

---

Book Reviews

---

**Female Power and Male Dominance: On the Origins of Sexual Inequality.**

Peggy Sanday. New York, Cambridge University Press, 1981, 295 pp., \$9.95 (paper), \$34.50 (hardcover).

Sanday's book *Female Power and Male Dominance: On the Origins of Sexual Inequality* is an addition to the speculative evolutionary literature in anthropology, a persistent tradition that attempts to delineate the origins of culture and society through historical and ethnographic reconstruction. Such reconstruction requires nerve, imagination, and wit, for it is a creative enterprise in which the author attempts to engage the reader in imagining an unknown world inhabited by people brought to life largely through the author's rhetorical skills. Though her book is written for an "interdisciplinary audience" (p. 1), which deserves a lively presentation of the anthropological materials she uses, Sanday's prose is listless and lacking in conviction. Her writing is hard to follow and I cannot recommend the book to a general audience looking for a fresh, provocative investigation of the origins of sexual inequality.

For readers well versed in anthropological theory and the ethnographic sources on simple societies (that is, hunter-gatherers and horticulturalists), the book fares better. Sanday's thesis is that sex roles are based on the type of economic system in a society — "a people's adaptation to their environment in pursuing the necessities of life" (p. 7). Male dominance is most likely to arise in systems where warfare or food stress is prevalent (p. 11). Sanday believes that we should study ideology and belief systems in establishing precise links from environmental adaptation to sex-role behavior. Her arguments are based on her interpretation of the data contained in the Human Relations Areas Files, which she analyzes using the standard cross-cultural statistical method.

What is most interesting in the book are Sanday's tables of statistical associations between variables representing ideology, sex roles, and type of economy. For example, she shows that the creator in an origin myth is usually male in societies where animal husbandry is important, and usually either female or a couple in societies with semi-intensive agriculture (p. 69). In societies where fathers have a lot of contact with children, the creator is usually female. These and other statistical tables present exciting new material which is open to a variety of interpretations. Unfortunately, Sanday does not provide a clear, coherent interpretation, so that while the reader gains some food for thought,

it is in very raw form. I hope to see further analysis, by Sanday and others, of the statistical associations that her work has established.

Sanday argues that male dominance is now much more widespread than formerly because of stressful conditions arising from war, food shortage, and social dislocation such as that associated with migration. Her argument is tested by comparing societies with and without male dominance. Sanday compares 45 societies without male dominance to 94 societies with some or much male dominance. However, only by ignoring several crucial factors related to sexual equality is she able to find the astonishing total of 45 "sexually egalitarian" societies. Had she considered some of the following facts she would have found none or a tiny handful: (1) childbearing is not accorded prestige and ritual elaboration in simple societies, (2) men control women in marriage exchange, (3) male activities are universally more highly valued than female activities, and (4) male political dominance is universal (see Quinn, 1977). Sanday's criteria for sexual equality are inexact and constantly shift, so the reader must refer to her discussions of each society to decide how she arrived at the designation "the sexes are equal" (see Table 8.3, p. 170). However, I must reiterate here that there is no evidence of truly egalitarian societies. In no societies do women participate on an equal footing with men in activities accorded the highest prestige. Nor are there societies where women hold the highest formal political offices, except in rare cases that involve succession to a hereditary seat of power in hierarchical systems. Certainly, no societies are matriarchies, a tired argument which Sanday attempts to revive (p. 118) despite the glaring lack of evidence. Because there is not the kind of variance in the male dominance variable which Sanday posits, her argument that stress correlates with male dominance is untestable.

Any book which purports to deal with the origin of sexual inequality must attempt to wrestle with the questions of marriage exchange, male dominance in politics, differential valuation of male and female activities, and the lack of prestige accorded childbearing in simple societies. I take Sanday to task for this because although she ignores these perplexing questions, others, such as sociobiologists, do not. Sociobiology worries me not because it is completely wrong as far as it goes, but because it incorporates no sociocultural variables. It is therefore open to interpretations that support the maintenance of the status quo, wherein women are seen primarily as childbearers and nurturers who have no business sticking their noses into the male world of politics and power. Sociobiologists have proposed a highly elaborated, internally consistent theory to account for sex-role differences which appears to be capable of explaining quite a lot. It is a formidable contender in the theoretical battle, and needs challenging by those who see that sociocultural variables, as well as genes, shape sex roles. Sanday completely ignores sociobiology, and instead attempts to refute the uninspired theories of cultural materialists such as Marvin Harris. Her argument is presented as though she has dealt thoroughly with opposing theories, when in fact her archival goes unchallenged.

