This is an interesting and valuable book which examines care and, therefore, children to the realm of "employee benefits" similar to sports facilities or subsidized meals? What are the sociological implications of this analysis? Employer-supported child care be seen as relegating child involvement in child care primarily for reasons of self-interest (e.g., to attract staff in short supply, to decrease staff turnover and absenteeism, and to promote staff morale). Can employer-supported child care be seen as a Band-Aid solution which does very little to address the overall need for child care, and consider it a diversion from the main issue. Only about three percent of all child care falls into this category at present in either country. It can be seen as a sign of "surface activity" rather than a sign of a realignment of the "subterranean sociological plates." These issues certainly would appear to fall within a sociological analysis of the topic.

From a different perspective, the book does not deal with the issue from the perspective of the children involved. Auerbach quite legitimately claims that the issue of child care "as relationship" and the effects of child care on children is outside the realm of the book. However, as she asserts, child care is a societal issue, not just a parental or employers' issue, and children, as persons, must come into the argument somewhere. The evidence reported in the survey indicates that employers become involved in child care primarily for reasons of self-interest (e.g., to attract staff in short supply, to decrease staff turnover and absenteeism, and to promote staff morale). Can employer-supported child care be seen as a potential additional factor keeping women in traditional low-paying jobs. Those who support social policies for comprehensive and accessible child care comparable to education and (in Canada at least) health care see it, at best, as a Band-Aid solution which does very little to address the overall need for child care, and consider it a diversion from the main issue. Only about three percent of all child care falls into this category at present in either country. It can be seen as a sign of "surface activity" rather than a sign of a realignment of the "subterranean sociological plates." These issues certainly would appear to fall within a sociological analysis of the topic.

The conclusion begs a number of questions about power and dependence relationships involved in gender and employment, child care as role and institution, and the role of government in family policy which are not dealt with here. Not everyone sees employer-supported child care as a positive development. Canadian evidence indicates that women prefer neighbourhood-based care (Status of Women, 1985). The fact that the majority of employer-supported facilities are found in traditional places of women's employment, for example, health care facilities and insurance and banking services, can be seen as a potential additional factor keeping women in traditional low-paying jobs. Those who support social policies for comprehensive and accessible child care comparable to education and (in Canada at least) health care see it, at best, as a Band-Aid solution which does very little to address the overall need for child care, and consider it a diversion from the main issue. Only about three percent of all child care falls into this category at present in either country. It can be seen as a sign of "surface activity" rather than a sign of a realignment of the "subterranean sociological plates." These issues certainly would appear to fall within a sociological analysis of the topic.

This is a "why you should" and "how to" handbook for employers. It is not an academic book. It is a book written to persuade employers that it is in their best interest to support child care, and to lay out for them the ways in which they can do this. It first sets the scene with a brief description of the child care problems of working women (although there are six lines under the topic "Not Just a Women's Issue")! Next, evidence mainly from government statistics, newspapers and journal articles together with vignettes of the experiences of individual organizations is presented to support the central argument that employer-supported child care can increase recruitment and productivity, decrease turnover, absenteeism and health costs and enhance employee morale and corporate image.

In chapters three and four, a number of options for employer child care support are examined with sections on flexible hours and leaves, financial assistance to employees, support for existing community programs, referral services, family day care and direct work place child care facilities. This provides a comprehensive picture of the different ways employees can and have become involved in child care and their motives for doing so. It is also a useful reminder, not just to employers, that the
solutions to the issue of child care are neither simple, nor unifaceted.

The next chapter, entitled "Getting the Job Done," takes the employer, or person who wishes to advise the employer, through each stage in the process of implementing a service. At each step, the author has provided sample worksheets (126 in all) for gathering relevant information, and planning and implementing a program. It is probably inevitable that anyone who has a certain depth of knowledge in any area will find unsatisfactory the accounts of her area of specialization written for "lay" persons. Physicians, no doubt, feel this way about popular medical books, as would plumbers about manuals on "how to rebuild your bathroom and increase the value of your property."

Adolf does suggest that employers hire or use a consultant on child care and, throughout, stresses the need for good quality care. However, the material on what children need and what constitutes quality for them is, at times, oversimplistic and incorrect, which is inevitable given that the issues are not at all simple. There are eight lines, for example, on how children learn, and fifteen on health and safety. On the question of infant care, the author quotes an article in Working Mother magazine, which asserts, "Contrary to what many people think, research shows that infants can do as well in group settings as with one caregiver" (p. 148). A recent review of research on infant day care (Clarke-Stewart, 1989) was much more cautious, concluding that we still have much to learn about the effects of day care on infants and a number of researchers have voiced quite strong concerns on the topic.

In its own terms, the book targets its audience well, provides the kind of information most likely to encourage employers to support child care, and gives them information on the options. Considered from a broader perspective on child care, the book raises the same questions as the Auerbach book reviewed above. First, is it something we should unreservedly be promoting? And second, what are the implications of encouraging increased employer support for child care for the question of child care as a whole, for relationships between gender and employment and power and dependency, and for the place of children in society?

From this perspective on child care, children seem to be relegated to the position of an adjunct employment or an employee benefit. Children and their needs are not explicitly central to the argument. This stands out most clearly in the section on quality child care, where care is defined, in this order, as care that makes the difference between parents whose minds are not on the job because they are worried about their children, and parents who feel at ease about their children and are able to devote their full attention to their work; care that is more likely to meet the standard of insurers, thus reducing liability; and, care that meets the basic developmental needs of children. Of course, these are not mutually exclusive benefits but the order says something about priorities. The question of for-profit versus public non-profit child care is extremely contentious in Canada at present. Employer-supported child care raises a different question: Should child care be operated as a component of business or as an employee benefit? Should the provision of child care be in the hands of those who are in it for a "good return on investment?"

Mary E. Lyon  
Mount Saint Vincent University


This book contains seventeen articles divided into four sections entitled "traditional visions of femininity reasserted," "new visions of femininity," "today's woman," and "issues in the therapeutic relationship." It is claimed on the cover of the book that these essays, primarily by women analysts, "articulate a strong challenge to the 'deficiency model' of female identity that has long dominated psychoanalytic theory, and they offer constructive alternatives to the preconceptions of the past."

I am reviewing this book from the position of a teacher of women's studies and psychology of women courses, who has a wide range of interests in topics which can be characterized as falling within the broad area of the "psychology of women." I am not a therapist or an analyst. Although the articles may be seen as provocative and ground-breaking by those steeped in the analytic tradition, I suspect that most interested non-analysts will find that some of the essays reflect views informed by current psychological and/or feminist scholarship, while others reflect more traditional views.

The titles of the articles do indicate that a number of topics of importance to women (i.e., mother-daughter relationships, reproductive motivations, marriage and divorce, the empty nest, aging, women and work, to name a few) are discussed in the volume. The reader interested in