

LORBER

"The Social Construction
of Gender"
47-57

**Race, Class, and Gender
in the United States**

An Integrated Study

FIFTH EDITION

Paula S. Rothenberg

William Paterson University of New Jersey

WORTH PUBLISHERS

Occidental College Library
1600 Campus Rd.
Los Angeles, CA 90041

Race, Class, and Gender in the United States, Fifth Edition
Copyright © 2001 by Worth Publishers
Copyright © 1998 by St. Martin's Press
All rights reserved

Manufactured in the United States of America

ISBN: 1-57259-950-2

Printing: 1 2 3 4 5 04 03 02 01

Executive Editor: Alan McClare
Production Editor: Margaret Comaskey
Art Director: Barbara Reingold
Design: Paul Lacy
Cover Design: Wiktor Sadowski
Production Manager: Barbara Anne Seixas
Composition: TSI Graphics Inc.
Printing and Binding: R. R. Donnelley & Sons Company

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Race, class, and gender in the United States: an integrated study / [edited by] Paula S. Rothenberg.—5th ed.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 1-57259-950-2

1. Racism. 2. Sexism. 3. Social classes—United States. 4. Sex discrimination against women—United States. 5. United States—Race relations. I. Rothenberg, Paula S., 1943—

HT1521.R335 2000
305.8'00973—dc21

00-035427

Worth Publishers
41 Madison Avenue
New York, NY 10010
www.worthpublishers.com

Contents

PART I: THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF DIFFERENCE: RACE, CLASS, GENDER, AND SEXUALITY

PREFACE	XI
ABOUT THE AUTHOR	XV
INTRODUCTION	
1 Racial Formations <i>Michael Omi and Howard Winant</i>	1
2 The Ethics of Living Jim Crow: An Autobiographical Sketch <i>Richard Wright</i>	2
3 How Jews Became White <i>Karen Brodtkin</i>	3
4 Rethinking Women's Biology <i>Ruth Hubbard</i>	4
5 The Social Construction of Gender <i>Judith Lorber</i>	4
6 Ah, Ya Throw-Like-a-Girl! <i>Mike Messner</i>	5
7 In a Male-Centered World, Female Differences Are Transformed into Female Disadvantages <i>Sandra Lipsitz Bem</i>	6
8 The Social Construction of Sexuality <i>Ruth Hubbard</i>	6
9 The Invention of Heterosexuality <i>Jonathan Ned Katz</i>	6
10 Deconstructing the Underclass <i>Herbert Gans</i>	8
11 Domination and Subordination <i>Jean Baker Miller</i>	8
<i>Suggestions for Further Reading</i>	9

The Social Construction of Gender

Judith Lorber

Until the eighteenth century, Western philosophers and scientists thought that there was one sex and that women's internal genitalia were the inverse of men's external genitalia: the womb and vagina were the penis and scrotum turned inside out (Laqueur 1990). Current Western thinking sees women and men as so different physically as to sometimes seem two species. The bodies, which have been mapped inside and out for hundreds of years, have not changed. What has changed are the justifications for gender inequality. When the social position of all human beings was believed to be set by natural law or was considered God-given, biology was irrelevant; women and men of different classes all had their assigned places. When scientists began to question the divine basis of social order and replaced faith with empirical knowledge, what they saw was that women were very different from men in that they had wombs and menstruated. Such anatomical differences destined them for an entirely different social life from men.

In actuality, the basic bodily material *is* the same for females and males, and except for procreative hormones and organs, female and male human beings have similar bodies (Nafolin and Butz 1981). Furthermore, as has been known since the middle of the nineteenth century, male and female genitalia develop from the same fetal tissue, and so infants can be born with ambiguous genitalia (Money and Ehrhardt 1972). When they are, biology is used quite arbitrarily in sex assignment. Suzanne Kessler (1990) interviewed six medical specialists in pediatric intersexuality and found that whether an infant with XY chromosomes and anomalous genitalia was categorized as a boy or a girl depended on the size of the penis—if a penis was very small, the child was categorized as a girl, and sex-change surgery was used to make an artificial vagina. In the late nineteenth century, the presence or absence of ovaries was the determining criterion of gender assignment for hermaphrodites because a woman who could not procreate was not a complete woman (Kessler 1990, 20).

