, F. (1977). World War I intelligence testing and the development of psychology. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 13, 274–282.
Samelson, F. (1985). Organizing for the kingdom of behavior: Academic battles and organizational policies in the twenties. Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, 21, 33–47.
Santrock, J. W. (1997). Psychology. Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.
Seligman, M. E. (1971). Phobias and preparedness. Behavior Therapy, 2, 307–320.
Shaver, K. G., & Tarpy, R. M. (1993). Psychology. New York: Macmillan.
Skloot, R. (2010). The immortal life of Henrietta Lacks. New York: Crown.
Stockman, F. (2009, May 8). Psychologists' e-mails stir interrogation issue. Boston Globe, p. 1.
Wade, C., & Tavris, C. (2006). Psychology. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall.
Watson, J. B. (Writer/Director). (1923). Experimental investigation of babies [motion picture]. Distributed by C. H. Stoelting Company, Chicago, IL.
Watson, R. R. (1930, December). I am the mother of a behaviorist's sons. The Parents' Magazine, 5, 16–18, 67.
Watson, J. B., & Rayner, R. (1920). Conditioned emotional reactions. Journal of Experimental Psychology, 3, 1–14.
Weiten, W. (2008). Psychology: Themes and variations. Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth.
Wood, S. E., Wood, E. R. G., & Boyd, D. R. (2006). Mastering the world of psychology. Boston: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
Worchel, S., & Goethals, G. R. (1989). Adjustment: Pathways to personal growth. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
Zimbardo, P. G. (1988). Psychology and life. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
Zimbardo, P. G., WGBH, & American Psychological Association. (1989). Discovering psychology [television series]. South Burlington, VT: Annenberg/CPB Collection.