



June 1996

Individual Voices, Collective Visions: Fifty Years of Women in Sociology. Ann Goetting and Sarah Fenstermaker (Eds). Reviewed by Karen E. Campbell, Vanderbilt University.

Karen E. Campbell
Vanderbilt University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw>

 Part of the [Social Work Commons](#), and the [Sociology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Campbell, Karen E. (1996) "*Individual Voices, Collective Visions: Fifty Years of Women in Sociology.* Ann Goetting and Sarah Fenstermaker (Eds). Reviewed by Karen E. Campbell, Vanderbilt University," *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*: Vol. 23 : Iss. 2 , Article 12.

Available at: <https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol23/iss2/12>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Social Work at ScholarWorks at WMU. For more information, please contact maira.bundza@wmich.edu.



body, according to Barry, marriage, dating, rape and prostitution become indistinguishable, except by degree of exploitation. Finally, she dismisses out of hand those anti-censorship feminists and other "sexual liberals" who believe that state power should not be used to restrict sexual expression.

Despite these flaws, the book is a serious contribution to a complex and important problem. Barry offers an analysis well grounded in feminist theory and principles, and provides a concrete strategy to address female oppression on a world-wide level. For these reasons, her book merits close attention.

Beth Cagan
Cleveland State University

Ann Goetting and Sarah Fenstermaker (Eds.) *Individual Voices, Collective Vision: Fifty Years of Women in Sociology*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1995. \$49.95 hardcover, \$18.95 papercover.

If there were ever any doubt about the diversity of women's experiences—even within academic sociology—*Individual Voices, Collective Vision* surely puts it to rest. The recollections of eighteen senior women are almost breath-taking in their variety. Yet, as the title of the volume suggests, shared threads emerge quite clearly from these autobiographies. In her conclusion, Sarah Fenstermaker refers to these common themes as "living outside" (the marginality that these women—and many sociologists—experienced early in their lives) and "living inside" (their struggles to succeed in the often unfriendly world of academia). The end result, as Ann Goetting suggests in her introduction, is to give voice to women's reality. Rather than simply summarize each writer's chapter, I hope to describe some of the diversity and commonality of this reality.

First, the diversity. The contours of these women's lives vary widely, both in their youth and as adults. Gaye Tuchman, for example, writes in great detail of the Sugarman Family Circle, and rues its diminution: "No one phones to say that my grandfather's first cousin's granddaughter has had a child" (304). The lives and families of several of the women who wrote for this collection

were scarred by the Holocaust; Shulamit Reinharz describes the near annihilation of her parents' relatives. Suzanne Keller had two sets of parents: her "peasant parents," with whom she spent the first few years of her life, and her biological Austrian parents, with whom she fled the tide of Naziism. (Already, of course, you see one of the common threads amongst varied family circumstances: several writers, either with their parents or on their own, came to the U.S. from other countries.)

Few of these women had the sort of linear career that Goetting describes as typically male, and the non-linearities are legion. Datha Brack began in nursing training; she, Beth Hess, and Helena Lopata all took substantial time to be full-time mothers and homemakers. Janet Lever and Elaine Hall traversed the most circuitous paths, I think. While most of these women experienced obstacles and diversions along the way, none but Lever co-hosted a show on the Playboy Channel called "Women on Sex." And only Hall spent fifteen years wandering the U.S., taking odd jobs when she needed funds (work that informed her later research on waiting tables).

Now, the commonality. I have already hinted at several shared themes: immigration, traditional women's roles on the way to academia, careers characterized by twists and turns, fits and starts. But there is more, much more. As Fenstermaker notes, a sense of marginality is common among sociologists, and there are no exceptions here. I would argue that marginality based on sex is the central theme of this collection: no writer came through college, graduate school, and employment without some sense of being an outsider *because she was a woman*. But additional dimensions of difference imbued their lives. Nationalities other than U.S. (Hannah Wartenberg, Britta Fischer, Keller, Martha Gimenez, Lopata) and even region within the U.S. (Jane Prather, a non-Southerner raised in Arkansas) stood some of these women apart. For Reinharz and Pamela Roby, most clearly, class standing lower than that of their peers in the neighborhood and at college shaped their visions. And many of these women experienced marginality for combining traditional women's roles (being wives and mothers) with graduate training and professional sociology. Some revealed in their distinctiveness: Fischer enjoyed the "near-stardom" of being a foreigner in the U.S., and Reinharz writes of "pleasant

marginality" in both the U.S. and Israel. Pleasant or not, being outsiders gave sociological insights before most of these writers knew the discipline existed.

The marginality that accompanied motherhood crosscuts a second common theme in these writings. Several women, as children or adolescents, examined the lives of women kin and found them wanting. Hall, Linda Holmstrom, and Roby explicitly write of rejecting their image of the traditional woman. Roby believed that her "foremothers had paid dearly when they abandoned careers for family. Not only did they lose work they enjoyed, they lost control of their lives as well" (322). Hall resolved to be the "Unwomanly Person" (205).

Third, none of the writers began college with an express interest in sociology as a discipline. Hess calls herself "an accidental sociologist;" Diane Margolis chose graduate school in sociology because all the books she was reading were authored by sociologists; Helen Hacker writes of "slouching toward sociology." (To digress: Fenstermaker notes that she felt both connected *and* unconnected to the experiences described in the collection. That simultaneity struck home when I read that Hacker taught at Randolph-Macon Woman's College; the conservatism of the college and town appalled Hacker. On that campus, 30 years later, I encountered a mentor—herself an alumna of R-MWC—who was the spark for my career in sociology.)

Finally, these sociologists were, early on, inured to gender inequality. Almost to a woman, they write that even upon recognition of inequities based on sex, they had no "feminist framework" (Goetting's phrase) with which to analyze their experiences. Judy Long is most pithy, describing her denial of tenure at Cornell: "I think that was the last time I didn't get it" (120; emphasis in original). Eventually, all "got it," and saw that womanhood disadvantaged them in academia. Further, their recollections illustrate a point made by Coramae Mann: "the many roles of professor for a woman are not the same as those of a man" (Mann, 282). Thankfully, these women had the energy to write of the ways in which they and their roles are distinct.

Karen E. Campbell
Vanderbilt University