

UC Santa Barbara

UC Santa Barbara Previously Published Works

Title

Still a Man's World: Men Who Do "Women's Work,".

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0r78m503>

Journal

Contemporary Sociology A Journal of Reviews, 24(6)

ISSN

0094-3061

Authors

Bielby, Denise D
Williams, Christine L

Publication Date

1995-11-01

DOI

10.2307/2076713

Peer reviewed



Review

Reviewed Work(s): Still a Man's World: Men Who Do "Women's Work,". by Christine L. Williams

Review by: Denise D. Bielby

Source: *Contemporary Sociology*, Vol. 24, No. 6 (Nov., 1995), pp. 809-810

Published by: American Sociological Association

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2076713>

Accessed: 11-12-2018 18:35 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

American Sociological Association is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Contemporary Sociology*

having children, influence tomorrow's population structure (p. 151). But to him, for unspecified reasons, this feedback is "a small one in most cases" (p. 151), implying, I think, that little is lost by ignoring it.

As a demographer, I find Blau's treatment of population composition as a prime mover of macro- and microphenomena very appealing. But as one interested in macrosociology, I am not sure that Blau has told me enough. I wished to hear more about the interdependence of the parts of wholes. The makeup of parts, emphasizing the relative numbers of different types of them, is only half the story. The interdependence of the parts, emphasizing the working and the evolution thereof, is the other, equally important, half. Also, Blau's insistence that individuals have freedom of choice, which they exercise, and that the choices people make must be taken into account in studying their social relations (p. 14) whetted my interest to hear more about how Blau would, if he must, deal with the actions of individuals (resulting in events such as births, deaths, marriage, and mobility) and their impact on population composition. His postulate (p. 14) that social structure, along with each choice that an individual makes, restricts subsequent freedom of choice implies that an individual's degrees of freedom vary from one choice-situation to another. The question is whether macrosociologists leave out anything crucial when they do not explicitly discuss in their theory how individuals exercise whatever degrees of freedom they have in making choices. There are many who say "yes." To Blau, however, the task of macrosociology is not to aggregate from micro to macro, but to show how the (macrolevel) population composition determines probabilities or rates of social mobility and other phenomena observable at the micro level (pp. 5, 145–151).

Still a Man's World: Men Who Do "Women's Work," by **Christine L. Williams**. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995. 243 pp. \$40.00 cloth. ISBN: 0-520-08786-0. \$15.00 paper. ISBN: 0-520-08787-9.

DENISE D. BIELBY
University of California, Santa Barbara

In 1977, Rosabeth Moss Kanter's *Men and Women of the Corporation* (New York: Basic

Books) drew attention to the significance of proportional representation in organizational settings by detailing the limiting effects of token status for employee group dynamics. In the corporate world of the 1970s, when barriers to diversity were newly challenged, women and minorities were the primary recipients of the inevitable consequences of tokenism: role encapsulation based upon preexisting stereotypes and other generalizations, boundary heightening by the dominant group, which make inclusion difficult if not impossible, and the stress and other costs of being continuously subjected to assumptions that one can never be an insider. More recently, Reskin and Roos (*Job Queues, Gender Queues*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press 1990) have demonstrated the persistence of occupational sex segregation, despite two decades of efforts to increase equal access to jobs and educational opportunities. Given the apparent self-perpetuating nature of sex segregation at the job and firm level, tokenism may be as good as workplace dynamics ever get for those individuals willing to challenge barriers to career opportunities.

The work of Kanter and of Reskin and Roos focuses almost exclusively on the particular predicament of women. Moreover, a fundamental assumption in Kanter's work is that the dynamics of proportional representation are gender-neutral: All numerical minorities experience negative job consequences. However, what we now know is that because women hold a subordinate status in society's gender hierarchy, they are not just outsiders when they integrate male-dominated occupations and domains, they are subordinate outsiders. The missing piece in the mosaic of findings about sex segregation and tokenism is systematic study of men in female-dominated occupations. How do the dynamics of proportional representation operate in settings in which males find themselves to be outsiders? Christine Williams's book, *Still A Man's World*, is a significant contribution toward that effort, building upon diverse empirical and theoretical literatures about men in sex-atypical occupations, masculinity, and occupational segregation.

Drawing on evidence from case studies of men in four predominantly female occupations—nursing, elementary school teaching, librarianship, and social work—Williams re-

lies upon interview data from employees around the country, bolstered by aggregate level statistics about those occupations. Men in these fields actively work to preserve their masculinity, motivated by having to endure an onslaught of negative stereotypes to the contrary. How men manage essentials of masculinity—male power and privilege—in sex-atypical occupations to override their token status is well documented, as is Williams's Freudian-based framework, which accounts for their actions and practices. For example, male privilege is maintained by accepting a free ride on the "glass escalator" that creates opportunities for advancement, regardless of men's ambitions or prior accomplishments. Through this mechanism, female-dominated occupations become internally stratified, with men in the best-paying, most technologically oriented specialties, in the administrative tiers, and in the most advanced organizational sectors. Williams notes that gendered expectations already inscribed within organizations place a premium on qualities associated with masculinity. She argues that these expectations interact to men's benefit with gendered interests brought by both male and females to the workplace.

Men's gendered interests are enacted by "the doing" of masculinity in a manner that is ultimately hegemonic. Relying upon the power and privilege that masculinity comprises, men not only "maintain" hegemonic masculinity but also distinguish themselves from women in these occupations by segregating themselves into male-identified occupational specialties, emphasizing the masculine elements of the job, pursuing higher administrative positions, and disassociating from their work altogether. In short, the very disadvantages experienced by female tokens—role encapsulation, boundary heightening, presumed incompetence, and being an outsider—which keep them perpetually at a disadvantage when they are a numerical minority, have the opposite effect when the token is a male. These distinctive dynamics make the integration of female-dominated occupations (which would raise salaries, and increase valuation of the work performed and the prestige of the occupations themselves) complicated, if not impossible.

It is a depressing story that seems to paint

gender segregation as inevitable. Williams tries to introduce a note of optimism for change by pointing to possibilities for restructuring males' socialization into masculinity. This agenda seems to divert attention away from efforts to transform institutionalized organizational arrangements and interests, but a retreat from that challenge would certainly make matters worse, not better. These qualms aside, this is a provocative work that draws upon a wide range of theoretical and empirical materials and raises important questions about asymmetries and the dynamics of tokenism.

Commercial Culture: The Media System and the Public Interest, by **Leo Bogart**. New York: Oxford University Press, 1995. 384 pp. \$35.00 cloth. ISBN: 0-19-509098-5.

MICHAEL SCHUDSON
Department of Communication
University of California, San Diego

Leo Bogart is one of the rare sociologists who have achieved recognition almost entirely outside the academic world. He served for many years as executive vice president and general manager of the Newspaper Advertising Bureau, a research and support organization for the newspaper industry. The author of a number of books on the press, public opinion, television, and advertising, Bogart is enormously well informed and could scarcely be better qualified to tackle the subject he addresses here, *Commercial Culture: The Media System and the Public Interest*.

Bogart's immersion in the world of media institutions has meant relative isolation from sociology. Here is a book that discusses art markets, networks, and jobs without mentioning Howard Becker; that describes the stratification of taste without discussing Pierre Bourdieu or Herbert Gans. This does not prevent Bogart's talking good sense, rooted in a particularly thorough command of the economic structure of the media industries. But it may help explain why this work does not provide a coherent theoretical narrative.

Bogart's location close to the media industries may also explain the book's literary tics. For instance, each chapter begins