Sanday suggests that a society's ideology and belief system are created in part by perceptions of environmental circumstances. She spends considerable time discussing these belief systems and relies heavily on Mary Douglas' work. For example, Sanday tries to explain why male and female are distinct categories in primitive thought systems (even in what she considers to be sexually egalitarian systems). She appeals to Douglas' idea that "conceptual distinctions demarcating femaleness from maleness . . . help people create a semblance of order" (p. 90). Sanday explains beliefs about female pollution by saying that they are attempts to "control . . . dangerous forces." In discussing the sexual ideology of the Hadza people, she says that they are trying to deal with the "perception that the odds are stacked against them" (p. 94). In another context she asserts that ideologies arise as people "strive to achieve balance" (p. 95). Her explanation for the separation of male and female and the superiority of the male in primitive thought rests on supposed psychological propensities to create order, deal with danger, combat fate, and achieve balance (whatever that is). Whether such propensities exist is open to question; but if they do, it is difficult to see how such general proclivities can have such specific consequences for sexual ideology. Why are men and women universally opposed categories more salient than, say, old and young? Why do pollution beliefs indict women as the polluters? Why are women seen as the debased, devalued sex?

Sanday is working in an area in which it is difficult to be fresh and convincing, for the data bearing on the origins of sexual inequality in early societies are, for all practical purposes, collected and recorded. There will be no new data because the simple hunting-gathering and horticultural societies about which we have knowledge, and which are presumed to be like the early societies in which sexual inequality evolved, are either extinct or drastically changed. The extant data are hardly the careful, thorough, detailed stuff with which precise hypotheses can be generated and tested; yet they are all we have, and should be treated with respect and restraint. Sanday is anything but restrained, for example, when asserting that if the plant-gathering activities of women led them to have a key role in plant domestication, then they would have had "economic and ritual centrality, and hence, a primary voice in decision making" (p. 118). This is nothing but wishful thinking. In many societies women have key economic roles and an important (though not superior) place in ritual activities, but they are decidedly dominated by men in the decision-making sphere. In fact, this is probably the norm in horticultural societies worldwide, where women do a great deal of farm labor and participate in ritual, but lack political power.

Elsewhere Sanday's arguments turn on fragments of ideas such as "It is not that women cannot hunt or go to war; rather it is that motherhood, gentleness and forgiveness do not mix well with predation, toughness and warlikeness" (p. 90). Or "When humans congregate in larger settlements, the smell of menstrual blood must be more obvious. It is a frightening smell because it is reminiscent of death" (p. 94).

Sanday's statistical work is likely to inspire other researchers to follow leads suggested by some interesting correlations between such variables as warfare and the number of menstrual taboos (p. 106), and the number of sexual pollution beliefs and nature of food supply (p. 109). Sanday has juxtaposed some key variables in new and interesting ways and has provided statistical leads which merit further research.

#### REFERENCE

Quinn, N. Anthropological studies on women's status. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 1977  
6, 181-225.

*Bonnie A. Nardi*  
*Department of Anthropology*  
*University of Missouri-St. Louis*

**Woman-Battering: Victims and Their Experiences.** *Mildred Daley Pagelow.* Beverly Hills, California, Sage, 1981, 288 pp., \$20.00 (hardcover), \$9.95 (paper).

Pagelow, a prolific and incisive essayist, offers in *Woman-Battering* a detailed discussion of the research project underlying her work on abuse. Starting in 1976, Pagelow acted as an observer and volunteer at battered women's shelters. She also interviewed officials and developed a questionnaire answered by 350 women, most of whom were in shelters. *Woman-Battering* presents some of the questionnaire results, augmented by interviews and observations, and imbedded in a theory purporting to explain why women endure repeated batterings.

The main issue *Woman-Battering* addresses is this endurance.<sup>1</sup> Pagelow distinguishes "primary" and "secondary" battering, defines the latter as all but the first outbreak, and examines its duration among women in established relationships with husbands or male lovers. Women's endurance depends, she says, on a lack of resources, unfavorable institutional responses, and traditional ideology.

<sup>1</sup> Besides explaining the victim's behavior, Pagelow detours to discuss the culprit's, attributing his violence to a vague constellation of factors she likens to Bandura's social learning model. This discussion exhibits more methodological tangles than her analysis of victims, so I have omitted it here.

The question "But why does she stay?" has a deservedly unsavory reputation in abuse research. Pagelow has figured among its critics, noting that it unjustly implies culpability on the part of female victims.<sup>2</sup> In *Woman-Battering*, she reaffirms her opposition to it. Among the realities the question denies is that battered women have few alternatives. Too, they commonly attempt escape. They also call the police, work at a more pacific relationship with their assaulter, fight back, and in sum try all conceivable solutions. That these attempts often fail reflects institutional antipathy and assaulter persistence, not victimological culpability. It is precisely because her plight is so difficult to remedy that the battered woman's situation merits concern. But asking why she stays belittles her entrapment. Instead of scrutiny of institutional and assaulter roles, this question substitutes a false implication that the woman's free will betrays her: She could live differently if only she wanted to. This is victim blaming.

