to an ambitious and impressive list of seventy titles in the "Cambridge Studies in Romanticism." It is the third dedicated to theatre. Russell undertakes a compelling and pleasingly illustrated history of narratives that are peripheral to those which dominate late eighteenth-century theatre and involve women, extravagant fashion, calumniation and scandal, sumptuous masquerade, and the palaces of the *bon ton* of London. To this end, she recovers a lost history of women's participation in culture and theatre. She examines the expansion of kinds of entertainments in London after 1760, which consisted of theatre, opera, music, and masquerade, but also debates, public lectures, exhibitions, auctions, shopping, and the promenade.

Russell argues that to understand the political turmoil of the 1790s, including the revolutionary discourses of Romanticism like those of Mary Wollstonecraft, one must understand "developments in sociability and print culture" particularly as they relate to women and gender and the fashionable world of commercializing culture. In doing so, she feminizes Habermas's understanding of the public sphere, and proposes the idea of a "fashionable sociability," by which she means "a highly theatricalized and thoroughly feminized arena of social interaction" that was associated, in the main, with the female aristocracy and upper gentry. Among the new sites of assembly discussed by Russell are Carlisle House, Almack's, the Coterie, and the "pleasure dome" of the Pantheon; these member-only venues fostered novel types of social interaction that she calls "models of sociability" and "modes of theatricality" in which the sartorial splendour and masquerade of the patrons became the evening's entertainment.

Russell's study is fascinating because it refuses the public/private, domestic/professional dichotomies, associated with men and women respectively, which underpin so many conceptualizations of the period

and offer a much more nuanced understanding of something she calls "domiciliary sociability." It elaborates an emerging, feminized, upper-class, associational culture that lies somewhere between these dichotomies. Based on epicurean and hedonistic pleasures—music food, drink, and dance—she describes places in which political information and critique were circulated in semi-public locales that were usually organized by some form of private subscription. Her discussion moves from the periphery to the centre, from theatricality to theatre proper, and resolves in a few dramatic works of the period. These include Richard Sheridan's *The School for Scandal* (1777); the less canonical *The Belle's Stratagem* (1780) by dramatist and poet Hannah Cowley; and *Bon Ton or High Life Above Stairs* (1775), a two act after piece by actor-manager, playwright and producer David Garrick: all vehicles for the comedic acting ability of Frances Abington. Russell's analysis of these plays makes concrete a distinction that courses throughout the cultural entertainments she studies: that nascent forms of feminized urban sociability threatened institutionalized theatre, which saw itself as a more "legitimate," "manly," and "socially useful" art form. Not surprisingly, she reads Sheridan's play as a critique of fashionable sociability and female sexuality and a reassertion of "the model of male homosocial talk." The plays by women, on the other hand, she asserts, use domiciliary sociability, spectacular hairstyles, and divine decoration to symbolized female power. *The Belle's Stratagem*, in her treatment, is a response to *School for Scandal* and concerned with the same social phenomena, but in it Cowley treats the public women who control the play "not in the pejorative terms of disorderly whores, but as legitimate consumers of entertainment, print culture, the delights of scandal and, implicitly, theatre itself." *Bon Ton* goes one step further, using comedy and masquerade to "regulate social and moral excess" as well as to cri-

tique male efforts to appropriate and defend institutional theatre as more masculine, authentic, and socially valuable.

Ultimately, Russell's work is a careful and captivating study that reinvigorates the discussion of eighteenth-century British theatre and reinvests in it women's energy, their efforts, and their theatrical and cultural contributions.

Dr. Bird is an associate professor of theatre history in the School of Arts and Letters, Atkinson Faculty, York University. She is responsible for recuperating a significant body of lost plays by early Canadian women dramatists.

WORKING-CLASS STUDENTS AT RADCLIFFE COLLEGE, 1940-1970: THE INTERSECTION OF GENDER, SOCIAL CLASS, AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Jennifer O'Connor Duffy
Lewiston, NY: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2008

REVIEWED BY MARLENE CLAPP

In her text, *Working Class Students at Radcliffe College*, Dr. O'Connor Duffy examines the intersection of social class and gender in elite higher education. There has been a lack of research on how social class and gender intersect not only in the field of higher education but in the social sciences in general, according to O'Connor Duffy. The text also provides an in-depth look into a period of women's higher education history, 1940-1970, that the author's research indicates has been previously little studied.

