Do Babies Matter? Gender and Family in the Ivory Tower. By Mary Ann Mason, Nicholas H. Wolfinger, and Marc Goulden. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2013. Pp. xiv+172. $29.95 (paper).

Dana M. Britton
Rutgers University

Despite recent dramatic advances in the educational attainment of women and their increasing movement into the fields of science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM), women are still underrepresented among the faculty ranks, particularly at the highest levels. *Do Babies Matter* argues that the most important factor impeding women's careers in STEM, and the academy more generally, is the difficulty women face in balancing work and family.

Mary Ann Mason, Nicholas H. Wolfinger, and Marc Goulden's conclusions are based primarily on analyses of the Survey of Doctorate Recipients (SDR) covering 1981–95 (except for the analysis of tenure, which extends through 2003). The authors supplement with surveys of campuses in the University of California (U.C.) system as well as qualitative data collected as part of this and other projects. The book is divided into six chapters. Four capture stages of the academic life cycle: graduate school and postdoctoral experiences, getting a job, obtaining tenure, and promotion to full professor through retirement. There is one chapter on faculty women's intentions to have children and their experiences being mothers, and a final chapter detailing policy recommendations to make the academy more family friendly.

With a few exceptions, Mason and her coauthors generally demonstrate that women faculty are disadvantaged by having children and by heterosexual marriage, particularly in the STEM disciplines. For example, compared to a woman without children, a woman with a child under six is 21% less likely to obtain a tenure-track position (and 16% less likely than a father with a child under six). Neither marriage nor the presence of children affect the rate of being awarded tenure among all faculty women, but the latter has a dramatic impact for women in STEM; a female scientist with a child under six is 27% less likely to get tenure than a similar man. Conversely, being in a heterosexual marriage increases the odds of tenure for both men and women in STEM, net of other factors. Women are more likely than men to be unmarried, to have no children at all, and to wish they had more children. The authors' surveys of U.C. faculty show that one-third of women between the ages of 40 and 60 have no children, and more than one-third of these women wish they had (which implies two-thirds have no regrets). Further, relying on an analysis of U.S. census data, Mason and her coauthors demonstrate that academic women differ from their presumably

comparable counterparts in medicine and law, delaying childbirth and having fewer children overall.

To provide explanations for these patterns, Mason and her coauthors rely largely on qualitative data from a range of sources, from interviews to comments in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*. These are stories of advisors suddenly unwilling to write letters for women graduate students who became pregnant, hostile department cultures—including an account from one woman whose colleague suggested she get an abortion—and department chairs and administrators who lack training about how to reasonably accommodate faculty parents. Mason and her colleagues also point to idiosyncratic features of the academy itself, such as the culture of long hours in STEM disciplines, the rigidity of the tenure clock, the inflexibility of the academic career structure, and a lack of access (relative to the high end of the private sector) to family-friendly options like paid leave, quality day care, and part-time work.

Mason and her coauthors conclude the book by offering a number of solutions to the problems faced by faculty mothers. Here Mason draws partly on her experience at U.C. Berkeley, where she helped develop and implement a range of policies intended to ease the stress of balancing work and family. Most of these will be familiar—tenure-clock stoppage, paid parental leaves, a part-time tenure track, dual-career hiring policies, and allowances by federal granting agencies that permit temporary interruptions of funded research. Indeed, many universities now offer some or all of these policies, though local cultures may still inhibit their use.

The utility of this book lies in its value as a resource. Mason and her coauthors present convincing data on how heterosexual marriage and family formation matter for women in the academy and particularly for women in STEM. Yet there are some important omissions. Because the SDR has no information on sexual orientation or same-sex couples, the authors' estimates of the prevalence of marriage are undoubtedly low. Race does not appear in the discussion of the results at all (though it is a control variable in the analyses), so Mason and her colleagues never discuss how the effects of marriage and presence of children might vary by race. If research on the "fatherhood bonus" in wages for all workers is any guide, it is likely that men of color do not benefit from having children in the same ways as their white peers. Controls for institution type are crude—Research I universities versus all other institutions—so the authors can say little about whether these penalties are attenuated for women in more teaching-intensive liberal arts institutions. And finally, perhaps due to limitations of the time series in the SDR, the section on promotion to full professor is brief and underdeveloped compared to the analysis of other career stages.

One other issue bears noting. I have observed a recent tendency in some research on the motherhood penalty to reduce all gender inequality faced

by women workers to the problems posed by family formation. Mason and her coauthors continue this trend, arguing that "traditionally conceived gender discrimination" no longer accounts for inequalities between men and women in the professoriate (p. 44, see also p. 85). I think this is a problematic line of argument that is contradicted by a range of studies, from experimental social psychology to qualitative interviews with women faculty themselves. Surely there is a need to address gendered discrimination in all its forms.

This book would be an excellent resource for women faculty and graduate students and would work well as a text in a course on gender and work. I find that students are often completely unaware that the university is a workplace like any other, with equally (and sometimes more) vexing patterns of gender discrimination. It would also serve as an excellent primer for university department chairs and administrators on the problems faced by faculty mothers and on the solutions that might make our institutions more family friendly.

Family and Work in Everyday Ethnography. Edited by Tamara Mose Brown and Joanna Dreby. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2013. Pp. xii+228. $89.50 (cloth); $29.95 (paper).

Michaela Soyer
Pennsylvania State University

In *Family and Work in Everyday Ethnography*, editors Tamara Mose Brown and Joanna Dreby have put forward a collection of essays that describe how having a family influences ethnographic data collection and interpretation. Authors Erynn Masi de Casanova, Jennifer A. Reich, Joanna Dreby, and Leah Schmalzbauer describe how being pregnant or being a mother opens up the field in various ways. Having children, we learn, eases the transition into the field and helps to overcome class boundaries. Schmalzbauer, for example, describes how being pregnant allowed her to "bond" with her research subjects and also led her to assess the difference between the Mexican mothers' outlook on parenting and her own (p. 82). The experiences relate to the Weberian or Geertzian perspective of the malleability of ethnographic data. Had the researchers themselves not been related to the parental sphere, they would have likely gathered different data and would have drawn different conclusions.

The authors overwhelmingly argue their children enhanced their work. The volume in fact challenges what the editors perceive as the artificial boundary between field and home. As Dreby and Brown write in the introduction of the book: "These chapters . . . demonstrate that the work family divide that so profoundly shapes ideas about our work and our home,