By emphasizing the issue of victims' endurance, Pagelow participates in the victim blaming she deplors. The only relevant difference between others' and her arguments is that in attempting to eschew misogyny while using the misogynist focus of the "Why stay?" question, she reorganizes her material so that it says nothing. The hypotheses she wants to test and the conclusions she claims to reach differ from her actual hypotheses and conclusion. To illustrate the problem, I shall first describe Pagelow's data base and suggest what purposes it could have served and what purposes she uses it to serve in the preliminary essays on which this book is based.<sup>3</sup> Then I shall discuss the alternative she unfortunately pursues in *Woman-Battering*.

Pagelow's data base is mainly volunteer respondents in a few Florida and Southern California shelters. Consequently, her sample cannot be considered to represent any other group. It does not exemplify all women, for instance, or all battered women, or even all battered women in shelters. In her essays and in Chapter 3 of *Woman-Battering*, Pagelow, aware of this limitation, uses the data to test stereotypes rather than empirical claims. For instance, against the derogatory assumption that battered women masochistically solicit pain, Pagelow reports that only 33% of her previously married respondents had been beaten by

<sup>2</sup>For instance, see her "Blaming the Victim: Parallels in Crimes Against Women – Rape and Battering," delivered at the 1977 meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems, and her "Double Victimization of Battered Women: Victimized by Spouses and the Legal System," delivered at the 1980 meeting of the American Society of Criminology.

<sup>3</sup>These include "Battered Women in Shelters," delivered at the 1980 meeting of the Pacific Sociological Association; "Secondary Battering and Alternatives of Female Victims to Spouse Abuse," pp. 277-300, and "Sex Roles, Power, and Woman Battering," pp. 239-277, both in Lee H. Bowker (Ed.), *Women and Crime in America* (New York: Macmillan, 1981); and "Social Learning Theory and Sex Roles: Violence Begins in the Home," delivered at the 1978 meeting of the Society for the Study of Social Problems.

an earlier husband (p. 59).<sup>4</sup> Since a stereotyped masochism analysis might predict 100% of previously married victims had battering ex-husbands, Pagelow's lower 33% finding represents a numerical test which this version of the stereotype fails. As another example, the fact that 80% of her respondents had previously tried to leave numerically confounds the stereotype that victims wallow in their plight (p. 73). Thus, an unrepresentative sample can be numerically useful, for its distribution can be compared to the imaginary distribution implied by a derogatory stereotype.<sup>5</sup> Provided its unrepresentativeness does not reflect a special population in which stereotypes receive an unfair test, the sample comprises an illuminating test of claims of "What the world would look like if the stereotype were true." At her best, Pagelow interprets her data in precisely this unconventional but legitimate way.

Unfortunately, in most of *Woman-Battering* Pagelow abandons data-versus-speculation comparisons for traditional correlation and regression analysis. Inadvertently, this shift causes her to change her focus from a comparison of battered wives versus stereotypes to a comparison of battered wives versus other battered wives. In the first step of traditional social science statistics, groups are compared not to stereotype-generated imaginary distributions, but to one another. Because Pagelow's dependent variable concerns wives' endurance, her data analysis arrays the real victims of her sample on the continuum of their endurance. What she unwittingly ends up trying to explain is this continuum. Her underlying statistical question is why some respondents endured longer than other respondents in her unrepresentative sample. That Pagelow sometimes generalizes to all battered women, including women who avoid shelters, only exacerbates the difficulty. (For instance, the title of Chapter 6 is "Why Do They Stay?", something it is not clear shelter women have done.) The result arrays victims not against misogynist stereotypes, but against one another, a depiction inappropriately imbedded in a data analysis which asks why some victims responded less promptly than others.

The confusion of the book's core question infects its key concepts as well. For instance, Pagelow describes her dependent variables, "Secondary Battering Cohabitation," as a temporal measure "calculated from each questionnaire by noting the date of response . . . , the respondents' present age . . . , and the date of witnessing spouses' first violent behavior . . ." (p. 112). At least eight difficulties are imbedded in this definition. First, the onset date concerns any violent behavior, regardless of whether the wife was the target. In this context,

<sup>4</sup>This percentage is not much higher than the 28% incidence among all married couples in the representative national study conducted by Murray A. Straus, Richard J. Gelles, and Suzanne K. Steinmetz, *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1980).

