

M. C. Squire, Ed. (2000).
Culture in Psychology.
London: Routledge.

4 White girls and women in the contemporary United States Supporting or subverting race and gender domination?

*Michelle Fine, Abigail J. Stewart and
Alyssa N. Zucker*

There is a growing literature on what Lipsitz (1995) has called the 'possessive investment in whiteness', and Harris (1993) has theorised as 'whiteness as property'. These and other social theorists contest the view of whiteness as essential, and instead articulate the material 'worth' of whiteness 'for gaining access to a whole set of public and private privileges that materially and permanently guaranteed basic subsistence needs and therefore survival' (Harris, 1993: 1713; see also Ignatiev, 1995; Morrison, 1992). Whiteness is most evident, ironically, when it is denied or obfuscated as if only 'normal'. It is at once constituted by exclusivity and privilege and premised on innocence and deservingness. This innocence is maintained by Americans' preference for individual rather than structural explanations for social problems, including explanations that demonise 'people of color for being victimized . . . while hiding the privileges of Whiteness by attributing them to family values, fatherhood and foresight – rather than to favoritism' (Lipsitz, 1995: 379).

If US culture is organised in part through racialised, classed and gendered structures, relations and practices of domination that are justified in a language of freedom, choice and equal opportunity, then we ask the question, 'What about white women? What about girls and women who sit at the always contingent nexus of privilege and subordination – white girls and women who see too much, sometimes speak too loudly, or more often remain too silent and complicit at critical moments of domination?'

Hill Collins (1990) theorises that the knowledge and experiences available to us as individuals are determined, in part, by the positions in which we are situated within social power hierarchies. Drawing on the writings of Hartsock (1983), Hurtado (1996) and Hill Collins (1990), we find standpoint theory useful for understanding the analytic constraints and possibilities available to white girls and women now and in the past (for a revealing analysis of the standpoints of white slave-holding women in the South, see Fausst, 1996; for an analysis of the construction of masculinity from the standpoint of white English boys, see Frosh *et al.*, Chapter 3, this volume). In this chapter we discuss the complex forces defining both postwar American white girls'/women's position with respect to patriarchy and racism, and their choices to support or undermine them. We argue

that white girls and women perform an important role in sustaining or subverting the material and discursive hierarchies that organise cultural domination in America.

We present this story as if about white girls and women in US culture. But the analysis may apply to others in American structural arrangements who occupy positions of privilege and subordination within the same (contested) cultural space, including, perhaps, middle-class or advantaged racial minorities, successful black immigrants, and middle-class white gay men (see Guinier *et al.*, 1997). In a larger sense we may be discussing those men, women and children with one foot in the swamps of cultural subordination (see Apfelbaum, Chapter 11, this volume) and one foot in the stirrups of potential domination, torn by biography, loyalties and rewards. As post-structuralism has enabled us to understand that we all occupy many positions at once, we ask, 'Under what conditions do such liminal subjects – in this case white girls and women – collude in or subvert cultural domination?'

Almost twenty years ago Michelle Fine (1981) conducted an experimental study that provides interesting leads. In her study, sixty groups of three women (a victim, a non-victim and a victimiser) were situated in a context of 'social injustice'. The three engaged in a discussion and rewards were distributed unfairly, with the victim the clear undeserving loser, the judge the clear undeserving winner, and the non-victim privileged compared to the victim, but a loser compared to the victimiser/judge. All women were asked to rate the fairness of the distributions. Across conditions victims were most likely to challenge the distributions as unfair. Victimisers challenged least, and non-victims, *depending on the context in which they were placed*, selectively read the very same allocations as fair or unfair, deserving or not. When there was structural opportunity to appeal against the distributions, non-victims considered the victims' portion to be unfair; with no options for appeal, non-victims blamed victims. Non-victims, however, never challenged the allocations given to the judge/victimiser, while victims were most willing to challenge allocations to all three players; that is, to see and speak out about structural injustice top to bottom. In short, non-victims – those with contingent power and more to lose by a redistribution of the chits – were sometimes willing to 'help' or speak out against unfair treatment of the victim, but they never challenged the structural hierarchy of the distribution systems.

With two decades of hindsight, it now appears that non-victims occupied a position similar to that of white girls/women in the USA today: liminal political players, relatively (dis)advantaged; contingent on and providing comfort to the structures of domination; benefiting and benefited only relative to others at a greater loss; privileged and subordinated in the same sweep. While white women (like 'non-victims') often 'help', they rarely challenge the institutions of racialised domination *per se*.

We use the 'case' of white women to interrogate how our particular position of relative privilege and subordination operates in the racialised, classed and gendered hierarchies of the United States. This interrogation requires us temporarily to suspend attention to heterogeneity within the category of 'white women', though we recognise of course that it exists.

Frankenberg (1993) identified a set of discursive moves engaged by white women when addressing race. One of Frankenberg's discourses is most pertinent to our argument here: 'colour blindness', which she recasts as colour evasiveness and, more pointedly, as power evasiveness. By adopting this discursive white women promote notions of sameness and 'equality' in profoundly unequal times, flattening questions of power and injustice (see also Hollway (1989), MacPherson and Fine (1995); Miller (1976) for related arguments). This 'discourse of equality' may have offered radical possibilities in the 1960s when civil rights and feminism were (re)emergent in the USA, but in today's cultural shift to the Right it takes on a quite conservatising, blaming significance.

We have extracted from two studies – one qualitative and one quantitative – a set of critical commitments within this discourse of equality, in order to reveal how white girls and women can uphold or, alternatively, subvert deeply racialised cultural formations. We present data from one ethnographic study of a contemporary group of early adolescents (Fine) to document those practices (see Griffin, Chapter 1, this volume) in talk and relationships that constitute a discourse of equality in integrated conversations. We then document these same dynamics within responses to a survey of political attitudes of adult white women (Stewart and Zucker). This blend of methods and generations allows us to bridge a large methodological divide, while documenting how different groups of white girls and women understand their political positions and responsibilities for disabling or enabling racialised social justice.

Study 1: White girls patrolling the borders of race

In 1991, in New Jersey, the Montclair High School English faculty voted to offer an academically ambitious, multicultural world literature course – heterogeneous by gender, race, ethnicity, social class and academic history – in an untracked or unstreamed ninth-grade classroom, where pupils are around 14 years old. Michelle Fine engaged in an ethnographic study of this set of public high school classrooms from 1996 to 1998. Fine began observation in four classes of the world literatures course, one to two mornings a week, I met with the faculty every other week, and worked with a group of students who were writing over the course of two years (see Fine *et al.*, 1997a).

As we will see in the selected fragments from this classroom, educators are contesting dominant constructions of race, class and gender, attempting to decentre whiteness, and inviting youths to explore questions of 'difference' (see Fine *et al.*, 1997b). This is a classroom dedicated to intellectual rigour *and* racial justice. In reading a broad range of multicultural texts and genres, these young men and women – ranging from very poor to very rich, including whites, African Americans, Asians and Latinos – practise voices long sanctioned and those long smothered. Some listen to others, not always easily, not always gracefully. In the early months many of the white boys resist the multicultural core of the course, typically through silence. Many of the often very articulate white girls carry the torch of whiteness, often against African American girls. Fine extracts a set of

discursive practices engaged in by the white girls in this contested, stormy cultural space.

The cultural context: hierarchies of gender and race

It is October. Five students have been preselected by race and gender, forming an inner circle of conversation: one white female, one white male, two African American females and one African American male. The remaining fourteen students form a circle around them, and are asked to analyse how the 'group works together'. The observing students craft a joint analyses on the board:

The white male student sat at the head of the table, had the clearest and loudest voice, often tried to direct the discussion, frequently jumped in or even interrupted other students. . . . The white female vied for power over the discussion, often challenging statements made by other members and taking over the conversation when silences fell. Both the white male and the white female aligned with each other . . . when there was dissension with African American students. Both African American females made attempts to contribute to the conversation with one asserting her opinions, often arguing with the others, while the other was soft-spoken, seemingly uncertain about her own ideas. Their ideas were frequently challenged.

Jean Baker Miller (1976) named the gendered portion of this dynamic over two decades ago – that it is (white) woman's work to serve the patriarchy, know its weaknesses, keep the secrets and demonstrate loyalty – pretending, as Nell Painter (1995) writes, 'not to notice' the race politics. We share Baker Miller's (1976) view that women are assumed responsible not only for the maintenance of cultural hierarchies and the repair of cultural fractures, but also for keeping silent about the extent to which men depend on women, at home, work and on the street (see also Fine and Carney, forthcoming; Flax, 1990). And we share Painter's recognition that white women keep the secrets of patriarchy and racism.

If white women told the secrets of privilege, sexuality, danger, terror, violence and oppression, then the dependencies and fears that sustain the culture would be unmasked. But a substantial research literature shows that we generally do not tell (see Bertram *et al.*, forthcoming; Fine *et al.*, 1996; Gilligan *et al.*, 1990). In this class, as in the culture, white girls did not, for the most part, tell about the fall-out of racism, sexism or classism. But women and girls of colour more often, as in this class, did speak the critique (see Collins, 1990; Fordham, 1996). And as we have seen so often in US culture, these girls and women were, in turn, hated, demonised, silenced or banished for revealing hypocrites, domination and injustices (see Espin, 1998; Morrison, 1992). It is in this cultural context of domination that we can witness the discursive practices that sustain and, less so, subvert.

A discursive move repeated throughout the year may be categorised as *declaring universals and whitening out inequity*. Throughout the year, in this classroom comprising largely white and black students, ranging from poor to very

wealthy (with the black range enormous and the white range from middle-class to elite), there were many moments when African American girls spoke through a kind of critical conversation about social oppression and 'difference', or interrupted a smooth conversation about social relations. Such comments were typically followed by a white girl domesticating (making 'nice') the original comment, removing the sting, with what may be a 'relational' (*à la* Carol Gilligan) universal, which actually occludes the original comment, often intended to sting, to critique, to challenge.

To illustrate: Three-quarters of the way through the term, the students and their teacher, Dana, are discussing *Two Old Women* (Wallis, 1994). Dana raises the issue of social power directly:

Dana:

Is society really based on a hierarchy? Do we define ourselves hierarchically in relation to others? What if I said there is no such thing as better, less than or equal?

Joanna (white girl):

We were taught all our life we should be the best.

Nefertiti (black girl):

Not everyone.

(MF: **Here's the challenge to universalism.**)

Joanna:

Everyone wants an A in school.

Serge (Asian boy):

It's how a lot of people see things. But **it's a superiority complex.**

Sharon (black girl):

I have to disagree with Joanna. **Not everyone** is taught to be all you can be. Some are raised to grow up and try as hard as you can. Most parents don't talk to kids about getting an A. Half the time parents don't care.

Nina (white girl):

Everyone is taught being the best even though no one really taught us. It's there. *Everybody* gets it. And then there are those who acknowledge they are not going to be the best, but they know everybody thinks they should be.

A critical feature of the *equality discourse* (note the italics above) is its insistence upon universals. While Serge, Nefertiti and Sharon **challenge** (in bold) the universal claims, Joanna and Nina (in italics) elaborate declarations of universality. A decree for sameness both marks and unmarks the standard as the white self. A flattening of power inequities is attempted by a muting of 'difference' and, as you will see below, an assertion that everyone has 'choices'.

Within the same classroom, a second discursive move for 'equality' is the *insistence on everyone's 'choice' and therefore 'my innocence'*. In a discussion of the text *La Llorona* (Anaya, 1984), the story of Cortes colonising Mexico, partnering with the princess Malinche, the birth of their sons and Malinche's ultimate murder of the boys out of her belief that such an act would save her people, a small but vocal group of white girls rise quickly to blame Malinche. They insist that 'everyone has choices'. While Cortes' responsibility evaporates, students question why Malinche conspired with Cortes against her people (small

historic fact: Malinche was a 14-year-old princess who 'fell in love' with the Captain from Spain).

Dana (teacher): Maybe we need to recharacterise their relationship for a minute. She does have her forms of resistance – why does she go with the plan?

Paul (white boy): She's submissive because she loves him. She honours him. If you're in a relationship, you need to be submissive.

Laura (white girl): She's a sell-out. Like when bands trade in their sound to become more corporate. She sells out her people.

Natasha (black girl): She sells out her village, goes to new places with gold, but she realises she's wrong. Do you understand? She realises it's a mistake.

Cherie (white girl): Everyone has choices – even then.

While Dana (white teacher) and Natasha try to insert an analysis through power, Cherie resolves the conversation with a conclusion that everyone has choices. As Harris (1993) and Lipsitz (1995) asserted, the power of whiteness is not only in its material advantage but in its posture of innocence (see also MacPherson and Fine, 1995). The move to innocence and individualism severs its narrators, in this case white girls, from history, responsibility and cross-race solidarity.

Moving further into the semester, we can hear, from some, a *muting of racialised social critique*, replaced by a gender analysis. The class read widely internationally, globally, critically; now it wanders into India, late 1950s, with *Nectar in the Sieve* (Markandaya, 1954). Rykmani, an Indian mother who lives by dharma, fate, and asks few questions about why or what could be, befriends Kenny, the white, western-trained physician. Kenny prods Rykmani about what he sees as the ignorance and patience of her people.

Amid intense discussion about Rykmani and Kenny, Sondra – a young woman who calls herself African American but then explains, 'really part Puerto Rican, black, and part Native American' – pipes up, crawling out of her often silent mode, and says, 'Sometimes I think I would like to be white. I mean to have your' – she points to Steven – 'your house and cars and stuff.' Steven, the implied white boy, turns and assures her, 'If you try, you can have what I have.' Kito, a first-generation Dominican American, challenges notions of individualism and choice in a barely audible voice, after years in special education: 'But I do try hard. I try hard all the time. And I don't have what you have.'

Many African Americans in the class chime in to turn on Sondra. 'You should be proud of who you are.' 'You don't really want to be white. That's ignorant to want to be what you ain't.' Sondra tries to explain: 'It ain't about bein' white. It's about having what he has. Like if I was sittin' in a soft chair and you're in a hard uncomfortable one, you'd want to be switchin' seats. That's it.' She degenerates into apology: 'I'm not being clear.'

Chelsea enters the conversation with, 'You think it's easy being a white girl? Getting called white bitch in the hallway?' She speaks for a long time – over seven

minutes – responding in part to Sondra's muffled 'It's not easy being black and female.'

Again an African American girl in this class has opened a conversation about power and racism; again we hear a white girl insist upon an equality of oppressions, effectively shutting down the conversation.

In both fiction and non-fiction, we can find the power and courage through which women of colour articulate social critique, as in Audre Lorde's writing, Gloria Anzaldúa's (1987) 'tongues of fire', and Signithia Fordham's (1996) essay 'Those loud black girls'. And yet in this class, a practice of white girl etiquette is the rapid-fire rephrasing, softening or 'correcting' of what a black girl has just said. This strategy, aimed at alliance building, is often received as a form of discursive violence. The intervention whitens the original critique, converting it into a misunderstanding and/or a question of gender alone.

As we noted in our introduction, the pivotal white girl seat can both reflect and refract – in talk and in social practice – relations of domination. Thus it is important to close our ethnographic musings with an observation that it is also often white feminist girls in this classroom who pose powerful and direct critique around gender, and stretch to form a coalition with African American girls. Maya, in an interview about the course, admits, 'There are lots of ways to be smart. I went to school with so many of the people in this class and I never heard their voices. Maybe they're just not as comfortable speaking, or not a loudmouth like me ... but now I realise there are ways to connect where I never saw them before.'

In this strategic move, a small set of white girls practised and articulated a sometimes hesitant, perhaps naive *sense that change is possible*, desirable, to be grabbed and reachable. No cynicism here. The white girl *equality discourse* views change as good and achievable, and for this, feminist white girls pay a price to almost everyone for their optimism. To white boys and men they sound 'naive' or 'unrealistic'; and to boys and girls of colour they sound naive about the real 'micro-aggressions' (Franklin, 1998) and structural obstacles. This small set of girls are dreamers. They dare to call themselves feminist in high school. They know that something is wrong. The possibilities for multiracial activism sit, delicately and uncomfortably, in their hands.

Study 2: Surveying white women: documenting the power of feminism

Abby Stewart and Alyssa Zucker were poised to explore this issue in a different way, since we had collected survey data from adult women about their different views of activism, as well as race and gender inequities. Having discussed Michelle's findings with her, we were eager to assess whether signs of the responses she found might also be visible in survey data from white women. We also wondered whether different groups of white women could be identified, in terms of their views on the discourse of equality.

We had collected data from the University of Michigan alumnae for a study of three groups of women: those who identified themselves as feminists, those who

held some 'feminist' beliefs, but did not identify themselves as feminists (we called them 'egalitarians'), and those who did not hold egalitarian beliefs and identified themselves as non-feminists. In this way we could examine whether actually identifying as feminist was 'daring' and consequential in some way beyond simply holding feminist beliefs. Women were considered 'feminists' if they chose to respond to a set of questions headed 'The questions on this page should be answered only by women who consider themselves feminists' (and not those headed 'These questions are to be answered by women who do not consider themselves feminists') and they endorsed at least two of the following items: 'Girls and women have not been treated as well as boys and men in this society'; 'Women and men should be paid equally for equal work' and 'Women's unpaid work should be more socially valued'. Women were considered egalitarians if they endorsed all three of the items reflecting egalitarian feminist beliefs, but responded to the questions for women who did not consider themselves feminists. Women were considered non-egalitarian if they did not respond as a feminist, and they rejected at least one of the egalitarian beliefs (see Zucker (1998) for a description of the development of these criteria).

Because we had collected so much data on these attitudes and beliefs about gender and race, we began with the themes Michelle had uncovered, and identified items that assessed them. We then examined whether women in these three groups differed in their expression or endorsement of these themes. It seemed, for example, that feminists would be least likely to *endorse universals*, or to *protect gender and race hierarchies* (among other ways, by *suppressing critique*), and most likely to *envision alternative possibilities*. It seemed that egalitarians would be most likely to *endorse universals and individualism*. It wasn't clear exactly where non-egalitarians would fall on the different themes, but it seemed possible that they would be most likely to *protect race and gender hierarchies*. For the purposes of these analyses, we restricted ourselves to data from white women ($N = 301$), but our hope was to illuminate one kind of difference among them by focusing on these three groups.

The sample was drawn to represent three generations of alumnae, with an overall mean age of 47.² Because in this study women responded to items written by others, we couldn't capture the spontaneous expressions recorded by Fine in girls' conversations. However, because they responded to each item separately, and to all of the items, women could – in others' words – express a range of potentially contradictory views. We could find out whether the different elements of discourse which Fine had identified actually cohered in the perspectives of women with different relationships to feminist ideas.

Most of the women were married (75 per cent), and many were mothers (68 per cent). They were, on average, well educated; 37 per cent of the sample completed their education with a bachelor's degree, and the remainder were either pursuing or had completed advanced degrees. They had considerable experience in the labour force; 73 per cent were currently employed at least part-time and 20 per cent had retired.

As we expected, our three groups differed in the degree to which they viewed

the social landscape as including gender and racial inequality. (Except where specifically noted, all the differences we describe are statistically significant.) Feminists were most likely to rate white men as having more power than they should, and non-egalitarians least likely.³ The women also differed in their perceptions of the legitimacy of discrimination based on sex and race (Gurin *et al.*, 1980). Non-egalitarians were less likely than both feminists and egalitarians to reject the legitimacy of sex-based discrimination.⁴ They were also least likely to view race-based discrimination as unfair. In addition, egalitarians were less likely than feminists (though more likely than non-egalitarians) to question the legitimacy of racial inequality.⁵ Specific items from these scales, such as 'In general, men [whites] are more qualified for jobs that have great responsibility', are good indicators of the type of complicity required to *protect these gendered and racialised hierarchies*. A poignant expression of the motivation for this complicity lies in the fact that both egalitarians and non-egalitarians rated the item 'It is especially important to me to feel accepted by the men in my life' more highly than did feminists.⁶ In addition, both egalitarians and non-egalitarians also rated themselves as feeling more warmly towards white men than did feminists.⁷ These warm feelings and need for approval may indeed work to limit or constrain some white women's capacity to acknowledge gender and racial injustices, particularly when combined with an individualistic understanding of the origins of different social positions.

As we expected, the feminists were not especially prone to *endorse universals*; it was particularly the egalitarians who did. For example, over 80 per cent of feminists indicated that the current social system does not protect universal justice, by endorsing the item 'We must work actively to change institutions in society to be fairer to women'.⁸ Fewer than one-third of non-egalitarians endorsed this item, compared to fewer than two-thirds of egalitarians. Similarly, nearly one-third of the egalitarians and non-feminists suggested that universal principles do work well, by suggesting that the absence of discrimination against women was the reason for their lack of identification as feminists.⁹ One item assessed the tendency to see the linkages among different forms of inequality: 'I presently experience a much greater understanding of the connectedness of the women's movement and other movements against injustice and oppression.' Non-egalitarians scored lowest on this item and feminists highest.¹⁰

Beyond the acceptance or rejection of the legitimacy of inequalities discussed above, there was limited evidence about how these adult white women viewed white responsibility or innocence. There was, though, some evidence that egalitarian and non-egalitarian white women were particularly prone to *individualistic evaluations*. For example, the egalitarian women most strongly endorsed the item 'As I have grown in my beliefs, I have realised that it is more important to value women as individuals than as members of a larger group of women'.¹¹

Non-egalitarians most strongly endorsed an item blaming people of colour for their position in the social structure: 'People of colour may not have the same opportunities as whites, but many of them haven't prepared themselves enough to make use of the opportunities that come their way.' Feminists rated this item

lowest, while egalitarians scored between the two.¹² The tendency to view those at the top and bottom of hierarchies as deserving their positions is a key element in a worldview that supports the status quo.

The survey contained only one item that seemed to address the dynamic of white women *translating conflict into 'misunderstanding'*; it was non-egalitarian women who most strongly endorsed this item. Specifically, they indicated significantly stronger agreement with the notion that 'People make too much out of things that aren't meant to be offensive' than both egalitarians and feminists.¹³

Overall, it is clear that the feminists in the sample were least likely to express the elements of the discourse of equality so prominent among white girls in the classroom which Fine studied. They were also most likely to *envision possibilities* for different social relations. For example, feminists were more likely than the other two groups of white women to report that they 'want to work to improve women's status',¹⁴ to say that they want 'to make changes in society',¹⁵ and they were also more likely to participate in activist pursuits.¹⁶

Interestingly, the feminists recall themselves as having had more visionary perspectives even as teenagers at the age of the students in the Fine study. The survey asked women to describe the way they viewed gender-linked possibilities when they were teenagers, in eight domains. There were significant differences between our three groups on three of these, and nearly significant trends on three more. Feminists tended to be most likely to recall believing that a girl could grow up and be president, and that men could be the main cooks for their families. They were significantly more likely than the other groups to recall believing that women could pursue careers and have happy families at the same time,¹⁷ and least likely to believe that it was dangerous for mothers to leave their children in other people's care.¹⁸ In contrast, egalitarians were least likely to recall believing that women could be doctors and that women and men could do the same jobs.¹⁹

Conclusion

We conclude with a set of reflections on our findings. First, we note with some trepidation that across methods and generations, there rings a rather consistent and chilling *discourse of equality* through which many white girls and women express a conviction that contemporary US culture affords social justice by offering equality of opportunity by race and class to those who work hard and make wise choices. Some white girls and women use this discourse to support the conservatism politics that attack affirmative action, welfare, and access to higher education – all steps out of poverty and racism that are being cut out from beneath the feet of poor and working-class Americans, particularly Americans of colour.

For the women of different ages whom we studied, these practices of whiteness have four distinct 'moves'. First, we find a willingness to clean up the hierarchy by explaining away social injustice as misunderstanding, insensitivity and lack of intentions. Second, we find an insistence on 'universals' (that is, 'we are all the same'), and a concomitant refusal to hear about difference or power discrepancies. Third, white girls and women seem committed to the not-at-all-evident position

that 'we all have choices', allowing everyone to make a better life if she wants to. Fourth, white girls and women participate in an active muting of racialised critique such that when African American girls and women offer up their vibrant and often very critical analyses of racial and gendered relations, white girls and women often run to rescue the hierarchy. As culture is contested and domination challenged (even for only a moment), white girls and women may be the first to rebalance the status quo.

Beyond the shared discourse of equality, however, there is a second finding worthy of comment. Across the two studies, young and older white women who define themselves as feminist, those who avail themselves of feminist study and coursework and those who develop feminist consciousness may sometimes engage in this discourse of equality, but they do recognise the need for an ongoing struggle for both gender and racial justice, insist on the links between these forms of oppression, and endorse commitments to collective action. These adolescent girls and women are willing to see possibilities, and are ripe for multicultural coalition work. These women are, indeed, stretching the circle of 'we'.

It is important, in closing, to note that feminist consciousness is not only good for individual well-being – as several researchers have found (Ostrove *et al.*, under review; Tolman, forthcoming). Feminist analysis is also good for cultural well-being and global politics. Such consciousness provides white girls and women tools not only for analysing their own (potential and real) complicity in racial and class hierarchies, but also for moving from complicity to activism.

Notes

- This work was generously funded by the Spencer and Carnegie Foundations.
- The present sample is ninety-one women from the class of 1951 or 1952, 133 from the class of 1972, and seventy-seven from the class of 1992. The larger study included 333 women, with a response rate of 30 per cent; for detailed information about this study, see Zucker (1998).
- Non-egalitarians ($M=3.68$; $SD=0.84$), Egalitarians ($M=4.12$; $SD=0.79$); Feminists ($M=4.55$, $SD=0.62$); $F(2,265)=30.22$, $p<0.001$. All three groups differed significantly from each other ($p<0.05$).
- Non-egalitarians ($M=5.52$; $SD=1.18$), Egalitarians ($M=6.15$; $SD=0.78$); Feminists ($M=6.43$, $SD=0.63$); $F(2,268)=25.18$, $p<0.001$. Non-egalitarians were significantly lower than both other groups ($p<0.05$).
- Non-egalitarians ($M=4.56$; $SD=0.81$), Egalitarians ($M=5.07$; $SD=1.00$); Feminists ($M=5.49$, $SD=0.95$); $F(2,268)=20.57$, $p<0.001$.
- Non-egalitarians ($M=2.54$; $SD=1.06$), Egalitarians ($M=2.59$; $SD=0.90$); Feminists ($M=2.06$, $SD=1.04$); $F(2,267)=8.47$, $p<0.001$.
- Non-egalitarians ($M=70.21$; $SD=15.71$), Egalitarians ($M=71.78$; $SD=16.40$); Feminists ($M=59.25$, $SD=21.61$); $F(2,260)=12.11$, $p<0.001$.
- Eighty-three per cent of feminists; 62 per cent of egalitarians, 28 per cent of non-egalitarians; $\chi^2(2, 271)=54.67$, $p<0.001$.
- Five per cent of feminists; 28 per cent of egalitarians; 31 per cent of non-egalitarians; $\chi^2(2, 264)=28.13$, $p<0.001$.
- Non-egalitarians ($M=1.74$; $SD=0.98$), Egalitarians ($M=2.41$; $SD=1.09$); Feminists ($M=2.72$, $SD=1.05$); $F(2,266)=18.16$, $p<0.001$.
- Non-egalitarians ($M=3.17$; $SD=0.99$), Egalitarians ($M=3.29$; $SD=0.81$); Feminists

- ($M=2.96$; $SD=0.85$); $F(2,263)=3.59$; $p<0.05$. Egalitarians are significantly different from the Feminists ($p<0.05$).
- 12 Non-egalitarians ($M=4.72$; $SD=1.45$), Egalitarians ($M=4.10$; $SD=1.66$); Feminists ($M=3.61$, $SD=1.70$); $F(2,262)=9.66$, $p<0.001$.
 - 13 Non-egalitarians ($M=5.07$; $SD=1.46$), Egalitarians ($M=4.18$; $SD=1.90$); Feminists ($M=3.61$, $SD=1.83$); $F(2,266)=14.02$, $p<0.001$.
 - 14 Non-egalitarians ($M=2.02$; $SD=1.14$), Egalitarians ($M=2.23$; $SD=1.04$); Feminists ($M=3.05$, $SD=0.81$); $F(2,266)=30.77$, $p<0.001$. Feminists were significantly higher than both other groups.
 - 15 Non-egalitarians ($M=1.90$; $SD=0.63$), Egalitarians ($M=2.08$; $SD=0.70$); Feminists ($M=2.37$, $SD=0.67$); $F(2,268)=11.64$, $p<0.001$. Feminists were significantly higher than both other groups.
 - 16 Non-egalitarians ($M=12.28$; $SD=7.56$), Egalitarians ($M=13.64$; $SD=9.99$); Feminists ($M=20.35$, $SD=10.71$); $F(2,270)=18.85$, $p<0.001$. Feminists were significantly higher than both other groups.
 - 17 President: 62 per cent of feminists; 47 per cent of egalitarians vs. 54 per cent of non-egalitarians; $\chi^2(2,262)=4.81$, $p<0.10$.
 - Cooks*: 47 per cent of feminists; 31 per cent of egalitarians vs. 38 per cent of non-egalitarians; $\chi^2(2,259)=4.87$, $p<0.10$.
 - Career/family*: 81 per cent of feminists; 64 per cent of egalitarians; 63 per cent of non-egalitarians; $\chi^2(2,257)=9.16$, $p<0.05$.
 - 18 *Childcare*: 11 per cent of feminists; 25 per cent of egalitarians; 20 per cent of non-egalitarians; $\chi^2(2,255)=7.75$, $p<0.05$.
 - 19 *Doctors*: 95 per cent of feminists; 83 per cent of egalitarians vs. 93 per cent of non-egalitarians; $\chi^2(2,262)=8.56$, $p<0.05$.
 - Jobs*: 73 per cent of feminists; 61 per cent of egalitarians vs. 79 per cent of non-egalitarians; $\chi^2(2,263)=5.63$, $p<0.10$.

References

- Anaya, R.A. (1984) *The Legend of La Llorona: A Short Novel*, Berkeley, CA: Tonatuh-Quinto-Sol.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987) *Borderlands: La Frontera*, San Francisco, CA: Spinster/Aunt Lute.
- Apelbaum, E. (1979) 'Relations of domination and movements for liberation: an analysis of power between groups', in W.G. Austin and S. Worchel (eds) *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bell, D.A. (1992) *Faces at the Bottom of the Well: The Permanence of Racism*, New York: Basic Books.
- Bertram, C., Maruszka, J., Fine, M. and Weis, L. (forthcoming) 'Where the girls are', *American Journal of Community Psychology*.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Brodkin, K. (1998) *How Jews Became White Folks and What That Says about Race in America*, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Collins, P.H. (1990) *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*, Boston, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- Espin, O. (1998) *Latina Realities: Essays on Healing, Migration, and Sexuality*, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Faust, D. (1996) *Mothers of Invention: Women of the Slaveholding South in the American Civil War*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Fine, M. (1981) 'Options to injustice: seeing other lights', Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Columbia University.
- Fine, M. and Carney, S. (forthcoming) 'Resisting responsibility and responsibly resisting: a feminist analysis of social psychology', in R. Unger (ed.) *Handbook of Gender*, New York: Wiley.
- Fine, M., Genovese, T., Ingersoll, S., MacPherson, P. and Roberts, R. (1996) 'Insisting on innocence: accounts of accountability by abusive men', in M.B. Lykes (ed.) *Myths about the Powerless: Contesting Social Inequalities*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Fine, M., Weis, L. and Powell, L.C. (1997a) 'Communities of difference: a critical look at segregated spaces created for and by youth', *Harvard Educational Review* 67(2): 247-84.
- Fine, M., Weis, L., Powell, L.C. and Wong, L.M. (1997b) *Off White: Readings on Race, Power and Society*, New York: Routledge.
- Flax, J. (1990) *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and Postmodernism in the Contemporary West*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Fordham, S. (1996) *Blacked Out: Dilemmas of Race, Identity, and Success at Capital High*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Frankenberg, R. (1993) *White Women, Race Matters: The Social Construction of Whiteness*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Franklin, A.J. (1998) Personal communication.
- Gilligan, C., Lyons, N.P. and Hammer, J. (1990) *Making Connections: The Relational Worlds of Adolescent Girls at Emma Willard School*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Guinier, L., Fine, M. and Balin, J. (1997) *Becoming Gentlemen: Women, Law School, and Institutional Change*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Gurin, P., Miller, A. and Gurin, G. (1980) 'Stratum identification and consciousness', *Social Psychology Quarterly* 43: 30-47.
- Harris, C.I. (1993) 'Whiteness as property', *Harvard Law Review* 106: 1709-91.
- Hartsock, N.C.M. (1983) *Money, Sex and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism*, New York: Longman.
- Hollway, W. (1989) *Subjectivity and Method in Psychology: Gender, Meaning and Science*, London: Sage.
- hooks, b. (1988) *Talking Back: Thinking Feminist, Thinking Black*, Boston, MA: South End Press.
- Hurtado, A. (1996) *The Color of Privilege: Three Blasphemies on Race and Feminism*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ignatiev, N. (1995) *How the Irish Became White*, New York: Routledge.
- Lipnitz, G. (1995) 'The possessive investment in whiteness: racialized social democracy and the "white" problem in American studies', *American Quarterly* 47(3): 369-87.
- MacPherson, P. and Fine, M. (1995) 'Hungry for an us: adolescent girls and adult women negotiating territories of race, gender, class and difference', *Feminism and Psychology* 5(2): 181-200.
- Markandaya, K. (1954) *Nectar in the Steve, A Novel*, New York: J. Day.
- Miller, J.B. (1976) *Toward a New Psychology of Women*, Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Morrison, T. (1992) *Playing in the Dark: Whiteness and the Literary Imagination*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Ostrove, J., Deitch, S. and Stewart, A.J. 'Feminist identity and midlife women's well-being', under review.

- Painter, N.I. (1995) 'Soul murder and slavery: toward a fully loaded cost accounting', in L.K. Kerber, A. Kessler-Harris and K.K. Sklar (eds) *US History as Women's History*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Rollins, J. (1985) *Between Women: Domestic and Their Employers*, Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Taylor, J.M., Gilligan, C. and Sullivan, M. (1995) *Between Voice and Silence: Women and Girls, Race and Relationship*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tolman, D. (forthcoming) 'The ideology of femininity', Manuscript in preparation for Wellesley Center for Research on Women.
- Wallis, V. (1994) *Two Old Women: An Alaska Legend of Betrayal, Courage and Survival*, New York: HarperPerennial.
- Zucker, A.N. (1998) 'Understanding feminist identity in three generations of college-educated women', Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan.