self-esteem of black and white children? Common sense may suggest that when desegregation is peaceful black children will have higher self-esteem than when they are exposed to whites' hostility in a school where turmoil and conflict accompany desegregation. But a study in this volume shows that black children in an abrasive and "anxiety-arousing" situation of conflict showed the higher self-regard—apparently an outcome in part of the high level of morale and group support among black parents and within a unified black community (Meketon, cited on p. 262).

One can only echo with enthusiasm the recommendation in the chapter by Ashmore and DelBoca that research on prejudice (and discrimination) must specify the social context in which individuals exist and must treat prejudice not as an isolated variable to be explained by a single antecedent but as an interacting and interconnected aspect of an individual's self-system and group affiliations.

In view of the great importance assigned by several contributors to law and political action both for maintaining and for changing racial and ethnic relations, it is appropriate that this volume contains an exemplary review of federal laws and regulations relevant to racial discrimination. Its author provides (p. 437) a definitive quotation with which to close this review:

> It may not always be possible to "legislate morality," but it is clear that the law may take a leading role in pointing the way for the development of our morality. Accordingly, those involved in the continuing struggle for equal rights in this country must not overlook the powerful ally they have when "the law" is on their side.

ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR.
Department of Sociology, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

Interpreting the Results of a Social Experiment

Women in the Kibbutz. LIONEL TIGER and JOSEPH SHEPHER. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1975. x, 334 pp. $10.95.

The Israeli kibbutz espoused equality for women as one of its founding principles over 50 years ago. Yet, contemporary kibbutz life departs from this ideal enough to cause grave concern to kibbutz leaders and planners. *Women in the Kibbutz* presents a carefully researched, richly detailed account of the problem but a simplistic, misleading, and controversial interpretation of its causes. The book seems designed to leave readers with the impression, unfortunate and probably erroneous, that if the kibbutz cannot create equality and equity between the sexes no society can.

Though declaring that the results "startled" them—a coy statement, coming from a well-known biological determinist like the first author—Lionel Tiger and Joseph Shepher feel driven by their data to an "inescapable" conclusion: "Some powerful pervasive force or forces intervene between the intentions of kibbutz ideology and the reality of kibbutz social structure." They call these forces biological and attribute the failure of kibbutzim to achieve full sexual equality to a "relative intractability of sex roles despite major social change."

Men and women in kibbutzim, they argue, live as if in two separate communities, and there seems to have been an increase in sex-typing and role differentiation over time. Women, their time freed by collective child care, can theoretically "work" anywhere in a kibbutz, but they are concentrated in service, provision of food and clothing, and education, while men are clustered in production, management, and kibbutz politics. Men hold a very high proportion of kibbutz offices, and women attend community meetings less often and rarely talk when present. As the importance of the nuclear family unit has grown and the collective commitment of the revolutionary founding period has declined, egalitarianism in sex roles has diminished, a point first made by Yonina Talmon and a phenomenon consistent with experiences in Russia, China, and American intentional communities (*1*). Moreover, Tiger and Shepher's attitudinal data show that women appear to like things the new way. Kibbutz women report dissatisfaction not because of reversion to a traditional sexual division of labor but because they do not have *enough* "femininity" and familism. Yet, such results should be kept in perspective. The kibbutzim have made great advances in sex role equalization, in part as a function of self-conscious communal and egalitarian values.

Tiger and Shepher have proceeded with research rigor and caution, if with limited theoretical imagination. Their book presents a vast quantity of carefully collected and analyzed historical and survey data, differentiated by type and age of kibbutz and supplemented with interviews and observations. It is on the level of concept and interpretation that *Women in the Kibbutz* has major flaws. Tiger and Shepher do consider (and reject the importance of) circumstances that may have intervened to make the kibbutz a less than perfect social laboratory: its existence within a larger society and the influence of large numbers of worldwide visitors. And in their claims for the role of biological forces in kibbutz life they postulate them only as propensities, not as strict determinants. But they fail to see that their conclusion that the seeming intractability of sex roles is biologically based is far from "inescapable." The kibbutz was never a perfect test of nurture versus nature as the root of sexual inequality. Given the conditions that prevailed at the outset of this social experiment, the current place of women in the kibbutz can be explained on purely social grounds.

Tiger and Shepher fail to accord its full significance to one very striking fact they report: There were 20 to 50 percent more men than women in kibbutzim until Israeli statehood (circa 1910 to 1948). In some early kibbutzim, there were as few as one or two women among a dozen men. Such low representation makes it seem probable that women never interacted with men on an equal footing and that their concerns were not built into the evolving social structure of the kibbutz. Recent laboratory research and field observations have shown that there are special sets of interactional dynamics around "token" women or "tokens" of any kind—people with a salient ascribed characteristic who constitute distinct numerical minorities in a group (*2*). It is much more likely that the proportionately scarce will fall into stereotyped roles and at critical moments be reminded of their "difference." It is unlikely that they will become important leaders, although they might play necessary service roles. And it is very likely that the assumed attributes and actual tasks of those in the numerical majority will be assigned more social value.

Such "dynamics of tokenism" emerge in Tiger and Shepher's account. The women of the early kibbutzim were assigned sex-stereotyped roles even over their protests. While women sometimes did "men's" work, men never took on the residual and ideologically less important service tasks traditionally assigned to women, for it was considered unacceptable for men to care for young children. What the pioneers' cultures of origin defined as men's work retained higher social value.

Would the roles of the sexes today be different if the numbers of women and

men had been more balanced from the beginning? The kibbutz social experiment cannot tell us. But we do know that from the very founding of the kibbutz a pattern was established that greatly reduced the chances for a fair test of the "tractability" of sex roles. Today, too, none of the boys are trained in adolescence for "women's jobs," though girls are trained for "men's" work. Under such circumstances, should one find it "startling" and reflective of biological imperatives that women learn they are less important than men, deserving only a back seat in public forums?

