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

from drinking "spirits" before work but allows males to do so. As the authors note:

> Drinking at Brady's is the central symbol of membership in this small society and when someone is excluded from this kind of ritual participation they become, even if momentarily, marginal participants. Handicap rules for women in our culture often function in this way . . . to insure that males stay at the center of social significance and that women remain . . . at the periphery [pp. 37–38].

There is the "cross-over [role change] phenomenon," with its peculiarly asymmetrical character in which

> . . . a man loses if he does women's work . . . and so . . . avoids it or refuses to switch [but] a woman gains and is usually eager to cross over. . . . When a man crosses over to assist a woman, she should thank him . . . but when a woman crosses over to assist a man . . . *she must still express gratitude* [p. 41].

There is the "joking relationship" which softens and thus gives stability to the inequities of male-female interactions in the bar. There is the particular (but hardly unrepresentative) status hierarchy of Brady's which functions to strengthen the bonding between males but undercut it between females. There is the subtle affirmation of maleness in the ceremonies of "asking for a drink." And there are many more such phenomena noted in the book.

In addition to shedding light on the intricacies of socially constructed gender, *The Cocktail Waitress* contributes to our understanding of personal relationships in urban public settings. As the authors' descriptive and analytic materials make clear, Brady's Bar, for many of its customers and employees, is far more than simply a drinking or working place. It is a locale within which acquaintanceships, friendships, and intimacies are engendered, nurtured, and sustained. And for some of these relationships, it is a locale within which their existence is totally bounded. Students of the city have, I think, underemphasized the importance of such forms of human connection. It is one of the assets of this volume that it provides its readers with some rare close looks at the character and on-going creation of these wonderfully urban and urbane relationships.

To treat the commonplace with seriousness and respect, as this book does, is not perhaps to make much stir in the social science community. But I think it is from studies such as this that a truly relevant and *social* science will emerge.

LYNN H. LOFLAND
Department of Sociology,
University of California, Davis

Conceptions of Crowding

Crowding and Behavior. JONATHAN L. FREEDMAN. x, 178 pp. Trade edition, Viking, New York, 1975. $8.95. Educational edition, Freeman, San Francisco, 1975. Paper, $4.50.

The Environment and Social Behavior. Privacy, Personal Space, Territory, Crowding. IRWIN ALTMAN. Brooks/Cole, Monterey, Calif., 1975. xii, 256 pp., illus. $6.95.

Until recently, behavioral research on crowding consisted mostly of observations of animals living in conditions of high density or of humans living in cities. From these studies, the main answer that emerged to the classic question "What are the consequences of crowding?" was "Lousy!"

The two books under review provide contrasting examples of recent advances in the analysis of human crowding. Freedman writes exclusively about crowding within the traditional context, with a focus on the implications for life in large cities. He adopts a narrow conceptual orientation and finds a single generalization by which to interpret empirical results. Altman, in contrast, is concerned with understanding general relationships among environmental factors and behavior. His focus is upon an individual's ability to control social interactions through interpersonal spacing and territoriality mechanisms. Crowding in his view is a subjective state occurring at the end of a causal chain of coping mechanisms, signifying that something in the system has blown. The differences between these approaches can best be illustrated by a brief account of each author's orientation.

In keeping with the tradition established by animal research and research concerned with establishing correlations between urban crowding and behavioral phenomena, Freedman defines crowding in terms of population density. Crowding, as the independent variable, is a situational characteristic. Freedman reviews a mounting body of evidence, to which he has made major contributions, showing that increasing levels of density do not invariably produce negative consequences for humans, but may sometimes produce positive or neutral ones. When the classical question is phrased in terms of behavioral consequences of physical density, Freedman's answer is "It depends." Many authors give this answer because the concept physical density is a crude umbrella covering a variety of different, and sometimes unrelated, dimensions. It is Freedman's contention, however, that density per se serves to intensify the response an individual would typically make in a given situation because density heightens the importance of other people. It is predicted that situations evoking pleasant responses will become more pleasant as density increases, while situations evoking unpleasant responses will become more unpleasant.

There is much merit in proposing a testable idea. Appropriate tests of the intensification hypothesis will involve two restrictions. The hypothesis is intended to apply to density levels not sufficiently extreme to produce such negative by-products as physical discomfort, inability to move, or unpleasant odors. The second restriction, concerning the types of reactions expected to intensify, is not directly discussed in the book. Consistent with worries about whether crowding is good or bad, intensification is illustrated by reference to a positive-negative feeling dimension. Most of the examples cited and three of the studies designed by Freedman to test the intensification hypothesis, contained in appendices, involve such affective feeling. For other types of reactions, such as helping, self-disclosure, and dominating, the prediction of intensification would not seem as intuitively compelling.

Altman's analysis is a break from the crowding research tradition to which Freedman's work belongs. It represents a view currently gaining ascendancy among social scientists which locates crowding as a subjective state occurring as an outcome of interpersonal processes. According to this view, one must discover antecedent variables other than aspects of physical density to predict subjective crowding and its behavioral consequences. The particular antecedent variables deemed necessary to induce crowding vary considerably, with physical density not even included in some lists. Prominent in all lists, however, is a variable that is stressfully unpleasant, such as a need for more space or an excess of social interactions. Because crowding is defined as involving something unpleasant, it is pointless to ask whether it is pleasant or unpleasant. Instead, the major issues become defining the antecedent conditions for the occurrence of crowding and predicting the coping reactions induced by crowding.

By undertaking the ambitious task of setting up a framework for integrating the interdisciplinary evidence regarding person-environment relationships, Altman confronts these issues. Central to his pursuit is the concept of privacy, which is defined not by the mere absence