Yet in Western societies, we see two discrete sexes and two distinguishable genders because our society is built on two classes of people, "women" and "men." Once the gender category is given, the attributes of the person are also gendered: Whatever a "woman" is has to be "female"; whatever a "man" is has to be "male." Analyzing the social processes that construct the categories we call "female and male," "women and men," and "homosexual and heterosexual" uncovers the ideology and power differentials congealed in these categories (Foucault 1978). This article will use a familiar area of social life—sports—to show how myriad physiological differences are transformed into similar-appearing, gendered social bodies. My perspective goes beyond accepted feminist views that gender is a cultural overlay that modifies physiological sex differences. That perspective assumes either that there are two fairly similar sexes distorted by social practices into two genders with purposefully different characteristics or that there are two sexes whose essential differences are rendered unequal by social practices. I am arguing that bodies differ in many ways physiologically, but they are completely transformed by social practices to fit into the salient categories of a society, the most pervasive of which are "female" and "male" and "women" and "men."

Neither sex nor gender are pure categories. Combinations of incongruous genes, genitalia, and hormonal input are ignored in sex categorization, just as combinations of incongruous physiology, identity, sexuality, appearance, and behavior are ignored in the social construction of gender statuses. Menstruation, lactation, and gestation do not demarcate women from men. Only some women are pregnant and then only some of the time; some women do not have a uterus or ovaries. Some women have stopped menstruating temporarily, others have reached menopause, and some have had hysterectomies. Some women breastfeed some of the time, but some men lactate (Jaggar 1983, 165fn). Menstruation, lactation, and gestation are individual experiences of womanhood (Levesque-Lopman 1988), but not determinants of the social category "woman," or even "female." Similarly, "men are not always sperm-producers, and in fact, not all sperm producers are men. A male-to-female transsexual, prior to surgery, can be socially a woman, though still potentially (or actually) capable of spermatogenesis" (Kessler and McKenna [1978] 1985, 2).

When gender assignment is contested in sports, where the categories of competitors are rigidly divided into women and men, chromosomes are now used to determine in which category the athlete is to compete. However, an anomaly common enough to be found in several women at every major international sports competition are XY chromosomes that have not produced male anatomy or physiology because of a genetic defect. Because these women are women in every way significant for sports competition, the prestigious International Amateur Athletic Federation has urged that sex be determined by simple genital inspection (Kolata 1992). Transsexuals would pass this test but it took a lawsuit for Renée Richards, a male-to-female transsexual, to be able to play tournament tennis as a woman, despite his male sex chromosomes (Richards 1983). Oddly, neither basis for gen-

der categorization—chromosomes nor genitalia—has anything to do with sports prowess (Birrell and Cole 1990).

In the Olympics, in cases of chromosomal ambiguity, women must undergo "a battery of gynecological and physical exams to see if she is 'female enough' to compete. Men are not tested" (Carlson 1991, 26). The purpose is not to categorize women and men accurately, but to make sure men don't enter women's competitions, where, it is felt, they will have the advantage of size and strength. This practice sounds fair only because it is assumed that all men are similar in size and strength and different from all women. Yet in Olympics boxing and wrestling matches, men are matched within weight classes. Some women might similarly successfully compete with some men in many sports. Women did not run in marathons until about twenty years ago. In twenty years of marathon competition, women have reduced their finish times by more than one-and-one-half hours; they are expected to run as fast as men in that race by 1998 and might catch up with men's running times in races of other lengths within the next fifty years because they are increasing their fastest speeds more rapidly than are men (Fausto-Sterling 1985, 213–18).

The reliance on only two sex and gender categories in the biological and social sciences is as epistemologically spurious as the reliance on chromosomal or genital tests to group athletes. Most research designs do not investigate whether physical skills or physical abilities are really more or less common in women and men (Epstein 1988). They start out with two social categories ("women," "men"), assume they are biologically different ("female," "male"), look for similarities within them and differences between them, and attribute what they have found for the social categories to sex differences (Gelman, Collman, and Maccoby 1986). These designs rarely question the categorization of their subjects into two and only two groups, even though they often find more significant within-group differences than between-group differences (Hyde 1990). The social construction perspective on sex and gender suggests that instead of starting with the two presumed dichotomies in each category—female, male; woman, man—it might be more useful in gender studies to group patterns of behavior and only then look for identifying markers of the people likely to enact such behaviors.