<sup>5</sup>The approach I am suggesting might be called revisionist Bayesianism, Bayesian-like prior probabilities being derived in an un-Bayesian way.

asking why the woman stayed suggests she should have left after the first time her spouse may have done no more than angrily hang up on a client. Second, she is asked when she *witnessed* violence, which may be a different instance than when violence started. For instance, should the respondent include her husband's destroying her photo album while she was out? Third, the vagueness of the question encourages retrospective reconstruction. Victims, knowing the disastrous outcome of the relationship, may attribute disaster to its history. Fourth, information concerning both dependent and independent variables was necessarily obtained from the same questionnaire, and associations between the two sets are mainly correlational, rather than causal. Thus, before-and-after claims such as Pagelow's that contacts with service providers prolong women's entrapment (p. 152) are unjustified, for the reverse may be true: Prolonged entrapment may increase contacts. Fifth, her own data to the contrary notwithstanding (e.g., Table 6.1, "Spearman Correlations of Severity of Injuries and Frequency of Abuse," p. 162), Pagelow falsely assumes that time inevitably augments abuse. Thus, in her measure of endurance, all five-year periods outscore all shorter periods, regardless of how much violence any period actually incorporates. And violent outbreaks are not standardized by length of relationship. Sixth, no weight is given to previous attempts to resolve the situation. A woman who left but returned counts as having endured to precisely the same degree as one who stayed all along. Seventh, the termination and onset definitions may conflict. For a cutoff point, Pagelow uses the date each questionnaire was completed. But as she mentions, many respondents probably returned to their abusers after this date (pp. 218-220). In the determination of the onset date, since no weight is given to previous attempts at resolution, a return means that the respondent was counted as having stayed. For its termination date, however, the same possibility suddenly counted as a successful resolution. And, eighth, Pagelow says the variable incorporates each respondent's age. It is unclear why, for simply subtracting the onset from the present date shows how long "secondary battery" lasted. But including respondent's age means that the highest correlation between the dependent and an independent variable in the book — the correlation between secondary battering cohabitation and woman's age — may simply reflect the apparent fact that the former mathematically includes the latter. In sum, Pagelow's dependent variable is a mystery. The closest approximation I can suggest is "length of time between the day respondent answered the questionnaire and the day she now recalls first witnessing her present abuser's violence." What significance this approximation has is not clear.

Obscurities also characterize the three sets of independent variables: resources, institutional responses, and traditional ideology. The major resource item is respondent's age, the impact of which Pagelow agrees may be purely artifactual (p. 115). As for institutional responses, the set is misleadingly named: Its sole contents are yes/no answers to whether respondents ever asked psychologists, clergy, or marriage counselors for help. This set does not include whether

those consulted helped, and may simply reflect the passage of time. The final set, traditional ideology, is also misleadingly named and actually comprises the number of respondent's children, whether respondent was previously divorced, and whether respondent's parents are presently divorced or separated. Despite Pagelow's remarks to the contrary, none of these items necessarily concerns traditional ideology. And in addition to the confused definition of secondary battery, neither resources, institutional responses, nor traditional ideology is shown to affect it.

Pagelow reminds us on several occasions that research must be judged in terms of the practical context where it is used, and justifiably mentions her own provictim Congressional testimony with pride. I share her concern for the uses of research. But I fear that the traditional framework of *Woman-Battering*, and the book's consequent obscurities, may cause Pagelow to be seen as supporting the argument that abused women collaborate in their own victimization. Against this argument, her own earlier essays weight heavily, and I hope she will soon return to the incisive data-versus-stereotypes approach they embody.

*Ann Leffler*  
*Utah State University*

**When Mothers Go to Jail.** *Ann M. Stanton.* Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books, 1980, 199 pp., \$22.95.

Stanton's research project, reported here in detail as a monograph, was planned to examine "what happens to children when their mothers are sent to jail." The study supplies much information concerning separation experiences and an aspect of the penal system which has been largely ignored. The topic is approached with care and sensitivity to both the psychological and legal dimensions; the author, currently on the faculty at Arizona State University Law School, holds both a J.D. from Stanford Law School and a Ph.D. in psychology from Stanford University.

Data were collected by open-ended interviews with mothers, children, caretakers, and school personnel. The subjects were 75 mothers and their school-age children from four California counties. Fifty-four of the mothers were incarcerated in county jails, and 21 were on probation. They were predominantly young and poorly educated, living alone with their children. Most were dependent on welfare support. Maladaptive behaviors such as drug use, addiction, and alcoholism were common. The jailed women had pled guilty to criminal charges.



The children, all of whom had been living with the mother at the time of her arrest, experienced multiple disruptions. During the separation, they were cared for by relatives and their welfare status remained stable. Almost all knew of their mother's incarceration, many having visited her in jail; but most were hesitant to discuss their mother's situation. Although these children had experienced considerable exposure to the criminal justice system and there was a negative correlation between exposure and attitude, over half had an overall positive orientation toward police. It was impossible to assess the children's legal reasoning, as planned, because of a low response rate. Most of the mothers and children were reunited following the mother's release, but there was a high incidence of repeated separation during the first month. The mothers had little ability to deal constructively with problems associated with their incarceration.

The author emphasizes a provocative finding: The fact that the jailed women were mothers with child care responsibilities was never taken into account. Neither the arresting officer nor the courts nor the jail staff showed any interest in the children of the women — or even in whether there were children.

