
Book Reviews

Sex: Male/Gender: Masculine, Readings In Male Sexuality. *Edited by John W. Petras.* Port Washington, New York, Alfred Publishing Co., 1975, 265 pp. \$5.95.

Articles and books about the male sex role have recently begun to appear in increasing number, fulfilling a definite need of many sex-role courses for suitable material on males, and more significantly, showing that the masculine "half of the human experience" is equally fertile ground for the kind of sex-role analysis that feminist scholars have used to illuminate the experience of women. What began as a protest against women's oppression is rapidly becoming the most significant new route to understanding human behavior to emerge in social science in many years. Stimulated by the women's movement and the wave of research on women which followed it, empirical studies of male role dynamics are now under way in many places, and students are asking basic questions about "masculinity" which were unheard a few years ago.

Unfortunately this recent collection of readings on male sexuality and the male role may disappoint some potential users. The origin of the book is not indicated in the introduction, but it seems to have been intended primarily for a course in human or male sexuality. More than two-thirds of the selections deal however with more general issues of sex differences, roles, and the current men's movement, so it seems appropriate to evaluate its general usefulness as a source of readings for courses in women's or men's studies.

A reader which undertakes to cover a number of issues must necessarily touch lightly on each point, but it does not seem too much to ask that such a collection have a logical and coherent organization which places the selections in a helpful sequence and aids the reader in integrating them. While many of the articles in this book will be of value and interest to students, its organization is both elusive and distracting. The selections are grouped according to four "perspectives on masculinity" (p. 4), none of which is entirely explained either by its title or in the brief chapter introductions. In every section, moreover, there are articles which seem out of place. This distracting problem of organization is the major drawback of what is otherwise a useful addition to the sex-role literature.

Part One is titled "The Individualistic Perspective," a term meant to encompass both biological determinants and other unspecified approaches which

deal with the “nature” of men and women. The eight selections in this section seem to be of two very different types. On the one hand are four somewhat amusing excerpts from nineteenth-century moralists (the evils of masturbation, the need for self-control, etc.), plus a recent epistle by a prison warden who maintains that uncontrolled sex urges are the cause of virtually every crime, from automobile theft to arson. The three more substantial articles in this section are each problematic for different reasons. A short excerpt on hormones and chromosomes from *Sex and Identity* by Rosenberg and Sutton-Smith (1972) is meant to provide the basic case for biological determinism. But this excerpt is far from the best in that generally competent book, and contains both irrelevant background jargon and some factual errors (e.g., that male infants are more active; cf. Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). This brief excerpt also tends to misrepresent the conclusion of its authors by omitting their more compelling argument for the sexual “neutrality” of biology, based on the extensive research by Money, Hampson, and Hampson.

A rambling selection from *Men In Groups*, by Lionel Tiger, is described in the introduction (p. 7) as a currently popular example of the individualistic perspective. In the selection itself, however, Tiger’s emphasis is almost entirely on the contention that male violence occurs when men gather in groups; i.e., the “bloodletting, cruelty, sadism, and cavalier disregard for the suffering of others” which groups of men display “result not from something private as instinctive cruelty . . . but as a direct consequence of a process of male bonding which is deeply rooted to the *social* nature of human beings” (his emphasis, p. 35). Students will presumably wonder why this viewpoint was labeled “individualistic,” and so do I.

The final article in this section is Money and Ehrhardt’s well-known case study of a sex-reassigned male infant. The excerpt is descriptive and takes no stand on the broader questions of gender determination, but seems by implication to primarily support the anti-biological position. On balance, the eight articles in this section lead the reader toward no particular conclusion, not even to a real awareness of the critical issues in what is one of the more interesting current debates in psychology.

Part Two is titled “The Sociocultural Perspective”; its only serious drawback is that none of the five articles chosen have any obvious reason to be in this section rather than one of the others. The first two articles are “sexual remembrances” by Black celebrities. “Being A Boy” by Julius Lester has been widely reprinted and is excellent. The second piece, by Bill Cosby, is “contemporary” to the point of tastelessness and should have been allowed to remain in *Playboy*, where it originally appeared. The remaining three selections are basically descriptive sociological accounts of male behavior — at work, at home, and in college — by Professors Komarovsky, Shostak, and Bartolome. All three are competent and very much worth reading. None are more explicitly “sociocultural” than other selections in this book or articles in social science generally.

Part Three is titled "Masculinity/Femininity," a phrase which has nothing very obvious to do with the five articles that follow. These range from a lengthy discussion of sex-role socialization in one nursery school (the author could not gather much direct evidence of sex-role encouragement) to a survey of marriage manuals since 1830 (females are now described as more sexual). There is a Balswick article on male inexpressiveness, a Korda article on male chauvinism, and one other short selection which will be mentioned later.