What Sports Illustrate

Competitive sports have become, for boys and men, as players and as spectators, a way of constructing a masculine identity, a legitimated outlet for violence and aggression, and an avenue for upward mobility (Dunning 1986; Kemper 1990, 167–206; Messner 1992). For men in Western societies, physical competence is an important marker of masculinity (Fine 1987; Glassner 1992; Majors 1990). In professional and collegiate sports, physiological differences are invoked to justify women's secondary status, despite the clear evidence that gender status overrides

physiological capabilities. Assumptions about women's physiology have influenced rules of competition; subsequent sports performances then validate how women and men are treated in sports competitions.

Gymnastic equipment is geared to slim, wiry, prepubescent girls and not to mature women; conversely, men's gymnastic equipment is tailored for muscular, mature men, not slim, wiry prepubescent boys. Boys could compete with girls, but are not allowed to; women gymnasts are left out entirely. Girl gymnasts are just that—little girls who will be disqualified as soon as they grow up (Vecsey 1990). Men gymnasts have men's status. In women's basketball, the size of the ball and rules for handling the ball change the style of play to "a slower, less intense, and less exciting modification of the 'regular' or men's game" (Watson 1987, 441). In the 1992 Winter Olympics, men figure skaters were required to complete three triple jumps in their required program; women figure skaters were forbidden to do more than one. These rules penalized artistic men skaters and athletic women skaters (Janofsky 1992). For the most part, Western sports are built on physically trained men's bodies:

Speed, size, and strength seem to be the essence of sports. Women *are* naturally inferior at "sports" so conceived.

But if women had been the historically dominant sex, our concept of sport would no doubt have evolved differently. Competitions emphasizing flexibility, balance, strength, timing, and small size might dominate Sunday afternoon television and offer salaries in six figures. (English 1982, 266, emphasis in original)

Organized sports are big businesses and, thus, who has access and at what level is a distributive or equity issue. The overall status of women and men athletes is an economic, political, and ideological issue that has less to do with individual physiological capabilities than with their cultural and social meaning and who defines and profits from them (Messner and Sabo 1990; Slaton and Birrell 1984). Twenty years after the passage of Title IX of the U.S. Civil Rights Act, which forbade gender inequality in any school receiving federal funds, the goal for collegiate sports in the next five years is 60 percent men, 40 percent women in sports participation, scholarships, and funding (Moran 1992).

How access and distribution of rewards (prestigious and financial) are justified is an ideological, even moral, issue (Birrell 1988, 473-76; Hargreaves 1982). One way is that men athletes are glorified and women athletes ignored in the mass media. Messner and his colleagues found that in 1989, in TV sports news in the United States, men's sports got 92 percent of the coverage and women's sports 5 percent, with the rest mixed or gender-neutral (Messner, Duncan, and Jensen 1993). In 1990, in four of the top-selling newspapers in the United States, stories on men's sports outnumbered those on women's sports 23 to 1. Messner and his colleagues also found an implicit hierarchy in naming, with women athletes most likely to be called by first names, followed by Black men athletes, and only white men athletes routinely referred to by their last names. Similarly, women's collegiate sports teams

are named or marked in ways that symbolically feminize and trivialize them—the men's team is called Tigers, the women's Kittens (Eitzen and Baca Zinn 1989).