Women of the kibbutz early came to be ghettoized in routine, minimally challenging service occupations that men rarely entered. Given this occupational distribution, along with the fact that "success" or "achievement" (to the extent that these concepts still have meaning in a communal group, as I suspect they do) must have been associated with the men's pursuits, kibbutz women developed attitudes and behaviors that tend to be adopted by *anyone*—male or female—in routine, low-opportunity, low-valued work. Like many American male factory workers, kibbutz women desired escape into situations where they could be more independent and have more control over their work rhythms: for example, out of the communal laundry-factory and into their own "small business," the running of their own affairs in the nuclear family. Like people in growthless, dead-end jobs everywhere, kibbutz women turned to personal service and emphasized an ideology (romantic love) that would vicariously tie them to power, as a way to acquire recognition and status when the opportunity for achievement of their own was stifled (*3*). (These patterns are especially characteristic of secretaries in the United States, and it is interesting to note that kibbutz women in the management branches are overwhelmingly concentrated in clerical work.) Finally, kibbutz women clustered in service branches such as the kitchen and nurseries seem to have behaved like all work groups with low power, little institutional importance, easy replaceability, and close scrutiny by a clientele who cannot be kept at a distance with claims of worker expertise. Thus, each of the attitudes and behaviors that Tiger and Shepher claim differentiate the sexes in biologically basic ways can also be seen in a very different light: as characteristic human responses to work conditions.

That Tiger and Shepher saw only biology or beliefs as alternatives for explanation of male-female roles merely exemplifies a more general poverty of imagination in social and psychological theories of sex and gender differentiation. There has been a relative lack of attention to middle-range theories of social organization: how position in a particular division of labor affects behavior, attitudes, and preferences.

But there are other conclusions that the reader *can* draw from the kibbutz experience. First, equality and equity will not come about as long as they are seen solely as a matter of giving women a crack at male-dominated work. It is not enough to reduce "women's burdens" if they are not shared with men. Men must participate, too, in child care and other services, valuing them as important contributions to the community. And perhaps more fundamentally, sex roles cannot be changed through removing sexist socialization of children (as the kibbutzim tried to do) if adult sex-typing and inequity in the structure of roles remain. Despite "ideal" socialization, kibbutz children reverted to more traditional attitudes. This is understandable. Children learn not only from the present but from seeing what lies ahead. Waiting for the next generation, for the children of Utopia, instead of making change now, may ensure failure. That our children will bring about the world we desire but cannot effect may be a myth. It is the present structure of roles and relationships that locks us in and sets the future in motion.

ROSABETH MOSS KANTER
Harvard Law School, Cambridge, Massachusetts, and *Department of Sociology, Brandeis University, Waltham*

References and Notes

1. See Y. Talmon, *Family and Community in the Kibbutz* (Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1972); L. A. Coser, "Some aspects of Soviet family policy," in *The Family: Its Structure and Functions*, R. L. Coser, Ed. (St. Martin's, New York, 1974); R. M. Kanter, "Family organization and sex roles in American communes," in *Communes: Creating and Managing the Collective Life*, R. M. Kanter, Ed. (Harper & Row, New York, 1973).
2. Some of this evidence is reviewed in R. M. Kanter, *Men and Women of the Corporation* (Basic Books, New York, in press).
3. For an overview of this perspective and research evidence supporting it, see R. M. Kanter, "The impact of hierarchical structures on the work behavior of women and men," *Soc. Probl.*, in press.

Everyday Relationships in Urban Settings

The Cocktail Waitress. Woman's Work in a Man's World. JAMES P. SPRADLEY and BRENDA J. MANN. Wiley, New York, 1975. vi, 154 pp. $7.50.

One could argue, and I suspect some will, that an anthropological-ethnographic study of cocktail waitresses in a college-hangout bar (Brady's) located in an American city in what would appear to be the upper Middle West represents the ultimate in social science triviality. Had the study been federally funded (apparently, it was not), one can well imagine Senator William Proxmire "honoring" it with one of his awards. After all, consider the elements of focus: young, middle-class working women, neither poor nor delinquent; a college clientele, not even engaged in counter-cultural or revolutionary troublemaking; a bar, hardly the setting for the "truly important" events of the day. And if that weren't enough, the study is devoid of the panoply of "real" social science: no correlations, no cross tabulations, no path analyses, no numbers.

But triviality like other qualities is in the eye or ideology of the beholder. As a sociological social psychologist with an interest in urban phenomena, as a qualitative analyst, and as a feminist, I would argue that whatever strengths and importance this slim volume possesses emerge not in spite of, but because of, its nonquantitative attention to mundane aspects of social life. Its authors have managed (as more quantitatively sophisticated social science researchers bent on pursuing questions of current concern seem often not to do) to illuminate a portion of those interactions and understandings, patterns and processes that simultaneously create and are creations of the culture and social organization that structure our lives.

An explicit goal of *The Cocktail Waitress* is to contribute to our understanding of the social construction of maleness and femaleness. It is certainly not news in social science that male and female, man and woman, are socially constructed categories. Historical, cross-cultural, and feminist-sensitized contemporary materials show clearly that social groups, working with the clay of biological differentiation, create socially differentiated sexual selves. What is less clear, both to relatively disinterested analysts and to liberationist activists, is the micromechanisms by which such selves are produced and sustained and the microstructures in which they are embedded. Spradley and Mann have captured on paper a number of these elusive mechanisms and structures. There is, for example, the "handicap rule," which, at Brady's Bar, prevents female employees