This study stands as a conscientious, thorough, descriptive work. Unfortunately for the reader, another major goal in the writing appears to be the effort to demonstrate the author's competence in mastering the technicalities of research. The study is presented in the format of a doctoral dissertation, complete with (in order) review of relevant literature; description of methodology; description of subjects' demographic and situational characteristics; analysis and discussion of findings on an array of variables (mother's knowledge of child, child's knowledge of mother's legal situation, contact between mother and child, child's legal socialization, child's performance in school, welfare status of child, and postrelease factors); final discussion with recommendations; and 12 appendices giving, in full, the various forms used and relevant documents.

The work appears to be written for a committee of examiners and seems not to be edited for a wider audience. The reader is told that the study "met the requirements of and was approved by the Stanford Committee on Human Subjects," that "the significance level of  $p < .05$  was selected so that a result reported as statistically significant implies that a systematic relationship of some sort exists between the variables, with a chance of error 5 times out of 100, that is, a table with as large a deviation from the expected frequencies would occur by chance in only 5 samples out of 100," and that "percentages reported for the frequencies of observations are rounded to the nearest whole number, with .5 rounded up to even but not odd numbers." Readers who would seek documentation in the tables and figures are not likely to need such explanations, and the nonresearch readers who could benefit from the findings are not likely to reap benefits from such explanations — nor, I think, be much interested in them.

Because of the significance of the subject and the obvious social as well as academic need to bring attention to issues concerned with the children of of-

fenders, it is hoped that Stanton may communicate her concerns, findings, and recommendations more effectively to both researchers and the public in the future.

*Elizabeth S. Goodman*  
*State University of New York*  
*College at Fredonia*

**Minority Stress and Lesbian Women.** *Virginia R. Brooks.* Lexington, Massachusetts, D.C. Heath and Company, 1981, 219 pp., \$22.95.

In her book *Minority Stress and Lesbian Women*, Virginia R. Brooks makes a valuable contribution to our understanding of lesbianism. She also provides a frame of reference for viewing women as a minority and discusses the part stress plays in their lives. Brooks, a professor of social work at the University of Houston, has written a book appropriate for both undergraduate and graduate students and for laypersons comfortable with the writing style of academicians.

In the three parts of her book, Brooks first examines the etiology of homosexuality, then discusses stress and coping resources; and finally explores identity conflicts, intragroup differences, and social disclosure. Drawing upon the work of Gordon Allport and others, she gives an in-depth analysis of prejudice and how it relates to minority stress.

Her study, upon which much of her book is based, appears to meet the necessary criteria of scientific rigor. The study, conducted between April and August 1975, was based on data gathered with a seven-page questionnaire distributed to 2,200 women, two-thirds of whom lived in California, the other third living in cities in the United States and Canada. The return rate on her questionnaire was approximately 31% (675 questionnaires). The study of lesbian women was intended to gather data that would "provide a foundation for promoting change in current social policies and laws which impinge on this minority group."

In her study, Brooks states the eight hypotheses that concern the dependent variables of stress and deviance among lesbian women. She examines the factors that contribute to maladaptive behavior among members of minority groups and the factors that appear to mediate the impact of minority status. Her findings indicate that low socioeconomic status and public visibility as a lesbian woman are associated with higher stress level. Being female is more stress producing than being lesbian. Low socioeconomic status and high disclosure are related to

deviance. The expectation that older lesbian women would evidence higher rates of stress was not substantiated. Brooks states that this may be because the older respondents had higher incomes and socioeconomic status.

Brooks believes that women are a double minority, first, because of their sex, and, second, because of their sociosexual orientation. Drawing upon a number of studies, she concludes that women in our society have had unequal status with men, and women's ascribed status "has characteristics of both a caste and a minority." Because of this inferior status, the vested interests of men are protected.

Brooks categorizes the possible factors of the etiology of lesbianism into three areas: biophysical, psychological, and sociological. After reviewing the extensive literature, she concludes that "previously held 'exploratory' theories of lesbianism are not supported by the evidence." Her own belief about lesbianism is that "constraints imposed by the culturally assigned female sex role are a salient factor in the lack of impetus toward heterosexual relationships."

Brooks is particularly critical of psychoanalytic theory because of its double standard of mental health for men and women, and because it regards both homosexual men and women as "pathological." She criticizes sociological theories and points out that they also have led to the labeling of subcultures as "deviant." She feels that lesbianism should not have to be explained, refuting the belief that lesbians are masculine and, hence, pathological. By considering the new body of growing information about lesbianism, Brooks believes that lesbians should be able to eliminate negative assumptions affecting their self-esteem and cope more effectively with societal negativism. She indicates that nonconformity to the female sex-role has positive outcomes, and these outcomes are more prevalent among lesbians than among heterosexual women. She presents evidence that greater androgyny exists among lesbians than among nonlesbians; also, lesbians, more than nonlesbians, have resisted male reward systems that reinforce sex-typed behavior.