Assumptions about men's and women's bodies and their capacities are crafted in ways that make unequal access and distribution of rewards acceptable (Hudson 1978; Messner 1988). Media images of modern men athletes glorify their strength and power, even their violence (Hargreaves 1986). Media images of modern women athletes tend to focus on feminine beauty and grace (so they are not really athletes) or on their thin, small, wiry androgynous bodies (so they are not really women). In coverage of the Olympics,

loving and detailed attention is paid to pixie-like gymnasts; special and extended coverage is given to graceful and dazzling figure skaters; the camera painstakingly records the fluid movements of swimmers and divers. And then, in a blinding flash of fragmented images, viewers see a few minutes of volleyball, basketball, speed skating, track and field, and alpine skiing, as television gives its nod to the mere existence of these events. (Boutlier and SanGiovanni 1983, 190)

Extraordinary feats by women athletes who were presented as mature adults might force sports organizers and audiences to rethink their stereotypes of women's capabilities, the way elves, mermaids, and ice queens do not. Sports, therefore, construct men's bodies to be powerful; women's bodies to be sexual. As Connell says,

The meanings in the bodily sense of masculinity concern, above all else, the superiority of men to women, and the exaltation of hegemonic masculinity over other groups of men which is essential for the domination of women. (1987, 85)

In the late 1970s, as women entered more and more athletic competitions, supposedly good scientific studies showed that women who exercised intensely would cease menstruating because they would not have enough body fat to sustain ovulation (Brozan 1978). When one set of researchers did a yearlong study that compared 66 women—21 who were training for a marathon, 22 who ran more than an hour a week, and 23 who did less than an hour of aerobic exercise a week—they discovered that only 20 percent of the women in any of these groups had "normal" menstrual cycles every month (Prior et al. 1990). The dangers of intensive training for women's fertility therefore were exaggerated as women began to compete successfully in arenas formerly closed to them.

Given the association of sports with masculinity in the United States, women athletes have to manage a contradictory status. One study of women college basketball players found that although they "did athlete" on the court—"pushing, shoving, fouling, hard running, fast breaks, defense, obscenities and sweat" (Watson 1987, 441), they "did woman" off the court, using the locker room as their staging area:

While it typically took fifteen minutes to prepare for the game, it took approximately fifteen minutes after the game to shower and remove the sweat of an athlete,

and it took another thirty minutes to dress, apply make-up and style hair. It did not seem to matter whether the players were going out into the public or getting on a van for a long ride home. Average dressing time and rituals did not change. (Watson 1987, 443)

Another way women manage these status dilemmas is to redefine the activity or its result as feminine or womanly (Mangan and Park 1987). Thus women body-builders claim that "flex appeal is sex appeal" (Duff and Hong 1984, 378).

Such a redefinition of women's physicality affirms the ideological subtext of sports that physical strength is men's prerogative and justifies men's physical and sexual domination of women (Hargreaves 1986; Messner 1992, 164-72; Olsson 1990; Theberge 1987; Willis 1982). When women demonstrate physical strength, they are labeled unfeminine:

It's threatening to one's takeability, one's rapeability, one's femininity, to be strong and physically self-possessed. To be able to resist rape, not to communicate rapeability with one's body, to hold one's body for uses and meanings other than that can transform what *being a woman means*. (Mackinnon 1987, 122, emphasis in original)

Resistance to that transformation, ironically, was evident in the policies of American women physical education professionals throughout most of the twentieth century. They minimized exertion, maximized a feminine appearance and manner, and left organized sports competition to men (Birrell 1988, 461-62; Mangan and Park 1987).

* * *

Social Bodies and the Bathroom Problem

People of the same racial ethnic group and social class are roughly the same size and shape—but there are many varieties of bodies. People have different genitalia, different secondary sex characteristics, different contributions to procreation, different orgasmic experiences, different patterns of illness and aging. Each of us experiences our bodies differently, and these experiences change as we grow, age, sicken, and die. The bodies of pregnant and nonpregnant women, short and tall people, those with intact and functioning limbs and those whose bodies are physically challenged are all different. But the salient categories of a society group these attributes in ways that ride roughshod over individual experiences and more meaningful clusters of people.