Part Four, "Male Liberation and The New Masculinity," includes an excerpt on fatherhood from Brenton's 1966 book, a critique of male power in the family by Polatnick, and a student survey of attitudes on the Oberlin campus, which contains some interesting data about current views of gayness. The three remaining selections are from the men's movement literature. On the whole these will last articles will impress the reader as idealistic, highly personal, and extremely sincere. They are also rather dry, repetitious, and badly written.

To raise the issue of writing style may seem petty or even irrelevant to some readers. In a book assembled for use by undergraduates, however, the capacity to communicate must be a basic criterion. Consider this sample of language from Petras's introduction: "With the developing concern for expressiveness, affective responses are now characterized as appropriate for members of both sexes, and the traditionally learned gender distinctiveness with respect to emotionality vs. non-expressiveness is rapidly changing" (p. 4). What Petras seems to mean is that men are starting to let their emotions show a little more. Maybe so. If that's true, I hope we can soon start letting them show a little more clearly in the prose we write for students and for each other.

*Robert Brannon
Brooklyn College
City University of New York*

Women and Men: Roles, Attitudes and Power Relationships. *Edited by Eleanor L. Zuckerman.* New York, The Radcliffe Club of New York, Inc., 1975, 172 pp. \$6.00.

In the past few years many symposia have been organized which have provided lively forums for a discussion of sex roles, achievement, and other topics related to female identity. A number of publications have resulted from this kind of activity; the symposium-to-book format has often made possible the presentation of ideas just developing at the frontiers of knowledge. Although this process has great potential for hastening the spread of timely research and analyses, it also contains built-in drawbacks. Editors have sometimes been in the unenviable

position of having to include all of the papers or talks presented, which may lead to variability in the quality of the book's entries and create problems of cohesion and organization as well, since some papers fail to fit the themes of the symposium. In addition, some editors have been chary of editing the remarks of well-known individuals and thus have let their words appear as spoken, rather than organizing and condensing them for written communication.

Given both the advantages and pitfalls of conversion, the editor of *Women and Men: Roles, Attitudes and Power Relationships* has been very brave indeed, basing the book not on one, but on three, symposia! These took place during the fall of 1972 and winters of 1974 and 1975, respectively, and were chaired and organized by Zuckerman under the auspices of the Radcliffe Club. All of the problems endemic to this genre are evident in this otherwise fine and important book. It suffers from lack of a unifying theme, from inclusion of papers of differing quality, and from inadequate editing of several papers. The book's biggest weakness, however, is in the proofreading, which is abysmal.

The above notwithstanding, the majority of the entries range from very good to excellent to outstanding and have been presented by people who have distinguished themselves as astute observers of women's (and men's) roles. These include, among others, Pauline Bart, Jessie Bernard, Florence Denmark, Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, Elizabeth Holtzman, Matina Horner, Joseph Pleck, Doris Sassower, Barbara Seaman, Sheila Tobias, and Theodora Wells. From this list of Who's Who in Women's Studies it can be seen that the range of topics covered is quite broad. This catholicism has made organization of the final work difficult, although Zuckerman – wisely retaining the three distinct parts of the original symposia – makes a valiant and fairly successful attempt in her commentaries to forge links between the diverse parts. In its present form, the parts are better than the whole, as they provide some of the most stimulating dialogues (and to a lesser extent, research) of this decade. The book's usefulness is enhanced by including men's view of women and how this affects female socialization and identity formation. The title is slightly misleading, since the focus is primarily on women.

The first section centers on the topic of women's roles in a changing society and barriers to female achievement. The second focuses primarily on men's fears and attitudes toward women. The final section is concerned with the problems women encounter as they try to fulfill themselves in a paternalistic society, whether in the home, in business, or while engaging in a career.

The field of sex roles has been developing so rapidly that some of the ideas presented in Parts I and II have already been integrated into social science literature. Nevertheless, the book contains competent summaries of research and theory which can be useful for review purposes. These include Horner's widely known work on fear of success; Denmark's thorough presentation of research on culturally induced sex differences; Ehrhardt's pioneering studies (with Money and others)

on the influence of prenatal hormones on the behavior of human females; and Epstein's pithy comments on social, psychological, and political forces that constrict women's aspirations and achievements.

