a woman of color, or that the anti-semit draws of the Jew, or that the pornographer draws of figures resemble one one another. For they are the creations of one mind. This is the chauvinist mind, a mind which projects all it fears in itself onto another: a mind which defines itself by what it hates. (p. 60)

While it is commonplace in feminist literature to compare sexism and racism, one can readily see the sloppiness of her thinking when she compares the hate literature of pornography to the mass genocide of Jews. As a Jew and a woman, I can only be offended by such a flippant comparison. (But then again she may want to claim poetic license, a point I will come to in a minute).

On the few occasions when Griffen does attempt to address existing sociological data she is a dismal failure. For example, she uncritically quotes a study in San Francisco in which:

Women were asked if they had ever been upset by someone trying to force or persuade them “to do what they’d seen in pornographic pictures, movies or books.” Ten percent of the women answered yes to the question. (p.104)

Is this supposed to be supportive sociological research? She tells us little more about it. Mainly Griffen avoids dealing with existing research, preferring to spend her time weaving long-winded metaphors around the dichotomy of eros and pornography. Like a poet, she uses literary license in an attempt to get our attention. She speaks in fragmented phrases and sometimes uses grammatically incorrect sentences.

Our silence. The silence and the silencing of women. The creation of authority in the image of the male, of god in the image of the male. Rape. The burning of witches. Wife-beating, (etc. etc.) (p.201)

But all the dramatics and repetitiveness merely insult the seriousness of her subject matter, rather than highlight it. The issue of pornography is too important and complex to warrant just another gloom and doom polemical tirade. While it is hard to take issue with any of the substance of Griffen’s text, it is difficult to understand why it was necessary for her to belabour her point for some 265 pages. Incidentally, the Lederer reader includes an excerpt from Griffen that makes her point quite adequately.

In conclusion, I would not want to suggest that Griffen’s book is useless. It is clearly an important contemporary statement on pornography. Rather, my disappointment comes from the fact that it is not grand or profound as it promises to be. It suffers from too much righteousness. Lederer’s book on the other hand is terrific. It covers all the ground effortlessly. It refrains from preaching and tiresome feminist rhetoric. More importantly, it is far more informative.

Judith Posner
York University


An international study of women’s work attitudes and their structural correlates has all the potential of a first class contribution to both economics and sociology. This book, however, falls seriously short of its potential. The study in the field of motivation and job satisfaction, which is plagued with conceptual and operational problems aims to test the validity of “current” theories on “attitudes to work” (employment). The review of the literature is scanty, dated and inadequate. Even three highly pertinent books in the area published between 1973 and 1978 by the same publisher are not referred to. As a result, the theoretical significance is
diminished, since the author develops the book around an attempt to demolish theoretically dated straw men.

The volume is a report on the results of a 1976-77 interview survey of women employed in three occupational clusters below the semi-professional level in three countries: the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel and the United States. The occupational clusters were: sewers and stitchers in the needle trade industry; saleswomen and cashiers in retail trade; and clerical and secretarial workers in banks, insurance companies, universities, and labour union offices. The total sample of 761 women had almost equal numbers among the three countries and occupational categories. While an interview schedule formed the basis of the study, a copy is not reproduced in the book and only some of the questions asked are included in the text.

The key independent factors that are examined for their effect on women workers' attitudes are: initial aspirations (level of academic and vocational/technical training), domestic work load, progress in employment career, hygiene level of current job (conditions of work) and health condition of respondent (self-assessed). Curiously, although the occupational status of both of the respondent's parents and her husband were ascertained, (most blue-collar interviewees are blue-collar daughters and two-thirds of the married women have equal or superior occupational status to their husbands) there is no further statistical analysis or discussion of the influence of such family background characteristics.

As with most of the studies on working women in the 1970's, the results of this study refute the old theories that women, especially married ones, have a weak attachment to the labour force, only an instrumental attitude toward paid employment and little interest in advancement and promotion. Less than one-quarter of the sample held a clearly instrumental attitude toward their employment.

Fifty-one per cent of the respondents had children under the age of ten and in the U.S. industry sample, seventy-seven per cent had children under this age. Of those who have children, the norm is two and the period of non-employment related to child care is five years. This is a marked change from the 1950's norms of larger families and stopouts of ten to fifteen years from the labour force. Sixty per cent stated that they intended to be employed until retirement age and on a composite variable of commitment to work eighty-five per cent had average or high commitment. A mere eighteen per cent replied that they would stay home if they had no financial needs and the majority (fifty-five per cent) viewed themselves as a main or sole bread winner for themselves or family. No other measure of the proportion of total family income that the women contribute was included and the relationship of economic need and economic contribution to commitment to employment remains insufficiently analysed.

The variable found to be most strongly related to commitment to employment and to advancement and promotion is the respondent's sex-role identity. This is more powerful than nationality, occupational category, age, marital status and a host of other variables. Traditionalists (those who believe in rigid sexual division of labour and that women ought to do the domestic and child care work in the home) comprised about one-third of the entire sample. They have a lower "commitment to work" and less interest in advancement or promotion. Since the per cent of women who hold an egalitarian ideology is substantial and increasing, the differences in male/female commitment to employment and interest in greater responsibility and promotion is likely to continue to decline.

Acceptance of an egalitarian ideology does not however, correspond to the social reality of the lives of the majority of these women. Seventy-two per cent of those with children at home report receiving no help at all with domestic work or care of the children. Not surprisingly,
the study found that of those with a heavy domestic work load, forty-eight per cent were in a poor state of health. Moreover, a heavy domestic work load was found to contribute directly or indirectly, to the reduction of a woman's overall level of satisfaction, "commitment to work" and interest in advancement. Differences in average domestic work load reported seemed to be a national characteristic no less than an occupational one. The average reported national weekly domestic work load is 16.4 hours for the United States, 17.7 for Israel, and 21.5 for Germany. The average load by occupational groups is 15 hours for office workers, 19.5 for retail and 21 for the industrial workers.

On the nine separate measures of traditional vs. egalitarian ideology, the responses range from ninety-one per cent agreeing with the view that males and females should have equal educational and vocational training, to seventy-five per cent stating men and women have equal capacities and fifty-five per cent accepting the "principle of equal pay." Fifty-two per cent endorsed the view that women do not like positions of authority as a justification for their not being given them and fifty-six per cent accepted the traditional rationales for the sex-typing of occupations. These discrepancies beg explanations yet they are not provided.

While there are a number of distinctive differences between the national groups (e.g., level of unionization, domestic work load and preference of employment over housework), occupational differences between the three employment categories account for a greater portion of the range of responses. The occupational differences were found to be weightier for the work attitudes of "emphasis on content, concern for content, interest in advancement, an instrumental attitude" and the 'instrumental syndrome' (a composite variable). National differences were weightier than occupational ones for overt satisfaction/dissatisfaction, and "concern for hygiene" (i.e., conditions of work). Like men, womens' consciousness is strongly affected by the type of work they do.

The bibliography is short and incomplete with five references mentioned in the text not included. Repeatedly, the author makes vague references to the research of others but fails to provide concrete citations or documentation. While several significant analytical distinctions are made and illuminating composite variables developed, the overall presentation of the data and analysis leaves a lot to be desired. A significant portion of the book reads like draft copy from a dictaphone with one sentence paragraphs, repetitive phraseology, poor writing style and inadequately labelled tables. Agassi is now studying the work attitudes of a male control sample. One hopes that the results of that research, when published, will be the product of more careful writing, editorial review and theoretical development.

Mary Percival Maxwell
Queen's University