The achievement of this harmony also lies in examining why we assume that attempts at a synthetic approach ought to come closer to the truth; why a statistical presentation assumes more believability; why more is considered better or why quantities outpower qualities. A review of the book cannot critically discuss, giving academic justice to the argument, a book of this nature. There are many more points in the book which are worth lauding and criticising. I can only encourage others to read it so that the same ground need not be covered again.

Carole Farber
University of Western Ontario
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Women, Men, and the Psychology of Power.

As the author, Hilary Lips, points out in the preface to Women, Men, and the Psychology of Power, it has become popular to write books for women on how to get and keep power, but few people have attempted to think systematically about the reasons for power discrepancies between the sexes. In addition, little research has been carried out to examine the various factors predictive of power differences. To rectify this lack of a comprehensive, scholarly approach to power relationships between men and women, and to address critics like Millett who have stated that psychology has little to offer in the analysis of such relationships, Lips has chosen to discuss power from a perspective which is both feminist and social psychological.

This strategy is an appealing one. Many discussions of power differences between men and women engender frustration and anger or guilt. We are reminded, if female, that control over one's life is difficult to achieve and maintain unless one is willing to behave in a stereotypically feminine fashion: that is, to use manipulation and seduction. One the other hand, if we are male, we are reminded of our primary responsibility for these inequities, but reminded as well that is is considered unmanly to relinquish power. A social psychological approach to these issues seems ideal because it provides a framework for the analysis of power relations and, more importantly, because its contextual approach assumes that inequities are created or exaggerated by socio-cultural forces. While such forces may be difficult to overcome fully, they are at least identifiable and somewhat malleable. Presumably they could be altered by aware and determined individuals. As Lips points out, "Armed with a basic knowledge of interpersonal power, people are less likely to be victimized in their relationships." It is the advancement of such knowledge that raises this work far above the popular "how to" books—books which leave women with an arsenal of weapons to combat power inequities, but with no knowledge about the sources of these problems, and no awareness of how to prevent problems from occurring.

Lips points out that two assumptions guide the arguments contained in Women, Men, and the Psychology of Power: a feminist assumption that women have less access to power, thus creating sex differences in individual efficacy, and a social psychological view that both parties in a power relationship, the powerful and the relatively powerless, are responsible for its
maintenance. These two orientations are skillfully interwoven in the book; the former provides illustrations of power inequity and the latter provides theory and research findings from diverse areas within social psychology—for example, work on social justice, conflict analysis and attribution theory—selected to help the reader explore the dynamics of sex differences in power.

The book’s nine chapters are constructed to reflect the contributions that a feminist view of social psychological knowledge can make to an understanding of power. The first chapter “Images of power and powerlessness,” co-authored by philosopher Leslie Campbell, explores the complex nature of power and discusses the duality ascribed to it. For example, power is seen as destructive or creative depending on how it is used, and natural—when in the hands of those already in power—or unnatural—when sought by the powerless. The second chapter, “Men, women and the need for power,” is a compelling analysis of the normal desire to have control over one’s own life. The power motive is seen as similar in men and women, and aroused by similar events, but it may manifest itself in different behaviours for either sex in conformity to contextual pressures. Chapters 3, “Interpersonal power: How people exert influences on one another,” 4, “Feeling powerful,” and 5, “Dominance: The structure of power,” explore the reasons for dominance and dependency in any relationship. These chapters discuss social psychological principles such as the principle of least interest which predicts that the individual least dependent on the other for rewards will be the most powerful in a relationship. Such patterns of behaviour are used to present a contextual basis for sex differences in power and to argue that there is little evidence for biological determinism of such differences. Chapter 6, “Power and sexuality,” co-authored with Nina Cowill, 7, “Power and the family,” by Lillian M. Esse, and 8, “Power in the organization,” co-authored with Gary W. Yunker, apply some of the concepts from earlier chapters to the dynamics of power relationships in three areas of particular importance to women. These chapters are particularly noteworthy since each one in its own right presents a comprehensive analysis of power inequities by discussing examples, possible mediating factors (e.g. love in a marriage, or lack of knowledge of informal networks in a formal organization), and pointing out critical areas where further research is badly needed. The final chapter completes the book by supplying an added dimension to what is essentially an individual differences analysis of power discrepancies in male-female relationships. This chapter focuses on the importance of the interaction between men as members of a powerful “majority” group and women as members of a less powerful “minority” in predicting the occurrence of power discrepancies.