The remainder of the book contains a number of topical essays and/or reports on research in progress. Bart, in her usual engaging style, discusses the planned obsolescence of middle-aged women. She is a master (mistress?) at developing her thesis through witty presentation of research studies, theoretical writings, anecdotes, and sociological analyses. Her central point can be summed up in the following quote: "Middle age is when the image of the future catches up with reality and many women are confronted with their nothingness" (p. 54). In another article, Tobias, using the "social structural" model of research and intervention that Kanter has described so well in *Signs* (Spring 1976), shifts attention away from blaming the victim (i.e., women don't achieve because of internal conflicts) to the impact that external structures (the college curriculum) have on female self-esteem. It is her contention that colleges, especially those that attract the brightest women, have a latent curriculum that fosters the belief that intellectual commitment and intellectual arrogance are only valid for men. Tobias points out that many highly intelligent females begin college with confidence in their intellectual potential but leave at the end of four years with little faith in their abilities. Using the teaching of D. H. Lawrence as an example, she points out that "women are not able to get at and use the truth of what they are feeling about Lawrence, because that feeling is not acknowledged as a *real* one by the male approach" (p. 15). Her arguments, though extremely compelling, await empirical documentation, which, hopefully future doctoral dissertations may provide.

Bernard, shifting to another important topic, beautifully articulates the myths behind the belief that housewives "really have it made," and discusses how devastating these myths can be to talented women who seek achievement outside the home. On the other hand, the three psychiatrically trained contributors add a strange note to a book which is trying to dispel myths and to bring forth new information about women. Esther Manacker and, even more so, Natalie Shainess succeed more admirably than Wolfgang Lederer in avoiding some of the worst flotsam that swirls around so much psychoanalytic writing about females. Shainess, in a discussion of power relations in the family, continues to hold the view that women are essentially masochistic, although she blames culture rather than biology. As many neo-Freudians do, she fails to see that some women only have the opportunity to choose between bad alternatives and that wanting the best among the worst should be called oppression, not masochism. However, in her final paragraph Shainess eloquently describes the "can't win" situation most girls are placed in as they grow up in a sexist society.

Lederer's presentation is offensively sexist. He claims, in a rather elaborate argument, that man is oppressed, since he must work night and day trying to

please his woman, providing the home "in which she rules," putting ornaments upon her, and filling her womb, while she continually goads him to do even more. Lederer's article is mostly a series of derogatory and unquestioned statements about women. Happily, it is presented immediately after an outstanding essay in which Zuckerman analyzes male misogyny and its effects upon women's self-assertion and self-image. She gives the example of a female executive and a male representative from a large corporation. Just after the woman had won him over to her viewpoint in a negotiating session, the male asked, "Did it ever occur to you that underneath that tough exterior there lies the heart of a little girl?" She immediately shot back, "Did it ever occur to you that under this tough exterior lies the heart of a business woman?" (p. 61). It is the rare woman who can maintain confidence and courage in the face of incessant put-downs.

Another fine paper in this section, with an invaluable list of references at the end, is Pleck's. In a beautifully constructed exposition of models for research and change, he pulls together several strands of research on male attitudes toward women. One sees traditional men as authoritarian; the other views traditional men as lacking in self-esteem. Pleck feels it is important, in doing research on how to change male attitudes, to adopt the viewpoint "that men hold truly contradictory values and wishes about women, valuing both equality and superiority, both change and the status quo" (p. 103). Pleck's view is in marked contrast to psychoanalytic theory which views authoritarianism in males as psychically determined by such things as early mother-son relationships.

Seaman's article, following Pleck's, provides a fascinating behind-the-scenes report of the efforts of mental health and medical practitioners to "turn back the clock" on women's liberation of their bodies. She points out that most major research projects on sexuality and female biology are sexist, irrelevant, and retrogressive.

The articles in the final section (based on the 1975 symposium) are well executed and contain new and interesting material. One of the most exciting is Gould's, which describes a series of workshops, questionnaires, and interviews still in progress designed to elicit male (and female) reactions to women in positions of authority. In a similar way to Pleck, he focuses on the anxiety men have "when they have to cope with, work with, and learn to deal with women who are in positions of power and authority." Many of Gould's findings are surprising and far-reaching, which makes all the more regrettable his omission of references to either his own or other people's work.

Near the book's end, Wells, who owns her own firm devoted to organizational, group, and individual change, discusses in an optimistic and almost inspirational way strategies women can employ to get beyond women-as-victim psychology to self-enhancement and self-validation. Wells is a strong advocate of women forming mutual support systems wherever they work, or learning

how to assess realistically the risks connected with certain kinds of actions (women err in the direction of risking too little) and of having an abiding faith in their own self-definitions rather than letting others define them.

Despite the limitations mentioned in the beginning, *Women and Men: Roles, Attitudes and Power Relationships* contains much that is highly original, provocative, and useful. It would serve as an excellent supplemental text for courses on the psychology of women, sociology of sex roles, women in business, and men and masculinity. However, much of its contents await empirical verification through research and systematic observation. It has raised many issues and, hopefully, will lead to an expansion of the frontiers of knowledge about women where much work still needs to be done.