According to Brooks, because of the male control of resources and the ascribed inferior status of women, these factors result in a variety of negative life events over which the female has little control. The sense of powerlessness may lead to maladaptive responses to the environment. Because of women's inferior status, they often must maintain a degree of vigilance that requires them to be more frequently adaptive than nonminorities. Brooks believes that minority deviance is a way of adapting, even though it may have secondary negative consequences. She doubts that any single research effort can explain why some lesbians seem to cope successfully with stress and why others become dysfunctional. She believes that individual differences must be considered. She discusses the nature of stress at some length, and uses system theory to explain how individuals cope.

Brooks could have made this commendable book even better had she not fallen into the trap of sometimes overstating her case and going beyond the limit

of her data. She is overly condemnatory of men in general and fails to recognize that not all men are in a power struggle with women, nor are all men involved in a widespread conspiracy to oppress women. Although critical of the traditional family, Brooks offers no viable alternatives for some of the functions it performs. She ignores a growing body of research regarding the family and its importance to the well-being of children. Her writing is often verbose and at times requires several readings to be understood. These criticisms do not negate the fact that Brooks has made a significant addition to our understanding of lesbianism and women as minority persons. Also, the comprehensive bibliography she amassed regarding stress is a valuable contribution.

*Donald A. Brown*  
*University of Michigan – Dearborn*

**Prison Homosexuality.** *Alice M. Propper.* Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books, 1981, 227 pp, \$23.95.

*Prison Homosexuality* ambitiously attempts to address four dimensions of the phenomenon: (1) a discussion of the "Importation" versus the "Deprivation" perspectives on prison homosexuality, (2) a "large-scale" empirical analysis of United States juvenile justice agencies, (3) an assessment of the myths and realities surrounding institutional homosexuality, and (4) the presentation of a "Social-Psychological" model as a viable alternative to the Importation and Deprivation theoretical orientations.

Propper reviewed the literature and concluded that a theoretical controversy exists, one involving two major schools of thought – the "Deprivation" versus "Importation" Schools. Simply stated, the former suggests that deviance, including sexual deviance, is basically a consequence of the institutional environment, while the latter attributes institutional deviance to preinstitutional socialization. Moreover, Propper views this theoretical dilemma as significantly contributing to the "myths" associated with prison homosexuality.

In her attempt to clarify this issue, Propper initiated her own analysis of the problem. Seven juvenile facilities (two from the Southeast, three from the Northeast, one from the North Central and one from the East Central United States) were involved in the study. Three of the facilities were coed (all state-run institutions), five were public state institutions, and two were private Catholic youth homes. The targeted sample consisted of the staff and inmates at these

seven facilities. In all, 396 girls (93% of the total female inmate population) and 262 staff members (approximately 75%) participated.

Data collection involved "self-administered staff questionnaires, group and self-administered questionnaires to girls, and numerous interviews and conversations with staff and youth" (p. 29). The staff questionnaire consisted of a 26-page survey called "A Study of Staff Perspectives in Juvenile Corrections," and the youth questionnaire was comprised of 41 pages entitled "What Do You Think." Within this larger endeavor, homosexuality and homosexual relations were defined as follows: (1) going with or being married (pseudoinstitutional liaisons) to another girl, (2) passionately kissing another girl, (3) writing love letters to another girl, and (4) having sex beyond hugging and kissing with another girl.

Propper concludes that her work "summarized the available research on prison homosexuality among adult and juvenile populations of women and men and shows how the fragmented hypotheses can be subsumed under the more-general theoretical frameworks of importation and deprivation" (p. 177). Drawing on this analysis, Propper challenges the following myths about prison homosexuality:

1. Incidence of homosexuality is higher among female inmates.
2. Most inmates engage in homosexual experiences.
3. Inmates approve of prison homosexuality.
4. Homosexual activity ends once the inmate is released from institutional care.
5. Preprison homosexuality is not a critical variable in determining eventual prison homosexual activity.
6. Homosexuality is reduced in coed facilities.
7. Homosexuality is greater in custodial than in treatment-oriented prisons.
8. Quasi-family relations contribute to homosexual activity.
9. Homosexuality is the basis for quasi-families within prisons.
10. Quasi-families are found only among female inmate populations.

On page 184 of the 192-page text, Propper offers her social-psychological model of the causes of prison homosexuality:

Our study of girls in training schools dramatically demonstrated that preinstitutional effects do not simply stop when institutional effects begin. Rather, they continue to operate along with those in the new situation. Prison organizations seem to be arenas in which people act out predispositions they acquire earlier. However, they are also places whose surroundings and structure help to create new behavior that continues to operate when they leave prison . . . . The multi-causal model proposes that prison homosexuality is affected by a myriad of cultural, personality, and biological variables prior to imprisonment. (p. 184)

This statement may represent the most significant contribution of the book. Another interesting dimension of the work is the chapter (Chapter 7) on quasi-kinship. Beyond these, the book is confusing and ambiguous, the title misleading. The study addresses adolescent females (mean age of respondents = 15.9 years) in facilities designed for the care and treatment of troubled and/or neglected youth (not hard-core prison environments). Another problem lies in the selection of the facilities. While Propper claims that her study represents “a large-scale study of U.S. juvenile-justice agencies” (p. 1), it is not clear how the seven institutions were selected or how they are representative of such facilities in the United States. And the field research is further complicated by the nature of the research. The use of self-administered questionnaires – notably imposed upon incarcerated youth – raises serious questions concerning the reliability of the data.