Concern over a lack of access to the nation's most prestigious higher education institutions for students from underrepresented groups has recently been stressed. For example, Bastedo and Gumport (2003) noted that low-income and minority students are less likely to be admitted into the most prestigious higher education programs. Hoffman (2003) likewise pointed out that such students are more likely to attend less selective higher education institutions. In examining the time leading up to the Radcliffe and Harvard 1975 admissions equal access policy, O'Connor Duffy's book provides a timely and important account of the struggles of working-class women to gain access to one of the nation's most prestigious higher education institutions.

O'Connor Duffy provides a detailed overview of the literature on social class, the working-class in elite higher education, women in higher education, and the intersection of these three areas. For her research, O'Connor Duffy completed a secondary analysis of data from *The Radcliffe Centennial Survey* and also conducted a content analysis of archival documents from the Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Study and the Schlesinger Library. Combining quantitative analysis of survey data with qualitative analysis of documents helped to bolster the validity of the study. As O'Connor Duffy points out, researchers have urged mixed approaches when trying to decipher the complexities of social class.

While stressing that access to higher education is still an issue for students of low socioeconomic status, O'Connor Duffy's research is of critical importance in that it goes beyond issues of pure access to examine female working-class students' college experiences as well as their post-graduation outcomes. The research questions for the study specifically dealt with how undergraduate satisfaction and career outcomes differed due to class background and decade of graduation. O'Connor Duffy also took into account how historical developments both at Radcliffe and beyond may have impacted students' undergraduate satisfaction and career outcomes.

Social class shaped the undergraduate experiences of Radcliffe women more than decade of attendance, according to the findings of O'Connor Duffy's research. Additionally, social class also impacted Radcliffe women's professional attainment. Working-class students indicated more involvement in their academic pursuits and the labor force and exhibited a greater sense that their Radcliffe experience helped them to gain upward mobility.

In discussing the framework of her study, O'Connor Duffy remarks upon the importance of paying heed to the interaction of gender, social class, and race and ethnicity. Indeed, the period studied was chosen in part due to a lack of voice being given to Radcliffe College women who were not white and middle-class during that time. However, O'Connor Duffy notes that a limitation of her study was that sample sizes were not adequate to also account for Radcliffe women's ethnic or racial differences when examining the effects of their social class background. Further research is needed to study the interaction of race and ethnicity, gender, and social class.

As O'Connor Duffy notes, her text in part will help to increase class-consciousness at higher education institutions. As Tierney (2008) indicated, students who come to higher education with less cultural capital than other students would benefit from having their backgrounds affirmed rather than rejected. These students should not be viewed as "problems" to be assimilated into the mainstream campus culture. Acknowledging and honoring their backgrounds would not only lead to a greater chance of success for them but, because these students would also act as "social agents … [who could] produce the conditions for change and improvements in opportunity," (Tierney, p. 108) future generations of students would benefit as well. The research of Dr. O'Connor Duffy shines a light on the experiences of working-class women in elite higher education and helps to give voice to this historically marginalized group.

Marlene Clapp has ten years experience in the higher education field. She holds a B.A. from the College of William and Mary, a masters degree from Virginia Tech, and has worked as a higher education researcher since earning her doctorate in higher education administration from Boston College in 2005.

References

Bastedo, Michael N. and Gumport, Patricia J. "Access to What? Mission Differentiation and Academic Stratification in U.S. Public Higher Education." *Higher Education* 46 (3) (2003): 341-359.

Hoffman, Nancy. "College Credit in High School: Increasing College Attainment Rates for Underrepresented Students" *Change* 35 (4) (2003): 43-48.

Tierney, William G. *The Impact of Culture on Organizational Decision Making: Theory and Practice in Higher Education.* Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing, 2008.