Joyce J. Walstedt
University of Delaware

Woman's Work: The Housewife, Past and Present. Ann Oakley. New York, Pantheon Books, 1974, 275 pp. \$8.95.

The Sociology of Housework. Ann Oakley. New York, Pantheon Books, 1974, 242 pp. \$10.00.

Oakley and other feminists have been highly critical of previous research on the housewife role because they have feared that the very description of women in often complex role clusters including that of housewife would contribute to continued self- or other-imposed limitation of women to domesticity. Ann Oakley has now written two books on this subject, works that combine both a historically based analysis and a definitely negative stand concerning the role of housewife.

Except for the interjection of the politically motivated conclusions, I found her *Woman's Work* to be an excellent book, carefully documenting the historical process by which British women lost social and civil rights of participation in a variety of roles and activities with a variety of people since the seventeenth century, mainly with the introduction of the factory system. She also brings forth anthropological data to document an absence of the supposedly "natural, universal and necessary" division of labor which restricts the married woman to the home as the housewife and the main or even the only caretaker and rearer of the children. She rightfully points to ethnology, anthropology, and even sociology (note the *even* and guess my discipline) as perpetrators of many myths as to what woman's place has been, is, or should be. Prior to the introduction of industrialization, women had been involved in societal life at

two levels. Many were active in a broad range of occupations, going through apprenticeship training, belonging to guilds and practicing many professions. They were also involved in a family work group with a division of labor varying from society to society, but never restricted to the home. Many societal and ideological changes beginning in the eighteenth century moved economic production, political power, sociability, education – in fact, most of societal life – out of the home and its surrounding territory. At first all family members who had previously worked as a team in the home and on the land followed the productive activities into the factory. However, from the 1840s on until recent years, there developed a steady decline in the employment of married women and children outside the home and a push toward restricting women to “natural” housewifery. Simultaneously, status among Western European and American people became increasingly ascribed on the basis of the size of the pay check, making economic dependents of the wife at home and the children in school. “The transformation of the housewife’s role from manufacture to service had begun before the end of the [nineteenth] century” (p. 55), and the masculinization of all occupations outside of the home, except for the “domestic” ones such as nursing, teaching, and private household service, further restricted the life space of women.

Not only had the behavior of women begun to change with pressure from the outside, but the ideology defining them was modified with an increase in the importance of gender roles. “A ‘gender role’ is a role assigned on the basis of biological sex which defines specific personality traits and behavioral responses to a person of that sex” (p. 82). In other words, gender-role assumptions provided the justification for the restrictions of the rights of women, much as racism provided a “rational” out from the “American dilemma” (Myrdal) facing Whites who are determined to call their society democratic while they deprive Blacks of their rights.

I strongly agree with Oakley’s conclusions in *Woman’s Work* that we need to break the equation “woman = housewife,” that many households do not need anyone in the role of housewife, and that dramatic changes must be made in the ways our families and households are organized. But I cannot go the next step and demand that all women must get out of their homes at all stages of their life course. The final chapter of *Woman’s Work* contains three political statements which “point the way to the liberation of housewives: The housewife role must be abolished; The family must be abolished; Gender roles must be abolished” (p. 222). There is nothing inherently bad or oppressive about being a housewife; the oppression comes from not having alternatives, from not having the resources to perform the role creatively, from a lack of flexibility in the life course, from being constantly put down by both sides of all kinds of fences for it. Although Oakley concludes in *The Sociology of Housework* that most women are dissatisfied with housework and that those who identify with the role of

housewife are oppressed but do not know it, I would like to leave open the possibility that there are women who feel very fulfilled in managing a household. The tasks are onerous only in the absence of adequate resources and help, without the solution to problems of isolation and fatigue. The removal of the role from some households needs to be accompanied by a restructuring of the role in all households to remove problems.

I did not find *The Sociology of Housework* as rewarding as *Woman's Work*. Mainly, I am sorry that Oakley did not design the former study of the 40 London housewives so that her data would be comparable to other research, such as the Chicago-area housewives I investigated. Although there is a time lapse, my studies during the decade of 1955-1965 antecede the influence of Friedan's 1963 *The Feminine Mystique*, while Oakley's interviews took place in 1971; it would have been fascinating to have comparative data. Some of the material is similar, including the definition of the role of housewife, the division of labor, sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and so on. I was really surprised at the traditionality of the London mothers whom Oakley studied. They are as, if not more, traditional than the earlier studied Chicago women. Although recent studies (see Glazer-Malbin's article on Housework in *Signs*) indicate that American women are still retaining both the responsibility for managing a home and most of the work connected with it, the division of labor and leisure in London families seems to be even stronger.