Indeed, the greatest methodological flaws in this study are associated with the inferential issue. Paradoxically, Propper seems to fall into the same research dilemma she accuses others of – drawing conclusions from a questionable or inadequate data base. To illustrate, she infers (1) from a unisex population to all incarcerated inmates, (2) across age and developmental stages, (3) from delinquency and status offenders to convicted felons.

Another problem is that Propper offers the social-psychological model as a viable alternative to the deprivation and importation orientations, but she fails to adequately develop this model. Absent are the rich theoretical contributions that comprise this multidisciplinary orientation. Even when the focus of the book is narrowed to its obvious topic – “the perceived sexuality of institutionalized adolescent females” – a number of relevant classical theoretical approaches are either absent or only mentioned briefly: marginality and personal anomie (e.g., Stonequist, 1937; Sellin, 1938; Merton, 1938; Thomas, 1951; Davis, 1937, Coser, 1956); delinquency, social tolerance, and drift (e.g., Hyman, 1942; Dunham, 1965; Yablonsky, 1962, 1973; Reiss, 1964; Reckless, 1967; Matza, 1964); and institutional adaptations to stress and anomie (e.g., Goffman, 1961; Garfinkel, 1956; Giallombardo, 1966, 1974).

Given these inadequacies and limitations, one must question Propper’s assumption that her study sufficiently challenges the so-called myths associated with prison homosexuality.

*Laurence French*  
*Suncook, New Hampshire*

**Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials.** Edited by Patricia A. Schmuck, W. W. Charters, Jr., and Richard O. Carlson. New York, Academic Press, 1981, 337 pp., \$26.50.

Despite the progress of women in gaining access to many traditionally male professions in the past decade, only a disconcertingly small proportion of women are in high positions of educational leadership. For at least 50 years the number of female school administrators has declined to the point that today women hold less than 1% of all superintendentcies, only 3% of the country's assistant superintendentcies, and under 13% of all principals and assistant principals; however, women comprise over two-thirds of all classroom teachers (Frasher & Frasher, 1979). In sex-role terminology, the American public school system is generally structured like a traditional home: Men run the schools and women nurture the learners.

This collection of writings addresses that situation and the question of the contrasting development of women and men in educational leadership. Much of the work reported in this book came out of the Oregon Sex Equity in Educational Leadership Project, which aimed to increase the number of female administrators in the Oregon public schools. The editors note that many differing perspectives and methodologies are represented, both traditional and nontraditional, theoretical and data based. The editors attempt to organize the collection by dividing the works of the contributing authors into four parts: "Dissertation Research"; "Policy and Practice"; "The Structure of Educational Careers"; and "School Organization." The danger in any collection is that unless the editors pay extremely careful attention to providing an overall theoretical framework and theme, the result can be a hodge-podge of articles, uneven in quality and unrelated in substance. This is particularly true if the data come from a variety of sources, as in this book. One comes away from reading this book with the feeling that it was very difficult for the editors to construct a coherent organization. The lack of substantive theory in the field is also reflected in the collection.

Despite problems in organization and conceptualization, the book addresses an important problem in educational policy and practice, that of sex equity in educational leadership, and it provides a useful introduction to educators and professionals interested in variables related to the achievement of more equitable representation of women in the field. The introductory chapters by Shakeshaft and Charters give an excellent overview of the thesis literature and an especially useful critique of the state of the methodology in the field. The latter should be required reading for anyone undertaking study in this area and is perhaps the single most practical contribution in the collection. Missing, however, is a

chapter giving a general review and synthesis of the bulk of the published literature, which also would have been valuable.

Perhaps the most significant policy piece is the Schmuck and Wyant report on the Oregon Network study, an interesting and laudable effort to unravel the complicated selection process of school administrators and the possible effects of gender in this process. Schmuck and Wyant found, for example, that women tended to replace women and men tended to replace men; that a special effort in recruitment appeared to make the employment of a woman more likely once a woman had applied, but did not appear to make women more likely to apply in the first place; that women were more likely to be hired for an administrative position when the job was appointive than when it was widely advertised; and that except in the screening stage, a woman's chances of being hired were increased by the presence of at least one female on the hiring committee. These tantalizing findings from some 4,000 applications and 300 positions in 129 Oregon districts need to be validated by replication in other regions and states if they are to offer important policy and practice implications to educational leaders recruiting women for such positions.

