are better placed than others to successfully negotiate the kind of adoption, parenthood, and child-centered family that they want. For example, those same-sex couples with few economic resources in culturally conservative locations with minimal sexual community supports are likely to have limited options and choices with respect to adoption. In contrast, those couples who are financially well-off and who live in culturally liberal urban areas with access to organized sexual communities are most likely to be able to choose the kind of parenthood and adoption that they want. By bringing these issues into focus, Goldberg shows how heteronormativity as it links to gender and sexuality is not the only factor that limits new family possibilities in practice. Rather, class, race, geographical, and other positioning interacts with gendered and sexual positioning to delimit such possibilities.

One slight disappointment about the analysis presented in the book is the lack of consideration given to the links between the constraints and new possibilities encountered by gay adoptive couples and broader developments that are reshaping gay *and* heterosexual family life more generally (be they conceived as individualization, neoliberalization, or postmodernization). This omission raises the question of how the politics of contemporary family life in its broadest sense might be best conceived and the part that gay families and adoptive parenthood play in such politics.

Overall, Goldberg has written an engaging and accessible book that provides a benchmark for future studies of gay male adoption. The book makes a new and important contribution to scholarship on contemporary family diversity and to gay families and relationships in particular.

The Gender Trap: Parents and the Pitfalls of Raising Boys and Girls. By Emily W. Kane. New York: New York University Press, 2012. Pp. x+287. $75.00 (cloth); $23.00 (paper).

Allison J. Pugh
University of Virginia

At one moment in *The Gender Trap*, Emily Kane's account of how parents negotiate gender in childrearing, a mother observes that little girls are often told not to get dirty, but as for boys, well, "There are some days when those same parents just think . . . 'sit in the circle and don't punch anybody and I'll be satisfied'" (p. 113). Is this how far we've come? Are we still at a place where girls can't get dirty, while boys just have to try not to punch anybody? Kane's answer is both yes and no. Most parents she interviewed for this thoughtful, thorough book offered some essentialist explanations for how boys and girls are just so different. Yet most also tried to resist a gendered script dictating compliant, pretty femininity and aggressive, achieving masculinity. One of Kane's central points is the surprising degree to which many parents tried to push back against gendered structures, only to be forced back into reproducing those structures by the self-

reinforcing "trap" of gendered accountability to others—other parents, other children, even strangers weighing in on the street. Kane interviews 42 parents of preschoolers, mostly from Maine, who varied in their gender and class (and the gender of their children), with a handful of nonwhite and nonheterosexual participants as well. She divides them into five groups—"naturalizers," "refiners," and so on—that vary in how much they resist or reproduce gender and in how much concern they show for other people's judgments. She argues that parents produce their particular variant of gendered child rearing by balancing three factors: "their own beliefs about gender, the judgment of others in everyday interactions and the power of gendered social structures" (pp. 24–25). In the ensuing negotiation lie both the potential for social change and its constraints.

There is much to commend in this book. Kane is a sensitive analyst with an ear for subtext, which for the most part helps her to transcend the limitations of interview-based research—she helps us understand the powerful impact of other people and their judgments, even when we are not there to observe these everyday interactions. Kane sees the class privilege in one man's easy, laughing account of an encounter with his carpenter, who bore noisy witness to his son's gender bending, for example. In another case, a working-class mother who is trying to resist the gender binary comments that she doesn't "want my kids to feel like the oddballs out"; Kane suggests that some of the woman's uncertainty might come from the particular sensitivity she feels about "somebody making fun of him [her son]" (p. 192).

Kane also documents the tensions that arise when parents and children disagree, when either parent or child wants to depart from—or to follow—a more traditional gender script. She cautions against the most common mantra she heard—parents saying they teach their children that "you can do whatever you want to do"—as analogous to color-blind racism, obscuring the social structuring of gender that shapes children's wishes. The book is full of astute observations, such as the idea that often, especially for girls, the existence of conflicting messages offer them the "choice" of "whatever combination of essential femininity and traditional male activities they desire" (p. 79). For boys, meanwhile, the biological essentialisms invoked by the "naturalizers" not only limit boys' nurturing capacities but also "reinforce a set of structures and frameworks of accountability that could end up trapping their own children, and will certainly trap someone else's" (p. 80). Kane can call it like she sees it, sometimes beautifully.

Alas Kane's typology is difficult to keep straight. I ultimately could not understand why she chose to divide so few people into five separate groups that seemed to differ more in degree than in kind. "Some parents in all five groups connected a less gender-typed childhood with a healthier childhood," she writes (p. 152). "Most parents engage in a balancing act encompassing both [biological and social explanations of gender]" (p. 38). For example, Kane dubbed those who were more on the resistant end "innovators" and "resisters," with the former less perturbed by others' judgment and more likely to be fathers and the latter more resistant and more anxious

about it and more likely to be mothers. Why not combine these two into one, but discuss how there seemed to be gendered patterns in resistance and perceived consequences?

In addition, notwithstanding the class sensitivity noted above, Kane sometimes seemed a little blind to points of intersectionality, particularly when class and gender intertwined. "I can't really see how knowing about dump trucks is going to help you in college," observes one affluent mother (p. 148), noting how her preschooler could instead identify mammals and mollusks. While noting how the woman's class advantage afforded her some *confidence* to chart her own path, Kane labeled the woman a gender "innovator" when she sometimes seemed simply to be encouraging a different kind of hegemonic masculinity, one grounded in class privilege. In another example, Kane argues that parents who encourage a daughter's interest in child care are preparing her to be dependent on a man's higher wage, but thinking about the intersections of gender and class complicates that conclusion; the increasing threat of outsourcing for working-class jobs make face-to-face services like child care an option with a more secure, albeit low-wage, future, and thus not simply about curtailing women's reach.

Fundamentally, this book delves deeply into the meanings and practices of gender in parenting, offering concrete examples of the daily bargains and compromises that parents and children make and situating their negotiations in a palpable world of witnesses whose gaze parents feel upon them. Undergraduates will enjoy the real-world stories of gendered structures coming alive in interaction. The rest of us are likely to be surprised by what Kane found, either so much gender resistance or so much gender retrenchment—with both ably chronicled here.

Into the Fire: Disaster and the Remaking of Gender. By Shelley Pacholok. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2013. Pp. x+167. $50.00 (cloth); $21.95 (paper).

Sarah Thébaud
University of California, Santa Barbara

Can a disastrous wildfire undermine gender hierarchies in a highly masculinized occupation? This query is the focal point of Shelley Pacholok's *Into the Fire*, which examines the experiences of firefighters during British Columbia's Okanagan Mountain Park fire of August 2003. Locals described it as a "home-run fire" because it was fast and particularly devastating: in the end, it destroyed over 250 homes and nearly 26,000 hectares of forest. The analysis, which draws primarily on 36 in-depth interviews with a nearly all-male sample of firefighters, paints a picture of an occupational and organizational culture that has long venerated a hegemonic ideal of masculinity: bravery in the face of danger, physical strength, protection, competence, and aggressiveness are core aspects of firefighters' identities, both as individuals and as groups. Supplemental data from media reports and on-