Oakley found more dissatisfaction among the London housewives than I did among the Chicago women. There are two main reasons for the differences. She interviewed women who were between 20 and 29 years of age with at least one preschool child. My various samples ranged in age, the only criterion being the presence of a pre-high school child. She had 40 cases; I finally analyzed interviews with 571 women. This means that her subjects were highly concentrated, compared with mine, in the "expanding circle" and "peak" stages of their involvement in the role of housewife, a time when work is at its maximum (the London women work long hours, so do similar-stage women in Chicago). Isolation, particularly in bad weather, is at a high point, and the women are leading very different lives from those to which they had been accustomed through school and paid employment years. These are the stages of life which so many American sociologists have labeled as "the crisis of parenthood."

The second reason for the frequency of expressions of dissatisfaction by London women lies in the nature of many of the questions: "Do you find housework monotonous on the whole?" "Do you find you have too much to get through during the day?" "Do you ever feel as though you're on your own too much in the daytime?" "Do you feel you have enough time to yourself?" "Would you like more time/some time away from the housework and the children?" (pp. 210-211). These questions are based on a negative view of housewifery and can easily elicit statements of dissatisfaction.

Regardless of the bias in the questions, there is no negating the fact that the stages of life in which these London housewives find themselves are very difficult, and study after study has demonstrated the social and psychological harm to the woman as a person, to the mother and the child created by our very unnatural and historically rare method of restricting family life to an isolated and privacy-enforcing household. The burden imposed on the family by the Western European and American systems – which with the help of the Protestant ethic, focus on the economic-technological institution to the exclusion of other human values – will take a long time to offset. After all, as Ann Oakley clearly documents in *Woman's Work*, it took over a century to restrict women's social life space to the structurally simplified household – especially when the house contains small children dependent on them – to the exclusion of other occupations and identities. Only within the past decade or so have we begun to understand the extent of the oppression experienced by girls and boys, men and women, because of the strength and rigidity of gender-role assignments. We assume that, with all of us working on changing the system, it will not take a whole century to reverse the behavior and its ideological foundation which uses sexual designations to force people's placement in restricted gender roles.

Helena Znaniecki Lopata
Loyola University of Chicago

Clout – Womanpower and Politics. *Susan and Martin Tolchin.* New York, Coward, McCann and Geoghegan, Inc., 1973, 320 pp. \$10.00.

Political Woman. *Jeane J. Kirkpatrick.* New York, Basic Books, Inc., 1974, 274 pp. \$10.00.

Political Woman and *Clout* are welcome additions to the growing number of studies of women as political activists. The paucity of studies in this area is a function of both male-centered research and the small number of women political leaders available for study. The two books are different in approach and methodology, but each makes its own contribution to the field of study. *Clout* is written with a reporter's skill at observing political behavior and then selectively describing individuals and events which convey the realities of women's political participation. *Political Woman* takes a more scholarly and confined look at political activists by focusing on a sample of women serving in state legislatures.

Political Woman analyzes the backgrounds and political career patterns of women in state legislatures who attended a conference at the Eagleton Center

for the American Woman and Politics. At the time of the study there were 437 women serving in legislatures, and 46 of these women were interviewed. Questions may be raised about the representativeness of a sample chosen from conference participants recommended by the American Association of University Women, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, and the League of Women Voters — all these organizations have taken strong positions on women's rights and could be expected to recommend participants who have records of support of these issues or who are already predisposed in that direction. This may have resulted in the absence of the "Uncle Mom" legislator with whom we are all too familiar. An additional problem is that some of the interviews took place during the conference, where the legislators were exposed to speeches and discussions on the role of women in politics. This sensitizing climate may also have affected the results. Lest we overemphasize the problems of sample, it must be pointed out that Kirkpatrick's findings are consistent with other studies using a larger and more comprehensive sample. This indicates that a careful and sensitive researcher like Kirkpatrick can make a valuable contribution to our understanding of political participation even when working under restrictions. It also illustrates the merits of in-depth interviews when used by a knowledgeable scholar.

Kirkpatrick demonstrates that, like their male counterparts, women politicians vary. No single legislative style can be used to describe these women. Kirkpatrick develops a typology of four "nuclear types": *leaders*, *moralizers*, *personalizers*, and *problem solvers*. All four types have their own personal predispositions which can be detected in their style, role, and self-system. Kirkpatrick observes that even those who assume the "leader" role and have a passion for politics reveal a culturally induced orientation that requires that family *should* come first. Although Kirkpatrick's legislators claim no incompatibility between family role and citizenship role, most of them followed the traditional career pattern of waiting until their children were grown to seek public office and two-thirds had no more than two children. This is in contrast to Kirkpatrick's sample of male legislators, 60% of whom have larger families and ran for the office before they were 40. It is also interesting to note that the women assumed the major responsibility for housekeeping and child care and expected little help from their husbands. It is apparent that until attitudes toward sex roles and child-rearing responsibilities change, motherhood is going to continue to place restraints on women's political careers.