Other, less useful chapters in the policy area include one on sex equity in jurisprudence, which offers an interesting historical focus, but does not apply or detail specific cases or examples of policy affecting women in educational administration. Hutchinson's chapter on sex bias in curriculum materials is generally unrelated to the theme of the book and simply describes the now familiar, mundane rehash of sexism-in-curriculum charge previously detailed in dozens of articles and books (Sadker & Frazier, 1973; Gersoni-Staun, 1974). It does not address the critical issue — that of demonstrating effects — in any systematic, empirical way.

The section on the structure of careers in education is perhaps the strongest one in the collection, as it has a clear focus, topic, and organization and offers many valuable, if not controversial, chapters. Tyack and Strober, for example, see the composition of teaching by sex not as some ineluctable and unilinear evolution, but as an intriguing set of historical puzzles; their chapter is written almost as a suspenseful detective story. Paddock, in contrast, takes a more structural approach and finds that women are more likely to be found in "terminal" positions such as elementary principal, in which the next career move is generally an exit one, rather than in "mobile" positions such as secondary principal and administrator of instruction, the primary career routes to the superintendency. We need to look more closely at these key connections and assessment points and to go beyond a description of the pathway to an analysis of the why and how.

Carlson and Schmuck begin such an analysis in their discussion of the effects of the vacancy chain and its interaction with career barriers that govern the movement of individuals from one position to the next higher position.



One such career barrier is seniority, which acts to provide for the peaking of an individual's competitive advantage. The authors argue that because seniority provides a guarantee that one's turn will someday come, "The use of seniority would achieve equality of opportunity — it would achieve what equal-employment opportunity rules and regulations have not" (p. 126). The serious suggestion that seniority, a basically retrogressive employment practice, would achieve equal opportunity goals for women is quite naive. When the majority of administrators are male, seniority merely acts to upgrade yet another male. Seniority guarantees advancement in time only under certain favorable contingencies, that is, when there are vacancies and positive market forces. Consider women in higher education. When tenured faculty are under threat of being fired, the first to go are the newest in the rank with the least seniority, namely, women and minorities. The seniority system here actually acts to penalize these groups' progress. Furthermore, seniority rewards the traditional male, continuous career pattern of amassing uninterrupted years in rank, and not the more typically female one of numerous interruptions.

Related to this discussion is the definition of "career" and "success" in a career. Schmuck and Carlson and several others in this book note that the traditional definition of career — employing such criteria as movement, order, and logical sequence of jobs — represents an essentially male paradigm. They even relate some interesting findings that women who have achieved positions in administration do not aspire to attain the usual trappings of success as measured by higher status and salary. "One female principal said, 'Success is not measured by moving from job to job in a vertical continuum — it is measured by the quality of any job held'" (pp. 122-123). Paradoxically, it is this very definition on which all the studies and discussion in this collection rest. Jovick's study, for example, is based on the work of Lortie and Cohen, who assert that the teaching occupation is "career-less" because no successive status positions exist within a school by which teachers can gauge their progress and professional success. Measuring success in terms of the satisfaction of socially serving (such as a teacher might do) is not a part of this definition. Lest we fall into the stereotype that women teachers prefer intrinsic, more personal rewards such as those found in teaching versus the more extrinsic rewards of visible administrative leadership, Wheatley pointedly reminds us that the observed behaviors of women can become linked to stereotypes describing alleged intrinsic predispositions of their sex. It is difficult to look for alternative explanations of the observed behavior when such powerful historical stereotypes have been absorbed over time into the culture's image of a teacher.

Gender as an independent variable explains very little of the variance in performance as a teacher or administrator, and the studies in this book which explore such variables as communication style, task content, and influence on school and classroom basically support this conclusion. Pitner presents some

exploratory data from her field study of a small sample of male and female superintendents and finds that women superintendents employ power differently, effecting a more personal, intimate style of leadership than do men. Such studies, while providing a fascinating glimpse into possible differing styles of leadership between the sexes, lead us no further in articulating possible strategies to break the rigid system of sex-role stereotyping in this profession. The book does not address the issue of change and strategies for change so much as it cogently presents the asymmetrical situation and the possible reasons for it. Much of the work reported seems to contradict the often repeated assertion that simply trying to give women more visibility and opportunity will increase their numbers in the administrative ranks. As Stockard and Johnson note, changing the situation for women impacts on only one part of the system. If men cannot comfortably see themselves as nurturers as well as leaders, then their separation from females in all male professions, including educational administration, is not likely to change.

#### REFERENCES

- Frasher, J., & Frasher, R. Educational administration: A feminine profession. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 1979, 15, 1-13.
- Gersoni-Staun, D. *Sexism and youth*. New York: Bowker, 1974.
- Sadker, M., & Frazier, N. *Sexism in school and society*. New York, Harper & Row, 1973.

Joy K. Rice  
University of Wisconsin – Madison