Women, Men and the Psychology of Power is a comprehensive analysis of power relationships made especially convincing by its reliance on social psychological theory and research. The one weakness appears to be the “Epilogue” which suggests, in a sketchy way, the questions which still remain and the steps women can take to alleviate powerlessness. Given that these issues are raised and addressed throughout the book it seems anticlimactic to present them again instead of just summarizing the book’s main points. By now, the reader is well aware of the gaps in research, and should also have formulated a few ideas about solutions to personal, immediate power problems. Describing, for example, a woman whose own triumph over the toughness—gentleness duality was to powerlift weights while pregnant suddenly transforms the book from an intelligent and scholarly analysis to pop psychology.

Nevertheless, this problem is a minor one. Women, Men, and the Psychology of Power emerges
as an excellent treatment of the structure and
dynamics of power relationships between men
and women. It should prove a valuable re­
source for women's studies teachers seeking to
integrate their students' first hand experiences
of power discrepancies into a more theoretical
framework. It should also suggest new avenues
of research for social scientists and areas for
discussion for both women and men interested
in the factors mediating the acquisition and
maintenance of interpersonal power.

Joan E. Norris
University of Guelph

Between Women: Lowering the Barriers.
Paula J. Caplan. Toronto: Personal Library,

This is an extremely enjoyable and thought­
provoking examination of the intradynamic
development and interpersonal relationships of
women. Caplan's primary objective is to ex­
plore some of the psychological and social fac­
tors that have created barriers between
women. It certainly does not require much
reading between the lines to understand the
significance of these factors to women's in­
terpersonal relationships with men and the dif­
ficulties created for women in society at large.
This is one of the first works that has dealt with
the positive and negative aspects of female­
female relationships. Hopefully, Caplan's
work will stimulate the debate, research, and
interest by women that she intends.

The background for her analysis is provided
in Part 1. Freudian theories are briefly
reviewed in terms of the mother-daughter rela­
tionship. The significance of these theories for
the view that women are inferior is discussed
concurrently with the reasons why women­
women relationships have been neglected. All
of this is in the introductory chapter. The
second chapter of Part 1 is devoted to four big
myths about women: 1. Males are better than
females; 2. Females are naturally constrained
and orderly; 3. Females have unmeetable
needs for love and assurance; 4. Females are
naturally, endlessly nurturant. These are the
myths we must carry on our shoulders. Un­
doubtedly Caplan could have added other
myths as well; however, these are important to
her further analysis based on the role of nur­
turance in women's lives.

Caplan argues that the difficulties developed
between women is constructed around the life­
span development of the mother-daughter rela­
tionship. The cornerstone of her thesis is based
on the psychological impact for women of
being nurtured, losing the mother's nur­
turance, and then being expected to fulfill the
primary role as nurturer for her mother and
later for males. The development of the con­
flict over nurturance is begun in early infancy.
The female infant's mother is part of a cyclic
pattern. The presence of her daughter brings
back memories of the earlier neglect that she
herself received. The mother bears a feeling of
anger and loss. Her feelings influence her
relationship with her daughter and the
daughter comes to feel a lack of nurturance,
loss and anger. The cycle thus comes full cir­
cle.

The research literature that Caplan uses for
support of her argument is minimal. Indeed,
the literature on sex differences in neonatal eye
contact (Hittleman & Dickes, 1979) shows that
female neonates engage in more eye contact
with the mother than do males. Eye contact is a
very pleasurable and fascinating source of con­
tact for mother and child. Although limited,
there is a literature on infant sex differences
that could be used to argue for or against her
thesis. For example, female newborns' oral
sensitivity is greater than males. Korner (1978)
states that girls are both more frequent and