

view toward showing that even in such trials, there is much to be gained technically from a full Freudian reflection on the case. He reports a number of technical problems, one of which is that

the patient was unable, or I should say unwilling, to start the sessions by speaking first. Although I will discuss this important phenomenon later, suffice it to say now that for the first four years of treatment I started each session. (p. 82)

Elizabeth Lloyd Mayer, also a remarkable clinician informed by Freudian theory, presents her analytic work with a woman whom Mayer herself might have referred to a feminist educative approach or a mothers' support group, but decided to treat by psychoanalysis. The point is that these chapters, which are immensely instructive in their own right (although they will be subject to contending evaluations in the course of things), are there for the reader to see firsthand. Thus, whatever arguments ensue, the reader entertains them up close.

This is the seventh monograph from a series of American Psychoanalytic Association workshops set up to review and clarify Freudian theory in an intelligent and straightforward manner. In this monograph, the emphasis is on the theory of conflict and its implications for analytic technique. There is no better review of this subject in the literature than Boesky's workshop paper "Conflict, Compromise Formation, and Structural Theory," which is one of the opening chapters. Charles Brenner, a senior analyst much devoted to such matters, provides one of the discussions of the case material presented in this workshop. This is followed by several alternative orientations, an object-relations Bionian view by Frederick Vaquer and an ample review of the self psychological perspective by Paul Ornstein. These representations are then, in turn, responded to cogently by the various Freudians. The reader, by this point, is deeply caught up in the contending issues and, if not drawn away from any previously held positions, the reexamination prompted by this volume will reduce the complacency that gathers around all cherished beliefs. This is a crucial opportunity in the development of psychoanalytic thought.

Although this book speaks directly and urgently to psychoanalytically minded readers, it is also accessible to a wider range of readers, not only because the text consists of what was originally the spoken word, but also because the pre-

vailing problem of the relation between theory and practice in psychoanalysis is a problem for many other fields. It is always good to witness a group of capable colleagues facing their differences in good faith and collaboratively, which is

what this volume enables one to do. Its editor, Scott Dowling, deserves a large measure of gratitude for orchestrating this publication without any parochial heavy-handedness. ■

## Minority Influence: Integration of Comparison and Validation Processes

Gabriel Mugny and Juan A. Pérez

Vivian Waltz Lamongie (Trans.)

*The Social Psychology of*

*Minority Influence*

Cambridge, England: Cambridge

University Press, 1991. 190 pp.

ISBN 0-521-39054-0 (United States);

2-7351-0395-1 (France). \$64.50

*Review by*

Sara M. Baker and Richard E. Petty

*Gabriel Mugny, professor of social psychology at the University of Geneva (Switzerland), is author of The Power of Minorities. ■ Juan A. Pérez is professor of social psychology at the University of Valencia (Spain). ■ Sara M. Baker, assistant professor of psychology at the University of Oklahoma (Norman), is coauthor, with R. E. Petty and F. Gleicher, of the chapter "Multiple Roles for Affect in Persuasion" in J. Forgas (Ed.) Emotion and Social Judgments. ■ Richard E. Petty, professor of psychology at Ohio State University (Columbus), is past editor of the Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin and coauthor, with J. T. Cacioppo, of Communication and Persuasion: Central and Peripheral Routes to Attitude Change.*

Gabriel Mugny and Juan A. Pérez are important contributors to the literature on minority influence. In this volume, they review their numerous experiments on the topic and propose a new and integrative theory. The theory descends from the prevailing European perspective on minority influence originated by Serge Moscovici (1980) and his colleagues but goes considerably beyond it. Mugny and Pérez incorporate psychological processes from intergroup theories of social identity and categorization along with concepts from current theories of social influence in an attempt to provide a more complete explanation of the sociocognitive process underlying social change due to minority influence.

A critical distinction in their work is between direct and indirect influence. Direct influence refers to adoption of or movement toward the specific position advocated by the source. Indirect influence refers to a change in position on an issue that the source did not explicitly mention but that is nevertheless linked to the original advocacy by some orga-

nizing principle. For example, many of their studies rely on the notion that pro-abortion and pro-contraception positions are linked by the principle of tolerance and that a minority group, although advocating a change in abortion laws, can produce a change in contraception attitudes. Mugny and Pérez prefer the direct and indirect distinction to others that have been proposed (e.g., public-majority change vs. private-minority change, immediate-majority change vs. delayed-minority change, etc.) because the latter distinctions still involve changes that are tied to the explicit recommendations of the source. In contrast, because the source does not take a stand on the indirectly linked issue, change on this topic cannot be due to mere imitation or conformity processes but rather implies that some inferential cognitive activity has taken place.

The authors' theory and the processes it entails are unveiled gradually as the chapters in the book unfold. They begin with basic social comparison processes. In Moscovici's theory, social comparison

processes were tied most strongly to majority influence. Mugny and Pérez take a more global perspective. That is, social comparison processes are viewed as basic to understanding and defining one's position in the social universe and are applied to both majority and minority sources. It is here that they nicely integrate useful concepts from the intergroup theories of social categorization and social identity. Through social comparison processes, the perceived relationship between the target and the source of influence is established. If the source is viewed positively, identification with the source is possible and direct influence on the targets' attitudes may be witnessed. If the source is viewed negatively, however, an identification conflict results, and although direct influence is unlikely, there is a possibility for indirect attitude change.

If the source conflict is not too intense an (in)validation process ensues in which the target attempts actively to resist the source. However, the process of attempted refutation can involve a careful consideration of the issue conveyed by the minority and can eventually yield an understanding of the organizing principle underlying the minority's perspective. Importantly, this cognitively effortful process does not necessarily mean careful thought about the specific content of the minority message. A change in the targets' attitudes is possible nonetheless if there is a realization that the minority offers a new (although not necessarily acceptable) point of view. Any influence due to this process is manifest as indirect change as a result of the extracted organizing principle being applied to issues that are not mentioned by the source. That is, targets do not adopt the content advocated by the source per se but may adopt the underlying principle (e.g., tolerance) on which the content is based.

Although Mugny and Pérez focus mostly on the (in)validation process and indirect influence instigated by minority sources, they take a significant departure from the prevailing European perspective on minority and majority influence that has attributed separate processes to majority and minority sources. Consistent with the emerging idea that variables can induce change by serving in multiple roles in different situations (e.g., Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), Mugny and Pérez note that "validation and comparison processes are no longer to be considered as typical, one of minorities, the other of majorities. Both can be at work in majority and minority influence" (p. 73). Of

course, if either majorities or minorities can produce comparison and validation processes, it is essential that the determinants of these processes be specified. In the remainder of the book, the authors build on their theory by providing an explanation of how these processes can work together or can be dissociated and how other variables (e.g., flexibility or rigidity of the source and ingroup and outgroup source status) can moderate the effects observed. Their analysis is comprehensive and typically cogent. The authors might only be faulted for perhaps being overly flexible at times in accounting (post hoc) for any pattern of influence observed.

Although rather dense reading in places, a problem likely due in part to the nature of translations, *The Social Psychology of Minority Influence* makes several noteworthy contributions. In addition to presenting a number of intriguing ideas, as noted above, and making a meaningful linkage between the literatures on social cognition (person perception) and social influence (persuasion), a nontrivial contribution of this book is that an extensive amount of theoretical and

experimental work that was previously published in non-English language journals is now accessible to a larger cadre of social scientists. Because some of the experiments will be unfamiliar to many investigators, however, it is unfortunate that at times insufficient detail is provided (e.g., significance tests) to allow a detailed analysis of the studies. On the other hand, the authors have included a useful Appendix that describes the specific procedures they use to test their theory.

Issues surrounding minority influence are experiencing a resurgence of interest, and this book provides a very timely exposure to the important research and ideas stemming from Mugny, Pérez, and their colleagues over the past 15 years.

#### References

- Moscovici, S. (1980). Toward a theory of conversion behavior. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 13, pp. 209-239). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1986). The Elaboration Likelihood Model of persuasion. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 19, pp. 123-205). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

## The Embodied Self

Thomas F. Cash and Thomas Pruzinsky (Eds.)

*Body Images: Development, Deviance, and Change*

New York: Guilford Press, 1990.

361 pp. ISBN 0-89862-438-X. \$39.95

Review by

C. Peter Herman

*Thomas F. Cash, professor of psychology at Old Dominion University (Norfolk, Virginia), serves on the editorial boards of the Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology and the Journal of Applied Social Psychology and is author of the audiotape series Body-Image Therapy: A Program for Self-Directed Change. Cash maintains a private psychotherapy practice in Norfolk. ■ Thomas Pruzinsky, assistant professor of psychology at Quinnipiac College (Hamden, Connecticut), is coauthor, with J. Persing, of the chapter "Psychological Perspectives on Esthetic Applications of Reconstructive Surgery Techniques" in D. K. Ousterhout (Ed.) Esthetic Contouring of the Craniofacial Skeleton. ■ C. Peter Herman, professor of psychology at the University of Toronto (Ontario, Canada), is former editor of the Journal of Personality and former advisory editor of Contemporary Psychology. Herman is coauthor, with J. Polivy and P. Pliner, of the chapter "Perception and Evaluation of Body Image: The Meaning of Body Shape and Size" in J. M. Olson and M. P. Zanna (Eds.) Self-Inference Processes: Proceedings of the Sixth Ontario Symposium and coeditor, with M. P. Zanna and E. T. Higgins, of Appearance, Stigma, and Social Behavior: Proceedings of the Third Ontario Symposium.*

The single most prevalent definition of body image in the research literature was provided by Paul Schilder (1950): "The picture of our own body

which we form in our mind, that is to say, the way our body appears to ourselves" (p. 11). This definition, although inelegant, is simple enough. Indeed, it is much