I am not saying that physical differences between male and female bodies don't exist, but that these differences are socially meaningless until social practices transform them into social facts. West Point Military Academy's curriculum is designed to produce leaders, and physical competence is used as a significant measure of

leadership ability (Yoder 1989). When women were accepted as West Point cadets, it became clear that the tests of physical competence, such as rapidly scaling an eight-foot wall, had been constructed for male physiques—pulling oneself up and over using upper-body strength. Rather than devise tests of physical competence for women, West Point provided boosters that mostly women used—but that lost them test points—in the case of the wall, a platform. Finally, the women themselves figured out how to use their bodies successfully. Janice Yoder describes this situation:

I was observing this obstacle one day, when a woman approached the wall in the old prescribed way, got her fingertips grip, and did an unusual thing: she walked her dangling legs up the wall until she was in a position where both her hands and feet were atop the wall. She then simply pulled up her sagging bottom and went over. She solved the problem by capitalizing on one of women's physical assets: lower-body strength. (1989, 530)

In short, if West Point is going to measure leadership capability by physical strength, women's pelvises will do just as well as men's shoulders.

The social transformation of female and male physiology into a condition of inequality is well illustrated by the bathroom problem. Most buildings that have gender-segregated bathrooms have an equal number for women and for men. Where there are crowds, there are always long lines in front of women's bathrooms but rarely in front of men's bathrooms. The cultural, physiological, and demographic combinations of clothing, frequency of urination, menstruation, and child care add up to generally greater bathroom use by women than men. Thus, although an equal number of bathrooms seems fair, equity would mean more women's bathrooms or allowing women to use men's bathrooms for a certain amount of time (Molotch 1988).

The bathroom problem is the outcome of the way gendered bodies are differently evaluated in Western cultures. Men's social bodies are the measure of what is "human." Gray's *Anatomy*, in use for 100 years, well into the twentieth century, presented the human body as male. The female body was shown only where it differed from the male (Laqueur 1990, 166-67). Denise Riley says that if we envisage women's bodies, men's bodies, and human bodies "as a triangle of identifications, then it is rarely an equilateral triangle in which both sexes are pitched at matching distances from the apex of the human" (1988, 197). Catharine Mackinnon also contends that in Western society, universal "humanness" is male because

virtually every quality that distinguishes men from women is already affirmatively compensated in this society. Men's physiology defines most sports, their needs define auto and health insurance coverage, their socially defined biographies define workplace expectations and successful career patterns, their perspectives and concerns define quality in scholarship, their experiences and obsessions define merit, their objectification of life defines art, their military service defines citizenship, their presence defines family, their inability to get along with each other—their wars and rulerships—define history, their image defines god, and their genitals define sex. For each of their differences from women, what amounts to an affirmative

action plan is in effect, otherwise known as the structure and values of American society. (1987, 36)

The Paradox of Human Nature

Gendered people do not emerge from physiology or hormones but from the exigencies of the social order, mostly, from the need for a reliable division of the work of food production and the social (not physical) reproduction of new members. The moral imperatives of religion and cultural representations reinforce the boundary lines among genders and ensure that what is demanded, what is permitted, and what is tabooed for the people in each gender is well known and followed by most. Political power, control of scarce resources, and, if necessary, violence uphold the gendered social order in the face of resistance and rebellion. Most people, however, voluntarily go along with their society's prescriptions for those of their gender status because the norms and expectations get built into their sense of worth and identity as a certain kind of human being and because they believe their society's way is the natural way. These beliefs emerge from the imagery that pervades the way we think, the way we see and hear and speak, the way we fantasize, and the way we feel. There is no core or bedrock human nature below these endlessly looping processes of the social production of sex and gender, self and other, identity and psyche, each of which is a "complex cultural construction" (Butler 1990, 36). The paradox of "human nature" is that it is *always* a manifestation of cultural meanings, social relationships, and power politics—"not biology, but culture, becomes destiny" (Butler 1990, 8).

Feminist inquiry has long questioned the conventional categories of social science, but much of the current work in feminist sociology has not gone beyond adding the universal category "women" to the universal category "men." Our current debates over the global assumptions of only two categories and the insistence that they must be nuanced to include race and class are steps in the direction I would like to see feminist research go, but race and class are *also* global categories (Collins 1990; Spelman 1988). Deconstructing sex, sexuality, and gender reveals many possible categories embedded in the social experiences and social practices of what Dorothy Smith calls the "everyday/everynight world" (1990, 31-57). These emergent categories group some people together for comparison with other people without prior assumptions about who is like whom. Categories can be broken up and people regrouped differently into new categories for comparison. This process of discovering categories from similarities and differences in people's behavior or responses can be more meaningful for feminist research than discovering similarities and differences between "females" and "males" or "women" and "men" because the social construction of the conventional sex and gender categories already assumes differences between them and similarities among them. When we rely only on the conventional categories of sex and gender, we end up finding what we

looked for—we see what we believe, whether it is that "females" and "males" are essentially different or that "women" and "men" are essentially the same.

