

self-identification, adds crucial context to our knowledge of residential assimilation among Hispanics—context truly different from the research on European immigrant groups, since no European groups ultimately were seen as black.

Chapter Six addresses a relatively new question in segregation studies: how to interpret the rise of stable, diverse neighborhoods. Iceland shows that from 1980 to 2000 in U.S. metropolitan areas, segregation among multiple groups generally decreased as diversity rose. But at the same time, growing diversity was associated with greater white segregation and lower African-American segregation. It remains unclear whether the greater white segregation stems from white avoidance of minorities or from growth among Asians and Hispanics, who initially would be unlikely to settle among whites. Multiracial persons are particularly likely to favor diverse neighborhoods.

Where We Live Now is a careful, even-handed and long-needed assessment of segregation at the metropolitan level. The appendix alone contains a wonderful primer on the nuances of measuring segregation. It draws judiciously on other kinds of research to suggest mechanisms for the patterns it finds. And yet, as the book's case study of Washington, D.C. illustrates, metropolitan-level analysis doesn't provide the whole story. In Washington, Hispanics occupy a middle space between blacks and whites, and African immigrants are moving to suburbs with a strong black presence. Even without being mapped, this example shows how much more one can learn by delving within the metropolitan level into the internal spatial distribution and the types of neighborhoods where immigrants live. Since Iceland has mentioned locational attainment under "future research," perhaps a complementary volume will someday be published. Yet as it stands, for decades to come this book will remain a critical citation on residential segregation, particularly for new immigrant groups.

References

- Lieberson, Stanley. 1963. *Ethnic Patterns in America*. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe.
- Massey, Douglas S., and Nancy A. Denton. 1993. *American Apartheid: Segregation and the Making of the Underclass*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Between Good and Ghetto: African American Girls and Inner City Violence*, by **Nikki Jones**. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2010. 211pp. \$22.95 paper. ISBN: 9780813546155.
- ZINE MAGUBANE
Boston College
magubane@bc.edu
- Between Good and Ghetto* is an expertly written and fascinating ethnography of the gendered racial dimensions of violence in the inner city. Many years ago, an important book in Black Women's Studies, *All the Women are White, All the Men are Black, But Some of Us are Brave*, emphasized how sociological research elided black women's lives. Prior to the publication of *Between Good and Ghetto*, sociological studies of violence had this same character. Books about violence "in the African American community" focused on men and boys. Books about violence among women and young girls focused exclusively on suburban white women (where such violence was seen as aberrant). Thus, the lives of African American women and girls were ignored. As Nikki Jones explains, "popular representations of mean girls who fight only with body language and relationships and not with fists or knives typify and reinforce mainstream beliefs about gender-based differences. . . . Yet not all girls can so easily cast aside any consideration of the use of physical aggression" (p. 20).
- Jones spent three years doing participant observation, direct observation, and formal and informal interviews with young girls in a distressed area of Philadelphia in order to understand how race and gender shape their experience of and response to violence. What emerges is a sensitive and penetrating account of the "uniquely gendered challenge" that young women in the inner city face (p. 7). African American girls must measure up to *two* competing sets of gender expectations. They are evaluated in light of mainstream gender expectations that impact

both black and white women as well as a unique set of gender expectations set by the standards of "Black respectability." According to the norms of "Black respectability" women and girls must be lighter in complexion, smaller in body size, and more refined than so called "ghetto" blacks who are stereotyped as dark, loud, and large. Because violence is an everyday reality, however, the girls must also live by the "code of the street" which dictates that inner city residents must have the mental and physical toughness to deal effectively with violence. Thus, the girls profiled by Jones must navigate a minefield of conflicting social expectations.

The book is concise and accessibly written, suitable for undergraduate courses in criminology, race, and gender. The sophistication of the ethnographic methods, however, also means that it is an excellent choice for graduate level methods courses—particularly those that aim to introduce students to feminist methodologies. The book unfolds over five lively and artfully composed chapters, which intersperse theoretical concepts with deeply textured ethnographic portraits of the young women as sensitive, sentient, and agentic subjects. The first chapter introduces the social settings within which the girls' lives unfold. Unlike many classical sociological studies of the inner city, the school, the "hood," and "the corner" come alive as *gendered spaces* peopled by mothers, grandmothers, and daughters who experience violence in different ways across the generations. Jones makes the important point that grandmothers and mothers often find themselves in the position of socializing girls to cope with violence. An important part of being a mother or a grandmother means being willing and able to engage in violence to help a daughter or granddaughter secure her reputation. In Chapter Two, Jones turns to a detailed explanation of how girls who define themselves as "good girls"—meaning they seek to avoid violence using strategies like social isolation, conforming to mainstream class and gender stereotypes, and relational isolation—manage actual and perceived threats. She notes that "the good girl consciously works within the bounds of normative femininity" (p. 73).

In Chapter Three, Jones turns her attention to the "situated survival strategies" of "girl fighters." These are girls who embrace identities that "distance her from what is commonly understood as gender-appropriate and respectable behavior" (p. 77). This chapter is notable for its artful use of Goffman's notion of the presentation of self in everyday life. Jones makes the point that for many girl fighters, their identities as violent people are "not really who they [are] but rather roles [they] play, a front developed over time...to facilitate interactions with others as well as movement throughout both [the] neighborhood and school" (p. 99). In Chapter Four, Jones looks at girls as not only perpetrators of violence, but victims of it as well—in particular gendered forms of violence like domestic abuse and rape. She makes the point that even girls who consciously embrace a "fighter" persona are not immune to gendered forms of violence, indeed "the expectations of manhood embedded in the code of the street, often encourage the use of violence against women and girls" (p. 18). The final chapter broaches the issue of policy recommendations. While the chapter is not extensive, it does highlight the need for policy makers to appreciate the unique, gender-based challenges that characterize young women's lives, and formulate policies with them in mind. Jones also points to the need for change within the black community itself, noting that "Black leaders who highlight and politicize the crisis of the young, Black male must give *equal* and *simultaneous* attention to the struggles of young, Black girls. ... Ignoring the plight of these young residents of the inner city wastes time, energy, and resources while simultaneously reinforcing the sort of gender politics that have isolated Black women in the past, to the detriment of the entire Black community" (p. 160).

The cover of the book features a striking mural of the face of a young African American girl. Jones writes that she was drawn to the mural because it reflected the "strength and sensitivity" of the girls she interviewed (p. xi). Jones does an excellent job in communicating that strength and sensitivity to her readers while, simultaneously, producing

a work of tremendous insight and immense sociological imagination.

Unveiling Inequality: A World-Historical Perspective, by **Roberto Patricio Korzeniewicz** and **Timothy Patrick Moran**. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation, 2009. 192pp. \$37.50 cloth. ISBN: 9780871544834.

GÖRAN THERBORN
University of Cambridge, UK
gt274@cam.ac.uk

This book is part of an ongoing re-direction of the sociological space of imagination and investigation, from the national to the global, and of comparative cross-national research, from the mostly "Western" OECD world to the globe. In this perspective, the authors note, U.S. income inequality no longer appears outrageous but in the middle.

The empirical base of the study is a set income distribution data from 96 countries, unavoidably of less than perfect reliability and comparability, but reasonably good working material in an imperfect world. Through cluster analysis they then divide their sample into three groups by the level of their Gini index of inequality. The Low Inequality group has an index value of less than 0.33, and the High Inequality group above 0.50. As is well known, the former includes Europe east of the British Isles and Portugal and west of Poland, with a few Eastern additions, plus Northeast Asia except China. The High group consists of Latin America, Sub-Saharan African countries, with shaky figures but plausible location. Just above the threshold is India, on the fragile basis of a single, unpublished study, diverging from virtually all other Indian studies, with varying adjustments for translating expenditure data from standard surveys into income distributions. China, Russia, the United States, and the United Kingdom are in the middle category, left out of most of the global analysis. The authors' empirical presentations are sometimes blurred by bad editing. The graph of

the three country clusters is in part so cluttered as to be unintelligible. Their listing of global deciles—calculated from Gross National Income, and not from household income—will require many readers to resort to a magnifying glass.

The book puts forward two main arguments. First, low and high inequality within countries are long-term stable patterns, and should therefore be taken as equilibria: ". . . the areas . . . today having low and high levels of inequality are for the most part the very same areas that had relatively low and high levels of inequality during or even before the eighteenth century" (p. 23). Second, the "ascriptive criteria" (p. 120) of national citizenship and the nation-state are the main culprits of existing income inequality: ". . . the nation-states . . . became the main axis for the articulation of inequality . . . over the past several centuries and continue to constitute such an axis today" (p. 111).

These are bold and interesting claims, which fail to convince, however. In part because the authors have little grasp of history, their claim to a "world-historical" approach notwithstanding, and in part because their predominant development economics focus gives little room or time for sociological reflection.

The alleged long, centuries-old division of high and low inequality countries is largely a fiction, entangled in a tangential argument about high income plantation slave economies being capable of generating much wealth in their time. Western Europe is the core of the authors' Low Inequality group. For two of the major European countries rather good historical data on income distribution exist. The French Gini index on the eve of the Revolution was above 0.6, a figure touched again under post-revolutionary capitalism in the 1860s. England and Wales in 1801 and the United Kingdom in 1867 were also High Inequality countries, with Ginis above 0.5. Scattered data and recent scholarly estimates from other countries indicate strongly that not so long ago Europe was a "High Inequality" area, the Netherlands had an index of 0.63 in 1808 and probably above 0.5 in 1916, and eight towns in Norway in