

APSR  
March 1980, pp. 122-123

**Body Politics: Power, Sex, and Nonverbal Communication.** By Nancy M. Henley. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977. Pp. ix + 214. \$9.95, cloth; \$3.95, paper.)

For Nancy Henley, politics is everywhere. It manifests itself in the day-to-day interactions around us in the form of nonverbal (and also verbal) means of expressing status and power, submission and dominance, authority and control. Henley, a social psychologist, has written an often fascinating, sometimes irritatingly polemic, and always informative review (and in many cases a reinterpretation) of a vast body of recent literature on social interaction, body language, and environmental psychology. Her central theme is that "nonverbal behavior is a major avenue for social control on a large scale, and interpersonal dominance on a smaller scale" (p. 179).

While many students of nonverbal behavior focus on its use as a means of expressing emotion or intimacy, Henley is concerned with the nonverbal manipulation of power relationships, especially (though far from exclusively) those between women and men. In chapters dealing with territoriality and personal space, environment, control over access and time, gesture and demeanor, touching behavior, eye contact, and facial expression, Henley provides a number of intriguing hypotheses about the ways in which nonverbal behavior is asymmetric between superior and subordinate and can be used to express acceptance of or challenge to the status quo. Many of the points she makes are amusingly and anecdotally illustrated in addition to being supported by studies from the experimental research literature.

About territoriality and personal space, for example, we learn that "dominant animals control greater territory; that they are freer to move in other animals' or common territory; that they are accorded greater personal (bodily) space; and that subordinates yield space to dominants when approached or in passing" (p. 29). Indeed, high-status people even take up more space with their signatures. "The higher your place on the academic ladder from undergraduate to professor, one study found, the bigger your signature is likely to be" (p. 31). More generally, individuals in subordinate roles (of whom children may be the paradigmatic type) lack control over their own time, the space about them, or even their own bodies. Each area is subject to invasion or control by superiors with little or no warning and little or no redress.

In the chapter on the politics of touch, Henley devotes some space to rebutting the widely held view that in our culture touching is either a means of conveying friendship or support and comfort or has a function latently sexual in intent. She reminds us that touching has a clear power dimension, and that at least as typical a picture is that of a superior status person touching (or patting, or holding) the inferior status person, or the lower status individual supplicating for the privilege of being allowed to touch the superior's flesh or accoutrements (e.g., kissing the Cardinal's ring). "Rights of possession of another person are indicated, much as territorial rights are, by putting an arm around the other's waist, holding the other's hand, or otherwise touching the other's body or property" (p. 127).

In her discussion of demeanor and gesture, Henley reviews studies which show that subordinates are more likely to look down to avoid the challenge of direct eye contact with superiors; that those of lower status are less likely to stand erect (i.e., "to walk tall"), and also less likely to make expansive gestures redolent of power (e.g., arms akimbo). Similarly, subordinates are less likely to maintain a relaxed posture and demeanor in the presence of superiors than vice versa. I found particularly interesting her discussion of the impact of nonverbal behavior which is regarded as "unnatural" or inappropriate (e.g., because these behaviors contradict other factors governing the status quo such as gender). Henley points out that use of nonverbal symbols of power by women (and other powerless people) may be ignored or punished or (in the case of women) reinterpreted as sexual advance rather than as assertion of dominance.

In her discussion of language and social interaction, Henley makes a number of interesting points about requisite forms of address in asymmetric relationships, the largely culturally determined nature of differences between men's and women's speech patterns and even speech timbre, and the use of jokes as a means of supporting the social order (e.g., in one study of laughter among colleagues at mental hospital staff meetings, the target was never higher in the hierarchy than the person making the crack and usually lower [p. 71]). I found especially intriguing her discussion of the use of interruptions as an indicator of status (e.g., in one study of faculty department meetings, "women were interrupted much more [proportionally] than men and within sex interruption patterns followed a hierarchy of status within the department" [p. 69]).

While some political scientists would have the principal focus of the discipline be on the "art or science of government," others, like Harold Lasswell, have argued for a broad definition of politics as the manifestation of power or authority relationships. With this definition in mind and Henley's review of the existing literature in hand, political scientists might be encouraged to investigate the politics of day-to-day life (e.g., office politics or the politics of the family). At a minimum, political scientists should be encouraged to consider the ways in which we can learn about politics at all levels by observing interpersonal behavior at both the verbal and the nonverbal level.

BERNARD GROFMAN

University of California, Irvine