REFERENCES

- Birrell, Susan J. 1988. Discourses on the gender/sport relationship: From women in sport to gender relations. In *Exercise and sport science reviews*. Vol. 16, edited by Kent Pandolf. New York: Macmillan.
- Birrell, Susan J., and Sheryl L. Cole. 1990. Double fault: Renée Richards and the construction and naturalization of difference. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 7:1-21.
- Boutlier, Mary A., and Lucinda SanGiovanni. 1983. *The sporting woman*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Brozan, Nadine. 1978. Training linked to disruption of female reproductive cycle. *New York Times*, 17 April.
- Butler, Judith. 1990. *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York and London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Carlson, Alison. 1991. When is a woman not a woman? *Women's Sport and Fitness* March:24-29.
- Collins, Patricia Hill. 1990. *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman.
- Connell, R. W. 1987. *Gender and power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Duff, Robert W., and Lawrence K. Hong. 1984. Self-images of women bodybuilders. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 2:374-80.
- Dunning, Eric. 1986. Sport as a male preserve: Notes on the social sources of masculine identity and its transformations. *Theory, Culture and Society* 3:79-90.
- Eitzen, D. Stanley, and Maxine Baca Zinn. 1989. The death/leicization of women: The naming and gender marking of collegiate sport teams. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 6:362-70.
- English, Jane. 1982. Sex equality in sports. In *Femininity, masculinity, and androgyny*, edited by Mary Vetterling-Braggin. Boston: Littlefield, Adams.
- Epstein, Cynthia Fuchs. 1988. *Deceptive distinctions: Sex, gender and the social order*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Fausst-Sterling, Anne. 1985. *Myths of gender: Biological theories about women and men*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fine, Gary Alan. 1987. *With the boys: Little League baseball and preadolescent culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1978. *The history of sexuality: An introduction*. Translated by Robert Hurley. New York: Pantheon.
- Gelman, Susan A., Pamela Collman, and Eleanor E. Maccoby. 1986. Inferring properties from categories versus inferring categories from properties: The case of gender. *Child Development* 57:396-404.
- Glasner, Barry. 1992. Men and muscles. In *Men's lives*, edited by Michael S. Kimmel and Michael A. Messner. New York: Macmillan.
- Hargreaves, Jennifer A., ed. 1982. *Sport, culture, and ideology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- _____. 1986. Where's the virtue? Where's the grace? A discussion of the social production of gender relations in and through sport. *Theory, Culture, and Society* 3:109-21.

- Hudson, Jackie. 1978. Physical parameters used for female exclusion from law enforcement and athletics. In *Women and sport: From myth to reality*, edited by Carole A. Ogelby. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger.
- Hyde, Janet Shibley. 1990. Meta-analysis and the psychology of gender differences. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 16:55-73.
- Jagger, Alison M. 1983. *Feminist politics and human nature*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.
- Jankofsky, Michael. 1992. Yamaguchi has the delicate and golden touch. *New York Times*, 22 February.
- Kemper, Theodore D. 1990. *Social structure and testosterone: Explorations of the biosocial chain*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Kessler, Suzanne J. 1990. The medical construction of gender: Case management of intersexed infants. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 16:3-26.
- Kessler, Suzanne J., and Wendy McKenna. [1978] 1985. *Gender: An ethnological approach*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kolata, Gina. 1992. Track federation urges end to gene test for femaleness. *New York Times*, 12 February.
- Laqueur, Thomas. 1990. *Making sex: Body and gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Levesque-Lopman, Louise. 1988. *Claiming reality: Phenomenology and women's experience*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Mackinnon, Catharine. 1987. *Feminism unmodified*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Majors, Richard. 1990. Cool pose: Black masculinity in sports. In *Sport, men, and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives*, edited by Michael A. Messner and Donald F. Sabo. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Mangan, J. A., and Roberta J. Park. 1987. *From fair sex to feminism: Sport and the socialization of women in the industrial and post-industrial eras*. London: Frank Cass.
- Messner, Michael A. 1988. Sports and male domination: The female athlete as contested ideological terrain. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 5:197-211.
- _____. 1992. *Power at play: Sports and the problem of masculinity*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Messner, Michael A., Margaret Carlisle Duncan, and Kerry Jensen. 1993. Separating the men from the girls: The gendered language of televised sports. *Gender & Society* 7:121-37.
- Messner, Michael A., and Donald F. Sabo, eds. 1990. *Sport, men, and the gender order: Critical feminist perspectives*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Molotch, Harvey. 1988. The restroom and equal opportunity. *Sociological Forum* 3:128-32.
- Money, John, and Anke A. Ehrhardt. 1972. *Man & woman, boy & girl*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Moran, Malcolm. 1992. Title IX: A 20-year search for equity. *New York Times Sports Section*, 21, 22, 23 June.
- Nafolin, F., and E. Butz, eds. 1981. Sexual dimorphism. *Science* 211:1263-1324.
- Olson, Wendy. 1990. Beyond Title IX: Toward an agenda for women and sports in the 1990s. *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism* 3:105-51.
- Prior, Jerlynn C., Yvette M. Yigna, Martin T. Shechter, and Arthur E. Burgess. 1990. Spinal bone loss and ovulatory disturbances. *New England Journal of Medicine* 323:1221-27.

Richards, Renée, with Jack Ames. 1983. *Second serve*. New York: Stein and Day.

Riley, Denise. 1988. *Am I that name? Feminism and the category of women in history*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Slatton, Bonnie, and Susan Birrell. 1984. The politics of women's sport. *Arena Review* 8.

Smith, Dorothy E. 1990. *The conceptual practices of power: A feminist sociology of knowledge*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Spelman, Elizabeth. 1988. *Inessential woman: Problems of exclusion in feminist thought*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Theberge, Nancy. 1987. Sport and women's empowerment. *Women's Studies International Forum* 10:387-93.

Vecey, George. 1990. Cathy Rigby, unlike Peter, did grow up. *New York Times Sports Section*, 19 December.

Watson, Tracey. 1987. Women athletes and athletic women: The dilemmas and contradictions of managing incongruent identities. *Sociological Inquiry* 57:431-46.

Wallis, Paul. 1982. Women in sport in ideology. In *Sport, culture, and ideology*, edited by Jennifer A. Hargreaves. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Yoder, Janice D. 1989. Women at West Point: Lessons for token women in male-dominated occupations. In *Women: A feminist perspective*, edited by Jo Freeman, 4th ed. Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.

Ah, Ya Throw Like a Girl!

Mike Messner

Although the sociology department at U.C. Berkeley is situated on the fourth floor of a very ugly post-war building, the place does have one thing going for it: the fourth floor balcony overlooks the women's softball field. There I have spent not a few fine afternoons in the past few years basking in the sunshine and watching some of the most talented softball players in the nation.

When I am joined on the balcony (usually only briefly) by my hard-working friends and colleagues who kid me about "taking the day off in the sun," I retort that I am actually doing *research* at this very moment. After all, I am doing my dissertation on "sports and male identity" (great thing about sociology: everything is data).

From Michael A. Messner and Donald F. Sabo, eds., *Sex, Violence and Power in Sports: Rethinking Masculinity* (Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press, 1992). Reprinted by permission of the author.

One spring day I was enjoying a beautifully played pitchers' duel between Cal's women and another top-ranked team. It was late in the game, with the score tied 1-1 when I was joined in my personal left field pavillion by a friendly and gentle man who is nearing the end of a very successful career as a sociologist at U.C.B. Suddenly, with a runner on first via a rare base-on-balls from the Cal pitcher, the batter drove the ball on a line into left-center field. The left fielder managed to run the ball down, turn, and fire a strike to the shortstop just at the edge of the infield, who in turn spun and threw perfectly, laser-like, to the plate, nailing the lead runner. What precision teamwork and execution! And the game was still tied!

My fellow fan smiled, as did I, and shook his head. "You know, it amazes me to see a woman throw like that. I always thought that there was something about the female arm that made it impossible to throw like a man."

I'm 8 years old and I'm playing Little League Baseball for the first time and my dad's the coach! It's my first tryout/practice and it's an exciting, confusing, scary affair, with what seems like hundreds of boys, all with identical green caps and leather mits facing each other in two long lines, throwing balls back and forth as fathers furiously race around coaching, criticizing, encouraging, demonstrating, and scrawling mysterious things on clipboards.

Later at home, my father informs me that there are two boys on the team who throw like girls, and that I, unfortunately, am one of them! By the next practice, he tells me, we will have corrected that problem. That evening, with glove and cap securely in place, I anxiously face my father on the front lawn. And we play catch. For quite a while. I am concentrating, working hard to throw correctly ("like a man"), pulling my arm back as far as I can and snapping the ball overhand, just over my ear. When I do this, it feels very strange—I really have very little control over the flight of the ball, and it hurts my shoulder a bit—but I am rewarded with the knowledge that *this is how men throw the ball*. If I learn this, I won't embarrass either myself or my father. When at times I inadvertently revert to what feels like a more natural and more easily controllable throwing style (more of a shot-put style, with hand and ball starting just behind the ear, and elbow leading the way), I immediately am rewarded with a return throw that sails far over my head and lands two or three houses down. "Run! Run after that ball! You won't have to chase it anymore when you quit throwing like a girl!"

Simple behavior-modification, actually. And it worked—I learned very rapidly how to throw properly. But it wasn't really the having to run after the ball that taught me: it was the threat to my very fragile sense of maleness. The *fear*—oh, the fear of being thought a *sissey*—a *girl*!

I was momentarily taken aback that a renowned sociologist would have such a "biological" explanation for gender differences between women and men. I explained to him that, indeed, "throwing like a girl" is actually a more anatomically natural motion for the human arm. "Throwing like a man" is a learned action which can, repeated over time, actually seriously damage the arm.

58

A few years ago, a sportswriter did an informal survey of major league pitchers, asking of those who had played Little League as youngsters just how many of them had been pitchers in their youth. The astounding answer: zero. Stories of Little Leaguers burning their arms out for life are common. The destruction of young shoulders and elbows has led to some Little Leagues outlawing curve balls. Others have even instituted systems in which adults do all the pitching for 8- and 9-year-olds.

"Throwing like a man" is an unnatural act, an act that (like most aspects of "masculinity") must be learned. Indeed, I learned it at a very young age, as did most of my male peers. And while I was on the front lawn with Dad, my older sister Linda was God-knows-where, but certainly not playing ball. Only this past summer did she join a softball team and learn how to throw a ball. She's a natural athlete who had to wait until the age of 31 to get some simple coaching.

Things change far too slowly for most of us, but it is a fact that things are changing. People are changing. As we men begin to question the traditional meaning of "maleness" and reject those aspects of the traditional male role which have been oppressive to others and destructive to ourselves, we discover new ways to be men. After a 15-year break, I, for one, have taken up pitching a baseball to a friend who used to be a catcher. I throw exclusively submarine-style (almost underhand) which does not hurt my shoulder like overhand throwing always has. And we do it just for the simple joy of throwing and catching the ball.

As women become more and more visible and competent at tasks (including sports) that are traditionally "male territory," our conceptions of masculinity and femininity are being challenged. While watching women play softball, my professor friend learned something about the social basis for traditional differences between men and women. My sister not only plays softball, but coaches her 9-year-old daughter Jennifer's team, where she is determined to teach the girls how to throw a ball accurately and safely, among other things. And with this kind of role model and a changing social context, Jennifer is a girl who plays with a sense of enjoyment and confidence that was never allowed her mother. She loves to play. And she even loves to be the "bat-girl" for her father's city-league softball team. The first time she went to clear a bat away from home plate, she was confronted by a boy about her age who said to her derisively, "There's no such thing as a bat-girl!"

"Watch me," she replied.

59