Clout has a quotation from Karen De Crow which connotes a different order of priority. De Crow says:

I personally think that the best thing that can happen to a child . . . particularly a girl child . . . would be to have a mother in the Congress of the United States. Maybe she would have a bad day when the sitter got sick, and Daddy wasn't around and she had to go into the drugstore and sit for two hours. But what that girl has going for her is that she knows she could do anything in the world, and that would be just fine.

Kirkpatrick observes that her respondents displayed characteristics most frequently associated with men. They were not personalistic and had the self-confidence and self-esteem commonly associated with male politicians. In the legislature they functioned in a manner similar to their male counterparts. This suggests that so-called female characteristics are not simply the result of early socialization, but may be related to structural realities. The women in Kirkpatrick's sample had experienced success, thereby receiving the reinforcement generally reserved for males. Success itself may socialize individuals toward certain behavior patterns.

One strength of *Clout* in comparison to *Political Woman* and most elite studies of women politicians is that it confronts the issue of limited opportunity structures. Most of the research being done in the area of women and politics has stressed socialization and motivation as primary factors. This is especially true in discussions of women's relative lack of political ambition and their unwillingness to seek public office. These studies suggest that women's status could be improved if women changed their own attitudes and motivations. While not questioning the validity of these findings, more emphasis needs to be put on structural restrictions that may also explain and clarify the relative scarcity of women political leaders. *Clout* describes numerous incidents in which competent self-confident women faced structural limitations which made it impossible for them to function.

Studies have shown that women political activists are less willing than male activists to say that they will make great sacrifices in order to hold public office. The conclusion is drawn that the traditional female role makes women reluctant to sacrifice home and family. Organization behavior studies of the work force indicate that low mobility workers have lower work commitment than those with high mobility prospects. Women may not be willing to make great sacrifices if they do not foresee a successful conclusion as a realistic possibility. *Clout* cites the case of Ronnie Eldridge, who served as Senator Robert F. Kennedy's liaison in New York City and later organized women across the country during John Lindsay's attempt to win the Presidential nomination. For all her efforts Ms. Eldridge was awarded a third-in-command post in an almost powerless city department. The authors note that almost any man who had served in the dual capacity of campaign manager and top political aid would have been rewarded with a city cabinet post. How much more unrealistic must political ambition appear to the countless women who are never permitted to go beyond telephoning and licking stamps! An interesting study would be one that compared not women and men, but women and men who for various reasons had a restricted possibility of advancing in the party. Then perhaps we could determine what is sex difference and what is limited opportunity structure.

Women are unlikely to receive any positive reinforcement if they attempt to gain real leadership positions. When Ronnie Eldridge ran for county leader, the Democrats changed the rules in the middle of the balloting. When it was

evident that she had a majority of the votes, they simply stopped the count and changed the rules to require a two-thirds vote. John Bailey, former Democratic National Chairman, was said to believe that the only time a party should run a woman was when the situation was "drastic." In later years this same John Bailey decided to promote a female protégée, Ella Grasso, and the result is the first woman governor elected in her own right. Although Ella Grasso has many outstanding characteristics, she was undoubtedly helped by having a powerful mentor of the type most frequently found promoting male candidates. Male candidates are often given such a boost by co-optation, females rarely.

Joanna Prevost has one of the most powerful jobs in city government. She is the patronage dispenser for Kevin White, the major of Boston. She is effective because White is willing to back her decisions and supports her when she is challenged. Tolchin and Tolchin observe that even she has to prove herself again and again, whereas a man could rest on his reputation. Prevost reports, "even now every time a department head is changed and a new commissioner comes in, the power struggle beings once again."

Both *Clout* and *Political Woman* are interesting, useful, and commendable efforts to explain women's political behavior. Ideally, they will encourage readers and researchers to raise new questions and find new answers that will ultimately lead to fuller political participation for women.

Naomi B. Lynn
Kansas State University

Undoing Sex Stereotypes. *Marcia Guttentag and Helen Bray.* New York, McGraw-Hill, 1976, 342 pp. \$8.95.

Non-Sexist Education for Young Children – A Practical Guide. *Barbara Sprung.* New York, Citation Press, 1975. 115 pp. \$3.25 (paper).

"What can be done to make the classroom non-sexist"? To find out, Guttentag, Bray, and their colleagues "conducted the first major field survey and intervention program for changing sex-role stereotyping in children." Using 409 children at three levels (K, 5, 9) they studied sex-role attitudes and developed a six-week intervention project implemented by teachers in 22 classrooms. This book documents in great detail the rationale for the intervention and the elements of the intervention itself. A critical part of the project was a full-scale evaluation of the impact of the intervention on the students. The findings are interesting and provide some support for the conclusion that positive effects can result from such intervention in schools. The book is to be lauded on a number of counts, and its weaknesses – while they should be pointed out –

need to be seen in the context of an otherwise impressive experiment in a curriculum area that is of growing interest and is looking for guidance.

The book begins with a brief review of the research on sex differences and sex-role perceptions among different-age children, and then turns to a consideration of how parents and teachers socialize boys and girls. A second chapter outlines the measures used in the evaluation of the project. The reader is told that the "sex-role measures can easily be used in the classroom," yet the chapter and accompanying appendix provide no instructions for scoring and interpretation.

The goals and the curriculum at each grade level are described in three separate chapters. Overall, the objectives are fairly vague and general; for example, "to encourage students to consider a variety of occupational roles, regardless of sex . . . develop non-sexist attitudes about participation in sports activities . . . see themselves and adults of both sexes in multiple family and personality roles" (from the fifth-grade curriculum).

The curriculum materials are of several types. Case studies of nonsexist teaching are helpful to prepare a teacher who is attempting this strategy for the first time. Complete lesson plans for units in varying subject matters give as much guidance as a teacher might need while she or he is becoming comfortable with this new part of the curriculum. Some exercises for students are complete enough to be copied verbatim and distributed to children (given the intent, the standard copyright provision in the beginning of the book is particularly inappropriate). Finally, background pieces provide general advice to teachers.

A separate 100-page chapter provides a compendium of resource materials invaluable to the interested interventionist. Books and other resources are classified by type (e.g., humor, biography, fiction, fantasy) and grade level. Other parts of the resources chapter can be thought of as essays to educate teachers on the philosophy of nonsexist education. A final section summarizes teacher reactions to the curriculum.

The weaknesses in this book concern the evaluation, the design of the intervention, and the reporting and interpretation of the results. The authors were clearly quite careful to train the teachers ahead of time and provide them with ample materials. But the teachers were told that they could use the material as they wished; thus the intervention varied considerably from classroom to classroom.

One chapter is devoted to a prose description of the research results. It is clear that the authors were working with a large volume of data. While there is only one statistical table in the book and no detailed listing of the variables in the study, this reviewer estimates that there was a minimum of 55 data points per student. For analysis, the authors needed to consider (1) pre- and poststudy data for (2) boys and girls and (3) three different grade levels. This is indeed a large data display from which to draw conclusions about the curriculum's impact. The attempt to compress the findings into brief prose unsupported by data tables

is most troublesome and unsuccessful. The reader is left confused in a sea of sometimes unconnected findings. Numbers occasionally appear in parentheses with no explanation of what they mean. Indeed, the one data table that is provided (p. 280) raises some question about the prose interpretation which otherwise must be taken on faith. Clearly, statistical significance was the major criterion of success in this experiment, and not substantive significance. To give only one example, a “significantly longer list of jobs for males than for females” describes the statistically significant finding of five jobs listed for males versus four jobs for females. If the authors are going to devote a full chapter to discussing data it seems imperative that data points be provided – if only in an appendix – to allow other scientists to consider the accuracy of the conclusions.

Similarly, in the interpretation chapter (Chapter 8) some of the conclusions seem weak in the face of the findings. A failure to find differences in program impact by family SES leads the authors to conclude that the family is unimportant (pp. 303-305) in sex-role stereotyping. Yet the stereotyping phenomenon could be deep seated enough in American society that families transmit stereotypes at all levels of the socioeconomic scale. Similarly, the conclusion that mass media is one of the major socializers in this area is certainly not to be concluded from data in this study.

The central conclusion of the project is that sex-role stereotyping can be explained from a “socio-psychological view which emphasizes the environmental influences on the child.” While the evidence presented seems supportive of this conclusion, the strength of the authors’ conclusion seems to be greater than warranted given the methodological limitations of this study – particularly the timing of the posttest assessment.

On the whole the effort is laudable. It illustrates a model for curriculum development which is very sound in this reviewer’s opinion. The curriculum is preceded by a careful review of the literature to delineate the nature of the problem, the developmental needs of the target audience, and the needs of the teachers of the curriculum. The curriculum intervention flows from the findings (thus, a multiple-aged intervention stemming from an appreciation of the different developmental needs of the target audiences). Finally, impact is assessed – the product is validated – by measuring effects within the framework of an appropriate research design, and the assessment is used to guide judgments about continued use of the curriculum. My reservations about this project stem from weaknesses in the application of the evaluation aspect of the model. Nonetheless, the book needs to be widely read, both for the curriculum ideas which it offers and the curriculum developmental model which it illustrates.

The Sprung work is a resource book for teachers of young children in preschool and kindergarten settings. It is similar in many ways to Guttentag and Bray’s *Undoing Sex Stereotypes*, without the explicit scientific experimentation framework in which the other work is imbedded. Sprung describes the first model project of the New York-based Women’s Action Alliance. She describes

nonsexist curricular approaches and materials which were field-tested in 1973-1974 in four child care centers in New York City. Eight objectives guided development and they reveal a lot about the book's approach:

1. "To present men and women in a nurturing role so that children understand parenting as a shared responsibility . . ."
2. "To show women and men performing a wide variety of jobs . . ."
3. "To encourage girls as well as boys to engage in active play and to encourage boys as well as girls to enjoy quiet play."
4. "To help boys and girls respect each other so that they can be friends . . ."
5. "To encourage boys and girls to develop and be able to express a full range of emotions."
6. "To encourage the full physical development of all children . . ."
7. "To portray everything in a pluralistic context . . ."
8. "To present a more open view of the family than the typical nuclear family."

Taken together several things can be noted about the objectives. First, almost equal emphasis is placed on the educational needs of boys and girls. This is a refreshing change from many programs which focus only on girls, and it is a more balanced approach than the Guttentag and Bray curriculum. Second, the objectives can be characterized as fairly liberal in their political orientation — at least more liberal than those of Guttentag and Bray. There is an explicit goal not only to encourage nurturance among males but also to portray parenting as a shared responsibility. Objectives 7 and 8 go beyond strictly nonsexist goals and try to help children cope with the multiracial/ethnic surroundings and with the increasingly common occurrence of living in nonnuclear family groupings.

Sprung begins with a brief introduction to the developmental needs of the 3- to 6-year-old, followed by a consideration of the potentially negative reactions of parents to sex-equal education: homosexuality, doll play for boys, and inherent biological differences. The book then proceeds to deal with three aspects of nonsexist education. The first is creating an educational environment that gives a balance of female and male messages. There are helpful suggestions for what to use in every area of preschool activity: housekeeping areas, dolls, cooking, blocks, outdoor play, clothing, workbench and shop, arts and crafts.

A second aspect of the program is the curriculum. Here Sprung has provided detailed instructions for conducting units on the family, jobs, the human body, homemaking, and sports. The instructions include helpful hints about the kinds of reactions to expect from children. The curriculum is described in ways that can make local adaptation easy because Sprung suggests a variety of activities which can be used to illustrate a single objective (see the jobs unit).

The final chapter contains a rich collection of nonsexist materials (block accessories, photos, puzzles, games, records, toys). In addition to resources that are commercially available, some scarce resources from less well-known outlets

are presented. Many teachers will appreciate the inclusion of instructions to make some resources on their own, such as puzzles and games.

As a curriculum resource this book is very helpful, whether the teacher is a confirmed feminist or an inquiring person with a recently budding sensitivity to sex-role stereotyping in education. It provides a convincing rationale for the sex-equal educational approach and sufficient guidance that no one need guess how to conduct a unit on the topic, even if doing so for the first time. The educational philosophy is sound (“As always . . . begin by finding out what the children already know”) and imaginative (use olders to teach younger children about sports, but first work with the olders on the teaching approach necessary on their part).

The project goes beyond a concern for classroom education. Among the goals in training parents is an objective to “mobilize parents to conduct letter writing campaigns against sexist advertising, packaging, and programming on television.” Similarly, in a toy discussion with parents an attempt is made to educate them not only to the nonsexist quality of toys but to their durability and safety as well.

The language level and tone of the writing makes the book appropriate for a wide range of reading ability and book-savvy. But two aspects of the presentation are bothersome. First, references to social science sometimes appear to be included solely for the legitimacy they provide for a point of view rather than for an understanding of the complex messages which the reference contains (cf. the Mussen reference on p. 20). Also, a single lecture by one biologist made the author “entirely comfortable” with the philosophy of essential biological equivalence of the sexes (save perhaps the reproductive organs). A second concern is the uncritical tone which pervades the book and suggests that all problems in implementing this curriculum were instantly neutralized by good intention and a positive outlook. For example, the author anticipated parental anxiety over a program of sex-equal education. But the feeling conveyed is that each area of parental anxiety — homosexuality, doll playing, biological differences — is so tentative that a few references to Mussen and Distler or *William's Doll* will be enough to neutralize all concerns. I'm sure this is not the case, and if I'm right the author does a disservice to the potential interventionist who is going to attempt a curriculum modification in a topic area exceeded in public sensitivity only by reproductive sex education. Such an interventionist would be helped most by a realistic description of the problems as well as the potential benefits. A more formalized evaluation of program impact and the inclusion of such findings in this report might have provided a more objective assessment of the strengths, weaknesses, and potential problem areas associated with such a project.

Jerome Johnston
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan